

Red-Curious

ARCHIVE

www.TheRedArchive.com

ABOUT THIS ARCHIVE

Everything **/u/Red-Curious** wrote across the subreddits TheRedArchive holds: 290 posts and 4,798 comments published between June 2017 and June 2026.

About /u/Red-Curious. Most of the posts here come from /r/RPChristians — 218 of 290 — with the rest in /r/MarriedRedPill and /r/askMRP, and 3 other subreddits. The 4,798 comments come mostly from there too. Between them the posts drew 8,250 upvotes; the most upvoted is “Social Influence and Defying Context” (March 2018, 364).

About TheRedArchive. TheRedArchive is a free, public archive of the Red Pill community, built so that none of this writing can quietly disappear. It holds **1,737,515 posts** and **40,041,416 comments** from 45 subreddits and 58 blogs. Much of it survives nowhere else — the accounts deleted, the subreddits banned, the websites long offline. All of it is free to read, search and download, and always will be, at www.TheRedArchive.com.

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

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

Best regards,

/u/dream-hunter

Founder of TheRedArchive
August 15, 2026

CONTEXT

My wife and I are Christian. For the most part, I don't see much conflict between TRP/MRP with our faith. If anything, it's a return to how God set things up in the first place. It's important to note that due to our faith, divorce is not an option (not that either of us are contemplating this).

TRP/MRP EXPOSURE

Today is the first day I've discovered this sub and its related subs. Honestly, my faith was the inspiration for the changes before coming here (explained more below) - this, if anything, just seems to be a community of people with similar goals, even if we have different motivations for getting there. That said, due to being off work for a few days for the new baby, I've had the time to read several of the top posts, most of the current posts on the main subs, and familiarize myself with which books need to be read and their essential message.

MY STRUGGLE

During our dating years and early marriage (i.e. 2006-2012) I was pretty alpha and she loved it, but sex had always been an issue for us, even during that time (noting that we waited until marriage). Although I would initiate frequently, she often refrained: "My parents taught me two things about sex: (1) it's bad before marriage and (2) it hurts a lot. So, sorry if I'm frigid, but it's been ingrained in me for so long that I don't know how else to be." (EDIT: I should probably note that she has no difficulty finishing; I'm primarily aroused by the female orgasm, so we've only had sex 2-3 times in our marriage where she hasn't finished - a fact that I fully believe she would not lie about ... but she's never been willing to try for multiples).

For a long time I became very frustrated, leading into several arguments and ultimately a 19-month stretch without us having sex at all (8/14-2/16 ... to be fair, she was pregnant for some of that time). I pretty much gave up, losing all interest. As a result, after about the first 12 months of that (i.e. by 8/15) I handed the reigns over to her and I became a beta. So, she made most of the major family decisions, I stopped initiating sex altogether (I had continued trying to initiate during that first year), I let her be the primary parent in raising the kids, taking care of the house, etc.

PROGRESS

During that dry-patch I learned to become outcome-independent. In essence, I stopped relying on my wife to validate me through sex and began to realize that I didn't need anything other than God and to be the man he created me to be. Although the definition might be slightly off, I think my attitude was about as close to "OI" as a Christian can/should get. I started pursuing my own passions, independent of whatever her plans may have been, and I refused to back down on the direction I was going, although she still ran the show at the house. I also cut off porn and other harmful addictions (food, video games) around the same time (late 2014). I developed new ways of communicating through arguments that did not depend on "winning" or persuading her of my way or just always giving in to her way.

CURRENT

As a result of my changed direction, from mid-2016 to the present all major/heated arguments stopped, but there was still an unspoken dissatisfaction in the relationship until about 2/17 when I started getting my crap together. I lost 35lbs through a combination of dieting and frequent trips to the gym and am in good shape now. I became more decisive, taking ownership of responsibilities around the house (particularly including raising the kids), and not deferring to my wife on major life decisions (ex. job changes, new car, home remodeling, etc.). I make a good living (low end of 6-figures), and my wife is on par with me in her job. We now have 4 beautiful kids ages 5, 3, 2, and 5 days.

We've had sex a few times (5-6) in the past 12 months, up until she became too pregnant for it to be comfortable (about 3 months ago), at which point we mutually agreed to stop, which will last until after her 6-week recovery from the c-section. When we were having sex, I've tried changing from the normal routine, but as soon as I try to do anything different she either tries to revert back to her comfort zone or just cut things off entirely. Part of me still wants to stay in "screw it, I don't need sex" mode, but another part says that it would be a good idea to re-awaken that desire in me and try to develop a healthy sex life in our marriage. If I take the first option, sex will almost assuredly be a 3-4 times a year thing.

QUESTIONS

1. A lot of TRP/MRP thinking about sex boils down to this: be a man/leader and she'll be attracted to you. I'm in and started that process before even finding this place. But what if her hang-ups about sex have nothing to do with me in the first place?
 - I get the impression that the typical answer here is, "Get out of the marriage and find someone else." That's not an option I will ever take (nor will she). So, is the only alternative just to learn to not give a crap and go on living with a crappy sex-life (which I feel is where I'm at right now)?
 2. How successful have others been in stretching clearly communicated boundaries in sex (ex. "I will never do ____") through TRP/MRP practices within the context of a pre-TRP/MRP marriage? For example, BJs are off the table. I also tried to go down on her once and she cut things off on the spot, insisting I never do that again. Is this something where I should just give up and move on or does your version of "being a man" mean setting a goal and making it a reality, no matter how much opposition you face along the way/never giving up even if the goal is highly improbable?
 3. I keep reading that the captain has to have a vision. What if my vision for life has to do with helping other people and it doesn't matter whether crap gets done around the house in order to fulfill that vision (or that my standard of what does need to get done in order to live out my vision is much lower than the standard my wife expects re: her life goals/vision)? The result is that I'm doing what I'm passionate about in life in my personal time (after 4 years, I've finally struck gold), frequently asking her to join along, but it doesn't address the things she wants me to be passionate about/have a vision for. I've long since accepted this as a fact of life and moved on, but is this the right conclusion or just me being callous?
 - Most posts here just assume that the vision centers around improvement of your own living circumstances. I don't give a crap about my own life circumstances beyond a relatively low threshold, so I feel like most of the posts/comments I've been reading don't apply because they innately assume that setting a vision and working toward it will include home remodeling, doing dishes, getting a nicer car, taking better vacations, etc.
 4. Despite the fact that my passion in life has nothing to do with taking care of the home, I've taken ownership of our house and family anyway. It's exhausting, but Philippians 2:14 says, "Do everything without complaining or arguing," so that's what I do. I don't mention it to her, but she has let me know a couple times that she's noticed. Great/whatever (I only mention it to say this isn't likely a factor in the sex-related issues). Between that, developing solid eating/exercising habits, and an OI attitude ... what's next? Or is it just mastering the basics and learning how to make the past few months something sustainable for life?
-

EDIT: I should note, as this has come up a couple times: my house is not a pig sty. It's about what you'd expect from a family that grosses a quarter mil a year, and we hired a cleaning lady to come every other week. I have remodeled one of our bathrooms, redone our kitchen flooring, refinished our deck, painted rooms, hung shelves,

etc. The problem isn't that I don't do stuff, it's that getting it done doesn't matter to me or my vision for life. But I suck it up and do it anyway, no complaining or boasting.

1
UPVOTE

Do you introduce your wives to TRP/MRP or RPW, and if so: when?

27 June 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill · Archived copy · Reddit

[removed]

Context:

- Wife has noticed my efforts toward self improvement (primarily the lifting/exercise and diet, significant weight loss, etc.).
- Today I went to an out-of-county courthouse; a random 8/10 woman attorney at the courthouse sees me, goes to the part of the court I was in (she had no reason to be there), strikes up a conversation and asks what I was doing afterward. I smiled, answered the question and went on my way. In casual conversation with my wife, I told her about it playfully; she laughed and was playful back.
- Later in the evening, someone from reddit sent me a Facebook message asking a biblical question, and I answered it in my typical analytical fashion (I do this for lots of people). My wife noticed the chat head on my phone was a younger, beautiful girl and became very upset, coming to me in private saying that I'm not respecting healthy boundaries in our marriage and that I should be going out of my way to avoid conversations with other women that might lead into temptation.

My response - I never lost my cool. Said very boldly, yet calmly, "I don't think I did anything wrong. If someone asks for help, I'm going to help them. You have nothing to worry about; this girl has a boyfriend and lives in another country. I am not going to cheat on you with her or anyone else."

She continued to complain about the situation. I reassured her that she had nothing to worry about and that I also have a standard of healthy boundaries - that they might be different from hers, but that I'm not her and I know what lines I should not cross and I am not even close to crossing any lines.

Questions

1. Was my response DEERING? I noticed after the fact that I did defend myself ("I didn't do anything wrong"), I explained the situation ("has a boyfriend, out of country"), I made excuses ("It's okay because I'm not at risk of cheating on you with her"), and all of this could amount to rationalizing the situation.
 - If this is, in fact, DEERING, what would the appropriate red pill response have been? Just succumb and say, "You're right, I shouldn't be talking to any women who are young and pretty" (i.e. fogging)? That doesn't sound right either.
2. My interpretation of today's events goes something like this, tell me if I'm off-base: The accusations were a crap-test; the first incident probably raised her dread level, but she played it off (any thoughts on why?). Nevertheless, it made her insecure, so when the second incident came up, even though that was far less objectionable, she took it more seriously and was trying to use her anger to push me back into the box of her control, testing the strength of her frame against my frame.
3. Am I correct in understanding that the correct RP response was to do as I did: hold frame (i.e. not get upset, act as if everything is normal) and refuse to back down when I haven't violated any of my own personal standards or boundaries?

NMMNG for women?

28 June 2017 · /r/RedPillWives · Archived copy · Reddit

How old are you and how familiar are you with RPW? - 32M married to 32F. I'm brand new to any form of "red pill" but have been spending a ton of time the past 2 days on MRP and doing recommended readings. I find that I've already been living a good chunk of the principles by virtue of overlap with my faith, but haven't figured out totally to what extent yet (probably around half - but even that half isn't perfect). From what I've scoured of this sub and the other one for women generally, my wife's views probably already naturally align with a lot here (if not consciously, then by historical context of her life and upbringing), but I have not mentioned anything about "red pill" to her yet, so she herself is out of the loop.

What is your relationship status? - Married

What is the problem? - I'm reading No More Mr. Nice Guy and seeing a lot of "Nice Guy" traits in myself. I also see a lot of principles that might be very helpful to my wife. For example: accepting that it's okay to focus on your own happiness/needs and not put everyone else above you; all the stuff about covert contracts; caring v. care-giving, etc.

- What is the RPW position on these types of things (not necessarily as relates to men living them out, but in women's lives)?
- The book is obviously written to/for men, but is there a similar resource to help women figure out what they should do in regard to these types of issues too?
- Is NMMNG a book that she should read directly and find a way to apply it in a feminine context?

How have you contributed to the problem? - N/A (It's not really a problem so much as a question; I guess you could say I've modeled many features of "Nice Guy Syndrome" in our house, but I'm not sure if that's even a problem for women to live that way, hence my question)

How long has this been an issue? - For her, probably her entire life; for me, off and on most of my life, but at least the past 7 years.

What have you done to resolve this problem? - N/A

How long have you been together? - 9 year anniversary next month

Is your relationship long-distance? - No

Do you have an active bedroom life? - No

Sorry to those who might think I'm commenting too much. I'm an extrovert ... I can't just lurk for 3 months while reading sidebar. Rest assured, I am reading sidebar. Finished NMMNG in 2 days, will digest and review for a couple more days, then move on to WISNIFG, which I understand will take much longer.

That said, hopefully this is a less-often asked question (if it's ever been asked at all), so it can give you something new to chat about rather than the same old garbage.

In my circles, *The 5 Love Languages* is easily the most quoted and recommended book for married couples, regardless of whether they're having problems or not.

After reading NMMNG and lots of stuff on this sub, I'm starting to see a different side to things. Nothing is totally incompatible, but if you made a Venn diagram, the overlap is a lot narrower than I would have expected.

For example: 5LL peddles the idea that we should find our partner's love language and cater to them, even if it is not natural or desirable for us to do so because that's what's going to fill them up to give love back.

That's great, NMMNG also talks about giving out of abundance and not emptiness, so it's good to be filling each other's tank that way. But at the same time, 5LL makes no effort to encourage or even suggest that owning and adopting someone else's love language is necessary.

As a result, virtually every church-guy walks away telling his wife, "Physical touch is my primary love language" and virtually every church-girl who reads it walks away thinking, "Okay, I have to give obligation sex now because that's how I'm going to get him to do the dishes more often." I seem to recall Gary Chapman (5LL) does speak against doing things *quid pro quo*, but it's pretty much explicitly stated: "When you speak your spouse's love language, they will reciprocate."

Two huge problems with this:

- First, 5LL is almost entirely premised on the concept of fortifying covert contracts. "If you love your wife the way she needs to receive love rather than the way you want to give it, then she will love you back the way you need also." NMMNG says to cut that crap out of your life. As a practical matter, I've found that 5LL doesn't work in that way and the "Nice Guy" in most church-going men simply conclude (as NMMNG also says), "It's because I wasn't trying hard enough. I just need to give her even more of her love language in order to get her to give back."
 - Pastors peddle this and bolster it like Jesus himself said it, but I'm not seeing that in the Bible anywhere, except in relation to God. But with God the contract is overt and explicitly stated (Matthew 6:33, Psalm 37:4, for example). When we try to treat what he has said overtly as something covert, it comes off as us trying to use the Bible to manipulate God, which is obviously plain wrong.
- Acting out of obligation is not authentic, undesirable, and unattractive. I've read this over and over on this sub. "Do it because it's who you are; don't do it to make someone happy or because you *have to* - you don't *have to* do anything, and neither does she." If my wife followed the 5LL book to the T, we'd probably be having sex more often, but it would be crappy obligation sex. I've walked away from obligation sex dozens of times in our marriage because I hate it and it's unsatisfying.

What do you all think. Is 5LL compatible with RP thinking, or does it create a bunch of nice-guy, wife-catering pansies?

4

UPVOTES

NMMNG and Divorce

29 June 2017 · /r/askMRP · Archived copy · Reddit

I'm refreshing and reflecting on some stuff from NMMNG and noticed that over half of his examples of people who "finally got it right!" ended in divorce. He then commends these people for their strength and improvement, etc.

I totally understand why TRP would push this. After all, if you're becoming awesome and she wants off the awesome train, let her get off; or if she doesn't follow your rules for riding, you kick her off.

But isn't MRP supposed to be about preserving the marriage and rekindling the LTR? Should we accept concepts from the book but reject some of the author's conclusions? What do you all think?

The after/eternally persistent test ... ?

30 June 2017 · /r/askMRP · Archived copy · Reddit

Another user posted [this question](#). To summarize, suppose the conversation goes something like this:

Her: You'd better never talk to younger hot girls again. [Unreasonable demand; seems like an obvious ST.]

You: [A&A] Sure, but how are we going to get that three-way I bet you've always wanted?

Her: <> Cute ... but seriously. Tell me you're not going to do it.

You: [Redirect] Not sure what to tell you. You hungry? Let's go get some pizza.

Her: Stop playing games. Tell me you won't do it ever again.

You: [Nuke] You don't look good in red; especially when it's all over your face.

Her: <> I need an answer.

You: [Command Respect] I love you, but you can't treat me this way. I can set my own boundaries.

Her: Maybe I'd respect you if you weren't so evasive all the time.

You: [Assume it's really a CT in disguise; Distract with sex] Don't worry about it. <> We're good. <> You can count on me. <>

Her: <> Are you crazy? You're still trying to evade responding to me?

I know this whole situation is a bit obscene (and maybe I'm not far enough along yet to realize how test-passing mechanisms work), but the point is you've tried everything and she still wants to continue the conversation.

Is it really as simple as: *"I'm going to do what I want to do. If you don't like it, you're free to go"* and then walk away? What if she just starts following you around the house? You leave the house? Try to go to bed and ignore her? I assume these are all correct answers, but I'm still clueless :p

I get the impression that all of this "test-passing" stuff is really just evasiveness. That's fine, it proves that you don't answer to her and she needs to see that in her leader if she's going to submit to her role as co-captain. My wife often calls me "captain" or similar terms, but thinks she's an admiral sitting in the co-pilot chair with authority to evaluate my performance ... Regardless, asserting the role boundaries is obviously crucial, but is it just that the first several methods are a lot less jerk-ish than just saying, "I don't have to answer to you" every time she's angry? Sorry ... probably getting off topic now and I know any more questions down that line will just be responded with: "Read more sidebar!!!"

As a divorce attorney I have the privilege of seeing (1) why most marriages fall apart; and (2) how different family and parenting structures function in the context of the new relationships of my clients and opposing parties. As to the first point, that's why I'm at TRP/MRP - it's just plain truth, and I can't imagine a single male divorce attorney who would deny it (female attorneys have stronger hamsters, so I rarely trust them).

As for family structures that work, I've developed the theory I call "biological step-mother." It is based on this one infallible law of divorce and custody cases:

Men don't get custody after marriage because they don't live like they have sole, exclusive custody during the marriage. (Shared parenting is a conversation for another day). **Men must develop *subliminal custody* of their children in their wives' minds.**

LEGAL CONTEXT

Although laws are changing, custody matters always involve judicial discretion. This will never change. Period. That judicial discretion will always tilt slightly toward mothers, regardless of what the statute says. Why?

- Judges inherently respect history, even when it has been overruled. History dictates that mothers are default custodial parents. Many judges have been in the profession since before the law change and can't get the old ways out of their heads.
- The law still (and always will) assume default custody to a mother simply because the baby came out of her belly, whereas men can't know for sure who the father is (no matter how faithful she says she's been) until that DNA test comes back. Divorce law is slightly different from custody law in that it presumes shared parenting, but the legal bias from juvenile law is still subconsciously present because most DR (divorce) judges are also the JV (juvenile/never-marrieds) judges.
- Abortion law implies that children are the property of the mother. It's her body, so she can decide whether the child lives or dies. When the child is born, there is a slight change, but the legal context of "she decides what happens to her baby" subliminally carries over to DR/JV law.
- Most DR/JV judges are women. As to the few male ones, they are virtually always closet betas who put women on a pedestal. They act alpha because it's their courtroom and they have positional authority, but they have no internally radiating authority. They still crack jokes from the bench: "You're here because you didn't do the dishes like she told you, right?"

Can dads win custody? Absolutely, I do it all the time. But women don't believe this until it actually happens. This is key. Women make decisions based on their perceptions, not actuality.

Here are the two parenting structures that often result in stressed marriages.

TRADITIONAL BIOLOGICAL MOTHER

The biological mother has a unique and unashamed relationship with her children. She carries them in her womb, nurses them when they're young, and often takes primary responsibility for their basic growth and development. For all practical purposes, they are *her* kids. This is especially true for SAHMs.

You, as the father, are involved to the degree that she finds your involvement advantageous to the development of the children. If you start doing things she doesn't like, she throws a hissy fit or just leaves. More significantly, she

will undermine your relationship with the children in any number of ways.

TRADITIONAL STEP-MOTHER

Step-mothers respect the fact that her husband is the ultimate authority figure over the child. If the relationship went sour, she accepts the fact that she will have no custodial rights in the child. As a result, she does not take personal responsibility for the growth and development of the child, giving it to her husband. By placing him in charge, she sees herself as a helper who comes alongside him to assist in raising the child.

Unfortunately, step-mothers often maintain a subconscious emotional detachment. This is because of the custody issue. They don't want to form a close bond with someone when there is a possibility that they may never see that person again. I've heard it said many times: a woman's greatest fear is abandonment. In this case, instead of a romantic abandonment, it's a parent-child relationship that's lost. For women, this is too close a bond to risk, so step-mothers remain subliminally detached and allow their husbands (the birth fathers) to be the final authority and emotional rock for the children.

BIOLOGICAL STEP-MOTHER

This is a relatively rare phenomenon, but I find it often occurring when divorced or nearly divorced couples decide to reunite - particularly when the father has demonstrated that he is likely to get custody of the children, or at least shared parenting and that she would not be the default custodian. To be clear, if the father convinces the mother of this through emotional abuse ("You'd better never leave me or I'll take the kids" and she believes him), a different maternal structure develops that is distinct from the biological step-mother. I won't go into that here, but suffice it to say that it is harmful and usually results in unruly kids. The biological step-mother is when the woman respects the father's authority, rather than fears it.

When the traditional biological mother finally acknowledges that she does not have exclusive ownership of her children they become "our children." Many traditional biological mothers will use this lingo, but do not actually feel or experience this until it's concretely rooted in their heads: *The law won't back you up*. I have a distinct advantage here, being a divorce attorney. My wife knows that I will not position myself in a way where she would get custody and I know how to break through false accusations. For non-divorce-attorneys, the key in developing this frame of mind is to convince her this: **YOU, the father, are the PRIMARY CAREGIVER of the children, NOT HER.**

The perception of the "primary caregiver" is the overwhelming majority of custody law, even in states (like mine) where that phrase has been uprooted out of the statutes. Traditional biological mothers subconsciously rely on the default assumption that women are primary caregivers when they develop their approach to parenting. When custody is at risk, if they want to preserve the marital relationship their approach to parenting issues changes drastically.

This is when the biological mother takes on specific traits of a step-mother without losing the important value of the traditional biological mother connection either:

- She shifts parenting responsibility back to the father, accepting that he is an authority figure over the children **[because he has subliminal custody]**.
- She lives as if she is a helper whose job is to implement the leadership decisions her husband **[the subliminal custodial parent]** makes, as they pertain to the children.
- Her lifestyle around the house changes. She enjoys the comfort of living in *his home* rather than *her home* or *their home* **[because he has subliminal custody and her parenting time is in his home on his terms]**.
- She still has the same loving bond with her children that traditional biological mothers have, but she does not use that as a motivation to draw authority away from the father. **[She won't disrespect the subliminal custody**

arrangement, but will still love and long for her kids all the same.]

- The children are lovingly bonded with mom, but now are able to develop both a love and respect for their father, which the mother fosters rather than undermines [**because the children also subliminally understand that dad has custody - and side bonus, if you do get divorced, guess who they want to live with now?].**

YOU DON'T HAVE TO BATTLE CUSTODY TO GET THERE

This is where OYS is extremely vital. If the father doesn't follow OYS principles, the mother will never respect him as an authority figure over the children. He is essentially saying, *I want you to do all the responsibility stuff of a custodial parent, but I still want to have the positional authority*. Per John Maxwell, leadership is influence, not position.

The father/husband must take the following attitude, regardless of whether or not it makes legal sense to do so (remember: women do things that don't make a lot of sense too):

- It's my house. I have provided a place for my children to live and thrive. I've invited her to live here with me because that's what I want. I'm going to take care of the house as if it's my responsibility, just as I would if we were dating and she just came over a lot.
 - **NOT:** It's our house and we both have equal responsibilities to care for it. She'd better hold up her end.
- My time is my time, which I invest in raising our children. I invite her to enjoy my time alongside me because I like having her around. I'm going to use my time in a way that balances efficiency, productivity, and enjoyment for our family. As my wife, I am inviting her to participate in that efficiency, productivity, and enjoyment (with a few boundaries), but she does not rule my time.
 - **NOT:** We're married. We both have obligations to each other. We must allocate our time in a way that meets these mutual obligations.
- It's my money, which I invest in our children's upbringing. I set the household budget. Even if she's working, it's because I am leading her in her fulfillment of that role instead of her maintaining a SAHM role. I allow her to spend money within the confines of the budget that I have set for the family because it is helpful to me and builds trust for her.
 - **NOT:** We can each do whatever we want with our own income. Or, we each contribute to the marriage in different ways, so we both have a say in how the finances are spent.

CHANGING BRAIN PATTERNS

As a matter of fact, these assertions would not stand up in court if you were to get divorced. But remember, women don't want to feel like wives; they want to feel like the hot girl who's dating the bachelor who *has it all together*. That's why they felt all tingly before they were your wife and stopped when you started treating them like a wife (in the modern cultural context of how wives are understood, of course).

The stable husband mentality is, essentially, to live as if you are a single dad with sole custody of his kids dating a hottie who you like having around. It says: *"I have an established life, but I'm inviting you into my life. You are an outsider, but I want you here anyway. As you respect the fact that I am inviting you into my life, you will learn to enjoy the safety and comfort that my life has to offer you. I respect that you have independent wants and desires, but they will be exercised within the boundaries I establish for your participation in my life."*

The above mindset establishes step-mother thinking in her. Step-mothers often accept the fact that they are joining in on a pre-established system. They do so because they like that system. If the guy is beta, he'll let her change the system, but often she doesn't like what she makes it become, hence repeated divorces and remarriages. As has been

often said before: *Women don't know what they want*. When they think they do and try to get it, they are often disappointed. If their husband tells them what they should want and then fulfills it for them, one of two things can happen:

- She finds that he's right and respects him for knowing her so well and making her happy; or
- He's wrong, but she chalks it up to her husband trying something and it didn't work; it's his fault she's not happy, not hers. Incidentally, she's happy that she can blame someone else for her unhappiness.
 - This is unconscious salvation from the alternative: she fails to make herself happy, causing a mini-crisis because happiness becomes an elusive concept that is always beyond her reach. Take away her control over her own happiness and, ironically, she will be much happier.

PERSISTENTLY UNHAPPY WIVES AND FOOTBALL-LOVING GUYS

Some people complain that nothing they do makes their wives happy. They're just always sour. To them, I say: Keep up the *stable husband mentality*. Even if his method fails to make her happy repeatedly, she eventually learns to love his system anyway - not only because it gives her an excuse for her own internalized emotional ignorance, but also because she will feel fulfilled contributing to something beyond herself.

It's like when a man is happy that his favorite sports team wins a game. He experiences happiness vicariously through the players. His life has not actually improved in any way, but his emotional state does because their emotional state does. By developing an emotional commitment to that team, he has entered their system and allowed his emotional state to be tied to their successes and failures. Your wife does the same thing with you.

The problem is that if you've been failing for too long, she stops believing the victories matter. I grew up in Cleveland. Nobody really gets excited when the Browns win a game. There's a half-hearted cheer, but at the end of the day, they all know they're not going to the super bowl. But when the Cavs won the NBA championship and the Indians made it to the world series, now those are teams we can get excited about, even when they lose a few. Why? Because the potential victory is there. If your wife sees that you could be a super bowl champion kind of dad and husband, her emotional satisfaction will latch on to your victories, even if they're small ones, like the first couple games in a season.

It's also worth noting, if you see a team of fat and/or scrawny video game/porn addicts romping out on that football field, even if they win the super bowl by some miracle, you're not all that excited for the win, and you have no confidence in them for next season. You chalk up the victory to a fluke. That's why fitness is key: she has to believe you're a consistent winner, not a fluke-winner.

REGAINING THE STABLE HUSBAND MENTALITY

I'm not going to say much here other than to follow most of the rest of the advice on this sub and do the required readings. I'm done with the "course prerequisites" and will be starting the 101 series after developing my ability to apply the material from the prerequisites first.

But from what I see, the most important factor in regaining the stable husband mentality is simply to take over. Act like you're a single dad dating a hottie and you invited her to live with you. Even if you don't think she's hot, treat her like she is anyway. When she feels sexy, she'll try harder to be sexier. I started this process a few months ago (officially discovering TRP/MRP about two weeks ago) and am already seeing tremendous results.

- I consolidated calendars so I'm the one scheduling the kids' doctors appointments, birthday parties, swim lessons, etc. *She sees that I am the lead parent and she helps implement my plan.*
- I started organizing the crap shelf that's had mail and who-knows-what items sitting on it for the past month. *She sees that where she brushed responsibility aside, I get stuff done.*
- I straightened out the garage so it's an actual part of the home again, not the aftermath of a tornado. I fixed the

floor of the deck that caved in a week and a half ago. *She sees that her rule threatened our shelter [read: biological necessity] and mine restores and bolsters it.*

- I keep my car clean, whereas hers is a mess (even though I do most of the driving with the kids). *She sees that her life is chaotic, but I bring order in those exact same issues under harsher environments.* Next up: clean out her car too.

SUMMARY: Every woman looks at the rest of the world and thinks, "They have it *all together*. Why can't I *have it all together* too? I wish my life was like theirs." This is how cheating starts - desiring things outside the home. You want her to think: "My husband has it all together. I wish my life was like his." Now she is desiring you inside the home. She sees your system (which I now see is just another word for "frame") and genuinely can't resist wanting to attach herself to your life. She will still feel like an outsider for some time, but that's okay - you want to foster that a little. If she sees you as an outsider [Edit: assuming no other psychological barriers]:

- She will respect your decisions.
- She will let you parent your children and not undermine you with her emotional connection to them. Bonus points: when she sees you as the primary caregiver of the children, she internally realizes that her legal basis for custody is whimpering away, making her less likely to do anything that would instigate divorce.
- She will be happier because she is no longer responsible when things go wrong (it's not *our* mess; it's *his* mess).
- She will desire you. A simple note on this: ever wonder why people think marriage commitment sucks the life out of sex? Because she's no longer the outsider operating within your system; she sees herself as your co-equal peer. You don't even need dread for this to work (though it certainly helps). [Edit: Desire doesn't always mean sex or action conformity. Women desire things but don't do anything about it all the time. All you're doing is fostering a psychological condition in her that opens doors for active conformity and puts shiny things on the other side; she still has to choose to walk through, and women don't always make the logical choice.]

Best wishes guys.

65

UPVOTES

Dealing with the stressed wife.

7 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill · Archived copy · Reddit

As a corollary to my previous post on **The Biological Step-Mother mentality**, I should address the issue of wives who are constantly stressed out.

DEVELOPING THE PROBLEM

In my previous post I made this assertion as a core principle:

Women don't want to feel like wives; they want to feel like the hot girl who's dating the bachelor who has it all together.

How do "wives" feel? By cultural context, wives are always stressed out. This is true even if they're not stressed out. AWALT - they share what's stressing them and it becomes a comparison game. When they realize they're not stressed, they see another woman on Facebook or at the mall with a better life claiming to be stressed and have to hamster their way into believing they are more stressed so they can justify why their life isn't as good as the other woman's. This self-comparison game in and of itself creates stress and discontentment. There's some hypergamy behind this too, but I won't get into that now.

Wives will always blame their husbands for their stress, but won't always tell them they're doing so. The hot babe a guy dates will rarely blame him for her stress. He is her salvation from stress. Again, there's some hypergamy to this as well (he'll pull her up out of the muck), but I'll skip straight to this: Your wife wants to be the hot babe, not the wife. With her words she wants all of the technicalities of wifedom, but she doesn't want to *feel like* a wife. Why? Because wives are stressed and you were supposed to save her from that. The fact is, stress is unavoidable and inevitable; but the prospect of a savior at least gives her hope, which is the strongest force fighting against stress.

If she's still stressed, you weren't the savior she was looking for, so she either (1) looks for another savior, letting her hamster justify it, or (2) she lets the hamster spin even further into the realm of developing mental disorders to cope with the decision to stay with her husband. This is why all husbands think their wives are at least a little crazy. If she chooses 1, he's not her husband; if she chooses 2, he is her husband and she actually is crazy.

No. 2 most often comes in the form of depression, sometimes developing histrionic tendencies (i.e. addiction to drama, most often creating it through angry outbursts). When her mental state plummets, she can once again justify staying with her husband. "I really did marry up. Look how much of a mess I am! I'm lucky to have him to take care of me. Those other girls don't have to deal with this stuff; that's why their lives are so much better. I guess I should give my hubby some obligation sex to thank him for sticking it out with me through all this." The husband then gets the obligation sex and is totally dissatisfied, yet somehow jumping up and down at the fact that he actually got sex.

UNDERSTANDING THE PROBLEM

I've learned this lesson a million times over: **Women are stressed by thinking about what they have to do, not actually doing it.**

Most stress for women comes from comparing themselves to other women. When they make these comparisons, they begin formulating ways to make their lives more like the other women's lives. Unfortunately, these other women only reveal the best aspects of their lives, always talking about their stress, but never showing it, creating cognitive dissonance (the explanation on how is too long to get into here). Because it's impossible to live up to the displayed standard, this creates a never-ending list of things that needs to be done for your wife to accomplish her goal. At first, she deals with the minor stress because it is rationalized by the verbalized stress these other women

say they experience. Unfortunately, because hamsters can't run infinitely (even the brain can't compute infinity) and she can never compute a list long enough to satisfy the cognitive dissonance, the system overheats, the hamster passes out, and she can no longer justify how she's living her life. She is stressed to the max.

Interestingly, most husbands will notice that when their wives actually finish a project, they feel good about themselves. There is a sense of accomplishment. That is because the work itself is not as stressful as thinking about the work. The list is what burns out her brain, not checking things off of it.

SOLVING THE PROBLEM

Women need to have someone else think about the work for them, then allocate them actual work to do. Some guys (especially rich ones) take all the burden off her shoulders altogether by hiring everything out. Get a cleaning lady, hire a live-in nanny, get the boy down the street to mow your yard, etc. Some of these things actually increase her stress because it denies her the sense of accomplishment and her hamster has to justify doing nothing. Contrary to popular belief, women don't want to go shopping and lay on the beach all day. They want that in periodic bursts, but they need to feel like they're nurturing their husbands and children in some way. This is a God-given biological imperative for them.

The best way a husband can help his stressed wife is by taking the burden of thinking about the work away from her. Incidentally, we're actually very, very good at this because we're not trying to compute infinity. How do you do this? I said in my last post: take over. How do you do that?

OYS is one way, but here's a more practical solution that (1) gives immediate relief, (2) kick-starts a new tone for the relationship, (3) develop your wife's ability to trust your lead and (4) confuses the heck out of her, making her more susceptible to noticing the changes you're making without you bragging about them to her. Ready? Here it is:

Honey, for the next 3 days let's agree that you'll do absolutely nothing productive except what I ask you to do.

My wife laughed at first. "That's ridiculous. How will things get done?" "I'll be responsible for everything." "You can't do it all yourself." "You're right, I'll delegate tasks to you to help out." "So you're going to tell me what to do?" "Yes" [don't explain this away, just say "yes"]. "You don't even know what all needs to be done. You'll forget very important things." "Then I'll be responsible when it doesn't get done, not you" [she's going to eat that up!] "But it still won't get done, and we can't have that. These things are important." "When it doesn't get done, if it's important I'll find out it didn't get done, take responsibility, and will remember next time." "Well, what am I supposed to do when I run out of things you've told me to do?" "Whatever makes you happy." "What if being productive makes me happy?" "Then ask me and I'll find more productive things." "What if I just want to do the things that I think need to get done?" "Don't do it. Go for a walk, head to the mall, or watch some Netflix instead." "Okay!"

When you leave for work the next morning, "Today I need you to do the dishes, run a load of laundry, vacuum the living room, pick the kids up from school, and make spaghetti for dinner." "What about ___?" "I've got that covered. You just do those things I told you to do." It doesn't matter what it is - if she asks about it, you have to take responsibility for it or else you've just proven you can't keep your end of the deal. She won't give you slack because you're "new to this." Your newness is exactly why she'll be uncomfortable accepting this proposal. If you need to, allocate it to her the next day.

If your wife also works, assign her "go to work" as one of your things on the list and adjust your list to be realistic in light of the time she has at home.

If she has something on her list that hasn't gotten done in a long time, she'll eventually ask about it. Just say, "I'm responsible for that. I'll get it done in my time. If it's not done, you keep enjoying yourself and blame me if it becomes a problem." Inviting your wife to blame you does two key things: (1) it proves she can rely on you because

you're making yourself extremely vulnerable in an area where most guys won't be (they usually pass blame away), and (2) it takes the impact out of blaming you, so there's no point in bringing it up when she actually gets around to trying; eventually she'll just give up trying, seeing that throwing blame that you willingly accept doesn't do anything for her histrionic tendencies.

POTENTIAL PIT-FALL - She might still keep computing a list just in case you fail. Be ready for this. Ask her: "What else needs to get done today that I didn't do?" If she tries to answer, you stop her, make a buzzing noise and say, "I'm sorry, but the judges would accept 'nothing' or 'you already did everything.'" Seriously, though, I made a judgment about what needed to be done today and those things didn't make the cut. You don't need to worry about those things, I do. Let me decide what needs to get done, you help me do it. Got it?" Then secretly run to another room and make a note in your phone not to forget those things next time because you're an idiot and you forget things too. The difference is: you can handle forgetting things and doing better next time; she can't.

CONCLUSION - Women are stressed not by doing things, but by thinking about what needs to be done. Do that thinking for her so she doesn't have to. Get her to agree to this up-front so she doesn't stress herself out thinking about how to handle it when you fail. Let her cast the blame on you for things that don't get done, diffusing her ability to get to you in the first place. Test her periodically to make sure she's not secretly creating lists behind your back and learns that the correct answer is: "It's your responsibility."

CLARIFYING OI

This post is probably going to get a lot of heat because it draws a fine-line in the otherwise broad term: Outcome Independence (OI). TRP/MRP throws around OI like it must apply in all situations without exception. The implication of over-application of OI is twofold: (1) you lose sight of the consequences of your own actions, and (2) you undermine your MAP and the ultimate goal for which you set it up in the first place.

OI is often discussed in the context that *we should not become emotionally invested in the outcome of our efforts*. To do so undermines the authenticity of our change, and women can sniff out a phony from a mile away. That said, **it is unrealistic to assume total OI is possible, and the default conclusion proves this**. The default conclusion goes something like this: *If you desire me and start screwing me, great; if not, that's fine too, I can find someone else who will give me what I want*. There is a third option that gets left out of this mix, which is the only true OI: *If you don't desire and screw me, that's fine too; I won't cheat, won't divorce you, etc. I am okay with living my life alongside you even if I don't get what I want*.

The "ditch and replace" mentality actually proves you aren't OI. It proves that you are emotionally invested in the outcome of your efforts, which is why you can't stay with her if she won't give you what you want. You must find someone else who will give you that outcome instead. So, what gets passed around as being OI is really a way of saying, "Don't be true OI, but do break oneitis. True OI is BP."

To that end, here is a foundational truth upon which the rest of this post is grounded: **Husbands have actual desires and it matters to us if they're not being met. There is nothing wrong with adjusting probability in our favor, as long as we accept the alternate probability as a real occurrence and not just a theory - and we don't let that occurrence hinder our ongoing efforts toward probabilistic stage-setting.**

WHAT IS A CONFIDENCE INTERVAL (CI)?

Suppose I want to get my protein up for the day. I buy lots of chicken and separate them into 8oz sections. On average, these 8oz sections have approximately 72g of protein, but none of them has exactly this much. One might have 68 and another might have 77. The total distribution of these numbers on a graph would look something like [this](#). The horizontal axis represents how many grams of protein each chicken has, the vertical represents how many chickens in your sample have that many grams. How narrow or wide the curve appears is called 'standard deviation.' If it's normal for 8oz of chicken to have 60g or 84g of protein, we'd have a wide curve; if the range is typically more like 70-74, we'd have a narrow curve.

Now, your sample produced an average of 72g of protein. What if you bought another batch of chicken and got an average of 68g? Then another batch gives you an average of 77g? The more information you have, the more confident you become about the actual average protein amount for all 8oz chicken slabs everywhere in the world.

At some point, you can calculate from the average and standard deviation different degrees of confidence for what that true average actually is (rather than the sample size averages). For example:

- I might be 95% confident that the actual average is between 70g and 72g
- 90% confident that it's between 71.6g and 72.3g, or
- 99% confident it is between 65g and 80g.

WHAT DOES THIS HAVE TO DO WITH MY MARRIAGE?

We are creatures of habit. We have biological and social conditioning that shapes the way we think and process information. Newton's first law of motion is: *An objection in motion stays in motion unless an external force interferes*. Our decision-making patterns are the same. We will keep making the same decisions toward the same destination until some external force/motivator bumps our direction or alters our speed. This could be a lack of sex, declining fuzzies from the husband, observing someone else's marriage, discovering TRP/MRP, or any other number of external influences. But for the most part, even if they're unhappy, many women prefer the security that comes with consistency as being of greater significance than their unhappiness, and thus will be fairly consistent in their behavior patterns as established by biology and social conditioning (MMSLP talks about this in more detail).

Assuming these principles can be relied upon (as most of the required reading in the sidebar presumes), every day of interaction with our spouse gives us a set of data points. There are two directions confidence intervals move from here:

- **UNIVERSAL CI:** When we compare our spouse's data points with our neighbor's, co-worker's, friend's, etc. we now have multiple samples. Collectively, we start to see a collective average that describes the totality of all women. **This is where phrases like "AWALT" come from.**
- Alternatively, if I look at my wife's interactions in one day as one set of data points, then another day as another sample of data points, and eventually get to a month of data points, I can develop a degree of confidence in a range of possible reactions that are relatively close together. For example, if I sneak up and wrap my arms around her from behind while she's looking out the window:
 - I can be 100% confident that her reaction will be somewhere between *complaining she doesn't want to be touched* and *screwing me on the the floor right there*.
 - I can be 95% confident that it could be between *neutral reaction* and *starting to get a little wet*.
 - I can be 90% confident that her reaction will be somewhere between *a smile and a happy sigh* and *turning around and kissing me*.

SUBCONSCIOUS INTERVALS

Whether we like it or not, we are all operating under these subconscious confidence intervals. We have established patterns of living with our spouses that influence how we interact around them. Here are a few things to consider:

- Men who first discover TRP/MRP (myself included) have experienced an external force that moves us in a different direction. So, our responses to her behaviors are intentionally/consciously different, which starts to change her subconscious impressions of us. Because this starts in the subconscious, it takes time to fully change how she perceives us as the new, better men we're trying to become.
 - Note: I do not count ordinarily occurring stimuli as external forces, even if they are external. For example, my wife often gets jealous of aspects of her sister's life. When she comes back from visiting her sister, she has experienced an external stimuli affecting her response patterns, but it's one for which I have already figured out the ordinary data points and have adjusted my subconscious formula for how to deal with her in those situations.
- Her subconscious expects us to act a certain way toward her when we get home from work, and it also has a pre-prepared response to that anticipated action. This is operating within the "typical" or "average" under the system as it has always been. We understand and expect a possible range of behaviors (our confidence interval) and the

possibility that someone might act outside that range, but for the most part our predictability remains in tact. This is why DB marriages stay DB marriages until something changes. Things don't magically get better one day.

Here's where things get important: **Operating on subconscious principles is beta/BP. Alpha/RP is about being conscious and intentional with what we do.**

- What if a new pill was discovered that could safely put chicken on more steroids and increase protein count per oz? That previous confidence interval is no longer 95% for 70-72g, it's now 90% for 120-125g. It takes more time for us to measure and adjust to the new expectations, and someone has to put in more effort to feed the chickens differently, but the norm has now changed.
 - When men take the red pill, it's like putting those chickens on steroids. It would be stupid to expect the same response to a different set of stimuli. That said, there is a lag between subconscious expectation and actual changed interaction.
- I suspect that RP guys who have been RP for a long time (from what I've observed in RP marriages in my legal practice) eventually have just adapted to the new norm and now have a new subconscious set of confidence intervals that they have established with their wives, and those wives have established on them. **These marriages also fail. Why? Because something is lost when we operate subconsciously instead of intentionally - it's still beta, even if it has the appearance of alpha.** That is why I think I still see alpha men who give good fuzzies still end up in boring DB relationships. They are coasting on a previously successful balance of alpha/beta traits rather than maintaining intentionality.

OI AND CI

When people on this sub say to be OI, it's usually in the context of not letting your wife's reactions affect your drive for self improvement. But at the same time, there's no point in self-improvement if it doesn't make us happy; and sometimes we require things outside our own internal psychology to make us happy. If I get lost in the desert with no food, I can mentally tell myself to be happy all I want, but the fact is that I'm starving. That experience of starving has an actual impact on me and will eventually affect my emotional state whether I like it or not.

Likewise, if I'm in a DB marriage, I can mentally tell myself to be happy all I want, but the fact is that I have a biological imperative that's not being satisfied. Again, "ditch and replace" isn't really OI; it's just finding someone else who will give the outcome I want, proving I actually am still invested in the outcome. All I've done with that mentality is broken my oneitis and blamed oneitis for my dissatisfaction (which in some cases might legitimately be the problem). As a post on TRP/MRP (can't remember which) recently said, "Guys, yes it's good to focus on self-improvement, but let's remember that this sub is still about sexual strategy." Self-improvement and becoming "OI" (in the more appropriate uses of the term) are not the end in and of themselves; they're more like catch-22 principles whereby you get your goal by abandoning the goal. But you still have a goal, and that's okay ... otherwise no one would be here.

There is nothing wrong with establishing new patterns of living and developing confidence in the expected results of that new pattern. Being OI doesn't mean we are forbidden from becoming invested in those results; it means that we accept the fact that we're only operating on confidence intervals and not absolutes. We should expect that for a 95% interval our SOs "typical reaction" will actually be atypical 5% of the time. That's okay.

If we start seeing things like 7 or 8 times out of 20 instead, it means one of two things:

- There are additional variables that we have failed to account for.
- She has been moved by an external force as well.

PROBABILISTIC STAGE-SETTING

I used to call this "psychological conditioning," but that sounds way too negative for what I actually mean. The idea is that we are all here because we have goals and desires that we want to see met in our lives. If you don't have any goals or desires, you're not alpha. Period. If you do have goals and desires, you should expect them to be met as a result of your actions. This is not "covert" anything - it's just a fact of life. We are allowed to have expectations.

Covert contracts are about establishing a system of absolutes. We develop hard, rather than soft expectations. When we develop a mindset of probabilistic outcomes, we can create the emotional detachment that the OI mentality seeks while still maintaining appropriate focus on the end-result. For example, if I try to initiate sex with my wife and she rejects me, I accept this as a possible outcome of the probabilistic stage I have set. If she rejects me 90% of the time, I have set a very crappy stage at fostering a healthy sex-life. As the man, I am responsible for setting that stage because she is incapable of setting a stage whereby she is attracted to me. If she tries, my changes are not authentic - they are extremely beta in an effort to please her.

In response, when I realize I have done a crap job with probabilistic stage-setting I should re-adjust my stage so that the average/mean/typical response my wife gives is more aligned with my desired outcome.

ISN'T THAT BEING MANIPULATIVE?

To be clear, we're all manipulating each other all the time, whether we like it or not. Every single action we take is intentionally or subconsciously manipulative in some way. What we really need to discern is harmful manipulation from productive manipulation. When a trainer at the gym is yelling at his trainee to get more reps out of him, that's manipulation. He's using psychological tactics to produce a desired result. It's also beneficial and the trainee wants it.

Likewise, I enter the conversation with the assumption that wives want fuzzies and tingles. They want to be sexually attracted to their husbands, and they also want to feel safe, secure, and comfortable with them. As MMSLP says, a woman cannot will-power herself into these types of feelings. As a result, we must adjust conditions (i.e. manipulate) to produce these feelings. I should probably put this in bold:

If I love my wife, my desired outcome is also aligned with her best interests.

I see nothing wrong with operating in this type of manipulative framework until it becomes abused to get her to do things that she will eventually regret doing. Getting her to do things that she doesn't want to do initially is fine. That's how you discover what you like and don't like. Hopefully she'll be doing the same to you. This avoids boring and mundane lives that don't ever change or involve new things. But if it's clear she'll regret it, don't go there just because you want it - that's harmful manipulation and can produce serious psychological damage and destroy pair bonding.

VARIABLES

You already know a lot of the key variables that will set up the probabilistic stage for accomplishing your goals. OYS, passing tests, getting fit, etc. are all primary variables. They follow principles developed from universal confidence intervals (AWALT).

But every individual woman has additional variables that only her husband knows about, which he has discerned through developing personalized confidence intervals. For example, my wife hates the word "juicy." So, although I may do everything else right to set the stage for attraction and comfort, if I slip up at dinner and say, "This steak is so juicy," that's going to push her away from the average/mean and toward more of an outlier response, defying my confidence interval. So, I have to start accounting for that in future interactions.

This is significant in distinguishing between TRP and MRP. Plates and new relationships often don't have the opportunity to discern these additional variables. So, although responsibility, routine, and the lack of the "mystery" effect are examples of things that work against us, this intimate knowledge of our spouse is one key advantage we have that we should take advantage of if we have actually bothered to pay attention to our wives throughout the relationship.

CONCLUSION

Nobody wants true OI and we are biologically incapable of it. The way we talk about OI is really an effort to break oneitis while maintaining our goals/desires. While breaking oneitis is sometimes helpful, there's also nothing wrong with pursuing your goals and desires in the context of your existing marriage/LTR. To pursue those goals, we must develop a framework of probabilistic stage-setting whereby our spouses are most likely to meet our needs and desires, which benefits both of us. Because we are only fostering probability and not demanding absolutes, we graciously accept the undesired outcome as periodically expected and part of the plan, but adjust our probabilistic stage when it becomes the norm. That stage is defined by primary universal confidence intervals, which is what you will learn from this sub, as well as personalized confidence intervals, which is what you will learn from paying attention to your wife.

As I have found to be true among most Christian marriages, I lived through the dead-bedroom marriage (DBM). Sadly, because sex is "dirty" or taboo in the church, there are few places to talk about it. Even when you do find forums of people willing to chat, they're usually extremists who want to cave to social pressures or subjugate women altogether.

Red Pill thinking is essentially this:

MEN

- Men are responsible for leading the household. If things don't go the way they want, they have to take responsibility for it, not blaming it on their wives.
- Leadership requires setting boundaries and maintaining them. This is called a man's "frame" and the entire household should find comfort in resting within it.
- Frame doesn't work if it's weak or too small, causing it to break or preventing anyone from finding comfort in it. This is unattractive, causing your wives and children to lose respect.
- Men, you can strengthen your frame when you own your stuff (OYS). You must show your family that you are a capable captain, able to pilot the ship where it must go. This means balancing and delegating responsibility rather than avoiding it so your wife has to deal with it or dictate the balance.
- Being a capable captain means setting goals and following through in all areas of life, not just the ones that you think will improve your sex life.
- A man's motivation to improve himself and lead his family must come from within, not from a hidden agenda to make his wife owe him sex. Women can sense covert manipulation.
- To lead in fostering a healthy marriage means cultivating both attraction and comfort - these are the man's responsibility to generate, not the woman's responsibility to find.

WOMEN (taken from r/redpillwomen)

- "Relationships generally work better if the man is in charge. It is a preferred relationship to both the man and the woman. This is due to the inherent dominant nature of men and the submissive nature of women."
- "The ultimate goal for a woman is a long lasting relationship with a man who she loves, respects, and is attracted to."
- "Women are gatekeepers of sex, men are gatekeepers of commitment."
- "If you want to have a good partner, you have to be a good partner. This means having some understanding of what men want in a partner ... and then using that information to become the best version of yourself you can be."
- "Truth is more important than feelings and truth is measured by results."
- "Every woman ultimately bears agency for her outcome and satisfaction with life. One of her most important responsibilities is choosing a man worthy of her trust and devotion."

As Christians, we view all of these principles and more in the context of Matthew 6:33 - "Seek first His Kingdom and His righteousness and all these things will be added to you as well." This verse is where my journey began.

Seeking God's Kingdom is not a magical wand that makes all your needs fall from the sky; but seeking His righteousness is the groundwork for an active plan toward pursuing God-honoring goals with faith and confidence that He will help you fulfill them on His terms.

I look forward to interacting with you all.

Pretty much any RP sub is going to tell you that the first place to start is hitting the gym. You want to improve your relationship and sex life? Get fit. This goes both ways, but Christian men seem to have a harder time wrapping their heads around the need to be physically fit.

WHO JUDGES YOUR WEIGHT?

I had gained nearly 100lbs through the first 7 years of my marriage. In a couple weeks I'll have my 9th anniversary and have lost more than half of that while gaining muscle mass. How could I let myself go?

- Pastor preached, "Your body shape should never get so bad that it hinders your ministry." Meh, I was still actively involved in ministry and a leader in my church, so no problems there.
- My doctor said my cholesterol was a little high, but still within appropriate ranges; otherwise I was perfectly healthy. So, no concerns there.
- My bedroom was dead even when I was in shape, so no motivation to get back in shape there.

I didn't have a reason. I went to the three key motivators in my life (God, health, and sex) and none of them got me off my butt. They all affirmed that there was no real imperative to conquer my obesity. I wasn't particularly happy with my body, but it didn't bother me either. So, why should I bother changing?

Because I'm a man under God!

My pastor is not the ultimate judge of how much I should weigh. My doctor can tell me what might happen if I get too obese, but his stamp of approval shouldn't be my validation. Even my wife should not be the judge over how physically fit I should be. Truth be told, I shouldn't be either. God is my judge.

A CLEAR CONSCIENCE DOESN'T MAKE IT RIGHT

I've mastered the clear conscience. For reasons I won't get into here, I am fairly immune to things like guilt and shame, which are most people's primary motivators for getting into shape. God had to dig 1 Corinthians 4:3-4 in me for me to realize that my clear conscience about my weight didn't make it right:

- *I care very little if I am judged by you or by any human court; indeed, I do not even judge myself. My conscience is clear, but that does not make me innocent. It is the Lord who judges me.*

Although my ultimate judgment is grounded on Christ in me and not my faults, I have to accept the fact that Paul wrote this passage as a Christian, after he was saved. His non-innocence doesn't condemn him to hell, but that doesn't mean it's right either. We have a responsibility to God and to live as though we will be judged by God. James 2:12 says this:

- *Speak and act as those who are going to be judged by the law that gives freedom.*

I have freedom in Christ and am right for resting in that freedom! But this does not excuse me from living as if I will be judged by the law anyway. The Bible clearly condemns gluttony in a number of places. Although it does not set height-to-weight thresholds or the righteous BMI level, 1 Corinthians 9:24-27 does implore us to take control over our bodies, and 6:12 says that we should not be mastered by anything.

FITNESS DEVELOPS ATTRACTION

In Genesis 1-2 we see God creating man and woman in their naked bodies and saying, "It is very good." It's not explicitly stated, but I seriously doubt God created Adam and Even as swollen up balloons. They ate healthy in the

garden and when they were kicked out they worked hard for their meals (see Genesis 3). These are the people from whom the entire earth was populated! I can only imagine there was great physical attraction to have enough sex to make so many babies for each successive generation to multiply.

This attraction between men and women for physically fit bodies was ingrained in us by God for the purpose of giving us motivation to (1) work the earth he gave us, making us fit, and (2) filling the earth with offspring. There are a ton of books that talk about these biological imperatives and why physical fitness is attractive on a biological level, so I won't go much further than that.

But I am also reminded of Joseph and Potiphar's wife. Genesis 39:6-7 - "Now Joseph was handsome in form and appearance. And after a time his master's wife cast her eyes on Joseph and said, 'Lie with me.'" This shows us that not only is physical fitness attractive among peers, but it can even be enough to warrant crossing social gaps. In this case, Potiphar's wife could have been killed if she was caught (which is why she ultimately shifts blame to Joseph), but that attraction to his being "handsome in form and appearance" just drove her nuts to the point where she couldn't resist herself.

FITNESS IS NOT THE ONLY FACTOR

Let's not be fooled - physical fitness isn't the only thing necessary to breed attraction. But it does make attraction much, much easier to foster between two people. If you're not attracted to your spouse, it's often because you don't feel attractive yourself.

Seriously, I had given up on fixing my DB. My libido went kaput and I literally didn't care whether or not my wife slept with me. We went about a year and a half with no sex at all. Although there were other factors playing into this, I did notice one thing in particular: **As I got in shape, I felt sexier, which in turn made me start desiring sex again.** My wife experienced the same thing when she lost her baby weight after each of our first three children. **Feeling sexy makes you want to have sex.**

Once I started desiring sex again, that was a gateway to other aspects of self-improvement beyond just physical fitness that I knew were necessary to foster attraction with my wife and develop a healthy sex life. But it took me a solid 5 months of intentional fitness and dieting before I developed enough desire to start functioning with my body and in my marriage the way I know God intended - and the way I wanted before I gave up on sex.

This isn't a license for men to ship their wives off to the gym or vice versa in order to get them wanting sex again. This is a basic psychological strategy to put you in a position to develop your own **INTERNAL MOTIVATION** to want to follow through with improving your sex life. This internal motivation is key. Why? Because your spouse knows when you're faking it - when you give only to get. If you give her the gift of a physically fit husband in order to get sex from her, she might comply here and there to reward your good behavior, but in doing so, you're putting her in the position of leading the relationship by deciding when you get rewarded or not, and you're not going to be happy with obligation sex in the long-run. You have to do it for you and for God because God is your judge, not your wife.

Again, this isn't a magic wand to fix all your problems. That's why it's 101 level material. It doesn't take a lot of skill or in-depth study ... just get some exercise and start dieting. Anyone can do it. A failure to be able to do this is a failure to maintain self-control, which is part of the fruit of the Spirit. I'll let you ponder the implications of that on your own.

BASIC ROLES

Most Christian men have been raised with the, "Let me run that by my wife first" mentality. In response, women have taken a liking to having the power. In fact, God told us they would:

Your desire will be for your husband, and he will rule over you.

That word for "desire" is *teshukatech*, which is the same word used a chapter later in Genesis 4:7

Sin is crouching at your door; its desire [*teshukatov*] is for you, but you must master it

Notice the stark similarities in these two phrases spaced only a single chapter apart? The man must treat his wife's desire to boss him around as a sin that he must attain mastery over.

To put it bluntly: **Men are to lead; women are to help.**

DESIRE

Desire is an emotional investment in an object or outcome. God designed both genders to have desires, but women in particular are more susceptible to making decisions based on desire. Even before the fall and the curse, the serpent saw God had created woman this way and used it to his advantage, tricking Eve instead of Adam (see also 1 Timothy 2:13-14):

So when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and it was a delight to the eyes, and that the tree was to be desired to make one wise, she took of its fruit and ate (Genesis 3:6).

Interestingly, Eve's desire to rule over Adam is dictated as a product of the curse. This makes me think that **Eve's original desire actually was for Adam to rule over her and that she be his helper, as God declared.** For this reason (as confirmed by pragmatic observation of marital satisfaction issues in my practice of divorce law), I am fully persuaded that women have two irreconcilable desires: (1) a husband who will lead her, and (2) power to make her husband give her everything else she wants.

In traditional thinking, these conflicting desires are mutually exclusive. If she lets her husband lead, she loses her power to control getting everything else she wants. If she takes back that control, she may get all those other things, but she no longer has a husband who will lead her. In biblical thinking, the husband will lead in a way that will naturally satisfy most of the wife's other desires as well because he loves her. But this is done on his authority and not her demands.

MAN V. STUFF

A woman must choose between her desire for her man or her desire for other stuff. When a woman takes control of a relationship, she is communicating, "My comforts are more important than having a desirable husband." When she cedes control to the man's frame she communicates, "I desire you more than my comforts."

Although women must make this choice, it's important to recognize that **the ultimate decision is the man's to make.** If the man refuses to lead her, her decision to let him lead is worthless. She will still not be fueled by her desire for him. If the man does lead appropriately, even if she does not want him to, his God-given authority gives his frame an advantage over hers and he will win if he persists. The reason the woman must make the choice is

because this determines how happy she will be living in light of the context that the man has set for the marriage.

We must remember that a marriage is about the people, not the stuff. Although a woman may be happy because she controls her man to get all of the other stuff she desires met, virtually all of these women openly acknowledge that they do not feel secure in the marriage itself. Most such women would readily acknowledge, "I have a good life, but an unsatisfactory marriage." For the marriage to work, the primary desire must be for the person and not all the other stuff.

Here's where it gets difficult: **A man cannot make himself desire his wife, nor can a woman make herself desire her husband.** Instead, we must make ourselves desirable to one another. From here, it is essential to recognize that **healthy marriages require mutually supported efforts toward self-improvement.** The previous post (101) explains how fitness is one basic way we can start moving in the right direction.

BASE ATTRACTION

God gave the command to "be fruitful and multiply" before the fall. In order to ensure this command would be followed, he gave us all libidos. In order to ensure our libidos did not hinder us from doing everything else he put us on the earth to do, he made our libidos dependent on our actual fulfillment of those duties *and our ability to let the other person fulfill their duties in the context of a relationship with us*. When Adam and Eve became sinners, they lost the ability to trust their natural impulses because of the new sinful nature. To help set things right, God articulated the curse as a clarification of our duties:

Women are to bear healthy children and help their husbands, who would lead them. Men are to work hard to provide what is necessary for life and lead their wives.

A person is considered "attractive" if they have the appearance of: (1) being able to fulfill their duty, and (2) being able to let the other person fulfill their duty also.

Physical beauty is a sign of a woman's ability to bear healthy children (her duty). Most widely acknowledged standards of beauty are also expressions of frailty, showing a need for provision and protection (letting him fulfill his duty). Although a female body-builder is extremely physically fit, most men do not find her giant muscles and bulging veins attractive because it subconsciously implies that she does not need the man's leadership, provision, and protection. They tend to partner with men who are even more physically fit than they are (elements of hypergamy here, to be discussed later).

Physical fitness and a history of being a hard-worker are attractive on a man because they are expressions that he will continue to work hard to meet her and the children's needs and provide what is necessary for life (his duty). A video game nerd or porn addict are not attractive to women because these men defer to fantasy worlds for life experience rather than looking to real women for reproductive acts and being a helper (letting her fulfill her duty).

Part 1 - Signs your wife might have a personality disorder

12 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill · Archived copy · Reddit

In my experience practicing divorce law in a firm that specializes in psychological issues, I have found that personality disorders have the most significant impact on marriages. There are certainly worse disorders to have (ex. MPD, schizophrenia, etc.), but personality disorders often go unrecognized or thought of as "that's just how she is." As much as you may have gotten used to her antics, sometimes it's good to face the music: she might actually be crazy (and you might be too!).

In this first part I will explain the basic personality disorders and general characteristics for discerning when one is present. As much as we might like to throw around "AWALT," certain PDs do require unique and special attention that general RP advice might not otherwise hone in on in a manner helpful to your unique situation. So, Part 2 will address how to interact with people who have PDs in order to maximize your chance of getting through to them. If you're all interested, I could possibly do a Part 3 on how to negotiate with someone who has a PD, such as in my area of expertise: divorce negotiations.

But first, a quote from the guy who taught me divorce law, particularly to all you who are thinking of divorcing someone who you think has a mental health problem: **"All women are crazy. Every judge knows that - even the women ones. It's not enough to prove she's crazy. Your job at trial is to prove that her craziness goes beyond 'normal woman crazy.'"**

ONE - Borderline - BPD is most commonly found in women, particularly those who have a history of physical or sexual abuse. Borderlines often have a mental detachment from reality. If the ordinary hamster is like driving a car, a BPD's is like the Millennium Falcon on the Kessel Run. They are often very explosive with no rational basis. They are driven almost entirely by emotion with scant ability to comprehend logic in the midst of an emotional episode, although they may appear perfectly normal when not otherwise triggered. **RP men are at high risk** because BPDs are typically very sexual. Their emotional explosiveness causes them to be extremely passionate and have very large libidos. They are also the most likely to cheat on you. BPDs are often very insecure, impulsive, antagonistic, and prone to depression. As a coping mechanism to deal with past abuse or trauma (existent in most people with BPD), their detached sense of reality causes them to experience their explosive fits not as their own life, but as if they are a third person in the room sitting in some out-of-body experience bleachers with a bucket of popcorn enjoying all the drama and entertainment. BPD is often accompanied by a histrionic personality disorder too.

For more information on BPD, check my comments [here](#) and [here](#).

- BPD women are extremely likely to respond to RP men, but for longevity and peace, the strategy requires a few limitations in how to handle explosive outbursts (see my posts above), given that some advice (ex. STFU) will simply not work and will likely make the situation worse.

TWO - Histrionic - HPD is the second most common personality disorder I see in women. It's rare to find men with BPD or HPD. Histrionics are addicted to drama. They will start crap with you not as a fitness test, but just because bad drama is better than no drama at all. They are easily bored. They are prone to excessive emotionality and attention seeking. They are incredibly flirty and seductive so, once again, **RP men are at high risk**. What's so bad? They cry a lot, usually for no reason at all. They are the type of people who are going to embarrass you in public with flamboyancy. They are easily suggestible to being put "on edge." They can't handle being alone, making them very clingy, needy, and very likely to stalk you if they get suspicious. If you take them out on a date, you're a great boyfriend and she can't stop posting on social media about it. If you take them out on another date the following weekend, you're being too nice to her, so you must be cheating. Your car is probably gonna get keyed

when she finds the flowers you bought for her because that must mean you're hiding something and trying to distract her with gifts. Seriously, they make stuff up just to increase the drama levels to feed into their compulsion for exaggerated emotional expression. Interestingly, although they seem highly emotional, it is just that: an exaggeration. In reality, they are often very vague and shallow, not lacking any substance to their emotions. Unlike BPD, HPDs can comprehend and articulate some degree of logic in the midst of their flamboyant emotional expressiveness.

- HPD women are likely to respond extremely well to RP men.
-

THREE - Paranoid - PPD is the third most common I see in women and is almost always paired up with another PD, although I don't see any overarching trends as to which ones. They think everyone is out to get them. They make sweeping generalizations about their susceptibility for abuse or risk of being used (ex. "Guys don't actually want *me*, they just want sex"). They're quick to make assumptions based on very small indicators. If you do anything to reinforce their paranoia, they will not stop fixating on you. PPDs have trouble letting go of past wounds. Although they usually just want to "get away from the jerk," they can't stop talking about how much they want to get away. They assume he is stalking them all the time because they see him everywhere. As a result, in a relationship they are emotionally distant, constantly waiting for when you're going to show your true colors like she knows you will. This creates self-fulfilling prophecies that can quickly destroy relationships. As a defense mechanism, they sometimes even strike the first blow, hoping that a good offense will be their best protection from the expected imminent onslaught you'll give them. No matter how nice you are, they believe you have some manipulative intention for doing it. High functioning PPDs will believe you are a manipulative jerk, but they will accept the manipulation and look at it as a game that they have to serve back in order to maintain a safe balance in a relationship, rather than letting you be the only one with special manipulative powers. PPDs rarely have close same-gender friends, as they don't trust anyone enough to be deeply honest. When they go out, it's usually superficial.

- PPD women are likely to respond reasonably well to RP men.
-

FOUR - Narcissistic - NPD is most commonly found in men, but is not infrequent in women as well. **RP men are at an extremely high risk of developing NPD.** NPD is characterized by a disproportionate sense of self-worth and self-entitlement as compared with reality. They believe they deserve special treatment. If their girl does something nice for them, it's not because she's a great girl; it's because you deserve it. NPDs assume they are far more brilliant, attractive, or skilled than they actually are. For the true NPD, this is not a game to set a social presence, but an undeniable fact of their identity. They often live in fantasy worlds about how far their awesomeness might take them in life. NPDs are easily angered and extremely aggressive, especially when confronted with the fact that they share common human limitations with everyone else. They lack the ability to empathize with others because they see themselves as superior and don't understand what it's like to be normal. As a result, they have great difficulty developing emotional or intimate connections. To cope with this difficulty, most NPDs become extremely manipulative, and often consider their manipulative prowess as one of their super powers. Interestingly, most NPDs suffer from other mental-health disorders associated with subconscious emotional insecurity. They have told themselves for so long that they are better than everyone else that they begin to believe their inflated sense of self. Unable to cope with the potential shatter of this self-image, they have a subconscious compulsion to seek approval of others in order to validate their perceptions. When others do not validate this, they see them as (1) "lesser" and incapable of comprehending their true value, or (2) insecure people who have to attack others to hide their own insecurities. These perceptions are often incredibly irrational, and it's absolutely hysterical to watch two NPDs trying to argue, as they both are trying to seek validation from the other on a subconscious level by asserting their superiority (dominance and authority), while consciously trying to come off as if they don't care. NPDs try to present a DNGAF attitude and believe that they actually have this attitude, but are often unhappy

nonetheless and they do not understand why.

- NPD women are likely to express significant resistance to RP men. Although AWALT re: desiring a man to dominate them, these women are going to put up a huge fight. From doing divorce law, I note that the man usually has to have mental disorders of his own in order to get the job done, and then cope with the damage she made him go through on the way. If an RP man does manage to tame her, he's set for a long time because he can then feed into her sense of self-worth by helping her win "The Comparison Game."

With the big-4 done, here's a shorter description of the less common ones.

FIVE - Antisocial - ASPD is very similar to NPD in expression, but the reasons behind it are very different. Although they both come off as extremely aggressive, hostile, arrogant, and manipulative, where NPDs do so out of an inflated sense of self, ASPDs express these things because they have no care or concern with the rights of other people. They lack a core sense of morality common in most other individuals. They often come off as bullies. They are reckless, impulsive, and prone to danger - sometimes because they don't even have a healthy regard for their own rights and safety. Being manipulators, they know how to feign remorse and regret without actually experiencing it. In relationships, they are unlikely to take responsibility for their actions. They don't bother with hamsters because they see no need to rationalize anything in the first place. They are likely to be physically, emotionally, and verbally abusive.

- RP strategy is not likely to work on women with ASPD because they will insist on chewing up your frame, crapping it out, then making you eat it every meal of every day for the rest of your life ... or just leave without a second thought.

SIX - Avoidant - In contrast with ASPD, AVPD is characterized by a hypersensitivity to others thoughts and feelings. They constantly feel like they're being judged, and always feel inadequate. They avoid social situations for fear that people will think less of them for how they interact, creating a negative loop where they can never build confidence. Even when incredibly attractive, they can only focus on their own flaws. In a relationship, women may only want to have sex in the dark so their partner can't see their flaws, or may avoid sex altogether for fear of not being good enough at it. They also have trouble finding relationships in the first place and are quick to latch on to the first thing that comes along, building long-term commitments where they shouldn't.

- RP strategy is likely to work extremely well with AVPD women.

SEVEN - Dependent - DPDs experience a subconscious compulsion to have someone else manage their life for them. They require significant support structures and constantly seek second opinions for everything they do. They are terrified of conflict because friction in a relationship may cause them to lose their ability to depend on that person in the future. At their core, they are people-pleasers. In a relational context, they cannot handle being alone, often trying to live vicariously through their SO. As a result, they are very clingy. When the relationship ends they give themselves no time before immediately hopping into a new one without being able to assess clearly whether or not this is a good idea.

- RP strategy is likely to work reasonably well with DPD women.

EIGHT - Obsessive-Compulsive - Because of public perception of extreme examples, ordinary cases of OCPD often go undetected because they don't seem as bad as what you see on TV. In reality, ordinary OCPD is characterized by someone whose fixation on rules and structure dominates their thought processes. They are often perfectionists who cannot easily settle for "good enough." They are more concerned with doing "the right thing" than what needs to be done. The details are more important than the bigger picture. They are inflexible, and therefore are usually incapable of delegating because the other person might not do it as well. In relationships, OCPDs are extremely controlling and stubborn and come off as "holier than thou" or having a sense of moral

superiority.

- RP strategy likely can be effective with OCPD women insofar as it may actually improve their condition; if the condition is too heavily rooted, RP men will burn out their hamsters because OCPDs won't stop obsessing about everything the RP man is doing "the wrong way."

NINE - Schizoid - Despite public perceptions, when most people say "antisocial" they really mean "schizoid." Schizoids have a limited capacity for emotional expression and cannot for interpersonal bonds. As a result, they withdraw from society, preferring to be alone. These are your extreme introverts, who prefer anonymity in their relationships through online gaming or internet forums without having to build actual relationships in real life. They come off as very awkward and superficial. They often don't express a wide array of facial expressions or body language, making them seem disengaged from conversation. Both because this disorder is fairly rare and because they isolate themselves, it is highly unlikely you will find yourself in a relationship with such a person.

- I have only ever once observed a marriage/divorce with a schizoid, so although I could make something up, I really don't have any evidence on the efficacy of RP strategy on schizoids.

TEN - Schizotypal - Unlike schizoids, schizotypals actually do desire human interaction, but they're so quirky and weird that they can't sustain them. They often have very extreme and unconventional beliefs that are almost certainly untrue, despite the sincerity of their belief. They are also flagrant liars - so much so that they begin to believe their own lies. They lack the ability to retain mental response standards to social situations. As a result, they do not recall appropriate reactions to social situations and often do bizarre or unusual things, like laughing at inappropriate times or moving their body in ways and at times that don't make sense in the course of conversation.

- Similarly, this is rare enough that I don't have any observable experience upon which to opine on the efficacy of RP theory on schizotypals.

SPECTRUM, NOT STATIC - It is extremely important to note that all of these PDs function on a spectrum. It's not an on/off switch. For example, in the DSM-IV days there was a subjective scale known as "GAF" (Global Assessment of Functioning). Someone might be diagnosed with a PD, but have a GAF score of 75, in which case they are moderately functioning with minimal expressive symptoms. However, if the GAF score was a 45 they would show serious symptoms with impairment in social environments. A GAF score of 50 or less is typically enough to qualify for most disability benefits on mental health grounds (SSDI/BWC). So, if you think your spouse might have a mental health problem, try not to lump her into a category - figure out how far into that zone she is first.

Part 1 - Signs your spouse might have a personality disorder (also posted on MRP)

12 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

In my experience practicing divorce law in a firm that specializes in psychological issues, I have found that personality disorders have the most significant impact on marriages. There are certainly worse disorders to have (ex. MPD, schizophrenia, etc.), but personality disorders often go unrecognized or thought of as "that's just how she is." As much as you may have gotten used to her antics, sometimes it's good to face the music: she might actually be crazy (and you might be too!).

In this first part I will explain the basic personality disorders and general characteristics for discerning when one is present. As much as we might like to throw around "AWALT," certain PDs do require unique and special attention that general RP advice might not otherwise hone in on in a manner helpful to your unique situation. So, Part 2 will address how to interact with people who have PDs in order to maximize your chance of getting through to them. If you're all interested, I could possibly do a Part 3 on how to negotiate with someone who has a PD, such as in my area of expertise: divorce negotiations.

But first, a quote from the guy who taught me divorce law, particularly to all you who are thinking of divorcing someone who you think has a mental health problem: **"All women are crazy. Every judge knows that - even the women ones. It's not enough to prove she's crazy. Your job at trial is to prove that her craziness goes beyond 'normal woman crazy.'"** [My wife once countered this: "True, but if all women are crazy, all men are lazy." Her point is, it's probably true as to our natural tendencies, but some people can break out of it.]

ONE - Borderline - BPD is most commonly found in women, particularly those who have a history of physical or sexual abuse. Borderlines often have a mental detachment from reality. If the ordinary hamster is like driving a car, a BPD's is like the Millennium Falcon on the Kessel Run. They are often very explosive with no rational basis. They are driven almost entirely by emotion with scant ability to comprehend logic in the midst of an emotional episode, although they may appear perfectly normal when not otherwise triggered. **RP men are at high risk** because BPDs are typically very sexual. Their emotional explosiveness causes them to be extremely passionate and have very large libidos. They are also the most likely to cheat on you. BPDs are often very insecure, impulsive, antagonistic, and prone to depression. As a coping mechanism to deal with past abuse or trauma (existent in most people with BPD), their detached sense of reality causes them to experience their explosive fits not as their own life, but as if they are a third person in the room sitting in some out-of-body experience bleachers with a bucket of popcorn enjoying all the drama and entertainment. BPD is often accompanied by a histrionic personality disorder too.

For more information on BPD, check my comments [here](#) and [here](#).

- BPD women are extremely likely to respond to RP men, but for longevity and peace, the strategy requires a few limitations in how to handle explosive outbursts (see my posts above), given that some advice (ex. STFU) will simply not work and will likely make the situation worse.

TWO - Histrionic - HPD is the second most common personality disorder I see in women. It's rare to find men with BPD or HPD. Histrionics are addicted to drama. They will start crap with you not as a fitness test, but just because bad drama is better than no drama at all. They are easily bored. They are prone to excessive emotionality and attention seeking. They are incredibly flirty and seductive so, once again, **RP men are at high risk**. What's so bad? They cry a lot, usually for no reason at all. They are the type of people who are going to embarrass you in public with flamboyancy. They are easily suggestible to being put "on edge." They can't handle being alone, making them very clingy, needy, and very likely to stalk you if they get suspicious. If you take them out on a date, you're a

great boyfriend and she can't stop posting on social media about it. If you take them out on another date the following weekend, you're being too nice to her, so you must be cheating. Your car is probably gonna get keyed when she finds the flowers you bought for her because that must mean you're hiding something and trying to distract her with gifts. Seriously, they make stuff up just to increase the drama levels to feed into their compulsion for exaggerated emotional expression. Interestingly, although they seem highly emotional, it is just that: an exaggeration. In reality, they are often very vague and shallow, not lacking any substance to their emotions. Unlike BPD, HPDs can comprehend and articulate some degree of logic in the midst of their flamboyant emotional expressiveness.

- HPD women are likely to respond extremely well to RP men.
-

THREE - Paranoid - PPD is the third most common I see in women and is almost always paired up with another PD, although I don't see any overarching trends as to which ones. They think everyone is out to get them. They make sweeping generalizations about their susceptibility for abuse or risk of being used (ex. "Guys don't actually want *me*, they just want sex"). They're quick to make assumptions based on very small indicators. If you do anything to reinforce their paranoia, they will not stop fixating on you. PPDs have trouble letting go of past wounds. Although they usually just want to "get away from the jerk," they can't stop talking about how much they want to get away. They assume he is stalking them all the time because they see him everywhere. As a result, in a relationship they are emotionally distant, constantly waiting for when you're going to show your true colors like she knows you will. This creates self-fulfilling prophecies that can quickly destroy relationships. As a defense mechanism, they sometimes even strike the first blow, hoping that a good offense will be their best protection from the expected imminent onslaught you'll give them. No matter how nice you are, they believe you have some manipulative intention for doing it. High functioning PPDs will believe you are a manipulative jerk, but they will accept the manipulation and look at it as a game that they have to serve back in order to maintain a safe balance in a relationship, rather than letting you be the only one with special manipulative powers. PPDs rarely have close same-gender friends, as they don't trust anyone enough to be deeply honest. When they go out, it's usually superficial.

- PPD women are likely to respond reasonably well to RP men.
-

FOUR - Narcissistic - NPD is most commonly found in men, but is not infrequent in women as well. **RP men are at an extremely high risk of developing NPD.** NPD is characterized by a disproportionate sense of self-worth and self-entitlement as compared with reality. They believe they deserve special treatment. If their girl does something nice for them, it's not because she's a great girl; it's because you deserve it. NPDs assume they are far more brilliant, attractive, or skilled than they actually are. For the true NPD, this is not a game to set a social presence, but an undeniable fact of their identity. They often live in fantasy worlds about how far their awesomeness might take them in life. NPDs are easily angered and extremely aggressive, especially when confronted with the fact that they share common human limitations with everyone else. They lack the ability to empathize with others because they see themselves as superior and don't understand what it's like to be normal. As a result, they have great difficulty developing emotional or intimate connections. To cope with this difficulty, most NPDs become extremely manipulative, and often consider their manipulative prowess as one of their super powers. Interestingly, most NPDs suffer from other mental-health disorders associated with subconscious emotional insecurity. They have told themselves for so long that they are better than everyone else that they begin to believe their inflated sense of self. Unable to cope with the potential shatter of this self-image, they have a subconscious compulsion to seek approval of others in order to validate their perceptions. When others do not validate this, they see them as (1) "lesser" and incapable of comprehending their true value, or (2) insecure people who have to attack others to hide their own insecurities. These perceptions are often incredibly irrational, and it's absolutely hysterical to watch two NPDs trying to argue, as they both are trying to seek validation from the other on a subconscious level.

by asserting their superiority (dominance and authority), while consciously trying to come off as if they don't care. NPDs try to present a DNGAF attitude and believe that they actually have this attitude, but are often unhappy nonetheless and they do not understand why.

- NPD women are likely to express significant resistance to RP men. Although AWALT re: desiring a man to dominate them, these women are going to put up a huge fight. From doing divorce law, I note that the man usually has to have mental disorders of his own in order to get the job done, and then cope with the damage she made him go through on the way. If an RP man does manage to tame her, he's set for a long time because he can then feed into her sense of self-worth by helping her win "The Comparison Game."

With the big-4 done, here's a shorter description of the less common ones.

FIVE - Antisocial - ASPD is very similar to NPD in expression, but the reasons behind it are very different. Although they both come off as extremely aggressive, hostile, arrogant, and manipulative, where NPDs do so out of an inflated sense of self, ASPDs express these things because they have no care or concern with the rights of other people. They lack a core sense of morality common in most other individuals. They often come off as bullies. They are reckless, impulsive, and prone to danger - sometimes because they don't even have a healthy regard for their own rights and safety. Being manipulators, they know how to feign remorse and regret without actually experiencing it. In relationships, they are unlikely to take responsibility for their actions. They don't bother with hamsters because they see no need to rationalize anything in the first place. They are likely to be physically, emotionally, and verbally abusive.

- RP strategy is not likely to work on women with ASPD because they will insist on chewing up your frame, crapping it out, then making you eat it every meal of every day for the rest of your life ... or just leave without a second thought.

SIX - Avoidant - In contrast with ASPD, AVPD is characterized by a hypersensitivity to others thoughts and feelings. They constantly feel like they're being judged, and always feel inadequate. They avoid social situations for fear that people will think less of them for how they interact, creating a negative loop where they can never build confidence. Even when incredibly attractive, they can only focus on their own flaws. In a relationship, women may only want to have sex in the dark so their partner can't see their flaws, or may avoid sex altogether for fear of not being good enough at it. They also have trouble finding relationships in the first place and are quick to latch on to the first thing that comes along, building long-term commitments where they shouldn't.

- RP strategy is likely to work extremely well with AVPD women.

SEVEN - Dependent - DPDs experience a subconscious compulsion to have someone else manage their life for them. They require significant support structures and constantly seek second opinions for everything they do. They are terrified of conflict because friction in a relationship may cause them to lose their ability to depend on that person in the future. At their core, they are people-pleasers. In a relational context, they cannot handle being alone, often trying to live vicariously through their SO. As a result, they are very clingy. When the relationship ends they give themselves no time before immediately hopping into a new one without being able to assess clearly whether or not this is a good idea.

- RP strategy is likely to work reasonably well with DPD women.

EIGHT - Obsessive-Compulsive - Because of public perception of extreme examples, ordinary cases of OCPD often go undetected because they don't seem as bad as what you see on TV. In reality, ordinary OCPD is characterized by someone whose fixation on rules and structure dominates their thought processes. They are often perfectionists who cannot easily settle for "good enough." They are more concerned with doing "the right thing" than what needs to be done. The details are more important than the bigger picture. They are inflexible, and

therefore are usually incapable of delegating because the other person might not do it as well. In relationships, OCPDs are extremely controlling and stubborn and come off as "holier than thou" or having a sense of moral superiority.

- RP strategy likely can be effective with OCPD women insofar as it may actually improve their condition; if the condition is too heavily rooted, RP men will burn out their hamsters because OCPDs won't stop obsessing about everything the RP man is doing "the wrong way."

NINE - Schizoid - Despite public perceptions, when most people say "antisocial" they really mean "schizoid." Schizoids have a limited capacity for emotional expression and cannot form interpersonal bonds. As a result, they withdraw from society, preferring to be alone. These are your extreme introverts, who prefer anonymity in their relationships through online gaming or internet forums without having to build actual relationships in real life. They come off as very awkward and superficial. They often don't express a wide array of facial expressions or body language, making them seem disengaged from conversation. Both because this disorder is fairly rare and because they isolate themselves, it is highly unlikely you will find yourself in a relationship with such a person.

- I have only ever once observed a marriage/divorce with a schizoid, so although I could make something up, I really don't have any evidence on the efficacy of RP strategy on schizoids.

TEN - Schizotypal - Unlike schizoids, schizotypals actually do desire human interaction, but they're so quirky and weird that they can't sustain them. They often have very extreme and unconventional beliefs that are almost certainly untrue, despite the sincerity of their belief. They are also flagrant liars - so much so that they begin to believe their own lies. They lack the ability to retain mental response standards to social situations. As a result, they do not recall appropriate reactions to social situations and often do bizarre or unusual things, like laughing at inappropriate times or moving their body in ways and at times that don't make sense in the course of conversation.

- Similarly, this is rare enough that I don't have any observable experience upon which to opine on the efficacy of RP theory on schizotypals.

SPECTRUM, NOT STATIC - It is extremely important to note that all of these PDs function on a spectrum. It's not an on/off switch. For example, in the DSM-IV days there was a subjective scale known as "GAF" (Global Assessment of Functioning). Someone might be diagnosed with a PD, but have a GAF score of 75, in which case they are moderately functioning with minimal expressive symptoms. However, if the GAF score was a 45 they would show serious symptoms with impairment in social environments. A GAF score of 50 or less is typically enough to qualify for most disability benefits on mental health grounds (SSDI/BWC). So, if you think your spouse might have a mental health problem, try not to lump her into a category - figure out how far into that zone she is first.

Something that TRP/MRP doesn't touch on much is the God-given imperative toward intimacy. They recontextualize intimacy in the only contexts in which it can be understood by non-Christians. To adapt something from a conversation I had with /u/rocknrollchuck:

- TRP assumes we are unitary beings - we have physical impulses and that's it. Accordingly, physical intimacy (i.e. sex) is all that matter.
- MRP assumes we are binary beings - we have physical impulses and emotional longings, both of which must be satisfied for an LTR to work. Accordingly, physical and emotional intimacy (i.e. sex and comfort-sharing moments) are all that matter and need to be found in balance.
- RPC knows we are trinitarian beings - we have physical impulses, emotional longings, and spiritual authority, all of which must work and be exercised in harmony for a person and relationship to be healthy. That spiritual authority is not "frame" or "having a vision" in the ordinary sense of the word, which plays on physical and emotional attractiveness. It is Christ in us, radiating from us as we live in the pattern he set for us.
 - It's worth noting that we also have a "mind," which is that part of our identity that balances these three attributes of our God-given, yet culturally-broken character.

The goal of Christian relationships is to develop a oneness bond with someone in all of these areas and not just one or two. Although it may not be the best technical definition, it really helps me to understand intimacy as this:

Intimacy is a oneness bond created by internalization of external things.

THREE TYPES OF ONENESS/INTIMACY

Ephesians 4:4 says, "There is one body and one Spirit, just as you were called to one hope when you were called." In short: physical, spiritual, emotional. Paul acknowledges the need for unity among believers by saying, "Make my joy complete by being like-minded, having the same love, being one in spirit and purpose" (Philippians 2:2). Of the things above, the only one he leaves out is physical oneness. Why? Because marriage is the only context in which the true, perfect oneness trinitaria can exist. Here are examples of how this can play out for a Christian:

- **Physical** - Sex is deeply intimate. It is literally an external man becoming internal within the woman, making the two become one.
- **Emotional** - Heart-to-heart conversations are intimate. There are external situations that are discussed that the listener/recipient internalizes, fostering empathy and creating a common heart.
- **Spiritual** - Communion is intimate. It is taking external bread and wine/juice and internalizing it (Jesus' body and blood entering into us) in a context that is meant to be shared with those who are also one with Christ, creating a unity between fellow believers, including spouses, because of Christ in us (more on this later).

THREE TYPES OF LOVE, BORN FROM INTIMACY

In the Hebrew, there are three core words for "love," all found in Song of Solomon.

- **Raya** - a friendship that says, "We do things together, we get along great, we have similar interests, and we enjoy each other's company. I am excited to be around him/her." [Although it's not exact, the Greek equivalent would be a combination of agape and phileo.]
- **Ahava** - a commitment that says, "No matter how bad things get, I will always be by your side and will remain

faithful to you." [Greek pseudo-equivalent = pragma.]

- **Dod** - a passion that says, "I long for you and can't wait to see you every day; to be with you, close to you, and united with you. [Greek pseudo-equivalent = eros.]
 - Raya = emotional oneness; Ahava = spiritual oneness; Dod = physical oneness

In MMSLP, Athol Kay refers to these as Dopamine (Raya), Oxytocin/Vasopressin (Ahava), and Testosterone (Dod). A lack of any one of these creates problems:

- **No Raya** = boring couples who get isolated and feel like their relationship is going nowhere; great sex and strong commitment don't fix their day to day living
- **No Ahava** = spouses cheating on each other. If the sex and friendship are great, but there's no strong commitment, someone will leave when the next best thing comes along.
- **No Dod** = dead bedroom for the rest of your life.

If you combine two of these things together, such as a lack of dod and a lack of ahava, the sexlessness is what will prompt the divorce. If little raya is coupled with a lack of dod, it will be the boring monotony that leads to divorce. If raya and dod are lacking, you might remain married, but it will be purely a roommates-relationship with ever-increasing hostility and cold-shoulders.

Koinonia

It's worth a brief pause to describe spiritual intimacy in greater detail, as this is the most elusive subject. Spiritual bonds can be formed in the context of physical and emotional connections. For example, 1 Cor. 6 and 2 Cor. 6 both talk about how sex makes you become spiritually one with someone, and also implies that whoever else you are spiritually one with is being bound to that link as well, specifically citing trying to create a oneness bond between Belial (demon/idol) and Christ when a Christian and non-Christian sleep together. Other passages like Ezekiel 36:26 imply a connection between the heart and the spirit.

But there are also purely spiritual connections, which tangentially impact physical and emotional aspects of relationships. The word the Bible uses for this in many examples *Koinonia*. Most often, that word is translated as "fellowship." But it carries a context of what that fellowship entails that goes deeper than the English translation would imply.

The Greek word for "communion" used in many translations of 1 Cor. 10:16 (more currently: participation or sharing) is *Koinonia*. This term is most commonly used in Scripture to reference a oneness bond, usually formed in the spirit. Consider:

- "You were called into *fellowship* with His Son" (1 Cor. 1:9)
- "What *fellowship* has light with darkness?" in the context of two people becoming one flesh (2 Cor. 6:14)
- "May the ... *fellowship* of the Holy Spirit be with you all" (2 Corinthians 13:14)
- "In view of your *fellowship/participation* with the Gospel" (Philippians 1:5)
- "Any *participation* in the Spirit" in the context of being "united" with Christ (Philippians 2:1)
- "So that you also may have *fellowship* with us. And our *fellowship* is with the Father and with his Son, Jesus Christ ... If we claim to have *fellowship* with him and yet walk in the darkness, we lie and do not live out the truth. But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have *fellowship* with one another, and the blood of

Jesus, his Son, purifies us from all sin" (1 John 1:3, 6-7).

These concepts are very reminiscent of Jesus' saying, "I and the Father are one" (John 10:30). Similarly, Jesus asks beginning in John 17:21, "That all of them may be one, Father, just as you are in me and I am in you. May they also be in us so that the world may believe that you have sent me. I have given them the glory that you gave me, that they may be one as we are one - I in them and you in me - so that they may be brought to complete unity." Jesus isn't talking about "unity" in a "let's all get along" kind of way that we tend to think of it today. He literally means a oneness bond between our spirits that goes deeper than simply "getting along" or even merely acting in unison for a common purpose.

RELATIONSHIP AND IMPACT

In his book *Understanding People*, Dr. Larry Crabb (Christian psychologist) suggests that all people are driven by two core longings: (1) relationships and (2) a need to have an impact on our world. The first is derived from the fact that "it is not good for man to be alone" (Genesis 2:18). The second is from the fact that even before the fall God gave us a world and He intended us to use it. Note that even before the fall, the command was to "fill the earth and subdue it" (Genesis 1:28) That meant humanity was destined to leave Eden regardless. People need to know that what they do matters and will leave a lasting impact because God created us not as idle dummies, but for a purpose that we must live out.

- In MMSLP terms, fostering relationships requires developing healthy beta skills (comfort, reliability, trust, affection); having an impact on our world requires developing healthy alpha skills (one-track-mind, confidence, maintaining composure in the face of testing, strength and determination). A man is best able to foster physical intimacy (as well as spiritual and emotional) with his wife when he is living in light of these core longings and expressing them in a manner consistent with God's original design for humanity. As I said in 102, he made our libidos dependent on this to some base degree.

I have found throughout my life and marriage that it is impossible to experience healthy intimacy if we are not living out both of these. I can be the greatest preacher who ever lived, sharing the Gospel all over the world, making a difference not only in our world, but in God's Kingdom for eternity. That's a huge impact! But if I try to do this as an isolated effort, I will feel sorely dissatisfied - not because God can't satisfy me, but because he decided when he created me that he wanted me to require other human relationships to satisfy me as well (Genesis 2:18). This may come in the form of a spouse, but it doesn't have to (Matthew 19:12; 1 Cor. 7:7). If I lack this relational connection with God's people (spouse or otherwise), I will be sorely missing an aspect of my relationship with God that will prevent me from experiencing intimacy with my creator. To be clear: I challenge you to look through the Bible and count the number of examples of people having a corporate relationship with God (ex. on a national level, church-level, small groups, praying together, etc.) as compared with having an individual, personal relationship with God. Although our present church culture idolizes the personal relationship aspect of our faith (because our culture idolizes individualism), God has always intended us to relate with him predominantly in a corporate fashion, hence creating Eve to be one with Adam so they could be with God together and not independently.

Similarly, I can have the best spouse in the world and more close friends and family than I know what to do with - not just superficial relationships, but close and meaningful ones. But if I'm just spending all my time swapping emotional baggage and uplifting hearts with no actual active effort to do what God put me here to do, I will lack a fulfilling relationship with God. To be plainly logical, sin separates us from God (Isaiah 59:2). Failing to do what God has commanded us to do is sin - not just in the negative commands, but the proactive ones as well (James 4:17). A prime example: God commanded us to make disciples of all nations (Matthew 28:19-20). If I'm not establishing a lifestyle of disciple-making, I am not having the impact on the world that Jesus intended me to have. As a result, I am in sin, and this separates me from God. Sure, arguments could be made that Isaiah 59:2 might be about a pre-salvation impact of sin, but there's more than enough to back up the fact that post-salvation does have

an impact on our spiritual intimacy with God as well.

Now I want to be clear: we cannot compartmentalize these two desires and expect to be fine. I cannot say, "I will have an intimate relationship with my wife, but will make disciples with my church buddies." This simply does not work. God intended the compulsion for relationships and the command to impact the world he gave us are inextricably linked. An effort to separate them will also be a type of compartmentalization of our relationship with God. How many men or women like it when you have a highly emotional connection through a very deep and intimate conversation (emotion), but get mad at your partner when that doesn't lead to sex (physical)? That's because our desires aren't meant to be compartmentalized - they're meant to function in balance and unity. Likewise, if you have a deeply emotional connection with God, but that's not compelling you to share your faith, there is a serious problem and the intimacy you're feeling might only be one-way, just as the intimacy the wife feels in that emotional conversation isn't received the same way by her husband when it does not escalate into a physical connection as well.

CONCLUSION

If we want to experience true intimacy (relationally, sexually, and spiritually), we must be seeking godly relationships and working within the context of those relationships to have an impact on our world. We must have a *koinonia*-type oneness bond with one another. Although we can have this type of bond with brothers and sisters in Christ in general, it is only with our spouse that we can share all aspects of intimacy. These aspects should not be compartmentalized, but should function harmoniously for the purpose of doing what God put us here to do.

It should go without saying: as intimacy develops in one area, it is more likely to overflow into other areas, *but this does not happen magically by itself - the man must be intentional about facilitating this in the relationship*. Good Christian sex strategy could be as simple as fostering intimacy and addressing core longings where your efforts are currently at their weakest. For guys who are predominantly beta, you might not be weak in the "relationship" side of things or expressing *raya* or *ahava*, but you need to start taking measures to work on your physical traits or alpha qualities such as your *dod* appeal or proving that you have something to offer the world and not just something to offer your spouse.

Reacting v. Responding v. STFU

14 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill · Archived copy · Reddit

I have seen this issue come up a few times here, most recently this morning. I have learned the hard way that reacting is unattractive and breeds more problems, but responding resolves issues without losing momentum. These may not be perfect dictionary definitions, but this may do more to clarify the point:

- **Reacting** - instinctual patterned behavior, usually based on emotional investment in a stimulus
- **Response** - informational communication or assertion, usually based on a desired outcome

Not only have I seen this in many other people, but I have experienced it myself countless times. Reacting to what your spouse says or does teaches her that she can manipulate you. My wife very early in our marriage learned what buttons to push to get me to react the way that she wanted. As a result, like a good beta, I let her get her way while I became predictable, boring, and unattractive.

When I realized what was going on several years ago I stopped reacting altogether. Instead, I followed STFU better than any man who has ever lived. This infuriated my wife because I was applying it where it didn't belong. My non-reactiveness was a step in the right direction, but my non-responsiveness showed her that while I would not let her control me I was not willing to lead or rule over her either.

STFU is a great tactic in its proper place. But when there is an issue on the table that actually matters to you, your wife needs you to take charge, even if this goes against what she is proposing. Since I started responding to her suggestions, thoughts, and tantrums, rather than reacting or emotionally shutting down and withdrawing, she is much more willing to follow my lead. Because I stopped reacting, she stopped trying to manipulate me, seeing that it would not work. Because I stop shutting down, she started following me because I was actually proposing a better plan and she realized that the issue was important to me, whereas shutting down makes her think that I don't care enough about her, the family, or the issue to take a couple minutes to think about it and make a decision myself.

This was probably the first of the red pill concepts I started following in my marriage several years ago. It is the single most effective tool I have found at resolving arguments quickly, while also moving the relationship forward in the direction I intend to take it.

My wife read the book *Parenting by the Book*, by John Rosemond. I haven't read it, but one of her take-aways was this. The author cites a shift that took place in the 70s/80s from the terms *housewife/homemaker* to *stay at home mother* as one of the primary contributing factors to most parenting problems we see today.

Specifically, he says that this terminology change, as well as the corresponding shift in focus of a woman's responsibilities, leaves a cultural stigma that a woman's primary responsibility is to her children first and that any duties around the home are secondary. That is, it's not her job to take care of the house, which is a mutual endeavor with her husband; rather, it is her job to raise the children, and she is the spouse primarily responsible for their care and upbringing.

As a result, the role of the father in children's lives has been minimized and became subsidiary to a "mother knows best" mentality. NMMNG talks about how children are impacted when women are the primary parents, particularly over their sons - they become "nice guys" instead of leaders who are bold, assertive, risk-takers, etc. I also get the idea that it's more convenient if a woman doesn't have to work that many child-related responsibilities would fall on her. But where is the balance?

What do you all think of this dichotomy? TRP and MRP uses the phrase "SAHM" a lot. Do you think we're re-enforcing this mentality when we do so? Should we be pressing for a return to terminology and a cultural stigma that restores a father's role with his children and affirms more traditional (perhaps biblical) roles between husbands and wives? Is it possible that Christian women hang onto the "SAHM" title as their last bastion of authority, since the Bible tells them they shouldn't try to control or rule over their husbands? Or is this really just a matter of convenience? What does your church teach about this stuff, or is it swept under the rug as one of those things too difficult to parse out, so it just never gets brought up? Or do words not really matter, so it's okay to call it whatever everyone else is calling it and any conversation on the topic is worthless in the first place?

Here is something that has worked extremely well for me in the last few weeks. It happened again today, prompting me to think about it and share my findings.

My wife has worked a lot on being appreciative over the years. I learned to accept her appreciation. Beginning my journey with MRP also prompted me to try something new, which actually worked better than accepting her appreciation: rejecting it. Not in a pig-headed way, and there are certainly times when it's appropriate to accept her appreciation ... but in the right way and at the right moment this can be another powerful tool.

Appreciation should be rejected when two conditions are met: (1) she associates the subject matter as her responsibility, and (2) it is actually your responsibility (OYS and all that).

If you helped her figure out a problem with her co-worker [not your responsibility], accept the appreciation. Good on you. Be happy with your praise, but don't expect it. If you took the car in for an oil change and she shows appreciation for being the type of man she wants to admire [she knows it's your responsibility], accept that praise like a champ and move on. After all, too much DNGAF is just going to ruin her fuzzies.

But that little word "me" in the phrase makes a difference: "Thanks for helping **me** with ____." It implies that she feels responsible for things and you stopped being passive and lazy and actually got something done for once. Her praise is actually somewhat insulting when you see it for what it is: "I'm in charge here. I'm responsible for this stuff, but got you to do what I wanted you to do anyway. I'll show appreciation so you are motivated to keep doing my bidding." You shouldn't be accepting praise you don't deserve, especially when there's subtext you haven't considered.

But what's more important than you rejecting praise you don't deserve is what she sees in the process: *I married a man who's got his act together independent of me.*

Here's a recent sample convo:

ME: [Pulled some weeds. Didn't mention it to her. She noticed anyway.]

HER: I saw you pulled the weeds. That really helped me out. Thanks!

ME: I didn't do it to help you. I saw weeds. I pulled them.

HER: What do you mean you *didn't do it to help me*?

ME: It needed to get done. I did it. That's all.

HER: [Puzzled look on her face.]

ME: [Go to grab a drink out of the fridge.]

HER: [Slams fridge closed, presses me up against it and kisses me hard.]

Parallel events have happened 4 or 5 times in the last few weeks. Interestingly, for the last few days I'm not seeing that "me" even subconsciously implied when she shows her appreciation.

Why does this work? - I'm probably just guessing, but here goes:

- When she sees that I get things done without her telling me to do it, the pressure goes off her shoulders, as she feels less responsible for sustaining our household. When this pattern becomes consistent and not just a once-or-twice kind of thing, she feels safe to relax her standards altogether, relieving lots of stress. See my previous post,

Dealing with the stressed wife for more on that.

- OYS is attractive. This sub has enough about that, so I won't elaborate.
- When that "me" (whether spoken or subliminally implied) goes away, it's a sign that she sees you as a man she actually appreciates rather than a helper she manipulates with "words of affirmation" (per *The Five Love Languages*).
- She sees that I'm not in it for her praise. If I'm not trying to get anything from her, the action is more authentic. Authentic men are attractive, and most women can spot a phony/manipulator with relative ease.
- Rejecting appreciation is a sign of dominance. The type of appreciation I referenced (i.e. meets both rules) usually comes from a condescending place. However well-intentioned, it shows that they believe they have power and authority to validate you - that their opinion of you should matter to you. Flipping this on her probably has a subconscious impact on her condescension, making her look up at you instead of down.
- Akin to the last point, rejecting validation from her shows her you don't need her, possibly having some impact on dread.
- At a bare bones, if you won't accept her verbal appreciation, it's possible she may just be resorting to showing physical appreciation. In that case, I don't recommend rejecting it. After all, without being intentionally manipulative (i.e. you're just telling the truth without undermining yourself), she's responding to you with what you want. That's a good result in my book, even if her subconscious isn't entirely pure about it. After all, you'll never totally rid yourself of the hamster, so you've got to start accepting it at some point.

3

UPVOTES

What's the stance on using RP stuff in other arenas?

17 July 2017 · /r/askMRP · Archived copy · Reddit

For example, I used to subscribe to r/deadbedrooms and stuff like that. I still see these posts pop up occasionally and it's usually full of a lot of over-beta garbage, like, "Just keep being nicer to her and doing more chores and she'll come around when life is easy enough on her that she has time to think about sex."

Someone recently posted on one of the RP forums that RP shouldn't just be about individual sex goals; rather, we should have somewhat of a recruitment mentality without breaking Rule 0 - and that in the long run this will prove beneficial for everyone.

With that in mind, does it make sense to give RP advice on DB/LL/etc. forums and refer people over for more, or is this just a waste of time?

Feeling Sexy

Here's something I have noticed as a trend in my marriage, although I had never really connected the dots until recently.

Axiom 1: *When a woman feels sexy, her interest in sex goes up proportionately to how sexy she feels.*

Corollary 1: *Feeling sexy and feeling beautiful/pretty are not the same.*

This should go without saying, but

- **Sexy:** a woman feels sexy when she knows someone has a strong desire to sleep with her.
- **Beautiful:** a woman feels beautiful/pretty when she knows she's radiating a positive aesthetic in her environment.

Women need to experience both of these, but only one of them significantly contributes to a higher libido.

One of the most powerful libido-stimulating factors for a woman is believing that she's irresistibly sexy to the point that people will fight for (or even against) her. I'd dare say this is even stronger when coming from her husband.

Why? Because most women like being re-affirmed that they have made good decisions. If the attention is coming from outside the marriage, this creates minor insecurity that she made a bad decision in marrying her husband. But if it's coming from her husband, she is affirmed that she married the right guy. This increases attraction.

Directed Desire and Fitness Tests

In 102 and 103 I talked about desire and intimacy. Here's an added corollary that combines some concepts toward improving your marital sex life:

Corollary 2: *Your wife needs to know that she is so irresistible that you will fight through any barrier to get in her panties - even barriers that she herself puts up.*

This is why we talk about passing fitness tests. Sure, there's all the talk about frame (and I'm sure there will be posts on that too), but every time you do pass a test in a way that escalates your physical connection, you're telling her that your desire for her is so strong that you're going to plow through any obstacles in the way of getting her. When a man buckles at "I'm too tired" or "I'm too busy right now," she subconsciously interprets this as: *he wants sex, but I'm not sexy enough to be worth his trying a little harder.*

The key in this is the distinction between "**he wants sex**" and "**he wants me**." She has to believe that **she** is the only one who can make you feel this way. If she sees you as just some sex-crazed chump stuck with her low libido, she'll chalk up your bold passion as your high libido finally having had enough. You need to show her that you don't want some other woman; you want her and no one else. *Your desire is directed at her and her alone.*

So, if Sexy Suzy walks down the street and propositions you, your attitude needs to be: "Screw that, do you have any idea how hot my wife is?" When you bear that attitude toward your wife, regardless of whether or not she sees it, you yourself will be bolder about your sex life and your wife will likely eventually feel it. Of course, you've got to maintain a degree of OI in this.

Generic v. Specific Compliments

The problem is that just telling your wife, "I desire you more than any other woman" doesn't convince her. You've

got to get the conversation decked out with specifics that wouldn't apply to the masses. This can be tricky, but here are some examples in three fairly common areas of physical appearance.

First - Clothes

- **Generic:** "That dress is driving me crazy"
 - Her interpretation: "He might have a fetish for this style of dress."
- **Specific:** "The way that dress fits over your body is so tight, and your hips curving out that way ... it's turning me on."
 - Her interpretation: "He noticed the way my unique body shape is complimented and accentuated by my dress - and that makes him want me."

Second - Hair

- **Generic:** "I love the way your hair looks today."
 - Her interpretation: "He likes this hair style on women, generally."
- **Specific:** "When you put your hair up that way, it reminds me of when we were at that one event, and the sex we had afterward - I can't get that out of my mind. [Playful/sarcastic:] Go change your hairdo or I might actually go insane."
 - Her interpretation: "He likes this hair style, but his memories of me are what's turning him on. We must have a strong connection."

Third - Skin

- **Generic:** "Your skin looks so smooth, I just want to rub my hands all over you."
 - Her interpretation: "He generally likes soft skin. I happened to use lotion today."
- **Specific:** "Your skin feels so smooth, I want to gently glide my hands across your legs and feel all the goosebumps that come up."
 - Her interpretation: "He's attracted by the way my body responds to his touch."

Guys are notoriously bad at compliments. We stick with the generic because it's easy, but wives want to know that **it's her and her alone** that we crave. If she thinks it's just about getting sex and any woman will do, that's a huge turn-off. To her, you've just become like the stereotypical sex-craved man-pig who would hump a rock if it wasn't sinful. Show her she's wrong!

To address the lack of Scripture in this post, my source of inspiration is not only my personal experience, but 90% of the book of Song of Songs. Pretty much the entire book is one compliment after another, unique to the other person - all leading toward a heightened sense of physical intimacy. Rather than quoting dozens of verse examples to back this post up, I'll let you read the book yourself.

11

UPVOTES

The More You Know: Profanity and evasive efforts are auto-filtered, so use alternatives

19 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

I set up the auto-mod to delete profanity and evasive efforts, such as using an asterisk instead of a vowel. I know there are certain catch-phrases in the manosphere like STs and OYS. That said, for the sake of others who find this place without such familiarity and who prefer to have a cleaner discourse, the preference is to use alternatives like "fitness test" and "own your stuff" or just to use the acronym. If I knew how to exempt specific phrases from the filter while still filtering other uses of the words, I would do so, but that's beyond my capabilities.

For the next week or two I'll try to be pretty lenient with approving these types of posts anyway, giving you all some time to adjust. Sorry for any inconvenience.

12

UPVOTES

105 - Non-Negotiable Attraction

21 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

I've talked some about cultivating desire, which leads to intimacy, and using that intimate knowledge to develop a feeling of being "sexy." But a few points need to be clarified, as most RP people should already know:

Axiom 1: *Attraction cannot be negotiated or will-powered into existence.*

Axiom 2: *You can't fix your wife; you can only fix yourself.*

Axiom 3: *Some people won't respond, even if you do fix yourself; and it's okay to let them walk away if they insist.*

Interestingly, all of these principles are found straight in the Bible, which can re-affirm that we do right by following them.

TOTAL DEPRAVITY

I don't care if you're Calvinist or Arminian - we all agree that humans are sinful from birth and cannot be saved (read: reconciled relationship with God, the way he wants) unless God draws him (John 6:44). We may disagree with what that "drawing" actually is, but the core principle is there. Hebrews 11:6 goes another step: "And without faith it is impossible to please God." Isaiah 64:6 clarifies, "Even their good deeds are as filthy rags." Genesis 6:5 makes this bolder: "Every inclination of the thoughts of man's heart was only evil all of the time." In Romans 3:11, Paul re-frames the human condition in the context of relational desire and pursuit: "No one understands; no one seeks God."

In short, if God wanted a healthy relationship with us *he could not sit by and wait for us to come to him*. We were utterly incapable of doing anything that would genuinely please him. Even when we try and think our motives are pure, our hearts deceive us and we are really doing wrong if it's of our own effort (see Proverbs 14:12, 16:2, 21:27, Jeremiah 17:9, Romans 8:8). Jesus even says boldly in Matthew 7 that some people think they're doing right by Him, but in the end he tells them, "I never know you; away from me you evildoers."

TOTALLY DEPRAVED SPOUSE

This is how we must imagine our spouses. Wives will not enter into right, reconciled relationships with their husbands (read: genuine desire for their husbands, the way we want) unless the husband draws her. In reality, God can change her heart in the absence of our efforts, but it's idiotic to make that assumption without a prophetic guarantee. I know I prayed endlessly for God to change my wife. The response I got from God was, essentially, "Screw that, go change yourself." So, I ask:

ONE - How many of you have endured sexlessness and disrespect from your spouse and just hoped that without you doing anything different they would magically change?

TWO - How many of you have had your spouse try to initiate sex or serve you around the house, but totally killed the mood because you knew their motive was out of duty and not desire?

Now you know how God feels! God doesn't bargain for our obedience. He doesn't negotiate for our love. He knows this would be futile *because we are INCAPABLE of loving and desiring him of our own will-power*. In the same way, our wives are **INCAPABLE** of loving and desiring us of their own will-power.

DON'T FIX, BE FIXED

Fortunately, God's pretty smart, so he gave us the answer. Pop quiz: which did God say was the answer to our sin and depravity?

- (A) Screw them, they can all go to hell!
- (B) I'll just magically fix them because I love them!
- (C) I'll just keep waiting until maybe someone down there figures out how to solve this problem!
- (D) Maybe I can negotiate with them: I give them heaven, they give me sinless perfection!
- (E) I'll put the responsibility for their salvation on myself, be perfect myself, set the example by myself for what I expect, own all the crap and sin in the world myself, and let them respond to **who I am**, taking on my identity through my being in them, rather than me trying to "fix them" as they are.

[Obviously the answer is E!]

Instead of fixing us, God became an example to us of what a "fixed" human being looks like. That was incredibly alluring! Everywhere he went, people were drawn to him. When you fix yourself, people are drawn to you. In Jerusalem, Cana, Capernaum, the gym, the grocery store, and the park ... people turn their heads and notice the one who is living as a "fixed" and right person who "has it all together" (or by RP terminology, is fit and has mastered OYS and frame, etc.).

THE BREAK-DOWN

Let me split this up into pieces.

I'll put the responsibility for their salvation on myself

Husbands, if you want to make your wives right with God and with you, the responsibility for accomplishing this is on you, not them. Just as God determined that the responsibility was his and not the church's to figure out, so it is with husbands and wives.

be perfect myself, set the example by myself for what I expect

This is why RP refrains: "fix the man, not the marriage."

own all the crap and sin in the world myself

OYS, yes ... but also taking responsibility for things that go wrong in the family. Jesus bore the church's sins. Not just the ones he thought weren't so bad ... **all of them**. So, when your wife screws up, don't shift the blame. You're the captain. Ephesians 5:23 literally sets up the metaphor that you are "God" to your wife. I love what Brother Lawrence said when he was convicted with sin: "I shall never do otherwise, if you leave me to myself. It is you who must hinder my falling and mend what is amiss" (*Practice of the Presence of God*). Husbands, this is part of leading your wives.

let them respond to **who I am**

God doesn't force every person on the planet to respond to him. He's OI. He accepts the fact that some people will reject him, and yet this actually glorifies him even when people reject him! He loves them and cares about their salvation, but his frame is unaffected by their rejection of him. He doesn't push them away, but he certainly lets them walk away, or never approach to begin with.

Instead, the focus is on letting people respond to who he is as expressed by all the things he has done for us, most notably through the Gospel. Salvation is about responding to what God has revealed to us about who he is. It's not

about us; it's about him.

taking on my identity through my being in them, rather than me trying to "fix them" as they are

The result of being "saved" - after we have responded to true RP manliness from God, his bride (the church) fits within his frame, taking on his identity rather than trying to craft one for itself. God does not fix our broken frames to be like his anymore than we should bolster our wives' frames to secure for her her own independent identity. God opens his frame up and says, "I am the gate; whoever enters through me will be saved" (John 10:9). To reword that in RP terms: "Jesus is the door to God's frame; whoever goes through Him will rest securely in God's frame." That's what you want your wife to do!

But none of this can be done if you are trying to lobby for your wife's desire, as if we could overcome the sinful nature on our own in the absence of God's help. What I call "the sinful nature" here can, in part, parallel the concept of *hypergamy* in the wife, but that's another post for another day.

Mini-FR - The vasectomy conversation

21 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

My wife and I agreed that we're done having kids and that I would get a vasectomy. We had our 4th and final child about a month ago, so I'm eager to get the procedure over with. This morning ...

ME: I called the doctor yesterday and should be hearing back this morning about scheduling an appointment.

HER: What appointment? What doctor?

ME: For a vasectomy. If possible, I'd rather skip the consult and just go in for the procedure so I don't have to take a second day off work.

HER: Why would you do that?!? Our baby is only one month old. Wait until she's 6 months and the risk of SIDS goes down.

ME: I get that you're worried about SIDS [fogging], but I'd rather get this done now, so I'm going to schedule the procedure [broken record].

HER: [Getting vocally angry] You didn't think to talk to me about this before doing it?

ME: We discussed this [literally the night before] and agreed I'm going to get the procedure [broken record].

HER: But you didn't say you were going to do it so soon. You should have told me you were going to call him so we could talk about it more first.

ME: I agree that you may not have understood my intended time-frame [fogging], but I'm still going to get the procedure done [broken record].

HER: Is this all because you don't want to use condoms for the next few months? Is that what this is about?!?!?!?

ME: You're right, I don't like using condoms [fogging], but it's really that I would just rather get the procedure done now [broken record].

HER: [Giving me nasty dirty looks in silence for a minute] **You'd better not do it. This is really stupid. You have no idea how much this is going to hurt me.**

ME: I understand that you may feel hurt by this decision [fogging], but it's important to me [self-disclosure], so I'm going to get the procedure done [broken record].

HER: [Crying] I don't understand. I don't agree with any of this.

ME: I can see now that you don't understand or agree [fogging]. But I don't need you to understand or agree [self-disclosure], I need you to accept that I am going to get the procedure done [broken record].

I then kissed her on the forehead, gave her an empathetic hug and left for work while she was still crying a little. A couple minutes later the doctor calls. They won't skip the consult, so I scheduled it.

About 5 minutes after that I get another call.

ME: Hello.

HER: Hi. You're right. I don't know what I was thinking. We did talk about this. There's really no good reason to wait to get this done. I'm sorry. Even if something did happen to our baby, I don't want to get another c-section anyway.

ME: That's great to hear. Thank you. The doctor called back just before you did, the consult is next Wednesday.

HER: That's good. Maybe we can give your little guys some fun tonight while they're still around.

17

UPVOTES

107 - Hyper-Hypergamy, the Comparison Game, and Positive Dread

25 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

HYPER-HYPERGAMY

It's no secret that women are predominantly hypergamous. This means that they will always trade up for the better man if the risks of doing so are outweighed by the benefits.

If you remember the previous post on [the curse](#), you'll know that women also desire to rule over their husbands. Putting these two concepts together, the woman's real imperative is:

- **Find the best man possible, marry him, then leverage the relationship to rule over him.**

It's not about finding the best man just for the sake of having the best man. There's a greater power to be won when she is a queen over an 8 than a queen over a 5. And even when she has conquered that 8, she will not be satisfied because now she sees all the 9s and 10s.

SATAN'S PLOY

Satan did the same thing. From Isaiah 14 and Ezekiel 28 we get the impression that Satan had great authority, but he was not content being master over angels who were a 5. He wanted the perfect 10 to master. So, he says, "I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will make myself like the Most High" (Isa. 14:14).

Flash forward to the first sin itself. Satan's tells Eve: "You will be like God" (Genesis 3:5). Sound familiar? He's tempting her with the exact thing that ruined him - but he's not telling her the outcome. Satan was cast out of heaven (Ez. 28:16) and Eve was cast out of Eden, but not before she tried to take leadership over her man by having him eat the fruit too (Gen. 3:6). This is where the curse sets in: that Eve's desire would be to rule over her husband, but that he would actually be the one to rule over her.

Satan imparted his struggle, his curse, on Eve, and the daughters of Eve have been struggling with this hyper-hypergamy ever since. **It's not enough to have the best man; they must also rule over the best man.**

THE COMPARISON GAME

I've never seen this concept talked about on an RP forum, but it's one that is fairly infallible in my experience with women. I have yet to find an exception. AWALT.

- Start with basic hypergamy. Higher SMV = better; will trade up if circumstances permit.
- Preselection = if other women find a man desirable, there must be something about him you don't know yet.
 - This at first seems to be only for "new" men, as it's the only way to gauge the non-looks aspects of their SMV, by trusting the attention of other women. That said, this works in marriages too. When a guy starts improving his SMV, when he starts getting attention from other women, his wife starts to realize, "Maybe there's more to his changes than I've noticed."
- Preselection assumes competition against the other women who prove the preselection. **The comparison game** goes one step further: *Women have an innate drive to outdo other women in the aspects of their lives that matter to them. How good their husband is always matters.*
 - Something like how good a woman's job is might not matter at all to a housewife, so she won't feel the need to compete with a working mom on that front. Instead, she will compete with her on how happy and successful her children are. That does matter to her. Since the working mom presumably also cares about the

upbringing of her children, it becomes a two-way competition, increasing emotional investment in the outcome.

- The comparison game is the primary motivator for women to keep a separate frame from their husbands, to strengthen those frames, and to force their husbands into those frames. On an external level, they will appear to other women as having won the comparison game. Ironically, this is counter-productive because on an internal level the wife will know that her husband is not as high-quality as she brags about him being.

Note: It doesn't help that men are constantly comparing women to each other.

POSITIVE DREAD

Dread is the concern that other women want what you have and might actually get it. Interestingly, it's not a negative in low/moderate doses. Women actually **WANT** to experience some degree of dread. It is an internal sign to her that she is winning the comparison game. Other girls want her guy, but she's the one who locked him down.

In appropriate levels, her husband becomes the trophy that she can wave around to all the other women proving she is the champion of the comparison game. But if the trophy is external-only (i.e. she's the one sculpting it), then she will know she cheated and that the victory is hollow. If it's the real deal - a true RP man - then she has won for real and she experiences the fullness of this victory over the other women.

I do distinguish this from more overt versions of dread, where the woman is controlled by fear of her man, not pride in her man. It reminds me of a comedian who once said: "There's no greater compliment a guy can pay me than staring at my wife's rack." Take that in the reverse and that's how dread helps win the comparison game.

HUSBANDS: DON'T PLAY THE GAME

By now, it might be tempting to help your wife win the comparison game so she'll take pride in you and desire you more for it. There is some benefit in this, but in my personal experience, it's not an effective strategy. This is a trap, just as the game itself is a trap for the woman. When she wins against one person, there's always a new competitor just around the corner. You also might find yourself becoming a slave to the game's rules rather than being your own man.

Paul says plainly: **"Not that we dare to classify or compare ourselves with some of those who are commending themselves. But when they measure themselves by one another and compare themselves with one another, they are without understanding"** (2 Cor. 10:12).

My wife used to cry every time she came home from her sister's house. Somehow she always found some aspect of her sister's life that was better than hers. Her sister has a strong frame, so my wife's frame would crack to her sister every time. As a good beta, I used to pull out the duct tape and fix her frame with all the reassurance and confidence she needed, then we'd start fortifying it. Next thing I knew, I was inside her frame, as that was the best angle to hammer in those nails and lay a concrete border.

My wife couldn't wait for her sister to come over to our house so they could play the comparison game again, this time on her turf. If it failed, I got an emotional lashing for not making her frame strong enough. If it succeeded, my wife set her sights on new targets (subconsciously, of course; it became other women at church she'd compare herself against instead of her sister).

Solution? Don't play the game.

SAVING HER FROM HERSELF - DEVELOPING WIFEY OI

We all have a sinful nature. That is who I am in my core self apart from Christ. God had to save me from myself. In my last post on [Non-Negotiable Attraction](#), I commented that "'the sinful nature' here can, in part, parallel the concept of *hypergamy* in the wife." Without God giving us a new identity (2 Cor. 5:17), we will always be ruled by our sinful nature (Romans 3:9-18).

Similarly, unless a husband gives his wife a new identity, she will always be ruled by her hypergamy and the comparison trap (because we now know it's not just a game). When we rest in God's frame (per that previous post), we assume His identity. Likewise, when your wife rests in your frame, she assumes your identity. I previously quoted 2 Cor. 10:12. The next verse says, "But we will not boast beyond limits [frame], but will boast only with regard to the area of influence God assigned to us." That is, your wife's only concern will be what you have delegated to her within your frame - and she will be free to boast about this: that she is fully pleasing to her man, making her a great wife with a great man.

My frame will destroy my wife's sister's frame every time. She can't convince me to do things her way because I'm not playing a comparison game with her. I'm not trying to do everything she can do, then one-up her. I am my own man. In my view, I'm not at competition with my wife's sister and I DNGAFlip who is better at what. When my wife rests in my frame, she stops playing the comparison trap and appreciates what we have for what it is. Why? Because that's what I've told her to do (with my actions, not my words - words will always fail with that instruction).

When my wife visits her sister alone, she still struggles periodically. But, interestingly, whenever we go together, she comes back all smiles.

Incidentally, this ends up winning her the comparison game anyway. It is the wife's version of OI. When she stops caring about comparing herself to others because she rests in her man's frame instead of battling theirs, that is the only way she will get the kind of life she really wants. When she has that, she will win the comparison game incidentally.

5

UPVOTES

What's the best way to play this out?

26 July 2017 · /r/askMRP · Archived copy · Reddit

Today is my and my wife's 9th anniversary. She arranged a baby-sitter, but we have not discussed what we're going to do when we go out. I have 3 date ideas in mind:

- A concert and dinner. One of the upscale outdoor malls has a band playing in the street, so we could listen and people watch, talk, go in and out of shops, and grab dinner at one of her favorite places that I haven't been to in a decade (she usually goes with girl friends, bridal showers, etc.).
- Escape game and dinner. We've both always wanted to do a live escape the room game, but we've never done it. There's one not too far from our house, walking distance from several restaurants.
- Go to the state fair. She's a country girl, so she'll eat that up.

I'm cool with all of these options. I have not mentioned any of them to her yet, and I'm not asking which one we should do. That said, I have to strategies that I'd like feedback on.

FIRST

Text her mid-day asking what she wants to do when we go out (beta tactic). I might even ham it up a bit, "Sky's the limit. Your wish is my command. My baby gets what she wants on our anniversary." Maybe play along for a bit, but ultimately ignore whatever answer she gives and say, "I'm just screwing around. I already know what we're doing tonight. In fact ..." then hop to strategy part 2.

My hope with this first part is to give her a clear reminder of my past beta ways, then provide an immediate and stark contrast with the alpha traits I've been developing over the past several months ... but in a playful, indirect, yet take charge kind of way. An additional goal is that by laughing off that stupid crap I used to do, it will be obvious that we now both view my old ways as somewhat of a joke, subconsciously instilling in her that the changes she's been seeing are (1) real, and (2) permanent.

SECOND

I then add: "I actually have three options: A, B, and C, but I'm not going to tell you what they are. Instead, when I come home, I'm going to look at how sexy you're dressed and that decides which date you get."

This will hopefully make a fun game of it for her. I will, in fact pick the date based on her attire. If she wears jeans, for example, were going to the fair. But no matter what she does, I only have two responses:

- If she didn't even try, I tell her she gets option C, but that'll be a fun time anyway. She'll love the fair and wonder, "If C was this good, I really wish I knew what A and B were!" I won't tell her, but reveal she can play the dressing game again on our next date night. Hopefully she'll take it more seriously.
- If she does doll herself up good, I just pick whichever of the options I feel like doing and tell her she got option B. I'm acknowledging her effort, while still pushing her to feel safe and encouraged to "slut it up" a little more when she's with me.

I suppose there's a third option where she goes for full, raw sex appeal ... but that seems so unlikely knowing how uncomfortable she is looking sexy in public (especially still having a bit of post-pregnancy baby weight) that I don't take that possibility seriously.

Thoughts? Suggestions? Is the first strategy going to crash and burn?

This issue comes up a lot in Christian circles and it's worth discussing here too, especially since RP thinking is mostly derived from these in the first place.

WHAT IS LUST?

When Jesus says in Matthew 5:28, "Anyone who looks at a woman lustfully has already committed adultery with her in his heart," he's using the words *epithumeo* for lust and *moicheia* for adultery. This is different from the word *porneia* that he gives as the exception for divorce, but that's beside the point and /u/BluePillProfessor already tackled that issue in a separate post. *Moicheia* is actual adultery, as defined in their culture (which is a little different from how we view it, but not too too far off).

But that word *epithumeo* does not mean "lust" in the way we think of the word today. It's actually the same word that Exodus 20:17 in the Septuagint (earliest known Greek translation of the OT) translates as, "You shall not covet [epithumeo] your neighbor's wife."

Biblically, the idea of *coveting* is not merely any old desire. It's an *I would if I could* mentality. If you see your neighbor's cow and think, "If I knew I wouldn't get caught, I'd totally steal his cow!" that's coveting. If you see it and think, "Dang, that's a great cow. I wish I had a cow like that. But I don't ... oh well." That's not coveting. That's desire.

Desire is healthy. Coveting is not. It's really that simple. If we were to stifle all of our desires and pretend we never wanted anything that anyone else has, we would totally lack all ambition in life and fail as a species. Paul saying things like, "Run in such a way to win the prize!" (1 Cor. 9:24) makes no sense if we're not allowed to desire something we don't yet have.

DRAWING THE LINE

Here's my simple test for discerning whether you're lusting or not:

- Is the object of your desire not your spouse?
- If there were no earthly hindrances to gratifying yourself with the object of your desire, would you do it?

If the answer to both questions is yes, then it's sinful lust. If the answer to either question is no, then it's not sinful.

EXAMPLES

Assume someone is just looking and not necessarily touching himself or anything (which *de facto* proves point 2).

- She's only a character on the screen; she's not a real person; I can't have sex with a screen. *If she stepped out of the screen and into your basement, would you bang her?*
- I don't know where she lives - it's probably the other side of the world. *Okay, if she knocked on your door and walked in your bedroom, would you bang her?*
- I keep eyeing my girlfriend; she's getting me hot, but there are too many people around right now, which helps me keep control. *If you were alone, would you have sex with her right then and there?*
- There's not enough time, so I'm just looking. *If you got a free pass from all of your deadlines, would you then proceed?*
- You're alone with your GF on the couch making out. No one else is around, you have no deadlines, you're super into it, but you're afraid if you try to go further she might say no, so you exercise restraint. *If you knew for a fact she'd say yes, would you bang her?*

- Suppose she would say yes and you're extremely confident of this, but you're afraid of what your mom might think if she found out. *If you knew for a fact your mom would approve, would you do it?*
- Suppose everyone would approve of this, but you know you're not married and you don't want to ruin your sense of moral superiority. *If you knew your sense of moral superiority could not be tarnished by sleeping with your girlfriend, would you do it?*
- Suppose everyone would approve, you have no worries or concerns about it, you're appropriately humble, but you know that it's wrong to sleep with someone outside of marriage because God said so. *This isn't lust - it's appropriately self-controlled desire. Why? Because it's not an "earthly" hindrance.*
- Suppose you know God wouldn't want you to do it, but you also have the moral superiority thing going on, you're also afraid of her saying no, you're also afraid of what people would think if they found out, etc., and also in that situation you would refuse, and it is impossible to discern which of these hindrances would be primarily responsible for your refusal and you are not sure if "honoring God" alone would be enough (but it might be, you just don't know) ... *This is probably sinful lust. At the very least, you know you're being reckless with your thoughts because you don't know whether or not you would be able to restrain your desire if all of those other things were removed. As such, you're exposing yourself to temptation without knowing if you can resist on the right motives alone - and that itself goes against the grain of the command to "flee from temptation," rather than the repeated condemnation the Scriptures give to our efforts to justify our temptations and desires on some technicality.

CLARIFYING INTERNAL MOTIVATORS

As noted above, one of the "hindrances" can be internalized humanistic motivations. For example, "I'd feel really guilty afterward" is a hindrance that's usually not a righteous motivation.

This gets me a lot of heat in Christian circles, but I fully believe that all forms of feeling "guilty" are not from God - that Jesus came to free us from guilt. So, when pastors talk about "guilt" as a healthy reaction to sin that keeps us motivated to avoid sin, I usually object and say something like this:

No, trying to avoid guilt is a humanistic motivation that places our own internal emotional state as an ultimate priority. Our reason for living should be our faith, hope, and love. Romans 14 says anything that does not come from faith is sin. So, if your motivation is a desire to avoid negative feelings, you're really doing it for yourself, not for God, and that's sin - and that applies to all negative feelings, not just guilt. The better option is simply to eliminate this guilt and negativity from your life altogether. After all, you're already forgiven - why bother feeling guilty when God has already declared you "not guilty"? Then, live in that freedom out of appreciation for the verdict he rendered, not for fear that he might undo that verdict and somehow make you feel or be guilty again.

FINAL THOUGHTS

Sadly, many people think they're in "honoring God" mode, when in reality, if the circumstances were right, that alone would not be enough to hold them back. The temptation of having some porn star in your bedroom without consequence, without guilt, without anyone finding out, etc., and she's all over you ... "honoring God" simply wouldn't be enough of a motivator for as many people as would like to think it would be. As a result, many people force themselves into that last category in the hopes that creating ambiguity can give them some wiggle room.

Now ... the thing that gives context to all of this is that actual self-gratification in any of these circumstances proves that you actually would act if you had the opportunity because you *are acting*. So, if the thought leads you to beat off, then it's sinful lust, unless the object of your desire is your spouse ... in which case it would not be sinful lust (although there's debate over whether or not it would fall under some other kind of "sin" category).

15

UPVOTES

106 - What doesn't work

31 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

A short one for /u/OsmiumZulu. This is a filler because I obviously can't count to 7 correctly. Nevertheless, it's a massively important concept I realized about a year ago, which often goes unnoticed. Even though I haven't heard it said directly in TRP/MRP, I doubt anyone would disagree:

AXIOM: *If it wouldn't make a single person want to sleep with you, it's not going to make your spouse want to sleep with you.*

Someone on another sub was complaining:

I have argued, pleaded, cried, begged, demanded

... and then concluded that divorce was the only option. I once tried these things too. Know what I learned? If it doesn't work with single people, it probably won't work on your spouse either. Imagine going to the bar ...

- **Argue:** I'm really mad that you haven't had sex with me yet. I know we just met, but here's a list of 7 reasons why your actions have upset me ...
- **Pleading:** Please, please, please have sex with me! I just need to get laid. I'll do anything!
- **Crying:** <Sob, sob, sob> ... I'm so sorry, I'm just pathetic and miserable. If you'd have sex with me, ... maybe I wouldn't be so sad right now ...
- **Begging:** Come on. Please? You know you want to. DO IT! Come on. It'll be fun. Stop looking at that hot guy, I'll take you home. I don't have any STDs. C'mon. C'mooooon. Pleeassssee! C'mon!
- **Demanding:** The Bible says you must submit and have sex with me! I know we're not married yet, but you're just a woman and I'm a man, so you'd better do what I say.

These don't come from a place of cultivating desire; rather, they're from self-entitlement. To add a few that aren't on that guy's list:

- **Chore Play:** Hey, I see you spilled some beer on your skirt. How about we go back to your place, I'll do your laundry, wash your windows, vacuum the carpet, and organize your fridge, and if I do all of that you'll have sex with me, right?
- **Bragging:** Hey, I just bench-pressed 250lbs at the gym. I also got a pretty good bonus. Do you want to sleep with me now?
- **Gift-Giving:** I bought you some flowers and chocolates. These are pretty romantic things and I didn't skimp on the cheap stuff. Is that enough to buy some sex for the night?
- **Flattery:** You're looking really good tonight. You're pretty much the hottest girl I've ever seen. How do you get your hair so silky? You're so out of my league, it's amazing you're even talking to me.
- **Unwanted Touch:** Oh, I'm sorry, was that your boob I just grabbed? Hmm, let me feel the other one too. Are you getting turned on now?

My efforts in these areas with my wife in the past haven't necessarily been this extreme, but you get the point. It always boggles my mind that people (including myself!) by default try to use different tactics to try to get their spouse to sleep with them than they would employ with trying to get together with a single person.

A couple key verses:

- 2 Thess. 3:10 - "If anyone is not willing to work, let him not eat." By extension: if you're not willing to put in the work to improve yourself and flirt with your wife, don't expect the benefit of what that work would have gotten you. Lift. Sidebar. Etc.
- James 4:1-12 - (in part) "What causes quarrels and fights among you? Is it not this: that your passions are at war within you? You desire and do not have, so you murder. You covet and cannot obtain, so you fight and quarrel. You do not have, because you do not ask. You ask and do not receive, because you ask wrongly, to spend it on your passions." This is self-entitlement mentality. We do this to God and we do it to our spouses. Don't do that. God doesn't respond to it. She won't either.

Also, go back to Song of Solomon. He had a great body and he knew how to flirt. He was a high quality man worthy of her desire. He had a mission from God apart from her and was pursuing it and this attracted her to him. He was surrounded by other men - armed guards even. Other maidens took notice of him. Be a high quality man. Period.

High quality men do get chores done, buy their women gifts, flirt through flattery, and grope their wives - but they can get away with these things because, like Solomon, they're not using them as manipulative tactics. They do it because they want to. The first list? I don't know any high quality men who do those things at all, nor does Solomon model them for us.

I posted this to someone else in the Divorce Inc. thread, but this might be worth noting for a more public review.

- 85% of all children with behavioral disorders come from fatherless homes (per CDC)
- 90% of all homeless/runaway children are from fatherless homes (Census Bureau)
- 71% of all high school dropouts are children from fatherless homes (National Principals Association)
- 75% of all adolescents in chemical abuse centers come from fatherless homes (Rainbows for all God's Children)
- 63% of youth suicides are from fatherless homes (Census Bureau)
- 80% of rapists diagnosed with displaced anger come from fatherless homes (Criminal Justice & Behavior, Vo. 14, p. 403-26)
- 85% of all youths in prisons grew up in fatherless homes (GA and TX Dept. of Corrections stats)

Children from fatherless homes are:

- 5x more likely to commit suicide
- 32x more likely to run away
- 20x more likely to have behavioral disorders
- 14x more likely to commit rape
- 9x more likely to drop out of high school
- 10x more likely to abuse chemical substances
- 20x more likely to end up in prison

... than children where they have an active, present father-figure in their lives.

Now, I get that "fatherless" means no father at all, as opposed to "mom gets custody, dad's still present as a non-custodial parent." So, when it comes to custody-based stats, here are a few from the Pew Research Center (yes, it's a Christian resource - deal with it):

- **Median household income** - F: \$40,000, M: \$26,000
- **Average Age** - F: ~40, M: ~34
- **Education** - Interestingly, F/M are almost equally likely to have a college degree (17/18), women are more likely to have started, but not finished college (32/40), but men are more likely to have graduated high school (32/26) - remembering that these are stats only for single fathers v. single mothers, not all men/women
- **At or Below Poverty** - F: 24%, M: 43%

Why I Prefer Female Judges for my Male Clients

My county actually has 5 domestic judges, 4 of whom are women. Interestingly, if you go into smaller counties, the judges are almost exclusively men. Those smaller counties are **FAR FAR FAR** more likely to hand custody over to a mom than my big-county female judges.

Why? Because women judges don't have anything to prove - they are already the epitome of female power. They can do whatever the heck they want and the feminists will support them for it because they're powerful women. As a result, they're more fair. The men, however, are so used to sucking up to women that they can't get it out of their systems. This isn't true for every male/female judge dynamic, but in my county every attorney knows who they'd rather have presiding over their cases with male clients.

I also see empowered female judges looking down on SAHMs and needy/dependent women. Do I like the condescending tone they have toward their "inferior" sisters? Not really. But I do find it interesting that their attitude is, essentially, "I'm a woman and I made it into power. You obviously chose a different path that didn't lead you into power. Why should I use my power to help you when you've done nothing to help yourself?" In this sense, they often do maintain that feminist entitlement attitude, but it doesn't play out to favor other women the way you'd think.

As for the men, I actually had a case where a male magistrate said on the record (he forgot it was still recording), directed toward my client (I was representing the woman in this case) - "Man, I would do anything to tap that. Doesn't someone like that make you wish they'd repeal that ethical law about not sleeping with your clients? You'd have it so easy because you're her savior!" He then proceeded to flirt with my client repeatedly throughout the trial. Needless to say, we won that one and that fat magistrate didn't get any from her.

More fun stats: In a neighboring county where I practice, a statistical analysis was done on a male judge's most recent 60 custody cases at the time (2014):

- Shared parenting was requested by one or both parties in 45 of the cases (75%), but was only granted twice.
- Custody was granted to the woman in 51/60 cases (85%).
- Of the 15% of cases where dad got custody, 6/7 were because the mother had severe substance abuse or violence problems, the remaining 1 was due to extreme mental health issues and medical disability. None of them were just because dad was clearly the better parent.
- Although it wasn't part of the study, that same judge also rejected an **AGREEMENT BY ALL PARTIES** that Father get custody. The Father, Mother, and the children's Guardian ad Litem all testified under oath on a fully-signed agreement at a final uncontested hearing that Mother was incapable of parenting the children and Father had to be the custodial parent, and that Father was stable and capable. The children even went in-chambers to talk to the judge and explained that their mom never fed them, often left them in the home unattended (they were under 11), and just slept all day when they were over ... and the judge ripped up the agreement and gave custody to the mother anyway.

CONCLUSION??? - Beta and SJW men are more likely to help women than empowered women.

Custody theories that could ruin you ... and the merits of shared parental rights

2 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill · Archived copy · Reddit

Occasionally people here will comment or PM me about shared parenting, so here are some things worth noting.

JUDICIAL HAMSTERING

Approximation Rule - Children spend around 80% of the time with their mothers while the parties are married, so that should continue in the divorce.

Assuming a SAHM situation, this might be true, but the research actually shows that this is not what kids want, nor is it empirically beneficial to them, and it also creates financial dependency as the mother has less ability to get a job. The situation isn't even remotely true when both parents are working. Richard Warshak wrote an article in the Baltimore Law Review with much more information on this.

Attachment Theory - Children build a stronger bond with one parent, thus will have developmental advantages if primary care is given to that parent.

This floats around in the courts a lot and gets argued regularly, but there's really no evidence to back it up. In reality, the research shows that kids develop mutual attachments with both parents, albeit sometimes to varying degrees. But even when there is an imbalanced attachment, there is no evidence to support the conclusion that the child will develop better under that parent's care.

Too Young Rule - Because mothers need to breastfeed and infants/toddlers are more sensitive to maternal connection from the fetal time, when the children are very young they are better off with the mothers.

Proponents of this theory also point to irritable behavior or maladjustment when their mothers are away for too long. There is very limited research done on this subject, but all 7 cases I know of came back with the conclusion that this is a bogus theory. Courts will still lap up the "I need to breastfeed" argument, and it is universally accepted that authentic breast milk is better than formula - but she can pump and give you a supply at parenting exchanges. Don't fall for this garbage rule of thumb.

Stability Argument - Most children thrive under consistency and routine, so it's better if they have one primary residence.

Again, there's no evidence to support this. In fact, all of the evidence points to the exact opposite. It is true that children thrive under consistency and routine, but the appendage is misleading, as it presumes that consistency and routine have a greater influence on a child's ability to thrive than a mutual relationship with both parents, and it also presumes (often falsely) that having one primary residence will actually increase consistency and routine.

Conflict Avoidance Rule - If parents can't get along, it's better to avoid shared parenting because that conflict will hurt the kids.

Yes, the conflict between parents post-divorce will hurt the kids. This is undeniable. But the false assumption is that granting custody rights to one parent will actually reduce the conflict. In fact, it increases it, as the non-custodial parent often feels the need to step up his/her game in order to impress the courts for round 2, which forces the custodial parent to defend his/her position, which increases conflict. Most often, a well-crafted shared parenting plan is the best way to minimize this conflict, yet one of my state's statutory factors for assessing the viability of shared parenting is "conflict between the parents."

Caveat: There are legitimate situations where parents' inability to cooperate really is an insurmountable task and the increased conflict from granting custody (creating a victor/loser mentality between the parties) is outweighed by the fact that the parents legitimately cannot get anything done if the court requires them to agree on decisions.

Reversion Theory - Even if shared parenting is granted, most couples will revert to a more historical balance of

parenting rights anyway, so why try to force shared parenting if the parties won't follow it?

This theory does play out more often than I'd like to admit. It's extremely common that one parent will fight for equal rights, then once they get them they'll constantly try to use the other parent as a babysitter. That's stupid. Don't do that. You fight for the time, you use it. But courts need to be reminded that even though this does frequently happen, they can't speculate about whether any individual case may end up there - they have to take the facts as they are given, and insist on that.

Okay, bogus theories out of the way, here are a few things to keep in mind when negotiating parental rights.

Quality of Time, Not Quantity - Many people spend tens of thousands of dollars just to get a little extra time with the kids. This is stupid. That money can be spent on the kids. I once had a client pay me over \$125,000 for his divorce simply so he could get an extra 18 overnights per year than his wife. We go it, and he said it was worth it to him ... but I think he was insane and he refused to settle for 50/50. Huge win for him there! /s.

For the most part, you have to remember that parenting time when the kids are in school, at camp, working summer jobs, etc. doesn't really matter. Sleep could be added to this list in many occasions, but there is something to be said for having the kids go to bed and wake up at your house. So, it's low-quality time, but it does add a sense of bonding and adjustment.

More to the point, I've had cases where the mom insisted on no overnights for my client, the father. Know what we did? We agreed to it. Why? Because he got every school day from after school until 9pm and he also got 3 weekends per month from 8am until 9pm - and he was still allowed 2 weeks of vacation per year that did include the overnights. So, basically, mom's only time with the children was while they were at school, sleeping, or one weekend a month. For her, the comfort of having them in her home at night and the "bond/adjustment" to her home had high value. But, 5 years down the road my client called to ask a question and is absolutely loving the plan. Why? Because all of the actual relational time is with him and the kids have so little home/awake time with mother that they're not forming memories with her. Huge win there, mom! /s

Now, in that case, dad actually got more time than mom. But the same concept can apply if your wife is insisting on her having more time. If you'd rather save the money, focus on getting the high-quality hours rather than the high-quantity of hours.

Faux Shared Parenting - Some people shouldn't have parenting rights, but is it really worth paying a small fortune to go to trial to prove it?

Agree to a plan that says "Shared Parenting" in the title, but put a clause in there that says, "In the event the parties are unable to reach a mutual decision, Father shall be the default decision-maker until such time as the court has an opportunity to hold a hearing and render a decision on the matter."

This is the *EXACT SAME THING* as having custody. Even with sole custody, you still have to inform the other parent, let them weigh in their opinion, etc. You just get to make the final call. With this language, the practical reality is that no one wants to file a custody case over a disagreement as to which doctor to use, and the court would kick that issue out and sanction that party so fast you'd laugh. So, the practical effect is that you just get to make the final call, but they can still hold their head high, telling all their friends that you're trying the "co-parenting" thing because it's "best for the kids."

Where 100 level posts have been more about theory, 200 level stuff I'm hoping to focus on being practical "how to" stuff. From a Christian perspective, the biggest issue with male sexuality is pornography or sinful lust, so I wanted to cover that first. The next things I think many Christians struggle with are sloth and gluttony. So, although there may be more fun posts down the line, let's hit the big ones right off the bat.

If you're interested in writing a "how-to" on something for this 200-Level series, let me know. I'd appreciate having lots of guest writers here :)

As previously noted, taking care of your body is essential and should be motivated by your internal desire to do right by God with what He's given you. So, how do we do this?

Biblical Context

A few things up-front: Proverbs 24:5 says, "A wise man is full of strength, and a man of knowledge enhances his might." Why? Because wise people know how important it is to be strong and given the pros v. cons, you'd have to be pretty dumb to choose to be weak when strength is an option. Similarly, even for women, Proverbs 31 describes a desirable woman saying, "She dresses herself with strength and makes her arms strong."

In all of this, though, remember the lesson of 1 Timothy 4:8 - "For while bodily training is of some value, godliness is of value in every way, as it holds promise for the present life and also for the life to come."

LIFTING

So, how do we acquire physical strength? I'm not going to pretend to be a personal trainer, but I've talked to many personal trainers and have a best friend who does it for a living and has divulged most of his "secrets" to me.

It's been pretty well proven within the fitness community that a person can accomplish more in 45 minutes of lifting if you know what you're doing than you could otherwise accomplish in 2 hours of making it up as you go. My preferred method is the 5x5x5 workout with a few bonuses mixed in. The premise is you do 5 workouts for 5 sets with 5 reps of each set. You should always set the weight at something where you cap out at 5 or less. If you can only do 3, that's actually better than using less weight and doing 5 (most of the time). Between the following 5, you'll hit most every important muscle group in your body. This is also the order I tend to do these in (assuming the appropriate bar/bench is free).

- *Bench press* - I always start with this one because it's my favorite. When the bar is all the way up, I like to tuck my shoulders in a little to push it up an extra inch or so. I feel like this works the pecs even further. This hits pretty much all of your upper-body muscles, but with a particular focus on the pecs, triceps, and front shoulders. It hits back shoulders, upper-back, sides of the chest, and biceps as secondary muscles. For maximum gain, the flat bench is ideal. If you feel like your lower pecs need to be rounded out better, work in a decline bench as one of your sets, but this hits less muscle groups overall, so don't make it a habit. Don't worry about inclined bench, as those muscles will be hit later.
- *Squat* - This is usually hailed as the king of all lifts, hitting the most major muscle groups. As its primary targets, it hits the hamstrings, quads (back/front upper-legs), butt, and the back muscles along the spine. I like to do calf raises at the end of each repetition to hit my calves as a primary too. Secondary muscle groups include abs and all parts of the outer (i.e. non-spinal column) back. Good form is key here. The others are pretty straightforward for form, so it's hard to screw it up, but this one really won't help like you want it to if you mess up the form. Watch some videos if you need to.

- *Shoulder press* - I usually just drop a few plates from my squat and go right into this one - pick the bar up from chest-high and lift it over your head until your elbows lock, drop it to below your chin and repeat. I find it works better if I look straight ahead rather than tilting my head back. It also is best to keep your back vertical, not leaning back. This works your biceps, triceps, shoulders, upper-pecs, and upper-back as primary muscle groups (this is also why you shouldn't waste your time with an inclined bench press if you're using this routine). Secondary groups include the mid-back and outer chest region, as well as possibly your abs as stabilizers if you can keep your back straight.
- *Dead lift* - This is my least favorite one and it seems to overlap with other exercises too much, but I do it anyway. I find it works best if, once I am fully upright, I pull the bar just a bit toward my upper-waist while simultaneously doing a calf raise. Primary muscle groups: quads, hamstrings, shoulders, triceps, abs, butt. Secondary: upper-back, biceps, calves.
- *Standing Barbell Row* - No special tricks here - just do it. Lean forward, pull the bar up to your chest, and drop it back down. Primary: all things back, shoulders, neck, triceps. Secondary: abs, butt, and quads for stabilization.

If time permits, between each of the above I'll also try to work in some declined sit-ups, usually doing 3 sets of 25 in a given workout - do more if you can. The abs aren't directly targeted in any of the above, so I like to pinpoint them in particular. Also, if I'm too lazy on a given day to do calf-raises with any of the above weights, I'll bounce some sets in periodically throughout my routine.

After 10 weeks of doing the above (5-6 days/wk ... although this routine is probably only 4 of those days), here's my progress:

- Bench press: 165 to 250
- Squat: 185 to 335
- Shoulder press: 95 to 135
- Dead lift: I've never maxed it, but usually just do whatever I squat for the day, so same increase?
- Barbell Row: 115 to 225 (I've never officially maxed this one either; 225 is 5 reps struggling)

Cardio

It should also be noted that I run 2 miles everyday before lifting (with one day off as an exercise Sabbath). I usually start at 10mph on a treadmill and every .15 miles I lower the speed by .5mph. This keeps me motivated - because I know if I can just make it a little longer it'll get easier and easier. It also naturally builds in a decent cooldown before lifting, as the last 3 cycles are all under 5mph (i.e. walking pace). If I'm really tired, I'll use one of my sub-5 periods as a breather after finishing 9 or 8.5, then crank it back up to whatever would have been next - remembering not to redo that low-level period that already got used up. I try not to make the breather my 3.5, as that (being the lowest) should really be my final cooldown and really only accounts for .05 miles (i.e. 1/3 of everything else). All of this usually takes around 15 minutes or less.

If I'm feeling really ambitious, I'll do a full 5k, running .25m for all full mph markers (i.e. 10, 9, 8, etc.) and .2m for all the half markers (i.e. 9.5, 8.5, 7.5, etc.). Once again, this finishes on a 3.5mph cooldown, which will be less than the .2 you'd expect to be doing (it's actually .15 - so don't sub this one in the middle). This whole routine finishes your 5k in about 30 minutes ... which isn't going to win you any awards, but it's a nice pace before a heavy lifting session.

On the chance I don't make it to the gym (which happens for at least 1, at most 2 of my 6 days/week), I run a 10k

(i.e. 6.2 miles) outdoors. Why not a treadmill? Because outdoor running requires muscle to propel your body forward, whereas treadmill running is literally just rotating your legs. Treadmills are great for getting your heart rate up and keeping it there, but it's no substitute for actual outdoor running if you're on a pure cardio day. Plus, if I'm at the gym where the treadmills are anyway, I have no excuse for not lifting.

I still have a long ways to go due to weight, but I've dropped my outdoor 5k time from 41 minutes (6 months ago) to 27:16 (2 weeks ago). Between cardio and lifting, my entire time at the gym is about 90 minutes. Including driving time, that's about 2 hours. I usually do this from 9pm-11pm after my wife and kids are in bed, but will 1-2 times/wk take my kids to the gym with me and go earlier, then do some swimming with them afterward.

Dieting

There are lots of good diets out there. Here are a few that have worked well for me:

- *Daniel Diet* - If I feel like being biblical, I've sometimes done the Daniel diet. I'll assume most of you are familiar with this, but you can get more info [here](#).
- *Adam and Eve* - This is similar to a paleo diet, but it basically says: If Adam and Eve could have eaten it, eat it; otherwise, don't. The idea here is that we're only eating foods that God originally gave for mankind to eat (including out-of-the-garden, so meats are allowed here).
- *Whole30* - I did this and found it to be of benefit. The point of the diet is to figure out which foods your body reacts negatively to. So, to do this you remove virtually anything that could possibly cause inflammation or other internal health problems. By the end of 30 days, your body should be clean and you should notice fairly quickly if certain foods are causing you to lose energy, feel bloated, or react negatively in some way, so you know to cut those out of your diet more permanently. This is pretty good for figuring out what your own personal diet should be after your 30 days are over, as most other diets won't target your own personal biology the same way.
- *Keto* - I've done this off-and-on. It's basically a more intense atkins, less intense Whole30 ... but there's a lot more to it than that. go to r/keto for far more information. This tends to work well for rapid fat loss when combined with lifting, and it's designed for sustainability (unlike the Whole30, which is only designed for 30 days).

Over the past 6 months I've dropped my weight from 275 to 235. I don't intend to do any cutting until I'm benching at least 275 as my max - but I'm flexible on that.

What all do you do? What works, what doesn't? Do you know of any tips to improve this plan? Additional exercises worth including?

Abundance mentality comes natural for me, even when I was a broke law student, living on student loans. Let's get the definitions out of the way real fast:

- **Abundance Mentality:** To be bare-bones, if you believe you have options, you have abundance. This applies to finances, time, relationships, sex, etc.
- **Humility:** Having a right perception of who you are before God and man.

Discerning Humility

I do not have an abundance of Ferraris in my garage, nor do I have the option to to have an abundance of them. I might be able to have one if I took out a loan. I am humble about the fact that I'm not a Ferrari-owner.

I do have an abundance of racquetball skills. I can play pretty much anyone I want and know I'm probably going to win. I am also humble about this. In all due humility, I can look a man in the eyes with a straight face and tell him, "I am probably the best racquetball player you know." Why? Because it's true. Now, if I go on and on about my skills, I have shifted to bragging, which usually relates to pride. **Humility doesn't mean downplaying yourself; but it does involve downplaying how much you talk about yourself.** Confidence or cocky/funny techniques do not defy humility, if they are delivered appropriately and revert to basic rules of being a good conversationalist: listen more than you talk.

Jesus could say point blank, "I am the way, and the truth, and the life. No one comes to the Father except through me" (John 14:6), essentially declaring himself to be the single most important person in all of human history - and yet he has not lost his humility in such a bold claim because he is speaking accurately of himself. Moreover, we see Jesus engaging with other people on their own terms far more often than we see him bragging about his status as a divine savior. You'd think this would be something Jesus would be shouting from the rooftops: "I am your savior! Come follow me!" Instead, he's constantly running from the crowds, rarely ever looking for them, occasionally even saying things that cause people to walk away from him (more on that in 300-level stuff to come).

Contentment: The Path to Abundance Mentality

RP spends a lot of time deconditioning people from the social agenda of the Western World. One such agenda should be the American Dream. "If you try hard enough, you can have a great job, lots of money, a hot spouse, beautiful house, etc." There's nothing wrong with wanting to improve your life circumstances. But the fact of the matter is that not everyone is going to be a millionaire. The American dream is impossible for everyone. Even if it you can get it done, there's an important step along the way: **contentment**.

Paul says in Philippians 4, "I have learned the secret of being content in any and every situation ... whether living in plenty [abundance] or in want [scarcity] ... I can do all things through him who gives me strength." That oft quoted 4:13 verse doesn't mean you can faith yourself some wings and fly! It means that no matter how hard things get, you can do it because Jesus empowers you. Paul concludes the book: "And my God will supply every need of yours according to his riches in glory in Christ Jesus." See Matthew 6:33 (and the passage before) for more affirmation from Jesus' own mouth.

When we are content, we are only one step away from experiencing abundance mentality. I say "mentality" because "abundance" itself is a very nebulous concept. Just this morning I saw a comment on TRP saying, "Nobody can be red pill if you only make \$40,000/yr." This is idiotic. I've known millionaires who did not feel like they were living

in abundance. If a person perceives himself to have options, he will feel like he's living in abundance and will radiate abundance, even if he is not in relative abundance with respect to those around him. To people in third world countries, an impoverished American citizen lives in abundance, but that American doesn't usually experience an abundance mentality - he experiences a scarcity mentality.

Scarcity: The Path Away from Abundance Mentality

I see post after post on TRP/MRP saying things like, "How do you guys do it? Where do you find the time? How do you get the money? Find the friends?" All of this stems from a lack of contentment. "If only I had a little more ____ ..." is the mantra. When we think this way about our lives, abundance is impossible. We're desperately trying to increase one resource, but exhausting two others to get it. Eventually people just feel broken. The eat-work-sleep cycle gives a defeatist attitude. I shouldn't have to spell this out, but it's worth being clear: *If we think we don't have enough, then we are slaves to our scarcity and can't live like we have options.*

The resource-swap game is the pit that people with a scarcity mentality get stuck in. We're slaves to the next "need" on our list of scarce things in life. Sometimes that means you're so exhausted that you withdraw from your savings [money] to afford a couple days off work [time]. Other times it means reading sidebar for a few hours instead of mowing your lawn [time] so you can figure out how to impress been pining over [relationship]. Or it could dropping frame [relationship] to vent those feels that have been killing you [emotional]. Whatever it is - stop playing the resource-swap game. If you're constantly putting one resource in debt to pay the debt on another resource, you'll never get out and you'll never be satisfied.

Acquiring Abundance Mentality

If you're not living in an abundance mentality, here are a few steps I've coached men through that can really help:

Step 1: Identify your scarcity mentality - all the ways you feel pressured to do something to get something (i.e. the resource swap game). Throw that crap out the window. How? Read Philippians 4 - pray about it, meditate on it, and memorize the whole chapter. Heck, memorize the whole book. Philippians is the most RP book of the Bible I know. It's 104 verses. At 2 verses/wk you'll have the whole book memorized in exactly a year. No excuses. Do it.

Step 2: Start with money. This is where most people feel like they're lacking abundance - because more is never enough. Develop a skeletal budget - something you know is beneath your capabilities. Live on that budget for 3 months and put everything else into a separate bank account.

- No eating out. No buying name-brand stuff. No junk food. No new clothes. Replace your own break pads - watch a YouTube video (it's not hard). Ditch the 3-bedroom apartment for a 2-bedroom if you're really that tight on your budget. **Don't live beyond your means.** This will help you really learn to OYS, while giving you some extra bank as well. Just don't cheat. If you really can't fathom how this will work, go hang out with hispanic immigrants for a week - learn from them. They really have this low-budget/abundance mentality thing figured out.
- Your real purpose in this phase is to learn to be content with little to nothing. Paul goes on and on about how his life was made and how great things were before Christ, then concludes: "But whatever gain I had, I counted as loss for the sake of Christ. Indeed, I count everything as loss because of the surpassing greatness of knowing Christ Jesus my Lord. For his sake I have suffered the loss of all things and count them as rubbish." Where was that? Oh yeah, Philippians 3 - **the whole book** ... memorize it.

Step 3: Time. When you learn to be content with nothing, you'll start to realize your financial excess. Once you have a financial abundance mentality (which, again, is all relative - if you're making \$20k/yr you're in financial

abundance relative to 90%+ of the world), start utilizing that financial excess for things that free up other resources that are harder to self-generate, like time.

- Hire someone to clean your house for \$100/mo, or mow your yard for \$20 every couple weeks. Pay the \$5 fee to have someone do your grocery shopping for you and have it delivered to your door. These seem like luxuries, but you're really buying your time back. Your scarcity of time is going away and you'll have an abundance of it. 9 times out of 10, once you've figured out that budget, the excess finances are better served buying harder-to-acquire resources [time, relationship, etc.] rather than more stuff. Always start with time. This is the easiest non-producible resource to buy. At this point, go ahead and pay the mechanic to change your break pads - if you think the cost/time ratio for that investment is better than for another investment.
- *Note:* This is different from the "resource swap game" because instead of going in the negative on one to get out of the negative on another, you're spending excess of one for more of another. Huge difference there.

Step 4: Once you have an abundance of time, you'll have more opportunity to head to the gym, read sidebar, practice game, etc. What you're doing here is spending your newly acquired abundance of time to improve yourself and acquire an abundance in your relational life, whether with your spouse or, if you're single, trying to find a date. Incidentally, this self-improvement will almost certainly improve your confidence and dominance in your vocation, helping you shift upward, earning more money, giving more abundance to buy more time to spend on more self-improvement, to get/keep that girl on fire for you - and a positive feedback loop is formed.

Humility Revisited

Notice that in all of this I never said, "Go flaunting how much abundance you have." That's for chumps. Betas *try to* impress people. Alphas *are* impressive people - not because of objective abundance (which doesn't exist), but because of an abundance mentality. They don't flaunt it; they just have to be it. When you feel like you have the option to decide what to do with your time, how to spend your money, what to do with your wife, which girl to ask out, etc. ... you're not cultivating pride, you're cultivating freedom. Jesus came to set us free (John 8:36). Know what that freedom leads to? You knew I couldn't write this post without this reference: "I came that they may have life and have it abundantly" (John 10:10).

This is a 100-level post because I'm going back to theory. If I haven't explained it before:

- 100-Level = Theory
- 200-Level = "How to"/Practical
- 300-Level = Mission beyond the relationship
- 400-Level = Internal depth

A few years ago I developed **THIS SET OF GRAPHS** to explain life-cycles at different layers of interactivity. It is the culmination of most everything I've learned in analyzing marriage after marriage in my career, as well as my experience in ministry over the last couple decades. It has resonated soundly with groups I've led, couples I've counseled, and men I've disciplined.

Four things to note in advance: (1) Only focus on the lower-left graph, ignoring the other 3 for now (we'll probably circle back to those someday); (2) the axes are for demonstrative purposes only, they don't imply a "0" value or "negatives" if you're on the left/bottom end of it; (3) this graph is not to-scale as far as time, as one phase could be 3 months and another take 8 years; and (4) it might be helpful to split your browser so you have the graph on one side of your screen and this post on the other for quick-reference.

For context, the dating/marriage culture graph was originally created for the purpose of explaining to Christians how so many couples get to the point of filing for divorce, or otherwise having a major break-through/turn-around in their relationship and how to move in the right direction (a "main event" in RP terms). I've since adapted it for a few other purposes as well.

Lower-Left Quadrant

Everyone starts with absolutely no relational affinity or relational purpose because there's no relationship - you're strangers. Then you meet and become friends. Even if you're dating right after the first interaction, you're really just purposed-friends at that point. You still have to go through all the same phases that a non-dating friendship would involve, which is predominantly about learning as much about each other as possible.

During this phase, your relational affinity (especially when you're dating) should be increasing like wildfire. If it's not, why are you still with him/her? The result of the rapid relational connectivity growth is a risk of alienating others. There's a common trope about the guy who drops all his buddies as soon as he finds a girl, and girls go through similar things. Also, even when you are around people together, the lovey-dovey aspects of your public interactions may cause people to not want to be around you. But these ongoing interactions with others are what will ground the relationship in reality and are quite necessary for the relationship to grow in a healthy manner and at a healthy pace. Too much exclusivity is dangerous.

The relationship doesn't move very far along on the "purpose" axis because the only real purpose during this phase is to discern whether or not you're going to get married. The actual emotional connectivity/affinity, however, moves very quickly. There should actually be some minor ups and downs, but this shows the overall trend.

The biggest and most common mistake people make in this phase is the assumption that the rapid increase of relational affinity will equate to a successful marriage. They have ignored the "purpose" axis altogether or assume that it will just work itself out. As a result, people dive head-first into bad relationships and get in too deep to the

point where it's hard to back out.

Upper-Left Quadrant

As the relationship becomes more serious, it dives deeper than a friendship. Everything is sunshine and rainbows as you start to uncover deeper truths about how the other thinks, what their passions are, how they respond to different situations, etc. You're still learning, but it's less about discovering new things and more about enjoying what you have together.

That degree of relational affinity continues to rise until you get married. If I were smarter when I made the graph, I would have made that green circle much larger, as the actual peak could be either before or after the wedding, but you get the idea all the same.

Shortly after the marriage, the couple starts figuring out how their marriage will function. Interactively, things stay positive for a while, but as basic life obligations set in, the affinity decreases, albeit still pleasant.

Before the wedding point, the risk is still the time-restriction and lovey-dovey alienation. After the wedding, most couples end up isolating themselves from the outside world not because they're spending so much time with each other or too touchy-feely that it makes people gag, but because life obligations increase and limit time. You've suddenly got a mortgage to worry about, kids to feed, a couple car payments, shuttling kids around, etc.

Most people really start figuring out **an actual** relational purpose during this phase (albeit, *it's never a good one*), so there's a lot more horizontal motion on the graph. There's also a huge swing in affinity that happens.

Lower-Right Quadrant

As stress increases, people start living out of obligation and not desire. In the previous phase, the stressors affected the relationship, but not necessarily your mood. In this phase, you're actually feeling the stress. The result is that you hit a "main event", where you're either going to get divorced or something's going to change. **Every marriage hits a main event - sometimes several.** Personally, I've had 3 main events that I know of in my marriage - the most recent being about 3 years ago, immediately before developing this graph, which I crafted to show how my wife and I got through it. We haven't had a main event since.

For most people, their "purpose" is something akin to making a lot of money, having their dream home, x number of kids, a great sex life, vacationing at all their ideal spots, etc. This *is an actual purpose*, but it's a really bad one. The "main event" precludes a couple from getting any further in these purposes because they're not able to enjoy them together. As long as they stay in the lower-right quadrant, any and all progress on the "purpose" meter will actually stagnate. They may even be stuck in one point on the graph for a very long time, never moving up, down, left, or right at all. This non-motion usually happens immediately before the "divorce/turning point," but never after.

When a marriage hits the lowest point, there are usually 3 things that will happen:

First: Divorce

Divorcing is basically trashing this whole chart and starting over with someone else, beginning at 'start' all over again. Because virtually 100% of relationships hit a main event ("ARALT," I'll say), all you're really doing is hoping that when you do hit this point in the next relationship it won't hit as hard. Most people either (1) numb themselves to divorce or (2) numb themselves to the stress so they can tolerate more before hitting that main event.

Second: Regress

This is the most common answer I see, and it's also the least useful. The mentality is something like this: "We used

to be happy back in the upper-left quadrant, so let's figure out what we were doing back then and find ways of returning there." Result? Blow your savings on a vacation, kill your budget to get more frequent baby-sitting, ignore mowing the yard and cleaning the house to have more time for date-nights, etc. The bottom-line is that you're sacrificing the pace at which you've been progressing forward in order to glide backwards up that affinity line again.

Most people will successfully get back in the upper-left quadrant again, and the more resources (forward progress on the "purpose" axis) they throw at it, the further back (and up the affinity axis) they'll go - but as a rule, you can never get further than the marriage/honeymoon point because the higher you get, the more resources it takes to make the next step up. The law of diminishing returns sets in. I should note here: everyone's mileage per resources may vary. Some people might not have to expend a large % of their resources to get 3/4 the way back again, whereas for others they might need to exhaust their entire life retirement contributions to do it (I've seen it happen many times).

Eventually, the resources run out (or you're not willing to expend any further) and you end up sliding forward again. It can happen at a slow, steady pace because you've had a nice recharge and that lasts you for a while, or it can be all at once as soon as the fun stops. Regardless, people always hit the "main event" again.

Many people regress repeatedly every time they get there, sometimes even before the main event because they can see it coming. But each time you get there you're losing your resources. So, if you've been incredibly financially successful, you might be able to afford keeping this up for a long time - even forever. But for most people who have more traditional income fluctuation degrees over time, it means that the next "main event" will hit harder than the last because you have less resources to get you up that hill again. Also, even for the wealthy, they're losing their time with every cycle, which is a precious resource that cannot be self-generated.

Third: Progress

The last option is the rarest one to see happen, but is the only one I've seen with a lasting solution. That solution is to begin operating together for a common mission. That mission can never be: "make \$X, get a dream house, have Y kids, get crazy awesome sex, and visit Z places in the world." This is not a sustainable life purpose because all people will find when they achieve it they are still not satisfied, and when that's all people are shooting for, your forward progress will always plateau. Those are things that held your affinity at the "marriage" bubble, but it's not going to work going forward. Instead, your purpose has to go beyond you.

Personally, I believe the only true purpose is the one Jesus gave us: *disciple-making*. If that's not your purpose (or at least part of it), then you won't get the satisfaction from God that comes with fulfilling what he put you here to do, and the result is that you won't be satisfied with each other. That said, I don't discount the possibility that other purposes can work - but it's always got to be something bigger than you and your spouse. Your own internal spiritual well-being (even together) is also insufficient and will not provide that satisfaction, so when couples have "get closer to God together" as their purpose, they **ALWAYS** end up sorely disappointed in the long-term.

When my wife and I were at the "main event" a few times, we refused the divorce path, and fiddled with regression in very small ways to no avail, always returning to the "main event," and in quick succession (all 3 happened over only 2 years; we've been married for 9). We didn't spend much resources, so didn't get much return - and I'm glad we didn't waste more effort on that process!

At the time, I had already (since before we were even married) been committed to the vision of disciple-making. My wife was intellectually, but she had a lot of baggage that prevented her from connecting with that purpose in her heart. Instead, for her, it was all about the "\$X income, dream house, great kids, etc." I was a terrible leader during this time and didn't know how to awaken her heart to this. Instead, I just saw that we weren't on the same page. I lost all attraction to her and the thought of having sex together was often repulsive to me, although I harbored the hope that maybe if our sex life returned my attraction would as well. I mistakenly blamed our poor sex life for my dissatisfaction in the marriage.

About 3 years ago I stopped being so passive and started leading and became more independent of her in my

pursuit of the mission God gave me (and I believe all Christians, including my wife). I removed her as my emotional center and made it Christ, putting his mission for me as my priority. This caused a lot of friction in our relationship, embittering her toward the idea of discipleship. But (and that is a story for another day), when she came around, things started changing for us.

At first, she became individually invested and began discipling other women. This helped, but did not actually solve our problems. More things had to change to the point where now we're on the same mission *together*, rather than individually invested alongside each other. Our relationship has flourished ever since. Instead of regressing, we started pushing forward. Our progress in life did not decrease - it kept increasing, but our relational affinity began to grow in the midst of that progress now - even because of it.

Upper-Right Quadrant

The relational interactions and emotional connectivity changed very rapidly - almost as fast an increase as when we were dating. Those fuzzy romantic feelings came back, and her heart started skipping when I walked in the door again. The sexual interest I had lost in her began to return and I was actually attracted to my wife again. It was like falling in love all over again, but instead of "marriage" being a destination, our eyes were now on God's Kingdom in the vein of Matthew 6:33.

Now, let me be clear: the fuzzies came back for her, but not the tingles. This is a huge distinction to make. My relational satisfaction skyrocketed, but I still experienced sexual dissatisfaction. This is when I first truly realized that sex wasn't the cause of our relational problems, it was only a contributing factor. When sex became an isolated dissatisfaction, I had a better perspective on my marriage as a whole to start moving in the right direction again, leading to the many pre-RP improvements I had started - and ultimately getting me to RP in the first place. This is why RP resonates with me quite strongly: because I literally had everything else figured out except the tingles. Most people come in with crappy relationships and crappy sex-lives and RP is really only designed to fix the sex-life (although MRP has some directive toward fixing the relationship too, just not much; TRP has none at all). My hope for RPC is to find a better balance in these things :)

I've heard it said many times on MRP or subs like deadbedrooms: "Our marriage is perfect in every way, except we're not having sex." Most people say that not realizing how imperfect their marriages actually are, thinking sex will be the magical cure. In reality, by solving all of the relational background, I was staging myself perfectly so that when I discovered RP and started implementing actual sexual strategy, all of the nuts and bolts started kicking in all at once and a pulse was revived almost instantly. We've still got a long way to go, but the immediacy of some of the turnaround has been more than I hoped for.

This is when we have truly become "alive" again. Not only our individual lives, but our marriage jointly has become productive for God's Kingdom. We no longer live for ourselves, but for a purpose beyond ourselves - and not individually, but as one joint flesh. We still have to prove responsible with the physical kingdom God's put us in charge of, as our investment in greater things is depending on being faithful with basic things (parable of the minas and all that), but it's not about the physical *stuff* in life anymore. When we both got on the same page about that, everything changed. Regression still happens periodically, but we've never fallen back to a "main event" - we've always stayed on the upswing of that U shape - usually even in the upper-right quadrant even with some regression.

54

UPVOTES

Why I'm not afraid of divorce rape - and how to get yourself there too.

15 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill · Archived copy · Reddit

Many know that I'm a Christian, so I won't actively seek divorce. But if my spouse ever chose to leave, cheat, etc. I'm not afraid in the slightest. When beginning new cases I always give my clients an outline of all of the primary matters a court has to make decisions on and ask them to fill out in each section: (1) their ideal outcome, and (2) their bottom-line acceptable outcome. This gives me a framework for understanding the bounds in which I should be litigating.

I'm giving you guys that outline (the categories in bold), but am also filling it out with my life details so you can all see why I don't fear divorce and what types of things you should be doing to establish yourselves to avoid the fear of divorce rape as well.

ASSET DIVISION

Real Estate - We co-own a house. This is a straight 50/50 split of the equity. I'm not married to the house, so if we have to sell it, so be it. If she wants to keep it, she can take out a second mortgage to pay my share of the equity. Her keeping the house does not actually give her an advantage in a custody determination if you know how to argue that issue and as long as you relocate in the same school district.

Vehicles - I make sure that we both have comparable vehicles or that the car my wife drives is higher value than mine. She loves the humility I express in this, while at the same time I know that if we get divorced I'm going to get half of the equity in the car she drives less half the equity in mine. Nevertheless, due to a recent upgrade with the birth of our latest child (6 people didn't fit in my last 5-seater), my car is now on par in value with her minivan.

Bank Accounts - We maintain joint accounts for everything. 50/50 and done. Although not licensed as a CPA, I am more qualified to function as a forensic accountant than most actual forensic accountants utilized in my cases (I'm usually the one having to tell them how to do their job and when they missed numbers, etc.), so if my wife tries to play funny with the bank accounts, I'm on top of it. I don't scan regularly, but when I notice irregularities I can find the problem quickly and it's usually because she bought something big without running it by me first - not cool and that gets addressed with her. She hasn't done this in years now.

Retirement Accounts - I got a little clever with this one. I had my wife put a higher share of her income into retirement because her company has better benefits than mine offered. In turn, I chose not to have a separate retirement account (until about 3 months ago, for tax reasons). The result is that I will get half of her retirement if we divorce, while I have relatively little as an offset, yet I maintain the appearance for court purposes as being the one to pay the greater share of marital expenses (nevermind the fact that I have a slightly higher income).

Personal Property - This all gets split 50/50. If parties can't agree, the court just orders it all sold at auction, the auctioneer takes about 20-35% of the proceeds and the parties split whatever's left behind. In short, everyone works this out and I'd get half of the stuff. I have less sentimental attachment to stupid things, so I have a lot more leverage in knowing how to get what I really care about.

SUPPORT

Spousal - My wife earns about \$110k/yr and I'm around \$125k. My state has actually one of the least favorable support splits of any state in the country (between 50/50 for LTRs (i.e. 25+years) and 55/45 split for everything else), but because our incomes are so close (53/47) this pretty much guarantees that I'll never have to pay her spousal support.

If you're thinking of marrying someone who you know will not be able to compare to your income like this, get a pre-nup, as there are ways to mitigate spousal support for this. If you're already married to this person, you're going to have a harder time, but get them educated and/or working sooner rather than later to mitigate your losses. Other than his misinformed efforts at Christian-bashing that generally didn't advance the point of his post in any way, /u/redpillrobby just did a good write-up on this. Check my comments over there for more on spousal support. The tl;dr is not to feed into her being lazy and non-contributionary.

If she's not pulling her weight, even if you want to stay married and live together, get a legal separation and split all your bank accounts. It might cripple your marriage in the short-run, but if you want to salvage something long-term out of it, that's the best way to get it done, as you'll have a smaller spousal support obligation than if you wait it out, virtually no risk of future support if you play your cards right, and you can walk confidently in the relationship knowing that you're in it for her and not just to avoid divorce rape - which she might actually appreciate (I've seen this happen a couple times, although I admit it's rare because most people don't know of this tactic and get too far in over their heads on the divorce path).

- Another point on this: intermittent working is a fantastic idea if your wife wants to stay at home. Most professions have seasonal work hours available. Even in the law field, where there is no change in the case-load from season to season, I know several female attorneys who only work during the school year and take every summer off to be with the kids - and even the larger firms are allowing this (smaller firms like it even more because they get as-needed help without having to pay as much). Since your wife is working full-time part of the year, the fact that she's part-time part of the year doesn't diminish her income for consideration - she'll be imputed at her annualized full-time rate. This is true even if she's been doing part-time work like that for 15 years (assuming full-time hours will become available upon request or relatively soon). The fact that she maintains her credentials and is current in her profession as far as experience and practice makes the court all too quick to impute her at that full amount if she's not willing to go full-time voluntarily. So, you get a mostly housewife while still avoiding all of the negative financial repercussions of her staying at home in the event of a divorce. My wife has done this for a couple years in the past and I expect she'll do this again starting next summer and until the kids are all in school (i.e. another 5-ish years). Plus, if our budget is ever in crisis, she just tells her boss she wants to hop back into full-time and we're making the big bucks again. It's a win-win.

Child - In most states this is a straight calculation, but almost every state has deviation factors. Set yourself up for equal time rights and you can almost always cut your support at least in half by doing that. If your incomes are also approximately equal (as in my case), you won't have to pay child support at all.

CHILDREN

Custody - Most people mistakenly assume that custody has to do with how much time you get. This is wrong (at least in my state). Custody only has to do with decision-making. I have actually seen a case where one person was awarded sole custody but got no time with the children and the other person had 100% of the time, but no decision-making authority. It was idiotic, but it does happen. Here's the path to guaranteed shared parenting:

- Don't do drugs, alcohol, prostitutes, or general addictive substances.
 - Don't bring plates in front of the kids until you've known them for at least 6 months.
 - Don't physically, mentally, or emotionally abuse anymore or do anything that could be misconstrued if recorded as being such. Cussing her out by text, voicemail, over the phone, in person (especially in front of the kids) = a huge red flag that shared parenting won't work.
 - Attend at least 25% of your kids' functions (doctor, dentist, ortho appointments, etc.; parent-teacher meetings; extracurricular games; etc.). It doesn't have to be all of them, but enough that she can't say you're not involved.
- Bonus points if you're the one scheduling these and not her.

That's pretty much it. You do those things and you're pretty much guaranteed shared parenting. If you're doing all this and she fails in any two of these areas, you'll actually be the one to get custody. The idea is to do these things better than she does.

Parenting Time - Same factors as above. You follow those, you get 50/50. This one's a bit tougher, though, as there are more factors to consider:

- Are you flexible with rescheduling things? I'm always more flexible than she is.
- Have you ever withheld the children from the other? Of course not, nor do I foresee a reason to unless she's abusing controlled substances or violent.
- Are you current on child support (if any)? Wouldn't have to pay it in the first place, but I make sure it's clear that where her income goes to things like retirement, savings, investments, mortgage, etc., my income is the one earmarked for the more day-to-day family related expenses, and this is clear from how our banking works, so I'd have docs to back it up.
- How well connected are the children to you? If you do their night-time routine every night, she'll love the break and you'll have a solid place in the kids' lives. That night-time routine is probably the single most important stabilizing factor for children and how they connect with each parent. My kids love my wife (their mom, but she's my wife first), but they have a closer connection with me because I make sure to do the night-time routine every possible opportunity, which is about 95% of the time. I also make sure to "take them off her hands" frequently. This gives her more time to focus on the menial chores around the house that I don't care for, while making her feel like she's getting a special treat by not having to deal with the kids. It's a win-win-win (1: she's happier, 2: closer connection with my kids, 3: she does the chores I don't want to do). This gives me a huge leg-up.
- How far apart do you live? Again, just make sure you relocate in the same school district and you're golden.

Vacations/Holidays - These get split evenly.

Medical Costs/Insurance - This really doesn't matter. I like to utilize my wife's insurance plan because it's better than what my firm offers, but also because if we were to get divorced most attorneys and parties are too dumb in a \$0 child support case to remember to split the child-related insurance premium costs. Result? She'd end up paying this and I'd only have to contribute 50% to out-of-pocket costs of actual healthcare needs [I probably wouldn't actually do this to her because of my faith, but I'm guessing most of you aren't Christian, so there's a nice tip].

Dependency Deduction - We have 4 kids, we'd each claim 2; as each one drops off, we alternate one of the kids when there's an odd number. This is pretty typical and doesn't put me at a disadvantage.

Childcare Costs - These are allocated in the child support worksheet in my state as being by % of income. But, most other attorneys are dumb enough not to realize this, so with about 80% success when I represent the higher-earner I can get away with a 50/50 split anyway. Also, most child support guidelines will have a line to factor in the tax deduction, but many (about 90%) attorneys forget this and don't know how to take advantage of it in their cases. Pay attention to that and tweak the numbers whichever way work for you.

Although I never intend to divorce, I know that if it happens to me (I'm not ignorant of possibilities) I'm rock solid and have nothing to worry about. If my wife ever did anything to compel a divorce (left me, cheated, etc.) then I'd be in a better position both legally and in my personal life after-the-fact. In short:

- I'd get half of all the assets, and I keep more assets in her name to keep my income disposable, which puts me in the advantage.

- I wouldn't have to pay support (and I've given you all a huge trick that can help mitigate your potential future exposure).
- I'd get shared parenting with 50/50 time with my kids, plus my exposure for costs wouldn't be any more than equal.

For those whose wives are not capable of earning even close to your level, the next time you have a main event, instead of threatening divorce suggest: "Honey, I'd love to make our marriage work, but the longer I let this go on the more exposure I give myself to the risks of divorce and I'm not okay with that. Let's file for a legal separation so that we can have an official allocation of what all of our rights and responsibilities should be. Once we know where we each stand, we can keep living together and know that we're holding up our own end of the deal. And if it doesn't work out, at least we won't have to pay for an expensive divorce because it will already be done." This might end up leading her to give up and just switch it to a divorce anyway, but at least you're giving your marriage a chance while mitigating virtually all the risks - and with the intention to continue living together and work things out, these types of cases (at least for the 2 or so I've done) end up being extremely low-cost, low-argument. If you do it with the intent to live separately, though, then it ends up being exactly the same as a full-blown divorce, except at the end you're not free to marry someone else (I've handled many of these - it's a total waste).

TL;DR ...

- **Assets:** This is all 50/50 if you don't back down; be smart about things like tax-effecting and what's liquid and not.
- **Support:** Get her earning money or at the next main event file for legal separation to get a court-ordered allocation of income, expenses, assets, etc. (essentially: cut your losses sooner before they build further), then keep living together after that to work on your marriage without the fear of divorce clouding your judgment.
- **Children:** Act like a sole custodial parent during the marriage and your chances of getting custody (or at least shared parenting) soar through the roof.

5

UPVOTES

Job 31 - Prime example of an RP conversation

15 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

This is a comment I made on askMRP. For context, OP's wife's mother's friend wanted to post something on ebay and OP's wife decides to put the pressure on him to do it for the old lady. He doesn't want to, but doesn't know how to answer. He says he keeps DEERing and can't hold frame when she keeps questioning him on why he won't do it. This is my reply, which I thought this community might enjoy :)

I believe in God. You don't have to for this to make sense, but read Job 38:1 to the end of the book. For context, Job is stuck in a really crappy place in life. His family dies, his entire fortune is plundered, his body is covered in boils. If anything could go wrong, it has gone wrong (and this was part of an intentional plan). Job starts questioning God with all that "Why?" garbage. God's answer to Job is the ultimate RP answer. It starts ...

Who is this that obscures my plans with words without knowledge?

Your plans are what matter; she can't tell you what to do.

Brace yourself like a man; I will question *you*, and *you* shall answer me.

Pressure-flipping.

Where were you when I laid the earth's foundation? Tell me, if you understand. Who marked off its dimensions? Surely you know!

Amused mastery - God's getting playfully sarcastic about how trite this issue is in comparison to the bigger picture, and ultimately refuses to answer Job's questions.

[God:] "Will the one who contends with the Almighty correct him? Let him who accuses God answer him!"
Then Job answered the Lord: "I am unworthy - how can I reply to you? I put my hand over my mouth. I spoke once, but I have no answer - twice, but I will say no more." Then the Lord spoke to Job out of the storm:
"Brace yourself like a man; I will question you, and you shall answer me."

God's pressure-flipping and amused mastery worked. Job STFU and gave up, even though God never answered his accusations. So, God pressure-flips some more:

Would you discredit my justice? Would you condemn me to justify yourself?

This is what most wives do: they spin their hamsters to find a way to make you the bad guy, even when they're the one making the unreasonable request. She can do the whole ebay thing herself, but she doesn't. Instead of faulting herself for her laziness, she faults you as the lazy one to justify her not doing it.

Job's final conclusion?

Surely I spoke of things I did not understand, things too wonderful for me to know.

Become that wonderful to your wife - become that high-value and display that same sense of amused mastery at how trite this "ebay purchase for your wife's mom's friend" is in the grand scheme of your lives.

Of course, in the end, God doesn't do this just to stifle Job as some peon. God loves Job and ends up blessing him greatly beyond pretty much anyone else alive in that day. In the same way, bless your wife ... just don't put up with her garbage or feel like you have to answer her questions and challenges. Bless her on your terms, not hers. She'll

value it more that way anyway because people value what they can't control. If she can control what you give her, it's cheap - she knows she can get what she wants when she wants, leaving it with no value to work for. If you decide when and how you're going to bless her, then your goodwill gets its value back.

3

UPVOTES

Just for fun: What's the dumbest thing you've ever said to your spouse?

16 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

Someone on another sub complained that his wife didn't want birthday sex on her birthday. It reminded me of this idiot moment I had.

When I was really, really (yet secretly) resentful at my wife one year I actually told her: "I got a great birthday present for you this year" with a wink.

"What is it?" she says with a big smile.

"For the entire day, I won't do anything to imply I want to have sex with you!"

That did not go over well ...

PURSUIT - Christian women love to play the pursuit card. "You're the man. It's your job to pursue me!" This is not a biblical concept. I can't give any citations because they don't exist. At best, I could explain sociological structures that existed at the time the Bible was written, but the Bible never endorses those cultural concepts as God-ordained any more than polygamy. In reality, this is a ploy from the feminist imperative telling women that men should be doing everything and women can just do whatever they want and the "Good-Christian Guy" just needs to keep being a beta chump toward her anyway, no matter how frigid or denying she may be.

SEDUCE - Instead, what I do see happening repeatedly is that women who wanted men to pursue them had to take the responsibility for seducing the man before he chased her. Interestingly, we have two primary books dedicated to female characters: Esther and Ruth. Esther got her position by seducing the king into selecting her as his new wife. Likewise, Ruth seduced Boaz. Although many like to reject this, it's pretty obvious Naomi had an agenda of hooking the two up from the start and Ruth did whatever Naomi said. The plan was to get Boaz to marry Ruth from the very beginning. Are we really to believe these women weren't chatting up about this plan each night? The Bible as much as tells us they were.

Now, some people would want to throw out the immediate objection: "But we're the bride of Christ and God pursues us, so shouldn't we emulate him by pursuing our wives the same way?" This is the type of thinking of someone who still has the wool pulled over his eyes. This tries to impute the feminist imperative on how we understand God and the Bible when Scripture itself actually says the opposite. Yes, there is an element that God is the original initiator - he has to be because we're incapable of our own salvation apart from him. But once his enabling grace was given:

- "Seek first His Kingdom"
- "Come to me, all you who are weary"
- "You will seek me and find me when you seek me with all of your heart"
- "Those who seek me diligently find me"
- "Ask and it will be given; seek and you will find; knock and it will be opened"
- "Draw near to God and he will draw near to you"
- "He made one man from every nation ... that they should seek him and find him"

This list can go on for ages. But let's also look at the practical observation-approved aspects of the world. If God was pursuing everyone the way we think, then how can billions of people in the world go day by day without ever feeling any real impact of God's pursuit on them? I'll tell you why; or rather Paul will. Starting in Romans 1:18 Paul explains that God puts himself out there - he makes himself known to us, then the responsibility for responding is on us. If we fail to respond to our awareness of God, he hands us over to a darker mentality, then darker and darker until the "depraved mind" in verse 28. Where is God's pursuit in the path that Paul preaches? It's the reverse - the expectation is that we would be the ones to pursue God.

Lost Sheep - Once we're his, if we wander astray he brings us back (the lost sheep and all) - but that's us applying RP to a wandered spouse who is walking away from the relationship, not a pursuit in the way most women mean it when they charge their husbands with pursuing them, which usually amounts to "buy me flowers; give me love notes; massage my back without expecting sex; etc." Sure, we can do these things in our own right when we want to - but not in response to her demand. That actually cheapens our affection because if she can get it on demand, she

no longer values it any more than free pens when you're at a job fair.

It's the husband's responsibility to keep his wife safely within his frame (the sheep pen). But at the same time, the wife has a responsibility to seduce her husband just as Ruth and Esther seduced their men, and just as each of God's people began their journey by opening their hearts to God and fostering a condition where he would come in and change our lives. In that sense, "the prayer" is (although often ineffective) an effort to seduce God - to say, "God, I want you to come inside me" just as a wife might do things to communicate to her husband, "I want you to come inside me."

INITIATION

Now, I know that some people are ready to accuse: "But you can't control her, so the *seduce* section is worthless!*" Righto. Let me be clear, though: the burden of initiation in sex is still on the man, whether she seduces or not. There have been several times that I've initiated with my wife when she made no effort on her appearance that day. After having a baby she had to remember how enjoyable sex is before she could want it again (specifically: enough to seduce me). Otherwise she'd just be eating up all my self-improvement as an easy freebie. Don't be a doormat - initiate even when she's giving you the "off signals" or else what's the point of all your self-improvement? (just be ready to back off on a hard no). As you start to function within the natural order of the system, ideally she will return to that order as well. And if she doesn't, that's why you work on your OI and ultimately why Jesus gave the Matthew 18 process for when someone sins against us (not to mention 1 Cor. 5 and 7).

As I have often said, physical reproduction is synonymous with spiritual reproduction. God is always initiating with us to share our faith. After all, it's his great commission to us. Remember how when you were first saved you thought everyone needed to know about Jesus?!? We have simply rejected him so often that we have numbed ourselves to his approach, like our feminized society tells us is normal and appropriate for wives. By rejecting evangelism, we are accepting the reality of the feminist imperative in the way we live our spiritual lives. If God didn't give me an internal compulsion by His Spirit toward sharing my faith, I'd probably never do it except in fulfillment of a duty (and how much do you enjoy duty sex?). Like any case study of a LL (low libido) on r/deadbedrooms, "I could go the rest of my life without it and I'd be just fine." But boy does God not want that from us. He's initiating all the time - stop numbing yourself to it. Bringing it back to the physical: husbands are and should always be the ones to initiate physically with our wives just as God initiates with us.

[Bonus: Does that mean God's a bad leader? No, because he has abundance. If you won't respond to the call to share the Gospel, he'll raise up someone else who will. And if all of humanity rejects him ... "I tell you ... if they keep quiet, the stones will cry out" (Luke 19:40).]

The key distinction here between pursuit, seduction, and initiation here is that as God leads us [read: real pursuit, not the way wives present it], if we're faithful to following, we actually become the [seducers] who are eager to respond to God's [initiation]. As we develop an internalized passion for evangelism, the Spirit no longer has to prompt the desire for evangelism in us - we're constantly wanting it with every new non-Christian we meet, and it's exciting. Sometimes we even do initiate without a clear prompt from the Spirit. In those cases the Spirit either follows suit or he doesn't. God's plan doesn't depend on our actions any more than your plan should depend on your wife's, though we can happily incorporate favorable behavior into our intentions. More often than not, the Spirit responds to our matured desire for evangelism (which is spiritually "sexy" to God) by initiating with us to help us find those opportunities.

Bottom Line: The order goes something like this: (1) Men should lead their wives; (2) Ideally this prompts a wife to be seductive; (3) Husbands then initiate sex with their wives under ideal conditions

- Note 1: The typical female intentions behind "pursue me" are discretionary in #1, not mandatory in any part of

this process.

- Note 2: Often-times step 2 has to be skipped for most of the early months of a man's RP journey or through certain life situations (such as time off sex due to a newborn) because until the wife remembers how great it is to have sex with a real man, she's not going to want it enough to seduce you. The conclusion is that it's all your responsibility - but you need to lead her in fulfilling her role (i.e. #2), not in overt ways (i.e. "You need to seduce me, here's how ..."), but by being a man she wants to seduce.

In starting the 300-Level series, take note that this is all about your spiritual maturity and relationship with God. I'll start with two key axioms:

AXIOM 1: You cannot lead someone further than you are, only as far as you are.

AXIOM 2: The greatest way to excel is by mastering the basics.

Luke 6:40 says, "The student is not above the teacher, but everyone who is fully trained will be like their teacher." If you want to lead your wife spiritually, you have to be further ahead spiritually - and the more mature and Christ-like you are, the further you can lead her. She stops growing where you stop growing. If you keep growing, she keeps following. You can't have a wife who follows if she's already at where you are and you're not moving. If she is attracted to spiritual maturity (as I believe all godly women with the Spirit in them are), then you will increase attraction by being a godly man.

The second axiom comes from experience over and over in my own life and in the lives of the 30+ people I've disciplined over the years. Michael Jordan's basketball coach once instructed him that the best way to master the game wasn't to learn trick shots or how to dribble between his legs or pass behind his back - it was to master the basics: freethrows, layups, normal dribbling, passing, etc. The same is true in faith. It's not about mastering then next tricky theological concept or figuring out how to heal someone by laying hands on them and praying. These things may come in time, but always start with the basics and make them your go-to.

7 Basics

For the past 15 years my view on what these spiritual-growth basics are have not changed, and this list has existed since the 1930s. Here they are:

1. Know the Gospel/Assurance of Salvation
2. Quiet Time/Devotional
3. Bible Study
4. Scripture Memory
5. Prayer
6. Fellowship
7. Evangelism

There are things that could be added to this list, but without new empirical data to prove an improvement beyond what I have seen works with my own eyes, I'm going to stick with this.

What to do with the basics?

I'll probably spend time in separate posts going through these in a more detailed break-down, but for right now rank yourself on how competent you believe you are with each of these (i.e. if you put in the effort, how great would your mastery be?) and also rank how intentionally you have been practicing each of these for the last 3 months.

If your competency is low, work on it. Period. I don't mean intellectual understanding of a subject - I mean your

actual ability to practice it. If you have read 2 dozen books on evangelism but you've never actually gone out and shared your faith with someone, you have no competency. It's easy to know how to have a quiet time and to read your Bible periodically, but until you actually develop a relational connection with God through that time, all you're doing is reading a book and acquiring head knowledge, which is low competency. If you know a lot of passages by memory inside and out, but you've never learned to cite them to yourself and/or others when they become applicable, your Scripture memory is low competency. Until you have developed each of these arts in practice, your competence is low.

Once your competence is acceptable or high for all 7, then start balancing a few of these at a time, implementing them in practice as part of your daily routine.

What does this have to do with RP?

As noted above, if your wife has the Holy Spirit in her, she's going to be attracted to a display of the Holy Spirit in you. Your primary reason should simply be because you love God and want to follow him. But the peripheral benefit of attracting your wife should not go unnoticed. If she's not a godly woman, maybe your pursuit of God whole-heartedly will be the example she needs to get her moving in the right direction where you otherwise may have been reinforcing an attitude of materialism and idolatry of the marriage itself in your relationship, among other things.

More to the point, as you grow in these areas, your capacity to lead her will grow as well. I can't count the number of Christian men I've disciplined whose wives were far more spiritually mature than they were. They came to me usually because their wives were fed up with their spiritual immaturity and it was causing major friction in their relationship.

As I disciplined these men, they grew to love and pursue God even more than their wives. Want to know what happened? Their wives suddenly wanted to screw them every chance they got. After two years of discipling one guy in particular, he was simply beaming because his wife had started screwing him 2-3 times a day. Why? Because being a godly man is attractive to a godly woman. Rather than the nag who thought she was superior to them, these wives saw that their husbands were now men who had a clear mission of eternal significance and who could lead them in the most important aspect of life and the only one that makes life worth living: faith in Jesus.

Caveat

To be clear, this is a powerful attractive force, but is not the only one. Many of these men who saw these results were already physically fit and I was helping them learn how to own every aspect of their lives. Don't be an idiot. Lift, OYS, frame, etc. These things still matter. But OI is key here - you've got to be doing all this because you love God, not because you want to attract your wife. Why? Because even if your wife can't see through it (and she will), God will see through it. Don't be a Matthew 7 guy who does all the great things God has for us, then Jesus says, "I never knew you."

When looking at the 7 basics, some of them should come naturally. Many people miss the relational development aspect of having a quiet time, but still know how to have a quiet time all the same. From there it's just a matter of OYS - are you being responsible or lazy?

TYPES OF STUDY

There are typically three approaches to Bible study:

(1) **Mama Bird Studies** - This is where a leader chews up all the food for all of the participants and basically spoon feeds it to them. The participants have almost no prep-work. They just come and learn, asking questions and making comments along the way.

- Great for spiritual infants or those who simply aren't disciplined enough for a true study.

(2) **Off the Cuff Studies** - This is where everyone shows up without any meaningful preparation and shares their thoughts on a passage or topic with one another. There may be a facilitator, but even the facilitator hasn't done any significant preparation.

- Great for topical studies or life-on-life groups, where you never know what issue someone will bring up that needs discussed.

(3) **True Bible Studies** - This is where all participants in the group have agreed upon what passage will be studied and have actually followed through with preparation.

True studies are incredibly valuable for anyone who has even a basic degree of competency in how to understand the Scriptures. That said, they are incredibly rare, as it is overwhelmingly difficult to find anyone who is willing to put in the time and effort to give the passage the level of preparation and dedication necessary.

By way of example only, when I study a single chapter (20-ish verses), I typically expect that I will spend a minimum of 3 to 5 hours with the material itself, 30 minutes in prayer throughout the process, and 15 minutes reviewing commentaries to discern whether or not my interpretations are reasonable. On average, this is about 4hr per week process. This process applies when I'm leading a mama bird study or in a true study. When "off the cuff" issues come up, I get a week off. I'll typically maintain this for about 25 weeks out of a year (i.e. 100hrs of Bible study per year).

A general church group is typically lucky if everyone is willing to spend 15 minutes skimming the passage and googling a few key phrases. This is unfortunate, but it is a sad reality for modern church-goers who do not prioritize in-depth understanding of the Scriptures. Take this as a challenge to man up. Work those spiritual muscles like you do your physical ones.

THE INDUCTIVE METHOD

Rather than musing over what you think something means, the better interpretive method is to figure out what the author meant when he/she wrote it. The author is the one we agree was inspired by God in writing the Scriptures, not you in reading them. How do we figure out authorial intent?

BACKGROUND: Learn as much as you can about the culture and the context of the passage.

OBSERVATION: Once you have an idea of the context, make as many observations as possible.

INTERPRETATION: Once you have a lot of observations, start asking questions - then use the text to answer the question.

APPLICATION: Make it personal. How are you going to live differently now?

BACKGROUND

I typically advise people to avoid commentaries as much as possible until after their study is complete. When people rely too heavily on commentaries up-front they lose the ability to think for themselves. Instead of studying the Scriptures, it's as if they're sitting in on someone else's Bible study and reporting the results to their own group. Or a more apt example: it's like going to the gym with your buff friend, having him lift the weights for you, and then bragging to everyone around how impressive you are.

Instead, I recommend that people start by going through the entire 4-part process first and then refer to commentaries at the end to discern whether or not their conclusions are reasonably aligned with a scholarly consensus. The one exception I make is in the case of a passage where it is clear that historical context is going to play a major role, in which case there is some necessity to know this historical context in advance.

In place of commentaries, the up-front part of researching the background should be reading the passages before and after and addressing correlating passages that reference the subject matter. A cursory book overview is also immensely helpful.

OBSERVATION

Here's a challenge I give to every man I disciple: make at least 20 observations per verse on average over a passage. So, if you're studying a 5-verse passage, try to make 100+ observations on it. Early on, this will seem almost impossible, as I once thought it was too. As you practice, it'll become second nature and you'll find that even 50+ observations per verse is quite doable.

What types of observations should you be making? I break them up into the following categories with the acronym GRAPES:

Grammar - Look for things like past, present, or future tense; if it says "and" or "or"; who is the object of the sentence? etc.

Repetition - If something is mentioned more than once, it's probably important

Absence - This one is the hardest to process, but look for things that you would normally expect to appear but seem to be missing

Patterns - Look for different things that fit together; for example, if you see the "Father," "Son," and "Spirit" all in a few verses, that's a pretty clear pattern that means something

Extratextual - These are observations based on things outside the text itself; it might involve observing what a Greek word dictionary says or what you noticed in a historical reference book; it most often takes the form of correlating passages outside the one being studied

Statements - This is the most common type of observation and it's the easiest; simply put, you're just noticing what the passage actually says and taking its word for it

INTERPRETATION

As with observation, I give a challenge: 10 questions per verse, then answer them. Let's assume you're studying a

20-verse chapter. You should now have somewhere around 400 observations made. Now, go back through all of those observations and ask 200 questions.

I've found that there are no less than 5 different types of questions. I will use Philippians 1:1 for each of my example questions: "Paul and Timothy, servants of Christ Jesus, to all God's holy people in Christ Jesus at Philippi, together with the overseers and deacons"

BASIC - Questions that are readily answerable by the text.

- Ex. Who wrote Philippians?

INTERMEDIATE - Can be answered by the text or surrounding passages, but not immediately apparent from the verse prompting the question.

- Ex. What is an overseer or deacon?

DIFFICULT - Answerable, but require significant research beyond the text itself. These types of questions usually require an understanding of the Bible as a whole and intimate knowledge of God's character to answer.

- Ex. Why is Paul writing this book to the Philippians?

CRITICAL THINKING - Usually don't have a definitive answer, but are worth pondering because they alert us to aspects of God's character of which we would otherwise be ignorant.

- Ex. Why did God have Paul write this letter to the Philippians rather than just telling them directly or having someone in their own city write this book?

CATEGORICAL - This is the most important, yet most difficult type of question to address. They focus on observations that span multiple verses and connect them to a single point that can be succinctly summarized. All of your other observations and questions should be leading to this, as these questions (and their associated answers) are the core of what you're trying to get at with Bible study in the first place.

- Ex. What do verses 1-2 mean? What do 3-11 mean? What do 12-26 mean? 27-30? Based on each of those, what does 1-11 mean? 12-30? What does Chapter 1 mean? How does chapter 1 flow into chapter 2? How does it fit into the greater context of the rest of the book?

APPLICATION

An application references some way your life will change because of what you studied. Applications are worthless unless they are practical. My basic rule is that *an application must be observable*. It doesn't have to actually be observed; rather it has to be capable of being observed.

For example, "I'm going to love my wife more this week" is not practical. "I'm going to love my wife more this week by doing, and ___" is practical. That can be observed. The fact that she may never see you doing those things is immaterial. Your goal in loving your wife more shouldn't be to try to get her to notice; rather, it's to be the loving man God told you to be - covert contracts being destroyed in the process.

5

UPVOTES

302 Challenge - Philippians 1:1-2

31 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

Here's the text:

ESV: Paul and Timothy, servants of Christ Jesus, To all the saints in Christ Jesus at Philippi, with the overseers and deacons: Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.

NIV: Paul and Timothy, servants of Christ Jesus. To all the saints at Philippi, together with the overseers and deacons: Grace and peace to you from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.

See if you can come up with 40 observations and 20 questions on these two verses. No repeating questions from the main 302 thread. If you're feeling bold, try to put a G, R, A, P, E, or S before each observation to show what types it is, or number the questions based on their type. Good luck.

For all of you looking to take some nice pot-shots at me, here you go.

My wife's getting ready for bed. I initiate. As usual, she brings up that she's only been on the mini-pill for 3 weeks and her doctor said it's not effective for the first 4. I've repeatedly told her I'm not worried about it. Literally every legit website plus a doctor I talked to in person have all said 48 hours, not 28 days. She gets worked up about this discrepancy. I'm not worried about it. So, I proceed and she readily obliges.

About 30 minutes in, she stops me and says, "Just so you know, I'm ovulating right now." I say, "I know." She asks how and I just say, "The little things." That really turns her on and we continue. She stops me again and says, "Well, just in case, you probably shouldn't finish inside." I'm cool with that - I wasn't planning on it anyway (I like to change it up frequently). After we're eventually done, she starts worrying because it hasn't been the full 28 days yet. So, I pull up the webmd article that says 48 hours to allay her concerns - "Whether you're just starting or if you miss a pill, it's effective 48 hours afterward."

She laughs and drops: "Oh, well I forgot to take my pill yesterday."

Although I didn't finish inside her, she starts bringing up the sperm in my natural lubricant. I tell her I'm not worried about it and she shouldn't be either. Another passionate kiss and I'm in the basement to screw around on reddit and get some work done.

Now, I have 2 key concerns:

1. She didn't know I knew she was ovulating and waited until half way through to tell me.
2. She didn't tell me she missed a pill until afterward.

I'm confident she doesn't want to get pregnant again right now (we just had a baby in June and both agreed no more). I'm also not really worried about her being pregnant after tonight. So, maybe there's no problem. But, her failure to disclose important information is certainly a serious concern and I'm pretty confident you'll all agree that risking having another child unexpectedly is not the time for the DNGAF attitude.

Is this simply a matter of communicating clearer boundaries (i.e. "You need to tell me when you miss a pill beforehand from now on") or is there some other way I should be responding? Or is this a "no harm, no foul" situation and I should just ignore it? I'm not worked up, but my RP-senses are telling me I shouldn't just ignore this. [Note: My vasc appointment isn't until the end of September - I haven't mentioned that I scheduled it to her yet.]

14

UPVOTES

I decided to read a Focus on the Family article on developing a "satisfying" sex life.

4 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

I wanted to know what the #1 Christian organization on the subject had to say. [Here's the article](#). Here's my breakdown:

GOOD

- He acknowledges: "our intimate life would not magically happen simply because we were in love."
- He seems to understand the different social dynamics for men and women. For himself, it's his own immediate needs and context that shapes how he interacts with the family. For his wife, she's more interested in the betterment of the group itself. Although these social dynamics are more prominent in extra-familial social circles, I have no doubt they carry over into the family as well.
- "The longing in her heart is for her husband to interrupt her life with a lingering, unhurried sexual escape." Spot on there. Many men fail to see this because women hide this very, very well. It's their anti-slut defense carrying into their marriages.
- He encourages flirting with your wife - something many men somehow miss.
- He acknowledges that looking at a screen in front of your wife is unattractive.
- "We take each other - rather than our cellphones - to bed."

BAD

- He mistakenly seems to assume that sex can/should only happen when his wife is into it - a lesson I have learned the hard way should be rejected.
- He believes that "she is more interested in my physically" "when I care about her emotionally, respond sensitively to her needs and assist her with tasks."
- "I don't want to put pressure on her." If she's constantly stressed, sure. But if she's not, women need that pressure from their husbands - that's where leadership begins. They want to be desired so hard that you'll do anything to get them, breaking through any resistance and passing any tests along the way.
- He fails to realize that the way "Pam tends to evaluate the quality of our intimacy" is not the same thing as how she evaluates the quality of their sex or her sexual desire for him.
- He misses the other aspects of his character that explain why he happened to have this one special encounter: he's surrounded by other women for an entire weekend, he's showing excellence in his profession, and he's owning his stuff at home (albeit almost assuredly for beta instead of alpha reasons).
- Although I'm sure he didn't mean to imply he's only has once a month sex, the fact that he only made time for "unhurried, uninterrupted time" once a month is highly troubling.
- I'm not a fan of his "this one's for you" language they explain back and forth, as if it's not something they're both mutually going to enjoy.
- Covert contracts abound.

All in all, he has some of the common sense things right and a few of the more subtle things as well. But he misses so much that I'm not sure how valuable this article can be in actually helping anyone revitalize their sex life in

marriage. So much for Focus on the Family having all the answers (not that I expected otherwise going in - I was just satisfying a curiosity).

43

UPVOTES

50/50 v. OYS/Value

7 September 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill · Archived copy · Reddit

The 50/50 attitude shows up quite a bit in askMRP. This post is an adaptation of a couple of my comments there. This is perhaps one of the single greatest discoveries I had made in my marriage prior to finding RP, which has helped me hone the craft.

50/50 is Wrong

Life is not fair. Stop training your wife to believe otherwise. We don't get ahead in life by playing fair with others, otherwise we'd all be communist peons - but even then we'd exist only to support the true alpha dictator.

"You cook, I'll clean" is garbage thinking. It's your house, your food, your dishes, your sink, your time. If you're planning divorce, yeah, don't think that way. But it's a crap life worrying about divorce all the time. If you're high enough value, why would she leave? And if you're leaving her, you have the forethought and context to prepare. Bottom line: treat everything as if it's yours.

OYS as a Mindset

When I see OYS get mentioned, it's usually in the context of what you're doing to take care of the house and improve your lifestyle. Sure, an OYS mentality leads to this as a conclusion. But you can't sustain that lifestyle without actually believing everything in your kingdom is actually yours. A citizen may own land just as your wife and kids may technically own stuff, but that land is still subject to the governing authorities, hence taxes, eminent domain, etc.

To be clearer: don't think about OYS as "I need to be responsible and diligent with *OUR* stuff." Think about it as you literally owning everything in your domain. It's not "some things are hers, others are mine." It's not even co-ownership. Unless she contributed separate value to get it, it's yours. And even then, if you already paid her for that value, don't let her double-dip on the reward.

EXAMPLE 1

My wife did a great job during last busy season at work and earned herself an extra \$500 bonus. I rewarded her by buying her a new oven, which cost well over \$500. When her bonus check came in she handed it over to me, understanding that the family finances are mine - even what she earns. She contributed an extra \$500 in value to the family with her hard work.

I could have **let her keep her \$500 bonus** as her reward and done nothing else for her, in which case **she allocates her appreciation for the reward to her company**.

Instead, **I took the credit for rewarding her**, channeled how I wanted her to be rewarded for that value rather than how she would have spent that check, and now she's overjoyed with appreciation to me at the new oven I BOUGHT HER (as opposed to her company) and I still get the \$500 check to spend however else I see fit. Plus, since I do most of our cooking, extra benefit to me (hence spending more than \$500 on it).

If I wanted to, I could have also just taken her bonus check and given her nothing, and I've done that before too. But most of the time I like to reward good behavior so she keeps up the good behavior. This will remain true for the \$3,500 bonus she's about to get in her next paycheck. I'm not going to go out and buy her \$3,500 worth of crap. I'll find other ways to reward her for adding value.

But if I reward her with my love, affection, gifts, appreciation, etc. and then still let her spend her own bonus money - she's double-dipping, getting twice the reward for the same work, and at my expense.

Contributing Value

In a 50/50 mentality, you both expect each other to do half the chores, half the cooking, half the cleaning, etc. But odds are you don't value those things equally, so no true 50/50 arrangement ever works. If you see everything in your domain as your stuff, you'll realize it's 100% responsibility on you. If she wants to use your stuff she has to contribute value. You're not a benefactor for free-loaders.

How does that value work? Maybe you do 100% of the work around the house and contribute 100% of the income and she just lays around all day waiting to give you the best sex of your life every single day multiple times a day.

Maybe sex alone isn't enough value for you, so if she wants to keep living in *your* house, eating *your* food, and watching *your* TV, while scrolling social media on *your* phone that *you* let her keep in her purse all day - she needs to start contributing other value. So, she cooks you breakfast. She vacuums the floors. She cleans up after the kids. She works a job. Is this enough value to you?

Sex as Value

What if she thinks she can add enough value that she can ignore sex? If she has a 50/50 mindset, sex ends up not fitting into the equation at all. It's not the same as the other household chores, and you should rightly be reinforcing that she not treat it like a chore (unless you like duty sex, then be my guest). In her mind, she's already contributing her 50% (most likely she perceives it more as 80%), so she thinks of herself as a high-value contributor and if you're only doing 50% you're just doing your fair share and she owes you nothing. Why should she care about sexually gratifying you, or even herself? That's not a variable in the 50/50 equation.

If you deviate from the 50/50 mentality to an OYS mentality, you're the one who dictates where you find value. In 50/50, there's a pseudo-objective standard. "You do this, I do that." In her mind, *this* has the same objective value as *that*. But what if *this* has more value to you than *that*? In OYS, your subjective impressions become the standard that she must meet.

EXAMPLE 2

My wife constantly tries to get affection and appreciation for doing things that she values and I don't. I've had to communicate to my wife repeatedly (sometimes even verbally), "That's great that you vacuumed the house three times this week. I'm glad you find value in that. I don't. I'm fine if it's only vacuumed once a week. You did the work, you're reaping your own reward from it. But don't expect me to pamper and reward you for something I don't value. You want pampering and rewards? You know what I value in the marriage. Go do those things instead."

She usually gets all huffy at me and says, "Well, you should value it!" I ignore her. Sometimes she'll add, "It's not fair, though, that if I do that extra work you still get the benefit of it even if it's not something you would have cared to do yourself." Sometimes I'll ignore her and go about my business. Other times I'll note quickly: "I honestly can't tell the difference between vacuuming the carpets 1 or 3 times a week. You're the only one who experiences that value."

In the past, she still harbored bitterness over this against me because I was still flawed in my execution. After refining things since discovering RP, she hasn't brought this stuff up once. Instead, she's focusing more on the things that she knows I value, including sex. That's a huge win.

Effort v. Value

It's also worth noting that effort $\neq$ value. If something takes 8/10 effort for her to complete, but I only get 3/10 enjoyment out of it, that's only a value of 3/10. She feels like it should be an 8/10 because of all of her effort, but

over time is now realizing that value is based on the result, not the work put in.

Decent sex might have a value of 7/10 for me, but only has an effort level of 4/10 for her. Great sex might be an 8/10 in effort, but gives 10/10 in value. When she's contributing less effort than the value her effort produces, she's in her "sweet spot" - **especially when she becomes cognizant of the fact that I reward good behavior based on value, not effort.**

The problem is that most women don't understand this effort-value dynamic. Why? Because they're living in a 50/50 dynamic, not an OYS/value-based relationship.

- In a 50/50 system, effort dictates what you *should* objectively value.
- In an OYS system, you dictate what you actually subjectively value.

If you succumb to the 50/50 mentality, you'll never be able to pull her out of it. Learn to OYS - not just by taking responsibility, but by actually assuming ownership. If she continues in a 50/50 mentality, that's on you. Lead her out of it. *But don't be an idiot in how you make that transition or expect it to happen all at once.*

I get asked this one a lot, so here's a short post to point you all in the right direction.

Avoid "Men's Rights" Law Firms

This is a trick meant to prey on guys like you. They claim to be experts in helping men in divorce and custody cases, as if they know some trick that the rest of us don't. This is idiotic because we all play with the same statutes, same judges, same rules of procedure. People who represent women know the same tricks as the ones who represent men. How do I know? Because I go up against those guys constantly and if they had any special tricks they would have used them by now. They're not bad lawyers. They are often just as competent as everyone else. They just have no distinct advantage and they're not fighting any harder than any other attorney.

They do have two distinct differences, though: (1) They have labeled themselves in their community, and judges are aware of these labels and reputations, decreasing credibility. (2) They're more into using marketing gimmicks to get your money, which means they're usually more interested in the money than anything else. These firms often charge way more than their competitors. Why? Because they're intentionally marketing to the demographic that they know has more money to spend. Screw those firms.

Two-Part Test

A good attorney should be able to communicate two clear things in the initial consult:

- I will be utterly and honestly real with you about case expectations and what the likely outcome will be.
- No matter how improbable the result may be, I will fight hard through trial and appeal to pursue your goals.

Some attorneys lack the second and are just pushovers. They want a quick buck, to settle the case, and then churn the mill over to the next sad sap who hires them. They'll act strong and courageous up-front, but as soon as the other side makes one good point and the judge seems to agree, they back down and pressure you into settling. These guys are usually wimps afraid of a good trial.

Others in the reverse will promise you custody, support, extra parenting time, that they'll make her pay your legal fees, and that they'll even convince the judge to make her buy the moon and hand it over to you in the final entry. Then, when they obviously can't deliver, instead of owning up to the fact that they're lying scumbags only after your money, they actually blame you for why you didn't get everything they promised. "Hey, you didn't tell me about ____ at the first meeting. If I had known about that I never would have said those things. It's your fault for doing that or not telling me about it up front."

If an attorney is both honest about the realistic outcome, but vigorous in his pursuit of your goals, that's an attorney I would trust. When an attorney has both, you almost always get a solid stream of cost-benefit analysis at every step of the process. You're getting the right bang for your buck.

Vetting

Pushovers

Ask the bailiffs in your county how often they see that particular attorney going to trial on his cases. Look up the public docket to see how many cases he files a year. Go to the initial consult with specific questions in mind: (1) ask him how often he goes to trial; (2) ask him to tell you a story about the *most recent* time he went to trial; (3) ask him how much appellate work he does (if he doesn't do appeals, next him); (4) pre-meditate all of the weaknesses in your own case and ask him his strategy for arguing against those weaknesses; (5) tell him point blank that you don't think this case will settle (even if you really believe it will) and gauge his reaction.

Promisers

These guys are bold-faced liars, so you're not going to get an honest answer out of them. They'll tell you story after story of their great victories, none of it actually true. One such attorney in my area was bragging to every attorney in the courthouse that he got the court to award \$220,000 in legal fees to his client. That's actually a huge accomplishment. Interestingly, though, \$205,000 of that went to my firm because we represented the client through most of litigation.

How do you vet them? Ask them about the weaknesses in your own case and how they think a judge would respond to those arguments and allegations. If they're dismissive and can't recognize the seriousness of some of your flaws (and heaven help you if you don't even recognize your own case's weaknesses), don't trust them. Ask them point blank how much they think the case will cost. If they are evasive or quote you some ridiculously high number and give you no other numbers, screw them. Good attorneys will give you ranges: "If we settle before we file, it'll be around \$w; if we settle mid-way through litigation, \$x; if we take it to trial, it'll be another \$y; and if we have to appeal, that's usually in the ballpark of \$z." Each of these can be ranges or general figures - but if they refuse to acknowledge any cost estimates or give you upper-end estimates only, then they are intending to charge you an arm and a leg regardless of your actual case prognosis.

Lastly, and most importantly: ask people who work for the courts. Other attorneys will lie to get your business. But actual court staff tends to know the attorneys and their reputations and they will be blatantly honest.

Good luck.

Sorry for the general inactivity. Until 10/15 I'm in single-dad mode and have people staying in my basement pretty much every day, so I don't have computer access except when I'm at work (like right now - slow day).

Spend Time With Godly Men

A crucial aspect of both faith and RP prescription is fellowship. In the RP world we talk about the need for men being among other strong, like-minded men. Paul says the same thing: "Join together in following my example, brothers, and take note of those who live according to the pattern we gave you" (Philippians 3:17).

As believers in Christ, it's not enough simply to be around other RP men (or for women, other RP women), otherwise we'll be led astray. 1 Cor. 15:33 says, "Do not be deceived: 'Bad company ruins good morals.'" With all respect to places like MRP, if that's your only or primary source of fellowship, you're in trouble. Any effort to deny this falls in the "do not be deceived" category.

I'm not saying that to promote this sub either. You should have a fellowship of believers *in person* and not just online. As Hebrews 10:25 notes, "Let us not give up meeting together, as some are in the habit of doing." Don't let an online community be a substitute for real life interpersonal relationships. At best, on reddit we are "leaving messages" for each other - certainly not "meeting together."

Don't Overdo It

With that said, I used to think fellowship was somewhat of a blow-off lesson. Most Christians know how to spend time with other Christians, right? In reality, a few years ago a buddy of mine showed me that fellowship is actually one of the hardest of the 7 basics to master.

Hanging out with other believers is massively important. For a new believer, this is how they're going to stay alive - even to the point that I would call this a priority more than any of the other basics. When a coal is removed from the flame, it burns out almost immediately. Put it back in and it lights on fire again - immediately! New believers should learn how to maintain a healthy balance of fellowship in their lives so they don't lose the life that comes from the gathering of believers.

Here's the problem, though: they go too far. They never learn a healthy balance of fellowship - they learn how to become obsessed with fellowship. New Christians become so excited about their new-found relationship with Jesus that they want to completely abandon their old life and dive head-on into the "church world." Church people are so excited that one among them actually shared the Gospel and "it worked" that they're all too eager to pull that person into everything they're doing. And then that person becomes a "church person" and does the same thing with the next guy who comes around.

The problem is that all these "church people" get so used to hanging out in their own bubble that they forget to build intentional relationships with other non-Christians around them. Sure, they have casual non-Christian acquaintances that they may say hi to every now and then, but conversation rarely goes deep enough for a true heart-to-heart.

The point here is that Christians like fellowship so much that they over-emphasize it and neglect other areas. As I often tell people, it's possible to be "sinfully negligent" of any of the basics (more on that later too), but it's also possible to be "sinfully overdosing" any of these as well.

To the new or "not yet mature" believers: build solid, trusting relationships with those you meet in the church, but don't abandon your old friends who still need to hear about Jesus.

To the rest of you: learn how to re-engage with those in your world for the sake of the Gospel. Doing "the church

thing" day in and day out isn't why you're here. Learn how to have an appropriate balance of fellowship with evangelism and not become obsessed with the church life. As I said, this is possibly the most difficult of the 7 basics to master - not because people aren't good at it, but because they're too good at it.

Critical Thinking Question

- *What defines "good Christian fellowship"?

Consider the following scenario: Bob is hanging out with his church buddies at the bowling alley. They have some drinks, munch on some pizza, tell some jokes. Everyone is laughing and having a good time, swapping stories about stuff they've done recently. After a few frames Bob says before leaving, "Thanks for a good time, guys. It's great to have good Christian fellowship."

Is this "good Christian fellowship"? [Note: rather than giving the answers and a long essay up here, I'd prefer to engage in the comments on this one.]

9

UPVOTES

What's the MRP stance on responsive sexuality?

20 September 2017 · /r/askMRP · Archived copy · Reddit

The more I'm ingesting information the more I'm coming across this idea that sex drives work in two separate (allegedly) *legitimate* ways:

- **Spontaneous:** "I just get in the mood sometimes and I don't know why. Even small triggers can set me off."
- **Responsive:** "I won't have any sexual desire for you until you get me in the mood."

It seems like a cop-out to me. Even so, I see two competing RP principles at work:

- RP seems to assume women are naturally spontaneous but become responsive when their man goes beta and they no longer desire him. Then, when they spot a higher value man who shows IOIs, they become spontaneous again. Ideally this is her husband becoming that higher-value man.
- RP also says that men should always initiate, even when their wives aren't giving off IOIs because that initiation might get her in the mood. So, RP suggests flirting, game, kino, etc. to get her in the mood.

Thoughts? Is the second RP position a tacit acknowledgment that some women are mostly responsive in their sexual desire and that's okay/legitimate? Or does RP suggest that all women *can and should* be spontaneously sexual and it's just a matter of the man becoming high-value enough? If the answer is "it depends on the woman," does this mean "AWALT" is not true in regard to how female sexual desire functions on a categorical level (obviously specific desires will vary)?

Divorce

Most of you know by now that, although being a divorce attorney, I'm fairly against the concept of divorce. I believe all appropriate effort should be made to resolve the marriage. That said, here is when divorce is biblically appropriate:

- *Sexual Immorality* - In Matthew 5:32, Jesus uses the word *porneia* for sexual immorality instead of *moicheia* for what we know today as adultery. I won't go too much interpreting that here; there have been other threads about it.
- *Unbelieving Spouse Leaves* - This only applies if your spouse files the divorce first. If your spouse is a believer, you are obligated to follow the Matthew 18 path toward reconciliation/repentance. At the end of that path, if the person still doesn't repent, Jesus says to treat them like a non-believer, at which point 1 Cor. 7 says you're allowed to let the unbelieving spouse leave.
- *Death* - Nuff said.
- *Spouse Disowns You With a Callous Heart* - This one's a lot shakier, so research it yourself. Suffice it to say, Jesus says, "Whoever disowns me before others, I will disown before my father in heaven" (Matthew 10:33). If someone is the bride of Christ and verbally declares with a callous heart (Hebrews 6/10 level) that they want nothing more to do with you, just as Jesus disowns his bride before the Judge, so can you. Just don't run afoul of 2 Timothy 2:13 (with 12 for context) and do this merely because your spouse is lazy or "faithless." It must be active and intentional (see Hebrews 10:26 et seq.).

Stay Plan = Go Plan

With that in mind, MRP has this saying: "The stay plan is the go plan." It's not hard to understand and internalize: *Your path to improvement is the same whether you're trying to save your marriage or preparing for a nasty divorce.*

Now, the immediate objection to this is that we should live differently as married people than as single. This is true. There are clearly different obligations and expectations placed on married people, including biblically. It has an impact on how you live your life. As with the parables of the talents/minas, you should do your best with what God has given you - because this is how you will mature and improve. As you are faithful with little, he will give you more because he knows you will be faithful with much (Luke 16:10). So, be good stewards within your families. More on that to come in other posts, no doubt.

But here's something that gets overlooked: "From now on, let those who have wives live as though they had none" (1 Corinthians 7:29). Some people like to discredit this passage saying, "Paul thought Jesus was going to return in a few years; that's the only reason he said that." But if that's an excuse for ignoring the authority of a passage, are we suggesting Paul's intent in writing those words wasn't inspired for the rest of us centuries/millenia later?

Just "The Plan"

There is no "stay plan" or "go plan" - there's just "The Plan." It's the plan Jesus gave us when he ascended: "Make disciples of all nations." In 1 Cor. 7, Paul is making it clear that our mission to God takes precedence over our marriages. Indeed, our marriages are part of that mission (as our spouse and kids are a small part of "all nations") - but we cannot live as if our marriages are the primary, singular most important central point of our lives, which is

the beta mentality. God has called us to something bigger.

Our mission is threefold:

- Love **G**od (greatest command)
- Love **O**thers (second greatest command)
- Make **D**isciples (great commission)

Most people love to leave that third one out. It's easy to say we're "loving God" and "loving others" when the word "love" is so watered down in modern society. In reality, Jesus clarified: "A new command I give you: Love one another ... as I have loved you so must you love one another." "Love one another" wasn't a new command. The "as I have loved you" part is what's new. How did Jesus love his disciples (this passage was said just before they started eating the last supper, so he's only talking to them)? He disciplined them. He trained and taught them. He rebuked and helped them. He oriented his life around their spiritual growth and well-being so they could reproduce the Gospel in others as he did for them.

If we're not making disciples, we can't legitimately say we love one another. Moreover, if "God is love" (1 John 4:8), then if we are not sharing God with others in our relationship with them, how can we say that we "love" them? Jesus did not say the second greatest command is to "be nice to others" or "be kind" or "be a servant toward" others - he said to "love one another." That biblical understanding of love transcends the individual components. He wasn't referencing 1 Corinthians 13 because that book hadn't been written yet. He was referencing what he had modeled for everyone. The 1 Cor. 13 things were parts of what he modeled, but discipleship was the purpose.

"The Plan" Jesus gave us is to make disciples. All of your self-improvement is worthless if it's not leading toward your participation and fulfillment in that plan. Whether your marriage is on the rocks or in full bloom doesn't matter if you're not making disciples. This is the plan, whether you stay or go. Jesus says in Matthew 7 that we'll know who is truly in him by their fruit. Where's your fruit? If you're so wrapped up in your marriage that you forget your greater purpose, that's about as beta as it gets, no matter how good you get at passing tests, lifting weights, or whatever.

Do you have a plan? Is it the one Jesus gave you or did you make it up yourself and decide to go a different direction?

This is such a huge concept that there may be more posts on the topic, but here are the core, basic concepts.

Why Evangelism/Discipleship?

To start, it's worth noting that there are only two good things we can do on earth that we cannot do in heaven. Evangelism/discipleship (two ends of the same spectrum) is one of them. That should tell us that evangelism is pretty darn important. If you're not sharing your faith, why are you even here? You'd be better off just dying and going to heaven. As Paul says:

For to me, to live is Christ and to die is gain. If I am to go on living in the body, this will mean fruitful labor for me. Yet what shall I choose? I do not know. I am torn between the two. I desire to depart and be with Christ, which is better by far. But it is more necessary for you that I remain in the body. Convinced of this, I am certain that I will remain and will continue with all of you for your progress and joy in the faith. (Philippians 1:21-25)

RP Context for Evangelism

I've said many times that physical marriages are meant to parallel our spiritual marriage to Jesus. I also believe firmly that the pre-marriage process (i.e. dating) is meant to parallel the pre-marriage-to-Christ process (i.e. evangelism). So, what works in pre-marriage?

- *Shotgun, not sniper.* As Rollo talks about, you want to spread out your efforts, not just hone in on that one "special snowflake" who you really care about, but who keeps rejecting your evangelistic efforts over and over again.
- *Plating.* This requires more attention than I can give it here, but suffice it to say you should be working with several people to draw them to Christ. As "serial monogamy" is not often an effective strategy, neither is "serial mono-evangelism." Don't focus on just one. Kick that spiritual ONEitis. Don't take the attitude, "If only my best friend/spouse/kid/person I really look up to would come to Jesus!" That's great. Pursue that person too. But keep your evangelistic options open.
- *Fitness Tests.* Prospects are going to test the crap out of you. They'll ignore you, mock you, laugh at you, argue against you, etc. At the end of the day, as you pass those tests, a respect might develop - just remember to accept the hard no if/when it comes so they don't feel like you're spiritually raping them. Don't be a "bible-thumper," but do be persistent.
- *Abundance Mentality.* Don't get depressed when you're rejected. God has other options out there for you. You literally have eternity at your fingertips. You don't need to be seeing new converts constantly. Your lack of confidence in your own spirituality and insecurity in Christ will not foster confidence and security in a prospective believer. Abundance mentality shows the prospect that what Christ has to offer is something they want - even *need* in their life.
- *Cocky/Funny.* For that matter, aspects of game like being cocky/funny really helps. Christians get such a negative social view because people think we have sticks up our butts all the time, or we're viewed as so humble that we're weak and can't even understand our own beliefs. A show of rational confidence with humor and charm can go a long way in causing a person to think: "I want what he has!"

The list goes on, but you should get the idea by now.

Relational and Proclamational

Purely relational evangelism comes from the theory that all we need to do is live our lives and be around non-Christians and that somehow our faith will rub off on them and they will magically believe - that being the message is more important than preaching the message. In this model, we find most Christians sitting in their homes watching Netflix all day, maybe getting together with the neighbors every now and then, but keeping the relationship mostly cordial and zero-pressure.

Purely proclamational evangelism comes from the theory that we just need to preach and tell and it doesn't matter how people perceive us in the midst of our preaching - that preaching the message is more important than being the message. In this model, we find most Christians standing on street corners shouting "Turn or Burn!" or debating with hecklers.

In reality, the two models must work in tandem. The only exceptions are when you have little to no capacity to engage in one type. For example, if you're sitting next to someone on an airplane and the Spirit prompts you to share your faith, there's not much room for relationship-building, so go full proclamational. But always be tactful in how you communicate - let your words be "seasoned with salt" (Colossians 4:6).

Systematic Evangelism

Step 1: *Find a Non-Christian*. Notice I didn't say "Find a Non-Christian Who is Willing to Talk About the Bible With You." Non-Christians are literally everywhere. I'm sick of Christians telling me, "I just don't know any non-Christians." Look around. Do you have a neighbor? Do you go to the gym? Do you play with your kids at the mall? Do you walk down the street? Do you go to church? You just found some non-Christians.

Step 2: *Introduce Yourself to the Non-Christian*. Okay, this is a "no dip, Sherlock!" situation, but seriously ... for some reason this is the stopping point for 99% of Christians. "I'll observe non-Christians, but don't ask me to say 'hi' to them."

Step 3: *Assess and Respond*. This is the meat. Figure out just how far away from Christ the person is and take steps to move them forward. Each "Christian's job" section is a middle-point between the two phases of what usually has to happen to get from one to the next.

Relational Phases

- **Antagonism:** The non-Christian lives in intentional defiance of God, openly insulting Christians. They don't have true relationships with Christians because they despise them.
 - The Christian's job here is simply to engage with new people. If you happen upon one of these people, just be friendly, whether the person knows you're a Christian or not.
 - In game terms, this is your "instigate" phase. This phase lasts approximately 10 seconds.
- **Aware of Messenger:** The non-Christian has some relational connection to a Christian. It may be nothing more than recurring acquaintances, but that's fine.
 - The Christian's job here is to follow-up with the person. Don't overdo it by smothering the person, but don't neglect him either. Try to engage in a one-on-one setting.
 - In game terms, this is your "isolate" phase. This phase can last anywhere from a week to several months.
- **Favorable Attitude Toward Messenger.** Simply put, get the non-Christian to like you. If you're a Bible-thumping, condemning street preacher, you're going to fail here every time. Be witty, charming, and overall a

high-value person. As you self-improve, other people will want to be around you and will like you.

- The Christian's job during this phase to get to the next is to start gradually exposing the non-Christian to your spiritual beliefs. This is best done passively at first. "Sorry, can't hang out Tuesday. I have a Bible study. How about Wednesday?" It's as simple as that. Because they already like you, when they realize you're a Christian this will begin to challenge their stereotypes about Christians.
- In game terms, this is the start of escalation. This phase typically lasts a few weeks to months.
- **Aware of Messenger's Spiritual Beliefs.** The non-Christian should now know from passive cues that you are a Christian. Although their respect may initially decline a small bit at that discovery, their relational history with you will be overpowering - especially because you haven't been reinforcing the negative stereotypes about Christians up to this point.
 - The Christian's job during this phase is to begin transitioning natural exposure of his beliefs to intention conversation about the non-Christian's spiritual beliefs and life philosophies.
 - Escalation continues. This phase can last anywhere from weeks to years before hitting the next milestone.

Proclamational Phases

- **Comfortable Discussing Spiritual Things.** The non-Christian now has no problem engaging in regular spiritual conversations and somewhat expects it as part of the friendship. He is fairly transparent about his own views and beliefs and is starting to become curious about the Christian's thoughts, although he likely doesn't ask directly because he still thinks he knows what Christians believe.
 - The Christian's job here is to communicate empathy and sympathy toward the non-Christian with regard to his/her life experiences that have formed the basis of his/her spiritual beliefs.
 - If the relational phases can parallel the IIE model of getting to sex, the proclamational phases are where actual spiritual reproductive acts happen, so on the DEVI plane, this is your E. First, you must develop an emotional connection with God to share in God's compassion for the lost person standing in front of you. Second, the non-Christian needs to see that you care about him on more than a rote, intellectual level. Once comfort is established, the path to "positive reaction" is usually pretty short - days to weeks.
- **Positive Reaction to Spiritual Conversations.** This is easier today than it was a few decades ago. "Sex, politics, and religion" were taboo topics. Most generations after the baby boomers actually enjoy talking about things their parents found to be taboo.
 - The Christian's job in this phase is to introduce his own views into the conversation naturally, and to be ready to respond to questions in a way that accounts for the non-Christian's worldview. You don't have to have actual answers to all of these questions - only know how to explain the reason for your own faith. As with fitness tests, the non-Christian is trying to figure out how strong your own convictions to your faith are more than they are trying to figure out whether or not Christianity itself is rational. All non-Christians intuitively understand that Christianity can fit within a rational, logical framework (although some are in denial); they're more interested in prodding every different angle about you specifically.
 - In the DEVI system, this is where variety creeps in. First, God has to work in you in a variety of unique ways to inspire you to start and continue these conversations. Second, you have to engage in the conversations with the non-Christian in numerous ways to bolster the fact that you really know and believe what you're talking about - that you're skilled and spiritual things aren't boring. Getting from "positive reaction" to "acceptance of possibility" is much longer than the last phase. This can be anywhere from the first good conversation to years.

- **Acceptance of the Possibility the Message is True.** After much conversation, the non-Christian, without actually making a profession of faith himself, acknowledges that he cannot deny your beliefs and that everything in the Bible may actually be true, despite his present rejection. The non-Christian may never verbally admit this, but if you're perceptive you'll know when he's here.
 - At this point, the believer's role is minimal. The believer must be consistent in demonstrating his faith in his own lifestyle. Any inconsistency will set the non-Christian back several phases or reintroduce the negative stereotypes that you had previously broken. The Christian must also continue to be intentional at instigating these conversations in an isolated setting and escalating to the Gospel. The focus of your interactions should shift to a 1 Cor. 2:4-5 mentality: "My message and my preaching were not with wise and persuasive words, but with a demonstration of the Spirit's power, so that your faith might not rest on human wisdom, but on God's power."
 - In the DEVI system, this is where dominance takes over. First, because God is the husband and he must now dominate the show from here. You can plant and water, but only God can make it grow. Getting to the next phase is 100% up to God. You cannot force it to happen. You, as the bride, must actually be submissive to God's initiative at this point. Second, you must dominate spiritual conversations with the non-Christian. Once he accepts the possibility that the Gospel may be true, you must balance your passionate insistence on the importance of his acceptance in Christ with the fact that you're dealing with someone in a fragile state, whose entire world-view up to the present is slowly crumbling away as he realizes eternity is in the balance and he doesn't know what's real and what's not anymore. There is no time-frame here. It works at God's pace.
- **Acceptance That the Message is True.** The work of the Spirit alone, the gap from "possibility" to "actual belief" is crossed. But this intellectual acknowledgment is not enough - "Even the demons believe that - and shudder!" (James 2). The new-Christian must also now commit his life to following. But this is where the discipleship process begins.
 - The Christian's job is now to affirm the new-Christian's beliefs through ongoing conversation about the meaning and applicability of the Gospel to daily life, and get the non-Christian engaged in the 7 basics gradually (see 301).
 - In the DEVI system, this is where immersion happens. First, you are overwhelmed with the Spirit's work through you that you are immersed in your own relationship with God. Second, the new-Christian now desires to become immersed in his newfound relationship with Jesus and you've got to be there to help him. Don't leave him as a spiritual orphan.

9

UPVOTES

We now have flair!

2 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

My CSS coding is pretty much non-existent. This is what I could figure out in about an hour. Enjoy. Let me know if you have any suggestions or have the skill to help out.

For now I'm leaving flair self-editable so people can put in their own relationship, gender, faith, etc. information. I'm doing this on the honor system based on the fact that most participants are Christians. If this ends up getting abused, I'll have to switch to how MRP does it - assigned flair where users get no say. I don't want to do that, so let's not let a few ruin it for everyone.

Take this as more of a field report. I stumbled into the concept accidentally, by virtue of not having time to get my laundry done. All of my "sleep shorts" were dirty (I use the same shorts as when I go to the gym, so I go through them fast). The pants I was wearing were too hot to sleep in, so I just decided to sleep naked. I love sleeping naked when my wife's out of town - so much cooler and more refreshing. Never really tried it with her around. She used to get weirded out by nakedness and exposed genitalia (for those who don't know me, she was brought up in an extremely conservative, sexually repressive religious environment). I think I had done it once in my beta days and she made a nasty comment and I never tried again.

Anyway, for the first couple days she didn't notice, or at least didn't say anything. Then day 3 hits and she mutters while mostly asleep, "Are you naked?" She then cuddles up to me in the **king position**, claiming to have no memory of this the next day.

Interesting. I do the laundry, but decide to keep sleeping naked anyway. If nothing else, I thought it would help toward deconditioning her anti-sexual programming by normalizing nakedness. Since then, she's cuddling up to me most nights and now remembering doing so, oftentimes playing with my junk, and a couple times leading into sex. This is totally backwards, given that even as recently as a month and a half ago she's firing her tongue off about how rude and insensitive it is to initiate in the middle of the night, demanding I never touch her while she's sleeping. ("Well, how am I going to give you a mind-blowing orgasm without touching you? Challenge accepted," I said with a smirk. Of course, the next night I lost the challenge, but still won the game.)

Point being: a door that was previously closed (sex after she falls asleep) is starting to open. Why? I don't know. Humor my speculation:

- Pheromones not being stifled by my clothes.
- Increased access to genitalia boosts sexual awareness.
- Increased skin-to-skin contact while we cuddle (specifically below the waist, where her legs touch my legs rather than my shorts) = unintended night time kino.
- Just laying down next to someone in bed who is naked subconsciously (if not actually consciously) produces sexual thoughts.

CAVEAT: I'm 100% confident that this would not have worked if I was still overweight and weak. Noobs: don't try this until you hit the gym for a few months.

I'm going to keep this test going for more data. 2 weeks isn't quite enough for a fully-fledged conclusion yet. But, I thought it'd be worth sharing and seeing if other people have had similar experiences.

ALSO - I'm thinking after another week or so, if results are still good, I'll explain to her how refreshing I feel sleeping naked and suggest she try doing the same. I'm confident on my suggestion that she'll try it at least once ... not sure where it'll go from there. But, given that I'm most horny right when I go to bed (a couple hours after she's been asleep), this might be a solution to getting sex *when I want it* and not trying to force myself to be into it at times that are convenient to initiate for her.

111 - "As I Say" v. "As I Do" and the Polygamy/Hypergamy Divide

11 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

How do we reconcile the discrepancy that we are meant to model life for others (1 Cor. 11:1, Phil. 3:17, John 13:15), while also acknowledging that there are genuine differences between men and women? At what point does modeling stop and instruction become an authority for its own sake apart from demonstration?

BIOLOGY V. SPIRIT

RP appropriately acknowledges that there are clear biological distinctions between men and women. These distinctions extend to spiritual ones as well. Where they try to explain concepts of male polygamy and female hypergamy from an evolutionary standpoint, the Bible is far more clear: this is a result of original design combined with the implications of sin and the curse (i.e. spiritual in nature and not purely biological).

So, when RP says things like *women would rather share a high value man than have a beta to themselves*, it's a biological prerogative to hold different standards between men and women. Men should be expected to want multiple women (who share him), and women should be expected to want to leave the man they're with to be with the best guy in her life (other factors affecting the judgment notwithstanding, of course).

That said, from a spiritual standpoint we have to grasp what Paul says in Romans 7:25 - "I myself in my mind am a slave to God's law, but in my sinful nature a slave to the law of sin." When RP talks about the biological distinctions between men and women and the imperative that causes, they are spot on. But the Christian should also have a spiritual truth planted in them which can save them from their biological impulses, which have been distorted by the fall (James 1:21, referencing the parable of the sower).

As such, secular RP may endorse things like cheating as a biological imperative (whether by a polygamous or hypergamous drive), and they have every right to do so from their limited perspective. But when we factor in spiritual redemption, we have a higher purpose that demands we escape our biological impulses of the flesh. We can find victory in the battle between flesh and spirit because of Christ in us - and we know that living solely from a biological imperative has dreadful spiritual consequences (see Hebrews 10:26 et seq).

To put it clearer: **RP properly understands biological dynamics, but misses the spiritual compulsion found in those with Christ.** As a result, we must consider the whole picture and not merely the biological truths that RP presents to us.

HISTORY

It's worth noting that the polygamy/hypergamy divide is one that is evident all throughout history - not only in biblical cultures and examples, but worldwide and throughout time. Most notably is the direction of polygamous societies. We predominantly see men with multiple wives, scarcely the reverse. Even the biblical examples we see follow this pattern, something God even seems to endorse or otherwise neglects to condemn (2 Samuel 12, Jacob with Leah and Rachel as compared with Abraham and Hagar, 1 Timothy 3).

Polygamy

I'm not endorsing polygamy in a modern society. If it's illegal in your country, Romans 12 should be clear enough: respect that law. My point is simply that when RP talks about "spinning plates," from a historical perspective this seems commonplace for men, but would be inappropriate for women, where hypergamy would lend itself more toward serial monogamy with each successive man being of higher value than the last.

In both circumstances, cheating is expected and permitted in the RP view - but from a spiritual vantage point we must re-evaluate.

Historically, if a man had multiple "plates," he married each of them, bringing a financial obligation of support into the mix. They could not simply divorce their wife and pick up another without having some obligation to the "wife of your first youth," to whom God consistently calls us to be faithful.

Because of this financial obligation to each, in societies where polygamy was permitted, it was usually only exercised by the wealthy and elite - the truly high value men who had the resources to support all of these women. I simply don't see this being true for most men in modern America, who can barely support one family within a reasonable standard of living, even if the laws on polygamy did change.

Hypergamy

That said modern first world countries do blatantly permit serial monogamy. Divorce laws are geared to this exact purpose, having begun with the initiation of no fault divorce as early as 1969. To this end, many RP men are rightly frustrated that female hypergamous tendencies have been legalized - even encouraged, whereas male polygamous tendencies are stifled and socially shamed.

Men are not permitted to marry multiple women, and they're spat on when they cheat on their wives, or must keep their pornography (pseudo-expression of polygamy) habits a secret. In turn, women are praised for being empowered enough to leave their "no-good, deadbeat husbands" in favor of finding and marrying a higher-value man.

But from a spiritual perspective, let's consider the above activities: (1) polygamy in a marriage context, (2) extramarital polygamy/cheating, (3) pornography, (4) divorce and remarriage. 2-4 are clearly condemned by Scripture, yet are technically legal in society, whereas the only one that Scripture may actually endorse (or at least passively permit) is the one that has been made illegal.

Conclusions?

I don't know that I have a conclusion on that point, as much as I find it a point of intrigue. If there is any conclusion to be had, it is simply in understanding that the feminist imperative has managed to stifle the male impulse while legalizing and praising women for exercising their hypergamous drive. After all, what gang of girls or beta men (i.e. 95% of society) wouldn't side with the wife who tells a fine tale of dissatisfaction in her marriage and takes matters into her own hands through divorce, then to find a better man? The cultural narrative paints this as a success story for the woman, not a failure for the marriage. Biblically, this just seems sick and demented to me.

One additional matter of note is that most RP men complain about no-fault divorce laws as being a horrendous evil that gave women all the power by making divorce easier. I agree. Yet at the same time, these same men want to have the ability to divorce their wives easier with fewer/no consequences. This is where things have gone too far. The true spiritual imperative (as opposed to a purely biological outlook) should be for laws to encourage marriages to remain together, not to advantage one side or the other for leaving.

DAISNAID

Now, when RP addresses distinctions between men and women, there is some backlash about the general "do as I say, not as I do" mentality. That is, it's easy to tell women: "This is how you should behave, but I don't have to behave that way because my biological imperative is different from yours."

But we must remember that from a spiritual perspective (again, not a purely biological one), men live in a dual role. Although in a physical sense, we are the men in our physical marriages, at a spiritual level we function as the bride of Christ and are submissive to his headship the same way we expect our wives to be submissive to our headship (1 Cor. 11:3). So ...

- If a man tells his wife to be submissive, is he submissive toward Christ? If so, the phrase becomes: "Do as I do."

- If he tells her not to cheat, does he whore himself out to worldly idols? If not he's better off saying, "Do as I do."
- If he wants his wife to engage in frequent reproductive acts, is he engaging in spiritual reproduction with Christ through the Spirit? If so, "Do as I do."

To this end, husbands must lead their wives by modeling for them what a good bride looks like. We simply do this in a spiritual sense and not in a physical one. We cannot simply say, "Do as I say, not as I do," and explain it away based on the differences in our biological impulses of our flesh/sin nature.

This is something the secular RP community can not possibly understand - and it is also why there can never be any true argument that the dominant/submissive or leader/helper dynamic makes one gender "inferior" or "unequal" to the other from a value-perspective - only from an authority/role perspective. Of course, we are spiritually inferior to God, who never plays the submissive, although Jesus modeled even that, as 1 Cor. 11:3 points out.

87

UPVOTES

Deconditioning the wife who is disgusted at your touch - 10 Levels of Kino

12 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill · Archived copy · Reddit

This post is not for the vets or people whose wives actually like sex when it happens. Some women are legitimately psychologically conditioned (by you) to be disgusted at the thought of any physical contact with you. This post is for you guys. Her reaction isn't just because you're a fat slob and she's afraid of getting lost in your rolls. It happens even to in-shape men. Primary cause? Being butthurt when sex doesn't go your way.

There was a time a few years back when I tried to initiate sex with my wife and it went horribly. Despite trying to go along with it, she gave enough subtle clues that I stopped and asked what was going on. "I'm just not attracted to you. You're too fat and the thought of having sex right now is really disgusting." She wasn't saying it in a mean way - she was just being honest, but you'd better believe that destroyed me inside. These "Ick! What's he doing?!" reactions had crept in not just during initiating sex, but any time I tried to touch her.

Why would holding her hand make her recoil? She learned over time that physical touch = "He wants sex." Because she thought sex with me was gross, that meant physical touch from me was gross too. I lived in this for 7 years with several periods of 6+ months with no sex at all, the longest being 18 months. That said, **THERE IS HOPE!**

PREREQUISITES

I'm not an idiot. At my worst, I weighed 275lbs. No matter how hard I tried, there's no way I was ever going to convince her that physical touch with an obese man would be desirable. Don't kid yourself on that point either. That said, to turn things around, I didn't have to be a male model either. Once you're in pretty good physical shape, you can begin your journey toward deconditioning the psychological scars you'd left behind on your spouse. "Pretty good physical shape" probably means both benching 185 and having under 20% body fat. These are incredibly easy benchmarks to hit. They are not the end of your physical fitness journey by any means, but they are prerequisites before starting this process. Try doing this before then and it may backfire. Don't say I didn't warn you.

It took me [EDITED] ~~less than 2~~ 4 months to go from 275 at 29% body fat down to 18% body fat *and another 2 months to drop to 15%* - and my bench went up from 160 (having not lifted in 5+ years) to 225 *in only 2 months*. That's nothing. You can do it. 2 more months in and I'm maxing the bench at 285 and at 15% BF.

The reason you need both is because just as much as 'fat' is unattractive, so is 'scrawny.' Don't be either.

LEVELS OF KINO

Anyway, once you've got a moderately acceptable body, here's the path I followed that healed the psychological scars I had given my wife about physical touch. She still has psychological scars from other people about sex itself, but that's a different story - my touch is now a source of pleasure to her - something to be desired and that she longs for, not something to be disgusted at.

LEVEL 1: Start by small acts of physical touch. Put your arm around her shoulder while watching TV. When asking her a quick question, put your hand on her upper-arm. When driving, pat or rub her thigh periodically. Most women receive it very well if you come up behind them while they're doing something and wrap your arms around them, sometimes even snuggling into their neck or kissing them on the neck. **DO THIS ONLY AT TIMES THAT SEX WOULD BE IMPOSSIBLE.**

- Don't do anything more than this for 2 weeks unless she initiates [remember, this is geared toward overcoming psychological conditioning, not just getting sex]. If she initiates: **NEVER TURN HER DOWN. EVER!** If you reject her, you're training her that initiating with you = pain (incidentally, the same thing she trained me to

believe, which is why I had given up on initiating for long periods of time). Even if she does initiate, don't skip any steps. After engaging in whatever activity she initiated with (making out, sex, holding hands, whatever), go right back to this path as if she had never initiated. Don't take it as an excuse to skip ahead. I tried skipping ahead at one point due to positive reactions and escalation from her making me think I was ready for the next level ahead and it backfired ... had to start over from scratch.

LEVEL 2: Start touching her out of a normal context, but still in relatively innocuous ways. Maybe you hold hands in public, but now you're going to hold her hand while sitting on your couch. Maybe you used to rub her leg in the car with a short smile, and now you're going to rub her leg while you're eating dinner. Again: *do this only at times that sex would be impossible*. This phase lasts another 2 weeks (psychological reconditioning takes time).

LEVEL 3: Implement the 10-second kiss. As above, during some time when sex would be impossible (ex. when you're leaving for work), instead of your normal peck on the cheek or lips, hold it and keep the kiss going for 10 seconds. For the first few attempts, she might pull away - don't force it, but put your hand on her cheek or the back of her neck if it helps encourage her to hold it (don't tell her what you're doing, though - just enjoy it for as long as it lasts). If you can only get her to 2 seconds, so be it. Eventually she'll get to 5, then 8, then 10. Once you have her at 10 seconds, do this at least once a day - go longer if you feel like it and she's willing. When you've got 10 seconds for 2 weeks, you're ready to proceed.

LEVEL 4: Add peripheral touching during the 10-second kisses. Now you're not just making out briefly or holding her head, you're putting your hands on her waist, maybe sliding them very slightly under her shirt - not trying to cop a feel of her chest, just trying to engage skin to skin on a part of her body that she doesn't normally feel skin contact (i.e. hands, face, legs, feet don't count - abs, butt, hamstring, back - live there). Do this for another 2 weeks - again, at times when sex is impossible.

- At this point you should never be touching her when you're alone in a room together with no other time commitments. The reason for this is because you need context (rather than you verbally) to explain to her that the touching is not associated with sex - it's just touching. That way she can actually enjoy it and not be afraid you're trying to initiate sex with her, which she is still psychologically conditioned to think is gross. At this point, you're only trying to de-grossify physical touch itself. By de-grossifying touch, you'll be 75% of the way toward de-grossifying sex as well. So, up to now you've only been touching when in the car, about to head out to work or an appointment or when she's about to leave, when you have friends over, when the kids are up and walking around, etc.
- If she's not responding well, camp out here. Backtrack if you need to. She should be responding positively before you move from one phase to the next.

LEVEL 5: If she is responding well, the next step is tricky: engage in overtly sexual behavior at times that sex is impossible, but where privacy exists. For example, when the kids are up and playing or when you're about to walk out the door - initiate the 10-second kiss and put your hands on her front torso/belly like before, but this time slide the tips of your fingers just beneath the waist line of her pants. It should be just enough to make it clear you're going further than before, but that you're not trying to initiate sex either. If your whole hand is down her pants, you've gone too far.

Your directive here is to show her your desire without having to say it - to make her *feel wanted* rather than just being told she's wanted ... but to do this with a lingering elipse "... to be continued." That sense of mystery is very attractive. "What would have happened if only ____ weren't standing in the way?" If she doesn't look for the sequel, at this point don't bring it up. If she initiates, wanting to finish what you started, go for it! Again, **NEVER REJECT HER!!** But at the same time, **your goal here is not to get sex; it's to recondition her psychology about physical touch.** If she thinks you're doing this just to get sex, that will undermine your greater goal. But if *she herself wants sex*, that's fine and you're free to engage.

LEVEL 6: Once you're able to accomplish level 5 in convenient settings and it's well-received (regardless of whether she asks to see the sequel), start doing it at inconvenient times. If you have company over for a meal, follow her into the pantry when she goes to get some food and start the 10-second kiss. She'll immediately backlash, but you continue. If she gives a hard no the second time, stop. If it's more an "I'm too embarrassed, what if we get caught?" with a blush, keep going. This is much easier when there's no one else around, but more exciting with the company example. Once the 10-second kiss lands, follow the same pattern as above - hands on torso, slide fingers slightly past the pants line. Let this phase percolate for a while.

People who don't understand the nature of the wife who is psychologically conditioned to be disgusted by physical touch won't understand this and will give me heat, but let me repeat: **DO NOT** escalate to sex yourself. If she does, go for it ... but always return to the plan right where you left off and don't skip any steps just because you think she's over her issues now.

LEVEL 7: By now you're ready for actual initiation at convenient times. Wait until there's a night when the kids are in bed, no major appointments in the morning, and no major life-stressors getting in the way. Plant your 10-second kiss, hand on her abs, fingers playing underneath her pants-line, then just pull her in close and say, "I want you." Her response doesn't matter unless it's a hard no. Your second phrase is always the same: "I seriously have to have you right now." If she does give you a hard no, respect it, smile back and say, "No worries, I'm not going to make you do anything you don't want to do," and then kiss her on the forehead to show her that you're not upset with her for rejecting you. Give her a long hug, make out for a few seconds - whatever you have to do to convince her that you're really okay with her rejection.

- Usually the hard no at your initiation in this phase is because she can't tell if you're still emotionally insecure about your sex life or not. If you are emotionally insecure and show it, she'll think that everything these past couple months has all been an act and it's not the real you. Because she doesn't want to get duped, you've then just lost a month of progress and she's once again convinced that any time sex is initiated it's a source of pain - don't reaffirm that conditioning you're trying to break. If you're not emotionally insecure about it, though, and you can convince her that you are truly okay with her rejection, then this will advance your cause of deconditioning the negative reaction to sexual initiation. She will realize that whether she wants sex or not, you're not going to blow up at her, so she can be free to express herself without fear of fostering resentment between the two of you. The key here: *don't be resentful!* That's on you. This is the beginning of deconditioning her negative psychological disposition toward sex even beyond physical touch on its own.

LEVEL 8: If she accepts your initiation, **you actually have to be good at sex.** It's got to be a mutual thing. If you're just trying to please her all the time and not interested in making her please you, this communicates that all that pent-up desire you've been communicating toward her is really fake - it's still so weak that you're repressing it and don't really need to let it out. But if you're purely acting on your own desire and not cultivating her arousal and climax (which is actually better for her than the first mistake), she's going to start seeing you as selfish and it'll affect other areas of your life, although she may want to keep trying in the hope that you'll learn how to please her now that you're actually showing desire for her. Ideally, you want to be balancing between your desire and hers. Personally, it works well for me that I just do whatever I want to do to her until I'm ready to peak, then stop myself and focus on her until I can calm down a bit, then I go at it for myself again until I'm about to blow ... then calm down again while I ramp her up. This both make her feel the full weight of my desire for her while not feeling neglected either - and that's the biggest turn-on for many women.

LEVEL 9: Once she's responding to initiations at convenient times 80%+, then move on to initiating even at inconvenient times, at your discretion and with wisdom. If she just got out of surgery, that's inconvenient, but wisdom says to maintain restraint, so restrain yourself. But if it's inconvenient because she's tired or has a headache or there's company in the room down the hall or there's an important meeting in the morning - be considerate, but don't back down. First, show her that you want her so bad that you'll overcome your own inconveniences to have her (i.e. when you're the one with the early appointment, or you're sore from working out, etc.). After that, work

toward letting your desire for her overpower her inconveniences too. I'm still working on this part of the process, but I've noticed that when I am successful here, the sex is much better than when it's convenient or when overcoming one of my own conveniences. This is probably for two reasons: (1) if she's going to do it at an inconvenient time, she wants to make it worth it, but more importantly, (2) because you're showing her that she's so desirable that you're willing to fight through obstacles she used to put in your way, and that makes her feel really, really, really good inside. You have now become the prince who has fought the dragon and won. Just be cautious for spotting the hard no when it comes. Don't be an idiot.

LEVEL 10: By now your physical touch should be an expected part of daily routine and something she legitimately desires. You can touch her in pretty much any way at any time and she'll enjoy it, although circumstance may still dictate her reaction from time to time. Putting your hand down her pants while you're at a coffee shop with some friends probably won't go over well. But do the same thing at a dark theater and who knows ... that former recoil may now turn into the bashful, "We might get caught!" which might turn into, "OMG, it's worth the risk." I was here at one point very early in my marriage, but long since lost it. So, I know she has the capacity to be there - I'm just trying to get it back.

All of this said, I have noticed that once my wife disassociated my physical touch from an expectation of sex, she became far more receptive toward my physical touch and accepted and enjoyed it freely. Incidentally, her enjoyment of my physical touch then starts to make her aroused, so she ends up wanting sex anyway - something that could only happen if she genuinely believed I wasn't trying to lead her own that road. At some point, that has since evolved even further to the point where she welcomes overt initiation - she now wants to know that I'm leading her toward sex. But don't miss that important disassociative phase, which is crucial in getting there.

In all of this, just remember to be patient. This whole process took me about 3 months with my wife - and I had the benefit of being in shape before it started working for me. Good luck.

As many of you know, there's been some drama on MRP. I was caught up in the middle of it and am doing my best to stay out. All of that led me to do a lot of thinking about what it means to be "red pill" - and I am now more than confident that even among the flaired people on MRP, there's no clear consensus.

The primary dividing line is between (1) one who sees and understands how the world works [descriptive RP] and (2) one who behaves a certain way (or at least is willing to) in order to accomplish certain goals [prescriptive RP].

Early on in my RP journey, I used to fall into the first camp. Seeing the matrix for what it is was "RP" enough for me. Some time ago I changed my mind. Just as we, as Christians, acknowledge that rote intellectual affirmation of the Gospel does not constitute saving faith, so also does rote intellectual acknowledgement of the "RP-Matrix" mean nothing if it does not compel us to *be different* - not just act different, but actually *be different*.

If RP is "sexual strategy," it cannot just be about understanding. It must be about doing. The question is then found in how we define the parameters in which the strategy applies.

Hard-Core v. Higher Priorities

Hard-Core

Hard-core RP prescription cares nothing about a person's life than achieving his 100% ideal sex life. **This is the nature of sexual strategy in its RAW FORM.**

What it does not account for is the myriad of other factors influencing a person's decisions. For example, on RPC we believe that hell is a real thing, sin matters, and someone living in deliberate, intentional sin is in danger of fiery judgment (Hebrews 10:26 et seq). So, hard-core RP says, "I don't care if you end up in hell. If you want your 100% ideal sex life, here's what you do. You choose between great sex and avoiding hell on your own. It's one or the other, there is no middle ground."

This choice between sex and some other higher priority doesn't compute for most hard-core individuals. They don't have a higher priority than sex. The result is that they will abandon anything and everything to get their 100% ideal sex-life. For non-Christians this is a legitimate way of life and one that we have no authority to condemn. We gain nothing by changing non-Christian behaviors or beliefs - only by changing their hearts, and that's more up to God than us. We are simply to be dutiful messengers. So, don't read this as a license to go around condemning non-Christians for developing their own life priorities. "Who am I to judge those outside the church?" (1 Cor. 5).

Higher Priorities

Now, basic observation does show us that there actually is a middle ground. I exist in that middle ground, as I expect most of you do. I'm not living my 100% ideal sex-life right now, but I have made substantial progress in that direction, and I expect that progress to continue. So, I've gone somewhere between "sexual misery" and "My sex life makes me feel like I'm on crack all the time!" The middle ground does, in fact, exist. If someone was satisfied with where they are in this middle-ground, that person could maintain their current sexual strategy (even if it's passive or subconscious), but if they want to improve they will have to change their strategy.

For those who have higher priorities than sex, living in this middle-ground is satisfactory as long as those higher priorities are being met. If you say your highest priority is bearing spiritual fruit for God's Kingdom and you haven't struck up a Gospel-centered conversation in the last 12 months, this is a display of where "bearing spiritual fruit" actually ranks on your priorities - and if you've got a middle-ground sex life as well, then your priority is probably actually something like relaxing to Netflix or eating delicious, fatty foods everyday, or studying theology, or whatever (good or bad, it could be either). Just be careful that your priorities are *intentionally pursued* and not

passively lived.

For purposes of this sub, I will take it as a given that every Christian has a higher priority than achieving his 100% ideal sex-life - and that's going to connect to our faith in some way, even if, at a bare minimum, it's "I don't want to go to hell." The result is that most (maybe all) Christians are okay with living in the middle-ground to the extent that higher priorities require as much.

That said, there is nothing inappropriate about a Christian wanting to maximize his sex-life without compromising his higher priorities. **This is the nature of sexual strategy in its REFINED FORM.**

So, if a Christian is sitting at 5% of his ideal sex life (about where I was 2 years ago) and wants to bump that number as high as he can go, maybe 4 months later he gets up to 70-80% (about where I'm sitting right now) - and that number could go even higher - maybe even 100%. But the process of getting from 5% to 75% and beyond requires sexual strategy.

The Toolbox Approach

Base Mentality

The hard-core view of RP is that it is all-or-nothing. If you have higher priorities that prevent you from being willing to cheat on your wife or divorce her on a whim, then when those priorities come in conflict with your strategy, you're left with nothing and no other possible strategy can reap effective results.

The toolbox approach accepts all of the *descriptive aspects* of RP praxeology, but as to the *prescriptive aspects* it says, "Take what works for you and leave the rest." So, there is value in understanding the way culture has been shaped by the feminist imperative, that working out affects attractiveness in a variety of ways, the differences between alpha and beta mentalities, what fitness tests are, etc. (i.e. *descriptive aspects*). There is also value in actually learning how to lift, how to pass fitness tests, how to develop an abundance mentality or an amused mastery of life, fogging, etc. (i.e. *prescriptive aspects*).

But if there is a tool you'd rather leave in the box, that's your call. It must be vehemently understood that for every tool you leave in the box, you run the risk of decreasing the maximum % you can attain of your ideal sex life. So, if cheating on your wife is a tool you refuse to put in your belt, you might be dropping your maximum % down to 90% or lower. You've got to accept that. But it's also possible that you aren't dropping your maximum % at all - maybe it just means you're going to have to use a penny to turn the flat-head screws instead of your flat-head drill bit. Sure, this is going to be harder and take more time, but maybe it works.

Efficiency

Hard-core RPer's have found *the most efficient way* to have their 100% ideal sex life. Bravo. I legitimately applaud this accomplishment. For a non-Christian, they do well to enjoy this world as much as they can before eternity sets in - if they insist on rejecting Jesus, it's the only enjoyment they're going to get. That said, those with higher priorities than their 100% ideal sex life must choose among:

- (1) abandoning those priorities = *going hard-core and only utilizing hard-core tools*
- (2) accepting the natural adjustment to how far you can get in the middle-ground = *only existing RP tools allowed, but you decide which you use*
- (3) continuing to research and discover alternative tools that, when utilized, do not compromise your priorities = *viewing RP not as a finished product, but involving an ongoing need for discovery and swapping notes about what works and what doesn't.*

With regard to those "alternative tools" - the hard-core RPer's have no need to extend themselves beyond the status

quo. They have arrived. Their existing dogma of RP principles does not need adjustment or modification because it already meets their purposes. As a result, there is no room for new ideas, only tweaking old ones - and from their perspective this makes sense. They have no need to fiddle around with whether some new idea gives verifiable, provable results if they are confident that the new tool will be less efficient than the one they're using. Why test hitting a nail with a rock when you already have a hammer? Again, for a non-Christian this is an appropriate way of life.

The problem comes when this mentality extends into isolation territory: *Only this specific set of tools will work and absolutely nothing else can possibly work ...* or **You must be willing to utilize all of the tools we give you, and if you cannot, then it will be impossible for you ever to build that barn.*" This is flawed thinking. Hard-core RP may utilize a power drill for efficiency sake, but people were building barns long before the drill was invented.

For those whose priorities make them more selective about which tools they will utilize, if we want to build a barn without a hammer, we're going to have to get creative. Efficiency may go down when we start beating nails in with rocks - but we may still get our barn. At some point, there may have to be some compromise because there simply doesn't exist a rock that can get in the same narrow angles that a hammer might - and in that case, such a person might simply be okay with settling at 95% before compromising his higher priorities (which means turning down the hammer) to get that last 5%.

Descriptive RP as the Foundation

But here's the thing - **there are still laws of architecture that must be accounted for when building the barn or the whole thing will crash.** These are the *descriptive aspects* of RP. If one just starts willy-nilly using tools to hammer slabs of wood together and screw in brackets, but ignore things like creating a proper foundation or decides to use plywood for the entire structure, that barn will collapse at the first sign of trouble. That is why the *descriptive aspects* of RP are so important and must be maintained. Using the tools with an appropriate understanding of how architecture and craftsmanship actually function is where the only way to create a barn that stays up.

14

UPVOTES

Working on the Sidebar

18 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

Hi all, you may have noticed some significant changes to the sidebar. I'm excited to keep developing this, as many have suggested. That said, I'd love some help and feedback - specifically with regard to content.

I know it's like trying to find the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow, but which books, blogs, etc. have you enjoyed, which I can review and vet, to continue adding to our foundation? I'm happy to take suggestions!

It's been a while since I've brought this topic up, so let's talk about frame. Let's talk about dealing with the emotionally volatile woman who thinks she can wear you down with *feeeelllllzzz*.

STRIKE FIRST

How many of you have noticed your wife visibly upset and thought to yourself ...

- **Beta:** "I better do something to appease her before she rips my head off"
- **Purple:** Avoid her. "If she's going to have an attitude, I'm going to withdraw."
- **Jesus-Level:** Call her out on it and get the party started.

No kidding. The pharisees were mad at Jesus and started merely *thinking* mean and nasty things. Does he just avoid them and keep preaching? No, he stops what he's doing and calls them out: "Why are you thinking these things?!" (Mark 2:8).

I know when my wife's upset. Rather than letting it linger until she explodes, I defuse that bomb right away. "You're not acting normal. What's going on?" She usually tries to be evasive at that point because she hasn't processed what she wants to say yet. **DO NOT** give her time to let her hamster spin up a million reasons why she's justified in being mad at you. Nip it in the bud to find out what the core issue is - not the rationalizations she'll come up with after-the-fact.

The battle is inevitable. Strike first to keep it on your terms, not hers. Why? Because you're capable of steering the ship where it *needs to go*. When she's angry, she's only thinking about *where she wants it to go*. Let her lead the argument and the ship crashes. You're the captain for a reason. If you know there's an iceberg ahead, don't let the ship steer straight for it until your first mate calls it out first. This isn't a game or a test. This is your life.

NEGATIVE INQUIRY

This WISNIFG gem is probably the most underrated tool for beginners in the entire manosphere. We hear lots about AA, AM, fogging, etc. because they're easy and fun. Those are predominantly deflection tools to avoid actually dealing with the issues. Before discovering RP I had already put STFU, AM, and fogging as my primary tools - AA was a nice addition. But my wife (to steal a BPP description) "has a lawyer level hamster." She's smart and deflecting can only work for so long.

That's where NI comes into play. NI is for when you don't want to deflect - you want to cut through the crap and get straight to the core of the issue. Like Kevin Costner said in the climactic scene of *The Post Man*, "Wouldn't it be great if wars could be fought just by the a-holes who started them?" All the hamstering (on both sides!) just creates infantry, air force, navy, etc. that makes the war quite explosive and tragic. That's why we don't DEER anymore. NI says, "No, I want to know what's *REALLY* causing this problem - and let's fight that instead."

How do you NI? Just ask, "Why does *make you so upset?*" followed by, "Why is that bad?" followed by, "Why don't you like it when I?" and so on down the line. The goal here is to get to one of two possible results:

- *Less Likely:* She realizes that her demands and arguments are silly and apologizes for the whole thing. I've seen this happen, but it's not often.
- *More Likely:* She reveals the actual core of the issue. In my experience, that core issue is usually as simple as, "Because that's my personal preference." Sometimes there's a legitimate reason behind it, but it's almost always just a matter of her personal preference.

If the NI doesn't end the matter with the "less likely" option, once the "more likely" option concludes, just AA that sucker away. "I don't know why! I just don't like it when you do that." *Darn right you don't! Let me see if I can figure out some other things you don't like either.* <wink, wink> *No, sorry, I like that one too much. I'm not giving that up.*

Now, when it comes to NI, Jesus is Lord! His primary MO was to respond to accusations with a question that cut through the garbage and got to the heart of the issue. I referenced Mark 2:8 above for starting the fight. Know what he did immediately afterward? NI! "Which is easier: to say to this paralyzed man, 'Your sins are forgiven,' or to say, 'Get up, take your mat and walk?'" In other words: "What's so bad about what I just did?"

EXERCISE AUTHORITY

As good as old-me used to be at arguing, this is where I always fell short. I knew how to stand up to my wife in a fight, but I often found myself questioning my own behavior. Learning to be intentional about NI has helped a lot at finding the core issue - but my weak frame always left me wondering: *Maybe she's right. Maybe I really should change that aspect about me or what I do.* This is idiotic when it's really just a personal preference thing - especially when it's an issue that affects the direction the ship is headed.

When you engage in NI, there's an implicit jab at your spouse that subliminally translates: "What's so bad about ?" *into "There's nothing wrong with ."* Now, maybe there is something wrong with _____. That's why you're asking it as a question and not making it as a statement. But the statement is heard nonetheless. This gives you the ability to decide for yourself whether the answer she gives holds the value of a concerned first mate or a narcissistic insurgent. Sometimes my wife actually sees in my blind spot. That's why she's there! To help me. But when it really does boil down to just a personal preference issue and she wants her preferences to control how the ship is run - not only does a line need to be drawn, I've got to communicate that line clearly. I must exercise my authority in a way that makes it clear: "This issue is now over."

If you leave the issue lingering, she's going to keep hamstering out - and you probably will too. That's where resentment lives. Arguments must end with a clear plan of action. As the man, you must exercise your authority by making it clear: "We've said everything there is to say. This is what we're going to do from here." Don't ask for feedback. You're leading, not negotiating.

Let's finish our Mark 2 story. After Jesus demonstrated the above in 8 and 9, now in verse 10 he says, "'But I want you to know that the Son of Man has authority on earth to forgive sins.' So he said to the man, 'I tell you, get up, take your mat and go home.' He got up, took his mat and walked out in full view of them all. This amazed everyone and they praised God."

Look at that pattern again. The pharisees had an attitude. Jesus didn't wait for them to blow up at him - he took charge and initiated the confrontation. Then he asks the moralizing question, knowing that his answer is in the right. Then he demonstrates his authority by carrying out a plan of action that proves his authority and heightened his glory as the people were amazed. Go and do likewise.

CAVEAT

Let me be clear up-front: none of this is meant to be a license to engage in protracted discussions about your wife's feelings and whether or not they make sense. Still prioritize *Acta Non Verba*. If it's a small issue or they're only surface-level emotions, AA/AM/Fog/etc. - all the deflecting tactics, then get back to leading by living.

This post is more for when it's a major issue where you know your silence could lead to mutiny. To recap, the plan is: STFU and listen to everything she has to say. When she seems done, ask to make sure: "Is there anything else you'd like to say?" If she keeps talking, keep STFU. When she's finally done, that's when you engage in your NI. If

that doesn't resolve things, once you're at the core of the problem, simply communicate your action plan and end the conversation.

- "But when I NI, I don't know how to respond to her answers. They seem to make sense." If she's giving you good feedback, fog and make a conclusion that incorporates the good things she's offering. If it's garbage feedback, just remind yourself: *YOU DON'T HAVE TO RESPOND*. That's operating in her frame. Just ask more questions until you get to that core, which means she most likely admits it's just a personal preference on her part. Be steadfast and don't give up.
- "I tried that and it didn't work! She kept trying to bring it up again!" That's because you didn't end the conversation - you left something still in limbo. If you're clueless about what, just broken record your action plan. Be steadfast and don't give up.
- "But my action plan isn't working!" That's because you're a garbage leader with a weak frame. Learn to be steadfast and don't give up. But be smart too. Go read more books until you're able to think on your feet.

STEADFASTNESS

2 Peter 1:5-7 shows a clear path: "For this very reason, make every effort to supplement your faith with virtue, and virtue with knowledge, and knowledge with self-control, and self-control with steadfastness, and steadfastness with godliness, and godliness with brotherly affection, and brotherly affection with love." Paul tells us that "love" is the greatest of the virtues (1 Cor. 13:13). Jesus says the greatest and second greatest commands revolve around our ability to love. Everything hangs on our ability to love, he says. So, how do we get to love?

1. You can't truly love without faith. God is love. Those without God cannot love. Period. It all starts here.
2. Once you have faith, you're finally freed from sin and able to do good, taking on positive virtues.
3. As your virtuous character develops, you start to learn and understand how the world works and what God wants you doing in it
4. That knowledge of how God created the world to function and the impact of sin on the world (which we call being "RP-Aware") leads to self-control. Before taking the red pill, Neo was always running around, controlled by his environment. Once he took the pill and mastered seeing the code behind the world, the environment was controlled by him. He was in control of himself and his situations. [For Christians the rabbit hole goes much, much deeper than basic RP-awareness, but that's for another post].
5. Once one is in control of his emotions, decisions, actions, etc. he is able to be steadfast. This is as far as you need to be in order to deal with the raging battles your spouse is likely trying to draw you into. Self-control is about your external response. Steadfastness is your internal security in the midst of your controlled responses. One who is not steadfast will quickly lose their self-control. You have to keep pushing forward or you will fall back.
6. Interestingly, the implication of the verse is that a person *cannot be godly* until he has developed his iron frame - one that is both externally applied and internally experienced.
7. Once you have your iron frame and have molded it after godliness, this is when you can finally have the strength to help others. You can't genuinely be an asset to your environment until you're strong enough to deal with your own issues first. Again, once Neo was aware (knowledge/3) he gained control (4), which led to an inner-calm (5), which made him all god-like (6) to function within the matrix - *AND ONLY THEN* did he have the power to help his sleeping brothers and sisters (7).

8. And only when we help our brethren can we truly say we are living of love. "By this all men will know that you are my disciples: If you love one another" (John 13:34-35) ... and, "Whoever does not love his brother whom he has seen cannot love God whom he has not seen" (1 John 4:20).

Similarly, if you say you love your wife but don't have an iron frame, you're deceiving yourself. You must be her oak. If you can't brace yourself for the battles she tries to wage against you, then you are incapable of loving her.

10

UPVOTES

Anyone have experience with NMMNG groups?

20 October 2017 · /r/askMRP · Archived copy · Reddit

In all likelihood I'm about to start one with a handful of guys within my church who have been asking me for help and I just don't have time to meet with them all individually.

Has anyone ever led one or been part of one before? What works? What doesn't? How fast of a pace do you take it? Any advice would be appreciated.

Note: I know /u/reddreadwolverine has done this before - and I'd love more feedback on this from you, especially, given the limited nature of our previous exchange. Thanks!

Perseverance and self-control through tests are a crucial aspect of the red pill framework and also part of the fruit of the Spirit. We can't say we are "mature and complete, not lacking anything" until we have mastery over ourselves, our desires, our mission, etc., which the bible says comes directly as a result of passing tests (James 1:3-4).

The question is simple: *How do we develop this perseverance and self-control?*

Odysseus and Jason

Odysseus was on a quest that would lead him past the island of the sirens - vicious monsters who would lure men in by singing an enchanting and alluring song. Even the most strong-willed men would be unwittingly tempted to their shores to be eaten alive. Fortunately, Odysseus was smart and had a plan.

He filled the ears of every crewman with wax so that they would be unable to hear the sirens' song. But Odysseus wanted to know the beautiful melody that men would die for. So, he had his men chain him to the mast of the ship. As they passed by the sirens' island, Odysseus beat his chains against the mast at the seduction of the song, but his men were instructed not to let him free. They heard nothing and knew to ignore their leader's pleadings. He pulled at his chains so hard that his hands were bloodied and his muscles were torn at exerting so much force, but his restraints held him at bay. In the end, the crew were none the wiser as to what all the fuss was about; but Odysseus was a bloodied and beaten man.

Jason, on the other hand, had a different idea. He sought a man named Orpheus to accompany him. Together they journeyed with the Argonauts past the sirens' island. And when that beautiful song was sung, all of the crew rushed to the side of the boat as if to jump in the water and swim ashore. But Orpheus stops them, saying, "Hold on guys, I got this ..." He whips out his lute and begins playing a melody so much more wondrous than the sirens' song that the crew cared very little for the foul temptresses as their ship sailed safely past.

AVOIDANCE OF SIN

This story presents a double-whammy for us. The first aspect is in teaching us how to address the temptation of sin in the world.

- **WAX:** The first option is to be like Odysseus' crew, who poured wax in their ears. They avoided every possible temptation so they could go on about their business. For the weak-willed there is merit to this, but we are incapable of bubbling ourselves off from the world indefinitely. The sirens only used one sense (sound), but our enemy uses all 5 - and we are not to end up gouging out our eyes every time we lust (Matthew 5:29-30), so there has to be a better way.
- **CHAINS:** The second option is to be like Odysseus. We set clear boundaries and limitations in our lives to make it virtually impossible for us to sin. We see the sin. We smell it. Our lips can taste it. But our safeguards hold us back. We live our lives always **wondering how great things could have been if only we could have broken the self-imposed chains that have been holding us back**. In the end, we become bitter, never truly satisfied. The focus is on what we've missed, not what we get.
- **LUTE:** The third option is that of Jason - find something better to do than dawdle in temptation. More specifically, as alluring as temptation from the enemy may be, we have God. What can be better than that? If we know the actual joy that a genuine relationship with God brings (and I don't pretend that everyone on this sub has this - or even that every Christian has experienced it yet) ... there is no room for being drawn away by sin.

It's not even worth our time anymore. Why leave what's great and healthy to get what's mediocre and will kill you?

What's your usual approach to sin?

FITNESS TESTS

Our wives tempt and test us the same way as sin. I'm not even kidding. Take a look at this:

- Genesis 3:16 - "Your desire [*teshukatech*] will be for your husband, and he will rule over you" (NLT: "Your desire will be to control your husband")
- Genesis 4:7 - "Sin is crouching at your door; its desire [*teshukatech*] is for you, but you must master it"

Just a chapter apart, we see the same phrase to describe what sin does as what wives do to vie for control. Now, the manosphere labels these as "fitness tests" under the impression that women secretly want us to pass the test - to tell them "no" and maintain our headship over the family. They're right. This desire comes from the way God created women before the fall.

But sin has tainted that desire, as with all things, and women are now lost in their ability to discern whether they want a man who can lead them or a man who will supplicate to them. I always appreciate the Wife of Bath's story in Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*, where a knight is sentenced to death unless he can answer what all women want. Stumbling upon an old hag he deals with her for the answer: *Wommen desiren to have sovereynetee, As wel over hir housbond as hir love, And for to been in maistrie hym above.*

How do we handle this?

- **WAX:** This is the epitome of STFU, but in more of an extreme ridiculousness kind of way. Pretending like you don't hear her has some merit, but as with this method in response to sin, it cannot practically last indefinitely any more than Odysseus' crew would be willing to leave wax in their ears for the rest of their lives. They eventually sailed past the sirens, but many of us are living with one "until death do us part."
 - **CHAINS:** Just as Odysseus engaged in the sirens' song, but refused to be lured away, this is engaging in your wife's emotional hurricane, but digging your heels in and refusing to budge. In arguments, it's called DEERING. Yeah, you may be standing at the end of the day, but you'll have gained nothing and probably gotten all butthurt as a result. If it's not in an argument, it's letting yourself linger on the beta mentalities, enjoying the juicy bites of sweet deliciousness it promises, all the while knowing that actually sinking your teeth in will mean death. You won't get her dripping juices - you'll only have killed yourself a little inside with each passing day and nothing to show for it. Even if you fail to give in, you'll always be wondering what the fantasy world of dazzling blue might have offered if only it were real.
 - **LUTE:** Simply put, you've got better things to do. Go do that instead.
-

SONG OF SOLOMON

Interestingly, we see this solution played out perfectly in Scripture. In Song of Solomon 5:2-6:3 we see a conflict play out between the Shulammite woman and Solomon. Here's an easier rewording to see this:

- 5:2 - She's asleep and he wakes her up wanting to come in
 - 5:3 - Her: "I don't have clothes on. Do you really expect me to answer the door? And my feet are clean, do you
-

really think I'm going to get them dirty walking across the floor?"

- 5:4 - Solomon starts to open the door anyway, but changes his mind. "Screw her, if she's going to be like that."
- 5:5-6 - She finally finishes getting ready, but by the time she opens the door, he's gone. He had better things to do than deal with her defiance.
- 5:7-8 - His withdrawal causes her to get all sore and butthurt (assuming the "watchmen found me ... they beat me, they bruised me" = metaphor for her emotional state; I can't imagine anyone would physically do this to one of Solomon's wives).
- 5:9 - 6:2 - She remembers how great he is and longs to have him back, then finds him and makes up.
- 6:3 et seq - He doesn't act all butthurt about it; instead he continues to seduce her.

Let me summarize: (1) She gets defiant; (2) He withdraws his time and affection without getting butthurt; (3) She gets upset; (4) She remembers how great it is to be "his"; (5) He seduces her and she willingly accepts.

DAVID

In 2 Samuel 6 we see another example of biblical conflict. The church actually notices this one, but sees it as a triumph for how much we should love God, not a model of how to deal with a wife who's acting like a shrew. They miss the point of the story. Something tells me that readers in Old Testament times understood that this was about how David handled Michal, not how cool it was that David celebrated in his underwear.

- 6:16-19 - David has a purpose higher than his wife and begins leaping for joy publicly in his underwear to see it advancing. Michal "despised him in her heart." David ignores her and goes about the celebration.
- 6:20 - Michal unleashes her emotional hurricane on David about the situation.
- 6:21 - David says, "You're right; I was undignified, but I've got bigger stuff going on than you. I'm going to keep doing whatever it is I feel like doing. You're not going to ruin my good mood - I'll keep celebrating."
- 6:22 - David ups it a notch (amplifies): "In fact, I'll make myself even more ridiculous and you can watch! Oh yeah, and all the other girls are going to gawk over me."
- 6:23 - God curses Michal and makes her barren.
- 7:1 et seq - David focuses on his vision of building a temple for God, seemingly giving Michal no further thought. She is never mentioned in the Bible again. The next we hear of David with a woman is with Bathsheba, who becomes his wife and the mother of Solomon, his true heir (2 Samuel 11).

Let me summarize: (1) She gets defiant; (2) He agrees that he was undignified, then amplifies and threatens to become even more undignified and to get the attention of other women; (3) She gets upset, but doesn't relent [unlike the Shulammite woman in Song of Songs], so God curses her and David ends up with Bathsheba.

CONCLUSION

We see at least five key principles in these stories to help us understand, as men, how to respond to our wives when they're fighting for control in the relationship:

- Neither Solomon nor David got butthurt.
-

- Solomon withdrew his time and attention; he had better things to do.
- David employed agree and amplify because he knew he did no wrong and wouldn't have his passion for God stifled by his wife.
- Both Solomon and David seem to have an amused mastery over their affairs - life's a thing to be enjoyed and celebrated, not a cause for bickering.
- In one case the relationship worked out; in the other it didn't. None of this guarantees results - it only creates conditions where results are most likely to occur. Be OI.

Did I miss anything? What other passages do you all see that demonstrate how to handle marital conflict? These are the only two I can think of off the top of my head that are directly on-point and give a specific example, as opposed to generic instruction without any context.

SCRIPTURE AS AN ALPHA

I'm always intrigued at how certain things that seem so obvious are somehow missed by the church. I *DO NOT* endorse reading Scripture for the purpose of finding a particular result. So, don't read it just to affirm alpha/RP tendencies or to force them where they don't belong. But the modern western church reading of many passages does exactly that, only from a blue framework.

They will read a passage like David and Michal (see 207) and totally miss the relational dynamic between the two. They will see it as: "David was passionate about God; Michal was not; Michal got punished and David didn't. Therefore, this is a story about how God interacts with those who are or aren't passionate about Him." Is that in the passage? Absolutely. But to completely ignore the fact of how David was dealing with his wife's outburst, or to refuse to make a statement on that tells me that:

- (1) BP Christians simply are incapable of seeing everything God intends to communicate in Scripture because they're filtering out what goes against their psychological conditioning; or
- (2) They're intentionally re-interpreting Scripture to avoid making statements that would be politically incorrect or culturally unacceptable.

Either way, it's wrong.

Now, reading Scripture from a red framework can lead to similar problems, but the risk is much lower. Why? Because the world was far redder back then than it is today. Blue is the dominant color today; red was the dominant color back then. So, if we want to understand what an author was trying to communicate, if we're going to have any bias in how we filter things, I'd much rather have a bias that's more consistent with the inclinations the author of each book likely held as well.

Moses didn't bat an eye at the concept of slavery or having a homosexual stoned. Today, Christians wince when they read those things because culture doesn't like it. I'm not calling to bring OT law back. I'm not Jewish, so I'm not under that law in the first place, just as the apostles said not to impose that law on the Gentiles. I'm glad that we don't have biblical slavery as a dominant economic force today. I'm glad I can embrace homosexual friends for the sake of the Gospel in their hearts today. But if we want to *understand* what the authors meant and were thinking when they wrote those passages, we've got to approach interpretation from the same mindset they were in - not one that has been polluted by worldly thinking. James 1:27 says that this (plus taking care of orphans and widows) is the only 'religious' practice that is "pure and undefiled before God."

HOW TO

The key to doing this is first and foremost to escape the fantasy world. Swallow the pill and accept the fact that God had an agenda when he created humanity and that agenda has been tainted. The "red pill" tries to explain how the world operates in the midst of this conflict between intentional design and mankind's fallen nature. Figure that out first.

Next, get some historical perspective. Once your **Bible study skills** are up to par, start reading some commentaries and learn what life was like back then. Don't just make wild assumptions or take the footnotes in your Bible at face value. Actually dig in and look it up. Get in the mind-set of the author.

Most importantly, ask the question "why?" to everything. Don't just read it and apply it. Try to figure out why God wants you to apply it in the first place.

EXAMPLES

The ten commandments are an easy example. Most people read; "Do not lie" and let that be the end of it. They do the best they can to stop lying, and that's that. But have you ever stopped to think about *why Go doesn't want us to lie?*

One can try to explain this stuff away with "higher morality" - to believe that there is some standard higher than God that decides right from wrong, and that God is always on the "good" side of this standard and wants us to be as well. That's garbage. There's no standard higher than God. God is the standard. If God wanted to say, "Lying is good - do it as often as you can," he could have done that. Who am I to put him in a box? But he didn't do this. *Why not?*

Probably because he wants to make us into the type of people who don't have to lie. Alpha men don't need to lie. Alphas are all OYS and tell it like it is. The beta avoids lying because he's afraid of the consequences, whether as small as getting caught or as grand as not wanting to be condemned to hell.

Consider some more:

- "Do not steal" = God wants us to become the type of people who don't have to steal. Alphas position their lives in a way where we can provide for those we love, not relying on someone else's work to get the job done. The beta avoids stealing because "it's wrong" or he might get caught.
- "Do not take the Lord's name in vain" = God wants us to be the type of people who both honor Him in the relationship we were designed to survive on, and also don't need to invoke the name of God over every trite thing in life. Betas "swear to God" that whatever story they're peddling to the girl at the bar actually happened. They ask God to "da** it" for them because they can't (or won't) do it themselves. God didn't want people to become so weak and passive as to defer everything to him when he empowered us with his authority to live and act on his behalf as his ambassadors and representatives.
- "Do not commit adultery" = God wants us to become the types of men who don't have to - men who dominate the bedroom with our wives and are satisfied with making good use of what he's given us. The beta's reason for avoiding adultery is one of fear that he might lose his wife. The alpha's reason is simply that he doesn't have to or want to.

By now you should get the idea. God wrote the Bible for a reason - *for our benefit*. If we take it at face value and never ask *why?*, we'll never become the type of people God wants to mold us into. Specifically, the *why* of it all explains exactly who it is God's trying to help us become - and for men, that's the path to being alpha.

MEDITATION

Meditation is a substantial part of the RP world. It helps a man focus, process his thoughts, hone in on his vision, and regain a sense of perspective about the world around him, assisting him in holding frame and maintaining an amused mastery and abundance mentality.

Although there is value in general meditation, as Christians we know there is greater value in focused meditation. Joshua 1:8 says, "This Book of the Law shall not depart from your mouth, but you shall meditate on it day and night, so that you may be careful to do according to all that is written in it. For then you will make your way prosperous, and then you will have good success." That's right - you want a formula for prosper and success? Meditate on God's Word and be careful to do everything written in it. That's the path.

QUIET TIME

A Christian's time in the Word is his life blood. John 1 tells us that Jesus is the Word of God. We also know that the Scriptures are Spirit-inspired. They're also a record of everything the Father has done. No matter how you look at it, if you want to know and love God, you've got to go through His Word to do it.

The most basic method of having a quiet time involves three steps. (1) Pray that God opens your heart to love Him and receive what He wants to show you. (2) Read a passage. (3) Prayerfully reflect on the passage and how it can help you be more like Jesus in very practical ways.

A quiet time shouldn't be an in-depth research session. Put down the commentaries, concordances, internet references, and study notes. Just read casually and absorb what God has to offer. Then meditate on what the Spirit is trying to do in your heart through the passage - or maybe even through something else entirely that has been weighing on you, and the passage is merely a vehicle to orient your gaze back toward Christ. The reflecting should resemble the phrase, "Be still and know that I am God" (Psalm 46:10).

If you lack anything else in your faith - make this one thing a priority above all else. I believe you will find that emphasis on a daily quiet time will develop in you a compulsion for all other areas of the faith, and thus all other aspects of our walk with Christ cannot appropriately grow if one isn't spending daily time in the Word.

RELATIONSHIP AND REST

The most often missed aspects of quiet times are the ways it's meant to be intensely relational and restful. Most people see quiet times as a chore - something they have to do to keep learning new things about the Scriptures. This is not God's design.

Relationship

Imagine being on a date with your wife. You ask, "Tell me about your childhood." She obliges with a 5 minute story. You follow up with, "Okay, now tell me about your trip to Europe as a teenager." She answers. You continue, "Okay, now tell me about your favorite concert," and this is how the date goes. You get home and how's she going to respond?

If it's all about the information, you'll never get to sex. You need kino, flirting, teasing, isolation, escalation, etc. What's the point of the date if it's not leading anywhere? If you just wanted to gather information about your spouse (or her about you), couldn't you have done that at home? Or couldn't you have sent her a questionnaire from your office desk? The point of the date is to build the relationship.

Now, try going the next 3 months with no alone time with your spouse except maybe 15 seconds before eating a meal and see how well the relationship flourishes and how revitalized your bedroom gets. [Hint: *It won't work!*] Have you spent some alone time with God yet today?

Initiate, Isolate, Escalate. God's trying to initiate with you all the time - are you willing to follow him into isolation and let him escalate within your spirit? Can you take what God's trying to do with you and implement those same tactics on your wife?

- Or let me get to the point: maybe your wife isn't responding to your initiate because you're rejecting God the same way she's rejecting you. She's just following your lead. **Show her how she should act with you by modeling that behavior with how you react to God's initiation.** That's how you'll lead her.

Rest

I can't write about QTs without touching on this subject. Everyone complains, "I don't have enough time!" or "I'm just not motivated ..." Boo hoo. *Man up and get it done* is what I used to say. Now I realize that there's a fundamental psychological problem that causes these types of attitude: we see it as *work* and not *rest*. It's a chore that must be checked off our list, and it's always more fun to procrastinate work. "Come to me all you who are weary and burdened and I will give you rest" (Matthew 11:28).

Do you *Netflix and chill* at the end of a hard day? I can't count the number of people I meet who say, "I don't have enough time," but somehow manage to have 20 minutes for a TV show. "That's not fair," they say, "you want me to give up my only down time during the week to do another *thing*?"

Therein lies the problem. Human brain chemistry has been so warped by the addictive noise we receive through our 5 senses that we dread the thought of giving it up for stimulation in our 6th sense - our spirit. Consider:

- **Touch/physical stimulation:** working out, sex, "self-gratification," massages, chiropractors, back scratching, long baths/showers, drugs
- **Taste:** food, wine, pop/soda, beer, candy, ice cream, drugs
- **Smell:** candles, cooking, camp fires, nature
- **Hear:** music, nature sounds, interpersonal conversations, OD-ing on sermons, books on tape, radio advertisements
- **See:** porn, Netflix/Hulu, movies, billboards posters, video games

Be still and know that I am God. (Psalm 46:10)

It is good to wait quietly for the salvation of the Lord ... Let him sit alone in silence, for the Lord has laid it on him. (Lamentations 3:25-28)

CONCLUSION

It's easier said than done, but if you can learn to weed out the noise in life that fills your 5 senses, you will find your greatest rest in basking in what God has to stimulate your 6th sense - not the intellectual curiosity of what the Bible has to teach you, but the Spirit-filled peace that comes from letting your spirit rest.

Intellectual comprehension of Scripture is a good thing, but it is often the greatest enemy of our spiritual ability to escalate in our relationship with God, rest in His strength, and re-center our focus through meditating on His Word.

Similarly, if we employ quiet times with God in response to His initiation, which is ever present, I have found in my own life that my wife tends to follow my lead and is more responsive to my initiation, to resting in my strength,

and to re-centering her focus away from the noise in her hamster and toward the focused path I am laying out for our family. She is a reflection of you.

The last post on leadership (by ruizbuyc) centered around styles. That is, if you're trying to lead someone through lecturing and they're not responding, switch to life-sharing or delegating and see if that changes the result. I've had great success employing those methods in my own life. Specifically, my wife learns best by life-sharing. So, when she was freaking out about something and I tried to talk her through the logical solution, she just got all huffy at me. I stopped myself, shared a story about a time when I had implemented the logical solution in a similar situation to what she was in - and all of a sudden she's all gushing and happy and felt like she really understood what I was trying to say. It was weird, like waving a magic wand. But this post will focus more on the process of leadership.

HOW JESUS DID IT

I've examined the Scriptures repeatedly to try to discern how Jesus started a movement and led his followers into becoming the apostles as we know them - flunkies who managed to turn the world upside-down. Here's the general trend:

- **Tell them what:** Jesus usually started by preaching. He laid out a road map and said, "Here's what I expect of my followers." He gave clear boundaries and enforced them. He said things like, "Anyone who doesn't *cannot be my disciple*" or "*By this* : all men will know you are my disciples."
- **Show them how:** The next thing he did was to live by example. He put into practice what he preached. Others saw his life and wanted to follow in his footsteps.
- **Let them try:** When they were ready, Jesus would give his followers opportunities to make a difference. He called Peter out to walk on the water in front of him. He asked the disciples to feed the 5,000. He let them try to cast out demons and heal people. Sometimes it worked, sometimes it didn't. He always gave feedback.
- **Send them out:** After developing some competency, Jesus sent them off to practice on their own - outside of his presence. At first he sends out the 12, then shortly after he sends the 72. And he tells them that their being "sent out" would soon become a permanent endeavor. But he always gave feedback when they returned, answering their questions and continuing to train them.
- **Pass it on:** His ultimate lesson to them was not merely one for their own benefit, but to help all the others who would be affected by their influence as well. In this way, Jesus would be like a grandfather to those that the 12 reached, and a great-grandfather to the people that the next generation reached, and so on. This is the core of generational ministry and what Jesus means by discipleship.

HOW I APPLIED IT

Now, I've done this twice in my own life. Consider:

- **Tell her what:** At one point early in my journey I informed my wife that I planned to start going to the gym and getting back in shape. I told her that I wanted our family to be healthier and more physically fit. I also commented on dieting. She did not follow, but she at least knew my intentions.
- **Show her how:** So, I started going to the gym on my own, without her. For a while, I was dieting without her too. She saw me diet, but didn't feel like partaking. At some point, she decided after seeing my improvements that she wanted to start going to the gym too. I would have to nudge her along and she'd only go when I went, but something was better than nothing. I tried to instruct her on how to lift weights and not just spin her rotators

on the treadmill, but she rejected. Even so, she'd come down to the weight area and watch me lift. She was curious about it all, asked questions, and I showed her what works and how to do it, proper form, etc. But she didn't partake.

- **Let her try:** About a month ago, my wife came down from the treadmills to the gym floor like usual, watched me lift for a bit, then says, "Can I try?" Of course, I get her a set of weights that will push her, but won't break her confidence, and she goes at it fantastically. Similarly, I started a cut diet last week and this time she decided she wanted in, so she's trying with me. She cheats more than I would (last night especially, as the kids bring buckets of candy home for Halloween), but something's better than nothing - she's still developing the will-power to make it through a strict regimen.
- **Send her out:** This past week she's now been going to the gym on her own time while I'm at work (she's still on maternity leave). Is she doing all the lifts I would have instructed her to do? No. But she's taking the initiative to go on her own and not needing me to push her along anymore. She also asks questions when she gets back about what she should be doing for next time. She's still hesitant, but has made substantial progress. Likewise, she's taking ownership in the diet by ordering groceries that are compliant rather than me doing all the grocery shopping anymore. Progress!
- **Pass it on:** She's now talking to friends and neighbors about her new workout routine and the diet we're on. We invited some friends over tomorrow night and will be cooking a delicious, yet compliant meal (I'm grilling babyback ribs, broccoli, an asparagus), and as much as I've invited men to lift with me (who are already members at my gym anyway), she's now talking about using up some of our guest passes to bring some of her neighborhood friends with her to the gym. This is a double-pro because it means she's passing on what I'm showing her in the way of lifting and dieting, while simultaneously building relationships in which we can invest for our mission of making disciples for Christ!

I can give a few dozen other examples of how this process has helped me, as it's one I've been employing since long before my RP days. But only when I developed the assertiveness necessary to stand firm have I noticed the results happening so quickly and more naturally in the relationship, rather than feeling forced. Live like Jesus lived. Give field reports as you're able.

FR: Why having a mission is so important

2 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

I know ... 3 posts in 2 days. But with how much I've been talking about having a mission in the comments, I couldn't let this one go.

My wife get all emotional this morning at something small I did. I hold frame and go about my day (i.e. off to work and don't really think about it). After the kids are in bed she brings it up again. I start my usual pattern of AA and it's not working, so I change tactics to Negative Inquiry (my favorite of the WISNIFG strategies).

"What's wrong with me doing that? ... Why is that bad?" Eventually I decide to land the big Q: "Why are you even still with me?" Now, until this point in the conversation she had been a little weepy and hard-hearted - very faux-repressive-aggressive.

I totally expected her to play the emotional manipulation card: "I don't even know anymore! Maybe I shouldn't be!" Now, I know her, and she wouldn't actually mean that. But in the past she had used that tactic to get me to back down - to feel like I have to make some drastic move to convince her I'm worth staying with. I've passed that test enough times by now that she knows it won't work on me. [*How?* you ask? "Hey, I had the same thought just two days ago! We have something else in common! No wonder we're together!" and a pat on the butt or a wink with a grin.]

No, her answer surprised me: **"Don't get me wrong. You drive me crazy. But I know one day we're going to be standing before God's judgment seat and you're going to be the one he's impressed with - the one who has fruit to show. I want to be the one standing by your side on that day. Other guys just care about watching football or making money. But you're actually doing something with your life. I want to be a part of that."**

Did we have hot monkey sex afterward? No. I probably should have initiated right then and there, but opted to keep STFU and letting her talk instead. As to the underlying issues that started the whole conversation, she concluded: "I know this makes no logical sense and I have no right to feel this way or to be upset with you; but that's how I'm feeling anyway. Just give me time and help me work through it, if you can." That's a conclusion I can work with.

My point in this story isn't some new trick to get wild hot monkey sex out of your wife. Initiations and general boundaries aside, we have that periodically. My point is more that if you want your wife to respect you - to value you *as the prize God put you in her life to be*, you've got to have that mission. I know many guys here have communicated to me privately that there not here for better sex (which they're allegedly already getting) - they're here because their wives don't respect or follow them. You you, I ask: *What's your mission, and is it one that she will proudly stand by?* Will God tell you, "Well done, good and faithful servant" (Matthew 25:23) and to her, "Thank you for helping him along the way"?

In Rollo's interview at the 21 convention he talked about hypergamy being the core driving force behind all sexual strategy. This got me thinking a lot, so I did a search and it's been over a year since hypergamy was discussed as a focal point, beyond a passive reference. So, I'm looking for conversation, but let me get things going.

ACTIVE HYPERGAMY

Virtually every time hypergamy is brought up it's in the context of divorce or cheating - how the woman acts with regard to other men in her life. This is very **active** in nature. She sees. She wants. She takes.

When I first discovered RP, I glossed over hypergamy as a thing that didn't really apply to me. My wife is faithful to a fault. I mean that literally: *It is one of her faults*. In my beta days I would wish that she'd start watching porn, reading romance novels, or oggling celebrities because at least that meant she had a sex-drive deep down somewhere. I got her hooked on the Twilight series. I would bring up 50 Shades and suggest she read it just to see what all the fuss was about. That was actually my first glimmer of *hope*: she came to me all teary eyed and guilty, confessing, "I just looked up the 50 Shades trailer on YouTube and watched half of it ... I started getting excited. I'm so sorry, I'll never do it again!"

I was unwittingly trying to fuel my wife's *active hypergamy* in the hope that it would cause her to desire me more while in a low SMV state. Having unplugged, I see now how stupid that strategy was. Fueling hypergamy while in a low SMV state is highly counter-productive to increasing attraction. That said, fueling hypergamy as the most valuable man in her life might actually increase attraction - as she seeks and does not find.

Why wasn't I leading my wife in the bedroom? Why wasn't I the one she was fantasizing about? Why did I need someone else to get my wife sexually excited for me?

PERCEPTIVE V. OBJECTIVE VALUE

Hypergamy makes clear that a woman will be most attracted to the highest value man in her life. Higher value = higher attraction; lower value = lower attraction. If you are objectively the highest value man in her life, she might have attraction toward you at a level of 9/10 (the perfect 10 reserved for those men she knows she'll never get). But suppose a higher value man comes along. Her attraction to you just bumped down to an 8 and the new guy now holds a 9 on the attraction meter - even though you have not changed in any way. She just found out there's someone better who she has a chance of getting, so she's less interested in you. Add 7 or 8 guys who are realistic options for her who are all higher value and suddenly her attraction to you is a 0-2.

In all of this, your SMV has not changed from an objective standpoint. Instead, it has changed from her subjective perception. For women, perception is reality. There is very little room for objective truth. As BPP says in his podcasts, women are designed to mold to the shape of their container. This container should ideally be your frame. But if they aren't in someone else's frame there are no objective boundaries to how they operate. If you're not containing her in your frame, she'll most likely default to (1) social constructs, like the feminist imperative as communicated through social norms or (2) a specific person, like the guy she's all tingly for, so she becomes whatever he wants. Point? Your objective SMV means nothing relative to her perception.

This sucks for guys who have been married for a long time. This is why going Rambo doesn't work and dread is to be applied over time and not all at once. It takes a long time to change perception (reeling in the 1,000 foot rope), particularly when the status quo has been going on for so long that there is no longer an expectation of change - and don't dare think you can cheat by telling her about your MAP.

PASSIVE HYPERGAMY

Married men face a unique type of hypergamy that singles don't have to deal with. This type is passive in nature. Where active hypergamy causes a woman to become attracted to someone outside the home, leading to cheating or divorce, passive hypergamy does the reverse - it decreases attraction within the home when the wife believes that there are better options outside the home - even if she has no active intention to pursue those options.

As I noted above, my wife is faithful to a fault. Is it possible she might cheat on me someday? Sure. AWALT. But the immediate impact of her hypergamy isn't a motivation to cheat on me or divorce me; rather, it functions as a decrease in her attraction for me. When she perceives that there are other men in her world who are higher value than me - especially if they're men who she believes are actually attainable - her attraction toward me goes down. She finds herself thinking that she stands too much to lose by acting on her hypergamous desires, yet simultaneously, "Those other guys are everything I wish my husband was; why can't he do ___ like they do?" = attraction plummet.

Now, as many of you know, I've been upping my game and demonstrating high value - physically, socially, financially, etc. Sure, this increases dread at the fact that my options are now increasing. The result is that her desire goes up.

But there is a secondary function to my SMV increasing that works alongside dread: **As my SMV increases, the number of higher value men decreases, removing the negative impact hypergamy was having on her attraction to me.**

CUTTING THE BRAKES

Anyone half way familiar with the sidebar should be fluent with the concept of "be attractive, don't be unattractive." This isn't redundant, it's actually saying two distinct things. Dread increases attraction. Beyond its negative emotional drawing force ("I better up my game or he'll leave/cheat! He's a man with options!") it also has a positive emotional drawing force through preselection ("If these other girls want him, there must be more to his changes than I first thought!"). In short, dread is designed to increase attraction.

But when it comes to decreasing unattractiveness, you may want to be mindful of passive hypergamy as a worthy tool to put in your belt. How? Here are a few suggestions:

- Whenever possible, engage with the other men in her sphere of exposure who she might see as higher value. As you stand toe-to-toe with them, maintaining composure and leading the conversation, the mystery that makes up much of preselection value diminishes and you show that he's not a threat to you, therefore must not be as high value as she thought.
 - Shortly after we were married, before I lost my alpha, my wife told me in tears how she was developing an emotional connection toward her boss. He was objectively higher value than me at that time. I was a student, he was her professional superior. I think I was better looking and smarter, but he was new and mysterious and paid his own rent. I told her I wanted to meet the guy, so she invited me to one of her work happy hours. I showed up, had a few drinks with the guy, told some jokes, led the conversation (other co-workers present too), and we went home. My wife was shocked, thinking I was going to confront him more directly. My response? "Nah, I didn't need to. You can do better. In fact, you already did." [How did I ever lose that attitude?!?]
- Develop orbiters and don't hide them. Unless your wife hangs out at bars and nightclubs without you on a regular basis, chances are she won't see many women orbiting other guys in a natural environment. But she's presumably around you enough to know how often other people are trying to get your attention. This presents

you as the higher value man from her perception - even if the other men in her life are otherwise objectively higher in value. She sees you getting attention, but doesn't see the same in them. As she asks, "What did they [the orbiters] want?" don't shy away from revealing the gender. "*She* just had a quick question." In fact, this goes even better if you get involved in the orbiter's drama as an advice-giver (particularly with regard to relationship advice - extra credit if you're telling her to leave the guy, for dread effect). Not only does this demonstrate high value as someone whose wisdom is sought after, but it also shows an amused mastery - that you can casually brush off other people's emotional drama with a casual wave of your hand, knowing the answer to their problems in seconds, whereas the orbiter has probably pondered it for days to no avail.

- On reddit and in church I'm constantly getting people asking me questions about the Bible. There have been several times in the past months where my wife has observed me interacting with other women as an advice-giver. Her early responses were to fire away with the tests to get me to back down. When that failed, she has since started having fun with hearing about the (anonymous) juicy drama, walking away with a simple, "Just don't get too involved."
- Be mindful of the ways other men display high value. Seeing a DHV in another man causes her to expect that same type of DHV in you. If you're aware, this is really a win-win for you. If you refuse to play the game, hold frame, and pass the test, that's a DHV, pitting you toe to toe against your competitor rather than taking a loss. But if it's a legitimate issue where you need some improvement, go ahead and improve - and that's another DHV, also negating the potential loss. But if you are simply unaware because you're not mindful of how other men act around her, *she will see you failing to display high value, which in her perceptive reality is actually a display of low value.*
- If you're extremely confident in your value and your wife has a small social circle, let her expose herself to more lower-value men. This comes off as a DHV because you're not mate-guarding and you demonstrate no sense of threat from your beta competitors.

Any other ideas on how to make hypergamy work for you? Leave some comments.

- Adapted and expanded from content originally discussed on r/RPChristians

This question comes up a lot here and on TRP and I just got yet another PM about it, so I figured I'd put this out more generally: a dozen ways to nip a false DV charge in the bud before it becomes a problem. But two things to note in advance:

- This is designed for those in live-in LTRs/married people. The list would require significant adjustment for singles.
- This is all based on risk assessment. I'm assuming you're conscious enough of your relationship to know whether you're in a (1) high-risk situation, and therefore need to be doing most of these things, (2) a low-risk situation, so you probably only need to worry about the easy ones, or (3) if you're in an extremely low-risk situation, thus can ignore this altogether (which I hope is the case for most of you).

1. **Call the cops in advance.** Tell them your wife is mentally unstable and you're afraid she will file false allegations when she finds out you're seeking divorce. Actual DV perpetrators think they can get away with it. No one plans to commit a crime, then calls the cops to tell them, "Keep an eye out, I'm about to get accused of committing a crime." I had a case where a guy did this and with nothing more, this alone was enough to persuade the judge that she was making it up.
2. **Record one conversation a day where you're talking cordially.** An underlying question in DV and CPO cases is whether or not she's actually afraid of you. If you can show several days after the alleged abuse (noting that you don't know when she will allege it) that she's still talking to you normally, the same as before, it casts a lot of doubt on her and usually is enough on its own to beat the charges. The key is to have conversations both before and after the alleged charge date. Since there is no actual offense, it means you probably need to have a week's worth of recordings. If she doesn't make the accusation when you think she will and the risk seems to drop, just drop the frequency of your recordings to whatever you feel comfortable with - but as long as that risk is there don't let it go longer than 1 week.
3. **Maintain a log of where you are at all times.** Let Google track your location constantly. I was impressed when I wanted to go to a bakery that I hadn't been to in 3 years, so I googled it and Google said, "You last visited ____ on [date]." When I clicked on that date, it showed a map of everywhere I had driven that day and what time of day I was at each location. That's creepy as heck ... especially when I found out it had this information for literally every day I've had google maps on my phone. Nevertheless, this is great for proving an alibi. If you weren't at home when she said it happened, you win.
4. **Keep friends or witnesses around** whenever you're together, otherwise record any time you're alone around her.
5. **Keep yourself clean of all drugs and alcohol** and don't let any drugs/alcohol containers sit around your house. "He got drunk/high" is the easiest way to explain why your version of the facts don't line up with hers. Don't give her that fuel.
6. **Ask her to go to marriage counseling, then hand select a counselor who will give each of you the MMPI-2** to assess for mental health issues before the counseling actually begins. This is essentially a way to trick her into revealing her mental instability, while simultaneously getting a professional witness on your side about how crazy she is. ^FN1
7. If she won't go to counseling, **submit yourself to individual counseling and get an MMPI-2 done** as part of

the process, then feed the counselor your version of events and your preemptive concerns. This is extremely persuasive. When you have a relationship with a counselor who finds you generally sane (albeit under stress, justifying your meetings), trusts you, has data to back up that you're sane and trustworthy, and sees that you "called it" before it happened ... that's your best witness right there. ^FN1

8. **Keep a journal of her erratic behaviors, or just a journal in general.** Journals are admissible evidence if they are recorded immediately after an occurrence. Although much of the content might be hearsay, the "present sense impression" rule in most states' rules of evidence allows it as evidence of your mental state and perceptions at the time of or immediately after a situation occurred. Also, if you have log entries for every day and just happen to be lacking any appreciable information about having abused her, it might look self-serving, but if the journal shows other times when you've explained fights between the two of you, if you don't have any arguments recorded on that particular day, that's going to look fishy against her story. Also, she might make up crap on a day when you literally can't remember what you were doing, so journals are great for refreshing your recollection.
9. **Record conversions with your kids about weird stuff she does.** Make it sound natural, not like an interrogation. Although the kids can't testify, a GAL can, and if she manages to manipulate the kids after-the-fact (parental alienation behaviors, for example), you at least have them on recording saying the truth. It might not be admissible, but it's still persuasive to a GAL. Be sure to include 5-10 minutes on the recording before and after you talk to the kids to demonstrate you didn't coach them right before the recording started and there was no de-brief session afterward.
10. **Document any lies or inconsistent statements from her** to demonstrate her lack of credibility. Keep all of your text messages and e-mail exchanges. Keep your conversation log positive and even flirty. The more emojis she uses in response the better - this proves she's not really frightened of you and doesn't perceive you as a threat, or even that she responds well to aggressive flirtation, which could put a different spin on her version of events if the judge believes she might have been asking for it because she likes it when you get a little dominant and rough. I literally had a case where an unmarried couple (but living together) were having rough sex and managed to get the case thrown out on the grounds that we proved the woman had a history of liking rough sex and was texting her man about how she wanted him to rough her up.
11. **Snoop through her chrome or IE settings to get her passwords and install a key logger.** Many women actually admit this stuff either before or after the fact in writing with their lawyer or close friends, if you can get access. Even if your state won't allow this type of evidence to be admissible, the knowledge you can acquire is invaluable all the same.
12. **Have a close mutual friend ask her in private** and record the conversation: "I heard you two are having troubles. Has he been violent or abusive at all? Are you afraid he might get that way?" Mutual friends are usually willing to help establish a record to avoid false allegations because they don't want either party to be dealt with unfairly. Just don't expect them to lie for you; they're typically more interested in fighting against lies.

^FN1 A note about counseling: RP usually advises against it. Why? Because they give horrible marriage advice. But if you're that worried that your spouse is going to start throwing around false DV charges, I'd be less interested in being attractive to my wife and more interested in avoiding jail. Attending marriage counseling here is not about fixing your marriage; it's about covering your butt.

As RPers, we know that feminism is the enemy. "Feminists" tend to stifle any sense of masculinity and shame it as a threat to their way of life. Social media has revolutionized the mass scale on which this can happen. How did we get to where we are? Let's look at the different waves of feminism.

First Wave Feminism - This started as early as 1848 with the first Women's Conference in Seneca Falls, riding on the coattails of the abolition of slavery. Its primary focus was toward equalizing legal rights, particularly including acquiring the right to vote. This phase lasted through the 1950s.

Second Wave Feminism - Where the first wave was about legal equality, from 1960-1990 the range of issues opened up drastically. Significant targets that were affected included representation in the workplace (from 24% in 1953 to 76% in 1990), reproductive rights (ex. *Roe v. Wade*), and a redefining of family roles, such as converting the term "housewife" (which had been around since the 1200s) into "homemaker" in the '70s (removing "wife" from her identity) and ultimately "stay at home mother" by 1990 - each of these drastically altering the expectations of non-working women and how they related with their husbands. The crowning achievement of the second wave was the institution of no-fault divorce laws, beginning with California in 1969.

Third Wave Feminism - Lasting from 1990 until 2008, the feminist goal here was to abolish all gender role expectations and stereotypes, treating men and women as having no appreciable differences. Whereas second wave feminism condemned female involvement in things like pornography and public displays of sexuality, much of the third wave encouraged it, believing it was a sign of women finally embracing their sexuality. The focus became less political and more about transforming individual identity, which carried over into the LGBT movement.

Fourth Wave Feminism - From 2008 to the present, feminism now exists predominantly on social media platforms for the uplifting of women and degradation of men. To quote *wikipedia*, "the internet has created a 'call-out' culture, in which sexism or misogyny can be called out and challenged immediately with relative ease" - yet any effort to call out women for *misandry* (female degradation of men or masculinity) is not tolerated. Any signs of traditional or historical masculinity are shamed as misogyny or otherwise deemed threatening. Social campaigns began gaining traction by using inaccurate or exaggerated slogans that stir up emotional reactions rather than assessing facts. Out-of-context title-shaming ("You're a sexist!" or "mysogynist!" or "chauvinist pig!") became the norm for manipulating social behaviors through crowd mentality.

- Fourth wave feminism has also been credited for the rise of the Social Justice Warriors - men who promote socially progressive views in order to win the approval of women. They believe that by supporting the underdog they will be seen as a "hero of the commoner," earning them admiration from the fairer sex. In short, they exchange or rationalize away genuine critical thought in exchange for a boost in their reputation, known as *virtue signaling*.

CHURCH RESPONSE

What should the Christian think about all of this? The Bible does not take a hard-nosed stance on the viability of some of the early feminist movement. The church's ability to maintain biblical intergender dynamics is not dependent upon the political climate the church lives in - if the men leading the church are strong enough to function within their own framework of operation.

The problem is that most church leaders are more concerned with getting people in the door than pursuing godliness. They have adopted the "great commission" in some bizarre sense, but they have abandoned biblical teaching in order to fulfill their hollow understanding of the Gospel. This is why we see so many churches watering down the Gospel into "*easy believism*", preaching prosperity through faith rather than the cost of being a disciple,

and ultimately failing to show any interest in the fulfillment of the great commission itself. Result? Many churches have abandoned the truth in favor of becoming social justice warriors in the hope that their rise in popularity would be the most effective way to win people to the Gospel - if, in fact, it is still the true Gospel at all. I'll be bold and call out the Episcopalians, Presbyterian Church USA (as opposed to the PCA), the United Church of Christ, and the Evangelical Lutheran Church of America (not to be confused with other types of Lutherans).

More to the point, I'm guessing we have a wide array of views even among RP men as to what degrees of feminism are appropriate on both societal and church-organizational levels. For example, I personally have no problem with first and part of second wave feminism on a societal level - particularly under modern divorce laws. The empowerment of women in the workplace helps offset the likelihood of financial divorce rape. So, if divorce laws aren't going to change, I'm all in favor of more women in the workforce and having comparable wages (of course, a reversal of those laws would be preferable on the whole ... but we have to be realistic as well). But in a more perfect world, at least to the degree of church leadership as its own path apart from cultural influences, I do believe that even first wave feminism should never have crept into the church in the first place.

MODELS FOR ENACTING CHANGE

There are two primary models for enacting change.

TOP-DOWN: This approach says that people follow positional leaders at the top, who have at least the appearance of authority. Because the masses view themselves as powerless to fight the system or are otherwise easily manipulated by marketing and propaganda from the top, the only real way to change the culture of a society on the whole is to transform the leadership so that everyone else will follow. Specifically, through political tactics, social media campaigns, journalism, etc. awareness can be raised to the degradation of masculinity in society, including within the church, and with enough numbers, finances, popular faces, and overall support, leadership will have to take notice and start changing the rules. When this change in rules occurs, society will follow.

Although we don't see Jesus or the apostles employing this tactic in Scripture, it is certainly a popular one among most Christian organizations. For example, the Christian Legal Society, Alliance Defending Freedom, and International Association for Religious Freedom all target the political sphere in order to effectuate a positive change in the culture for Christians+. Within my own ministry association, the Navigators Church Ministries teaches that the best way to change a church culture into one of disciple-making is to start with the pastor, have him reach the elders, and move on from there.

BOTTOM-UP: The alternative to the top-down approach is the discipleship model, which is what we do see Jesus and the apostles employing. It is a very long and difficult process and is often rejected because it does not reap immediate or fast-paced results and often goes so far under the radar in its earliest phases (sometimes intentionally) that it's hard to see from a logical standpoint how it could ever truly change a culture. The premise is that by reaching one other person, the following year you and that other person can now reach two more, and then it multiplies to 4, then 8, then 16, then 32, then 64, 128, 256, 512, etc. - and after enough time and generations of multiplication, the growing numbers become hard to ignore.

Where the top-down approach often leads to hollow compliance (i.e. people following because they have to), the bottom-up approach leads to dedicated compliance (i.e. people following because they want to and believe in the cause). As a result, proponents of the bottom-up approach believe that this system leads to greater authenticity within the culture and is thus less likely to be uprooted by a sudden change in political climate, whereas the top-down proponents would argue more along the lines of the difficulty of turning around a ship, even from the captain's chair.

Wherever you fall on the spectrum of how you view feminism or how to enact change, it's important at least to be moderately informed and to know what social factors are influencing the way you experience life. I look forward to fruitful discussion, as I'm sure many of you know even more about this stuff than I do. I'm also happy to edit this

post as comments roll in :)

Scripture memory is probably the most overlooked of all the basics. It is an essential part of the Christian way of life that somehow gets lost on the masses and isn't preached from the pulpit. Why?

- "It's too hard"
- "My mind doesn't work like that"
- "I can barely remember where I put my keys"
- "I can always just look it up on my phone"
- "It's enough to just know the gist of a passage"

BIBLICAL IMPERATIVE

What does the Bible say? This blows me away every single time. What is the greatest command? Deuteronomy 6:5 - "Love the Lord your god with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your strength."

What is the very next verse after the greatest command? Another command: "These commandments that I give you today are to be on your hearts" (v6). Why is this the very next verse? Because the best way to obey God's Word is to memorize God's Word! David says the same thing: "How can a young man keep his way pure? By living according to your Word ... I have hidden your Word in my heart that I might not sin against you" (Psalm 119:9-11).

Song of Songs 3:8 also says of the mighty men of Israel: "All of them wearing the sword, all experienced in battle, each with his sword at his side, prepared for the terrors of the night." The Word is our sword (Ephesians 6:17). Who charges the front lines with his sword still in its sheath? Or who tells the enemy, "Hold on, I know I've got a weapon for this somewhere, just let me find it"?

For some reasons, most pastors just don't talk about this. Looking for sermons on YouTube, John Piper is about the only one who has any appreciable content on the subject. Let me link you to one of my favorite sermons on the subject, if you're interested: [here](#). Don't know where to start? [Here's where I began](#).

HOW TO

References

First and foremost: memorize the references. Why?

- If you ever forget the verse, you know where to find it again.
- Lots of people will have trouble buying into the "trust me, it's in the Bible somewhere" excuse
- When you share it with someone, they may need to look it up for context, like the Bereans of Acts 17

Meditation

Regarding methodology, I like to use what I call "piecemeal meditation." Break the verse down into several components and let each one seep into your mind gradually. So, if I were memorizing 1 Samuel 12:23, I would say ...

- "As for me," and then ponder what that means
- "As for me, far be it from me" and then try to meditate on what might cause a person to say something like that

- "As for me, far be it from me that I should sin against the Lord," and then meditate on the aspects of why we shouldn't sin against the Lord and how the "far be it from me" attitude factors into that.
- "As for me, far be it from me that I should sin against the Lord by failing to pray for you" - how does failing to pray fit into the rest of the concept and how often do I make that mistake?
- "As for me, far be it from me that i should sin against the Lord by failing to pray for you; and I will teach you the way that is good and right" - what does teaching people have to do with prayer? Ask all kinds of other questions about the passage.
- Add the reference at the end every time.

By doing things this way, you're not just memorizing words, but meaning and application as well. You're meditating on Scripture in a way that commits it to memory with a purpose. Then repeat it several times.

Organization

In fact, Dawson Trotman suggests a verse isn't truly memorized until you've reviewed it every day for 49 days after the day you learned it. To help keep verses organized, I use what's called a **verse pack**, which can fit in your pocket to be pulled out whenever it's convenient - most easily used between sets or while doing cardio at the gym.

My discipler has one of the most impressive systems I have seen on Scripture memory. As a result, he has a verse for virtually every single scenario I have ever brought to his attention. His system?

- In the front pouch of the verse pack, keep verses you're currently trying to memorize. Review those multiple times a day.
- In the opening of the pack, keep verses you memorized within the last month that you still need to keep reviewing. those should be reviewed once a day.
- The pouch on the other flap on the inside is for long-term verses (over a month) that either need to be reviewed or honed. He would also review these once a day.
- All of his back-logged verses were divided into 30 groups and a new group entered that back pouch every day so that every verse he knows was erviewe at least once a month. If he had trouble, it went into the other middle pouch for closer review.

Bulk Memorization

I have developed my own niche in Scripture memory through working on longer passages. I find that by doing successive verses, it's easier to maintain a flow from one topic to the next. This also helps me understand and meditate on verses because I don't need to open my Bible to get the context - it's already stored in my heart and head, making application that much easier.

Again, the gym/cardio is a great time to get this done. Record yourself reading the passage and play that sucker on a loop, pressing the "restart" button every time you begin to falter.

If you want a verse pack, let me know and I'll PM you a number where you can order one ... or several - I like to hand them out to people I disciple after they get their first 5-10 verses down as a motivator.

Why does any of this matter? Because part of being a man is being disciplined. We shouldn't just discipline ourselves on matters that affect our outward appearance, like lifting and dieting. Much of MRP content is about developing emotional and mental discipline as well, such as passing tests, abundance mentality, amused mastery, stoicism, etc.

As Christians, developing spiritual discipline is even more important than all of the above. Sure, Scripture memory has a mental component, but the spiritual benefits are undeniable.

Most notably, John 1 references Jesus as the Word of God. The Bible is literally an expression of everything Jesus has to say to us as God's voice to the world. By internalizing the Word, we are asking Christ Himself to dwell within us. Think on that as you pick out your first verse to get started with.

THE OUTLINE

I usually break this down into vision, mission and calling.

- **Vision:** This can be one of two things: (1) how you conceptualize a perfect world, or (2) how you conceptualize your perfect life.
- **Mission:** This is what you intend to do in life to actualize the vision.
- **Calling:** The unique set of characteristics, talents, spiritual gifts, etc. given to each person that create the context for how the mission is pursued.

In my view, the vision must always incorporate the *3 Greats* in some way: Love God, Love Others, Make Disciples. But I'm not going to hold everyone to that. What I do recommend is that your vision err toward the first kind and not merely the latter. If your vision is only about how you conceptualize your own life, I'd suggest you're not thinking big enough and your mission may lack sufficient attractive value to draw women into a passion for the direction your life is moving. That said, I haven't observed this enough to make a definitive statement, so I'm presenting both options anyway.

The mission is the most important part of all of this. It's something that has to transcend your individual circumstances (calling) because you need to be able to invite others to join you in that mission - whether that's your spouse, or friends, because a good mission shouldn't be something you can accomplish alone. Again, if you can do it alone, you're thinking too small.

VISION

Write out a brief (2-4 sentences) description of YOUR perfect world, paying particular attention to the things you wrote down about what you value. If you were the grand master omni-president king of the universe, what would the world look like?

Now, it could be that your "perfect world" description is something like "everyone loves and serves me and bows down to me and gives me everything I want." So be it. Just because it's a global statement doesn't mean it can't be personalized to you. But as believers, I would hope our truest passions rise to heights beyond our own lives - that we actually want to leave a lasting impact on our world for Christ.

But even if you're a non-Christian coming here because practical steps toward finding a mission isn't often brought up on MRP, I would still recommend thinking beyond your own life and finding a cause greater than yourself. Read [108](#) for more info on why this is so helpful.

MISSION

Imagine yourself about to celebrate your 80th birthday. You are surrounded by people who have known you throughout all different phases of life, each sharing stories about how they knew you - from now until that day. Let the details run wild in your mind. Consider all the different ways they might have come in contact with you - through your career, your spouse, a friend of a friend, frequent acquaintance, etc.

- What will these people recall about your character, strengths and skills?
- What did you enjoy doing all those years?

- What are three or four of the most important things you've accomplished in all that time that you'd want people to be talking about?
- Will your memory continue affecting people after you're gone? If so, how did you accomplish that?
- Will others pick up the work you started and continue it, or will those you know scatter to their own directions? If your life's work will continue through those you've touched, how will you have invested that in them?

These questions will help you get a feel for (1) how your life contributed to your vision, and (2) what it might take to make your mission viable and successful.

CALLING

Write down two to four things you value. Use this list to stimulate your thinking, but feel free to go beyond and come up with your own words:

- Peace of mind, security, wealth, good health, family, recognition/fame, free time, happiness, spiritual fulfillment, friendships, longevity, making a difference, contributing time/knowledge/money to a cause, travel, sense of accomplishment, respect of others, close relationships, fighting against a cause

List some personal characteristics you feel good about having - up to 10. Look to your answers in the first section of this post to help. A non-exclusive list of suggestions include:

- sense of humor, charm, creativity, enthusiasm, passion, charisma, love of life, love of people, energy, nurturing ability, patience, wit, compassion, people skills, common sense, physical strength, mechanical genius, computer experience, leadership skills, insights, understanding of a topic, artistic ability, bringing the best out of others, street smarts, public speaking skills, intelligence

Consider how you successfully interact with people and write down up to 10 ways (remember: we're talking about when you're 80, not the present). Examples:

- teach, produce, educate, encourage, stimulate, speak, convince, develop, study, lead, love, help, inspire, care, write, promote, manage, motivate, plan, act, serve

These exercises should help you understand your unique calling so that you can develop a personalized path toward carrying out your vision.

COMPILE AND CONNECT

Now, of the words and phrases you chose above, pick two (or be flexible) of the words/phrases you chose when describing your character. Pick another two regarding what you value. Pick another two of the verbs/verb phrases regarding how you interact with the world.

When picking these things, make sure to focus on the ones that are most crucially important to you. The others can still be incorporated as secondary priorities, skills, traits, etc., but let's hone in on what's most critical for right now.

Combine all of this into one mission statement that can look something like this:

- **My life purpose is to use my [character 1] and [character 2] to become someone who [value 1] and [value 2] so that I can [verb 1] and [verb 2] people to move the world toward ...**
-

EXAMPLE

Now, I realize that this seems like an overly basic exercise ... like something you'd give to a graduating high school student who is just entering the real world for the first time. But the fact of the matter is that some people simply don't know how to boil down their personal gifts, talents, and priorities into a clear directive toward a higher aim. So, I still find value in an exercise like this, and when I lead small groups I've found that those I'm teaching - even adults in their 50s - still find value in going through this exercise to remind them what they should be shooting for and what resources they have within themselves to move in that direction.

When I first did this, my statement looked like this (noting that I've modified the format slightly from what I was taught):

- *My life purpose is to use my intelligence and creativity to love and lead people, so that the world will be filled with spiritual generations of believers who glorify God by living and discipling among the lost.*

Here I am, over a decade later, and I don't think I'd change that much. I might clarify and take out some of the boilerplate formatting to make it more appreciable - but the overall concept is the same. I also see incredible progress toward this goal ...

- My intelligence and creativity are the two traits about myself I have relied upon the most to win people to Christ successfully, and to gain influence with others.
- I have continued to be grounded in my love for people as a primary motivator and utilizing my intelligence and creativity to lead those people I love.
- And I have done this in a manner where I have discipled over 30 men, many of whom have discipled others who have discipled others who have discipled others - to the point where my generational line now extends into at least 14 different countries across the world.

FINAL THOUGHTS

I'd love to hear all of your mission statements! Feel free to share, whether they follow this model or not. As I should note with most of the stuff I say, I don't ever want to pretend that my way is ever the only right way (except when I specifically say so, like with a need to incorporate the Great Commission) ... but at the very least I do like to offer a plan to those who otherwise lack a better option on their own. Using a prefabricated cookie-cutter approach I give you that worked for me might not be the best thing for you ... but it's certainly better than not having any plan at all.

This is going to seem overly basic for a 400-level post to anyone who has been in the church for any length of time. But the 400-series is all about being transformed by the Gospel into the men God wants us to be. Where 100 was about intellectual inspiration and 200/300 about being physically/emotionally motivated toward living and experiencing life differently, the 400s will be about transformation itself, and the Gospel is at the core of that.

This conversation will be useful not only for men themselves (just because you're a man doesn't mean you're perfect!), but also for men to understand how to lead their wives to overcome significant internal problems that are holding them back from living as right wives/women in the order of how God designed them. After all, Ephesians 5:25-27 says this is your responsibility as her husband.

So, I don't think I could proceed without a clear, definitive outline of the whole of the Gospel message. Yeah, there are ways to shorten and summarize this or explain in greater detail, but here's what I believe covers all of the necessary components to utilize the Gospel as I intend to use it in this 400-series.

CREATION AND THE FALL

Why did God create the world? The Bible says it's because he wants a relationship with us. Acts 17:26-27 specifically says that throughout all of time and all of space in the order of creation, God determined where and when each of us should live. Why? "That they should seek God, and perhaps feel their way toward him and find him. Yet he is actually not far from each one of us."

In Eden, Adam and Eve were already with him in that relationship, but they sinned, which separated them and us from God (Isaiah 59:2; Romans 5:12-21). Romans 6:23 says that the result is also death - not just a physical death, but a spiritual death (i.e. hell). Romans 3:23 says that this is the natural fate of all people because all people are imperfect and sin.

HUMAN EFFORT

Since the dawn of time, humanity has tried numerous things to address the problem of sin, which is what separates us from God. All of these ways usually boil down to one of three categories:

- *Morals*: If we can be "good people" and avoid doing bad things, that will be enough to get rid of our sin.
- *Good works*: If we do enough good things, it will outweigh our bad things and God will love us for it.
- *Religion*: If we do enough religious practices and show our devotion to God, God will reward our effort with heaven, escaping hell.

Proverbs 14:12 says, "There is a way that seems right to a man, but in the end it leads to death." As to each ...

- Hebrews 11:6 says that without faith it is impossible to please God, so we can never be "morally good" on our own by God's standard.
- Matthew 5:48 demands perfection, so it's not a matter of good works outweighing the bad. A baseball player who strikes out once and gets on base every other time for the rest of his career will still not have a "perfect" record.
- Although sacrifice was the primary religious ritual for salvation in the old testament (where religion reigned supreme as compared to today), God was clear in Hosea 6:6, "For I desire steadfast love and not sacrifice, the knowledge of God rather than burnt offerings." Religious practices are not the answer.

To refrain Proverbs 14:12, anything we try on our own will still only get us to hell.

SALVATION

If left to ourselves, this would be a hopeless predicament. God didn't have to give us a solution. He could send everyone to hell and be totally just in doing so. But by grace he chose to give us a way.

1 Peter 3:18 says, "For Christ suffered for sins once for all, the righteous for the unrighteous, to bring you to God; he was put to death in the body, but made alive in the Spirit." John 3:16 clarifies that it is those who "believe in him" who will be saved and have eternal life. Because of all of this, Ephesians 2:8-9 says, "For it is by grace you are saved through faith, and this not of yourselves, it is the gift of God so no one can boast."

FAITH

So, what exactly is faith? Imagine you receive a note under your door in the middle of the night saying, "I am going to kill you and everyone you love tonight at midnight." How would you respond? There are three likely responses:

- You can choose not to believe the note. You have no faith in the genuineness in the threat, so you ignore it. At the end of the day, you and everyone you love are murdered.
- You can choose to believe it, but not to care. Suppose you're fine with letting yourself and all those other people die. Well, this probably means you didn't really love them, but it also means that your belief won't save you - you'll die too. (see James 2:17 - "So also faith by itself, if it does not have works, is dead"). At the end of the day, you and everyone you love are murdered.
- You can choose to believe the note and take some action to protect your family and yourself. Ideally, rather than running away (assume he'll find you) or getting yourself killed hunting him down on your own (or otherwise committing a crime that would equally ruin your life), you call the cops and let them save and protect you and your loved ones. At the end of the day, this is the only option that will save everyone.

In the same way, a mere intellectual acknowledgment of the truth is not enough. For it to actually save a person, it must be internalized within the person. Jesus describes this saying, "Remain in me, as I also remain in you" (John 15:4). If you don't internalize the faith in a manner that compels you toward action, it's not genuine faith. Note that the actions themselves are not what saves us in the case of Christ - it is the faith itself. But the actions are the automatic byproduct of genuine faith.

RECONCILIATION

Because of Christ and our faith in him, we have a *reconciled* relationship with God (2 Cor. 5:18) and it is our job to continue reconciling the world to Him (id). Because of the Gospel we are now able to experience with God what sin had stolen from us. We are able to be eternally and perfectly content. Satisfied. At peace. Joyful. Everything that we struggle through in this world can be satisfied by God because we are reconciled to Him by Christ to live life as we were always intended to experience it.

Now, not everyone, even after salvation, is willing and able to receive the benefits of this. We still live in sinful bodies. We still forget that we are free. We still fail to open our hand when God tries to give us what now belongs to us by right as his adopted children. But the option is there and the rest of this series will be about understanding how to utilize the Gospel to take it.

CONTINUING OBLIGATION

From here it is important to recognize that salvation is not the end-point, it is only the beginning. Philippians 2:12

says, "Continue to work out your salvation with fear and trembling." That "fear and trembling" bit comes because the Bible talks a lot about the need to be concerned with the genuineness of our salvation.

- Matthew 7 references people who thought they were saved and were doing great things, but to whom Jesus says, "Away from me, I never knew you."
- Hebrews 10:26-31 talks about those who continue in sin intentionally even after alleged salvation and that their fate is "a fearful expectation of judgment, and a fury of fire that will consume the adversaries."
- 2 Peter 2:20 says that if a person knows Christ and has escaped sin, but is again entangled in it, "the last state has become worse for them than the first."

Instead, we see Paul saying in Romans 1:16 that he is "obligated" both to Jews and Gentiles. We see Jesus and the apostles not preaching obedience not merely for the sake of showing the impossibility of perfection without Christ, but because of a genuine post-salvation obligation to follow what was commanded. Both Paul and Jesus' last recorded words centered around sharing our faith and making disciples.

If you want to prove your salvation, you must bear good fruit (Matthew 7:15-20) - and that fruit, by comparison with every other time Jesus talks about plants, fruit, seed, etc., is when your faith spreads so the Gospel can spring up and grow in others. If you don't have proof of your salvation, what good is it to argue that you're saved on a technicality? Didn't Jesus come to abolish technicalities of the law as a means of judging the saved from the unsaved?

So, I forever refrain: adopt the mission of disciple-making as the cornerstone of your frame. Build on it from there, but let everything else rest on that principle. This is how the Gospel will be taken to the nations. Like the parable of the minas/talents, the Gospel is wasted if given to you and you don't do anything with it - and we all know how it turned out for that guy ...

SUMMARY

To shorten this whole message, if someone asks me, "I just want to know how to get saved. What's the simplest answer you know how to give?" To that, I recite the ABCs:

- **A**dmit you're a sinner, can't be perfect on your own, and need a savior.
- **B**elieve that Jesus died and rose again to be that savior.
- **C**ommit in your heart to living out of love for him, proving this love by your fruit.

In 401 I explained the essential components of the Gospel itself. Most people get saved and leave the Gospel at the door. They will acknowledge it has value, but usually limit that value to things like:

- *Reminding ourselves of the Gospel makes us thankful to God.*
- **Jesus' sacrifice is an inspiration."*
- *We need to master our understanding of the Gospel to share it with others.*
- *We need to know where our journey started to know where we're going.*

These are good reasons. But they're also pretty nominal in comparison to the true impact the Gospel has on us today. Your very identity is defined by the Gospel itself. More to the point of this post: the way you experience life is controlled by what you believe about the cross.

THEORIES OF THE CROSS

The primary operative function of the Gospel is to restore us into a right relationship with God. That's what was lost in Eden. That's what Jesus was trying to fix. There are several ways the cross functions to address the problem of sin, imperfection, and our broken relationship with God. Here are nine.

1. **Ransom Theory:** In God's justice, the consequence of our sin is that it gave us over to Satan. God loved us so much that he sent his son to die as the ransom price for our sin. Mark 10:45; 1 Timothy 2:5-6.
2. **Reverse Ransom Theory:** Our sin was against God, creating a debt we could never repay. Jesus was perfect for us, paying the debt on our behalf. Satan is not a factor at all. Matthew 6:12, 18:21-35; Colossians 2:14.
3. **Wrath Theory:** God hates sin and must exert his wrath against those who sin. When Jesus bore our sins on the cross and died, God put his full wrath on Jesus instead of us. Romans 1:18, 5:9; 1 John 4:18.
4. **Recapitulation Theory:** Adam and Eve brought sin into the world, which spread to all of their physical descendants. Jesus lived, died, and rose in parallel to undo what Adam did. Romans 5:12-21.
5. **Atonement Theory:** God preordained that the blood of a sacrifice would wash away sins. The animal sacrifices were a symbol, but Jesus' blood washes us clean once and for all. Leviticus 17:11; John 1:29; 1 John 1:7.
6. **Penal Substitution Theory:** The wages of sin is death. We sinned, we deserve death. Jesus died in our place, taking the punishment instead of us so we are free to live. Romans 6:23; Isaiah 53:5; 2 Cor. 5:14-15.
7. **Moral Example Theory:** Jesus' life modeled how mankind should live. His death was designed as the ultimate example of the extent of the love we must have for one another. Matthew 5:48; John 13:34-35.
8. **Vicarious Repentance Theory:** Because mankind is imperfect, we can't repent perfectly. Jesus bore our sins and in his perfection he repented of them for us. Matthew 3:11, 15-16; Luke 23:34.
9. **Spiritual Warfare Theory:** There is a battle in the spiritual realm. Death was the enemy's greatest weapon. Jesus died and rose to defeat death so it has no power over us. Ephesians 6:12; Hebrews 2:14; Revelation 1:18.

All of these theories are grounded in Scripture and true, working in harmony with one another. There are others I'm sure we could add as well, but these are the most common ones I see that impact people's lives.

WHAT YOU BELIEVE MATTERS

I have found that everyone tends to resonate with one or two of these very closely, while inherently having an aversion to another one or two (or at least to recognize them less than the others). The aspects of the Gospel that resonate with you or which you shy away from are quite telling as to how most people experience life. Let me give some examples from my own observations.

ME: The wrath theory is the one I most closely identify with. I don't know why, but it just clicks with me. As a result, I experience no shame in life. I have no worry or fear that my actions will disappoint God. I know that any wrath God would have against me was expressed on Christ in my place. That doesn't free me to keep on sinning, but it does mean I don't go through what most others do who claim to struggle with feelings of guilt, shame, and depression at their sinfulness. I am free from these things. That said, I naturally reject the ransom theory. Ever since reading C. S. Lewis' *The Lion, The Witch, and the Wardrobe*, the ransom theory has not sit well with me. As a result, I don't emotionally experience the vast depth of love that God expresses toward me - that he would pay any price for me. I just don't experience that the same way others do.

MY WIFE: My wife closely identifies with the atonement theory. In knowing that she has been washed clean once and for all by Christ, she has great security in her salvation and has a deep conviction of the purity that God is leading her into. But she really struggles with the spiritual warfare theory, seeing that as more of an ancillary component to all of this. Result? She lacks any perception of what's going on in the spiritual realm in her daily life and struggles to see the value in prayer.

FRIEND 1: A guy I disciplined was very, very strongly aligned with the moral example theory. This view of the cross created a compulsion in him to live as a generous, humble servant. He lived out Christ's good-will to the world as the vessel by which it would be carried out. But he was weak in the wrath theory. Consequently, he struggled with a constant feeling that he was a disappointment to God, which was only magnified by the moral example theory compelling him to try to measure up to Christ's life and sacrifice.

FRIEND 2: Another guy I disciplined connected with the recapitulation theory. It was an amazing intellectual concept to him - the pattern from beginning to end that Christ was fulfilling. He had a keen sense of his place in this pattern that let him feel confident in the fact that God could and would use him as an ongoing expression of the reversal of the curse, namely through redeeming as much in this world to God as he could (i.e. social campaigns, service projects, ministry to the poor, etc.). But he really struggled with penal substitution. As a result, he constantly felt like God was going to punish him if he sinned, or he would often crumble under the weight of the fact that he doesn't deserve to be saved.

CONCLUSION

I could go on and on with different combinations and patterns - and they are all unique and fascinating to explore. I encourage you to think through some of these theories and process what you can learn about how your beliefs about the Gospel have affected your life - positively or negatively. Praise God for the positives that he has given you through the Gospel, and pray for repentance at those aspects of Jesus' sacrifice you inherently reject and the distance that rejection may have caused in your ability to relate with God.

As you strive to be a more complete, full man, living in light of how God intended you, remember that the Gospel is at the core of this. You cannot live to be the man God created you to be if you are not reconciled to God through Christ's death and resurrection - but also that *what you believe about the Gospel affects the terms of how your reconciled relationship with God will play out in your daily life*. Explore new ways of connecting with God by embracing different aspects of the Gospel that you previously had not considered. Then consider how those previously ignored theories were affecting your internal well-being and daily living patterns and start experiencing

and living life the way God intended instead!

I thought I was done with 100-content (I like the number 12), but here's a glaring one I was recently reminded I left out, and I'm sure there's more.

FRAME IS NOT:

- Avoiding getting butthurt.
- Biting your tongue.
- Being snarky in the face of an emotional whirlwind.
- Being an unmoveable rock against pressure.
- Stoicism.

I get the sense from here and MRP that many new guys think some or all of these things about "frame" - that somehow being stoic and snarky means you have a great frame. Just ... no. Those are all things that are natural byproducts of frame. They are things that guys with a strong frame will do *because of their strong frame*. But they are not your frame itself, nor are they things you do to "maintain a strong frame."

WHAT IS FRAME?

I've heard it said on MRP that frame is "who you want to be on your best day." I've also heard of it as "the projection of your worldview onto the world." Holding frame, therefore is living and experiencing your best all the time, no matter what challenges creep up, never acting inconsistently with the worldview within which you want to operate. Breaking frame, then, is being someone you don't want to be or operating in someone else's worldview.

For Christians, let me tweak this: your frame is *who God created you to be* and incorporates *projecting God's worldview through our lives onto the world*. In short, it is your identity. Secular RP lets a man choose his own frame. Christian RP dictates that God assigns us a frame, at least in its core. Holding frame, then, is living out who God calls us to be, no matter what challenges creep up, and projecting God's character to the world through our lives. Breaking frame in a Christian context will be addressed in Part 2.

STRENGTH OF FRAME

Another way to think about it is to consider your life as a movie. After all, God is writing a story with time and you're part of it. You are the main character of the plot thread that links the events of your life together. If someone were to watch a movie of your life, your frame is what they would see in you as a character and the influence you have on the plot.

The strength of your frame is, in part, an indication of how "main" your character is - particularly in the lives of others. For example, if I were watching a weak man's movie, I might say, "That's cool, but that alpha side character stole the show." Did he steal the show by being a pompous jerk? Maybe, but probably not. He did it by being the guy that everyone really wished the movie was about.

For example, my kids love the movie Moana. Although the movie is named after her and it's clearly designed by the writers to be her story, Dwayne Johnson as Maui obviously stole the show. He's the one who set the context for Moana's journey and is overall the more interesting character. Although she may have been more determined and persistent and tenacious than him, his frame was stronger than hers. At the end of the day, the plot moved forward on his terms and Moana was mostly there to persuade him to act. It was when HE decided to get things done that things finally got done.

So, if someone were watching a movie about your marriage, for example, would they see you as the main character to whom everyone else responds, or would your wife be the one who runs the show and you're just responding to her? *Everybody Loves Raymond* is another great example of this. We know that Ray is supposed to be the main character, but his wife is really the one who runs the show - not just because she has a more dominant personality than Ray, but because virtually all plot mechanics revolve around her worldview. Ray and company are always trying to appease her wishes and desires, which is the mentality that drives the show forward. Ray simply isn't interesting enough to hold anyone's interest apart from the conflict caused by his wife's projection of her worldview and expectations.

So, is your worldview creating the context in which everyone else around you operates, or are you merely responsive to someone else's (or even several others') influences on your life?

NOTICE that I did not say that a person's frame is strong if he bosses everyone else around and they happen to do it. This might be an indication of a strong frame, but there are numerous other ways to have a strong frame without being bossy. Instead, *bossiness* might be a facet of your individual frame, if you choose to make it so.

WHAT IS YOUR FRAME/IDENTITY?

I have put an immense amount of research into this and Romans 8:16-17 sums up all of my findings quite perfectly: "The Spirit himself bears witness with our spirit that we are children of God, and if children, then heirs - heirs of God and fellow heirs with Christ, provided we suffer with him in order that we may also be glorified with him."

Your identity is that you are an *adopted child of God and co-heir with Christ*. Period. Don't let anyone tell you otherwise. What that means will be addressed more in Part 2.

NUANCED INDIVIDUALITY IN FRAME

Premise

Despite having a common core identity, God has created us each uniquely. Romans 12 and 1 Corinthians 12 are both clear that we are one body with one common identity and purpose, one Spirit, one love - but that body has many parts and we each hold our unique place. I believe this works on both a categorical (i.e. roles/positions) and individual level. So, while our core identity might be in common among all believers, our specific blend of function and qualities/traits are unique to us.

To that end, some will be extroverts, others will be shy; some will love sports, others books; some will be intelligent, others passionate. We will all embody a balance of different traits. Although your core identity is given by God, the specifics of how you will live out that identity are often left for you to discern and sometimes decide. In this regard, you have a modicum of flexibility in discerning how you want to portray yourself to the world, although the Bible still gives guidelines on even this.

Mission-Oriented Traits

I always recommend finding your mission first. Your mission will determine which nuances of your frame you should be focusing on. You must become the kind of person who can live out the calling on your life.

"Disciple-making" is a mission I lay on all Christians, but even at that there are nuances about it. If I am gifted as a teacher, I will utilize one-on-one teaching sessions as my context for making disciples. If I am gifted at hospitality, I will invite individuals into my home to share my life. If I am gifted at prophecy, I will speak into the deep places of those I'm working with. If I'm gifted at mercy, I will comfort those around me who are mourning to establish a context for speaking the Word into their lives.

Or to go a different direction, if I'm an extrovert, I'm going to do active things with others so they can observe my life and learn from me. If I'm an introvert, I'll invite them into a private conversation, perhaps at a corner table over

coffee. If I love sports, I'll invite them to play on my team. If I like running, I ask them to run with me. If I do the grocery shopping for my house, I have them walk the aisles with me. Get it?

Disciple-making is your mission. How you do it is your calling. See [209](#) for more. Likewise, your identity is common, but your expression of it (i.e. your frame) is nuanced to your situation - and those nuances should support what is necessary to fulfill your calling.

If your calling is to play sports all the time and to share Christ with those on your team, or to invite those you disciple to join your team ... it wouldn't make much sense if part of your frame was being the guy who is a movie aficionado, watching Netflix all day. Likewise, if your calling is to reach movie-lovers, you'd be making a mistake spending 10,000 hours trying to master the art of ice hockey to develop a hockey-player's frame. But both the athlete and the movie lover would do well to hit the gym and spend some time relaxing to Netflix every now and then.

God's Preparation

So now I ask: *What is your mission in life and who is God shaping you to be in order to live out that mission?* Don't try to create your own mission and then train yourself for it; accept the task God has assigned you, which I'm confident he has already been preparing you to carry out for quite some time.

Jeremiah 1:5 says, "Before I formed you in the womb, I knew you, and before you were born I consecrated you; I appointed you a prophet to the nations." God didn't give Jeremiah a choice on his mission and calling, he assigned it himself.

Then in verse 6 Jeremiah says, "Sorry God, but I'm not good at that." In 7-8 God replies, "I don't care; I'll make you ready." Then in verse 9 we see God touching Jeremiah's mouth and saying, "Behold, I have put my words in your mouth."

In short, God is the one who will work through you - who will prepare you for a calling and give you the context for fulfilling your mission. I firmly believe that he has already started doing that (see Acts 17:26-27).

I started writing this as a reply to [this thread](#) on askMRP, but thought it would be worth posting here. The question posed was, essentially, if arguments ever stop and, implicitly, how to handle them.

My job right now is to argue (attorney). It's rare to have a case where I'm not arguing against someone. There's almost always an attorney or party on the other end. But if I were to run for judge and win, my new job would be to hear someone else's arguments and make a decision. Which role are you playing in your marriage?

Playing Attorney

When you DEER and argue with your wife, you are putting yourself on an equal playing field with her. You're saying that you're one attorney and she's the other and you're both pushing for differing agendas. The problem is that there's no invisible judge presiding over the situation. This means that you're both implicitly assuming that there's some objective "right answer" and you're more closely aligned with that objective reality. But because that objective reality is an inanimate ideology that never acts or reveals itself, the argument itself becomes the centerpiece of the show. The argument is emotionally devastating in many such cases because there is no absolute resolution - only a concession toward trial and error based on whoever has more steel plates in their head to keep banging.

- **EXAMPLE:** Suppose she starts arguing that you should never spank your kids. You argue back that spanking is perfectly appropriate and beneficial. There's so much evidence on both ends of the spectrum that nobody can definitively say whose way is better. There is no *magical parenting fairy* who will appear to screaming parents and tell them who's right.

Whenever you engage in an argument in a back-and-forth manner, even though you're arguing against her, you're actually validating her view. By playing the role of "opposing counsel" you're communicating that objective truth has not been discovered on that issue yet. You cannot then play the, "I'm the guy, I'm the leader, so I win" card because now it comes from a place of weakness. You have not persuaded her that your way is better, and you have just proven to her that no objective reality is going to decide the case either ... so, in her mind she's following a guy who keeps getting it wrong.

- **NOTE:** Winning arguments and getting your way aren't methods of strengthening your frame or "holding frame." Being an argumentative jerk who never backs down might be a persona you want to craft into your frame, but it is not your frame itself. Your frame is who you are and how you project that to those around you. If you deviate from who you want to be just to win an argument or get your way, you may prove a point, but you've broken frame to do it. You've shown her that she has the power (through sacrifice of her ideologies) to change you, for better or worse. This is not a display of strength, but of weakness.

Playing Judge

Instead, you just need to take the position of judge from the get-go. At that point, you're not arguing *with her* - you're *listening to her argument*. That's a huge difference.

Interestingly, go watch a real trial (not Judge Judy crap) and you'll notice something right away: **Judges STFU**. They sit there and listen. They don't argue. They really only speak when someone objects. When a witness is finished or the case concludes, the judge might ask some questions, but they never engage in the argument itself. They never argue back. They are only seeking more information with which to make a wise and informed decision. The judge's opinion, then, becomes objective reality. Yes, it may be subjective as to the decision itself, but the authority from which the decision is made is objective - something that everyone knows not to defy. As attorneys often tell clients, "I don't care if it's a bad decision; you better do what the judge says anyway."

Now, in his opinion the judge does address the arguments. He explains to the attorneys and parties, "I heard what you had to say and here's what I think about that." He explains himself because this builds validity and respect behind the ruling. Attorneys and parties learn from this which judges are the "good ones" and which are the "bad ones" - and it's how you preempt comfort tests, by letting her know that you heard, understood, and valued her input, even if you end up chucking it out the window. If the judge did not do this, every case would be appealed. But even if a party disagrees with the ruling, if the opinion is well-reasoned the party knows that the ruling will stand, even despite appeal. The difference is that the judge is not arguing, he's explaining. He's establishing precedent and saying, "If something similar happens again in the future, this is how I'm going to process that situation and rule on it."

Whether you're an attorney or judge, the arguments will be never-ending. The difference is that as an attorney the arguments are against you; but when you're a judge, the arguments are to you. Position yourself as judge, not attorney. Don't argue back; rather, STFU until she's said all she has to say, then issue your ruling: "Here's what I'm doing and here's why I'm doing it. I heard what you had to say, and here are my thoughts on it." If she tries to argue back, let her know that you're not arguing - you're deciding. I've had good luck often reminding my wife, "We could argue about this, but then there would never be finality. Do you want to have a decision and move forward or do you want to debate for the next three hours?" The question is, of course, rhetorical - she knows I'm not going to entertain the debate even if she says that's what she wants.

In Part 1 I explained that frame is your identity and how you project that identity onto your world. As Christians, we find our identity in Christ and we are to reflect Him to the world through our lives. Accordingly, frame should be a natural concept for a Christian. But let's dive deeper into what this looks like in practice.

LIVING YOUR FRAME

Motive Matters

My discipler once told me, "We are human beings, not human doings. Don't try to force an identity through what you do. Let what you do flow from who you are."

To some degree we should all be familiar with this concept. Even those living in sin understand this. Imagine trying to tell a homosexual person, "Just go have straight sex and you won't be gay anymore; you'll be heterosexual." Can you imagine the reaction? In Christianity we more often know this as legalism. "Just go do all the things Christians are supposed to do and that will make you a Christian" ... right? No, we know that our salvation and identity in Christ is not from our actions.

I remember a German Lit course in college where we were reading things like *The Sorrows of Young Werther* and *Demian*, discussing the nature of identity. Virtually everyone in the class took the "I am what I do" approach. I single-handedly took the opposite: "I am, therefore I do." A Christian girl in the class decided to argue, "I go to Bible studies, I pray, I attend church, I share my faith - and I do all of these things so that I can **BE** a better Christian." I replied, "No, your actions don't make you a better Christian. You should be doing those things **BECAUSE** you are a Christian - **BECAUSE** you love Jesus" (no, it wasn't a Christian school, just a rare classroom conversation). She and the rest of the class, including the teacher, were ultimately persuaded (another rarity in classroom conversation).

The Bible is pretty clear that motive matters. It's also clear that we cannot work our way into God's favor. The greatest command is not, "Do things that make Me feel loved." It's "Love Me." In Matthew 7 when people were *DOING* great and mighty things - casting out demons, prophesying, healing, etc. - Jesus said, "I never knew you."

Matthew 15:8 makes it clear that God wants our heart, not merely our actions. This means that you must internalize your frame. It cannot merely be an outward expression you maintain - it must be the very core of who you are and the motive behind why you do what you do. If you don't grasp it right away, then follow along the *fake it til you make it* path - but faking it indefinitely doesn't count. Eventually you do have to reach *make it*.

Understanding Matters

If your identity, at its core, is that you are an *adopted child of God and co-heir with Christ*, and you're ready to let that be what shapes your lifestyle, you'd better understand the implications of this identity.

The best way to grasp this is to look at human relationships - the parallel God gave us for understanding the relationship God has with His children. As a child of my parents ...

- I take on their surname and accept the first name they gave me. My very name is identified by their household and their wishes.
 - This is what it means when we call ourselves "Christian."
- I accept that they are the primary influences on my upbringing and that their agenda sets the tone for who I will become.
 - God decides who I will be, what I will do, and how to get me to become that. I accept that God has an agenda for my life that may not overlap with my own.

- I observe them as a pattern of living and model my life after the example they have set (for better or worse) until my own unique, personal nuances create room for divergence.
 - I model my character and lifestyle after Jesus as closely as possible, understanding that I am also uniquely crafted with a personality, skill set, interests, etc. tailored to the context of life and ministry God has placed me in (ex. just because Jesus was a carpenter doesn't mean I must be one also).
- I interact with the outside world as often as they lead me to do so and within the boundaries they establish for what I can/cannot do.
 - God is constantly sending people out - "Go, therefore" and not "Stay, therefore." I will engage with His world on his terms and not cross the boundaries he has laid out for how to interact with His children.
- I live within the rules and boundaries my parents create, eventually understanding as I mature that the rules I once despised were actually there for my good.
 - God establishes clear rules and boundaries for living within His house - His Church - and although I may not understand why those boundaries exist, I accept that they are good and profitable and I will abide by them and will see their worth if not on this earth, then in heaven.

I'll let you all figure out the next 30, 60, 100, etc. things that could be added to this list. The point is that you need to be thinking about what it means to be a child of God and how that affects your life. I didn't go into the specifics, but you can - process what those boundaries are that your parents set for you, then process what boundaries God is putting on your life. Then look at the freedoms, empowerment, enabling, etc. and continue exploring the parallels to get a good picture of what it means to be *an adopted child of God and co-heir with Christ*.

Nuance Matters

In Part 1 I talked about us all having "nuanced individuality in frame." This remains true. The above relates to common principles that are inherent among all believers and must be incorporated in our frame - things that we cannot break when creating our frame - that we must embody and project to the world as a reflection of Christ in us. I cannot rightly frame myself as both a Christian and someone who practices sexual immorality. 1 Cor. 5 says that such a person should be kicked out of the church.

But beyond biblical prescription, you're free to identify yourself any way you want. If you want to be the charmer, jock, rebel, goof ball, romantic, etc. or a blend of different attributes ... or if you want to incorporate your athleticism, intellect, passion, empathy, generosity, etc. into your frame - go for it.

Your individuality in how you craft yourself is part of what gives you a high value. If every alpha guy exuded the exact same blend of interests, character traits, mannerisms, etc., then even if we were still the rarity we wouldn't feel authentic and you'd be easily replaceable. Let your individual nuances be at the forefront of your persona while your God-given set of principles by which you live be the core that underlies everything you do.

BREAKING FRAME

Sin

Breaking frame is when we let someone else's actions or behaviors affect our expression of our identity through our behaviors. Because our frame is given to us by God (including the nuances, which are ours to discover and discern, unique from every other person), any time we sin we are breaking frame.

Know what that means? That people who sin a lot have a weak frame. Think on that one. That sin means you're not living out your identity in Christ - you're living the identity the world gives you. Your behaviors are being shaped by a combination of social pressures, worldly philosophies and ideologies, and a former identity that you forsook when you were adopted by God and took on His identity for your own.

We cannot say that "breaking frame" is selectively weak or strong. I cannot say, "I have a strong frame in my marriage, but a weak frame in regard to sin." You have one identity. You are you. You are not one person in your marriage and another in your faith. Your context doesn't define your frame, so you can't have a context-dependent strength of frame either.

Inconsistency

Beyond morally condemnable sins, any inconsistency between your behaviors and your active expression of living as a child of God is a break of frame - or even worse, an expression of a bad frame (remember: Christians don't have the luxury of "your frame is whatever you want it to be" that non-Christians have). This can apply even when you do things that seem productive.

For example, suppose your wife is complaining and starts to cry as you present a stoic front. You close off your emotions, give your best poker face, and calmly engage in a string of fogging, negative inquiry, broken record, and eventually AA. Well, if that was a negative fitness test, fine. But suppose it was a comfort test. You just failed. Even if you "held frame," you held the *wrong frame*. You just framed yourself as a jerk who isn't emotionally available and can't be trusted as a source of strength and comfort. Even secular RP understands this.

But take a similar example: your wife is complaining and starts to cry as you start by presenting a stoic front, but suddenly the Spirit moves in you to start crying alongside her (Romans 12:15 - "weep with those who weep"). Now, as an RP man you know that crying alongside your wife should be a rare exception and this doesn't seem to meet the RP criteria, but you do now recognize this as a comfort test, so without crying you begin hugging her, patting her back, and saying, "Everything's going to be okay; we'll get through this." Now you've just broken your God-given frame in order to create one of your own - a secular-manosphere-given frame.

Who are you going to be: the person that other secular men want you to be or the person God wants? Who is the source of your frame? Where does it come from? Are you committed to holding that frame, even when the rest of the world pressures you to change? Are your views evolving and growing or are they being molded and manipulated? These are all things to think about when determining what your frame looks like in practice and who/what you will allow to influence your frame - that includes RPC, as well as MRP, TRP, your church, your friends, etc. We are, at best, advisers - but it is you who must discern God's directive in your life and who must remain faithful and unshakable in how you live out that frame.

Christian Plate Spinning ... Seriously? Sure. Let's do this.

2 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

This comes up a lot, so let me finally address it somewhat officially. Nothing here is necessarily new from what I've said in comments of other threads, but I'll spell it out in more detail anyway.

DEFINING THE TERM

I always have to quote Rollo on this one because the secular guys like to take this concept further than it has to go. In Rational Male Year One > Plate Theory II > 2nd actual paragraph:

Spinning Plates doesn't necessarily mean you're f----- all of your plates. It's more of a spreading out of your efforts across a wider pool of subjects.

That's it. For anyone who wants to know my definition of spinning plates it's just that: *Exerting effort toward a relationship with a woman = spinning a plate*. Exerting effort toward multiple women = spinning plateS (plural).

THE BASICS

The whole point of secular RP's sexual strategy is to **fix yourself** so that you're high enough quality of a man to have either a sufficient **number of plates** or a sufficient **quality of plates** to keep you sexually satisfied.

Now, for every married guy out there, your wife is a plate, whether you like to think of her that way or not. She's a woman who's in a relationship with you and you're exerting effort toward that relationship. Even in a secular context, if she's nothing more than a sparring partner to you - that's still effort. You're still testing all your RPness on her to see how well you can spin that particular plate.

Secular RP says that if she is your only plate and you're not sexually satisfied (which is where most men are when finding MRP), you can do one of three things:

- **Fix Yourself:** There's a good chance you're not a high enough quality of man to warrant the type of sexual satisfaction you're looking for. Fix this, fix your problem.
- **Up the Quality:** If you've already got your "RPness" in top-notch order and she's just not a high quality plate, you can train her to be higher quality (they use the phrase: "create your slut").
- **Up the Quantity:** Just give up and find someone else.

THE PURPOSE

In his first post on plate theory, Rollo appropriately starts off the whole series with this:

the essence of plate theory is that **a man is as confident and valuable as his options**. This is the essence of the abundance mindset - confidence is derived from options.

Spinning plates is a sexual strategy of its own right, but a man without an abundance mentality won't be able to keep those plates in the air. You can put in a lot of effort, but get no return. Spinning plates only works with an abundance mentality. Incidentally, spinning plates is also how you get an abundance mentality. That's where "fake it til you make it" comes in to resolve the Catch-22.

Once you have an abundance mentality, the need to spin plates decreases proportionately to your increase of abundance mentality. With this in mind, **"Fix Yourself"** includes developing an abundance mentality, and spinning

plates is one method of doing this. With that abundance, the quantity of plates doesn't matter as much because you already know you are the quality of man who could keep them spinning if he wanted to.

EFFORT

There are different levels of effort required to spin different plates:

- Some plates require no effort, spinning themselves. We call these orbiters. You get IOIs that are totally unprovoked.
- Others require little more than natural exposure to you. Simply saying "hi" with a smile is enough to get some IOIs back.
- Others require intentional exposure. If you're both in the same conversation she wouldn't care much, but if you were to isolate her or otherwise escalate with her while in the group dynamic, she'd start giving IOIs, having seen your intentional displays of interest toward her.
- Others require high effort. This is usually where your wife is. She takes for granted the fact that you're supposed to be interested in her, so getting IOIs back requires more than you'd need to pick up the girl at the bar - especially since she already knows all of your moves.

Now, this scale actually only makes sense under two conditions: (1) you're not the highest value man in her relational network, and (2) you accept practical realities of interpersonal relationships.

I say the second simply to note that no matter how high value you are, some women might stop thinking about you as soon as you're out of the room. I'm sure even Channing Tatum meets women who aren't still swooning over him 3 days after he said hi to her. Sometimes they just move on.

But the first point is more relevant in that the higher value you are, the lower effort you need. A girl who would require intentional exposure from you to garner her interest might naturally orbit Channing Tatum if he was in her relational network, even if he never went out of his way to say hi to her. Why? Because he's probably higher value than you are. As your value rises from the "fix yourself" category, the amount of effort you need to exert to spin a plate goes way down.

This is why many blue pill men exhaust themselves trying to make their marriages work, only to end up in divorce. They are low-value men, so they have to put in an incredible amount of effort and at some point they simply say, "It just isn't worth it." To be fair, most secular RP men come to the exact same conclusion: "If I have to put in actual effort to get my wife to screw me, it just isn't worth it," and they go onto the "up the quantity" category.

HOW TO SPIN

This section is more of a joke. Spinning = effort. It's that simple. How do I spin? Say hi to a girl and let her orbit me = low effort. Put my hand on her back and start to flirt and suggest another meetup = moderate effort. Isolate her and follow-up with her on subsequent days = higher effort. Buying her crap, frequent compliments, and a bunch of other beta stuff that rarely works = high effort.

Remember: showing that you need to put in a lot of effort to get her spinning for you is a real obvious display of who has the higher value in the relationship. Also remember that just because you *can spin* doesn't mean you *should spin*. Ergo ...

RESPONSIBILITY & BOUNDARIES

Do I sin when I say "hi" and smile to a random girl on the street who isn't my wife? Have I intentionally led her on? Have I done anything designed to cause her to lust for me? Of course not. There's nothing wrong with saying "hi" to someone with a smile, but if you're a high value man this is going to generate interest anyway. That interest means her head is *spinning* with thoughts about me. I can't control what she thinks about.

Girls Do It Too

Now, girls do this constantly. Even among church girls, we constantly see them interested in different boys, and they'll spend time with each of these boys to figure out who they might want to start dating or "courting." Nobody condemns these girls for spinning plates, but that's what they're doing - and the church even encourages this. That's the whole point of the "courtship" model - be friends with lots of people in group settings so you can get an idea of who you might be interested in and what you want to look for in a man. Sometimes they're spinning multiple man-plates because they're not sure which, or if any, of them will ultimately ask her out, so she keeps building new relationships and meeting new guys until one of them finally has the guts to take her to dinner.

Of course, women often get shamed in the church for causing men to think lustful thoughts. So, we get overly prude girls who are afraid of their sexuality. But many people in the modern church are finally starting to realize that this isn't what the Bible meant when it said not to cause a brother to stumble into sin. Women are now being appropriately empowered in the church: "What men think about you is not your responsibility ... (unless you're acting in a way uniquely designed to cause them to think that)."

Responsibility

The same goes for men and "Christian plate spinning." If you say hi and smile to a girl, most will simply be put in a good mood and that's about it. Although I have abundance, I'm also conscious of reality: I'm not Channing Tatum. Even if I was, it's not my fault if a smile makes her go home to gab with her friends about the cute guy at the gym and she starts planning her wedding day. That's not your responsibility how emotionally invested she gets ... with certain limitations.

Specifically, if you are a married man with no intention of having an affair with her, yet still wink at her while cupping your junk **and flashing her your tattoo** ... now you're responsible for generating whatever reaction she comes up with to that.

Guidelines

If you want to have a general guideline to know what's okay and not, here's my suggestion:

- **Don't put yourself in a position where you're tempted to sin.** Suppose you made a funny comment to a girl on the street and she starts walking with you to continue the conversation. She gets to her house and invites you inside. If going in will cause you to sin, don't do it. It's that simple.
- **Don't put her in a position to want to tempt you to sin.** Even if you have a high threshold for temptation, if you're engaging with her in a way that makes her want to test your boundaries, that's bad news and leading her on. You're trying to "awaken love before it so desires" with her, per Song of Songs.
- **Don't do anything likely to cause her to believe you would do something sinful with her.** Simple enough.
- **Be up-front about your limitations.** When I get IOIs, I often make passive comments that let her know where I'll cut off a relationship - things like referencing my wife in a positive way, mentioning my faith (evangelism purposes there too), etc. From there, if she wants to make false assumptions about where the relationship might go, it's not on my head.

Female Friends

If I follow these guidelines and never hear from her again, so be it. If she doesn't care and continues to engage with

me anyway, suddenly I have a female friend.

I can hear it now: *Ooooooh ... there goes that Christian guy who is actually friends with a girl! Shame on him! Whoop-ti-do.*

Can guys and girls ever truly be "just friends"? I don't care. That's a philosophical or psychological or biological question ... and I'm not a philosopher, psychologist, or biologist (though I pretend to be all 3 at times). As long as she's aware of where she stands with me, and I'm not doing anything to cause her to think she can go further, and I'm not doing anything to cause her to tempt me to go further ... let her do what she's going to do.

If being "just friends" is possible, then I've just made a friend and my life is presumably better for it (otherwise I wouldn't keep her as a friend). If it's not possible, then we have the *illusion* of friendship and she's technically a romantic plate - but as long as I'm not responsible for the degree of her romantic feelings for me (acknowledging that in this worldview those feelings will always be there no matter what - whether positive or negative), I can continue in the illusion without fault ... particularly if I can keep my romantic feelings toward her in check, which goes back to the point about not putting myself in the way of temptation.

FOR SINGLES

When you're single, some of this changes. The "sniper" approach of singling out a target who you really want to be with (i.e. ONEitis) is obviously a bad idea. It doesn't work. It also carries with it the false theological implication of "soul mates," which we only see in Scripture as the exception to the rule (like Hosea and Jacob), whereas the overwhelming majority of marriages in Scripture seem to have been formed by whatever social construct prevailed at any given time throughout history.

In modern social dynamics, plate spinning makes sense. It's how a lot of people operate. *It's how most women themselves actually operate!* Single girls are trying to get male attention all the time. They don't pick one target and say, "I will ignore every advance from every other man except him." They keep their options open. If you're a single guy, you need to do the same.

The concept of "spinning plates" as a single guy really isn't all that much different from the stereotypical "group courtship" model - you hang out in bunches and see who piques your interest.

Once you're in an LTR, I still call you "single" for these purposes - and I would encourage you to keep your options open until you actually marry, or are at least engaged. Sure, at some point if you do decide to go through with it, there is value in changing this dynamic. But until that vow is taken, don't leave room for regret. Don't be the guy who meets the girl of his dreams the day before his wedding, ignores her, then secretly thinks about her every time he's in a fight with his wife - "If only ..."

EXAMPLE

I once said "hi" to a hot girl at the gym and smiled at her. I asked to use the weights that were behind her and made a comment about how busy it was. She smiled back and obliged with a typical response. I move on to another area of the gym.

Now, I could have just squeezed behind her and grabbed the weights while avoiding any actual communication. I decided to be friendly instead. I put the plate up and give it a couple small taps, then left it alone.

A few minutes later, she comes over to the bench I was at and starts talking to me. That plate is now spinning a lot faster than what my slight tapping would have warranted. Next time I'm at the gym, she approaches me and chats again - and this continues several times, often with "wow"s and compliments at how much I lift, hair swishes, giggles, and other IOIs.

- Is she into me? Probably.
- Have I given her any reason at all to think I'd be into her? Not really - I was just a high value man around her who decided to be friendly rather than cold. I knew that this was "effort" at the time, but not unnatural effort for my character. I knew that it might generate interest, but not at an inappropriate level.
- Have I taken appropriate measures to let her know how fast/long she can keep spinning in my world? Absolutely.
- Does she keep coming back anyway? You bet.
- Does that help me keep abundance? At first, but not anymore because I already have abundance even without her IOIs.
- Am I responsible for her ongoing emotional connection to me? No. I maintain boundaries (ex. not letting her touch me, passive references to affirm that I'm not interested).
- Is her interest in me affecting her relationships with other men? Doubtful.

SUMMARY

Spinning plates = effort toward a relationship with someone.

Some plates spin on their own. This is not you spinning that plate - it just spins and that's not your fault. But she is your plate nonetheless.

Even mild and innocuous forms of interaction are effort and can start a plate spinning, but that's okay. You can't be expected to avoid all contact with anyone who might possibly lust or obsess over you.

As your value goes up, the amount of effort you put in goes a lot further in starting/keeping a plate spinning. Be ready for that by knowing your limits and establishing clear boundaries for what you will/won't do.

The more effort you put into keeping a plate spinning (like your wife), the more you are communicating low value to that plate. She assumes she's worth the effort and that, implicitly, since you're putting in effort to get her, she has no reason to put in effort to keep you spinning as one of her plates.

If you're single, keep your options open until you actually create a covenant with someone, lest you regret what could have been.

PREMISE

My basic understanding is that spiritual marriage is not created when two people sign a piece of paper and file it with the courthouse. It's also not created when a pastor/priest says, "I now pronounce you ..." Adam and Eve didn't have these things, nor did their children. These are man-made conventions to publicize and officialize a covenant that was already otherwise created.

How was it created? By two flesh becoming one. In my view, this alone creates a marriage. The one possible exception is rape, so I'll often suggest that the act of becoming one flesh (i.e. having sex) must also be mutual/consensual. But the Bible also says that if a man raped a woman he was obligated to marry her (Deuteronomy 22:28-29). So, maybe even rape is considered to create a one-flesh marriage bond - I don't take a strong position on that. The exception here is, of course, that a daughter was considered at the time to be the property of her father, and her father (per Exodus 22:16-17) could refuse to give his daughter to a man who she had sex with, without ever having gone through a marriage ceremony.

In short, sex = marriage, even if there is no ceremony. Although I use the phrase somewhat flippantly, because of this view I really don't believe "premarital sex" is a thing. Instead, I would technically call it "pre-ceremony sex."

IMPLICATIONS

An Example

So, if a guy goes out and has "pre-ceremony sex" as part of a one night stand, I would see that as creating a spiritual bond of marriage between the two of them. The initial act itself is not sinful. It only becomes sin when he then abandons that relationship for another one, in which case his new partner is now someone with whom he is in an adulterous relationship. Of course, this only applies if you believe monogamy was God's only intent and that God always condemns polygamy as sinful, but just never specifically said it.

Alternatively, if you don't believe polygamy is inherently sinful (rather it's only sinful if your government condemns it, by virtue of Romans 13 and similar passages, which is the case in America), you could view the new partner as a polygamous relationship and say that the man is not in sin for now having married someone else. It is spiritually lawful polygamy. Instead, the sin is that he's not maintaining the God-given obligation to the first girl from the ONS. He has failed his first wife, despite being faithful to his second.

Polyandry

The sin compounds, then, if she goes off and sleeps with another guy. Why? Because tacit approval of polygamy in the Bible (i.e. the fact that God never condemned it and at times seems to endorse it) was only ever one-directional. Polyandry never got similar attention.

Would polyandry have received similar tacit approval from God if it was culturally common enough to be worth addressing? I don't know, but I'd wager not. If we look at the relationship with God and the Church, it still seems one-directional. Christ has one bride: his Church. Sure. But that church has many people. I am Christ's bride just as much as my pastor is, just as much as my wife is, etc. But ... if I, as Christ's bride, decide to go take for myself a second husband (i.e. marry myself to another god), that's a violation of Rule #1: "Thou shalt have no other gods" ... unless of course you want to argue that "no other gods *before me*" means you can have other gods as long as YHWH is your highest god - a position I would obviously reject based on other passages.

THE QUESTIONS

Now, all of this obviously seems ... *off*. But it's also the most Scripturally consistent understanding I can come up with of how marriage itself actually functions under a biblical model. So, am I missing something in the Bible here, or are all of our views on "biblical marriage" really just cultural views that "seem right to a man" (see where Proverbs 14:12 takes that), so we assume God meant to say that and just forgot to spell it out clearly enough?

What rubric do you use to discern if your views on marriage, premarital sex, extramarital affairs, polygamy/polyandry, etc. are based on cultural influences or Scripture alone? For Catholics, this is obviously different. Tradition has authority. Although polygamy has a rich tradition as well, I suppose decrees from church leaders can override the history of polygamy among God's people? Or am I misunderstanding that?

For those that do believe that a legal marriage certificate is necessary to create a marriage bond, where's the biblical basis for that? What if a government decided to change its laws to say that only homosexuals may get marriage certificates. Would you then argue that a Christian could not possibly get married in that country? (implications aside, of course, on whether or not homosexuals trying to get married can be rightly called Christians - a conversation held ad nauseam elsewhere).

DISCLAIMER: I have no intention of entering into a polygamous marriage, having an affair, or encouraging anyone toward pre-ceremony sex. Even if that sex is not sinful, waiting until there's a ceremony still has value in causing people to wise-up about what exactly they're doing when they create a marriage bond. I'm more just looking for feedback on a possible model for understanding marriage dynamics in the Bible.

Looking back at the 7 basics, you might notice that the first one is actually "The Gospel/AoS," but since 401 addressed the Gospel, I'll not re-hash that.

"I NEVER KNEW YOU"

Assurance of salvation is the first thing I teach to every new believer. I don't do it from a standpoint of trying to convince them of something that might not be true. God forbid I give someone false assurances! No, I'm more concerned with the paralysis that a new believer often experiences in doubting the sincerity of their faith and wondering if they're really "saved" at all. So, they need a direction to be pointed in.

The thing is, as 1 Samuel 16:7 notes, "man looks on the outward appearance, but the Lord looks on the heart." This is a great sentiment to say, but is often not helpful because we don't have the ability to see the heart - even our own!

In Matthew 7:21-23 Jesus talks of **MANY** people who will say to him, "Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy in your name, and cast out demons in your name, and do many mighty works in your name?" How many of you have prophesied and cast out demons? How many of you have enough mighty works under your belt that you'd have the gall to boast about them to Jesus? How many of you were so certain of your faith that you'd be so bold as to argue with the all-knowing God on Judgment day like this?

But Jesus' answer to them is: "I never knew you; depart from me, you workers of lawlessness." Wait - so prophesying in Jesus' name and casting out demons in Jesus' name is sin? Sure, if your heart isn't in the right place. That's why it's so important to remember that God looks at the heart, not our outward behaviors.

THE TEST

But if we can't see the heart, how can we ever have assurance in our salvation? Good thing Jesus gave us the answer *immediately before* that passage I just cited. In Matthew 7:15-20 he sets the stage by warning people of false prophets who think they are and appear to be genuine believers, but who actually aren't saved at all. To figure out who these people are he gives a clear test: **"By their fruit you will recognize them."** Let me go on quoting him:

So, every healthy tree bears good fruit, but the diseased tree bears bad fruit. A healthy tree cannot bear bad fruit, nor can a diseased tree bear good fruit. **Every tree that does not bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire.** Thus you will recognize them by their fruits.

I highlighted that section in bold simply to note this: *it's not enough to declare, "I didn't produce any bad fruit!"* A tree that fails to produce good fruit is also cut down and thrown into the fire. So, no one can argue, "But God, look at how much sin I avoided!" No, God will say to that tree, "I don't care about all the bad fruit you *didn't produce* - I want to see the good fruit you *did produce*."

Interestingly, Luke 13 adds some clarity on this saying. Jesus tells a parable of a tree that isn't producing fruit and suggests it be cut down. Another man says, "Hold on, let me try to protect it and fertilize it first, and if it does produce fruit, great; but if it doesn't after a year, then go ahead and cut it down." The implication I get from this is that if you aren't making any effort to grow in your faith, you'll just be cut down; but if you're in a position where growth is happening, God will give you some more time to start producing your fruit, but he won't wait forever.

WHAT IS THE FRUIT?

What it isn't ...

This is the part where most people falter.

- **Good Works:** Most people assume the fruit is "good works." But remember: IMMEDIATELY after giving this test Jesus talks of people who did great and mighty works - things that many of us have not even done - and yet says that they're still going to be cast away. So, I'm going to nix this idea.
- **Fruit of the Spirit:** Other people like to assume Jesus is referencing Galatians 5. I always found this suggestion somewhat absurd, given that Galatians hadn't been written yet (56AD) and Jesus never talked about "fruit of the Spirit" in that way on his own (30-ish AD). I can't imagine Jesus saying, "I'm going to say something and reference a concept that you'll have no idea what I'm talking about for another two and a half decades ... but just let me say it anyway." The notion that Jesus may have talked about the fruit of the Spirit on his own and the Gospels just didn't record it calls into question the sufficiency of Scripture in its ability to interpret itself, and it is also inconsistent with the fact that Paul typically cites his sources when making a reference.
- **A Heart Directed Toward God:** I've heard some people argue this. It makes no sense to me. The whole point of Jesus giving the test in the first place is so that other people can discern from their observations of a person whether or not someone is truly "in Christ." Going back to an internal, unobservable test would defeat the point of what he's trying to convey and make that passage practically worthless.

What it is ...

Instead, let's back up one more section. In Matthew 7:12-14 Jesus lays out the golden rule: "whatever you wish that others would do to you, do also for them." He follows this immediately with, "Enter by the narrow gate. For the gate is wide and the way is easy that leads to destruction, and those who enter by it are many. For the gate is narrow and the way is hard that leads to life, and those who find it are few."

Translation: "If you want to walk down the narrow gate and wish others would help steer you in that direction, you should be helping others do the same." That's your fruit: your disciples.

Oh, by the way, this is perfectly aligned with the other time Jesus talked about fruit and plants. Here are a few examples:

- In the parable of the sower, we are the soil. The Gospel is the plant that springs up in us. The fruit is what blossoms from the Gospel springing up in us, which contains more seed to "produce a crop 30, 60, even 100 times its yield." In other words, the "fruit" is the multiplication of the Gospel in us into other soil. We also see that the soil is condemned even when the plant springs up. The only soil that is praised is the one that yields a larger crop - the one that was actually able to produce a fruit that can start that crop forming.
- In the parable of the growing seed (Mark 4:26-29) the seed is planted in the soil and springs up - and eventually "when the grain is ripe" (i.e. has its fruit) "at once he puts in the sickle, because the harvest has come." What is Jesus usually talking about when he references a "harvest" when describing the Kingdom of God? That's right: new believers.
- Jesus says in John 12 that "unless a kernel of wheat falls to the ground and dies, it remains only a single seed. But if it dies, it produces many seeds." He's talking about how his death will save many. But he's also noting the nature of a seed falling from a plant to produce new life. What part of a plant has seeds in it? The fruit. The point of the fruit is to bear the seed that, when finally separating on its own into new soil, will produce new life to be cultivated into producing new fruit and so on. We call this evangelism and discipleship.

Also, feel free to reference the parable of the minas, parable of the talents, Jesus cursing the fig tree, the parable of the two sons, the parable of the tenants, and pretty much all of John 13-17 (which is the last supper - Jesus' parting

words and compulsion toward discipleship before his crucifixion), and 1 John 3-5 (or really, the whole book). All of these things affirm that a person's fruit is that which grows out of the Gospel within him to spread more seed, yielding a crop beyond himself which must be harvested. In short, the fruit is evangelism and discipleship.

WHAT I DID NOT SAY

Now, I did NOT say that the "fruit" is necessary for salvation. On that point I am undecided, but tend to lean against such a claim. All I am saying is that if one wants to be secure in his salvation, he must ask himself: *Where is my fruit?* Or if you want to test the salvation of someone else with observable evidence, ask: *Where is his fruit?*

Is this a perfect test? No. A perfect test would be if we could see into a person's heart and soul. We can't do that. So, Jesus said, "With what you can observe, here's the test I'm going to give you: *By their fruit you will recognize them.*"

WHAT I DO SAY

If you haven't built a lifestyle of evangelism and/or discipleship and you can't name anyone who is following Jesus today because of your life, you might be saved ... but you'd also be right to question whether or not the opposite might be true instead. You'll never have *assurance* of your salvation.

If, however, you have a long line of good fruit - a harvest of people who are following Jesus today because of your life - you have observable evidence to give you security in the fact that God is doing through your life what you could not accomplish without him, therefore you must be *in Him*.

It's time to introduce the last of the basics for this series, though there's no particularity in the order in which I wrote these.

CONVERSATION ARTISTRY

I take it as a given that everyone here knows how to pray. If you know how to talk to a person, you know how to pray. It's really that simple.

That said, RP talks about being conversational artists, and this is a concept I've been employing in my faith since long before RP, which only makes more sense now. Consider: there are some who are great conversationalists and some who aren't. Some who inspire with their words, others who make people laugh, others who help people understand, and others who evoke curiosity. What are you doing with your words in your conversations with God?

- If everyone else knows you as the "funny man," have you ever tried to make God laugh? He already knows the punchline, but I still love re-hearing old jokes.
- If you're the constant encourager, have you communicated encouraging thoughts toward God? Sure, he already knows what will unfold, but sometimes people like hearing it anyway.
- If people know you for talking about complex ideas, are you sharing thoughts thoughts with God and brainstorming together? Obviously he already knows more than you could ever tell him, but how can you learn if you don't share your brilliant theories with the one who knows how to take them to the next level or to fine-tune an otherwise rough-shod idea?

PRAYERFUL ATTRACTION

Let me add one more to the above non-exclusive list:

- Are you great at picking up girls with one-liners? When was the last time you tried to use prayer to enhance God's attraction to you?

You see, we're usually so concerned about our emotional passion and connection to God that we often forget we need to make ourselves desirable to him as well - to enhance his emotional passion for us.

In a conversation with the rich young man, despite that it ended poorly for him, when the man said, "Teacher ... I have kept all these [commands] from my youth," Jesus' response is unusual in all of Scripture. Before Jesus proves his point, we see the Scriptures say: "Jesus looked at him and loved him." Why? Jesus obviously knew the character of his heart. He knew the man's obedience wasn't genuine. He knew the man would turn away at the challenge to sell everything. Nevertheless, the man's words inspired love in Christ for him.

Matthew 15:8

Now, everyone's going to jump down my throat: *What about Matthew 15:8?!?* Sure: honoring God with your mouth and not your heart has little value. It doesn't do much for the relationship. That's like my wife dressing up in her sexiest lingerie and whispering dirty things in my ear, then acting like I'm crazy when I try to take her right then and there.

You see, even if she had no intent to follow-through, her words still affected me. They still aroused me. How horrible it is when they're hollow, yet even better when they're true!

So it is with your prayers to God. Are you saying the things that will cause him to love you? To enhance his passion

for you? As His bride, are you talking about all the ways you're going to please him and tickle that spiritually reproductive bone in his spiritual body?

- Note: If you're not aware by now, I equate physical reproductive acts (i.e. sex) with spiritually reproductive acts (i.e. evangelism) as a biblical parallel God intended to establish, just as I do physical child-rearing (parenting) with spiritual child-rearing (discipleship).
-

STRUCTURE

A lot of people like to use the ACTS acronym: Adoration, Confession, Thanksgiving, Supplication/Stuff. Sadly, this misses the single most important aspect of prayer itself: that prayer is first and foremost about relating with our God. You would have a pretty sucky relationship with your wife or LTR if you never communicated with one another.

I know, RP talks a lot about "let her speak more" and just STFU and the 2/3 rule and all that ... and God models this pretty darn well with his bride. But the fact is that most conversations between spouses shouldn't be purely logistical, they should be relationship building. Our conversations should be enhancing attraction and deepening intimacy, and if they're not doing this then we start to feel like business partners rather than horny lovers.

To that end, I rework the acronym into REACT.

- **Relate:** Tell God how your day was; ask him about his; make him laugh and let him make you laugh; share something you learned; practice every aspect of your conversational artistry.
 - **Entrust** - Lift up to him those things which are important to you and ask that His will be done. Trust him with what's concerning you, but also let him know how you'd like it all to be worked out ;) This is a better replacement for "supplication/stuff," in my view.
 - **Adore** - Praise him for the great things he has done and for who he is - because he deserves it!
 - **Confess** - Acknowledge your sins, faults, etc. and ask forgiveness.
 - **Thank** - For what he has done, for forgiveness, for grace, etc.
-

PRAY THE MEANS

With regard to making requests of God, another thing that has been quite helpful to me is to pray the means, not the end. Most people want to skip to the end because that's easier, but that also requires very little faith. Saying, "God, please help my friend come to faith" is one thing, but saying, "God, please give me the words to say to help my friend come to faith" is an entirely different monster. The same is true for, "God, please cause it to stop raining for three and a half years ... **SO THAT** your people will return to you" (see James 5:17).

Paul prays this type of prayer often and we should follow in his model. Consider:

- Ephesians 1:17 - He prays for "the Spirit of wisdom and revelation [means] **SO THAT** you may know Him better [result]."
 - Ephesians 1:18-19 - "the eyes of your heart may be enlightened [cause] ... **IN ORDER THAT** you may know the hope ... his glorious inheritance and his incomparably great power [result]"
 - Ephesians 3:18-19 - "may have power together with all the Saints, to grasp ... the love of Christ, and to know this love that surpasses knowledge [cause] **THAT** you may be filled to the measure of all the fullness of God [result]."
-

- Philippians 1:9-10 - "that your love may abound more and more in knowledge and depth of insight [cause] SO THAT you may be able to discern what is best and be pure and blameless [result]."
- Colossians 1:9-10 - "asking that you may be filled with the knowledge of his will in all spiritual wisdom and understanding [cause] SO AS TO walk in a manner worthy of the Lord, fully pleasing to him [result]"

This list could go on indefinitely and gets really interesting, not just with things like Elijah's prayer for it to stop raining, but with Elisha, who didn't pray, "God, please save me from my enemies," but instead said, "God, Strike this army with blindness" (2 Kings 6:18).

Are you bold enough to pray for specifics, or are you hiding behind vague generalities, hoping that your faith in the power of prayer will not be shaken if you avoid asking for anything too specific? Are you so insecure of God saying "no" or that he'll choose to fulfill your request a different way? It's been said a million times that men are overt and women are covert. Don't we as men wish our wives would communicate a little more overtly when they actually want something done and it's not just about sharing feelings? Being that we actually are men, despite being Christ's bride, should we not do him this favor in how we pray and make requests?

Several men have come here suggesting that they've been screw-ups most of their lives. Some come to me with mental health problems, a history of abuse, serious anger issues, addictions to alcohol, drugs, or pornography, or any number of problems. RP claims to fix the man, but there are limits to what can be done apart from Christ. This series will cross those boundaries into the realm of secular impossibility.

(1) YOUR IMAGE: YOU'RE NOT PERFECT

Accept this as a fact. Even if you think you're an awesome guy and have nothing to learn from this series, dig deeper. Romans 3:23 says all have sinned and fall short of God's glory. Romans 6:23 says that the wages of that sin is death - a spiritual death. That isn't just eternal hell later on, but starts internally in our spirits today. Even apart from hell, Ephesians 2:1 makes clear that this "death" is something we experience in the present on earth. In Romans 7 Paul affirms his ongoing sinful nature and references himself as having a "body of death."

What is it that's killing you inside? **Identify the issue.** Start with something bite-sized and work your way up. If you've been molested as a kid, shelf that for now and work on "I get mad when my wife denies me sexually," and get to the bigger issues when you're ready to wrap your mind and spirit around it wholly. Smaller issues at first.

For this series I'm going to use three common issues all the way through to demonstrate the application of this process in varying contexts:

- A struggles with loneliness/depression
- B struggles with pornography addiction
- C struggles with fear of rejection

(2) FIRST LENS: RE-FOCUS YOUR SELF-PERCEPTION

Most people's struggles are foggy and vague. Like a pair of glasses, you need to correct your vision to see your struggle for what it is.

Whatever negative in your life you're struggling with, re-frame it as a lost positive. Focusing on negatives is dangerous and leads to a vicious cycle if we don't see the good that they are rooted in. Specifically, we know that God is good (Matthew 19:16-17) and everything he creates is good (1 Timothy 4:4) and if there is anything good, it came from God (James 1:17). In the beginning was God and nothing else (Genesis 1:1; John 1:1). We were made in God's image (Genesis 1:27). Isaiah 59:2 says that sin is what separates us from God and walking in His image alongside Him. So, anything "bad" in your life is not of substance itself - it is defined by its being an inversion or absence of the goodness we were created in and from.

That said, let's apply this to our three examples. Bear in mind that there are many possible directions this can go, so I'm just going to pick one for each and run with it. Your "positive" might be different from what I describe here.

- A: The negative of loneliness is rooted in the positive of fellowship - specifically in the sense of the true oneness *koinonia* bond I referenced in 103. Similarly, depression is the negative of joy as a positive. So, rather than saying "I'm lonely and depressed," A would do better to understand, "I don't experience fellowship or joy."
- B: Pornography addiction could come from a multitude of places, and the feelings surrounding it are often their own beast that we won't tackle here. For now, let's just assume B does it because he likes the physical sensation and that's it. The negative of his behavior is rooted in the positive desire for physical pleasure.

- C: The fear of rejection is rooted in the desire for acceptance.
-

(3) FIRST FOCAL POINT: OUR EFFORT

The focal point is the conclusion you reached in the last section, but the question then becomes: How do you satisfy this positive that you now understand you're lacking? Most often we reassess through a secular reflective mirror. We take a good look at ourselves, assess strategies for solving the problem, and then take action.

- A: A can create a plan for meeting new people and seek joy through those relationships. He decides to join a local community softball team, gets more involved in his church, makes a point to call his friends more regularly, etc.
- B: He puts up porn blockers on his computer, puts sticky notes all over his desk with verse reminders, gets an accountability partner, tries to re-initiate with his wife, etc.
- C: He reads self-help books, practices reciting confidence-building phrases, works out to "become the prize," etc.

All of these things are good things. They're steps in the right direction. But if we look to them as *THE* answer, they will fail us. A's going to meet some people who laugh him out of the group. B's going to see a hot girl on the street and jack off afterward. C may actually act on the approach and experience the rejection he feared. All of them have made positive life changes, but have not yet addressed the core of the issue plaguing them.

Proverbs 14:12 says, "There is a way that seems right to a man, but in the end it leads to death." In other words: if we go with secular ideas for solving all our problems, somewhere along the line we're just going to keep returning to critical failures. Ephesians 2:8-9 makes it clear that we are saved by grace through faith, "this not of yourselves, not by works." Galatians 3:3 says, "Are you so foolish? After beginning by the Spirit are you now trying to be perfect by human effort?" Putting these two together, we understand that if salvation was by the Spirit and not our works, then solving the ongoing effects of sin in our life must also be by the Spirit and not by our works.

The result is that if left to our own devices, we will always reflect on our problems, create an action plan, follow through, see things get better for a time, then return to another critical failure, and repeat the cycle. It is endless. It is vicious.

In part 2 we will address the answer to the problem, which is found in the Gospel and how something that happened 2,000 years ago still helps us today.

Before solving the problem addressed in part 1, I think I must bring forth another illustration that I always share alongside The Lens. For lack of a better name, I call it "The Circles Illustration" and it comes from Dr. Larry Crabb's book, *Understanding People*.

[Here's the picture](#) so you can follow along.

THE PREMISE

Imagine a circle that represents the maximum fullness, abundance, joy, etc. you can possibly experience in this life. Now imagine another smaller circle just inside of that one, which represents the degree of fullness you're actually experiencing. If these circles were exclusively about sexual fulfillment, that'd be one thing, but the point of this sub is to address the whole of the man and not only his sexual satisfaction, so let's look at this as being from the whole of your life.

The size of that inner-circle is constantly fluctuating. Sometimes it's really big - almost as big as the outer circle, but other times it's really small, and other times in the middle. That's because our experience of life is constantly changing.

The gap between the inner-circle and the outer circle is the degree of dissatisfaction we experience in life. It's all of those negatives you're pondering from [Part 1](#).

Then there's the differentiation between how we are feeling from how we should be feeling. At any given time, our fullness might be legitimate and from the right sources, or it could be a product of relying on the wrong things. Likewise, we might feel empty without cause, or otherwise have good reason to feel that way.

NON-CHRISTIAN SATISFACTION CYCLE

For non-Christians, they tend to waver between two positions: illegitimately full and illegitimately empty. They don't have Jesus, so their fullness is only a hollow shell of what God intends for them, or as Hebrews 8/9 says, it's based off of "copies and shadows" of the truer heavenly things. Examples include:

- Alex got a promotion at work and feels great about it.
- Brahbrah's dog just got miraculously cured from epilepsy
- Carl's wife just gave him a BJ for the first time

These are all great things and good reasons to be happy. But if they are the reason the circle is full, each of them are in for a rude awakening. Alex's boss might resign and the new boss fire him. Brahbrah's dog might get hit by a car. Carl's wife might decide that was gross and say she'll never do it again.

Now Alex, Brahbrah and Carl are all feeling pretty empty because the thing that made them full let them down. But again, this is a legitimate emptiness because God has a true source of satisfaction that they could draw from, but they're looking elsewhere instead.

At some point, Alex will probably get a new job, Brahbrah will get a new dog, and Carl will find another sexual adventure to try and they'll be right back to their "illegitimately full" circle ... until Alex's new job has some annoying co-workers, Brahbrah's new dog keeps pooping on the floor, and Carl's wife starts getting a series of conspicuously timed headaches. The cycle repeats itself over and over.

Eventually Alex, Brahbrah, and Carl realize that these short-lived victories are hollow. Life is a series of ups and downs and it's making them seasick. They realize that nothing in this world will permanently satisfy them. Life is meaningless. If God isn't real, suicide is a legitimate option. They finally identify with Solomon's book of Ecclesiastes. Their emptiness is now legitimate because they're not blaming the wrong things; they're finally realizing the truth of the world. And that's what RP is at its core - an acceptance of the truth, which is why secular RP will always be limited in nature.

To that end, secular RP compels you to live in that "illegitimately full" circle indefinitely - to do whatever it takes to keep yourself there, and even when you're not there to pretend that you're there anyway and to maintain the same mentality as when you are there. But what if you could *actually* be full all the time? Enter ...

THE CHRISTIAN SATISFACTION CYCLE

Many non-Christians never reach the third "legitimately empty" circle, so their cycle is a constant shuffle between the first two circles. Christians, on the other hand, regularly use all three.

When we first connect with Christ, we feel the abundance that comes with the Spirit of God. It's beautiful. Everything in life is a blessing, even the bad things - because we have an eternal perspective about the good that will result from the bad. Nothing can get you down when you're legitimately full.

Instead, we see all of these wonderful things and we stay up. But the reason for our fullness shifts off of God and onto all of the blessings he's given us. David was at first full on God, but eventually received so many blessings that he had to take a census so he could feel good about the mighty kingdom he was ruling, or look out a window to feel good at the fact that he could have whatever girl he wanted. Rather than experiencing the blessings as a byproduct of our fullness in God, we shift away from God to the happiness that those blessings bring us and enter the realm of illegitimate fullness.

It's possible but rare for a person to go from an illegitimate fullness back to a legitimate fullness. More often what happens is that those blessings wane (including by the fact that God has less incentive to bless people when those very blessings are pulling them away from him) and ultimately the Christian feels empty. But there is no legitimacy to this emptiness. Because the Christian has the Spirit in him, there is no reason he should ever have to experience that emptiness, even through troubled times. He can always be full and abundant in Christ.

Soon enough, someone will remind him of this and he will rely on God once more and regain a legitimate sense of fullness until the cycle repeats. Sometimes the Christian has to bobble between the illegitimately full and illegitimately empty circles several times before he remembers the true source of his satisfaction.

CONNECTING TO THE LENS

Part 1 references the hopeless cycle - that constant bobble between illegitimate fullness and illegitimate emptiness. When a non-Christian is legitimately empty, this is when he is most receptive to the Gospel, which is the mirror that will be the focal point of Part 3. The Gospel is also the mechanism that allows legitimate fullness in the first place.

What was the issue that you thought of in Part 1? Ponder that in the context of these circles. Which circle are you in? Are you truly looking to God for your source of satisfaction? Or are you thinking, "If I could just deal with this one part of my life everything would be fine?" That's the hallmark of someone who is in one of the illegitimate circles - whether full or empty. That "one thing" is not going to satisfy you unless it's your relationship with Jesus. Period. I make no exceptions here.

- Alex might be thinking, "If I could just not have to worry about providing for my family, everything would be fine." This might be while he's unemployed. But he might also have this thought while he's crushing it at work ...

but secretly knows that the tides could change very quickly, so he never stops looking to his financial success even while he is very successful. His worry about provision is probably rooted in a positive desire for security, and Part 1 starts to connect with him.

- Brahbrah might be thinking, "I just want a companion in life," and be meditating on that both when her dogs are alive and when they're dying or having epileptic fits or pooping on the floor. Her desire for companionship is the direct good she needs as the subject of Part 1.
 - Carl might be thinking, "I can't take it when my wife rejects me," and even when she says yes he takes it not for what it is, but in the context of thinking, "Thank goodness she didn't reject me this time!" And even after 50 yeses in a row, he may still think that. His desire for intimacy is where he connects with Part 1.
-

RP PRAXEOLOGY

Now, it should go without saying that all of this is tied to several core RP traits, but opens the door wide on how they can be experienced and practiced.

The most notable is the abundance mentality. Our abundance comes from Christ, not how many plates we can spin or how much money we make or how much sex we're getting from our spouses. If you want the true abundance mentality, one that transcends the physical abundance preached in secular RP circles that only lead to an "illegitimate fullness," you have to be legitimately full in Christ.

The second is amused mastery. One who can see the circles for what they are and spot at a whim which circle he's in at any given moment can *easily and even without thinking* return to the legitimately full circle. He realizes that it's like the board game of "life." You roll the dice and crap happens - good or bad. But in the legitimately full circle, it doesn't matter whether your house burns down or you have another kid - it's all still just a game. You enjoy the good things in the context of thanking your good, good Father. You see the bad things and know you're still loved and protected under his care. You remain unphased because you have an eternal perspective about the world, knowing that it will all pass away. You've watched [Francis Chan's Rope Illustration](#) and think to yourself, "I totally get it now!"

The third is frame. When you are bobbling between circles, you have no frame. Your experience of the world is dictated by what happens to you. When you are legitimately full, nothing the world throws at you can shake you because you have a divine source of strength. You live under God's frame and have adopted it as your own. And when you live out that frame, others are drawn in and want its protection as well. Because of the Spirit's power exuding from you, you're the one to shape the world around you, not them shaping you - and all to the good of the Kingdom.

I'll let you all add to this list.

APPLICATION

So, I ask you now - and imagine yourself in a dimly lit auditorium, worship band slowly playing in the background, dozens of people praying and crying out to God all around you ... whatever gets you in the mood to think seriously and critically about your life: *which circle are you in and why are you living there?*

What is it going to take to get you in the legitimately full circle?

What's it going to take to keep you there?

What are the constant hang-ups that draw you back into illegitimacy?

Have you ever been legitimately full even once in your life yet?

Do you know people who are legitimately empty?

Do you know people who are caught in a vicious cycle - whether as Christians or non-Christians - who desperately need pulled out?

What can God do through you to bring yourself and others into His frame so that you can all be a beacon of light to the rest of the world?

As many know, I practice divorce law. I also recently watched the red pill documentary on Hulu - definitely worth the watch, although it addresses the MRA side as its primary focus. Some of the stories got me thinking about the financial inequality in many cases working against men - even more than what I'd previously believed (though for reasons beyond what's explained in the documentary).

So, I decided to try an experiment in court and my client was on board. Rather than just explaining, I'll make it fun and give you an abbreviated approximation of the transcript.

RELEVANT STATUTES

As background, the law in my state specifically says: "Each spouse shall be considered to have contributed equally to the production and acquisition of marital property." Now, at first glance this looks like it shouldn't affect spousal support, but the spousal support section has the following two among other factors: (1) "The standard of living of the parties established during the marriage," and (2) "The relative assets and liabilities of the parties, including but not limited to any court-ordered payments by the parties." Because the equal contribution law so heavily ties into these factors, it is imputed in our case law as a spousal support rationale as well.

Our case law also specifically says that a primary purpose of spousal support is to equalize the standard of living of the parties. Because of the equal contribution presumption, the court must assume that the value of the wife's house work is equal to the husband's financial contribution.

Other jurisdictions may not have parallel laws, but for those that do, track with me. Even if you don't, the principles might still apply.

THE HEARING

Within that statutory framework, I was handling a textbook case - guy's the breadwinner for 22 years, wife stayed at home and took care of the kids (not at issue because the youngest will be 18 in a few months). I had my client (guy) on the stand and coached him to try this new line of testimony for the first time ...

- Q: Do you agree with Ohio's equal contribution law that this court should presume your wife's contribution to your joint standard of living was comparable to yours?
- A: *No* [I let him explain why for a bit, since the presumption is technically rebuttable]
- Q: Do you understand that the court has the ability to make a decision under the statutory framework regardless of everything you've said? [This question could have ticked off the judge, but it was worth the risk to set the stage.]
- A: *Yes*
- Q: Under that framework, what do you believe would be an appropriate allocation of support?
- A: *Well, if both of our contributions are considered equal, then to maintain both of our standards of living, I should give her 50% of my paycheck after the divorce just like I historically did during the marriage, which would be \$4,748.55 per month ... and she should come over everyday and do all of my housework, laundry, cooking, etc., just like she historically did during the marriage.*
- Q: Now, legally the court can't compel behavioural performance, as that would be too akin to forced labor. So, what alternative do you suggest?

- A: *Well, if after the divorce she doesn't have to maintain her contribution to the marriage, i shouldn't have to either - at least to the same value as her contribution. So, if our contributions are deemed equal by law, then if she doesn't have to contribute X value in service, I shouldn't have to contribute X value in financial support. By making me pay any support, that would be an acknowledgement that our contributions to the marriage were not equal.*
- Q: And if the court decides to proceed on the presumption of unequal contribution? [Hand out an exhibit and have it marked]
- A: *I prepared this document [he authenticates it] demonstrating the variety of services she performed during the marriage and how much it would cost me to pay someone else to do these things, and relevant classified ads as proof of the market rate.*
- Q: And what is the significance here?
- A: *I'm expected to work to the same degree as before and now also to do everything around the house that she used to do, so I'm doing my job and hers. She won't likely be expected to work given her years out of work and her age, so she'll just have to take care of her house and collect my check - her job but not mine. So, to even the lifestyle balance I should get a discount in support by the cost for me to get that housework done, otherwise our lifestyles wouldn't be equal. [We then calculated that difference and proposed a new number that equated to around an 85/15 split of the joint income, other factors involved too.]*

The judge (female) let out an audible "Huh" with a bewildered tone like she'd never thought about that before.

THE RESULT

Result? My county has almost never deviated from their 50/50 to 55/45 split range (one of the worst in the US). In this case the judge did a 67/33 split in my client's favor, which is unprecedented.

My interpretation is that if she went too much more in my client's favor she couldn't justify it against historical case law and would get reversed on appeal. So, she found a middle ground that would preclude reversal, given that there are other counties in my state that will do a 65/35, so it's not totally beyond historical precedent in other jurisdictions in my state.

This isn't necessarily a groundbreaking argument (and it's far from perfect), but this judge had clearly never considered it before - and it may have just changed how she allocates support in other cases going forward, giving the other judges a precedent to follow in her footsteps as well.

Conclusion? Maybe you can't get a prefect result, but a novel argument (at least from your judge's perspective) can go a long way with appropriate documentation to back up the math. This is the best result I've seen from any argument yet (other factors notwithstanding). Don't give up hope.

The interplay between theology, praxeology, and philosophy on human behavior

30 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

I hear the phrase "reconcile RP with Christianity" a lot. Let's explore for a bit what that phrase actually means and how the reconciliation process actually works, as it's more than simply "filtering out what doesn't fit" or "rejecting the sinful parts of RP" (whatever that means).

There are three branches of thought relevant to a study of human behavior: philosophy, theology, and praxeology.

- Philosophy: attempts to solve problems and answer questions through the application of logic and reason. It is concerned with what *should be true*.
- Theology: attempts to discern Truth through the interpretation and application of Scripture and divine revelation. It is concerned with what is *actually true*.
- Praxeology: attempts to understand human behavior through the application of observation, repetition and experimentation. It is concerned with what *can be observed to be true*.

On the assumption that God is real and the Bible is true (as I assume every Christian agrees is the case), then all things must fit in the framework of what it teaches, and thus theology is the baseline form which all other things are derived. If a philosophical thought or a praxeological observation is in conflict, then we know there is either a logical fallacy in our thinking or a mistaken context to our observation.

But we also know that theology does not answer every question useful to life or developing healthy and productive interactions with other human beings. It only addresses those things that we *need* to know to live rightly with and for God. Accordingly, it says a lot about the value of interpersonal relationships and the principles for how they should function, but it's not going to tell you specifics, like how most women like having their hair pulled during sex or how to pass a fitness test.

Now, where theology stops some people like to philosophize about what *should* come next. Accordingly, philosophy is built on ideologies. It looks for how things *should ideally function*. But theology tells us that the world is broken and will never function in an ideal setting, which makes most philosophies moot. The blue pill is based on philosophy. And it is true: if the world actually functioned under blue pill ideologies, it would probably be a much better place. There would be lots more "happily ever afters" instead of a 50% divorce rate. People would be rewarded for being "nice" and "good," promoting positive values in the world. Instead of the DNGAF attitude necessary to increase sexual attraction, people would be motivated to care deeply and to help one another. Women would not turn into nagging harpies; rather, they would be supportive angels well-deserving of their pedestal.

But none of that is how the world actually works. Be it the result of sin or natural design or a combination of both - I don't care - praxeology pulls philosophy out from the clouds and slaps it in the face. Praxeology doesn't care about what the world *should be like*; it cares about *how it actually is*.

The reason praxeology is subservient to theology is that it is based on human perception rather than divine revelation. The whole point of faith is that we trust what God tells us over our own senses. But because God is the one who created the world and sovereignly guides the direction of history, it makes sense that most praxeological observations will not conflict with theological truths, except to the degree that we have only scratched the surface on a praxeological observation and do not yet know the full context behind it ... or when God decides to defy otherwise genuine praxeological principles.

For example, a praxeology of master-slave relationships in the time of Israelite captivity under Egypt would conclude that the masters losing their slaves would be a bitter event and cause tense and unfavorable interactions from the masters to the slaves. But Exodus 12:36 says, "The Lord had made the Egyptians favorably disposed

toward the people, and they gave them what they asked for; so they plundered the Egyptians." No praxeology could have concluded this to happen because God divinely intervened.

Now, when we consider modern intergender relational dynamics, theology continues to give room for similar behavioral norm defiance. In fact, the very act of someone coming to Christ should cause such an internal transformation that they defy the behavioral norms observed in the rest of the world (2 Cor. 5:17). This is why I draw the following two conclusions:

(1) Many people in the church whose lives do not have an appreciable difference from before their alleged salvation to "after" (other than the fact that they now attend a church service) are probably not saved. We should see a stark praxeological difference between these people and the genuine Christians. Yes, we do still have the sinful nature, but part of the point of salvation is that we have a directive to overcome it and to replace our sin with proactive biblical commands, like the compulsion to make disciples, and not with other sins or our own self-amusement. So, if a man stops watching porn and thereby saves himself an extra 30 minutes a day, if he merely shifts that time into vegging out to the TV instead of increasing in godliness, he is no better off and his life still does not reflect a praxeological behavioral change.

(2) God must employ a degree of **household salvation**. Although I am not firm on this conclusion (/u/BluepillProfessor was the first to make me aware of it as an actual theological line of thought), there's substantial biblical support. The concept is that if the husband is following God, then anyone else in the family who is following the husband will be following after God as well, as they are moving in that same direction. Anyone in the home who is defiant against the male head would obviously not be following God, and thus would not share in his salvation (ex. parable of the two sons and parable of the prodigal son). So, a wife may retain most or even all of the praxeological truths of the rest of the world even after salvation because she is sanctified through her husband, who is her conduit to God by virtue of his direct sanctification from God. Or to combine concepts from a couple key biblical passages (Exodus 4:16 and 1 Cor. 11:3 - both passages on the discipleship model, as marriage should mirror as well): God speaks through the husband and it will be "as if [he] were God to [her]."

My point in saying these is that even in a theological framework where God can and does change hearts, a husband can rely on most praxeological observations when interacting with his wife, just as a single man can when interacting with girls in the SMP and RMP. Contrarily, every woman whose husband claims to have a personal relationship with Jesus should rightly expect her husband to defy secular praxeological norms about male behavior to the degree that those mannerisms are the result of the fall and not a product of intended design, accounting for the influence of his ongoing sinful nature, of course. That is, a man who is well-on in his maturity with Christ should exhibit severely different behaviors than the one who has only just discovered he has the power in Christ to escape sin.

Where, then, is there room for philosophy when considering Christian marriage dynamics? There isn't any. Because theology already tells us the foundational framework in which humanity operates, and praxeology fills in the gaps through observational reality, conceptualizing what *should be* doesn't make sense if it is in conflict with *what actually is*, and if there is no conflict, then there is no point in the philosophy to begin with.

I hope you've enjoyed my musings on this subject. I'd love some feedback or suggestions on how to apply this stuff in new ways that I had not previously considered. As I've commented to some of you, I have been working on a book addressing RPChristianity and much of the content in this post is pulled from the introduction to the book. So, fire away with feedback!

There is no "Christian version" of anything

1 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

This won't win me any points with the secular crowd, but in light of my last post, if theology trumps praxeology, then the facts are the facts.

I hear people all the time saying things like:

- "What's the Christian version of spinning plates"
- "It's great to have a Christian version of RP"
- "I really wish there was a Christian version of MMSLP"

... or any other number of things along these lines. To be honest, I myself have thought these things before as well.

The fact is that God created the whole universe. Jesus was the centerpiece in all of this. "In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God and the Word was God. He was in the beginning with God. All things were made through him, and without him was not anything made that was made ... And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us." The Word is Jesus. The entirety of creation was in, by, and through Him.

From there, the fall destroyed things. It took the things of Christ (as all things were created by Christ, and therefore I will call them "Christian") and made **secular versions** of them. These secular versions spread and became the norm throughout the entire world. I've seen estimates of the world's population at the time of the flood as low as **750 million** and as high as **10 trillion** (see also [here](#)).

In the days before the flood, God allowed anarchy to reign. Secularism conquered the whole world. In the days after the flood, he established a people for himself so that there would always be a light to point the way. There would always be a remnant of what he intended. This is why Israel was always punished most severely when they did things that broke the image of God as he meant to be reflected to the world through them.

Today the Church is that light and remnant. We are the keepers of what is true. Because no one but God has the ability to create anything new (we may only rearrange what God has created), the secular world must copy from God's original design in order to have any ideas of its own. This is why Hebrews 8-9 calls the things of this world mere "copies" and "shadows" of the heavenly things. But once a copy is made, we cannot then make a "Christian version" of that copy - because what is "Christian" is what Christ originally created. We are either re-construct what has been distorted back to its original design. But we cannot rearrange a secular rearrangement of original design into something new and call it "Christian" that was not part of God's original design.

Imagine a white wall. Now picture someone painting over that wall with black paint - everything except a circle in the center, which remains its original color. The white wall cannot take the black paint and make a "white version" of it. But someone *can* chip away at the black paint to reveal the white beneath it.

And the black paint does not hold its place on its own - it is only there because a white wall beneath it holds it in place. Try creating a wall of black paint without a wall to put it on. It can't be done; it will all puddle to the floor and not maintain form. In the same way, the secular world only exists because there is a Christian world that was created first as its foundation, which it is covering over.

For this reason, there are no "Christian versions" of secular things. There are only secularizations of Christian things.

So, when secular RP comes up with a concept, they are only studying God's original design, but doing so from the vantage point of one who has spent their entire life living in the black paint. They assume that the white circle is

just something else - that there are black parts of the wall and there are white parts of the wall. They do not realize the foundation upon which their praxeology rests, which is our theological truth.

When we study the theology and praxeology of intergender relational dynamics on this sub, we are not trying to take concepts of "plate spinning" and "amused mastery" and "fitness testing" and all that and develop Christian versions of them - and I apologize if in the history of this sub I have done that by mistake and ignorance.

Instead, we are scratching away at the black paint to find the white beneath it. We are discovering what was always there - what was always intended by God. We are deconstructing the distortions of this world back to their original design. That is what RPC is about.

10

UPVOTES

The value of application

1 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

Someone on r/theredpill was just questioning the point of all the "lift and sidebar" advice people give on TRP. He said that lifting is fun and reading might hypothetically be useful in the future, but that on the whole he didn't see how it was actually making any difference in his life. Whatever he may have actually been trying to get it, here's what I thought he needed to know, and I figured you all might find value in this little parable as well. I share it with most men I disciple.

TRP is here to open your eyes. It is not here to give you a purpose or help you find meaning in life. For that, there are places like r/RPChristians.

What you're really struggling with is the difference between learning and applying. Consider ...

Adam and Bob are walking down the street having a friendly conversation. Adam tells Bob, I have something to show you, follow me. So, the two men round a corner and cross a few blocks before coming to a lot. Bob's jaw drops. Before him is the most impressive mountain of bricks he had ever seen. "I've never seen so many bricks," Bob tells Adam. Adam smirks and says, "I know, right?" The two marvel for a moment before Adam asks Bob, "So, do you have any bricks?" Bob motions for Adam to follow along.

The two men walk a few blocks down the street to another lot, where Bob lived. Adam runs a lap around the house but doesn't see Bob's pile. "Where is it?" Adam asks. "Where's your pile of bricks?" Bob shrugged, "Well, I don't have a pile of bricks. But my house is made out of bricks."

Are you accumulating a pile or are you building a house? What are you doing with all these bricks you're amassing for yourself from all this reading?

At the risk of sounding autistic, in light of the countless times I've had to say it on this sub, I'm making this an official part of the side-bar content. **HAVE A MISSION.**

In 209 I referenced how to develop a mission. Sure, it's a little juvenile. But if it works, it works.

Here's the thing: *If you're rightly on a mission, nothing else matters.* The church likes to throw out the three Ms as the most important things in your life: *Master, Mission, Mate.* Screw that. It's *Mission, Mission, Mission.* Here's why the other two don't matter.

MASTER

Jesus says plainly: "The one who has my commands and keeps them is the one who loves me" (John 14:21). It's not a large leap to assume, then, that anyone who deliberately rejects Jesus' commands doesn't love him, and that instead that person will be subject to fiery judgment (Hebrews 10:26-31). There is no middle ground, as Jesus said, "Whoever is not for me is against me" (Matthew 12:30).

Jesus gave us the three greats: (1) love **G**od, (2) love **O**thers, (3) make **D**isciples (Matthew 22:36-38, 39, and 28:19-20, respectively). I already addressed these more fully in [110](#). Go read that for a refresher. The point I'm drawing from that post is simply this: *You cannot claim your "master" is a priority if you're not making disciples for Him.*

MATE

You cannot keep a woman attracted to you if you don't have a mission in life that transcends her. Making your wife your mission or a primary aim in your life is the definition of being beta. Alpha men have better things to do in life than try to get girls interested in them. Ironically, having better things to do in life than trying to get girls interested in you is what will get girls interested in you - including your wife.

If you have no mission in life, then you're not going anywhere. If you're not going anywhere, how can your wife follow you? If she's not following you, then either you're following her or you're standing still and she's walking away. Either way, it's not good.

If you do have a mission in life, she might still walk away. That's her choice. If your mission is God-given (like the universal call to make disciples), then her choice to go in any other direction is sin. Follow the Matthew 18 process, and if she refuses to repent you're to treat her as an unbeliever. If she continues walking away from you, 1 Cor. 7 gives you the freedom to let her go. You don't need that in your life - Proverbs has plenty of passages that makes that clear.

ALL-IN-ONE PACKAGE

In [110](#) I wrote a lot about pursuing your mission above all else. This is Paul's compulsion to us in 1 Cor. 7 - to live as if we were still single: wholly devoted to pleasing God by doing what he put us here to do. But here's why this works.

If your mission for disciple-making is your highest priority in life ...

- **DNGAF:** You DNGAF about anything that pulls you away from that mission.
- **Amused Mastery:** You have an eternal perspective and know that even if your girl leaves you, that won't interfere with your having an impact on eternity.

- **Shotgun/Sniper:** You will have a wide social network, constantly meeting new people to share the Gospel with and potentially disciple, not wasting your time eyeing a girl from afar. You'll find someone who's pursuing Christ alongside you, you'll eventually get inflamed with lust for each other, and you'll decide it's better to marry than to burn with passion.
 - A note on evangedating: this is a "sniper" mentality. It targets all of your efforts into one specific girl. I have no problem with cross-gender evangelism. Just don't use dating as a context to do it. Keep a shotgun approach.
- **Fitness Tests:** You will pass these with ease because you won't be concerned about placating your wife when you've got more important things going on than her.
- **Frame:** You won't be lured into her frame because doing so would interfere with your mission. She will naturally fall into your frame because if she doesn't (1) that would make her a harpy, non-submissive wife, which she'll know is theologically sinful, and (2) because she'll want to share in the glory/credit you eventually get on judgment day.
- **Eternity:** It's probably worth noting that you'll have maximized your glory in eternity for Christ's benefit because of your service to His Kingdom.
- **ONEitis:** You won't care because you're interested in doing what God put you here instead of singling out some hypothetical soul mate.
- **DYELB?:** You will have a natural drive to stay fit because (1) the gym gives you yet another context to meet people who need Jesus and increase your social network for discipleship purposes, and (2) you know that looks matter and staying fit will give you more of a voice in people's lives than if you were a fat slob they're disgusted by, and (3) because you can't disciple someone into spiritual maturity as part of the body of Christ if you're not taking care of the temple he gave you - so your motivation to your mission compels you to do all these things as a natural priority anyway.
- **OYS Type 1:** You'll naturally have your act together because that's how you earn influence in people's lives. As 1 Thess. 4:11-12 says, "Make it your ambition to lead a quiet life: you should mind your own business and work with your hands, just as we told you [i.e. OYS] **so that** your daily life may win the respect of outsiders and so that you will not be dependent on anybody."
- **OYS Type 2:** You'll naturally be owning up to your flaws because confession is an essential part of your testimony, which is how you'll defeat the enemy and take ground for the Kingdom (Revelation 12:11), which Paul modeled for us (ex. Romans 7).
- **Sexuality:** I've already said a number of times on this sub, and I'll refrain it again: physical reproduction is a roadmap to help us understand spiritual reproduction. So, you'll be motivated to have lots of sex, as the physical ecstasy from this experience will remind you of the spiritual ecstasy you get from winning a new convert; and the joy of raising physical children will remind you of the joy you will have in raising spiritual children as well.
- **Dread:** Because your woman won't be your primary focus in life, and because you'll constantly be spending time outside the house working toward your mission, engaging with countless people toward a mission, as a high-value man with a mission, and looking really good to aid in your mission ... you better believe dread will come naturally.

Pretty much everything you learn in secular RP as a pursuit in itself becomes a natural byproduct for the one who is living on mission for Jesus Christ to make disciples of all nations.

If you don't have that mission ... you're screwed. You can try doing secular RP things in the context of being a Christian, but it's only going to get you about as far as secular people get in the first place. If you want the real deal,

live out these concepts toward the purpose for which God created you in the first place.

I see this issue come up somewhat regularly on r/askMRP and r/RPChristians, but I don't see a lot of content on this. People are told, "Don't get butthurt," but they apply that phrase in a totally wrong way. So, let's get this clear.

WHAT IS "NOT BUTTHURT"?

To be overly simplistic, there are only two reactions to any tests a woman throws at you: (1) butthurt and (2) not butthurt. Duh. Obviously we want "not butthurt." But most people mistakenly apply this by saying, "X is butthurt. I'm not X, so I wasn't butthurt." In reality, yes, X is butthurt ... but so is Y and Z and A, B, C, and a ton of other things. To that end, it's a waste to try to define everything that *is butthurt*. We're better off trying to define the much more limited response of *not butthurt*. Here's my definition of "not butthurt": **Positive emotional reaction**. That's it.

Now, this isn't the best definition, but for new guys it's the most useful one. Why? Because it leaves no room for ambiguity. We all agree that negative emotional reactions (anger, yelling, resentment, etc.) are definitely butthurt. Positive emotional reactions are not. There is a phase in-between where most guys wind up living, thinking that they're being "stoic." This emotional gray area is too complex for many men to understand or fake their way through, but a woman can sniff it out immediately. You're walking in gray, but they see black and white. This puts you at a serious disadvantage until you've developed a strong sense of your own frame.

So, if you're new around here and you read: "Don't get butthurt," rather than thinking, "Don't react with negative emotions," tell yourself, "Oh, I need to respond with a positive emotional reaction when she does that."

DISSECTING BUTTHURT

Women are emotional creatures. They thrive on emotions. They don't even care what emotions they're feeling most of the time - they just want emotions. Good emotions are the best, obviously. But to the surprise of many a man, bad emotions are actually better to women than no emotions. Accordingly, when a woman is testing you - be it a compliance, fitness, or comfort test - she's trying to evoke an emotional reaction out of you. If she can do this, it shows her that she has power over you.

Consider a wife who **asks her husband to warm up the car for her**. Assume she's equally capable of doing it or that it's a luxury and not a necessity. This is a clear test. What is hypergamy trying to do here? How should a man respond? I'll give the possible responses in order from worst to best.

- **BETA POSITIVE:** "Sure honey, I'll warm up your car. And maybe when I'm done, will you let me give you a foot rub too? After I get the dishes done first, of course."
 - This is a "not butthurt" response. It's also a garbage one. If she can evoke a positive, supplicating response, that's the ultimate source of affirmation to the BB side of her hypergamous drive. "I have him wrapped around my finger," she thinks. Don't be a BB. If you're her BB, she's going to look elsewhere for her AF. It's not enough to be "not butthurt" - you have to be alpha in your not-butthurt-ness.
 - This is the definition of acting in her frame.
- **NEGATIVE EMOTION:** "Screw you! Where do you get off thinking you can boss me around, you stupid whore!"
 - Whether you comply or not, if you respond with negative emotion, you're still giving her an emotional high. She might not like it in the moment, but it gives her something to complain about to her girl friends, something to post about on social media, something to stew about in the shower, etc. Her life now has a plot

and she gets to take the center stage. *Something* is better than nothing to her. If she ever feels bored in the relationship and she knows how to get you to react emotionally, she'll do it, even if she knows it's going to blow up in her face. She'll probably even cheat on you because that's going to give her the strongest emotional response of anything she could throw at you. Your negative emotional reaction = a display of her power to manipulate your emotions. Even if she doesn't get her way, because she knows she can manipulate your emotions, you're still her BB. She owns you.

- This is also acting in her frame.

- **NO EMOTION/"ROBOT MODE":** "No. I will not warm up your car." "I said no. No means no." <Broken record until she's gone.>

- This is where most guys screw up. When their wives come at them, they shut down into "robot mode." All emotions go out the window, they look with a plain, blank face, and they engage purely on logical analysis and calculated behavior patterns. I lived in this phase for a long, long time. This is absolutely infuriating to women because it denies them any semblance of what they're looking for, and it also shows them that you can't handle playing the game. It tells them you just don't care. Most guys think this "robot mode" is the same as "being stoic" (for example). It's not. The one redeeming factor in "robot mode" is that you finally learn to STFU and stop caring about whatever crap is spewing out of her mouth and all over your face. With your emotions shut down, it doesn't get to you ... at least not in the moment. But if you get into "robot mode" by bottling up the negative emotions, don't turn yourself back on and experience it all at once afterward.
- This is the ultimate spurn off to hypergamy. She doesn't get BB satisfaction of controlling you, but she also has no AF interest in you. This is the only way I know of actually defying hypergamy. Of course, the goal isn't to defy the system - it's to make it work for you.
- Congratulations. You've finally left her frame. Of course, you don't have a frame of your own yet either.

- **NEUTRAL EMOTION:** "Not today, babe." "It's not a big deal. You can warm up your own car. I'm watching the game. Have fun at work!"

- This is where you maintain your tone, unaffected by whatever she's doing. You continue to talk to her the same way as if she had asked you, "How's your day?" with a smile. But now she's saying, "How's that whore you've been hanging out with, you lying cheater!" and you answer her in the same emotional tone as if she had asked if you could pass the butter. You're not emotionless. You're normal. You're unphased. You're you.
- Now you're hinting at having an alpha side. You're unshakable. You're triggering her AF tingles.
- Now you are living in your own frame ... you just haven't invited her in yet. This is a necessary first step for most guys. It's one thing to say you're here, but if you haven't internalized it and you tell yourself, "I played it cool," but inside it's actually taking any effort at all to maintain that composure ... you're really in the "no emotion" camp and she knows it. As has been said here a number of times: women can sniff out your internal emotional state like a bloodhound. It's one of their God-given (or if you're an atheist: "evolved through natural selection") super powers. Don't assume you can put on "neutral emotion mode" and she won't know you're faking it. You actually have to *BE* unphased.

- **ALPHA POSITIVE:** "I have a better idea ... how about I warm you up instead?" with a big grin and a smack on the butt.

- This is when your mood actually brights up in response to her tests. AA stops being a tactic you employed in "neutral emotion mode" and just becomes part of who you are. She complains about you not doing the dishes, and her complaint makes you smile. You are happy to hear her complaining about you because (1) it's another opportunity to get her engines revved up, (2) it's genuinely funny to you how she prioritizes and

conceptualizes the world, (3) you can enhance the resolution on your relational cartography, and (4) she makes really cute faces when she's feisty.

- Not only do you have your own frame, but you're inviting her to join you in that frame. You're brightening her mood, despite your rejection of her request.
- If she accepts your invitation, once she's in your frame, you're the AF she's been waiting for. Congratulations: you've just made hypergamy work for you.

Now, technically a "neutral emotion" response is "not butthurt" as well. So, when I say that "not butthurt" is only defined by a positive emotional response, you can see where I go wrong. But because most guys think they're "neutral" when in fact they're in "robot mode," and because their wives can see it clear as day ... it's just not worth the risk. So, just skip "neutral emotion" mode altogether and shoot for "alpha positive."

The one caveat I give there is that if you've been living in "beta positive" or "negative emotion" for too long before finding RP, and the idea of being "alpha positive" is unrealistic under your current frame condition, then and only then should you shoot for "neutral emotion," understanding that 9 times out of 10 you're really going to be in "robot mode" and just not realize it.

I see this issue come up somewhat regularly on r/askMRP and r/RPChristians, but I don't see a lot of content on this. People are told, "Don't get butthurt," but they apply that phrase in a totally wrong way. So, let's get this clear.

WHAT IS "NOT BUTTHURT"?

To be overly simplistic, there are only two reactions to any tests a woman throws at you: (1) butthurt and (2) not butthurt. Duh. Obviously we want "not butthurt." But most people mistakenly apply this by saying, "X is butthurt. I'm not X, so I wasn't butthurt." In reality, yes, X is butthurt ... but so is Y and Z and A, B, C, and a ton of other things. To that end, it's a waste to try to define everything that *is butthurt*. We're better off trying to define the much more limited response of *not butthurt*. Here's my definition of "not butthurt": **Positive emotional reaction**. That's it.

Now, this isn't the best definition, but for new guys it's the most useful one. Why? Because it leaves no room for ambiguity. We all agree that negative emotional reactions (anger, yelling, resentment, etc.) are definitely butthurt. Positive emotional reactions are not. There is a phase in-between where most guys wind up living, thinking that they're being "stoic." This emotional gray area is too complex for many men to understand or fake their way through, but a woman can sniff it out immediately. You're walking in gray, but they see black and white. This puts you at a serious disadvantage until you've developed a strong sense of your own frame.

So, if you're new around here and you read: "Don't get butthurt," rather than thinking, "Don't react with negative emotions," tell yourself, "Oh, I need to respond with a positive emotional reaction when she does that."

DISSECTING BUTTHURT

Women are emotional creatures. They thrive on emotions. They don't even care what emotions they're feeling most of the time - they just want emotions. Good emotions are the best, obviously. But to the surprise of many a man, bad emotions are actually better to women than no emotions. Accordingly, when a woman is testing you - be it a compliance, fitness, or comfort test - she's trying to evoke an emotional reaction out of you. If she can do this, it shows her that she has power over you.

Consider a wife who **asks her husband to warm up the car for her**. Assume she's equally capable of doing it or that it's a luxury and not a necessity. This is a clear test. What is hypergamy trying to do here? How should a man respond? I'll give the possible responses in order from worst to best.

- **BETA POSITIVE:** "Sure honey, I'll warm up your car. And maybe when I'm done, will you let me give you a foot rub too? After I get the dishes done first, of course."
 - This is a "not butthurt" response. It's also a garbage one. If she can evoke a positive, supplicating response, that's the ultimate source of affirmation to the BB side of her hypergamous drive. "I have him wrapped around my finger," she thinks. Don't be a BB. If you're her BB, she's going to look elsewhere for her AF. It's not enough to be "not butthurt" - you have to be alpha in your not-butthurt-ness.
 - This is the definition of acting in her frame.
 - **Relevant Passages:** Samson and Delilah - Samson supplicated and it was his downfall (Judges 16); Potiphar's wife - her husband let her live high on the hog and left her alone with a hot guy (Genesis 39)
- **NEGATIVE EMOTION:** "Screw you! Where do you get off thinking you can boss me around, you stupid whore!"
 - Whether you comply or not, if you respond with negative emotion, you're still giving her an emotional high.

She might not like it in the moment, but it gives her something to complain about to her girl friends, something to post about on social media, something to stew about in the shower, etc. Her life now has a plot and she gets to take the center stage. *Something* is better than nothing to her. If she ever feels bored in the relationship and she knows how to get you to react emotionally, she'll do it, even if she knows it's going to blow up in her face. She'll probably even cheat on you because that's going to give her the strongest emotional response of anything she could throw at you. Your negative emotional reaction = a display of her power to manipulate your emotions. Even if she doesn't get her way, because she knows she can manipulate your emotions, you're still her BB. She owns you.

- This is also acting in her frame.
- **Relevant Passages:** "Proverbs 29:11 - "A fool gives full vent to his spirit, but a wise man quietly holds it back." Proverbs 15:18 - "A hot-tempered man stirs up strife, but he who is slow to anger quiets contention."
- **NO EMOTION/"ROBOT MODE":** "No. I will not warm up your car." "I said no. No means no." <Broken record until she's gone.>
 - This is where most guys screw up. When their wives come at them, they shut down into "robot mode." All emotions go out the window, they look with a plain, blank face, and they engage purely on logical analysis and calculated behavior patterns. I lived in this phase for a long, long time. This is absolutely infuriating to women because it denies them any semblance of what they're looking for, and it also shows them that you can't handle playing the game. It tells them you just don't care. Most guys think this "robot mode" is the same as "being stoic" (for example). It's not. The one redeeming factor in "robot mode" is that you finally learn to STFU and stop caring about whatever crap is spewing out of her mouth and all over your face. With your emotions shut down, it doesn't get to you ... at least not in the moment. But if you get into "robot mode" by bottling up the negative emotions, don't turn yourself back on and experience it all at once afterward.
 - This is the ultimate spurn off to hypergamy. She doesn't get BB satisfaction of controlling you, but she also has no AF interest in you. This is the only way I know of actually defying hypergamy. Of course, the goal isn't to defy the system - it's to make it work for you.
 - Congratulations. You've finally left her frame. Of course, you don't have a frame of your own yet either.
 - **Relevant Passages:** 2 Timothy 1:7 - "For God gave us a spirit not of fear but of power and love and self-control." Proverbs 3:6 - "Do not lean on your own understanding." See also all the times God interacts with his people - he's rarely a robot, more often responding with some type of emotion. Toward his people in their infancy, it involved anger. Toward his bride post-Gospel, it's usually a positive emotion, not a negative one.
- **NEUTRAL EMOTION:** "Not today, babe." "It's not a big deal. You can warm up your own car. I'm watching the game. Have fun at work!"
 - This is where you maintain your tone, unaffected by whatever she's doing. You continue to talk to her the same way as if she had asked you, "How's your day?" with a smile. But now she's saying, "How's that whore you've been hanging out with, you lying cheater!" and you answer her in the same emotional tone as if she had asked if you could pass the butter. You're not emotionless. You're normal. You're unphased. You're you.
 - Now you're hinting at having an alpha side. You're unshakable. You're triggering her AF tingles.
 - Now you are living in your own frame ... you just haven't invited her in yet. This is a necessary first step for most guys. It's one thing to say you're here, but if you haven't internalized it and you tell yourself, "I played it cool," but inside it's actually taking any effort at all to maintain that composure ... you're really in the "no emotion" camp and she knows it. As has been said here a number of times: women can sniff out your

internal emotional state like a bloodhound. It's one of their God-given (or if you're an atheist: "evolved through natural selection") super powers. Don't assume you can put on "neutral emotion mode" and she won't know you're faking it. You actually have to *BE* unphased.

- **Relevant Passages:** Proverbs 15:13 - "A glad heart makes a cheerful face, but by sorrow of heart the spirit is crushed." Romans 12:9 - "Let love be genuine."
- **ALPHA POSITIVE:** "I have a better idea ... how about I warm you up instead?" with a big grin and a smack on the butt.
 - This is when your mood actually brights up in response to her tests. AA stops being a tactic you employed in "neutral emotion mode" and just becomes part of who you are. She complains about you not doing the dishes, and her complaint makes you smile. You are happy to hear her complaining about you because (1) it's another opportunity to get her engines revved up, (2) it's genuinely funny to you how she prioritizes and conceptualizes the world, (3) you can enhance the resolution on your relational cartography, and (4) she makes really cute faces when she's feisty.
 - Not only do you have your own frame, but you're inviting her to join you in that frame. You're brightening her mood, despite your rejection of her request.
 - If she accepts your invitation, once she's in your frame, you're the AF she's been waiting for. Congratulations: you've just made hypergamy work for you.
 - **Relevant Passages:** 2 Samuel 6 - David dances naked and his wife nags him about it and he says he'll go out and keep dancing [note: she rejected his frame anyway - that can/does happen]. Luke 10:38-42 - When Martha nags Jesus about Mary and he just enjoys what Mary's doing anyway [presumably Martha did enter Jesus' frame after that].

Now, technically a "neutral emotion" response is "not butthurt" as well. So, when I say that "not butthurt" is only defined by a positive emotional response, you can see where I go wrong. But because most guys think they're "neutral" when in fact they're in "robot mode," and because their wives can see it clear as day ... it's just not worth the risk. So, just skip "neutral emotion" mode altogether and shoot for "alpha positive."

The one caveat I give there is that if you've been living in "beta positive" or "negative emotion" for too long before finding RP, and the idea of being "alpha positive" is unrealistic under your current frame condition, then and only then should you shoot for "neutral emotion," understanding that 9 times out of 10 you're really going to be in "robot mode" and just not realize it.

There's been some talk lately about the dangers of being part of the institutional church. It's certainly not an ideal environment for men. But how did things get this way? There's actually a cyclical pattern that has been occurring throughout most of church history. Here it is:

(1) A VISIONARY: A man with a vision rises up. He begins living it out, modeling his vision for the rest of the world.

(2) GROWTH: As people observe him, if his vision is powerful and worthwhile enough, they will start to follow him.

(3) ORGANIZATION: As enough growth happens, there is a need to add some degree of structure so that those on the fringe edges of the expansion of the movement retain the core elements of the vision itself, lest it be lost in a large game of telephone from the visionary to someone else to someone else to someone else, etc. on down the line.

(4) INSTITUTIONALIZATION: The line is blurred between the vision and the organization and leadership takes the position that they are one and the same. Accordingly, advancing the institution *becomes the means* of advancing the vision. People begin joining not for the purpose of adopting the vision, but to identify with what the institution allegedly stands for. The leaders gradually reallocate resources (time, manpower, finances, etc.) from the vision toward operational efficiency of the institution in order to maintain members and recruit new ones. The new recruits are rarely trained to adopt the vision for themselves; they are trained to find more recruits for the institution because *the institution itself is now the vision* as the leaders see them as one and the same. The primary driving force of carrying out the "vision" is the leadership itself and not the people, who otherwise see themselves as existing to support the leaders (again, because their primary interest is identification with the institution, not reorienting their lives toward a new vision, although maintaining that identity does involve a reorienting of one's life in some capacity too).

(5) RECYCLE: At some point, someone will determine that the original vision and the institution are no longer aligned or that the institution isn't doing enough to address a "new vision." A conflict occurs causing the following: (1) some people agree and follow the new visionary who starts the process all over again, or (2) the institution goes back to its roots for a brief time, reminding everyone why they're "right" for staying. The institution also usually begins utilizing secular tactics (bribery, fear, cultural appeasement, etc.) to keep people in the institution and continue drawing new people in, while rationalizing some consistency between this and the original vision (it is now more akin to a corporation than a church). Examples of this conduct include: "If you go with them you will be condemned to hell, so you'd better stay!" or "They were just over-zealous fundamentalists and we're glad they're weeded out; don't worry, world, we're not as bad as them, you'll like it here."

THE PATTERN IN ACTION

This pattern happens both on a micro and macro scale. I see this going on in individual churches. For example, my own church right now started with a pastor who met with a few people in his home, and it grew until he eventually had to start organizing a meeting place, scheduling a set time, etc. in order to facilitate that growth. It is now teetering into institutionalization, as the church has made an intentional pronouncement (in this last month) that its focus will no longer be on organic relationships, but on "systems and processes" as the means by which the church will continue to grow, arguing that nature proves God's intent is to operate through systems and processes, such as mitosis and photosynthesis and oxidation and all kinds of other natural, God-created phenomena.

It also happens on a denominational level. For example, John Wesley had a vision and people started following. He organized into the Methodist church. Some people within that church concluded that the "systems and processes" were running the show and the influence of the Holy Spirit was dwindling, so a guy named Phineas Bresee, with a

few others, became a new visionary and started the cycle all over again with a greater emphasis on the Holy Spirit's work in the church.

Then it also happens on a macro level. Jesus had a vision: get the Good News to the nations through a lifestyle of disciple-making. He *himself* was the good news and modeled a disciple-making lifestyle and people followed everywhere he went. He quickly started preaching about the "Kingdom of Heaven" on earth, which was the church - the organizational structure that would carry on his work after his ascent. That church, over time (and rather quickly, I'd suggest) institutionalized, exchanging the vision of disciple-making for the vision of church-building, suggesting that these are actually one and the same. The "recycle" phase has happened twice on a macro level: first in 1054 when the orthodox split away and again in 1517 when the reformation began.

I've re-worded this from how I typically write it in order to be as sensitive to my Cathodox friends as humanly possible, who generally continue to glorify institutionalization. As a Protestant, I don't understand this concept, and it makes sense that I cheer on the visionaries who are constantly pulling people back to what I believe Jesus modeled for us. Nevertheless, that's a debate I don't care to get into here (Cathodox v. Protestant) and any such comments will be removed from this thread as off-topic.

RP DOES IT TOO

Now, the church is not the only one to follow this pattern. It happens in the secular world too. Some PUA was having success (visionary) and people started learning from him (growth). Eventually it turned into a reddit community. That community was more interested in maintaining its structure than incorporating a new vision, so TRP was born ... and it grew and developed a structure of its own that didn't incorporate a vision for married people, so MRP was born ... and it grew and developed a structure of its own that didn't incorporate a vision for Christians to prioritize our faith as a broader context within which our sexuality would be expressed, and so RPC was born. Will it happen again? Probably. I have no idea when ... it could be a few months or a few years or a few decades ... who knows. All I can say is that this cycle always repeats. It always perpetuates itself.

But what I do know for certain is that the core of the Gospel has endured throughout time and I am confident that the vision for disciple-making, which has been lost by the institutionalized church, must be restored if we are to see the nations reached with the Gospel.

FEMINIZATION

The most concerning aspect of any of this is the culturalization that happens during the institutionalization and recycle phases. Specifically, when there is a distinct split between advancing the vision and advancing the institution (which are not always aligned), institutions will always favor the institution itself over the vision. They reason that the vision could not be carried out if the vision died, so there has to be some balance. Unfortunately, this is not what Jesus modeled for us.

Over time, especially in the most recent century, there has been a clear trend away God in most first world countries. Churches are now seen as the enemy because they stand against culturally accepted ideologies. How does the church respond? Well, those that are in the visionary, growth, or organization phases don't care - they keep doing their thing, standing strong. Those who have institutionalized have often not been training their members to carry on the vision of discipleship, so their numbers started to decline. How do they keep it up? They culturalize themselves. They say, "Hey, look, we're actually cool with those ideologies now. We might not agree with everything, but we'll adopt all of your biggest concerns and that way you can still go to heaven without giving up the ideologies most important to you ... and if you don't, then you can go to hell. But hey, that's your choice."

Sure enough, feminism was one of those ideologies that most churches adopted. But what is truly terrifying is that the new visionaries that are rising up from these institutions to start fresh are not abandoning this cultural thorn in

the church's side. It makes sense that the visionary will draw from the institution he's leaving as a source of inspiration. After all, it was his home for so long and he loved everything about it "except these few things," which are the focal point of the new vision. If feminism isn't one of those few things he's specifically trying to change, it stands to follow that it will be carried over into the things he's adopting into the new movement.

As alluded to in the last section, Christian bloggers in the manosphere are attempting to be the new visionaries, and RPC attempts to do this on a communal level. There has been a lot of growth - RPC having reached over 600 subscribers in only 7 months, and people like Dalrock having thousands of readers. I can't say we've done much to organize (as compared with the MRA's level of organization, for example), but that makes sense given the comparatively underwhelming minority of people we have behind us at this time. Nevertheless, it's encouraging to see some traction in the effort to remove feminization from the church - and I encourage you all to do your part in carrying on that vision in both bold and tactful ways.

As a recap:

- 401 laid out the essential elements of the Gospel.
- 402 showed that the way we view the Gospel affects our internal sense of identity and emotional dispositions.
- 403 began the "lens illustration" by showing that our negative experiences are rooted in a positive desire that is lacking and how it's futile to believe anything on this earth could satisfy those desires with any permanency.
- 404 utilized the "circles illustration" to demonstrate this impermanent satisfaction through worldly solution, but that we have the capacity to find legitimate fulfillment in Christ.

The purpose in addressing this is that many people come here from dark, broken places. Several men have disclosed either publicly or privately that they struggle with things like pornography, rage, depression, guilt, shame, or the like - or that their wives may struggle through one of these things as well - and that this affects their sexual and relational satisfaction. For single men, it also affects their framework for living in general, often compelling them to seek a wife as the means of curing these internal ailments. If we cannot discern through Scripture a solution to these problems, we will be left to the chaos of the world, which is too harsh an environment for the male heart to survive in.

If you want a right sex life, ministry, marriage, etc., you must be a right man. If you want a right wife, you must sanctify and cleanse her the same way Christ did: through the Gospel (Ephesians 5:25-27). That is why the Gospel as a solution is distinctively important for all men on this sub, above and beyond the technical strategies we may employ. If we are not made whole by the Gospel, all our efforts at sexual strategy will be worthless, and in Christian marriages, they will most likely fail.

GOD MAY CRUSH YOUR DESIRES

In 403 I referenced the general self-reflection that people do in an effort to find answers to the problems that ail them. This is why psychology often fails to do much more than give a temporary mood boost. Its solution is for a person to look inside themselves for the answer. In reality we must look to Christ for the answer. I referenced three people: A, B, and C, who struggle with loneliness/depression, pornography addiction, and fear of rejection, respectively. We also discussed the ways they expected their desires to be met: A wants friends, B wants physical pleasure, and C wants people to love and accept him. But the harsh reality of the Bible is that God doesn't promise any of these things:

- A: We constantly see Scriptural examples of people who were isolated from human contact. Jeremiah, Elijah, Isaiah, David ... even Jesus was abandoned by the 12 before the crucifixion. God never promised the Christian life wouldn't be lonely. If anything, the Bible narrative proves that this might be a real challenge for many.
- B: Again, the Bible never promises physical pleasure. In fact, for centuries people believed the Bible specifically condemned physical pleasures. Although I disagree with that interpretation, that alone should emphasize the point. More specifically, Jesus did promise we would suffer and be persecuted. The Bible also doesn't promise that everyone will get sex. Many people will die under God's will without ever having had sex.
- C: Jesus said point blank that the world would reject us. He never promised acceptance.

THE GOSPEL AS A MIRROR

If meeting our positive desires our way isn't guaranteed by God, what are we to do? I present that we should not self-reflect, but that we should reflect on the Gospel to find our answers. Galatians 3:3 is actually pretty explicit about this: "Are you so foolish? After beginning by the Spirit, are you now trying to become perfect through human effort?" That "beginning" is when they were first saved and "by the Spirit" references the Spirit drawing them to the Gospel and transforming them through the Gospel. Yet for some reason we all want to jump on the "self-reflection" band-wagon, rejecting what the Spirit can do through the Word of Truth, which is the Gospel, and who is Jesus Christ.

HERE IS THE LENS ILLUSTRATION. You will note the pattern we have followed thus far: (1) acknowledging our imperfection, (2) reframing it as a positive desire that we are lacking, (3) acknowledging that we are powerless to find permanent satisfaction - and that no amount of self-reflection can break the cycle, and God might not actually want us to get our desires met on our terms.

Now I add (4) that the Gospel gives us an answer. As I noted in 401, the prime function of the Gospel is to reconcile us to God. The crucifixion and resurrection are the means by which Jesus did this (as explored deeper in 402). Sometimes people get so hung up on Jesus bearing our sin on the cross that we forget the reason why he did it: to restore our relationship with God.

When we reflect on the Gospel we find that the pattern of viewing our ailment works almost the exact same way, but in the reverse ... kind of like a *reflection* (hence a mirror).

- We had pinpointed our actual desire on our terms, the Gospel shows us *that exact same desire*, but on God's terms
- What didn't satisfy us on earth now does satisfy us through Christ.
- Once we have that desire and satisfaction, rather than the lens taking things from our lives and focusing them into a concentrated point, that one nugget of truth we receive from the Gospel refracts to change multiple areas of our lives.
- Instead of being an image of imperfection, we reflect the image of God.

In Part 4 I will break down in more detail how the other side of the Gospel-mirror functions, including with reference to the examples given.

Is woman created in God's image? Let's explore.

13 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

/u/Whitified asked me why we're not more vocal about the notion that only men were created in God's image. It was an interesting question, as I had usually taken it for granted that Genesis 1:27 implies that both were made in God's image. Anyway, here's what I found. Enjoy - and I'd LOVE to hear some feedback on this, as I'm no Hebrew expert. [For the record, /u/Whitified, this is slightly modified and clarified from what I PMed you.]

"IN HIS IMAGE HE CREATED HIM" OR "THEM"?

An argument can be made either way. Starting with Genesis 1:27, a literal translation of the Hebrew in word order would look something like this (with Strong's reference numbers; a / denotes a transliteration distinction depending on different sources):

- 1254 wayibra/vaiyivra = created/shaped (the Hebrew is a conjugation of the root bara)
- 853/430 et Elohim = God (et is a connector with no known meaning)
- 120 haadam = man/mankind
- 6754 besalmow/betzalmov = own image
- 6754 beselem/betzelem = image
- 430 Elohim = God
- 1254 bara = created
- 853 otow = them [the interlinear includes this, the lexicon does not, [this source](#) confirms its presence)]
- 2145 zakar/zachar = male
- 5347 uneqebah/unekevah = female
- 1254 bara = he created
- 853 otam = them [same deal as last time this word was used]

To string that together: *created God mankind own image image God created them male female he created them.*

The core distinction is that the NASB lexicon leaves out the "otam," which translates to "them." I do believe this is in the original text based on a few minutes of research, although I admit I was less than completely thorough (at work). I confirmed with the Westminster Leningrad Codex and I think the Codex Orientales 4445.

When the NASB lexicon gets to that word it simply says "he created him; male and female" but that "him; male" they only attribute to one word: *zakar*, which they are using twice in the English even though it only appears once in the Hebrew. The other versions generally put *otow* before *zakar*, which would change the translation to: "he created them; male and female." That said, most mainstream English translations agree with the NASB's use of "him; male." There are numerous smaller translations that utilize "them; male," but the only mainstream translation that does so is the NLT. I can't explain why.

Obviously this unexplicable phenomenon leaves a large gap in answering the question - a gap that I cannot resolve without a PhD in ancient Hebrew. Is it "in his image he created them" or "in his image he created him"? My reading of the text suggests "them" as the proper translation, but the majority of Hebrew scholars go with "him," although some agree with my reading too.

The context of "male and female he created them" immediately after the "in his image he created him/them" suggests we are both made in God's image, but this is far from definitive. It could be a continuation of the "in his image" part, or it could be that God is saying, "I made man in my image, even though I created both male and female."

Conclusion: the evidence is simply too shaky to conclude definitively that women were not made in God's image.

GOD ATTRIBUTES FEMALE EXAMPLES TO HIMSELF

Now, if you want to go beyond that passage and into contextual characterizations of God, one could draw countless feminine qualities of God:

- mother carrying a nursing baby (Numbers 11:12)
- woman in labor (Isaiah 42:14)
- mother comforting children (Isaiah 66:12-13)
- mother who doesn't forget her nursing child (Isaiah 49:14-15)
- a woman leavening bread (Luke 13:18-21)

If God is specifically giving us feminine examples and attributing them to his character, it stands to follow that femininity was created in God's image as well. Personally, I have no problem concluding this. The alternative is, of course, that femininity is not something from God's image, which would then imply that it is sinful, and I can't accept that conclusion either, as that goes against passages like 1 Peter 3:3-4 and the broader RP notion of accepting and embracing femininity in women rather than trying to change them into men.

GOD IS NOT A MAN

Then there's numbers 23:19, where it says, "God is not a man." Some translations say "human," but the only main one is the NIV's post-gender-neutralizing language (the 2011 NIV gender neutralized everything; the 1984 NIV said "man"). The NASB lexicon and the Westminster Leningrad Codex used for the interlinear Bible I use agree that the word 376 *is/ish* is what's used for "man" and not 120 *haadam* for "mankind" (as used in Genesis 1:27). This *ish* is the same word used in Genesis 2:23 for "man" when saying that Eve "was taken out of man."

So, the likely interpretation here is "God is not a man" as opposed to "God is not a human." The prominence of the imagery used for God as a masculine figure (including the pronoun choice) throughout Scripture is probably for three distinct reasons (likely more):

- To reinforce his intended order of male headship in the leader-helper dynamic by virtue of the fact that we all recognize God as the head/leader.
- If men are to be leaders as God instructs, they're going to need a far more distinct and clear example, so God identifies himself in the masculine example far, far, far more often than he identifies in feminine roles. Where men need God as a leader-example, women are to look to their husbands for instruction on how to fulfill their role within the home.
- To connect with a patriarchal society that would not have respected a female god (granted, if God had identified predominantly as a female, would society have ever been patriarchal in the first place?).

Thoughts? Rebuttals? This is all a quick 30-minute cram session, so I'm happy to admit where I overlooked

something or made a mistake.

1

UPVOTE

"Author is Giving Writers \$2,800 If They Write a Crime Novel Without a Female Victim" - What to make of this?

14 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

I thought you'd all have fun spinning hamster wheels over this. [Here's the article](#). Some interesting quotes:

- "Bridget Lawless founded the contest after growing weary of violence against women being a 'go-to motivator' in books, films and TV shows."
- "Women are still being tied to the tracks, but now they have got to be raped first."
- "partly inspired by the 'Me Too' movement"
- Another author: "not to write about it is to pretend it's not happening"

I'm sure someone's gut reaction will be: "Look, another example of feminism! Now we aren't even supposed to write about women being victimized!" They'll probably also point to it coming from the #metoo campaign as a clear sign of feminism.

Then someone else will say: "But think of how women-victims in all these crime novels are setting a precedent for the notion that women's deaths are important and male deaths are not!" They'll probably also resonate with the other author who says that the better option for feminism is to keep writing about women being victims.

What say you? Is there any "win" in this otherwise apparent lose-lose scenario? Is culture so entrenched in a feminist frame that no matter what we do, there's always going to be a way to spin it as a feminist sentiment?

0
UPVOTES

"Author is Giving Writers \$2,800 If They Write a Crime Novel Without a Female Victim" - What to make of this?

14 February 2018 · /r/askMRP · Archived copy · Reddit

I thought you'd all have fun spinning hamster wheels over this. [Here's the article](#). Some interesting quotes:

- "Bridget Lawless founded the contest after growing weary of violence against women being a 'go-to motivator' in books, films and TV shows."
- "Women are still being tied to the tracks, but now they have got to be raped first."
- "partly inspired by the 'Me Too' movement"
- Another author: "not to write about it is to pretend it's not happening"

I'm sure someone's gut reaction will be: "Look, another example of feminism! Now we aren't even supposed to write about women being victimized!" They'll probably also point to it coming from the #metoo campaign as a clear sign of feminism.

Then someone else will say: "But think of how women-victims in all these crime novels are setting a precedent for the notion that women's deaths are important and male deaths are not!" They'll probably also resonate with the other author who says that the better option for feminism is to keep writing about women being victims.

What say you? Is there any "win" in this otherwise apparent lose-lose scenario? Is culture so entrenched in a feminist frame that no matter what we do, there's always going to be a way to spin it as a feminist sentiment?

INTRODUCTION

I do a lot of talking on this sub about the mission to make disciples, but I have yet actually to explain what I mean when I say that. As you probably know by now, I firmly believe that a person cannot be satisfied on this earth - sexually, relationally, spiritually, monetarily, etc. - if he is not living out the reason for which he was put here. [404's Circles Illustration](#) should illustrate this and the temporal nature of the satisfaction we find in the things of this world.

But it's not just about emotional stability and internal satisfaction in Christ that makes us godly men. It is the fact that we live on mission. It is that we have a purpose that matters and we can call others to join alongside us. For 7 years, including my dead bedroom, I did not understand why my wife was so unhappy when I was doing all I could to please her. It was only after I stopped trying to please her and invited her along a mission outside the home that our relationship started getting back on track.

Just as I could not be satisfied in Christ without living out my purpose in Christ to make disciples, she could not be satisfied in me without living out her purpose to be a helper to me. When I had no purpose, she could not help. Or when my purpose was something lame, like making money and having a cush life, she knew that her help toward me was (1) really a pursuit of her own selfish interests and not my mission, and (2) a vain pursuit that rendered her position as my helper meaningless and fruitless. There is no satisfaction in that or any joy in following a leader who lives like that.

WHAT IS DISCIPLESHIP?

Most people want to use dictionary definitions. "A disciple is a follower." "Discipleship is anything that helps people follow Jesus." With these types of generalities, we see churches assume that Sunday morning sermons are "discipleship" because it gives people something to follow. But this is not what Jesus modeled. Jesus did model preaching, but that's not what he meant when he called the 12 his disciples and invited them into something more.

My definition is based on a look at what Jesus did with the 12, which they then modeled with others: *Purposeful, intentional relationships that provide a model for someone to become more like Christ in spirit and purpose.* Let's break that down.

- **Purposeful:** It's not just "let's just hang and whatever happens will happen." You go in with an agenda, just like Jesus had an agenda when training his 12. Having an agenda does not undermine the integrity of the relationship; it only directs it.
- **Intentional:** No learning by osmosis or passive expectation. You have a plan. You might deviate from that plan frequently, but you know that on the whole the relationship should be moving from point A to point B, and if it's not you know how to start it in that direction again.
- **Relationships:** This isn't just some student-teacher session. It is a bond of love and *koinonia* oneness that you're trying to foster. Like Elijah to Elisha, the person you're working with should be longing for a portion of your spirit to be left behind with him, just as Jesus gave us his. This only happens from an intense depth of love for one another.
- **Model:** There's no room for "do as I say, not as I do." People don't follow hypocrites. The discipler must live out what he preaches and show the disciple what it looks like. In Matthew 10:24 Jesus makes it clear that you can't lead someone farther than you are yourself. See also [208 for more info on this](#).
- **Christlike:** The goal of any man - or any Christian in general - should be to live as Christ would live in our _____

shoes. Contextually things change, but we want to be transformed into the image of Christ.

- In Spirit: That our internal character would reflect Christ and take after his image.
 - In Purpose: That our purpose for living and all of our actions would be oriented around the same goal Jesus modeled for us: reaching the nations with the Gospel through spiritual generations of disciples living and laboring among the lost.
-

THE PATH

Here it is. This is what I use to gauge: (1) where a person is on their spiritual journey, and (2) what needs to happen to take them the next step forward.

Non-Christian

The Bible is clear that we're all born into sin and start here. No one is excluded. No one is born saved. As much as we'd like to say otherwise, we cannot save anyone. Only Jesus can save a person, which happens through the drawing influence of the Holy Spirit. Non-Christians need the Holy Spirit. But the Bible is also clear that the Spirit works through the existing body of believers. That's you. You must work together alongside the Spirit, who will use your effort to reach the non-Christian.

This "effort" is called evangelism, which is a systematic (albeit sometimes unintentionally so) and sometimes organic process for leading someone into a relationship with Christ who is not otherwise already in such a relationship. This process typically starts with building a relationship or rapport with the non-believer and leveraging that trust for the sake of the Gospel by verbally communicating Christ with a non-believer at some point.

Convert

This is someone who is freshly saved and often hungry to grow and learn. In the absence of spiritual leadership, the convert becomes complacent and either remains as a convert or back-pedals away from the faith altogether (or in the Calvinist view, was never really a true convert to begin with). Most Christians never advance past the convert stage.

The spiritual leader's job is to establish the convert in disciplines by which he can continue growing in his faith indefinitely without the need for indefinite spiritual leadership, just as a parent's job is to raise their kids such that they can survive on their own as adults without their parents' indefinite provision. Those disciplines have already been covered in 301-308 as the 7 basics, but I leave room for tweaking and adjustment. Again, this "path" is not a step-by-step GPS directive; it's an atlas with countless roads that will get from point A to point B. Some paths will be more efficient than others, but sometimes it's fun to take detours along the way at the expense of efficiency.

Disciple

The disciple is self-sustaining. You could throw him in the middle of a third-world country where Christians are being persecuted with no church in sight and he'd still be practicing and growing in his faith. He knows how to read the Word, pray, share his faith, etc. But he lacks a vision for his role in the greater work that God is doing. That vision is the ministry of discipleship that Jesus started, which when caught will enable him to see this process as a whole, where he fits in it, where others are in this process, and he will have the internal compulsion to help people move forward, including himself.

In order to aid him in this process, he must be equipped with several tools to help him. Those tools might be additional disciplines beyond the basics. It might be theological understanding. It might be a strong familiarity with the Word. It could be practical life skills, like charisma, passion, humility, etc. It could be practical things in one's life that help him connect with others, like his good looks, having a respectable family, house, and car, etc. All of

these tools can usually be summarized in three categories: things that foster (1) relationship-building, (2) ministry skills and understanding, and (3) character development.

Worker/Discipler

Where the disciple is self-sustaining, the discipler is others-sustaining. He is no longer pursuing his own spiritual growth; he takes on responsibility for the spiritual growth of others, through the help of the Spirit and on the authority of Christ. He sees fruit from his ministry in the form of those who are following Jesus today because of his life - not just that they said a prayer or had an emotional experience, but in that they are continuing to live for Christ. The worker should also see that those he influences are not just becoming disciples themselves, but are also becoming workers and leading new generations. If the worker/discipler is only seeing *disciples* produced and not *disciplers*, he may actually only be a disciple who needs to re-catch the vision for generational ministry.

His greatest need is accountability. It is not always easy living on mission for Christ, but through the fellowship of other workers and leaders it can be done. At first that accountability will be small because he will have very few people who share his vision. This is because the church is often weak and waters down its concept of discipleship from what Jesus modeled. But as he disciplines others, they will become his peers. He will watch as they even surpass him in maturity, and rejoice with their growth, as John said, "I have no greater joy than seeing that my children are walking in the truth."

Leader

The leader is a Worker/Discipler who not only engages in his own personal ministry, but who oversees other workers/disciplers. He helps them organize and coordinate. These might be people he has personally disciplined or their disciples, as the generations flowing from his life grow, but it could also be other people he has not disciplined who are ready to live on mission for the Gospel in the manner Christ modeled. On the path the worker and leader are vertically aligned with no horizontal progression because there is no inherent spiritual maturity distinction between them. I have known workers more mature than leaders or vice versa, but each hold their position because of the nature and quality of their gifts. That said, all people regardless of their spiritual gifts are called to be at least workers, though only a few will take on the added responsibility of being leaders.

Because of the peer mentality between them and the importance of the *koinonia* bond of oneness between them, and Paul's compulsion that we be one in "spirit and in purpose," an immense amount of trust must exist between workers and leaders. If the leader has disciplined the worker himself, this should be natural. But the balance of relationship and impact ([see 103 for more on all this](#)) is met in that when we are of one "spirit" that is our relational bond and when we are of one "purpose" that is toward the impact the Spirit would have us commit on our world through the purpose Christ gave us of disciple-making.

NOTES ON USING THE PATH

1. Anyone in any phase can lead someone as far as they are. A convert can make more converts. A disciple can make more disciples. A discipler can make more disciplers. A leader can train more leaders.
2. No one can lead anyone further than they are. A convert cannot train someone to be a disciple or worker or leader. A non-Christian cannot disciple someone. A worker cannot train a leader. This is not only a biblical mandate (reference above), but a practical reality.
3. People constantly fluctuate forward and backward in this process. I have seen countless workers get lazy and return to "disciple" mode, where they stop reproducing their lives. This is a decline in spiritual maturity - a falling away. I have also seen leaders who step down and focus on their own personal disciple-making ministry rather than trying to coordinate others'. This is not a spiritual maturity falling away, hence the vertical representation on the path.

4. You can be between two points. These 5 circles are not representative of where someone is; rather they are mile-markers along the journey as a whole. "I'm somewhere between convert and disciple" is a perfectly legitimate place to put yourself or to evaluate someone else in where you believe they are.
5. Very little of this progression depends on how much you know. I have known workers and leaders who could not articulate the difference between something as theologically front-lined as Calvinism and Arminianism. I have also known people who are PhD level scholars who have never passed the convert stage because they have not mastered the disciples or are not otherwise living for Christ other than their intellectual pursuits. For that matter, I've known non-Christians who have more theological understanding than many workers and leaders.
6. The primary function of this path is not to label people, but to give an evaluative process for understanding what someone else's next step might be in their journey toward living out the calling Christ gave us to make disciples. The person utilizing this path should become reasonably proficient in evaluating quickly where a person is, as this will assist him in helping that person move forward. This applies even in a contact-ministry sense where you only have a short time with one person.

WHERE TO BEGIN

If you don't know who to disciple, for many of you the answer will be obvious: **YOUR WIFE**. To be clear, you shouldn't go in with pre-fabricated assumptions about what "discipleship" looks like and try scheduling a weekly session for you to teach her things. For some of you that might work, but for many it won't.

Instead, remember the definition of discipleship: *Purposeful, intentional relationships that provide a model for someone to become more like Christ in spirit and purpose*. Note that it doesn't mean a weekly meeting session or a time of teaching, nor does it mandate joint prayer together. All of these things might be part of how you, specifically, implement discipleship based on your gifts, personality, and character traits. But they are not necessarily universal principles for all.

What I do recommend is discerning what your specific gifts, personality, and characteristics are, and then leveraging those toward your discipleship efforts. So, if you're a very structured teacher-type, you might want to meet with someone one-on-one in a coffee shop with a pen and paper. If you're a more casual, hospitable person who likes to laugh, it'd probably look more like inviting a friend over for dinner and asking him personal questions during that time. If your gift is one of mercy and you tend to enjoy helping people in difficult times, then you might find most of your discipleship relationships beginning by helping meet a unique need the person you're discipling experiences, and then leveraging that act of mercy and service toward the person's spiritual growth.

So, when starting with your wife, look back at the process image I linked to above and evaluate where you believe she is, then evaluate where you are. If you're behind her in the process, you've got to work on yourself first. If you're ahead of her (as you should be), then look toward what the next step for her might be. If she's part way between convert and disciple, figure out which of the basics she's lacking and find a relationally potent way of leading her into developing that aspect of her faith. If she's not having quiet times, how can you get her to start? If she's never shared her faith with a co-worker, what can you do/say to help lead her in that process, and how can you model that for her to see in your own life so that she can follow you in doing it? If she's already fluent on the basics and a disciple and you've got the vision, how can you impart that to her in a way that she will receive it? In all of this, **205 becomes immensely helpful**, as that's going to give you different methods of communicate beyond just a rote teaching session that many of you might otherwise be drawn into based on social stigma of what you think discipleship is supposed to look like.

Whatever context you want to create for discipleship, regardless of how formal or informal it might look, make sure you're remaining conscious of the mile-markers. If you've been discipling someone for a year and you've never had a conversation about their quiet times or prayer life, you're doing something wrong (yes, there are **WRONG**

ways of discipling someone). But if you don't hit those points in the first 2-3 months, depending on the context that might be perfectly appropriate. But if you're meeting with a non-believer, for example, you probably shouldn't be doing much in the way of vision-casting, and if you've got someone who's a new convert, trying to evangelize won't be helpful when he really needs the basics. Again, this isn't a step-by-step GPS coordinate directive; it's an atlas with many different roads to get to the same destination, but you will always cross different longitudinal mile-markers regardless of whether you're in Canada when you cross it or South America.

FINAL THOUGHTS

Because we have already addressed the fundamentals of evangelism and the relational/proclamational paths in 304 I won't rehash that any further, although I do invite further discussion on evangelism as a process itself and how it fits into the greater scheme of discipleship. That's where it all starts, after all.

I also already addressed the 7 basics in great detail in 301-308, and thus will not be re-hasing the establishing process. That said, if there are lingering questions not on what the basics are or why they are important to impart to others, but on how to teach them to other people, that's another conversation that would be worth having, but I won't initiate it without a demand to do so.

Instead, the rest of the 300 series will be focused on the ins and outs of the equipping and entrusting processes. I will have posts offering tools and illustrations to address some of most common issues that arise when people start to catch the vision for disciple-making and want to be all-in.

Conflict Resolution Controlled by Frame

1 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

I received a PM from a user who I'll keep anonymous. The issue seemed to be a common enough one to warrant sharing this with the rest of the community. For context, although his wife isn't a lawyer, she often acts like one (and irrationally so) during arguments, which prompted the following.

Parts in brackets are things I've added that weren't in my original comment reply.

What advice would you have for dealing with a female "lawyer" without a judge to dish out a final ruling?

You must have missed [this post I made on MRP a couple months ago](#) ;)

Long story short, you're positioning yourself as her peer when you argue with her. You're the Plaintiff and she's the Defendant and vice versa, and the judge is some mythical ideology that never actually steps in. [You create your own frame. If you think of yourself as the opposing counsel, that's a weak frame; if you think of yourself as the judge, that's a stronger frame. If you think of yourself as God to her, that's the ideal frame. Let me explain ...]

Of course, we know that God and his standard are ultimately the true judge, but God isn't going to step in any more than he was willing to communicate with Aaron in Exodus 4. God allowed Moses to work alongside Aaron, but specifically declined to talk to him. Instead, God appointed Moses to be the one to communicate with Aaron, saying, "you shall be as God to him" (4:16). [You should be as God to your wife.]

This is how it works in marriages too. 1 Cor. 11:3 says, "But I want you to realize that the head of every man is Christ, and the head of the woman is man, and the head of Christ is God." In other words, just as it was God > Moses > Aaron > Israelites, so also in your marriage is it God > Jesus > Husband > Wife.

A few chapters later Paul affirms this in 14:35: "If [wives] want to inquire about something, they should ask their own husbands at home." Where in there do you see a suggestion that your wife should debate you? Or more to your situation: she's going to debate you and you can't stop her, so where in there do you see an implication that you should let her debate you and act like she's the final judge? That's on you to set straight. [Again, you decide your frame.]

The point is clear that even though God is the judge who can settle disputes between you and your wife, he's not going to step in and do that because he appointed you for that role. He won't tell your wife the answer because he put you in charge to do that instead. Discipleship could not work as Christ modeled if God just stepped in and did everything himself.

To that end, ask yourself: Why did Paul write the books of Philippians, Romans, Ephesians, Galatians, etc.? Why did God say all of those things through Paul? Why not communicate directly to the heads of the churches at Philippi, Rome, Ephesus, etc.? Or one step further: why even use those church pastors and not communicate to the people in the church directly?

The answer is, of course, that God wants us making disciples. This is what Jesus modeled and established with his church, his bride. This is what he ordered in Scripture [to] be the established structure between husbands and wives. This is also the way that all of the church was commissioned in Matthew 28:19-20 to bring the Gospel to the nations.

Summary: don't debate with your wife as an opposing equal; hear out what she has to say as the judge.

Remember that God's actual design for authoritative leadership was not one of Kingship, which he specifically rejected in 1 Samuel 9 - it was the establishment of judges and prophets, which Israel followed in before Saul entered the picture. I'd rather be a judge or prophet under God's headship than a king of my own authority. Of course, I couldn't put most of that in the post to MRP because the secular world simply can't understand this

biblical premise. The "return of kings" concept is cool, but God never intended kingship in the first place. That was only a concession he made. As the prophet, your role is to discern God's will and lead your family in it. As the judge, your role is to hear arguments in a dispute and decide what must be done.

It's the getting to a point of consensus that's a royal pain in the [butt].

Ah, but that's the easiest part, and the way you frame this comes from some lingering blue pill mentality. You see "consensus" as an ideal that must be reached in all arguments with your wife. But who instilled that idea in you? Who is making you think you must reach a "consensus" with your wife on anything?

- It might be her. So, are you going to let her be the one to decide how arguments are resolved in the household? That it must be by "consensus"? No, that's your decision to make.
- It might be society. But that wasn't society's imperative for centuries. This is only a recent phenomenon. Until feminism crept up, most men did what they would do and their wives accepted it and helped them along the way. The societal imperative to give your wife an equal voice - that a "consensus" must be reached for the marriage to work - is inconsistent with the incredible divorce rates.
 - Simply put, most people will never reach a true consensus on anything, and constant compromise damages the integrity of the mission of the family (be it discipleship or anything else). It's like there are two paths to reach the same destination, you're each pulling toward opposite paths, so you end up walking not on either path, but on the weedy, overgrown, thorn-laden marsh between the two paths. It's highly inefficient. Don't let society tell you what to do, especially when society is dominated by feminism.

Of course, if you personally decide that "consensus" is an ideal that you want to maintain in your household, that's fine. You're the leader. It's your prerogative to decide what you value and what works and not. But don't make that decision because society seems to idolize it. Make it of your own evaluation and assessment of what you believe is best for your family.

And if you do decide that "consensus" is something you want to maintain as an ideal in your home and it's causing your marriage great difficulty ... well, there's nothing I can do for you. At that point you will have chosen to value an unnecessary ideal that has proven to be unmanageable, and you accept those consequences when you decide what conflict-resolution ideals you want to establish in your marriage. You may experience some advantages in doing this, but you must also accept the disadvantages where they come, and the inability to reach a consensus on all points of argument is one of the major pitfalls of incorporating consensus into your conflict-resolution model.

There is a continual process to learning and applying information. Understanding how this works is a fundamental component of life that I often take for granted and forget that some people haven't understood at a conscious level yet.

As with most RP concepts, the learning cycle is a tool that is amoral in itself. It is not distinctly "Christian" or "good" or "unChristian" or "bad." It just is. How you use it is up to you.

I Don't Know What I Don't Know

Everybody starts here with new concepts. Imagine an infant who is totally oblivious to the world on the day of his birth. He has no idea that he's even ignorant at all. In faith, there are things about God, Christianity, spiritual maturity, Scripture, etc. that you're entirely unaware even exist as a concept that you might have to deal with someday. In your marriage, there are aspects about how you and your wife function that you don't even know to look for because you're ignorant of their existence. There are psychological triggers, emotional buttons to push, and physical spots to tingle that are still yet to be discovered and you don't even know they exist.

I Know What I Don't Know

At some point you realize your ignorance. It might be by reading a book or an MRP post, it could be listening to a sermon, or maybe a friend mentions something you've never thought of before. Somehow you're exposed to something new and you are now aware of your ignorance. You have no idea what the person is talking about, but now you know there's more out there. If it's something stupid like a new species of fish in the deep sea that you didn't know you were missing out on seeing, you might not care. But if it's something important to you, you'll probably be intrigued enough to look into it more.

I Know What I Know

So, after much study, research, discussion, and application you've now finally mastered the subject. Maybe you did really care about that deep-sea fish and you know everything there is to know about it. Or maybe it's a new sexual position that you'd never tried before and you've mastered doing it with your wife. Or perhaps it's a sin issue you were previously blind to, but have since repented and now have the tools to battle against it. One way or another, you own that subject - it's yours whenever you want to make use of it. But it doesn't stop there.

I Don't Know What I Know

As you continue to utilize the information and apply it in your daily life, it becomes ingrained in you on a subliminal level. You store your knowledge of deep-sea fish in long-term memory. You forget you ever knew it, but can draw it up on a moment's notice if the subject arises. You no longer have to consciously think about how to maneuver into that awesome sexual position - your bodies just naturally flow into that pattern because it's like second-nature to you. You're no longer cognizant of your efforts to avoid that sin issue because you've developed a habit of living rightly, which is ingrained as part of your being. What you mastered is now a part of you without the need to consciously think about it anymore.

FOR YOU

Here is [The Box Illustration](#), which incorporates all of these principles in a neat package that's easy to remember (you can really ignore all the small print and just remember the titles; I created this illustration for the "Establishing" process when I disciple men, utilizing it to help them master and internalize the 7 basics).

Before your RP days you probably didn't even know that "fogging" or "negative inquiry" or "amused mastery" were effective strategies for marital communication. You didn't know what you didn't know. But then you read something about it on an RP forum and suddenly became aware of what you didn't know. You found value in the concept and started practicing it until you mastered it on a conscious level - you know what you know. Then you implement it so often that it becomes second-nature to you, ingrained as part of the way you operate day to day. It's who you are. You don't even know that you're doing it, but there it is anyway.

This is the cycle for mastering RP concepts and internalizing them so that you're not just "faking" it all the time. "Fake it til you make it" is often said on MRP, but it only works if you actually "make it." That last box is when you've finally "made it."

This is the same process you must go through whenever you want to learn about a new theological issue, conquer a new sin, master a new discipline, adopt a new mission, etc. Understanding the inner-workings of this process can be immensely helpful in evaluating how far along you are in mastering a concept and just how much more effort you should put in before moving onto the next one, as you can only juggle so many things at once.

FOR OTHERS

As beneficial as it may be for you to utilize in your own pursuit of self-improvement, there's also an aspect of how you can bring another person along this path. On MRP this is known as the "1,000 foot rope." Your wife is trailing way behind, and when you, the captain of the ship, steer things in a suddenly different direction, there's a bit of a jerk that happens as the rope becomes taught and she's now pulled in a new direction at the full 1,000-foot length, whereas before she may have been drifting alongside the boat with a lot of slack in the line.

In general, if your wife isn't following your lead, it's because she hasn't internalized the direction you're going. Her line is quite a ways out. A lot of that is because she is totally clueless about what you're doing. That can work to your advantage sometimes (i.e. keeping her on edge, being unpredictable), but on the whole, if you want her to follow your lead you've got to give her an opportunity to know where you're going, practice walking in that direction with you, and then internalize and adopt that directive herself also.

Example 1: Sex

On a sexual level, for example, my wife has generally been pretty clueless. She grew up in a hyper-conservative Christian bubble, has never seen porn, has never read a book on improving sexuality, etc. She didn't know what she didn't know. I could have just told her about a new sexual position and had a conversation about exactly how we're going to pull it off, but where's the fun in that? Acta non verba. Instead, I just put her body the way I want it and give it a go. At first it was kind of awkward, as neither of us were really good at it, but we added it to our repertoire and practiced. Each time it was a conscious endeavor to remember how to get back that way again. After a while, it became second nature and we just slide into position without even having to think about it. We just added some (DE)Variety(I) to our sex life.

Example 2: Mission

But I can do the same thing to reel in that 1,000 foot rope on other issues, like living on the same mission. When I met my wife she already knew I was passionate about discipleship and that this was my life mission, so box 1 was already done. From there, I failed as a leader, not understanding how she didn't jump straight from "I know what I don't know" to "I don't know what I know" - I wanted her to go from general awareness to having a subconscious lifestyle of discipleship. That didn't work.

So, I had to **utilize Jesus' model of training/leadership** to get her on board. She already knew "what" I was doing, so I lived it out myself, "showing her how." Then I encouraged her to give it a go by inviting people in our home that she could converse with in front of me, doing it together in a joint context. Once that was comfortable to her, she started trying it on her own in women's groups and eventually inviting other women out one-on-one to chat, and

she'd always report back and discuss with me how it went and I'd help her out. Now she disciples women on her own and doesn't feel like she needs my constant training and attention to live out the mission I've instilled in her - and I can now utilize her relationships with these women to reach even more men that those women are in contact with, advancing my ministry as well, not to mention the credibility boost that I get because of my wife's investment in others' lives.

Although my wife must still make a conscious effort to do all of these things, she does internally feel the compulsion toward the process. The internalized "second nature" part is starting to manifest in the form of those daily moments where she thinks to herself, "I should really give so and so a call and see if she wants to get coffee." This is a beautiful thing - and I'm intentionally leading her from one box to the next until she is at a point where she subconsciously lives out the purposes God has given to me to instill in our family.

Now, this is not rocket science. But it's also a process that often gets taken for granted. When utilized correctly, it can be highly influential in re-orienting a person toward your desired outcome, even to the point of changing their internal character such that they naturally live in alignment with the things you're instilling in them. Use that power wisely, but have fun with it too ;)

This will be a 2+ part series based on and adapted from Adelyn Birch's book, "30 Covert Emotional Manipulation Tactics." It's a short, yet fascinating read. Although it's clearly written from a feminist perspective, there's (I presume an unintended) dual nature to the book that I thought you'd all find some relevance in. Part 1 will be a series of factors to assess in determining whether or not you're being manipulated. This should resonate with a lot of new guys and where the veterans once used to be. Part 2 will be an identification of the actual tactics that cause people to feel this way, which may have to be broken up into additional parts depending on space and time.

Identifying Manipulation

1. Your joy at finding love has turned into the fear of losing it.
2. Your mood depends predominantly on the state of the relationship.
3. You're unhappy in the relationship and uncertain about it much of the time, yet you dread losing it.
4. You feel like you're responsible for ruining the best thing that ever happened to you, but you're not sure how.
5. Your relationship feels very complex, although you don't know why.
6. You continually obsess about the relationship and feel compelled to "figure it out."
7. You never feel sure of where you stand with your partner, leaving you in a perpetual state of uncertainty and anxiety.
8. You frequently ask your partner if something is wrong, and you feel like there is, but you're not sure why.
9. You're frequently defensive, feeling misunderstood.
10. You develop problems with trust, jealousy, insecurity, anger or overreaction, which your partner points out regularly.
11. You feel ongoing anger/resentment.
12. You play detective with your partner, feeling compelled to pry and spy.
13. You feel like you don't know how to make your partner happy.
14. Expressing negative thoughts/emotions feels forbidden.
15. You don't feel as good about yourself as you did before the relationship.
16. Constant feelings of inadequacy.
17. Constant feelings of guilt and compulsion to apologize a lot.
18. You carefully control your words, actions, and emotions to keep your partner from withdrawing affection.
19. You emotionally erupt like a volcano; you promise to stop, but it keeps happening over time.
20. You do things you're uncomfortable with or that go against your boundaries just to keep your partner happy or from leaving.

- "There is one caveat. If your past relationships have had an ongoing pattern of insecurity, mistrust and fear of abandonment, you may have a psychological issue that would benefit from professional intervention."

TL;DR: If you get butt-hurt, jealous, or are walking on egg shells a lot, you're likely emotionally manipulated unless you're the one with a mental health problem. In modern society, if you're a man feeling this way, you have a mental health problem ... because, you know ... a woman would never do anything to make a guy feel that way. If you're a woman feeling this way, your man is emotionally manipulative, which means he has a mental health problem.

RE: THE MAN

How many of these sound familiar to you? I remember days when I hit 1-3, 7, 11, 13-16, 18-19. One or two probably isn't a big deal, but that many means *I was being emotionally manipulated*. In fact, the third chapter quotes George R. R. Martin, "When you know what a man wants, you know who he is and how to move him." Are you the *Manipulated Man*?

In our beta, blue pill days we were taught that most of these things were "normal" behaviors that you just have to "work through" (whatever that means). In fact, from a different angle, I still believe a few of them are (heresies, I know!). For example ... #4, you might actually be responsible; #10, you might have good reasons to be jealous and untrusting; #13, there may legitimately be no way to make your partner happy, or it's too obscure to count; #16, you may actually be inadequate. You get the idea.

Now, the author assumes that every mentally healthy person is adequate, trusting, wise, emotionally stable, etc. We at the red pill know this is a false premise, unless we want to make sweeping generalizations about mental health issues on a categorical level, at which point it would just be "normal" and not a "disorder." But the point here is that the red pill man should not *feel compelled* to live in any of these things. He may decide to for his own amusement or to advance his own agenda (for a select few of these, at least). But as soon as it shifts from *I want to do this* to *I have to do this*, he has returned to his beta and allowed his wife to emotionally manipulate him again.

To give a few examples:

- **2 - If you want to draw from the relationship to affect your mood at a given time, go for it. This can be highly advantageous in certain circumstances. But if you feel like you can't control it, like the relationship is controlling you ... that's a problem.**
- **12 - If you want to spy on your partner, go for it. There are times this is worthwhile, especially if you have good reason to believe she might be doing something that could affect a custody case down the road. But if you feel *compelled* to do so because "I just have to know what's really going on!" ... that's a problem.**
- **19 - Being an emotional volcano can be very advantageous at select and sparse intervals. If you're doing it with cautious intentionality as to time, manner, and purpose, go for it. But if you feel like you *can't stop yourself* from erupting ... that's a problem.**

It could be that even for veterans there are warning signals, where your wife has chipped away at pieces of your

frame without even realizing it. Although this is far from a perfect guide, it's a nice little beacon that can help reorient you and scan for weaknesses in your frame.

RE: THE WOMAN

Feminist Intent

The author is obviously writing from the perspective of someone who was hurt from being in a relationship with a "dark triad" guy. The first chapter of the book starts with: "The most skillful and dangerous manipulators are those included in psychology's 'Dark Triad.' ... These individuals are detrimental to the mental health of anyone who has close contact with them." So, in typical feminist fashion she's trying to rile up people who have a shared experience. As such, she not just implies, but states directly in bold and uniquely formatted text: "If you are in a relationship and notice **ANY** of the following signs, there is a **HIGH** probability you are being manipulated" ... and then proceeds to list the 20 things I identified above. Just wow.

She also implies there's no good context for a person to live in any of these things. A far more extreme example would be another book saying, "Do you get angry sometimes? Do you have sharp objects in your house? Do you like to lift weights or engage in aggressive sports? If ANY of these things are true there's a HIGH probability that you're a murderer!" Obviously that's ridiculous. So, no ... not every woman is manipulated if she identifies with many of these things.

To that end, the author has also made no case for why being "manipulated" is a bad thing in some contexts. I can be pretty bull-headed sometimes. That doesn't always lead me down the best path. There have been people in my life who through love and good-intentions have manipulated me to redirect the course of my life. Looking back, I'm incredibly grateful to these people! On the whole, in the leader/helper or captain/first-officer dynamic, a wise captain should employ all tactics necessary to steer the ship where it needs to go. With an appropriate perspective, the first officer should and likely will be thankful of the captain for this ... which leads us to ...

Red Pill Truth

Contrary to the author's implication: **many women WANT to feel many of these things on her list**. I could go into all the ways that hypergamy plays into this - the AFBB dynamic is screaming out about women wanting to balance between finding a man to give them these emotional feelings and aroused tingles (AF) and yet also wanting to sublimate their men during the BB side of their cycle, ergo being the manipulator rather than the manipulated.

To remove oneself from everything on that list all the time would create such a dull monotony to life that it could hardly be enjoyed by anyone. Instead of women being excited by the relationship, they have to start looking outward - getting excited at having a new car, a bigger house, more kids, etc. Why do women in relationships with beta men seek these things? Because the relationship itself is dull, so they must go outward for their excitement. New and insecure is exciting. This applies when the beta man becomes "new" also. There's a reason the author felt compelled to write a book about this in the first place: because women are constantly pursuing relationships with these types of men because it's exciting, sexy, attractive, and sparks all kinds of tingles and feels. Notice that many of the things on the list are references to cyclical patterns - love/fear cycle; happy/dread cycle; jealous/not-jealous cycle; calm/volcanic cycle. Women like cycles. Cycles, by definition, are constantly changing, therefore presenting something new and that newness is exciting ... just don't get caught in an overly predictive cycle.

Sometimes what's best for the ship is to steer into turbulent waters. Also, in many cases what's best for the captain is best for the first officer; and sometimes what's best for the captain is to keep the first officer on her toes. I know movies aren't real life, but they do a good job illustrating points, so consider the stereotypical "boot camp" scene in many military or battle-type movies. There's always a harsh, pseudo-abusive, manipulative, arrogant jerk on the top screwing around with all the peons in training. At first they hate him for it. "He's so manipulative!" they might scream. And some quit the army right then and there, ending up where Adelyn Birch is when writing her book. But

... for those who stick around, they find that the grueling, manipulative, harsh behaviors of their commanding officer were actually beneficial and endeared the unit to their CO with a resolute and unshakable respect, which was good for everyone and saved the day in the end. This isn't true for everyone, but consider:

- Some people come off as manipulative jerks who legitimately don't deserve any respect.
- Some people come off as manipulative jerks who do legitimately deserve respect.
- The very fact that this dichotomy exists tells us that these particular behavior sets and characteristics associated with being a "manipulative jerk" are **NOT** the underlying issues affecting whether or not a person deserves respect (at least from a public perspective).

What's a man to do with this information? Accept the fact that sometimes acting in a way that makes you come off as a "manipulative jerk" is not only necessary in certain situations, but often-times absolutely essential in maintaining a fun and exciting relationship with someone. Simply put: men don't want to be manipulated, but many women do. It's totally politically incorrect to say this, but the facts are the facts. If society doesn't like it, they can just go brain wash women to stop responding this way ... and, in fact, they're trying, ergo (among others) the book *30 Emotional Manipulation Tactics: How Manipulators Take Control In Personal Relationships*, by Adelyn Birch.

22

UPVOTES

For Singles: Finding the Girl You Can't Keep Yourself From Banging

14 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

Someone recently PMed me about the single life. I know OZ has more of his incredible wisdom on the way for single men, but given that I just made this write-up anyway, I might as well share it more openly, with tweaks and adjustments to generalize and refine the content a bit.

MARRIAGE ORIENTATION

Are your life aspirations right now oriented toward marriage or away from marriage? There are all kinds of secular reasons for why you'll find an orientation away from marriage is ideal, which you can read about from TRP/MRP and the many comments by u/Whitified (not to say he doesn't have biblical reasons as well). Marriage laws, emotional complexities, risk factors, and all kinds of other things tell us that modern day marriage is a bad idea. But let's set that aside for now and just consider a biblical aspect.

I am an extremely firm believer in Matthew 6:33 - "Seek first His Kingdom and His righteousness and all these things will be added to you as well." In other words, if God wants it for you, then he'll give it to you ... *if you seek His purposes first* in your life. The implication is, of course, that if you're not seeking God, he's under no obligation to provide "all these things" to you. Jesus didn't end that verse with, "Or don't seek him, it doesn't really matter ... he'll still give you all that anyway."

1 Cor. 7 can in relevant part be summed up this way: *Don't look for a spouse because she'll distract you from your mission to God. If you're pursuing God first and find yourself about to engage in sexual sin with someone, then go ahead and get married. But even when you're married, you should live like you're single, fully devoted to God.*

For singles, take Paul's words to heart: don't pursue marriage at all. "Monk mode" should not be an X month thing for you. It should be with the mindset: "This will last until I'm in a context with someone where I know I won't be able to stop myself from sleeping with her for much longer." You're not pursuing a relationship (or even necessarily in one); you're pursuing God and finding yourself with women swarming you anyway - **BECAUSE** of your faithfulness to God.

This sounds counter-intuitive to many because you might secretly maintain your blue pill ideologies. It's hard to kick the idea that marriage is an ideal that should be sought after, as it was in the Old Testament times. But physical marriage was replaced by spiritual marriage to Christ. It and sex are no longer, in a post-Gospel world, the epitome of human existence. In fact, under current marriage laws, modern marriage doesn't even resemble Old Testament marriage anymore anyway, so even that is no longer a realistic ideal.

5 STEPS TO FINDING A WIFE (by not trying to find one)

Here's my general guide for single guys:

ONE: Find a mission in life. I personally believe this mission must involve the calling to make disciples as Jesus did (as opposed to the modern dictionary/church definition of "discipleship"). For further reading: *Master Plan of Evangelism*, by Robert Coleman, and *Lost Art of Disciple Making*, by LeRoy Eims. Master Plan casts the vision, Lost Art gives you practical tools for getting it done. You can also ask me for a copy of my book on discipleship and I'm happy to share it free of charge. Also listen to the sermon *Born to Reproduce*, by Dawson Trotman, which can be found [here](#) (top link). It's old, but still probably the best sermon I've ever heard. I listen to it at least 2-3 times per year.

TWO: Start living your mission. Start making disciples in the context of your particular skill set, interests,

hobbies, spiritual gifts, etc. For me, that involves a lot of TV watching. I kid you not ... I'm a writer and love different plot structures, so I utilize TV as an opportunity to hone my craft, but also to connect with friends, neighbors, co-workers, etc. Watching shows together is an easy way to build a connection with someone and to start a conversation with new people.

This, of course, doesn't distract me from lifting, reading, studying/memorizing Scripture, working full-time, spending time with my kids, etc. It just means that I focus my hobby time into things that help advance my calling to make disciples, creating relational bridges that can be leveraged for the Gospel and raising new believers into spiritual maturity. About 95% of America is addicted to TV and I'm not aware of a more universal hobby, so it makes sense to fish with the widest net.

THREE: Develop orbiters. As you live out your vision I guarantee people will take notice. I have never known an active disciple-maker (especially in a college setting, as the original question-asker was in) whose efforts didn't get noticed. Join a campus ministry (Navigators is my preferred, if you have one locally) or local church and utilize their meetings as an opportunity to find believers to disciple. Let the leadership know what you're doing. That leader will likely partner with you, which will drastically increase your social network alongside his (which is usually large if he's good at his job), and place you in front of plenty of women (possibly even the object of your ONEitis - **NOT THAT YOU SHOULD CARE**) who will take notice of your spiritual maturity and lifestyle for Christ.

Once the orbiters start to take notice of what you're doing and the fruit your life is bearing for the Kingdom, they're going to want to do three things: (1) Follow in your footsteps, modeling discipleship in their own lives; (2) Learn from you on how to accomplish that; and (3) "Leech" off of/help in your successes in your own ministry for God's Kingdom. Note that this process will typically also naturally weed out most of the women who don't take their faith very seriously, which means the types of orbiters you'll be amassing (as I did over a decade ago when I did this in college before I lost my alpha post-marriage) are the types of quality women you'll be looking for with low or 0 n-counts and who are likely to take their faith seriously. Admittedly, post-college the attractive draw of this becomes more difficult (a lot of the people you'll be attracting will be married), but it's not entirely negated in value. The real goal here is to be sorting out which women can actually be on board with your mission and not.

FOUR: Cultivate your orbiters. Your mission and lifestyle will be an inspiration to others, including those women, who will want to latch onto your life. In a TRP sense, it could be argued they want to "leech off of your spiritual credit." For example, I recently asked my wife why she's with me as opposed to some other guy (there was appropriate context for the question). Her answer: "Because I know on judgment day you're going to be the one God's impressed with and I want to be able to tell him I helped you do it." I'm not trying to toot my own horn, but to give you an idea of the female mentality - and this is *how spiritual marriage SHOULD be*. A great external reference (I'm a musical junkie) is the song *A Part of That* from the musical *The Last Five Years* (Anna Kendrick sings the song in the movie, which is on Netflix).

Long story short, you're going to find plenty of women who want to "leech" off of your spiritual credit ... or more theologically accurate: "be your helper" alongside the mission you're on. For the record: the reason my marriage sucked for 7 years is because when I got married I made my mission secondary to my marriage. HUGE mistake. Again, 1 Cor. 7 says, "Let those with wives live as if they had none." That means putting your mission first. Read 108 on the sidebar (I think that's the "life-cycle of a relationship" post), as that goes into more detail on the point and why the mission cannot be something internal to the home, like making enough money or buying a big enough house. Your real goal in all of this part of the process is to be finding an orbiter (or many) who is on the same mission you are (which likely will be caused by your influence in the first place) and to work together in tandem toward the fulfillment of that mission.

- Let me be abundantly clear here. This coop mission is what creates the context for your being together. This is what will put you in proximity enough to start having those sexual desires for one another - not because you're chasing tail, as if you *needed* a relationship to keep you happy and fulfilled.

FIVE: Start the relationship. Once you've got your flock of orbiters/plates/whatever you want to call them, eventually you're going to start feeling strong sexual urges toward one of them that surpasses the rest. When you feel that, do your best to avoid it. If she keeps pursuing you and you're getting tempted into a lustful relationship, then start orienting yourself toward marrying her.

ORIENTATION OF THE PURSUIT

Bear in mind that this is different from the blue pill ideologies put out by the church, which suggests that the man must pursue the woman. Note that the verses that imply God chasing after people are usually with his bride in a post-marriage context - and it's not in an "I was wrong! I *neeeeeeed* you! Please come back!!!" kind of way, but a "Hey, get back here. Stop wandering off!" way. It's usually a pattern of, "So and so was in the fold, then they left, then God pursued them and they returned." even to that end, there are still several examples where God lets people walk away and doesn't necessarily pursue them relentlessly to force them back.

But before marriage we see things more like Psalm 14:2, "The Lord looked down from heaven ... to see if there are any who ... seek after God." Jeremiah 20:12-13, "You will call on me and come and pray to me, and I will listen to you. You will seek me and find me when you seek me with all your heart." Deuteronomy 4:29, "But from there you will seek the Lord your God and you will find him." 1 Chronicles 28:9, "If you seek him, he will be found by you, but if you forsake him, he will cast you off forever." 2 Chronicles 7:14, "If my people ... pray and seek my face ... I will hear from heaven" (really, every few chapters of 1/2 Chronicles has passages about this). Doing a word search is producing virtually all examples of us seeking God, almost never in the reverse.

Skipping to the NT ... Matthew 6:33, 7:7, 28:5; Mark 3:32, 16:6; Luke 5:18, 11:9, 12:31, 19:3 (interestingly, when Jesus says "the Son of Man came to seek and save the lost" - a counter example in verse 10 - it's given in the context of Zacchaeus first seeking Jesus); John 6:24, 7:34, 8:21, 13:33, 20:15; Acts 15:17, 17:27; Romans 10:20; Colossians 3:1 ... and in all of this I found only one use of the word "seek" related to Jesus seeking us: John 4:23. But as with Luke 19:3 (Zacchaeus), this is the woman at the well and Jesus prefaces his conversation with asking for a drink from her, then saying, "If you knew who I was, you would have been the one asking me, not the other way around." Long story short: this feminized notion that God is just always seeking after us is only referenced in a few places, whereas there's an overwhelmingly greater amount of passages referencing the idea that Jesus' bride and those he wants to draw into relationship with himself are expected to seek Him. Now, the Spirit does have to draw us to God (John 6:44) - we can't seek him on our own. But that "draw" from God's Spirit is the same as a godly man having a spirit about him that is alluring women, drawing them to seek after him.

If you pursue something, it means you value it more than what you presently have or who you currently are - you're beneath it. If you are content in what you have, you'd have no reason to pursue anything else. As Christians, we are called to be discontented with a yearning in our soul for the size of God's Kingdom until all nations have been reached. But in relationships, we *ARE* called to be content in Christ. If you're pursuing relationships with women as a high priority in your life, that tells me you're (1) not content in your relationship with Christ, and (2) that you're "lesser" than (or status-wise: "beneath") the woman you're pursuing.

CONCLUSION

I guess what I'm saying in all of this is that you shouldn't be worrying about finding a wife. You should be the kind of man who makes women worry about whether or not they can find a guy like you. Be that man and women will come. But "that guy" isn't chasing tail all the time. He's on an independent mission for Christ. James Bond never said, "Hold on, MI-6 ... let me go find my girl first, then I'll go do my mission for you." He found her as part of his pursuit of that mission (not a perfect example, but you get the point).

In **Part 1** I discussed the 20-ish "signs" or "symptoms" to let you know if you've been the subject of manipulation and the difference between how many men and women experience these symptoms.

Now let's dive into the strategies themselves. What you do with the knowledge is up to you - whether you intend to employ them or be on the lookout to defend against them. Knowledge is power. That's all I'm saying.

THE TACTICS

The author probably could have greatly condensed this list, as there's much overlap ... but here you go anyway. For ease of reference, let's call Bob the manipulator and Sue the person being manipulated, although these genders could certainly be switched, depending on your context.

1. **Intermittent Reinforcement** - Bob pseudo-randomly applies positive reinforcement on a somewhat inconsistent basis, but only toward Sue's behaviors that suit Bob's interests. He does not reward her every time; rather, his goal is to cause confusion so that she is left in a perpetual state of seeking his reinforcement without having secure knowledge on how to get it. This is viewed by many psychologists as the most powerful manipulation tactic in existence, as it is the tactic most likely to create an addiction. That addiction could be to Bob himself, or it could be to the rewards that he gives her - the object of the addiction doesn't matter so much as the fact that Bob is in control of that which motivates Sue.
2. **Negative Reinforcement** - Bob doesn't like the context of the relationship, so he acts in a way that is upsetting to Sue; but when Sue conforms her behavior, Bob stops his disruptive and upsetting behaviors. This could be as simple as Bob withholding affection, time, etc. until Sue conforms her behaviors. /u/BluepillProfessor had a post a while back on *The Taming of the Shrew*, where Petruchio models this perfectly, engaging in bizarre and disruptive behaviors until his wife, Katharina, conforms.
3. **Backing Into an Emotional Corner** - Bob uses Sue's emotions as a scapegoat to pressure-flip. For example, Bob screwed up and Sue calls him out on it. Ignoring the issue, Bob accuses Sue of being overly emotional in the way she confronted him. Sue is upset that Bob makes this accusation of her and gets defensive. Bob yells back, "I knew it, you're doing it again and it's only going to get worse. I won't talk to you while you're like this," and then leaves. Sue's emotions have become the object of the argument instead of Bob's screw-up.
4. **Shifting the Focus** - This is akin to the last, but minus the emotional drama. Sue believes Bob is having an affair and has found some supporting evidence. Bob denies it then accuses Sue of not trusting him and invading his privacy, which he can prove definitively she has done, despite that Sue's "evidence" is not definitive, and therefore maintains the focus on Sue instead of himself, even if he really did cheat on her.
5. **Premature Disclosure** - Bob eyes Sue at the bar and wants to get in her pants. Within a few minutes they're talking and far earlier than contextually appropriate, he starts spilling his guts about deep and personal information about his life, which causes Sue to feel emotionally connected and bonded to him, regardless of the truth of the information. Bob has earned emotional leverage toward his goals with Sue, who otherwise has likely had a hard time finding a guy as "sensitive" as Bob to be so open about his life.
6. **Triangulation** - Bob is with Sue when he meets Amy. Bob brings up Amy periodically and occasionally says things to Sue like, "Amy said the same thing last week!" Bob denies interest in Amy, but Sue can't help but feel she must compete with Amy for Bob's affection. Bob may or may not actually be grooming Amy to replace Sue and inducing Sue to jealousy as his excuse to change the relationship when he's ready to move on.
7. **Blaming the Victim** - Bob is objectively at fault for his relationship with Sue going south. Nevertheless, he

spins a story that makes Sue look like the one at fault - and his story may be 100% true or predominantly false; it doesn't matter. He shares this story with mutual friends and even Sue herself, leaving Sue without a support structure and wondering if she really is the one at fault after all.

8. **Indirect Insults** - Bob tells Sue that her dress is very "slimming," causing Sue to believe she is otherwise overweight. Bob tells Sue that the sex was decent. Bob suggests that Sue could be a better wife to him if she took some cooking classes. Bob's not acting mean and Sue wasn't aware there were any problems, but Bob's comments reveal his negative perceptions of Sue in a way that would make her look like the "bad guy" if she reacted with negative emotion to his back-handed compliment.
9. **Insinuating Comments or Compliments** - To get her hamster spinning off-balance, after sex Bob says, "Dang, girl, you'd make a great prostitute." Sue begins to wonder why Bob is thinking about prostitutes while having sex with her, what his sexual expectations are, how he knows so much about prostitutes, and just what he really thinks about her. When questioned about it the next day, Bob has plausible deniability in saying, "I just mean you were really good in the sack last night."
10. **Guilt** - Bob says things to Sue like, "I can't believe you'd even think I could lie to you!" or "How can you feel that way after all I've done for you?" or "Don't worry, I guess I'll manage somehow if you don't want to help" or "If you really loved me you would ____."
11. **Shame** - Bob utilizes Sue's sense of self-worth and identity to affect her behavior. For example, Sue doesn't want to watch the kids so Bob can go out with the guys, so Bob comments, "What kind of a mother are you?" This is most powerful when Bob comments about the things Sue self-identifies with most, such as her status as a mother as compared with her general good qualities of being empathetic or caring. Although Intermittent Reinforcement is the most powerful tactic, this one is the most psychologically harmful and does have significant long-term effects.
12. **Empty Words** - Bob tells Sue what she wants to hear, but his actions are not consistent. For example, Bob repeatedly physically assaults Sue, causing serious bodily harm. He explains afterward, "I only did it because of how much I love you. You make me feel such intense passion - I could never have done that if I didn't have those strong feelings toward you. I love you so much, and I'm so sorry!" And then he repeats the process the next day.
13. **Crazymaking** - Bob said something that upset Sue. Sue confronts Bob about it. Bob denies it, even though he knows he said it. He denies it so fervently that Sue believes she's going crazy for having believed he said it in the first place.
14. **Gaslighting** - Akin to the last, Bob directly attacks Sue's sanity when evaluating a perception she has that is not favorable to Bob's interests. "I don't know where you got that idea from. It's all in your head. You've always had a bad memory. Are you crazy? You're imagining things." For example, Bob tells a story, leaving out important details. Sue relies on Bob's story and something bad happens because of the lack of information. Bob claims to have told her what she needed to know in the first place and that it's her perception that is off, not his narrative.
15. **Minimizing** - Sue is upset about something Bob did. Bob accuses her of blowing it out of proportion and that the issue is objectively not a big deal and it's her emotional state that's amplifying the problem, which he doesn't have to tolerate.
16. **The Silent Treatment** - Bob refuses to acknowledge Sue when her behavior is non-conforming to his expectations.
17. **Lying** - Bob provides false information or omits important information in order to get Sue to do something that advances his interests, often-times hiding the lie within a series of truths.

18. **Invalidation** - Sue expresses important aspects of how she is feeling about something, which expression is disaligned with Bob's interests. Bob replies with phrases like, "It could be worse" or "You shouldn't feel that way" or "Get over it" or "Stop taking things so personally" or "You've gotta be joking" or "I'm sure he didn't mean it that way" or "Every cloud has a silver lining." Rather than acknowledging the fact of how she is actually feeling, he's trying to change how she feels so that he doesn't have to deal with her feelings.
19. **Charm** - Bob sees Sue at the bar and wants to sleep with her. His natural form of self-expression would not get the job done, so he hides his flaws and amplifies his better qualities in order to impress her. He also distracts her from probing deeper into his internal emotional state and identity by utilizing a combination of positive attributes, usually involving humor, bravado, sympathy, and the like.
20. **Intentional Forgetting** - Bob didn't feel like doing something important. Sue calls him out on it, explaining how it negatively affected her. Bob acknowledges his failure, but minimizes or denies responsibility because he couldn't possibly have followed through with something he didn't remember needed done.
21. **Brandishing Anger, or "Traumatic One-Trial Learning"** - For select topics that are important to him, if Sue brings it up, Bob erupts with volcanic anger and a grandiose emotional display that Sue never wants to deal with again. As a result, Sue knows never to address that issue with Bob again.
22. **Scapegoating** - Beyond general victim blaming, Bob makes a repeated pattern of shifting his unwanted thoughts and problems onto Sue. If Bob is feeling ashamed of his alcoholism and Sue is having a glass of wine at dinner, he may accuse her of being an alcoholic or of being the one to perpetuate his alcoholism by not being sensitive to his condition.
23. **Belittling** - Bob constantly rolls his eyes, scoffs, gives smug smiles, or uses sarcasm or a mocking tone when Sue tries to articulate otherwise intelligent things that Bob doesn't want to hear or deal with.
24. **Putting You On the Defensive** - Although blended with other tactics, Bob's interest here is simply to cause Sue to become off-balance so that she responds emotionally rather than logically, as Bob knows he may not prevail in his position in a logical conversation. When sue reacts emotionally, he has a wide array of other tactics to utilize to redirect the conversation in his favor.
25. **Creating Fear** - Although fear is a common thread, Bob sometimes intentionally targets this emotion, specifically including the fear that Sue might lose him. Given that he becomes the only means to alleviate that fear, this gives him an immense amount of power and control in the relationship.
26. **The Pity Play** - "I am sure that if the devil existed, he would want us to feel very sorry for him" (Martha Stout, *The Sociopath Next Door*). Bob relays circumstances to Sue that portray him as the victim of great unfortunate circumstance, targeting Sue's conscience and eliciting her cooperation in Bob's interests.
27. **Rationalization** - Bob did something objectively wrong or subjectively inappropriate on a mass perception scale, but utilizes logical explanation to justify his behaviors so that Sue cannot hold it against him. Examples include: "I didn't do anything illegal, and if it was wrong there would be a law against it" or "Every man watches porn! It's not just me" or "I'm sorry I hit you. I just lost my mind for a minute because you pushed so many of my buttons." Sue desperately wants to understand Bob's behavior, and Bob is happy to help her do just that.
28. **Flattery** - Bob engages in a consistent pattern of making Sue feel good about herself when she's around him. This feeling can be leveraged toward the advancement of a singular purpose he wants to engage in with Sue, or it can be used to foster a long-term dependence on Bob that makes it hard for Sue to escape or perceive him rationally because "he's just so perfect all the time, except when ..."
29. **Love Bombing** - When utilizing flattery, Bob was engaging in consistent moderated behaviors to maintain a long-term dopamine association Sue has with him, but when love bombing he spikes those levels to intense

proportions over a short period of time to accelerate the stages of the relationship rather quickly to a degree that Sue would do anything for Bob because of how intense she feels when around him.

30. **Trance and Hypnosis** - Bob learns to utilize ordinary daily experiences to focus Sue's attention into a hyper-concentrated state that can be utilized to advance her intrigue and dependence on Bob. A common example is the "psychopathic stare," like when Bob's at the bar staring at Sue and she notices, but he won't stop and she can't think of anything else except why that guy across the room keeps eyeing her that way, all other aspects of the surrounding environment being phased out in the process. Hypnosis is when Bob has direct influence over Sue during her trance. Trances and hypnosis lower psychological defenses, making a person more susceptible to suggestion and other manipulation tactics.

There you have it: *30 Covert Emotional Manipulation Tactics* by Adelyn Birch. Lots more to say on what to do with this information, but I'm out of time ... feel free to engage in the comments. A fun exercise might even be sorting out which tactics are natural to blue pill men, which are natural to the harpy wife, which are natural to alpha men, etc. and then discerning what fosters attraction as compared with pure agenda-advancing.

Is Sex Outside of Marriage a Sin? An Official Stance.

20 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

This issue has come up countless times since this sub started, and I suspect it will keep coming up. For the purpose of enforcing Rule 7, let me be clear: any encouragement that someone engage in sex outside of marriage will be deemed a rule violation, the comment will be removed, and the person potentially temp or permabanned, depending on the context.

That said, legitimate conversation about the following are still perfectly acceptable: (1) whether or not it is actually sinful, (2) why God or the church believe it is sinful, (3) the practical and spiritual ramifications on life if one side or the other is true (ex. if it weren't sinful, let's explore what that would look like), etc.

Old Testament

The first thing to note is that marriage itself is defined by two things: (1) two people becoming one flesh (i.e. sex) and (2) a mutual covenant. The mutuality of that covenant in biblical times didn't even have to be between the people having sex - it could have been between the groom and the bride's father, for example. All that matters is that there is sex and a covenant.

Exodus 22:16-17 is a great example of this. The ordinary flow was bride price > marriage > sex. If someone violated this order by skipping straight to sex, he was obligated under the Mosaic law to go back and fulfill the first two, thereby legitimizing the sexual conduct through the bride price and marriage. Even if the marriage was refused (i.e. no covenant), the bride price for a virgin still had to be paid. This should make it clear that at least for Israel's society before the time of the Kings (i.e. when God made the laws rather than man), it was considered a violation of the law to have sex with someone outside of a (1) bride price and (2) marriage.

Note that this doesn't read like, "Park anywhere you want, as long as you're willing to pay the parking ticket." It's more like, "It is against the law to park there. If you do park there, you will have to pay a parking ticket." To that end, Exodus 22:16-17 is not an authorization to have sex outside of marriage as long as you're willing to pay the price; it's a condemnation of the practice, the penalty for which is the bride price and an obligation into marriage.

I should also note that I lean toward the view that if two people intentionally and with consent engage in becoming one flesh, then this intentional consent satisfies the "covenant" component. Accordingly, "premarital sex" isn't really even a thing - it's more "pre-ceremony sex." The reason I lean toward the view (I can still be persuaded otherwise) that intentional consent implies a covenant is because the act of becoming one flesh is clearly reserved for marriage (as this entire post demonstrates), and thus an intention to engage in such an act implies the covenants that are associated with the marriage context within which the sex is meant to occur. It's like going to the bar and ordering a drink. The context of your behavior implies that you understand and are bound to the covenant of paying for that drink. It is a contract by conduct (which is recognized even under most every modern legal jurisdiction and not just in ancient Israel) rather than by express words. Accordingly, if two people try to engage in sex without having a ceremony, they should be held to the legal requirements of marriage (under God's law, not man's) and treated as though they are married. This, if true, resolves the entire debate about premarital sex in full - because there would be no such thing as premarital sex, except in the case of non consensual sex.

New Testament

Now, there are several other OT passages I could dive into, but I don't like delving too much into the Mosaic law because that was really only applicable to Israel. Given that I'm not an Israelite in the time of Moses, there are certainly principles I can learn about God from the laws he established, but they are not by any means binding to me today as a non-Israelite. So, what else does the Bible say?

Jesus' framing of the issue is fairly telling. He gives the famous "except for *porneia*" line after which the disciples marvel at the severity of the restriction. Accordingly, this concept of *porneia* - whatever it means - is not meant to be interpreted in a way that makes it easier to get divorced. That is; Jesus meant a very narrow thing when he said that, which would cause the disciples to have the sharp reaction they did. But more interesting is that Jesus' response to the conversation is to skip straight to indefinite celibacy, as if those are the only two options. Either you get married, or you remain celibate. We can't really read a middle-ground in the way Jesus is talking about this. This tells us that Jesus' frame of mind was that sex outside of marriage is sin.

In 1 Cor. 7:8-9 Paul says that the unmarried and widows should actually stay single. However, if two people are burning with passion for one another, it is better to marry. If they were able legitimately to have sex without getting married, given Paul's extremely strong language in the rest of this chapter against marriage, I can't imagine Paul would have recommended marriage in that situation when "sex while staying single" was an option. This tells us that Paul's frame of mind was that sex outside of marriage is sin.

Neither of them were quoting the old testament *LAW* when citing these conclusions or establishing the context for expressing their frame of mind. Jesus cited the order of creation as the context for his assertion and his only reference to the law was in response to a question that was asked - and then he creates a direct contrast from his position from the technical legal conclusion, demonstrating that the OT law is not the basis for his opinion and mental framework on the issue.

It is also interesting, of course, that prostitutes were condemned as sinners. Most prostitutes' only crime was that they had sex outside of marriage. We're not talking about bestiality or objectophilia or other perversions, for which they would not have been paid. We're simply talking about sex outside of a marriage context - and yet they were considered sinners. We don't see Mary Magdalene going back to her old ways after finding Jesus. 1 Cor. 6:15-18 actually notes a clear imperative not to have sex with a prostitute, stating that this would be like trying to unite Christ with her. Paul didn't contemplate that the prostitute might be a Christian because he assumes that any Christian would have repented from prostitution (i.e. a lifestyle of sex outside of marriage), further evidencing Paul's mental framework regarding sex outside of marriage while writing his epistles.

Reflecting the Image of God

Direct passages aside, there's also a general spiritual framework for understanding the issue. As Ephesians 5 informs us, the husband-wife relationship is parallel in scripture with the relationship between God and his people (today: Christ-church, but it also applied in Israel, per numerous OT passages). Accordingly, if we want to understand appropriate boundaries for physically reproductive acts (i.e. sex), we can look to the example God sets for us in how he engages in spiritual reproduction.

Simply put: God does not reproduce with non-believers. Matthew 7 makes it clear: "No bad tree produces good fruit." We do see God using non-believers for his purposes, but we don't see the Spirit indwelling them for evangelistic intent with any success. So, if a man were to enter into a woman in a reproductive act, this would violate the parallel image of God that our physical conduct should be reflecting about His character.

Now, one could easily argue, "That's why we use protection - that way we're not producing fruit outside of marriage" and that the "having kids within marriage" concept is what's really spiritually protected. But this fails to do justice to the effort involved and the uncertainty associated with many forms of "protection." We don't see God indwelling with a non-believer at all - not in the same way he does with believers, at least. We see an external drawing toward himself and subtle nudges in appropriate directions. But when Romans 8:9 references an indwelling Holy Spirit, that's only for believers who are known as Christ's bride - and by extension, a man entering into a woman is only for his bride.

Don't Fall Into the Linguistic Trap

Some will try to argue that the Greek and Hebrew words in the passages usually referenced regarding premarital sex are more general terms for "illicit sexual activity," and don't specifically refer to premarital sex, and therefore premarital sex isn't explicitly rejected. This fails for two reasons.

First, there are lots of things not directly mentioned in the Bible, which we know to be sinful today. In fact, the Bible contemplates this in Romans 1 where it says that the person with the depraved mind "invents new ways of doing evil." Watching videos of child pornography on the internet didn't exist in biblical times, but it certainly would have fallen under some other category of sin, including "illicit sexual activity." I can hardly imagine anyone making a case that posting videos of minor children engaging in sexual activity on the internet does not fall into the category of "illicit sexual activity." Virtually everyone agrees about this, right? So, who decides what falls under *porneia* (or other words used for "fornication") and what doesn't? It seems arbitrary for someone to determine that child porn does, but premarital sex doesn't. What standard is being used to create that distinction?

Second, and in partial response to the above, it matters what people would have understood by the words being communicated at that time. We must assume that Jesus believed his intended audience would understand what he meant when he used certain words. This is clear from Matthew 13:13-17, where Jesus says directly that there are some people who he doesn't want to understand what he's saying, but others who he does intend to understand plainly. We have no reason to believe that his disciples were among the crowd he intended to confuse with his words when he talked about sexual immorality. So, what would these people have understood by the word *porneia* and other other such words associated with premarital sex? They would have known the common use of those words at that time, which includes premarital sex as being within the scope of the word. This is evidenced by countless literary texts including those outside the Bible which utilize those words to reference sex among non married persons. We cannot *ex post facto* remove a common understanding of a word in one time period and say, "Well, today we don't mean it that way, so the meaning of the Bible changed when our human dictionaries changed." Whether premarital sex is considered "illicit" today has no bearing on whether it was considered *porneia* 2,000 years ago.

Conclusion

There are, of course, countless other arguments that I do not have the time or interest to go through. However, for the purpose of this sub: premarital sex will be deemed "sin" and it will be a rule violation for anyone to recommend it.

If anyone wants to debate the merits of this position, be my guest. However, in the absence of a retraction, this rule remains.

That said, there is also great grace and love for those who have engaged in premarital sex. The Bible gives incredible judgment and condemnation against those who continue in willful, defiant, unrepentant sin ... so don't go there. But if it's part of your past, it's part of your past. We'll take you as you are in the face of repentance and never look back, except to the degree that your past may have *practical* (as opposed to *spiritual*) ramifications on your future.

Is the wife's desire in Genesis 3:16 affectionate or antagonistic? Let's explore

23 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

Someone posted this in another thread and I thought I'd open it up for the community at large to discuss. Here's what I found in about 45 minutes of research. Feel free to clarify if I've made any mistakes, as I'm certainly no Hebrew scholar. As my discipler used to say, "You know just enough to be dangerous."

The Hebrew for Genesis 3:16 reads as follows: *we'el isek tesuqatek we'hu yimsal bak*. Here's the breakdown (strong's ID in brackets):

- *we'el* [413] - the "we" is a conjunctive ("and," though sometimes silent); the "el" has a dual meaning, the two most common out of 404 uses being: 162 translations as "against" and 75 translations as "toward." Accordingly, there is no agreement on whether or not the author originally meant "and toward" or "and against," thus there can be no definitive conclusion.
- *isek* [376] - from the root "ish" for "man" (this is consistent with the two most common translations: 746 for "man" and 669 for "men," the next closest being "each" at 148. Some variation of "husband" is about 70. All 6 uses in the Bible of this particular conjugation of ish (specifically: *isek*) are within the 70 re: husbands.
- *tesuqatek* [8669] - longing/desire (nothing funny; it's only used 3 times in the Bible and all are consistent with this definition); the particular conjugation implies "you/your" instead of "my" or "his" or something else
- *we'hu* [1931] - again, the "we" is a conjunctive. "hu" can mean he/she/it/this/who; of its uses in the Bible, it's virtually always in the masculine
- *yimsal* [4910] - rule/control/have dominion. Its 4 most common uses are rule (27), ruler (18), rules (9), and rulers (6). This conjugation implies a "him/her/it" as the subject doing the ruling.
- *bak* - not referenced in the Strong's, but in this verse most translations agree: "over you"

If I put this all together it could read like any one of the following:

- (1) And toward husband you desire and he rule over you
- (2) And against husband you desire and he rule over you
- (3) And toward man you desire and he rule over you
- (4) And against man you desire and he rule over you

Given the context of child-bearing and the marriage between Adam and Eve, it's highly probable we're dealing with 1 or 2 (i.e. the "husband" options), but if it were 3 or 4 it would say quite a bit about why women through history constantly seek their identity through men (3) or why they are also simultaneously constantly trying to seek control over men vis a vis a feminine imperative (which /u/Whitified can speak a lot to) (4).

But if I'm right about the "husband" translation, then the only other real distinction is whether or not her desires are to be directed toward her husband or against his interests. This is why some translations reference a positive desire for a husband (NIV, KJV), but others reference a contrary/controlling desire (ESV, NLT).

Now, the Genesis 4:7 parallel regarding sin's desire for us looks like this: *we'elleka tesuqatow we'attah timsal bow*. Here's the comparative breakdown:

- we'elleka - same as we'el, except it adds a reversing conjunctive ("but"), making it now mean "but toward/against"
- tesuqatow - same as tesuqatek, but with the subject of "it" instead of "you/your" - "it desires"
- we'attah - parallel to we'hu; where "hu" meant a third party (he/she/it), the attah references "you" - "and you"
- timsal - same as "yimsal" except the subject ruling is no longer a third party, but "you" - "you rule"
- bow - same as "bak," but presumably a change in directive from "you" to "it"

These two phrases are unmistakably meant to parallel one another, as they are virtually identical except as to conjugation. To that end, Genesis 4:7 should be very key in our interpretation of Genesis 3:16. Which one makes more sense (noting that "it" is a reference to *hata* ("sin") from earlier in the verse):

- (a) But toward [you] it desires and you rule it
- (b) But against [you] it desires and you rule it

Between these two, does sin have a positive, affectionate desire toward us, or does it have a desire that works against us? If indeed these two verses are meant to be a parallel of one another, then the answer must be the same for both. Because sin's desire is a controlling desire against our interests, I don't see how we can contextually read a wife's desire as stated in the 'curse' as being an affectionate, positive desire for us ... unless we argue that Moses (the presumed author of Genesis) just accidentally used the exact same phrases a mere few paragraphs apart and had no intention of connecting the two, and God somehow has let the church mistake a connection between those verses for close to 3,500 years since this was put to writing without providing a prophet to communicate otherwise.

TL;DR - It seems pretty clear that the language in Genesis 3:16 references a woman having a desire against her husband (not for him), which is evident both from the fact that the "against" translation has over 2x the usage as the "toward" for the operative word (162 v. 75) and also because the language in Genesis 4:7 is an incredible parallel with 3:16, but clearly means to be interpreted in the "against" sense, and therefore 3:16 should be interpreted in the "against" sense also.

In the last week alone I've had 4 or 5 guys approach me with issues where the root of their problem is their inability to defy context. Consider:

- "I really like this girl, but I can't come up with a good reason to start a conversation."
- "I really think a boundary needs to be set with my wife, but the issue is in the past, so I need to wait until it comes up again to talk about it."
- "I want to do something, but it would be out of character and people might think I'm weird."
- "I really do/don't want to do this, but it would be socially awkward or unacceptable for me to do/not do it."

These (and more) are signs of a person who is controlled by social constructs.

Social Influence Matters

Given the frequency with which I see this as an issue on r/RPChristians, I'm going to have to dive into this some more over there too, but social influence and the size of your social circle matters.

When I start mentoring guys one of the first things I tell them is that if they want to earn influence with people, they must advance their social network - and I'm talking in the real world, not on reddit or facebook. Social networking is how I make most of my money. It's how I advance my mission. It's how I increase my sphere of influence. It's how I dread my wife. Etc.

A guy once told me, "I'd like to meet more girls, but I'm just not good at initiating conversations. How can I have more girls in my social circle?" The answer seems too obvious: *Increase your social circle*. He replies, "But I'm not good at meeting new people?" I point to a couple sitting at the table next to us and said, *There you are - new people. Go introduce yourself*. He couldn't do it (at least not back then). "I can't, he says." *Why not?* "Because it would be weird."

What he meant was: "There's no context for me to talk to them."

The Non-Importance of Context

I have spent most of my life practicing the art of defying social norms when it would advantage me to do so. Don't get me wrong: **defying social norms absolutely can be disadvantageous to you in many circumstances**. But complying with social norms against your own interests can be equally disadvantageous. Why do we do it? Because it's "safe." Screw safe. Women don't want safe. Safe is not sexy.

Consider many of the Blue Pill PUA strategies. A lot of them revolve around *creating context* or leveraging an existing *context*. Why? Because they're too scared to break context. Examples: (1) Spill something small on her and try to clean it up, then start a conversation. (2) Bump into her, apologize, and start a conversation. (3) Take something innocuous going on in the room and use it as a context to start a conversation. The list goes on.

This happens in blue pill marriages all the time too. Examples: (1) Guy takes wife out on a date to create a context for sex afterward. (2) Guy puts on a racy movie/TV show or encourages his wife to read the Twilight/50 Shades books to create a context for his wife to get a little horny. (3) Guy starts massaging his wife's shoulders while they talk on the couch after dinner, hoping to transition that into sex. The list goes on.

Yes, context can be utilized for your advantage. But the one who has no qualms with breaking social niceties to get

what he wants - that is an attractive man, not only to his wife and other women, but to prospective employers, reporters, social media junkies, and passive follower types all across the world.

What to Do?

One of the things I've recently started assigning guys to do: *Go start a 60+ second conversation with someone you've never met before and without context.*

One guy came back saying, "I had a few dates with girls I met online, and those conversations were over 60 seconds each," so he thought he'd done well. But that defeated the point of the exercise. He had context for the conversation. She expected him to talk to her on the date. I sent him back out to try again. The point wasn't for him to have conversations - it was to stretch him past his comfort zone. I wanted him learning to be comfortable engaging with people in new ways, whether it made sense to do so or not.

In my younger days this type of task was scary. In college and law school I started mastering it as an art. Today, I have no-context conversations with people almost every single day.

- In the elevator? *How's it going?*
- At the grocery store? *You're definitely going to want to pick up a box of these.*
- Walking down the street? *Nice day. Heading anywhere interesting?*

Yeah, people think I'm weird sometimes. More often they're thinking, "That was really cool that someone I don't know wanted to talk to me." Initiating without context often makes people feel good about themselves - especially if you employ charm in the midst of your context-defying conversations.

But even beyond making them feel good about themselves, it makes them feel good about you. They think, "Most people just stick to themselves, but that guy is actually interested in talking to people. He just does what he wants. I wish I could be like that." The phrase "I wish I could be like that" is a stone's throw away from, "I'll buy whatever he's selling." If I'm selling sex, she's buying.

After you've been doing this a while, you'll be surprised how many people you end up recognizing around town. I live in a suburb of 35,000 people. No matter what side of town I'm on, if I walk into a grocery store there's about a 75% chance I'll run into someone who waves to me because they remember me from a past conversation, and maybe 50/50 that one of these people re-initiates a new conversation [and this is not counting the people who no-context initiate with me]. *THEY* are the ones initiating now. Why? Because they had a positive experience talking to me, even though the only other times I've talked to them have been at a restaurant or in a store at the mall or whatever. I once overheard one such acquaintance asking another, "Oh, how do you know him?" with the answer, "I don't really know, I just see him around a lot and we chat."

I suppose if I wanted to, I could really leverage this for some money-making opportunities. For now, it's enough that most places we go, my wife sees that people know me - and she wonders how. I'm not going to the movies with these people. I'm not going to meals. I'm not calling them on the phone. I'll let her hamster spin on that one.

What's Holding You Back?

Are you living the life you want? If not, what's stopping you? You ever just walk up to your wife and grab her crotch? "No! I could never do that. I have to kino her first. Then I've got to get her into bed. Then, once it's clear we're going to have sex, that's when I have **context** to grab her crotch." Screw context. If you want to do it, do it. Is it always going to be wise? Probably not. Oh well. Figure out discretion as you go.

Did she cross a boundary in a restaurant? You going to do something about it? "Not yet. We're in public. Strangers might see how I'm talking to her - that's a double-whammy. It's poor social etiquette to have a confrontation in public, and I can't let anyone know that I set boundaries on my wife's behavior." So, you decide to wait until you're home to bring it up, but the conversation has long since moved on and you think, "Well, things are going well now, so there's really no **context** to bring it up and it might spoil the mood, so I'll just let this one slide." Then you fester some resentment. If it's important to you, just bring it up. Screw social norms. Let the people at the table next to you gawk at the fact that you're not ashamed.

In fact, social norms are the constructs your wife utilizes to keep you in control. They're how she creates her expectations for the relationship. They're also what establishes a sense of monotony in many dead bedrooms because they make you predictable. If you learn to defy social norms, she will never know what to expect from you. That's exciting. That's sexy. That's what lets her know you're worth being with - because you'll do what others won't, which makes you far more suitable as a protector and provider. It simultaneously adds healthy instability and reliability in the relationship. Screw context, screw your wife.

364

UPVOTES

Social Influence and Defying Context

30 March 2018 · /r/TheRedPill · Archived copy · Reddit

In the last week alone I've had 4 or 5 guys approach me with issues where the root of their problem is their inability to defy context. Consider:

- "I really like this girl, but I can't come up with a good reason to start a conversation."
- "I really think a boundary needs to be set with my wife, but the issue is in the past, so I need to wait until it comes up again to talk about it."
- "I want to do something, but it would be out of character and people might think I'm weird."
- "I really do/don't want to do this, but it would be socially awkward or unacceptable for me to do/not do it."

These (and more) are signs of a person who is controlled by social constructs.

Social Influence Matters

Given the frequency with which I see this as an issue on RPChristians, I'm going to have to dive into this some more over there too, but social influence and the size of your social circle matters.

When I start mentoring guys one of the first things I tell them is that if they want to earn influence with people, they must advance their social network - and I'm talking in the real world, not on reddit or facebook. Social networking is how I make most of my money. It's how I advance my mission. It's how I increase my sphere of influence. It's how I dread my wife. Etc.

A guy once told me, "I'd like to meet more girls, but I'm just not good at initiating conversations. How can I have more girls in my social circle?" The answer seems too obvious: *Increase your social circle*. He replies, "But I'm not good at meeting new people?" I point to a couple sitting at the table next to us and said, *There you are - new people. Go introduce yourself*. He couldn't do it (at least not back then). "I can't, he says." *Why not?* "Because it would be weird."

What he meant was: "There's no context for me to talk to them."

The Non-Importance of Context

I have spent most of my life practicing the art of defying social norms when it would advantage me to do so. Don't get me wrong: **defying social norms absolutely can be disadvantageous to you in many circumstances**. But complying with social norms against your own interests can be equally disadvantageous. Why do we do it? Because it's "safe." Screw safe. Women don't want safe. Safe is not sexy.

Consider many of the Blue Pill PUA strategies. A lot of them revolve around *creating context* or leveraging an existing *context*. Why? Because they're too scared to break context. Examples: (1) Spill something small on her and try to clean it up, then start a conversation. (2) Bump into her, apologize, and start a conversation. (3) Take something innocuous going on in the room and use it as a context to start a conversation. The list goes on.

This happens in blue pill marriages all the time too. Examples: (1) Guy takes wife out on a date to create a context for sex afterward. (2) Guy puts on a racy movie/TV show or encourages his wife to read the Twilight/50 Shades books to create a context for his wife to get a little horny. (3) Guy starts massaging his wife's shoulders while they talk on the couch after dinner, hoping to transition that into sex. The list goes on.

Yes, context can be utilized for your advantage. But the one who has no qualms with breaking social niceties to get

what he wants - that is an attractive man, not only to his wife and other women, but to prospective employers, reporters, social media junkies, and passive follower types all across the world.

What to Do?

One of the things I've recently started assigning guys to do: *Go start a 60+ second conversation with someone you've never met before and without context.*

One guy came back saying, "I had a few dates with girls I met online, and those conversations were over 60 seconds each," so he thought he'd done well. But that defeated the point of the exercise. He had context for the conversation. She expected him to talk to her on the date. I sent him back out to try again. The point wasn't for him to have conversations - it was to stretch him past his comfort zone. I wanted him learning to be comfortable engaging with people in new ways, whether it made sense to do so or not.

In my younger days this type of task was scary. In college and law school I started mastering it as an art. Today, I have no-context conversations with people almost every single day.

- In the elevator? *How's it going?*
- At the grocery store? *You're definitely going to want to pick up a box of these.*
- Walking down the street? *Nice day. Heading anywhere interesting?*

Yeah, people think I'm weird sometimes. More often they're thinking, "That was really cool that someone I don't know wanted to talk to me." Initiating without context often makes people feel good about themselves - especially if you employ charm in the midst of your context-defying conversations.

But even beyond making them feel good about themselves, it makes them feel good about you. They think, "Most people just stick to themselves, but that guy is actually interested in talking to people. He just does what he wants. I wish I could be like that." The phrase "I wish I could be like that" is a stone's throw away from, "I'll buy whatever he's selling." If I'm selling sex, she's buying.

After you've been doing this a while, you'll be surprised how many people you end up recognizing around town. I live in a suburb of 35,000 people. No matter what side of town I'm on, if I walk into a grocery store there's about a 75% chance I'll run into someone who waves to me because they remember me from a past conversation, and maybe 50/50 that one of these people re-initiates a new conversation [and this is not counting the people who no-context initiate with me]. *THEY* are the ones initiating now. Why? Because they had a positive experience talking to me, even though the only other times I've talked to them have been at a restaurant or in a store at the mall or whatever. I once overheard one such acquaintance asking another, "Oh, how do you know him?" with the answer, "I don't really know, I just see him around a lot and we chat."

I suppose if I wanted to, I could really leverage this for some money-making opportunities. For now, it's enough that most places we go, my wife sees that people know me - and she wonders how. I'm not going to the movies with these people. I'm not going to meals. I'm not calling them on the phone. I'll let her hamster spin on that one.

What's Holding You Back?

Are you living the life you want? If not, what's stopping you? You ever just walk up to your wife and grab her crotch? "No! I could never do that. I have to kino her first. Then I've got to get her into bed. Then, once it's clear we're going to have sex, that's when I have **context** to grab her crotch." Screw context. If you want to do it, do it. Is it always going to be wise? Probably not. Oh well. Figure out discretion as you go.

Did she cross a boundary in a restaurant? You going to do something about it? "Not yet. We're in public. Strangers might see how I'm talking to her - that's a double-whammy. It's poor social etiquette to have a confrontation in public, and I can't let anyone know that I set boundaries on my wife's behavior." So, you decide to wait until you're home to bring it up, but the conversation has long since moved on and you think, "Well, things are going well now, so there's really no **context** to bring it up and it might spoil the mood, so I'll just let this one slide." Then you fester some resentment. If it's important to you, just bring it up. Screw social norms. Let the people at the table next to you gawk at the fact that you're not ashamed.

In fact, social norms are the constructs your wife utilizes to keep you in control. They're how she creates her expectations for the relationship. They're also what establishes a sense of monotony in many dead bedrooms because they make you predictable. If you learn to defy social norms, she will never know what to expect from you. That's exciting. That's sexy. That's what lets her know you're worth being with - because you'll do what others won't, which makes you far more suitable as a protector and provider. It simultaneously adds healthy instability and reliability in the relationship. Screw context, screw your wife.

I was a groomsman in a wedding this past weekend in a wedding where virtually all of the attendees were self-identified Christians (authenticity unknown). Here are some observations for both married and single men.

Blue Alphas - Even naturally alpha guys can succumb to a blue pill ideology. Just because you are a type-A guy doesn't mean you're immune to self-defeating sexual strategies. The groom was an ideal example of this. He's generally a DNGAF, no-nonsense, does whatever he wants type of guy. But his wedding vows were full of unrealistic fantasy blah blah. I even caught him commenting "happy wife, happy life" at the reception.

Emotional Empaths - When the groom said "HW, HL," I tried to jab back, "True, but a happy husband is what makes for a happy wife." He just gave me a blank stare. The bride pretended to get it, but who knows. My wife actually backs me up on this now. She still likes the social acceptability of verbally proclaiming the HW,HL statement, but realizes that her happiness is directly related to mine. Women are empaths - they feel what others feel, especially those they're closest to. Ideally, there is no one they're closer to than their husband. If the husband is unhappy, they empathically pick this up and become unhappy as well. If he's doing well, his happiness rubs off on her.

Whipped - My best friend was at the wedding. He'd only had 2 girlfriends before and he's now 34 and engaged after a year of dating. Although he is a master at playing it cool, it's obvious that below the surface he has this "finally! I found someone!" feeling that's controlling his life. His fiancée likes to travel a lot and they just announced that they plan to move to Spain for a year after the wedding.

This is pretty ridiculous, given that if he were to stay at his current employer for 2 more years he would have all of his student loans forgiven - a windfall of over \$100,000. Neither of them have jobs lined up in Spain ... she just wants to go and he's going to ruin the last 8-ish years of working toward this loan forgiveness program to accommodate her whim. Don't be that guy. He's changed and is no longer the same person I once knew - at least not when she's around. When it's just us, he's back to normal, but that will obviously be much rarer now. Perhaps I should have been more intentional about red pilling him.

AWALT - I got hit on by two girls who came with dates and while my wife was leaning on my arm. With a little alcohol, there was no shame or discretion. One commented on my appearance and asked me to dance with her hand on my arm. The other actually asked me to "take a walk" around the lake with her. Their dates were good looking men, but happened to be sitting at the table eating cake instead of socializing.

Dread - Getting hit on had a noticeable impact on my wife's interest in me throughout the evening. Circumstance notwithstanding, my wife commented, "I'm really wishing we'd gotten a hotel."

Stress - At some point throughout the evening, my wife got a work e-mail that stressed her out. This pretty much ruined things for an hour. It didn't matter how great of a guy I was ... sometimes women are going to succumb to their feelings and you can't pull them out of it. Don't bother trying. Just keep having fun and invite them to join you whenever they're ready to stop being such a downer. I enjoyed myself and my wife enjoyed myself too when she was ready. Don't force it.

PDA - There were two primary crowds with virtually no one in-between: (1) those who had been married for under 5 years and had no kids; and (2) those who were married for over 10 years and have kids. The sharp contrast in levels of PDA between these two crowds was obvious. This was, no doubt, subliminal. I found myself victim to the pattern for the rehearsal/dinner and the first hour of the wedding reception, given that I wasn't planning on having sex after the wedding anyway (wouldn't really have been possible), so kino wasn't an intentional focus.

My wife noticed this distinction and it made her mad, complaining, "We'll see what they're like after having a house full of 4 kids!" My first gut reaction was to chew her out for her general aversion to sexuality and say, "It's not about who has kids and who doesn't; it's about who actually wants to have sex and those who have repressed it."

I didn't - it's not often these impulses come up anymore, but when they do I've gotten pretty good at STFU. I just upped my kino game and she responded. This made our time much more enjoyable. Conclusion? It's better to be sexual rather than complain about your wife not being sexual.

I'm sure I could pull out a lot more, but that's most of it. Enjoy.

I was a groomsman in a wedding this past weekend in a wedding where virtually all of the attendees were self-identified Christians (authenticity unknown). Here are some observations for both married and single men.

Blue Alphas - Even naturally alpha guys can succumb to a blue pill ideology. Just because you are a type-A guy doesn't mean you're immune to self-defeating sexual strategies. The groom was an ideal example of this. He's generally a DNGAF, no-nonsense, does whatever he wants type of guy. But his wedding vows were full of unrealistic fantasy blah blah. I even caught him commenting "happy wife, happy life" at the reception.

Emotional Empaths - When the groom said "HW, HL," I tried to jab back, "True, but a happy husband is what makes for a happy wife." He just gave me a blank stare. The bride pretended to get it, but who knows. My wife actually backs me up on this now. She still likes the social acceptability of verbally proclaiming the HW,HL statement, but realizes that her happiness is directly related to mine. Women are empaths - they feel what others feel, especially those they're closest to. Ideally, there is no one they're closer to than their husband. If the husband is unhappy, they empathically pick this up and become unhappy as well. If he's doing well, his happiness rubs off on her.

Whipped - My best friend was at the wedding. He'd only had 2 girlfriends before and he's now 34 and engaged after a year of dating. Although he is a master at playing it cool, it's obvious that below the surface he has this "finally! I found someone!" feeling that's controlling his life. His fiancée likes to travel a lot and they just announced that they plan to move to Spain for a year after the wedding.

This is pretty ridiculous, given that if he were to stay at his current employer for 2 more years he would have all of his student loans forgiven - a windfall of over \$100,000. Neither of them have jobs lined up in Spain ... she just wants to go and he's going to ruin the last 8-ish years of working toward this loan forgiveness program to accommodate her whim. Don't be that guy. He's changed and is no longer the same person I once knew - at least not when she's around. When it's just us, he's back to normal, but that will obviously be much rarer now. Perhaps I should have been more intentional about red pilling him.

AWALT - I got hit on by two girls who came with dates and while my wife was leaning on my arm. With a little alcohol, there was no shame or discretion. One commented on my appearance and asked me to dance with her hand on my arm. The other actually asked me to "take a walk" around the lake with her. Their dates were good looking men, but happened to be sitting at the table eating cake instead of socializing.

Dread - Getting hit on had a noticeable impact on my wife's interest in me throughout the evening. Circumstance notwithstanding, my wife commented, "I'm really wishing we'd gotten a hotel."

Stress - At some point throughout the evening, my wife got a work e-mail that stressed her out. This pretty much ruined things for an hour. It didn't matter how great of a guy I was ... sometimes women are going to succumb to their feelings and you can't pull them out of it. Don't bother trying. Just keep having fun and invite them to join you whenever they're ready to stop being such a downer. I enjoyed myself and my wife enjoyed myself too when she was ready. Don't force it.

PDA - There were two primary crowds with virtually no one in-between: (1) those who had been married for under 5 years and had no kids; and (2) those who were married for over 10 years and have kids. The sharp contrast in levels of PDA between these two crowds was obvious. This was, no doubt, subliminal. I found myself victim to the pattern for the rehearsal/dinner and the first hour of the wedding reception, given that I wasn't planning on having sex after the wedding anyway (wouldn't really have been possible), so kino wasn't an intentional focus.

My wife noticed this distinction and it made her mad, complaining, "We'll see what they're like after having a house full of 4 kids!" My first gut reaction was to chew her out for her general aversion to sexuality and say, "It's not about who has kids and who doesn't; it's about who actually wants to have sex and those who have repressed it."

I didn't - it's not often these impulses come up anymore, but when they do I've gotten pretty good at STFU. I just upped my kino game and she responded. This made our time much more enjoyable. Conclusion? It's better to be sexual rather than complain about your wife not being sexual.

I'm sure I could pull out a lot more, but that's most of it. Enjoy.

You all should know my position pretty well by now: that people should avoid marriage and make no active effort to find marriage-candidates until their undivided devotion to God situations them alongside someone else and they can't keep their hands off each other. This ensures that (1) the man is leading, (2) both parties are very spiritually mature, (3) the mission remains unhindered, (4) sexuality is maximized and understood in its proper degree of importance to the marriage, (5) that blue pill ideologies about marriage as a goal in itself are not part of the foundation of the marriage in the first place, (6) etc. etc. etc.

But I know that not everyone agrees with me. I accept the fact that there are other views out there and they may have a rational basis. Accordingly, I want to open this conversation up to the entire community for response, as I have yet to see a theological (as opposed to philosophical) basis for opposing views.

SPECIFICALLY: For those of you who do believe that men should be actively dating and trying to find someone to marry, what is your **BIBLICAL** basis for thinking that this is a good idea or a godly attitude to have toward marriage?

For discussion purposes, let's assume as a baseline that we're talking about a single guy who has hot Christian women asking him out periodically, but so far he has only gone on a few dates and resisting their advances was relatively easy. He only looks at porn on rare occasions, mostly because he's lonely. One day he thinks to himself, "I really want to get married. I don't want to end up alone." [Or if you want to create some other hypothetical man and respond to that, feel free to do so - just state how the differences in your hypothetical affect your response.]

Is there a biblical (not philosophical) basis for the man to argue, "God wants me to be married, so I better start looking for a wife"? Or is his desire for marriage a product of blue pill conditioning that

Common arguments I want to address up-front

To be clear, I've heard the argument a million times in my life: "I struggle with porn, so it'd be better for me to marry than keep sinning." But the fact is that virtually 100% of men who struggled with porn before marriage still struggle with it after marriage - marriage is not a cure. Additionally, this means you're letting your sin tell you what God's will is for you. So, I'm looking for other explanations with **biblical references to any passages that encourage men to get married.**

I will hear out OT references, although beware that my reply will likely be that physical marriage in the OT was clearly shown in the NT to be a road-map to help us understand the relationship between Christ and his Church (us), and that post-Gospel the physical things of the OT were rendered moot once the spiritual reality is achieved (see Hebrews 8 and 9, for example).

Lastly, I'm also aware of Proverbs 18:22 and when it says "whoever finds a wife finds what is good," the word for "finds" [matza/matsa] with a 3:1 ratio is most often translated in the same way as, "I just found a penny on the ground!" and not "I was looking for a penny and found one."

I also want to be clear that I'm not looking for anti-marriage passages to be explained away. I'm sure many of you have lots of thoughts on 1 Cor. 7 (the standard anti-marriage passage) and how it can be interpreted in a way that's less anti-marriage. But even if you are right on that point, it doesn't prove a pro-marriage case; it only chips away at the anti-marriage case. Accordingly, it does little to contribute to the conversation I'm looking for.

This probably isn't on-topic enough to be MRP-worth, so here it goes on AskMRP. I've handled two cases recently that are pretty interesting, and I know that every third guy I've PMed with on here claims to be self-employed, so this might be valuable.

CASE 1: THE WIFE

In the first case, I'm representing the wife (62). She's nuts. So is the husband (67). If I had to guess, she has PTSD and OCD and he has Narcissistic PD. Kids are all adults.

This wife has a horrid case of retroactive emotions. She talks about month-long vacations to the Bahamas as if they were the worst days in hell. Why? Because she feels like today is her worst day in hell. Divorce sucks. The guy is a hard-core dark triad follower over the last 30 years, but has pretty much sucked in his profession because he's a lazy bum, so he has no real money to show for it - maybe \$50k/yr. He does have a nice \$30k/yr social security income though. Wifey never worked in the 30 year marriage. He won a big case back in 2008 and has been living off of that, and the money ran out last year.

What does wifey do as soon as the money runs out? Divorce. What else does she do? Gets a chemical peel, shores up her diet, starts exercising and basically maximizes her SMV for her age group. She certainly doesn't look like she's in her 60s. AWALT.

What's her deal with this divorce? Well, that guy's solo practice is worth squat. What's his strategy? Claim he's about to retire and therefore can't pay her any spousal support. Our strategy? Get all her money up-front using his last 3 years of tax returns. Instead a 50/50 split of the assets, we're working with her getting 70%. This puts her about \$250,000 ahead. Given that he's got liver cirrhosis and still drinks a 6-pack a day, she thinks he'll only make it another 7 or 8 years. In her mind, that's around \$2,750/mo during what she expects to be his lifetime. If I calculate the numbers traditionally, she'd probably get somewhere closer to \$2,000 (worth about \$150k over the same period if we account for taxes). She's making bank on this deal and he's too stupid to realize otherwise.

Why else is this such a great deal? Because: (1) present dollars are worth more than future dollars, (2) cash-in-hand guarantees against the risk of him dying early, (3) cash-in-hand is post-tax, instead of pre-tax support that the \$2,000/mo would have been ... and the list could go on.

Moral of the story? Just because you made it 30 years doesn't mean AWALT is no longer true. Also, hire a divorce attorney who actually knows how math works (which is shockingly rare).

CASE 2: THE HUSBAND

In the second case, I represent the husband. It's essentially the same set-up, except:

- Instead of a big case in the past, my client was a brilliant engineer who resorted to being an embezzling swindler who live for years off of stealing from his old employer before turning himself in to avoid going to jail. In the end, he's still broke just like the other guy.
- Instead of having NPD, this guy's just a straight up beta.
- Wifey in this case is a lot crazier than in the other case - making up all kinds of things that have clear evidence proving she's wrong, yet she can't drop it.

Wifey's so psychotic that she's lost touch with reality. She is the definition of what we describe when we say women

will believe what they want to believe regardless of the facts. She's manipulative to the core - even to the point of threatening in front of the children and extended family at Christmas, "Sign over everything we own and agree to take all the debts and to pay me \$5,000/mo in spousal support or I'm going to start stealing property from the marital estate and giving it to my family." That didn't go over so well with the judge - especially when she actually went through with it.

Husband's response? He withdraws the case initially and tries to reconcile with her. It was never going to happen. When the case was withdrawn, that was her cue to start transferring the property away because the restraining order was gone. Two months later he realizes he got played and re-files the case.

Where'd the negotiations end up? Well, he didn't want to have to pay spousal support because this harpy would have brought him back for contempt every single month he didn't pay. So, he cooks up a deal to give her all the assets and he takes all the debts and she foregoes spousal support ... basically the same thing as above. I help him do it.

What happened here? He actually has the capacity to go earn \$200,000/yr again, but now will never have to pay her any support on it (yeah, we made that order non-modifiable!). Also, he's going to file bankruptcy on 85% of the debt because that's what was in his name already. Oh yeah, and he qualifies because he doesn't have any assets to offset the debts (which is why we gave them all away), but for bankruptcy purposes there was a legitimate equitable exchange in the divorce decree and we used language distinguishing it from a domestic support obligation, so they can't say squat about it. He's going to walk away with a \$200k/yr job in a year and no debts to worry about. Sure, he lost about 500k in assets, but he'll easily make that back.

Moral of the story? Do your math. The same deal that can cripple one guy makes another man laugh all the way to the bank.

Moral of both stories? If you're about to get divorced and you're self-employed, tank your income for 3 years before the divorce. If you can't feasibly do that, make large business expenditures on things that have low resale value. This decreases your income by virtue of adding large deductions, while having only a nominal impact on the value of the business, but at the same time increasing what you can potentially earn after the divorce is over because you've just invested all that money into your company.

Expressing our Flaws With Strength and Humility

4 June 2018 · r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

Given a recent conversation, I thought this should be made more public. A while back, as I started implementing various RP procedures in the context of a Christian marriage, I realized that there is a powerful way in which to communicate one's weaknesses.

To be clear, a man should communicate his weaknesses and faults to his wife whenever that weakness/fault affects the relationship. If I have a typo on a document I typed for work, I don't need to communicate this. It has no impact on the relationship. But if I have a habitual pattern of being lazy at work and it affects the family finances, that's the type of thing that I should communicate.

NMMNG makes it clear that we should not hide our weaknesses. That is part of beta strategy, hoping that by hiding our flaws she will see us as more ideal sexual partners. This is nonsense. But the solution is not blindly sobbing before her every time we screw up and asking her forgiveness.

Your Sin is Against God Alone

In Psalm 51:4 David says this interesting thing after committing adultery with Bathsheba and murdering her husband. He says to God, "Against You, You only, have I sinned." That doesn't mean there aren't consequences that affect other humans. It does mean that *our identity before God is not dependent on how our actions affect the world around us*. It is dependent on how our actions affect our relationship with God. That is the only sin that matters.

To be a bit clearer, in the parable of the unmerciful servant we see that when the Judge has forgiven us of a great debt, we have an obligation to forgive others of their debts too, extending God's forgiveness from our own lives. If my wife is God's servant, then if God has forgiven her of her great debt to him, it's no longer her choice not to forgive me of any wrong I may have done to her, unless (as was the case with the unmerciful servant) she wants her debt to God placed on her head all over again. And if her forgiveness can be assumed, then who should I appeal to for forgiveness? The only one who doesn't *have* to forgive me is God. Praise be to him that I know he *will*, for "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just and will forgive us our sins" (1 John 1:9).

Ultimately, whatever wrongs may be done to me or that I might do to others - those wrongs pale in comparison to the debt that each person on the planet owes to God. As a result, if I run over my neighbor's baby, I have certainly committed a heinous crime that affects her greatly, but the crime I have committed affecting her is still less than the debt she owes to God as a sinner standing before him. That baby wasn't hers to begin with - it was God's. If I cut off my neighbor's arm, this is still less of a debt that I owe him than the debt that he owes to God, for he had no right of entitlement to his harm; he only had it because God allowed him to have it.

Any harm I might do to one of God's people is not an offense to them, it is an offense to God. This is because no human has an inherent right to anything except eternal condemnation, for that is the only wage we can demand from our sin. As such, when I harm another, I have merely interfered with what God has done and not what they were entitled to, by any human terms.

The Role of Forgiveness

Why do I say any of this? Because **a failure to acknowledge this principle leads to the mistaken conclusion that you require your wife's forgiveness.**

It has often been taught, yet so rarely applied, that forgiveness is not about releasing the perpetrator from their wrong; rather, it is about the victim releasing their own bitterness so that they can feel whole again.

If this were not the case, then how would the world function if my internal sense of guilt for my actions were exclusively determined by someone else's choice of whether or not to forgive me? What if I sinned against my

brother, followed the entire biblical procedure for reconciling with him, but he refuses to forgive me? If forgiveness were about releasing someone else from their sin, he could hold that power over me - but we know that this is not how it works.

As a former pastor once defined it: **Forgiveness is accepting the consequences of someone else's sin and still choosing to love them.** This is what Jesus did for us on the cross. He didn't bear our sins and then say, "That sucked! I hate you all for doing that to me!" His response was to love us.

As a practical matter, there is wisdom in changing our pragmatic interactions with those people going forward; but our ability to love them despite our caution around them should be the foundation of our forgiveness.

Validation Seeking

Taking this concept into marriage, how do we address sinning against our wives? Or how do we address telling them about our own internal weaknesses and insecurities? This can easily come off as validation-seeking in at least two different ways.

First: If we maintain a mentality that we *need* their forgiveness, we are placing them in a position of power and judgment over us. That is, we are seeking the validation of their judgment. This is not consistent with a biblical attitude.

Second: Confessing weakness often implies in the other person a pressure that they must affirm us in the midst of our weakness. If I confess insecurity about my looks, it's implied that she will say, "No, it's okay - you're a very good looking person." If I admit I was wrong for calling her a mean name, it's implied that she will say, "It's okay, I'm over it now. It's not a big deal." No matter what the fault or flaw is, there's an implied, "She must tell me it's okay." This is validation-seeking. You're letting her be the judge of whether or not your behavior is actually acceptable. Even worse, the answer of that judgment is implied by the context of the conversation.

Regardless of which of these (or other) options you fall into, it's not healthy for a marriage if your wife feels like she must be your source of validation. Your validation should come from God alone.

Strength and Humility

So, if it's clear from both biblical and secular sources that we should be confessing our sins and flaws to one another in order to build healthy relationships, how do we do that without sacrificing our position of strength before our wives or our humility?

About 6 months ago I started implementing a process in my marriage that has worked wonderfully. It's quite simple, but for the technically-minded (as I am), it can be broken down into four sections: (1) Admit, (2) Repent, (3) Improve, (4) Involve.

- *Admit:* "Honey, I screwed up" or "I realized I've been failing at ..."
- *Repent:* "I realize this is wrong/less than Ideal and I don't want to do/be like that anymore."
- *Improve:* "To address the problem, I'm going to start doing x, y, and z."
- *Involve:* "Making changes like this won't be easy. It would be helpful to me if you could do a and b to facilitate some of the changes I want to make in my life."

In this process you're not peddling for her forgiveness. You're not seeking her validation that your behaviors really weren't all that bad. You're accepting responsibility for your flaws, demonstrating a plan for improvement, and allowing her to fulfill her role as your helper.

To be clear, there is a difference between transparency and vulnerability. Transparency is being open about your flaws, allowing others to see them. Vulnerability is placing yourself in a position where others have the power to hurt you. Transparency alone does not imply vulnerability; but when you invite someone else to participate in your wound or weakness, that makes you vulnerable. Where transparency can have some positive effects on a marriage, vulnerability is significantly more powerful because it allows your wife to fulfill a role that God designed her to fill.

Example

Suppose you're overweight and want to solve that weakness in your life. You've never acknowledged this as a weakness before, but it's pretty obvious to your wife that you need to lose 30+ lbs. Here's how this can go.

- *Bad:* "Wife, I'm sorry that I haven't taken care of my body. I know you must find me disgusting. God must be so disappointed in me for not taking care of his temple. It's no wonder you don't want to have sex with me."

Her probable reaction: She'll admit that she sees you as overweight, she'll immediately feel close to you for being *transparent* about your situation, might even have sex with you that night, and she'll probably console you about your weight and encourage you to do something different. But because you've made her the judge, she's going to expect you to do something in response to her validation or to earn her validation, and if you don't meet the expectations she has on what you should do to fix the problem, she's going to have an even lower view of you than before. After all, it's one thing when a problem is unspoken; it's another thing to admit there's a problem and then not be man enough to do anything about it.

- *Good:* "Wife, I've been a fat slob. I know I should be taking better care of my body. After all, I'm God's temple. I'm going to start going to the gym and eating healthier with a goal to lose 5-7 lbs each month. This will be a huge adjustment to our schedules and lifestyle and I'm going to need your support. It would be helpful if you would encourage me to go to the gym on days I don't feel like going and if you would cook meals that would be conducive to my plan to lose weight."

In this second model you're not putting her in a position of judge over you. You have already judged yourself or let God be your judge. You have already set a path that you're going to walk and you're asking her to follow you and help you walk that path. You're also taking away her ability to set expectations over you because you are setting the expectations for yourself and made those expectations clear. You are not obligating yourself to her expectations; rather, you're implying that she must adopt your expectations.

I have had this conversation in other contexts with my wife a little more often than once a month (I'm not perfect and screw up enough to make it worth it). I can attest from first-hand experience that the humility that this displays is a very attractive quality - but even more powerful is the position of strength that humility comes from. This enhanced respect and admiration for me does wonders in the bedroom and also instills in her an eagerness toward being submissive, rather than viewing it as an obligation.

CONCLUSION

When you screw up, remember:

- There may be practical consequences against your wife, but it is ultimately God's to forgive, not hers. God has promised his forgiveness, but you must make yourself right before him before anything else can happen.
- When you do feel compelled or have an obligation to confess something to your wife, do not do it in a way that places her in a position of authority over you or of being the one to validate you in the midst of your weakness.
- When you do communicate your flaws, do it from a position of strength by admitting the issue, repenting of your role in the problem, communicating a plan for fixing the problem, and inviting your wife to help you, as

appropriate, as you go forward so that she can live out the role God has designed her to fill.

WARNING: EXPLICIT MATERIAL AHEAD. DO NOT READ IF YOU ARE EASILY TEMPTED

WARNING: COMMENTS SUGGESTING SINFUL BEHAVIOR WILL BE REMOVED. I know, I'm making the mods arbiters of what constitutes sinful behavior. Not everyone will agree. If you think it's a questionable practice, feel free to provide Scriptural support pre-emptively or if your comment ends up removed, just message the mods with your explanation and we'll be happy to address it. We will be fairly generous with what we allow, but some things (ex. threesome, adultery, etc.) will have a hard line.

/u/palmorwrist recently asked what we have all found to be useful in maintaining "intoxication with your wife." I'm going to open up that question a bit more into a general brain-storming, strategy-sharing session - not just to talk about principles behind this, but about the practical stuff we do in the bedroom.

So, what types of techniques do you employ? What games do you play? Any particular strategy for maximizing the experience?

As I put in my post to him, for the first few years of our marriage, our average sexual encounter might have been 3/10. It wasn't great. Our best times back then were around a 6 or 7/10. More recently, the average has bumped up to a 6/10 and we probably peak out at a solid 9 when we have the time and privacy to devote to it.

Athol Kay makes a good point in MMSLP that at least 49% of the sex you have will, by definition, be below average. So, embrace that. Let's be willing to try new things, accepting that it might not work for one or the other or both of you. Hopefully you'll learn enough new things with your spouse that it actually increases the average so that even when you do dip below that 50% mark, instead of that being a 2 it could still be a 5 or 6 :)

In MMSLP Athol Kay talks through a few of his favorites:

- The shower move: he gets in the shower uninvited, fumbles around a bit, acts like it's crowded, makes her wash his back, then transitions this into sex.
- Neapolitan: this is essentially a position formula starting with a BJ, going into cowgirl, then ending with missionary.
- Simon Says: this is actually one of my favorites too. Text your wife periodically throughout the day with different things to do. End it with something like, "take your clothes off" then "open the door" right before you get home.
- I can't remember the rest of his and don't have the book in front of me.

ME, PERSONALLY

Favorite Position: Cowgirl

Ideal Length of Time: 2 hours

Average Length of Time: 30-45 minutes

Favorite Techniques, Strategies, Games:

I've looked online before, but most of the games are cheesy or require dumb props, which can often break

immersion (a very important aspect of sex to me). So, these are some of my favorites that tend to maintain and increase immersion. My wife and I don't call them anything in particular, we just do it, so I'm just going to make the names up as I go.

The kissing trilogy: My wife is very task-oriented, so immersion is hard when she has other stuff on her mind. Giving her a task in the bedroom shifts the focus of her thoughts back to the bedroom, increasing immersion instead of it being a weakness.

- *Guess Where:* We each think of a part of our body and the other person has to keep kissing different parts until they get there. Once one person gets it right, you switch.
- *Treasure Hunt:* Same as above, except no switching, and instead of random spots you start somewhere innocuous and after each time the kisser gets it right, the next spot follows a trail to a "final destination."
- *Hot or Cold:* Same concept, but you can add a modifier of "hotter" and "colder" to help them move in the right direction.

Edging: Always a solid favorite when time permits. Needless to say, this really increases the degree of pleasure of the ultimate orgasm. Basically you ramp each other close to orgasm and hold it there for as long as possible. It also makes multiples easier for her.

Close, But Not Quite: This can be part of the edging process or just foreplay. You can touch anywhere except her nipples and either one's genitals. The more you dance around the sensitive spots, the more fun it is. This goes on until one person can't hold it and forces the other person to break the rule. Or, instead of forcing her to break the rule I might break it myself because the sudden shock of getting her clit rubbed or a finger going inside of her when she wasn't expecting it can be quite powerful and fun to watch. The longer the game is played before that moment, the more unexpected it is and the more her body is aching for it, making it more fun to do.

Who Comes First?: This game is a finisher and is also great if you're low on time. After a bit of foreplay to heighten arousal (and this works especially well after edging for a while), both people try as hard as they can to force the other to orgasm. The only rule is you're not allowed to intentionally shut off your libido, which would obviously defeat the purpose of the game, as the point isn't to win but to enjoy someone trying desperately to increase your pleasure. Women have a general advantage in that it's easier to get a guy off, but men have the strength advantage in that I can often pin her down to prevent her from doing anything to me, while I have at it on her. This display of dominance usually ends up revving her up enough that I can win every now and then (though admittedly she wins more often than not).

Bondage: We started with just cuffs, but developed into rope. I like it best when her feet are tied too, holding her open so she couldn't stop me if she wanted to.

Caveats

It should be noted that with limited exception, we don't ever talk about these things ahead of time like, "Let's do the --- game tonight." I just do whatever I feel like and she goes along with it. Sometimes little cues will come in to tip off what's going on, like with the kissing trilogy I might whisper to her, "Is that the spot you want it?" or after she kisses me I might say, "That was nice, but try again." Subtlety is key here so as not to break the immersion.

It's also worth noting that we don't do these kinds of things every time. For us, sex isn't just about figuring out what the next gimmick will be. But it is fun to have something to try when the moment's right.

My favorites out of the way, what are some of your favorite things to do? I'm writing this less to share my stuff and

more to get new ideas on things to try. That said, as noted above, I've never been a big fan of props, like dice or a deck of cards or anything like that (which usually break immersion for us).

18

UPVOTES

EC on TRP explains why making sex your god fails

15 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

Here's the link.

This is a very long post. It's also worth the read. For all you noobs out there, read carefully. This is some pretty legit stuff about the importance of staying fit, developing a style, getting a decent hair-cut, and generally being top-tier. It is worth the read for that alone.

But the most significant part is the end. I've seen it written on TRP countless times. The end of the road for the secular method is ultimately hopeless despair. It's a flatness that prevents you from enjoying what you once poured your entire life into accomplishing.

Ecclesiastes 3:11 says that God has placed "eternity in the hearts of man." That means that nothing on this earth can satisfy us (I know - everyone knows a good CS Lewis quote about that).

This is also why I harp on the importance of having a mission that transcends you or whatever family you're hoping to build. You won't be satisfied if that mission doesn't incorporate what God designed you to do: make disciples. Enjoy the read, but take it with a filter.

I see this issue coming up again and again and again. I don't post often anymore, but when I see something creep in repeatedly that may not have been addressed in full, it's worth a whirl, so here goes.

Everyone should already know my position on marriage in the first place: avoid it at all costs. If you happen to already be married or one of the ones who can't avoid it, congratulations, you're normal and lack the grace and blessings given to the privileged elite. Culture will tell you that your only job from here is to find the "right one." Who might that be? Is there a "right one"?

WHAT IS ONEITIS?

Just as a brief recap, ONEitis is the view that this *one particular girl* in your life is unique among women and that she would be your "ideal partner." This is also referred to as a "soul mate" in many Christian circles.

This idea is rooted in a subconscious philosophy that goes something like this. Some people are good potential partners for you for a long-term marriage and others aren't. As such, there is a "good fit" and a "bad fit." If these exist, then it makes sense that there would also be a "worst fit" and "best fit." And if there is a "best," then because God wants what's "best" for us, then he must also want us to marry whoever that "best" fit would be.

Here's where it falls apart: except in rare examples, God doesn't tell us who that "best" fit is and we often change our minds about this. As sinners, our own perspective is unreliable. More so, there are numbers of situations where people exit marriages for perfectly legitimate reasons (ex. spouse dies) and end up remarried. So, does that mean a person has two soul mates? Or does it mean that God will allow us to marry someone who isn't our soul mate? Or, even if soul mates do exist, how do we even know that the object of our ONEitis is actually that person?

For example, consider Jacob. He had ONEitis for Rachel. After all, she was "beautiful in form and appearance." He worked for 7 years to get her. He gets drunk on his wedding night and wakes up next to Leah, whose "eyes were weak." Long story short, he works another 7 years to get Rachel. What does God do? He closes Rachel's womb, but opens Leah's, giving her 4 sons. Rachel, his perfect, beloved bride and object of his ONEitis, becomes a nagging wife and blames Jacob for her barenness. Jacob, of course, becomes infuriated. What does Rachel do? Gives him her servant to sleep with, who gives him 2 sons. Then Leah gets jealous and gives her servant to him also, who gives him two more sons. Then Leah has two more sons. Then Rachel finally has a child: Joseph. Years later Rachel had another son and died in the process. In all, Jacob's infatuation with Rachel caused him great stress and trouble and 14+ years of his life. He had in mind that she was the perfect girl, but God blessed his marriage with Leah instead. How can we take this other than to say that we can't trust our own emotional proclivities toward someone.

There are simply too many variable that prevent us from deriving any actual pragmatic use or application of the "soul mate" myth, and developing ONEitis for someone goes another step further into being downright unhealthy. Let's explore why.

MARRIED MEN

Even if you're single, listen up: your wife is not your soul mate - at least not in the way most people mean that term. Sure, she's your mate, and you have a spiritual bond that might even extend to the "soul" level, but she's not the *one perfect person God hand-picked for you from the beginning of time who you were destined to marry*. I could spend a lot of time debating that issue, but for now I'll just ask you to take my word for it. I'm more concerned today with the harmful implications of living as if your wife is your soul mate in the way culture traditionally defines that term.

One - Distraction

If you believe your wife is your soulmate, it's easy to fall into the mistaken belief that God's plan had been leading you to her all along - as if she is your destination. False. Even if God did predestine who you would marry, that's only a way-point on a much longer journey in life.

To use a crude example, Frodo's goal wasn't to find a fellowship. It was to get the ring to Mordor. The fellowship was formed because he needed help getting that job done. If you view your marriage as your destination in life, you'll be forever lacking in what God designed you to do. Mission first.

Two - Loss Paralysis

Having a ONEitis for your wife will paralyze you if you lose her - and the fear of this happening will have present ramifications at a subconscious or even overt level. I knew a guy who was head over heels for his wife. He was reasonably happy, but sacrificed a lot in order to keep her around. The fear of losing her caused him to compromise his job, his friends, and his long-term life ambitions and ministry opportunities. No, she didn't divorce him. She died. He wondered if he would ever find happiness again.

As much as the preemptive influence of the potential of losing her affected his life negatively, the actual loss paralyzed him even more. He hasn't recovered to this day. He has not remarried because no one will ever live up to his first wife. He has not renewed his vigor for Christ because he can't get past his loss. I know, your wife is still alive and with you ... but don't let your attachment to her dominate your decisions today. As my former pastor used to say in front of his wife: "I love my wife, but if I lose her I won't be devastated. I will be sad for a time, but I will move on because all I need is Jesus. She helps me walk with him, but my relationship with and satisfaction in Christ is not defined by her contribution to that relationship and satisfaction."

Three - Divorce

Accepting the "soul mate" myth and succumbing to ONEitis is (from my observation and analysis) the leading cause for divorce in Christian marriages. Many people - men and women alike - believe that if they are unhappy in their marriages, they must not have married their "soul mate," and therefore they must divorce their current spouse to go find their actual soul mate. Alternatively, developing ONEitis for someone other than your spouse can obviously lead to the same conclusion.

My dad is a shining example of this. He never officially bought into the soul mate myth, but did develop a ONEitis for another woman and took the view, "I'm obviously not with the woman God wants me married to if I'm so unhappy in my marriage and this other woman makes me feel this way." Needless to say, my dad was not a red pill man. He caved to my mom's whims, or employed covert methods of getting his way and DEERed when he got caught. His ONEitis got him married to my mom and it also got him divorced from her. Be smarter than that.

Conclusion

There's a lot more to say here, but you get the gist. God's plan for you is not to divorce your wife (Malachi 2:16); but it is to reconcile and redeem your marriage with her. Likewise, God's plan is not for you to make an idol of your wife; it is to view her in the proper context of the role for which God agreed to entrust her to you in the first place: to be your helper on a bigger mission (Genesis 2:18). You are not to view your wife as the only woman who could ever make you happy. Six months of marriage and you'll realize this isn't true. Instead, you're to view her as the one God entrusted to you to train to work alongside you.

The man who has ONEitis for his wife will live out of fear of losing her. The man who has options will not live by fear, but by purpose.

SINGLE MEN

Knowing what ONEitis can do to a married man, I now turn to the single men and ask: *Why would you want that to be the foundation of your relationship?* If indeed you are seeking marriage, it does not make sense to let such bad

theology and philosophy be the cornerstone of your relationship because that will not only doom you from a praxeological point of view, but in a spiritual and psychological way as well. Without rehashing some of the above, consider:

One - Proverbs

The soul mate myth leads men to the irrational conclusion that God has something wonderful in store for them through marriage. This is not necessarily true. Sure, "He who finds a wife finds what is good" (Prov. 18:22), but there are lots of things that God calls "good" that we find repulsive. Even the serpent was called "good" by God when he was first created.

Many men marry harpy women who have no discretion, grace, elegance, femininity, etc. Proverbs has a lot to say about those types of women too (11:22 comes to mind). Yet we don't hear these verses quoted too often in church (21:9 and 27:15 if you need some more). 18:22 gets quoted generally for an "it's good to get married" sentiment, but we fail to recognize that "good" also includes stories like Hosea and Gomer, David and Michal, and your best friend who regrets having married his high school sweetheart when he was 22 and fresh out of college. These are "good" marriages because they have a lot to reveal to us about how we relate with God as His bride. But just because something is "good" doesn't necessarily mean I want it or will enjoy it anymore than, say, chemo therapy.

Two - Selective Perception

It's a common psychological phenomenon that we have a tendency not to notice or otherwise quickly ignore/forget things that cause us emotional discomfort or which contradict our prior beliefs. As far as I'm aware, this happens in relationships far more often than anywhere else and is probably deserving of a post of its own. For now, suffice it to say that ONEitis creates an incredibly strong emotional attachment to a particular view of a woman that, once manifest, will make it almost impossible to view the relationship from a rational, objective stance, making your ability to evaluate the potential future of the relationship nearly impossible.

I once dated a girl named Rachel. She was a stereotypical college nympho. I didn't know any better. When I first met, we had several deep discussions of theology and the Gospel and she knew all the right things to say. But she also cheated on me with at least two dozen men during the 9 months that we dated. She complained it was because I wouldn't sleep with her until marriage, so she had to get her needs met elsewhere. Now, you'd think after the first dozen for sure I would have been gone. But my *selective perception* told me that she was really a good, godly woman who just got stuck in a bad rut and that if I forgave her the way God forgave me, she would eventually repent as all godly women do. Sounds funny, right? Yes, you should be laughing at my idiocy. But this is what ONEitis does to a man. The emotional attachment a man develops for a particular woman can lead to disastrous results. When I did finally leave her, it was after summer break and I had enough space to gain a right perception.

Three - Standards

A man should have standards. ONEitis tells you to abandon those standards because this *one girl is more than worth everything else you're giving up*. The worst is when a Christian man develops ONEitis for a non-Christian. The most fundamental biblical standard of all - not to marry a non-Christian - somehow gets thrown by the wayside because an emotional investment in a particular relationship tells a man that she's more important than God's Word. Don't let that happen to you.

I already told you about Rachel, for whom I violated many, many, many standards in order to keep the relationship alive for longer than it should have gone. So let me turn you instead to my friend Nick. He was physically fit - 8-pack and all - but overall a very weird and awkward guy who didn't know how to charm a woman or cut his hair. Well, there was a girl in our church who had been around the block, including with 3 of Nick's closest friends at the time. She had a kid with one of them, followed by a hysterectomy that precluded her from having her own kids. She was also a druggie. Nick wanted kids, but he also wanted her. It pained him to see her sleeping with his friends, but he waited out those relationships and 7 years after we graduated high school he started dating her and married her. Now he's raising his friend's kid, paying all the support, and is with a woman who can't give him kids of his

own, whose looks have quickly faded from all the drug use, and who leaves him with many questions about her fidelity ... and he's realizing she wasn't all his mind had made her up to be. He sacrificed his standards and put himself in a bad spot, but feels trapped because he (rightly) won't divorce her and he's (wrongly) too scared to stand up to her because she might divorce him ...?!?

Four - Lost Opportunity

This should go without saying, but as you focus all of your efforts and attention on one woman, you will inherently ignore the other opportunities in front of you. When I was in high school I was infatuated with a girl named Jessica. I had ONEitis to the extreme. Like a sniper, I played the long game and waited for my chance. I missed my shot. In the meantime, I had passed up every other opportunity that came along. Our homecoming queen even asked me to prom and I turned her down. I can't say objectively that was a mistake. But I can say definitively that I could have been a wiser man in college (especially in light of my relationship with Rachel) if I had not been paralyzed against other relationships by my ONEitis for Jessica.

Conclusion

If you're single, stay single. If you want to get married anyway, don't say I didn't warn you - but at least make sure you're exercising wise decisions and not acting out of an irrational infatuation. Allowing yourself to become infatuated with a woman will preclude you from seeing what God might intend from the relationship, from perceiving the reality of who the woman is, and may cause you to violate your own personal standards in finding a wife.

CURING ONEITIS

So, what do you do if you find yourself with ONEitis for a spouse or girl you want to date?

One - Time Together

Spend more time with her. Some people recommend ghosting her and moving on. This is generally a bad idea. I already mentioned Jessica, my high school ONEitis. Even to this day, I will every now and then find myself in a dream about *what could have been*. Why is that still lingering in my head? Because I don't know what could have been. If I knew what it would be like to be around her, it's all but guaranteed that I either (1) would have had her or (2) would have found a reason not to want her - and that reason exists for every woman on the face of the planet, even the one you'll one day marry, or who you're already married to.

Rachel, on the other hand - I am quite glad I left her. I acted on my crush, got to know her, and realized that she wasn't all my mind had made her out to be. The same thing happened with my wife. I had ONEitis for her for a time, but I was more cautious. I spent time getting to know her first. I realized she had some flaws before we started dating, but I was able to evaluate those flaws in light of the 3 years of context I had with her before we started dating. Even after marriage, the flaws abounded more and more - far beyond what I knew - and any lingering ONEitis died.

But here's the thing: I couldn't truly love my wife until I killed my ONEitis for her. Before then, I was married to an ideology of the woman who shared my bed. Today I am married to the woman herself. It is only when I see *her* and not *my image of her* that I can finally evaluate our relationship properly and learn how to lead rather than be a figure-head.

Two - Mission

I know you're getting sick of me saying this, but it's particularly powerful on this subject. If you have something better to do with your life than chase girls, you won't find yourself obsessed with chasing a girl. It's really that simple. If chasing girls is the most important thing in your life, then you've got bigger issues than this post can address. If that's the case, PM me or one of the mods and we can help you with that.

Three - Shotgun Mentality

When plagued with ONEitis it's easy to adopt a sniper mentality toward the object of your ONEitis. She's not an object for you to fixate on like that; she's a girl just like any other girl. I'm reminded of Notting Hill's famous line when the gorgeous actress tells the bookshop owner, "I'm just a girl standing in front of a boy asking him to love her." She's just a girl. There are lots of girls out there. Yes, spend more time with the object of your ONEitis, but also spend more time with other girls. The goal isn't to shift your ONEitis to another more attainable girl. Rather, by spending time around more women you'll realize that no one woman is this perfect ideal who stands light-years above the rest. If you don't do this, then if you're married and another woman does come along who you're attracted to, you may easily be swayed into believing she's something better than your wife because you won't have the social experience to recognize that every relationship with a woman will come with its own challenges not unlike what you may experience with your wife - 1 Cor. 10:13 and all.

I used to have a friend who told me his ex was "one in a million" and that he'd "never find another girl like her again." Two months and a few dates later and he finally realizes that she wasn't as special as he thought - and neither are the new girls he's been seeing. Everyone is unique, and there are certainly some who are more attuned to our specific tastes and interests than others, but on the whole nobody is perfect the way that ONEitis would have us believe.

From a married man's perspective, I am not encouraging you to go on dates with other women. What I am saying is that if you have no other female friends in your life and your wife is the only woman you have any meaningful contact with, you're going to be in trouble. First, it's socially limiting and can seriously hinder your mission by God. Second, if the only woman you know is your wife, it's easy to idolize her in an unhealthy way. Third, by building relationships with other women, you can gain a better insight into how to relate with your own wife, having observed female nature and developing a right perception of how your wife fits within the context of other women in her and your social circles. Fourth, you will be more resilient to temptation when that inevitable moment comes that another woman does find you attractive and attempts to seduce you, whereas the isolated man is more infatuated when something new comes along.

Four - Satisfaction

The most effective cure for ONEitis is simply to go to God for your satisfaction. I wrote this up more fully in [404](#). Someone with ONEitis is "illegitimatley empty" if he's single or "illegitimatley full" (or possibly even empty, depending on how she treats him) if he's married. Neither option is good for the Christian. In reality, you should be able to be a widower/divorcee who is homeless and starving and still smiling with joy - and if you don't believe that, contemplate again which circle you think you're in. Those who are legitimately full in Christ have no compulsion or longing for the things of this world. We may seek them to the degree that they enhance our influence in this world or our mission for Christ, but they are not a pursuit in and of themselves, as ONEitis would have us believe.

This is my ultimate conclusion and the one I implore you all to adopt: to look to Christ for your satisfaction, not to your wife or the woman you wish you could be with. When your mind is rightly oriented toward God, you will be able to choose with sober judgment a helper who is suitable to meet all of your God-given needs.

7

UPVOTES

Reworking the Sidebar

3 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

In order to save room on the sidebar, we're lumping different sections into one compilation post, which can be edited periodically if we ever need to add new content or replace/remove old content, but which won't take up more sidebar space. A part of the rationale behind this is in support of an initiative to highlight resources this sub has available for single people, as many of our newcomers are in this camp.

Although I strongly believe that singles should read the posts that have married men in mind, as it prepares them in advance for what to do and expect when that time comes and how to start orienting themselves now ... the mods here do acknowledge that there are stark differences in the struggles that single men experience from married men and that this must be addressed in its own unique way.

To that end, if you have any ideas for how we could improve the sidebar or for post topics that you would like to see addressed, please send us a message or reply to this thread so we can keep making this a better, more helpful place for everyone, to God's glory.

The theory and understanding section is designed to help men understand how the world works, specifically in the context of intergender relational dynamics. Some of the content is designed for married men, and others more applicable to singles - but both would do well to learn both sides of the coin.

The goal is to look to the Bible as our source of information. What we find is that many of the secular "RP" concepts are not secular at all - they were found in the Bible first. As such, we look not to secular RP as a starting point for which we find biblical support; rather, we look to the Bible as our starting point and are simply not shocked when the secular world has discovered what the Bible already said was true.

- **101 - Fitness Develops Attraction** - This post highlights a biblical foundation for maintaining our bodies in good shape with God as our motivator.
- **102 - Desire and the Curse** - God is the one who designed men and women, so let's look to God's original design and his compensation for the fall to see how our internal desires manifest and can be understood.
- **103 - Desire Cultivates Intimacy** - Explore the Hebrew concepts of *love* and the Greek *koinonia* bond that Jesus intended those in a oneness relationship to have. See the influence these concepts can have in fostering physical, spiritual, mental, and emotional intimacy with your spouse.
- **104 - When She Feels Sexy** - Many people are more interested in the concepts of sex, marriage, relationships, etc. than they are in the person they married. When a wife thinks "he wants sex" she's unimpressed; but when she thinks "he wants me" gears start turning. How can you communicate your desire for your spouse in a way that most effectively fosters reciprocal attraction?
- **105 - Non-Negotiable Attraction** - Playing the "this for that" game might get someone to fulfill an obligation, but if you actually want to be desired, it takes something more. Let's look at how Jesus draws his bride to himself through the Gospel as a model for how we can draw our bride to us as well.
- **106 - What Doesn't Work** - We've all seen sitcoms. They give a humorous caricature of what real people try to do to get sex from their spouse. Unfortunately these strategies rarely ever work, yet somehow we are emotionally committed to them. Let's reorient ourselves away from begging, arguing, or demanding sex or from covert tactics we employ that make us feel like we deserve sex ... and just learn to be attractive the way we once were when we were single and first alluring our spouse in the first place.
- **107 - Comparison Game and Positive Dread** - Has your wife every compared you to some other guy or herself to other women she knows? Maybe she doesn't do it overtly, but secretly she's wishing you were more like *him* or that she could have the life that Bob gives *his wife*. Why does she do that and how should we respond? How do we win with our wives and girlfriends when we're constantly being compared to other men?
- **108 - Life Path of a Relationship** - This one is a game-changer. It is the first real introduction to how a man's mission can be the only thing that turns a dying marriage into a successful one. Whether you're just starting to get interested in a woman or you've been married for 25 years, this path will probably ring true for where you are and what you can expect down the road.
- **109 - Pursuit, Seduce, Initiate** - How many Christian women demand that men be the ones to pursue them? The distinction between "initiating" a relationship and "pursuing" a woman is a significant one that is addressed countless times in the Bible with the way God interacts with his bride. When we understand the proper orientation of our pursuits, we can more effectively reflect God to the world through our marriage.
- **110 - Stay Plan is the Go Plan** - Some marriages are on the rocks to a degree where divorce seems inevitable. Of

course, biblically there is no "stay plan" or "go plan." There is just "the plan" - the orientation of our lives in the direction God would have us go.

- **111 - Polygamy/Hypergamy** - A biblical and historical look at the foundations of male polygamous desires and how hypergamy ascended as the dominant influence on intergender social dynamics. Ultimately, if a man wants his wife to be a good bride, he must model what it looks like to be Christ's bride first.
- **112 - Alpha Scripture** - God doesn't say things out of the blue just because he feels like it. What he tells us is designed to redeem us into the creation he always intended us to be. Looking at the 10 commandments as an example, what can we glean from God's imperatives to us that informs us about the type of people he wants us to become?
- **113 Part 1 - Introduction to Frame** - Who are you in Christ? How does your identity from God shape the way you orient your relationships or marriage? Do you cede God's intentions for you when your wife is angry? These questions hit at the core of what it means to have "frame" and how your framework for viewing the world and operating in it should shape not only your own life, but the direction your family moves.
- **113 Part 2 - Practicing Frame** - Once you know what your frame is, it's a different matter entirely learning to live it out. If our frame is rooted in God's intentions for our lives, then any time we break our frame or cave to the intentions of anyone else, we sin. How can we strengthen our frame to be the godly leaders we're meant to be?
- **114 - The Learning Cycle** - Have you ever found yourself saying, "I know it in my head, but not in my heart"? This post is about taking new concepts and how we can intentionally ingrain them into our character so that we're no longer faking our way through life with tidbits of knowledge; rather, we are being transformed by what we learn into godliness.
- **115 - Dealing With ONEitis** - Can't get your mind off that one girl? Have you made an idol of your spouse or female attention? This is a grave error that virtually every man struggles with at some point in life. How can you stop the idolatry and re-orient your life toward Christ in a way that doesn't sacrifice your ability to build healthy relationships with women?

The 100 series starts with what we need to know to have our minds and perception of the world oriented rightly. It's not complete, but it is a starting point.

The 200 series, then, seeks to answer the questions: *What do we do about it?* and *How do we live it out?*

- **201 - Healthy Sexual Desire v. Lust** - Men are too often shamed into believing that every hint of attraction they have for a woman is somehow evil and sinful. This simply isn't true. But there is a point where it becomes so. Let's walk through a series of progressive examples to figure out where that line might be.
- **202 - Conquering Addiction** - A personal story from a man who discovered that the only way to conquer addiction - whether from video games, pornography, food, etc. - is through the Gospel of Jesus and nothing else.
- **203 - Lifting and Diet** - Let's face it, most men in America today are fat slobs who need to diet and exercise. Even those in reasonable shape could stand to improve. No matter where you're at, even if you're already a veteran weight lifter, you'll find some useful advice here.
- **204 - Abundance Mentality and Humility** - Many people don't know how to make wise decisions in life. They trade one resource for another trying just to survive. But God designed us to live an abundant life - both in this life and the next. How can we experience this abundance and how does that affect our relationships? How can we remain humble through all of this?
- **205 - How to Lead** - By now you should be familiar with the concept that men are designed to lead. But is the way you're trying to do that actually effective with the people who you intend to follow? This post addresses different leadership styles in the hope that if one method isn't working, another will.
- **206 - Brace Yourself for Battle** - Conflict in a relationship is inevitable. How do you handle it in a way consistent with biblical principles? How can we communicate love while leading in the midst of relational discord?
- **207 - Perseverance, Sin, and Fitness Tests** - Sin wants to control us. Women's curse in Genesis 3 is that they want to control us too. The stories of Odysseus and Jason speak volumes about how we should handle the temptation to cave, and the lives of David and Solomon give a clear picture of what this looks like.
- **208 - Leadership Part 2** - What was Jesus' specific method for leading his prospective bride while he was on the earth? What can we learn from his method about leading the women we are in relationships with?
- **209 - Developing Your Mission** - Having a mission is perhaps the most important and foundational aspect of being a godly man. This post gives a practical tool for those who haven't yet figured out how to create a clear mission statement for themselves and their family.
- **210 - Mission Matters. Nothing Else.** - The church likes to use the "Mission, Master, Mate" trilogy as the three most important Ms in a man's life. But I hold that the Mission is the most important of these and that the other two are actually defined by our mission. This post explores how having a mission is the key to your relationship with God and your girl, and also how a strong commitment to one's mission inherently orients one toward living out virtually every red pill concept in existence.
- **211 - An Anatomy of Butthurt** - Too many men misunderstand what it means to be "stoic" or to have a "strong frame" and end up making themselves look like idiots in the process. When your wife rejects your advances, how should you respond?

It's one thing to understand how men and women function as products of God's creation and the fall (100s) and what we should do about it - how men should lead, avoid temptation, etc. (200s).

But if we are to ask women to follow us, we had better be men worth following. 1 Cor. 11:1-3 makes it clear that we should be following after Christ to set the example for how others - especially the women we love - are to follow us. To that end, the 300 Series is entirely about how we can be godly men and live out the mission Christ gave us.

- **301 - The 7 Basics** - Every believer needs to start somewhere. Whether you're new or have been a believer for decades, the best way to excel is to master the basics. This post outlines what they are and how to utilize them.
- **302 - Bible Study** - It's easy to pass the responsibility for learning Scripture onto a pastor or small group leader. After all, they're used to spoon feeding their followers. But if you want to lead others, you'll need to know how to do it for yourself first.
- **303 - Fellowship** - This is arguably the most important of the 7 Basics, and it's also the one that gets overlooked the most. People assume they are great at "fellowship" because they have a few Christian friends they hang out with a lot, but they fail to understand the real depth of relationship Christ intended or the ways that fellowship can be over-applied to the degree of sinfully neglecting other things God has called us to.
- **304 - Evangelism** - For as much as men love physical reproduction, it's frustrating how little we seem to care for spiritual reproduction with our spiritual spouse. Paul said in Philippians 1 that he'd rather be dead and with Christ, but that God was keeping him here for a reason: helping others journey toward Christ. If we're not doing that, there's no real point in our being alive. So, how do we do witness to others? This post gives a very systematic approach for those who haven't developed a clear plan for sharing their faith yet.
- **305 - Quiet Times** - Everyone knows we should spend daily time with God. Unfortunately, this usually ends up feeling like a chore. Why is that? How can we have a right perception of our time with God that rejuvenates us instead of draining us?
- **306 - Scripture Memory** - I'm amazed at how little the church endorses and teaches this fundamental discipline. If God's Word is what sustains us, we'd better know it inside and out. Memorization and meditation are the way we do that best.
- **307 - Assurance of Salvation** - One of the most often-asked questions in Christianity is, "How do I know if I'm actually saved?" Jesus gave us a clear test to filter the faithful from the frauds: "By their fruit you will recognize them." What does this mean and how can we find the assurance we need?
- **308 - Prayer** - Everyone understands the value of communication in intergender relational dynamics, but what about the spiritual dynamic in our relationship with God? How can we communicate with him effectively? What's the point of prayer in the first place?
- **309 - The Discipleship Process** - You've heard me say it a million times by now: God called us all to be disciple-makers. Once we're spiritually mature enough to follow God on our own, how can we start leading others to do the same? And how can we teach others to do the same for even more *others*?

To recap: the 100s were about understanding how God's creations function in light of original design and our fallen world. The 200s explain how we can take practical steps to live as God intended in the context of our relationships with others. The 300s are about how we can be godly men worth following.

The 400s now focus on healing the internal brokenness that many men suffer from. Whether it's depression, anger, addiction, loneliness, past trauma, or any other recurring struggle, the Gospel has an answer.

- **401 - The Gospel** - The Gospel is the foundation of all things. It is the core of God's plan from the beginning to the end, and it is also what defines us in our inner-most being. We'd better understand what it is first.
- **402 - The Impact of the Cross** - There are many theories on how the Gospel actually functions to save us and reconcile us to God. What are these theories and how do they affect our perception of the world and our internal state of being through daily life and struggles?
- **403 - The Lens Part 1: The Hopeless Cycle** - All men start in a cycle of hopelessness apart from Christ. There are measures we can do to understand our problems, but can we ever really escape them? This post explores the fallacy in traditional thinking about internal problem-solving.
- **404 - The Lens Part 2: The Empty-Full Dynamic** - As believers in Christ we have access to a source of eternal abundance. Do we experience that? Or do we look for our satisfaction in other things? This post explores the patterns that both Christians and non-Christians alike follow which ultimately interfere with our ability to find satisfaction from the only person who can truly and eternally give it: God.
- **405 - The Lens Part 3: The Gospel is the Answer** - Once we determine not to look to the wrong places for our satisfaction, how can we be legitimately full in Christ? When we reflect on the Gospel and the way it speaks to the very specific issues in our lives, as opposed to the general way the Church often views the Gospel, we see that God intended a power behind the cross that most people in the church never come to realize. That power is what can make us whole, healing all of our brokenness and bringing light to our darkest places.
- **406 - You are "not guilty" so stop feeling guilty** - This post is for men who feel a perpetual sense of guilt, inadequacy, or failure because of their sin. Sin is certainly a grave danger and threat to biblical masculinity. But if you have been freed from sin, why live in sin's frame any longer? Don't define yourself by your sinfulness, but by your godliness.

Social Influence and Defying Context

3 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

This originated as my first and only post on TRP (also posted on MRP) a few months ago, which was fairly well received, but for some reason I never actually posted it here. Anyway, given the request for content relevant for single guys, here's another one for you to dive into. It does talk about marriage issues too, but the overall concept is more useful for singles looking to meet new people. ([Original Post for Reference/Comments Section](#))

In the last week alone I've had 4 or 5 guys approach me with issues where the root of their problem is their inability to defy context. Consider:

- "I really like this girl, but I can't come up with a good reason to start a conversation."
- "I really think a boundary needs to be set with my wife, but the issue is in the past, so I need to wait until it comes up again to talk about it."
- "I want to do something, but it would be out of character and people might think I'm weird."
- "I really do/don't want to do this, but it would be socially awkward or unacceptable for me to do/not do it."

These (and more) are signs of a person who is controlled by social constructs.

Social Influence Matters

Given the frequency with which I see this as an issue on RPChristians, I'm going to have to dive into this some more over there too, but social influence and the size of your social circle matters.

When I start mentoring guys one of the first things I tell them is that if they want to earn influence with people, they must advance their social network - and I'm talking in the real world, not on reddit or facebook. Social networking is how I make most of my money. It's how I advance my mission. It's how I increase my sphere of influence. It's how I dread my wife. Etc.

A guy once told me, "I'd like to meet more girls, but I'm just not good at initiating conversations. How can I have more girls in my social circle?" The answer seems too obvious: *Increase your social circle*. He replies, "But I'm not good at meeting new people?" I point to a couple sitting at the table next to us and said, *There you are - new people. Go introduce yourself*. He couldn't do it (at least not back then). "I can't, he says." *Why not?* "Because it would be weird."

What he meant was: "There's no context for me to talk to them."

The Non-Importance of Context

I have spent most of my life practicing the art of defying social norms when it would advantage me to do so. Don't get me wrong: **defying social norms absolutely can be disadvantageous to you in many circumstances**. But complying with social norms against your own interests can be equally disadvantageous. Why do we do it? Because it's "safe." Screw safe. Women don't want safe. Safe is not sexy.

Consider many of the Blue Pill PUA strategies. A lot of them revolve around *creating context* or leveraging an existing *context*. Why? Because they're too scared to break context. Examples: (1) Spill something small on her and try to clean it up, then start a conversation. (2) Bump into her, apologize, and start a conversation. (3) Take

something innocuous going on in the room and use it as a context to start a conversation. The list goes on.

This happens in blue pill marriages all the time too. Examples: (1) Guy takes wife out on a date to create a context for sex afterward. (2) Guy puts on a racy movie/TV show or encourages his wife to read the Twilight/50 Shades books to create a context for his wife to get a little horny. (3) Guy starts massaging his wife's shoulders while they talk on the couch after dinner, hoping to transition that into sex. The list goes on.

Yes, context can be utilized for your advantage. But the one who has no qualms with breaking social niceties to get what he wants - that is an attractive man, not only to his wife and other women, but to prospective employers, reporters, social media junkies, and passive follower types all across the world.

What to Do?

One of the things I've recently started assigning guys to do: *Go start a 60+ second conversation with someone you've never met before and without context.*

One guy came back saying, "I had a few dates with girls I met online, and those conversations were over 60 seconds each," so he thought he'd done well. But that defeated the point of the exercise. He had context for the conversation. She expected him to talk to her on the date. I sent him back out to try again. The point wasn't for him to have conversations - it was to stretch him past his comfort zone. I wanted him learning to be comfortable engaging with people in new ways, whether it made sense to do so or not.

In my younger days this type of task was scary. In college and law school I started mastering it as an art. Today, I have no-context conversations with people almost every single day.

- In the elevator? *How's it going?*
- At the grocery store? *You're definitely going to want to pick up a box of these.*
- Walking down the street? *Nice day. Heading anywhere interesting?*

Yeah, people think I'm weird sometimes. More often they're thinking, "That was really cool that someone I don't know wanted to talk to me." Initiating without context often makes people feel good about themselves - especially if you employ charm in the midst of your context-defying conversations.

But even beyond making them feel good about themselves, it makes them feel good about you. They think, "Most people just stick to themselves, but that guy is actually interested in talking to people. He just does what he wants. I wish I could be like that." The phrase "I wish I could be like that" is a stone's throw away from, "I'll buy whatever he's selling." If I'm selling sex, she's buying.

After you've been doing this a while, you'll be surprised how many people you end up recognizing around town. I live in a suburb of 35,000 people. No matter what side of town I'm on, if I walk into a grocery store there's about a 75% chance I'll run into someone who waves to me because they remember me from a past conversation, and maybe 50/50 that one of these people re-initiates a new conversation [and this is not counting the people who no-context initiate with me]. *THEY* are the ones initiating now. Why? Because they had a positive experience talking to me, even though the only other times I've talked to them have been at a restaurant or in a store at the mall or whatever. I once overheard one such acquaintance asking another, "Oh, how do you know him?" with the answer, "I don't really know, I just see him around a lot and we chat."

I suppose if I wanted to, I could really leverage this for some money-making opportunities. For now, it's enough that most places we go, my wife sees that people know me - and she wonders how. I'm not going to the movies with these people. I'm not going to meals. I'm not calling them on the phone. I'll let her hamster spin on that one.

What's Holding You Back?

Are you living the life you want? If not, what's stopping you? You ever just walk up to your wife and grab her crotch? "No! I could never do that. I have to kino her first. Then I've got to get her into bed. Then, once it's clear we're going to have sex, that's when I have **context** to grab her crotch." Screw context. If you want to do it, do it. Is it always going to be wise? Probably not. Oh well. Figure out discretion as you go.

Did she cross a boundary in a restaurant? You going to do something about it? "Not yet. We're in public. Strangers might see how I'm talking to her - that's a double-whammy. It's poor social etiquette to have a confrontation in public, and I can't let anyone know that I set boundaries on my wife's behavior." So, you decide to wait until you're home to bring it up, but the conversation has long since moved on and you think, "Well, things are going well now, so there's really no **context** to bring it up and it might spoil the mood, so I'll just let this one slide." Then you fester some resentment. If it's important to you, just bring it up. Screw social norms. Let the people at the table next to you gawk at the fact that you're not ashamed.

In fact, social norms are the constructs your wife utilizes to keep you in control. They're how she creates her expectations for the relationship. They're also what establishes a sense of monotony in many dead bedrooms because they make you predictable. If you learn to defy social norms, she will never know what to expect from you. That's exciting. That's sexy. That's what lets her know you're worth being with - because you'll do what others won't, which makes you far more suitable as a protector and provider. It simultaneously adds healthy instability and reliability in the relationship. Screw context, screw your wife.

So, we seem to have a lot of newcomers as of late and it makes sense to me that we give an overview of some of the content so you know what to expect and look for when reading some of the relevant information.

To my knowledge, there is no solid Christian "red pill" book on the market yet. Most of the sidebar posts are meant to be a short-term solution to rectify that problem, helping men get biblical advice that stands out from the mountains of unscriptural and often downright sinful content you'll see in the Christian publishing industry.

In the meantime, until more published content is available, it seems necessary to borrow resources from some of the secular men who have spent significant time observing the order of God's creation and commenting on it. Obviously they are mistaken as to the source of how things came to be this way, which also leads to some inappropriate and sinful behavioral prescriptions (ex. suggesting sex before marriage, cheating on one's wife, etc.), but these can be redeemed by appropriately understanding Scripture and maintaining boundaries in not letting praxeological content affect our theology or application thereof.

To that end, this post will go over why I have included some of the secular books on the sidebar and the most relevant content from those books, in an irrationally brief way (which is my way of saying: you still need to read the books!).

NMMNG

The primary purpose of this book is to give an "awakening" of sorts to men who have been indoctrinated into blue pill ideologies of pedestalizing women and being controlled by them. Many men put themselves in a box of believing that they must interact with their wives a certain way in order to receive the love, validation, and sexual enthusiasm that they desire. This self-created prison places a framework in our minds from which it is very difficult to break out.

The author spends a lot of time defining the traits of these "nice guys" and how they develop. He then explains why many of these men feel trapped and how they create their own prisons. "Nice guys" believe that the only way they can receive the love and validation they desire in life is if they place others' needs above their own and hide all of their flaws. This creates "covert contracts," which are when a man expects that his behaviors should yield certain results with his wife - sexual favors, respect, admiration, etc. - but he fails to communicate this expectation to his wife. He is often internally resentful when she doesn't live up to his unspoken expectation, causing further degradation to the relationship. The author uses numerous examples of Christian men and women throughout the book as the majority of his examples. Why? Because the church is notorious for producing "nice guys."

Biblically, we know that God created men to lead and women to help. However, many Christian men mistakenly emphasize the need to be a "servant" over their role as a leader, creating a mistaken understanding of "servant leadership." As such, they believe that they must make their own desires subservient to their wife's. It is true that a man should serve his wife, but the way Jesus modeled this was always in the context of pursuing his own purpose and mission and calling others to join him. Jesus did not give up his life to help his followers become better fishermen, tax collectors, etc. His service was always in the context of the advancement of his own purposes, creating a beautiful balance between intentionality and humility.

For many men, the thought of saying "no" to your wife or prioritizing your own direction for the family over her wants and desires is incomprehensible and terrifying to most men. It is only when a man escapes his self-imposed prison and begins understanding that God placed him in charge for a reason that we can have the fulfilling marriages God intended. It is only then that your service to your wife can be genuine and authentic, rather than a means of covert manipulation. Where most men are merely figureheads for their wife's puppetry, God intended us run a household from a place of strength, wisdom, discernment, and ability to act. Our wives are valuable advisers

whose opinions should not be taken lightly; but they should also not be given more weight than they deserve.

WISNIFG

Bill of Rights

This book starts with a person's "Bill of Assertive Rights." They are as follows:

- 1) You have the right to judge your own behavior, thoughts, and emotions, and to take the responsibility for their initiation and consequences upon yourself.

Many men look to their wives for validation. When they do this, they let their wife be the judge over them. Giving her this power makes a man subservient to his wife, tailoring his actions to seek her approval. In reality, if he is the leader and she is his helper, she should be the one seeking validation from him, just as we seek validation from Christ, just as Christ sought validation from God.

Too many men try to pass off responsibility for their home to their wives. When things go wrong, they say, "I knew better, but it's what my wife wanted, so I went with it." Or when a decision must be made they look to her to make the call, thereby abdicating responsibility by saying, "I was just trying to make my wife happy in the situation." In reality, we must become our own judges. I cannot emphasize this enough.

- 2) You have the right to offer no reasons or excuses for justifying your behavior.

No DEERING (Defend, Explain, Excuse, Rationalize). Doing this once again makes someone else a judge over you by demonstrating that their judgment of you has power over your emotional state and self of worth and value.

- 3) You have the right to judge if you are responsible for finding solutions to other people's problems.

Sometimes you are, sometimes you're not. Don't let someone else con you into thinking you're responsible for their mess. If my wife doesn't like x, y, and z about the house and I'm fine with all of those things, it's up to me to decide: (1) if I'm going to do x, y, and z myself, (2) if I'm going to make my wife take responsibility for resolving her own interest in x, y, and z, given that it's not a problem I'm interested in, or (3) if I really don't want x, y and z to change, I'm going to put my foot down and make sure they stay exactly the way they are.

- 4) You have the right to change your mind.

Too many men feel trapped when their wives say, "You told me last week that ..." This isn't a trap. "I changed my mind" is a perfectly acceptable reply.

- 5) You have the right to make mistakes - and be responsible for them.

Again, no need to explain the problem or prove to her that you'll do better next time. You screwed up. Admit it, accept the consequences, address the issue, and move on.

- 6) You have the right to say, "I don't know."

Again, don't feel pressured to give a certain reply.

- 7) You have the right to be independent of the goodwill of others before coping with them.

That is, you do not need other people to like you. It's okay if your neighbor thinks you're a jerk. That's his business deciding what he thinks of you. You should not bend your will to impress him unless you have a reason for doing

so. Wanting to share the Gospel with him, for example, might be a great reason. If that's your motive, then by all means try to earn his respect. But don't put all your eggs in one basket. Don't orient your life around serving your neighbor when all that effort may never result in fruit for God's Kingdom.

To put it another way, just as the pre-marriage process should be one of a "shotgun mentality" and not a "sniper mentality," so also are we to scatter seed and not be seed snipers for God's Kingdom.

8) You have the right to be illogical in making decisions.

We're not robots. My wife's favorite phrase lately has been, "I don't know why I want to do things this way. I know it's not logical. But it's what I'm feeling. Can you respect that?" She figured that out before I did - and now it's a powerful tool to wield in return and gives an excellent basis for avoiding DEERING when I make a decision that I know she won't understand - even if it is a logical one in the first place. But let's be honest, at least 90% of what we do is not the "logical" best thing we could be doing at any given time.

9) You have the right to say, "I don't understand."

Simple enough.

10) You have the right to say, "I don't care."

"But we should always care about everything that our wife thinks is important, right?" Wrong. My wife likes to get on me for not cutting grapes in half for my 6.5 year old son. "Don't you care if he chokes on it and dies?" *No, honey. The risk is so low that I don't care to worry about those odds.*

He concludes: "You have the right to say no without feeling guilty."

Techniques

As important as the above are, the remainder of the book is even better: addressing techniques for asserting these rights. They are as follows:

- **Broken Record:** Just repeat what you want whenever the issue arises, offering no explanation. When they try to bring up another argument you simply say, "Thanks for telling me. I still want ..."
- **Fogging:** Agreeing with someone else's perception rather than arguing with it. This leaves them with nothing to argue against. If they say, "You're a liar!" you simply reply, *I understand that's how you feel*. You don't have to admit anything, you just acknowledge their perception, even if the conclusion itself is invalid. This often diffuses aggressive behavior by letting the other person know that you understand and accept their position at face value, even if you disagree with the conclusion.
- **Negative Inquiry:** This is my favorite tactic and, in my view, the most powerful when mastered appropriately. In short, you ask questions to explore why the other person has the perception they do. So, if your wife is yelling at you for spending time with your friends instead of helping her with the kids at home, instead of defending yourself you simply ask, "What is *wrong* or *morally objectionable* about spending time with my friends?" With every answer she gives, you ask another similar question until one of three things happens: (1) She realizes that her complaint is really not a moral issue at all; it's an issue of personal preference and she just didn't get her way; (2) She realizes that you didn't do anything wrong and drops the issue; or (3) After enough questioning, she opens up about a deeper issue at the core of her frustrations and acknowledges that her emotional reaction has nothing to do with the actual issue at hand, but with some other insecurity or vulnerability, which can then be addressed appropriately, often as a comfort test.
- **Negative Assertion:** Acknowledging your behaviors that she views negatively. This essentially nips her criticism in the bud by letting her know up-front that you already understand your behaviors and have evaluated

them. The implication (which you should not say directly, unless it's calm and composed) is that you don't need her to critique your poor choices and actions any further because you have already done so.

- **Workable Compromise:** Straight-forward: offer a solution that meets your goals while still addressing her concerns.
- **Self Disclosure:** Revealing additional information that she may not know about, which might affect the flow of the conversation. This is easy to confuse with DEERing, but can be done appropriately when you're **issuing a judgment, rather than defending yourself before her as your judge.**

All of the things in this book are appropriate and tactics we see employed in Scripture. The Bible does not present itself as a manual for conflict-resolution, but it does include principles for behaving in conflict and examples for what that looks like, all of which are consistent and aligned with the way these techniques can be practiced. As such, although they don't come from the Bible, they can still be valuable, just like knowing basic math doesn't come from the Bible, but is still valuable in daily life.

MMSLP

There is a lot that can be said for this book. Athol Kay is not a Christian, but there were many points where he was speaking so aligned with biblical principles that I found myself googling if he was - because I thought the only way someone could reach some of his conclusions is if they had read the Bible first.

The beginning of the book starts with an evolutionary perspective on alpha and beta qualities. Whether you're an evolutionary creationist or not, there's still some interest in this bit, but mostly in trying to understand what he defines as "alpha" and "beta" qualities and the balance that he suggests is necessary. To be clear, when he says "beta," he means specific behaviors and not the motivations behind those behaviors, which can get confusing when the manosphere defines "alpha/beta" by the internal motivators of a man rather than the actions themselves. Perhaps a better way to put it would be that Athol Kay is talking about strength-oriented behaviors and service-oriented behaviors. So, a man who gives his wife \$300 to go shopping at the mall is doing a service-oriented thing that Athol calls "beta," but this can also be done from a very alpha internal state by ordinary definitions of those words.

With an appropriate balance of alpha/beta, Athol then goes into developing a MAP (Male Action Plan), which is your personal road to improving yourself and your marriage/sex-life. This involves ways of ramping up the strength-oriented behaviors, like lifting weights, enhancing social status, developing confidence, etc.; and to the degree that anyone might actually be weak at beta qualities, how to address those as well.

After this he moves on to talking about certain strategies and techniques for maintaining sexual interest by displaying confidence and initiative with your wife. For example, he discusses "the shower move," where his wife is taking a shower, then he steps in naked, fumbles around with the soap and eventually butts her out, then initiates sex. It's a display of dominance with a context of already having your clothes off, among other things.

Lastly, he goes into the topic of divorce and what to do when a marriage simply can't be salvaged. Needless to say, he doesn't come from a biblical perspective, but some of his advice is still useful for those for whom divorce is inevitable anyway.

/u/BLUEPILLPROFESSOR'S PODCAST/BOOK

I'm not going to give much of a summary here because the entire podcast is, itself, a summary. He goes through all of the resources above as well as the collective discoveries of countless men in the manosphere and compiles a very short, concise, and easily-accessible means of ingesting the information that you need to know to set your marriage straight.

Although BluePillProfessor is a Christian, we must remember that he's writing for a secular audience, which adjusts how he communicates. That said, you'll probably find less issues with his podcast series than you will with the above books.

I always recommend reading the above books in that order and listening to BPP's podcast as you have time around the house or at the gym. I put MMSLP last, even though it is perhaps the most important of all of them. I have intentionally left that section more general to give you all a greater incentive to actually go through the book for yourself.

In all, even though these are distinctly secular books, they are still of great value and should be read by all men who have any interest in getting married or improving their sex-life in marriage. Just make sure that you're filtering what you read through Scripture. Again, the Bible may not be a manual for how to improve your sex life, so we have to turn to outside sources for that.

From there, the prime distinction between Christian and secular sources is that the secular sources will include recommendations that the Christian sources may have already filtered as being unbiblical. It does not mean that everything from the secular sources is somehow moot or irrelevant, as Christians and secular authors actually agree on a lot more pragmatic things than we disagree, despite the fact that the disagreements are what get publicized in the media, and therefore seem more prominent.

Here's another one for the single guys out there. How can you tell if she's interested?

MENTAL FRAMEWORK

The first thing I want to say is that you shouldn't care whether she's interested. You should be the one to decide if she's interested in you or not. I know it sounds weird and is not technically accurate, but it's a lot closer to the truth than the inverse - that you're at her whims.

If she's interested in you or not is a lot decided by whether or not you think she's interested in you. If you assume she's not interested in you, I guarantee that even if she is interested in you, she'll start questioning that interest when she sees your insecurity (an exception to be made for low-value women who are desperate).

More to the point: if you assume she's interested in you, even if she's not interested, your confidence in that assumption makes her interested. It might not be enough interest to get you a date, but at least you're starting to register on her radar at all.

So, if you're asking whether or not someone is interested or if something is an IOI, this shows a fundamental breakdown in your mental framework. The answer is always: "Yes, she's interested in me," followed by, "So, what am I going to do about it?" When you get a hard no, that's when you can feel free to move on. Of course, if you're single and not in a committed relationship you should always be moving on, not stopping to wait for someone who may or may not give you a hard no.

This is where I've written in the past about "[Christian plate spinning](#)" and the [shotgun/sniper mentalities](#). Girls - even devout Christian ones - build relationships with many guys who they hope will ask them out. Likewise, it's your prerogative and imperative, if you're a marriage-seeker, to build relationships with many women to figure out who you might want to ask out and possibly commit to. It's not wrong when girls do it. It's not wrong when guys do it. It's just being wise instead of putting all your eggs in one basket.

With that framework in mind, your goal should simply be to initiate and approach *as if she's just been waiting over there, longing for you to say hi*. If you have that level of confidence, you can garner interest that wasn't objectively there before. At best, you meet someone new who could be your future spouse. At worst, she says no and you move on. I suppose it could get worse if you have a garbage frame, letting her "no" be a condemnation over you and your sense of self-worth, but that's for you to figure out. Go read the [400-series](#) to nip that issue in the bud before it even starts - your satisfaction comes from Christ, not from getting a date with a pretty girl. Whether she says yes or no, your excitement meter should remain relatively stable. The more variance you see in your emotional state from a girl's response to your initiation, the more power she has over you in the relationship, the harder it will be for you to feel like a leader over her because you'll want to supplicate to her to keep her bumping that meter higher and higher for you, which isn't sustainable in the long-run.

Q & A

Okay R-C, that's great, but it doesn't help us figure out whether she's actually interested.

That's what many of you are thinking, I'm sure. My point is that it shouldn't matter if she's actually interested or not. You initiate with her as often and whichever way you feel like it until you don't feel like it anymore.

A hard no should make you not feel like it anymore because you won't get any return on your investment in the relationship. But if it's a soft no, you have to figure out for yourself when the odds of things working out will finally be outweighed by the time and effort your putting in. If all you're doing is texting once every couple weeks, that's

pretty low effort, but it might be worth it long-term. But if she works at Starbucks and you're going in there to buy a coffee everyday just to say hi and strike up a conversation, that's a lot of time and money you're investing for an indeterminate probability.

Cool, but you're still dodging the question. How can I evaluate the "probability" of her giving me a positive response down the road?

My gut reaction is simply to say: if she's not showing interest up-front, move on and don't look back. Your probability is pretty low - odds that I wouldn't bet on. But I do know that sometimes legitimate things can come up that don't necessarily mean "disinterest" or that sometimes good relationships need to be cultivated from very little - a seed, if you will - before they can blossom into something beautiful, just as is true for those God intends to make part of his bride. So ...

1. **Touching.** If she touches you at all, she's probably interested. Physical contact is a clear violation of personal space in most contexts. Nevertheless, people will violate your personal space as a means of showing you that they're okay with you violating their personal space. That's a clear sign of interest.
2. **Verbal Affirmation.** If she directly says she's interested, she's interested. This is one of the few times where you can ignore "trust what she does, not what she says." This, of course, does not apply to married men, where their wives have an internal sense of obligation to say they are interested in and love their husbands when, in fact, they do not. When a woman does not have this obligation, but communicates it anyway, that's often reliable, despite the fact that they could be intentionally deceptive just to screw with you, which they can do with their actions too (in high school I had a girl do that to me, so I do admit it's a real thing).
3. **No Context Initiation.** If she initiates a no-context conversation with you, this is a good sign she's interested. Girls don't start random conversations with creepy guys. If she does start one with you, you've just graduated to "he's not a creep" status. To be clear, a "context conversation" is when there is some socially normative basis for initiating with someone - like a food worker chatting with you while you order, or a girl asking you if you're done with a set of weights that she wants to use. As such "no context" is when no normal person would initiate with you unless they had an internal desire to want to talk to you independent of everything else going around. Some people will create a context to initiate with you, like bumping into you "by accident" or pretending to notice something innocuous and relevant, but which didn't really need to be mentioned, like how warm a pair of boots might look on a cold winter day. "Created context" is the same as "no context."
4. **Availability.** People don't make time for things they don't want to do. They do make time for things they're interested in. A friend recently asked a girl out to coffee and she said something like, "Okay, but I want to be clear up-front that I'm only interested in being friends." He went anyway. She made time for him. This means she had *some interest* in getting coffee with him. What was that interest? It was either (1) preserving her own self-image as being a nice girl who is friendly even toward men she isn't interested in; or (2) she is interested in him, but wants to deflate any of his expectations to give herself more control over the future of the relationship in the event she changes her mind during the meet-up. He stressed about which one it was. But, actuality aside, this is a good *indicator* that she's open-minded about his interest in her. Remember that *indicators* are not absolute proof; they're simply factors we consider when trying to assess what may or may not be true. If she makes herself available once, this might not indicate a lot. If she makes herself available again, that adds a lot of strength to the belief that she's interested.
5. **Mannerisms.** This is where "look what she does, not what she says" comes back. If she's smiling a lot, playing with her hair, primping herself when she thinks you're not looking, using a flirty tone of voice, etc. - those are all good signs. I put this last on the list, though, because guys often misread these "signs," thinking she's doing one of these things when she isn't. Why might guys misread these signs? Because of **selective perception**.

Woah, Red, you're telling me that if she taps my shoulder to ask me to move out of the way, that means she has the hots for me?

No. Obviously you have to use some common sense here. Basic social niceties are not considered an entry into one's own personal space. We assume that on a crowded subway you'll be bumping into people or that if you're in someone's way, they might tap you and ask you to move. Nobody feels like their space has been entered when that happens. But when someone stands unusually close to you during a conversation, or touches your hand or arm, that's somewhat unusual and often takes a bit of courage to do that. I know that some people are touchy-feely people in general ... but again, it's still an *indicator* - and only one of many.

Do any girls actually verbally admit that they're interested in you?

Yes. I've had situations where I wasn't even trying to flirt with someone and they communicated verbal interest. For example, I was at a wedding in April. While standing next to my wife (during one of these incidents I was even holding hands with her), I was approached by two different girls. The first one said, "You look really good in that suit. You wanna dance?" The second got up close and spoke in my ear, "You want to get out of here and take a walk around the lake?"

So yes, if she's interested in you, she very well might tell you. She may not either, but it does happen - and it should not stop even when you get married, although your effort in seeking these types of responses should change drastically.

Isn't initiating the man's job? Are you saying I should wait for girls to initiate with me?

No. I'm simply saying that if she does initiate with you without context, she might be interested in you. You should still be initiating separately. Even more so, if you initiate once and she initiates after that as a follow-up, even though there's now a context due to your first contact, this is another very strong indicator that she's interested. People don't follow-up with people that they don't care about or who they have no interest in seeing again.

What if I'm getting the impression she's interested, but she's just really busy and isn't available on the days I try to get together?

Some people are advance planners and don't work well on spontaneity. You have to account for this. If you're stopping in the coffee shop and asking her to hang out when she gets off, she might legitimately have plans. Or maybe she's interested, but doesn't want to get together without having the time to get primed for the date. If this happens 3 or 4 times in a row, it might be a bad sign; but it could also just be a sign that she needs to plan things in advance.

Of course, she also might just be using a "busy schedule" to avoid actually having to spend time with you. The way you test this is to ask her about something 3-4 weeks out and not on a holiday. Short of vacations, most single people don't schedule things that far in advance - or if they do, it's usually flexible. Another way is to offer an alternative time a few times. If she wants to hang out with you, she'll suggest another day.

What you shouldn't do is ask her to give you a day. It sounds RP because you're making her pursue you. But she might give you a day just because she feels pressured to do so, and then you're still in the dark. Try a few weeks out and give a few options and if she responds to any of your dates or with a different suggestion of her own, she's interested.

Okay, but what if she gives me a day, but she just looks kind of awkward and not into it? Should I even bother?

Yes, you should bother. Some girls don't know how to feel. It's your job to ease their anxieties about the approach

into something comfortable. For girls who are used to getting asked out or who know they're hot, this is somewhat natural. But for many Christian girls it's not. They're shy and not used to putting themselves in social situations where they get approached like this. Accept that it's awkward for her, go on the date, and gauge how she is after you've had time to smooth things over with your conversation skills.

What if she doesn't text me after the date and it's been a week already?

So what? Do what you want to do. You want to ask her out again? Do it. If you don't, don't. The key is that you're doing what you want to do, inviting her along as often as you feel like inviting her along, and moving on when she stops responding to your initiation. Your job isn't to pursue her; it's to initiate with her and invite her to pursue you, just like Jesus did when he said, "I'm here to fish for men. Come with me and I'll make you a fisher of men too." He was doing his thing, asking others to come along, and moving on from place to place whether those people joined him or not.

Wait, when you say "doing what you want to do, inviting her along" - does that mean I shouldn't be trying to schedule special dates?

If you're trying to impress her with your date, you're going to fail. Sure, it might work, but you're still setting a bad precedent for the relationship: that it's all about impressing her. For my first date with my wife, I simply said, "I'm going to grab some food. Want to come?" and we went to the local Skyline Chili - a pseudo-fast-food place that's delicious. I'd asked her this before and she didn't come. This time she did. Regardless of whether she came or not, I went anyway.

Other times I said, "I feel like going on a walk. Want to join me?" and she did. Or, "I'm going to church. You in?" and she'd say yes. Or, "I'm discipling a guy and need some time to process how I can lead him. Want to help me talk through it?" and she would. Or, "I'm about to have a quiet time/pray/fellowship with other Christians/etc. Want to join me?" and she would. Nowadays I say, "I feel like renting a movie and microwaving some popcorn. You in?" or "I want to take the kids to the pool. You coming?" or whatever ... and sometimes she joins, sometimes she doesn't. Either way, I'm moving. I'm doing things. I'm living my life. I'm inviting her to be a part of my life. I'm leading.

Between these times - from when we got married and for about 7 years after that - I did something totally different. I said, "What do you want to do?" "Where would you like to go eat?" "What movie would you like to see?" Even when I made plans, it was, "I bet she would love doing this!" and I'd craft the "perfect date" week after week. That got me nothing except a wife who showed contempt against me.

As I often say, you've got to be a man on a mission. Your mission is what's going to create the foundation and context for your relationship. That mission should keep you on the move. The direction you're moving should be the direction you're inviting her to join you in moving. I kid you not, sometimes it's even as simple as going to the grocery store. "I'm out of bananas. Want to go shopping with me?" [Emphasize the first A in banana instead of the second and do this habitually - recurring obvious mispronunciation of words is a fun little game that for some reason many women find endearing as a humorous quirk - especially when they know you're doing it on purpose.]

If you're moving and she's joining, that's the best IOI. How much effort you put into inviting her to join you can be assessed by contemplating all of the above.

10

UPVOTES

NEW RULE - READ BEFORE POSTING

10 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

Given the very large influx of people we've had over the last month (from 850 to over 1,250), it's worth drawing attention to our rules, which are located on the sidebar. I know the new redesign of reddit is not sidebar-friendly and often cuts things off or just doesn't show it at all. This is a frustration to us all. Nevertheless, that's the only way I know of posting community-wide standards.

To that end, we have just added a new standard to ensure that the quality of posts and discussion remains high and each new post isn't flooded with (1) requests for more information or (2) bad advice because it's predicated on false assumptions about how far along in his MAP each poster may be. Here it is:

ALL posts asking for dating/marriage help must include the following:

- Stats: body fat, height, weight, lifts, etc.
- Reading: Which sidebar content you've read (RPC and/or MRP)
- Finances: Current job and income quality, future prospects, debt issues
- Spiritual: How mature you are, how often you pray, have quiet times, share your faith, memorize Scripture, etc.

If you do not follow this rule, your post will be removed with a request from one of the mods that you edit it to include this information before we will re-approve it. If you have already given the information in a past post, you're free to link to your past post unless there have been updates worth noting (and if your post is over 2 months old, I seriously hope there are!). Of course, exceptions may apply if the above information is totally irrelevant to the question being asked, such as asking about Scriptural interpretation or how hypergamy works or some other theory-based content that is unrelated to specific dating/marriage help.

The reason we need this information is because it is impossible to give an accurate answer without it. If you're asking why your wife blew her lid when you didn't take out the trash and how to handle it if that happens again ... if you're fit, make good money, OYS, godly, etc. then it's probably one answer and we will give you a tailored solution ... but if you're obese, unemployed, and fight her every Sunday morning because you don't feel like going to church, there's a totally different answer that would not be appropriate at all to tell the other guy. If you leave us to make assumptions, then I'm going to ask you to make one too: assume we will make the wrong assumptions every time. Don't get mad when we do. That's on you if you don't give us enough information, not us.

If anyone has more suggestions on how to further improve the quality and quantity of content posted on this sub, please use this thread as an open forum for making such suggestions and discussing new ideas!

20

UPVOTES

I'm a Christian. I'm a "jerk." Deal with it.

13 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

[/u/KUZURI271828](#) asked in another post: "Steps to become less of a jerk and more of a Christian?" This question shows a fundamental flaw in how we perceive what it means to be a "Christian" that needs to be addressed on a wider scale than a simple answer in that thread. Let's discuss. I'll start with my response to that question.

How about be a jerk and a Christian?

WHO decides if you're a "jerk"?

I mean, there's no "Thou shalt not be a jerk" command. Being a "jerk" is defined by the person you're interacting with, not you yourself. I can act one way on this sub and people see me as a man. I can act the exact same way on [r/Christianity](#) and people will see me as a jerk.

Google defines "jerk" as "a contemptibly obnoxious person." There's certainly nothing wrong with being obnoxious. So, how does it become "contemptibly"? If you had contempt for your own behavior, you probably wouldn't be doing it in the first place. It's when other people show contempt for your behavior that makes you a "jerk."

Now, you can't read everyone's minds as to what they'll find contemptible or not - and I'm pretty sure Galatians 1:10 says you're not supposed to be trying to please all those other people anyway. If God would show contempt for your behavior, I'd be more concerned. That's a definitively bad kind of jerk. But if God has no contempt for your behavior, I don't know that it matters that other people do.

WHY are you being a "jerk"?*We Need Balance*

From there, it's all just a matter of motive. Are you acting like a "jerk" because you have no love for God's people, no kindness in your heart, and no compassion for those around you? Sure, that's sin. God has contempt for that kind of attitude. Or are you acting like a "jerk" because God has you doing things and nothing's going to stand in your way - especially not the types of people who want to sit around and judge people for being jerks?

Here's the thing: the world needs to find balance. On the "doormat to douche bag" scale, we need to be somewhere in between. The natural order of things is that we tend to fall into the middle of two opposing forces. Balance is natural. The problem is that the church and most of the secular world teaches us all to be doormats (one end) and most of the rest of everyone else is "balanced" (other end) with very few stragglers who are actual Christian douche bags. So, with this cultural tension, people will fall somewhere between doormat and balanced, which won't help them actually become balanced.

Be a Jerk to Create That Balance

Somewhere along the way we're going to need a few douche bag Christians to help pull people further toward the douche bag side until eventually they wind up in the proper balance - and then they need to stop moving toward douche baggery once they get there. The trick is being the Christian jerk (or even a little bit of a douche bag) without compromising your obedience to God. It's certainly doable. It involves stepping on a lot of toes and getting some people ticked at you. But if your orientation is right - that your life mission is to make disciples and your "jerk"ness is in the advancement of that cause, I say keep on being a jerk.

That's what I did at my last church. I tried playing "nice" with the pastor and people there. They wouldn't listen. So, I started stepping on some people's toes and suddenly I have the pastor's attention. Rather than being another "yes man" to him, I called him to a better way. I was blunt. I knew he could take it. He was intrigued, but not convinced. So, I challenged him, pressured him, refined him, and wouldn't back down when he tried to argue his way out of being a disciple-maker. Result? He adopted the mission of disciple-making, trained the elders to do likewise and in

the following year we saw 7 new people come to Christ who never would have heard the Gospel if we'd all just been a bunch of pew-sitters. The church eventually split up after the pastor and I left for independent reasons (it was a plant of about 50-ish people) and now there are disciple-makers in several other churches, some of whom I know are continuing on the mission in new congregations. If only they would be a little bit jerk-ish too, I know they could radically transform their new churches as well and we would see even more people come to Christ from those even larger congregations.

Jesus is a jerk too

If I just acted like a doormat who had a big heart for discipleship, nothing would have gotten done. I had to be a jerk to kick my church into the right gear, just like Jesus ...

- had to be a jerk to the money changers at the temple who were dishonoring God
- was jerk to the cyrophonecian woman to whom he said, "Go away, I'm not here to help you and your people" in light of his laser-focus on his mission
- was a jerk to the Pharisees
- was a jerk to Pilate and Herod
- is still a jerk to his bride, the church, by letting her flounder around in danger rather than swooping in and saving the day.

Seriously, think about that last one. If your wife is being disrespectful and she slips and falls in the mud and you don't help her out because of her disrespect, she'd call you a jerk, right? Pretty much anyone would. But isn't that just God's attitude in Romans 1:18 et seq? God's people ignore him, disrespect him, don't give thanks to him, etc., then they fall away and he just sits back and watches it happen.

That's the God we serve. That's the God I love. That's the God I want to emulate with every fiber of my being - just as much as I want to emulate his compassion, empathy, kindness, service and all those other things that we already know we're supposed to be doing.

For how important it is, this doesn't get talked about nearly enough. It deserves a theory post, but let me start with a bit of a field report. Many of you know that my wife was psychologically crippled by a hyper-conservative, downright manipulative upbringing on the matter of sexuality. It's a lot like [this guy](#) and I wrote a lot more of my story in reply to that post [here](#), if you're interested in reading more about just how bad things got.

My wife has had some very hard boundaries because of this - things that I thought we'd never break. Well, I just broke another small one today. Some people feel like it's their obligation to respect their wife's boundaries. I believe it's a husband's job to decide the boundaries. If my boundaries are wider than hers, I need to roam in the gap that's inside my boundaries and outside of hers to make her leave her boundary to come find me.

But I'm getting all theory-like again, so let's dive into the fun part.

My wife is overly modest, as I'm sure you could guess from the above. Even in private, she struggles with feeling like it's okay to wear sexy lingerie, though she'll do it now. We've actually made incredible progress with what she's willing to do when the lights are out. But even worse is any form of immodesty in public or where evidence could be left behind, like pictures or video, or any type of touching or flirting at the mall, at church, taking a walk down the street, etc.. So, sexting has always been out. I've tried a number of times before and it's usually crashed and burned.

Well, she's been out of town on business. A WORK function? That's pretty much the most "unsafe" place to do any type of dirty texting at all. But she's coming home tonight and I'm, I'm sure you could guess ... excited. So, it's time to feed my excitement for my wife a little bit.

This took place during a training class she's in - very public.

"I survived my meeting. Now in my last one."

"My plane lands at 615"

Glad to hear it went well.

I'll see you tonight <kiss emoji>

Send pics

<crying with laughter emoji>

<pic of her face drinking coffee>

Too high. Pan the camera down a bit.

<pic of her from the chest up; totally modest; hand conspicuously in front of her chest>

"Better?"

There's something in the way.

"You're terrible"

<wink emoji>

I then unbuttoned the top of my shirt, flexed my pecs, and took a pic of me doing a kissy face with some muscle-cleavage (making sure my co-workers didn't see, of course).

That's how it's done.

"Ow ow!!" <hearts popping out of eyes emoji>

"You are making me laugh out loud"

Now it's your turn.

[5 minute pause]

She sends a pic with a different background (she must have excused herself from the class) with her having a smirk and showing off her cleavage.

<hearts popping out of eyes emoji>

"What can I say ... you married one hot lady"

I'll make you feel even hotter tonight.

She sends an animated picture of a woman swooning with the word "SWOON" written across the top in big letters.

Now, this might not seem like a big deal to many of you, especially if your wife is already sending nudes or talking dirty ... but if you knew where I was coming from (read the comment I linked above), your jaw would be dropped. It's one thing to get her doing new things in our private bedroom, but now I've got her thinking about sex in public, sending texts and pictures in a room where people might oversee, and willing to do it in a form where I could (theoretically) post that picture online, to facebook, whatever. Obviously I won't, but our sexuality and her trust in me is worth that risk to her now. Just a few months ago when I tried a similar trick, it wasn't.

My point here is twofold: (1) be persistent. Just because it didn't work in the past doesn't mean she won't wise up to it later. (2) If your wife's boundaries aren't already fully aligned with yours, keep pushing.

My wife doesn't feel "degraded" that we had this conversation today. She doesn't feel like I'm manipulating her. She's happy. She likes feeling desired. Based on our last phone conversation (about logistics issues a la the airport), I get the sense that she's a bit excited and has that "I feel naughty. Is it really okay I just did that? I kind of liked it, but I'm not sure if I should have" attitude. This is where she needs to be. I can't lead someone who has already made up their mind about what they will and won't do. I can lead someone who is in a state of happy uncertainty.

Note that I wasn't demanding nudes or asking her to flash me. That's so far past her boundaries right now that when I've tried it in the past she took it as a joke and sent a joke picture in reply. This time I started small - something that I knew would be uncomfortable for her, but that she couldn't possibly play off as a joke. She had to take me seriously and it forced her into a decision: have fun, stretch her boundary, and respect my request ... or defy me and try to play it off as a joke ... or stall me until we were in a context that fell within her boundaries. I'm glad she chose the first option ... and here I am at work with a raging boner hiding under my desk.

OMG! And you call yourself a Christian ... talking about having a raging boner at work. The power of Christ compels, you, sinner!!!

■

If that's your reaction ... that's why I also just wrote a post on being a jerk Christian.

13

UPVOTES

[FR] Fixing your SMV

31 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

I normally hate posts that try to break-down how women evaluate a man's SMV. That's not the point of this post, and if that's what you get out of it, you're doing it wrong. I'm merely going to give a rubric to illustrate a point about how we should go about improving our SMV - both as married men and singles.

I was in New York City last week for vacation - more on that to come in another post. But after going to shows on Broadway, hitting up a comedy club, spending time at the bar, and simply walking the streets, I had a lot of opportunity to people watch, overhear conversations, and discuss things with some of these people. It affirmed a lot of what I already suspected to be true about how women evaluate a man's SMV and why some men are trying focusing too much on areas where they will make too little gains.

THE RUBRIC

Now, I don't mean this to be a hard rubric to follow. Everyone is going to evaluate things differently, but here's how I've observed women on the whole evaluating men over the last year, and especially in the last week:

- Looks: 3 points
 - 1 point for being of a reasonable body size
 - 1 point for being muscular (6 pack, bouncing pecs, etc.)
 - 1 point for having good hygiene, grooming, and fashion sense
 - Points can be lost if you have noticeable physical abnormalities, like an unusual scar or burn marks
- Confidence/alphanness/frame: 3 points
 - 90% of men have 0 points for being a typical beta
 - 1 point for showing initiative, passing tests, and having the balls to tell her no
 - 1 point for not getting butthurt or being beta-controlling (ex. mate guarding, making rage-demands)
 - 1 point for being OYS and intentional about managing your life and affairs (mission and steps thereto)
- 1.5 points for your financial position and/or prospects
 - If you earn less than \$40,000/yr and have no career ambitions you get no points
 - 1/2 a point for every \$20,000 after that
- 1 point for charm, charisma, wit, personality, etc.
- 1 point for social status and preselection
- 1/2 point for morality, ethics, and philosophical consistency with one's lifestyle

CAVEAT 1: Remember, this is just a general rule of thumb. Maybe I need to readjust a point here or there, or I left something off the list that deserves its own point or half. Whatever. This is meant to illustrate a point, not to be an ultimate guide to male SMV calculation.

CAVEAT 2: There are some things that aren't on the list because they're general disqualifiers. A godly Christian woman won't date a non-Christian guy. This doesn't mean he has a lower SMV to her. She might be highly sexually attracted to him, but she has an appropriate spiritual boundary she won't cross. This scale isn't meant to address that.

THINGS TO NOTE

First, I did NOT mention things like: shared interests, how affectionate he is, sentimentality, signs of ability to commit, etc. Those might be relevant in one's Relationship Market Value, but not one's SMV

Second, Unlike men, women can re-assign points at their discretion for exceptional features. So, if a guy makes \$500,000/yr he might get 3 points on finances, and they'll just steal the other 1.5 points from somewhere else. Or if the guy is incredibly charismatic, funny, and flirtatious, he might get 2 points and she'll steal the missing point from somewhere else that he's lacking.

Now, you'll note why the alpha/beta dynamic gets talked about here so much: because most guys have a full 3 points to gain from that improvement. Lifting gets brought up as one of the basic things because most guys can gain a whole 2 points from that. Imagine that - you go from being a chubby beta to a fit alpha and you could potentially have increased your SMV by 5 points right there - probably more than your total value to begin with. So, even if you're not charming or witty and you have no popular friends, just for being a physically fit alpha who is a decent human being with a solid job, you already potentially are a 7.5.

From there, learning to flirt, building your social circle, and earning that bit of extra cash will make up the difference to your being a perfect 10.

WHERE IT GOES WRONG

But here's what I see in the world (not necessarily here): many guys who are already a 2 on looks spending tons of time worrying about how to get that third point rather than working on the 3 points they could be gaining in their assertiveness and frame development.

What I imagine is more common to a sub like this is the guy who is probably already a 2-2.5 on his confidence/assertiveness, and would rather perfect his frame than hit the gym to get rid of that spare tire.

Or the guy who wants to learn how to flirt and be a charming conversationalist in order to get that one point rather than focusing on the easy 3 points he could get from working on his appearance and frame.

SELF-EVALUATION

Before discovering RP and through most of my marriage, my SMV was probably something like this:

- Looks: 1 point
- Alphaness: 1.25 points
- Finances: 1.25 points (even though I do earn 6-figures, my wife does too, so it's not impressive enough to her to max this for me)
- Charm: 0 points
- Social Status: .75 point
- Ethic: 1/2 point
 - TOTAL: 4.75 - a loser

Compare this to my wife, who at the time was probably an HB8-8.5 (although some of that may be due to my personal preferences). It's no wonder I had a dead bedroom. She saw herself as having married down in terms of SMV.

Today, I'd evaluate myself something like this:

- Looks: 2.25

- Alphaness: 2.75
- Finances: 1.25
- Charm: .75
- Social Status: 1
- Ethic: 1/2
 - TOTAL: 8.5

LOW HANGING FRUIT TIER 1

Notice where my gains came from so far:

- Looks: 1.25 points - The first thing I did was focus on my looks. Most of my noticeable gains happened in the first few months. After that, I doubt my wife could see the difference between my benching 265 and 285. I lost weight, gained a ton of muscle, and started dressing nicer both around the house and in public. In terms of body shape and build, I'm slightly above average (1.75-2), but I give myself an extra .25-.5 because of my improved fashion sense, hygiene, etc. and the fact that I'm getting hair cuts every 3 weeks now instead of every 6 months. On the whole, this was the easiest place for me to start because I already knew how to lift and diet. I just had to do it. That's low-hanging fruit number one.
- Alphaness: 1.5 points - After the first couple months of lifting, my confidence level started increasing, giving me the internal license to start practicing being more assertive and drawing harder boundaries. Since then, I've come close to capping what I can improve in this area. There are still a few situations where I'll act butthurt, so I can't give myself full points, but I've made significant improvements and the effect on our relationship is noticeable. My wife complained last week that she gets frustrated at times that she feels as if I act "too dominant" and that "sometimes I feel like you do things just to prove your dominance." Part of me says this is a good thing, part of me says I probably need to tone it down a bit - either way, better balance can be had, but I've definitely tipped to the other side of the scale from where I was.
- Charm: .75 points - After I saw physical gains and developed a solid frame, I figured the next easiest thing to work on (without neglecting the previous ones) was my charisma. I was generally a goofy guy who could make people laugh and think, but pathetic-funny is different from confident-funny. This was another easy one to turn around, fueled by the increased confidence from lifting and developing my frame. I learned to flirt, employ some kino (an area I could still work on a little), re-brand the way I tell jokes, etc.
- Social Status: .25 - I didn't actually have to do anything for this, as it adjusted naturally over time based on the improvements I made in other areas. I just didn't stifle social opportunities as they increasingly presented themselves. As I have improved, I have drawn more attention from others, which my wife notices and values in the relationship, triggering preselection when it's female attention and general social standing when it's from other guys.

LOW HANGING FRUIT TIER 2

So, I hit all the easy low-hanging fruit. I picked it all. Does that mean I'm done? NO! I've just got to go up a tier. I have to actually get out my ladder. I'm not going to climb to the very top of the tree **yet**, but I do have to start picking from a separate tier of branches on the tree.

So, where do I go from here? Do I try to get that last quarter point on charm or the last quarter point on finances? No, that would take immense amounts of effort to go beyond what I've already developed there. Those ones can wait.

Instead, my focus going forward is on dieting and lifting. Yes, I've already made significant improvements. I have my full point from hygiene, fashion, etc. I have .75 points for my body size, and half a point from my muscle - which should actually be higher, but because the definition is still hidden beneath that other .25 points of body size I'm lacking, the muscle I have isn't exactly showing to the degree I'd like. Once my body size decreases, my muscular frame will be far more pronounced. So, by working at the .25 points on my body size (i.e. dropping from 16% BF to sub-12%), I'll actually be gaining .75 points.

Right now, I will see more gains from making this effort from anything else. It won't be easy, but it will have a more noticeable impact on my relationship than gaining a combined half a point from upping my income and charm. Those would be far more difficult than dieting and cardio (without neglecting the lifting) for a couple months. It might take 2 years and countless hours of marketing myself before I see any actual improvement on her attraction to me due to financial gains. It's just not worth it. Likewise, working on charm and charisma literally involves changing parts of your personality to become accustomed to doing things you never used to do. Developing those kinds of habits only happens over long periods of time. I'll be working on that too, of course, but it's not where I'm expecting to see the next wave of improvement just yet.

APPLICATION

So, now I ask you all:

- Are you still in your first tier of low hanging fruit? If so, which ones are the lowest? What will reap the easiest gains? How much effort will you have to put in to accomplish it?
- Are you on your second tier or higher? Although all of it is worth the time and energy, is there anything that you can start building a foundation for now so that the third tier and beyond will be easier when that time comes?
- Are you appropriately balancing your efforts? Or are you trying to master something you're already proficient at? Are you that meathead at the gym who would rather spend time getting his bench from 290 to 300, or the guy who's fine with sitting at 290 for a while in order to read the sidebar and work on passing tests, saying no, STFU, and developing a mission?

A while back there was some conversation about what type of content you all would like to see more of on this sub, and one thing that came up was sharing testimonies and how God brought us to where we are today. I put it off for a while, but here goes.

MY TESTIMONY

False Spiritual Security

Picture the most arrogant know-it-all you've ever met in your entire life - the kind of person who sits on a high horse, looking down at all the peons wondering how they survive with such puny brains. Have you ever met someone like that? That was me. Even worse, I convinced myself that God had gifted me with such great intelligence because he wanted me to solve everyone else's problems, accomplishing what psychologists, philosophers, and theologians had failed to do for centuries. Nothing was ever truer of me in those times than Romans 1:22 - "Although they claimed to be wise, they became fools."

My journey to this dark destination began early on. When I was in kindergarten I learned a very dangerous lesson: *if you have all the right answers, they will like you and praise you for it*. Three decades later, I'm still struggling between the truth and the lie in this statement. The truth is that people will praise me if I can give them all the right answers. The lie is that their praise should matter to me.

Believing this lie, I spent my younger years in a sinful frenzy, trying to learn everything I could about God's Word, theology, church history, and the like. I was among those who would have cried out, "Lord, Lord," and yet he would respond, "I never knew you. Away from me, you evildoer!" I knew a lot *about* God, but I didn't *know* God, and my motive was selfish gain. I honored God with my lips, but my heart was far from him.

Knowledge was everything, and I had amassed a following of people who were intrigued by the things I had to say - though not necessarily because they believed any of it. I recall high school days sitting in the cafeteria across a table from an atheist, amidst several classmates. I had become known as "[name] the Christian" and my adversary was "[same name] the Pagan." We debated hot topics between Christians and atheists. The arguments never went anywhere, nor do I believe anyone was ever persuaded to Christ because of them, but they displayed to everyone the true desire of my heart at that time: recognition for my intelligence.

I didn't care whether people saw me as an outcast. I could find scriptural support for being "in the world, but not of the world." But I did want people to recognize that I was not like them - and I wanted them to know why. Unfortunately, the answer wasn't because of the transforming work of Jesus Christ in my life. It was my belief that I was smarter than them - that because I had a deeper understanding of God, somehow I was better than they were. Needless to say, it wasn't until many years later that I realized what was going on.

Ironically, virtually all my arguments and political stances that I held at that time have changed. Some of my present views are not even remotely similar - showing a testament to the fact that I was not as intelligent as I once thought. That's not to say that I'm any more accurate about myself today. I'm simply more careful with how I evaluate myself now, doing everything I can to avoid self-deception.

Confrontation With My Sin

It was not until college that Christ truly took hold of my life. At first, I realized that I could no longer ride my parents' coattails. Faith had to become personal. So, in my arrogant effort to be a "super Christian," I joined every single organization on campus that had anything to do with Jesus, attending Bible studies with three of them.

One Bible study in particular struck my interest. There were a group of guys with Cru (then-known as Campus

Crusade for Christ) who met weekly to discuss various topics. One of the leaders, Brian, referenced it as a group of "mini-theologians" in the way we discussed depth of material, although I now see that it was often lacking in application.

One particular night, we were having a uniquely in-depth conversation on the issues of predestination and free-will - something I had spent most of my high school years studying (in vain). Toward the end of our discussion, Randy, the other leader, asked to speak with me privately afterward.

This moment was the height of my pride. Most people would have taken it as, "Uh oh, I'm getting called to the principal's office." I legitimately thought to myself, "He wants me to teach him more about all my great ideas and theories." I kid you not. This is what I was actually thinking. Instead, he stood in my doorway to my dorm room, paused for what seemed like forever, and ultimately muttered: "Red-Curious, I think you struggle with pride."

"Of course I struggle with pride," I said. "We all do. It's the root of all sin. Everyone struggles with it. So, I'll work on that; you can work on that; we can all work on it together. Maybe we can talk about it at group next week." I blew him off. It wasn't until three days later, noticing that I was still furious at him for saying such a thing, that I realized he was right. This realization didn't come from Randy's words, but from the Holy Spirit's conviction against my sin - something I hadn't felt in my life until that time, despite my upbringing and prior professions of repentance.

This conviction wasn't a feeling of guilt at doing something wrong, nor was it some intellectual understanding of my misguided way of living. It was a submissive attitude of wanting to overcome the entire foundation of the last eighteen years of my life in order to become what I now knew God had always intended for me. The sad part is that I thought I had already become all that. This was the foundation of repentance.

Turning From My Sin

In the beginning of my sophomore year of college a man named Justin, who led the Navigators ministry, began mentoring me on-on-one. This process began with teaching me the balance between an all-head and all-heart Christian, and how I had swung extremely too far to one side. He helped me readjust that by focusing on my heart alone. He said, "Red-Curious, after getting to know you last year, it's clear that you know more about the Bible than 95% of Christians - even seminary-trained pastors. You don't need any more knowledge than you already have - and your thirst for more is going to keep poisoning your heart. You need to start using and applying what God's given you before you go back to learning." So, he instructed me not to listen to any sermons, participate in in-person or online debates, avoid Christian chat rooms, not to study the Bible (though daily quiet times were still okay), and to avoid virtually anything else that would intellectually stimulate a Christian.

Through his efforts, I actually went too far on the other side by the end of that year. I even recall at least two instances in which I saw people debating spiritual topics the same way I had once done, which caused me physically to vomit in disgust - not at these people, but in realizing what I once was before I had committed myself to Christ. This is what it is like to see your sin for what it is, and it gave a whole new meaning to Philippians 3:7-9 and 2 Peter 2:20-22.

Since then, I have continued to strive to live in the delicate middle point between the head and the heart, though my upbringing always has me leaning toward the head side if I'm not careful - and I encourage everyone not to make any assumptions about how often I'm careful.

Transformative Discipleship

After finding a reasonable balance in my life on these points, Justin continued to pour his life into me through one-on-one discipleship, and I absorbed every bit of knowledge, vision, passion, and desire from him that he had to bestow. In fact, a vast majority of the principles I teach here are rooted in the things I learned from him, which is why I always emphasize the importance and value of discipleship.

I was the "Godly offspring" Malachi 2:15 was talking about - the fruit of the union between Justin and the Holy

Spirit. As awkward as it may be to say, Justin saw fit to glorify Christ by acting like a bride to him and a mother to me, nurturing me in my needs, teaching me right from wrong, and training me toward self-sufficiency. More importantly, he also gave me a mission: to glorify God by advancing the Gospel of Jesus and His Kingdom into the nations through spiritual generations of workers and laborers living and discipling among the lost.

But not everyone has a Justin in their life. I didn't for almost 20 years. Even since graduating college, after which Justin became a missionary in Thailand, my efforts to seek a constant discipleship authority over me have often failed. So, I determined that if I could not find a willing one-on-one authority over me, I would create one. I would raise up a man so passionate about advancing God's Kingdom that I would one day follow him. I have since created at least 4 such men, who I could list by name and who have all now scattered to different parts of our nation to share the same mission God implanted in me - and they are doing far greater things than I have ever done. I now look to them to advise me, where they once looked to me for that role.

Of course, this was done in the context of pursuing Christ personally and directly. I learned a long time ago that if you're not growing toward Christ, it will be impossible to teach anyone else to do the same.

RP-IMONY

My Early Alpha

My early arrogance had developed an inherently alpha presence about me. That's not to say you can't be arrogant and beta simultaneously, which is quite common; rather, that my specific expression of pride caused me to believe that I was better than everyone else in very profound ways. This instilled a sense of confidence in everything that I did, assuming inherently that I was the prize. I wasn't. But my attitude was attractive nonetheless. I was also pretty darn in shape in those days. I'm slightly stronger today, but in those days I had the strength and thinness (under 10% BF).

I had hordes of women hanging over me in my early college years - and more who I didn't even find out were interested in me until years later. My freshman year of college, before I was saved, I started dating a nympho. She was hot and had dozens of guys all over her all the time. Literally. She cheated on me with dozens of guys - probably close to 30 in the 9 months that we dated. You'd think that would be a crude RP-awakening for me, although "the red pill" didn't even exist in those days (reddit hadn't even been created yet). She cheated because I wouldn't sleep with her until marriage, despite how she begged and pleaded.

Over and above all of this, I had a biblical view of marriage, family, etc. and did not succumb to the Disney fantasy that plagued most people. In fact, one of my points of pride was that I saw through the deception of the world and held myself to a higher biblical standard. I embraced the futility of marriage and relationships, but my desire for sexuality at the same time. In many ways, I was back then everything that I am today, as far as PR-awareness.

I Lost It

Then I actually started dating my wife. I remember having journaled quite a bit about three girls I was interested in at the time. One was a non-Christan who only made the list because of her persistence and how attracted I was to her - and she promised to convert *for me*. Another was already with another guy at the time. I could have pursued her, but the third was already available and was overall a better choice: better looking, better financial prospects (i.e. no debt, working toward a high-paying job), had a clear biblical attitude about marriage roles, etc. So, the choice seemed pretty easy.

We started dating two weeks before I graduated college. I saw her a bit that summer, but ultimately moved over 750 miles away. We were in an LTR for an entire year, then both moved to another city to attend graduate school together. We were married after my first year of law school, when she finished her 1-year master's degree in accounting and had a stable job lined up.

This is where it all went wrong. I was hopping between disciplers, being short of viable options for godly men to follow. Both of them were ruled by their wives under the guise of serving them. This was a bad influence. On top of that, I had recently brought a guy to Christ and he started going to church, so I went with him to monitor what he was learning. It turned out to be a PC-USA church (liberal denomination). My wife and I were actually married in that church. Although we were both very theologically and politically conservative, the liberal influence did start to grate away at our perceptions of what marriage should look like. My wife felt more and more empowered, and I felt more and more responsible for empowering her - which is amplified when you've got a wife who at the time is the primary breadwinner (I still had 2 more years of law school left at that point). In short, she began running the show.

Dead Bedroom

For the first 8 years of our marriage I saw a steady decline in our relationship. Sexual activity was high when we were first married, but after 6 months it was dead. Things rejuvenated when we were trying to get pregnant, but it was so passionless that I would start masturbating to porn *after having sex with her* because of how unfulfilling sex was. I literally felt like I was just a sperm donor whose only job was to drop a load so she could get pregnant.

For the years that followed, we had 4 children in rapid succession, so she was pregnant for large amounts of time. For the last trimester of pregnancy (3 months) and the 2 months after pregnancy, sex was either unappealing or inadvisable, which with 4 kids made up 20 months - almost 2 years from that alone. From August 2014 to February 2016 we didn't have sex at all - an 18 month dead bedroom. Even after that, we only had sex maybe once every other month, despite her repeated promises to "fix" the problem. Of course, I didn't realize I was the problem. She did, and she said it, but I didn't believe her.

During this time, I had gained significant weight. I used to be 6', 180lbs with under 10% BF when we were married. At my worst I was 285lbs and I don't even want to know what the BF% would have been. My wife told me directly at least twice: "I'm not attracted to you. You're fat and ugly. You can't expect me to what to have sex with that. So, just take whatever you can get." Duty sex followed in very rare intervals.

Cue RP

By fall of 2016 I had given up on having a healthy sex life. I resolved to do my own thing independent of my wife's needs, desires, etc. I wasn't abandoning the family, but I was checked out and she knew it. This was the start of my RP-awakening.

I started reading the Bible and memorizing mass quantities of Scripture - whole books (Philippians, Romans, James). This influx of the Scriptures started speaking to my life in a unique way. I read about Paul running the race and beating his body and recognized that I needed to take some of the analogies more literally. I started running heavily to put off some weight. By April 2017 I started lifting. At that point I had a much better biblical foundation for how a marriage should look. But I still had a long way to go.

I wasn't seeing much change in my wife's attitude toward me, which frustrated me even further. I started googling things about sex advice and stumbled on the red pill. Within a week I had read virtually every book on the TRP and MRP sidebar. Over the next months I started re-reading them, taking notes, etc. I frantically applied everything I had learned, taking great measures to ensure I retained enough of my old beta ways in the short-term to keep from going Rambo - I didn't want to do too much too fast.

It was in this period that I realized a drastic lacking of biblical advice for guys like me, and I was fed up with all the guys on MRP telling me my wife was an "outlier" and a "hopeless cause" and that I just needed to cheat on her or leave her entirely. From a secular perspective, I'm sure their advice would have worked wonders. But with my theological views, that also would have meant a life of sexlessness if I were to have divorced her. So, I dropped the covert contracts, resigned myself to monk mode, and merely worked on myself. This is the journey that's noticeable throughout the sidebar of RPC - because I wrote those things during my journey, not after I had already "arrived," as if such a thing is even possible.

Transformation

The lowest hanging fruit had obviously been my weight and lifts. I went from benching 135 when I first started in April 2017 to benching 275 in December 2017. My squat and deadlift went from 155 to 365 in about the same period of time. I also dropped my weight from 285 down to 225 at present. The weight and build change also meant buying a whole new line of clothes that actually fit, which was a prime opportunity to enhance my fashion sense. I started getting hair cuts more regularly, and changed the style to something more appealing rather than the generic cut I had been used to all my life. These enhancements had a drastic improvement on my confidence levels.

Sex went from every other month to every other week. Soon after that it went to every few days. I went from being denied about 19 out of every 20 initiations to only 1 denial out of every 20 - and even that was usually a simple, "Can we wait until the kids are in bed?"

Unusually, before all of this I wanted sex every day multiple times a day. Once I could get sex from my wife at-will, I realized that I no longer cared about sex as much as I once did. A couple times a week was fine, and even that felt like overkill. I realized a valuable lesson here: **The church told me I was addicted to sex. I was really starved for sex.** More on that in a post to come. Suffice it to say that once I was having my sexual desires filled, I realized my appetite wasn't as big as I thought it was when I was fooled into believing I had an addiction.

From there, rather than improving the quantity of sex any further than I cared for, I focused on improving the quality of sex.

- At the beginning of my RP journey, as my wife saw a lot of my early transformations happening, she started introducing bondage into the bedroom - something I didn't even have to initiate.
- About 3 months ago I had her literally screaming my name to the point where she thought the kids were going to wake up, which was the first time we'd ever had that in our marriage (before, sex always had to be hush hush with no noise at all).
- Last month we added cunnilingus - something I'd long wanted to do that she was always uncomfortable with and thought was evil or dirty. Now she's asking for it.
- Two weeks ago, when we were on our 10-year anniversary vacation, she started initiating multiple times a day and realized that her subsequent orgasms were better than the first.
- Last week we tried doggy style for the first time - something that she refused to do before because she thought it was degrading.
- There have been 3 other new positions in the last month alone, as compared to our 9 years of only missionary and cowgirl.
- Of all things, she even went online recently to buy some "his/hers" KY jelly just because she wanted to know what it would feel like. That is, she's starting to get curious about her own sexual limits, independent of my active influence - because of the passive byproduct of the influence and leadership I have taken in the bedroom to date.

It's not a linear progression

Admittedly, I've had days on RPC where I felt like a fraud. I'd see great progress, be writing about it, then one event would feel like a major setback. I'd think, "If these guys witnessed what just happened, they'd all laugh their way out of this sub and everything I've been trying to teach them." Then I'd look objectively at the strides I've taken and realize that one event doesn't define my marriage or sexuality - especially when my evaluation of that event was based on what my wife was *saying* rather than what *her behavior* said about her from the days before and after that event. I'd have to preach back to myself: *Look at what she does, not what she says.*

For example, many months ago, after I'd written a lot of the RPC sidebar content, my wife denied my initiation. I handled it appropriately, but she was still on that 1,000 foot rope and assumed I would still act like my old self and get all butthurt. So, she changed her mind and started offering duty sex, saying, "If we don't do this right now, you're going to get all pouty tomorrow and it's going to ruin the whole day for everyone." I assured her I was fine, but she started raging about it anyway. I STFU. She starts shouting about, "This is why I hate sex! The very thought of sex is abhorrent to me because it always ends up in a fight." She was crying and yelling about all the fights we've had about sex over the years and insisting that I have sex with her right then and there just to orgasm so I wouldn't be a mopey butt hole the next day. She didn't get it. I STFU.

We didn't have sex that night. The next day I did not act pouty and butt hurt. We had a very good day. I start working on something in the living room after the kids are in bed. She puts on lingerie and starts trying to lure me into the bedroom. I oblige - because at that point I was watching what she did, not what she said.

Where do I go from here?

I keep hitting the gym, reading, and all that other stuff. I have plans laid out for new things I want to try in the bedroom - and I have every confidence that she'll willingly oblige. She still has her boundaries (blowjobs being the last one she'll one day cross), but progress is progress, my friends.

More importantly than all of this, what I've found is that with the ability to have sex at will, I'm no longer worried about trying to get sex, which frees up more time for my mission. I'm discipling more guys than I have in a while and I have a solid leader discipling me. I'm starting to connect with more and more non-Christians, some of whom have already expressed curiosity about the faith - a curiosity that I want to keep cultivating in them. The guys I'm discipling are starting to build similar relationships of their own, reaching people who otherwise would have been left to fend for themselves spiritually.

Life is good. God is good. Greater things than these are yet to come.

Defining the Difference

Sexual addiction is a real thing that affects many men in our country. There are probably a few dozen, at least! Props to these guys for dealing with a very serious struggle. For the rest of us, I'm increasingly confident that what the world shames men for as "addictive behaviors" is really the product of starvation of an important biological imperative. Of course, one can't discern between an addiction and starvation until their desire has been sated.

For example, a true glutton is addicted to food. This is, unsurprisingly, quite common even under the very relaxed psychological standards that try to avoid labeling people as "food addicts." Here's what it really boils down to, though:

- The addict will keep on eating even after he is full.
- The starved person will stop eating once he has been filled.

The same is true for any other biological imperative, including our sexuality.

Many of you may know my background as a Christian. One thing the church is great at doing is shaming men for their sexuality. I can't count the number of men who have told me, "I'm a sex addict," as some big confession for which they're looking for my cure. I'd ask them about their behaviors and it would line up - they'd be thinking about sex constantly, be watching porn constantly, fantasizing about all kinds of things that their wives would never do with them, cheating on their wives, etc. I always ask two questions after I hear their confession: *How often do you have sex with your wife? And is it good sex or duty sex?* Sure enough, "We have sex about once a month, and it's usually duty sex." Hmm ...

These men, and countless others, are controlled by their sexual desires - but they are not addicted. They are merely unfulfilled. This distinction matters.

Why This Matters

We want sex. That's a good thing. Society tells women it's a good thing and that they should embrace their sexuality. For fun, I googled "women should embrace their sexuality." The results are pretty expected: 10 straight links of encouragement to women to embrace their sexuality. This is a good result. I like it. What if I change it to "men should embrace their sexuality"? I get 1 link shaming men for being toxic and blaming male-kind for school shootings (?!?), 1 link that encourages male sexuality, 2 links about the "masculine" in a BDSM relationship, and 6 links telling women to embrace their sexuality. Surprisingly, despite my search history, none of the manosphere blogs came up. I changed the search again to ask: "is male sexuality good or evil?" I get 6 links shaming male sexuality, 1 link encouraging male sexuality, 2 links shaming male use of porn, and 1 link of sex tips.

In short, if a man misunderstands his own sexual desire as an addiction rather than a starvation, he's likely to buy into the lies that society feeds him, making it harder for him to swallow the pill and embrace some of the best parts of being a man. If society can convince men that their mentality about sex is a disorder, then those men will be compelled to look for a cure. And believe me, there are countless people selling all kinds of "cures" - from physical pills to psychological strategies, and even philosophical ideals that advance someone else's agenda.

People as a whole are easily suggestible. If someone tells you, "You're fat," even if we know it's objectively wrong, some part of us will wonder if there is any truth in the statement. Likewise, if someone says, "You have a problem. I have something that could really help you with that," we're most often curious. If the world tries to tell you you're a "sex addict," at some point you'll probably question whether or not they're right. This type of questioning is good,

but the suggestion often lends itself to a particular conclusion. That's why attorneys always ask leading questions on cross-examination: because when you suggest a conclusion that doesn't seem far-fetched, people are more inclined to agree, and this often even changes a person's internal memory and point of reference on the issue once they have a present verbalization of assent to a concept that really should have gone the other way. But let's not get too sidetracked on that point, as I'm probably preaching to the choir.

What To Do?

I remember the days where I attempted to suppress my sexuality altogether. I just wrote [my story on r/RPChristians](#), if you want to read more about it, but the TL;DR of the relevant part is that my wife reasonably didn't want to have sex with me, but her and the church shamed me for use of porn, leaving me with no sexual outlet at all. I was told I was addicted to sex because of how frequently I was using porn at one point. Once I embraced the fact that I was sex starved and not sex addicted, things started changing.

For one, my internal desire for sex is now easily sated. Shortly after discovering RP I would engage in mental masturbation, getting excited about all the sex I would have once I was "man enough." Of course, the time soon came when I could have sex on demand. I found that I no longer wanted it as often as I thought I would when I was in my starved state. I remember fasting for a week once. When the hunger truly set in all I could think about was how much I would eat when the fast was over. Then the fast ended. I loaded up my plate with all kinds of goodies ... then ate half of it and went off to do something else. That doesn't mean I don't want sex anymore - I certainly do. Rather, it means that I can now enjoy my sexuality to the brim and appreciate it for what it is without an insatiable desire that forced me to pedestalize that which could momentarily appease me.

Second, once my desire for sex was sated, I was no longer controlled by my wife's sexuality. This meant that I was now free in my marriage to do what I wanted to do, and when I wanted to do it. If I wanted to have sex, I'd have sex. If I wanted to go to the gym, I'd go to the gym. If I wanted to do something to advance my mission, I'd do that too. My life became mine to control because I no longer demanded her supply; she supplied on my demand ... or more accurately nowadays, I am the supply that she's demanding, and I make sure I'm a commodity she doesn't get or see anywhere else - especially among the other church men.

Third, once I was no longer controlled by my wife's sexuality, she became controlled by mine. Because I didn't *need her* in order to be happy and fulfilled, the balance of power shifted, per Rollo's Cardinal Rule of Relationships: *The person with the most power is the one who needs the other the least*. When I didn't need to bend to her will, she bent to mine - **and she was happier for it**.

As I've noted on RPC often before, women are empaths - and that subject deserves a post of its own. But the basic concept is simply that when a man sacrifices his own happiness for the sake of his wife, she empathically experiences his unhappiness alongside of him and it makes the relationship miserable. When the man pursues his own happiness, even at the expense of his wife's interests, she empathically experiences his happiness alongside him, and it makes the relationship enjoyable for both of them.

Conclusion

Don't pedestalize your sexuality anymore than you pedestalize your wife. Believing society's lie that all men are sex-craved maniacs leaves a power of suggestion that you'd be better off rejecting - and not because you want to prove a counter-point (that you're not a "sex-craved maniac"), but because you have a healthy point of origin about why you crave sex in the first place.

ONEitis is dangerous, whether the object of your affection is a tangible woman or a sexual ideology. If you find yourself sexually hungry, don't become obsessed with your hunger. Accept that either you're not in a time of feasting and embrace the fast (monk mode) or go have sex and curb your appetite. Either way, by re-framing your

thinking away from an addictive mentality and toward a regulated (not restrained) desire can give you a greater sense of control in how you express your sexuality, which both improves your attractive draw and ultimately makes you more satisfied as a man.

Defining the Difference

Sexual addiction is a real thing that affects many men in our country. There are probably a few dozen, at least! Props to these guys for dealing with a very serious struggle. For the rest of us, I'm increasingly confident that what the world shames men for as "addictive behaviors" is really the product of starvation of an important biological imperative. Of course, one can't discern between an addiction and starvation until their desire has been sated.

For example, a true glutton is addicted to food. This is, unsurprisingly, quite common even under the very relaxed psychological standards that try to avoid labeling people as "food addicts." Here's what it really boils down to, though:

- The addict will keep on eating even after he is full.
- The starved person will stop eating once he has been filled.

The same is true for any other biological imperative, including our sexuality.

Many of you may know my background as a Christian. One thing the church is great at doing is shaming men for their sexuality. I can't count the number of men who have told me, "I'm a sex addict," as some big confession for which they're looking for my cure. I'd ask them about their behaviors and it would line up - they'd be thinking about sex constantly, be watching porn constantly, fantasizing about all kinds of things that their wives would never do with them, cheating on their wives, etc. I always ask two questions after I hear their confession: *How often do you have sex with your wife? And is it good sex or duty sex?* Sure enough, "We have sex about once a month, and it's usually duty sex." Hmm ...

These men, and countless others, are controlled by their sexual desires - but they are not addicted. They are merely unfulfilled. This distinction matters.

Why This Matters

We want sex. That's a good thing. Society tells women it's a good thing and that they should embrace their sexuality. For fun, I googled "women should embrace their sexuality." The results are pretty expected: 10 straight links of encouragement to women to embrace their sexuality. This is a good result. I like it. What if I change it to "men should embrace their sexuality"? I get 1 link shaming men for being toxic and blaming male-kind for school shootings (?!?), 1 link that encourages male sexuality, 2 links about the "masculine" in a BDSM relationship, and 6 links telling women to embrace their sexuality. Surprisingly, despite my search history, none of the manosphere blogs came up. I changed the search again to ask: "is male sexuality good or evil?" I get 6 links shaming male sexuality, 1 link encouraging male sexuality, 2 links shaming male use of porn, and 1 link of sex tips.

In short, if a man misunderstands his own sexual desire as an addiction rather than a starvation, he's likely to buy into the lies that society feeds him, making it harder for him to swallow the pill and embrace some of the best parts of being a man. If society can convince men that their mentality about sex is a disorder, then those men will be compelled to look for a cure. And believe me, there are countless people selling all kinds of "cures" - from physical pills to psychological strategies, and even philosophical ideals that advance someone else's agenda.

People as a whole are easily suggestible. If someone tells you, "You're fat," even if we know it's objectively wrong, some part of us will wonder if there is any truth in the statement. Likewise, if someone says, "You have a problem. I have something that could really help you with that," we're most often curious. If the world tries to tell you you're a "sex addict," at some point you'll probably question whether or not they're right. This type of questioning is good,

but the suggestion often lends itself to a particular conclusion. That's why attorneys always ask leading questions on cross-examination: because when you suggest a conclusion that doesn't seem far-fetched, people are more inclined to agree, and this often even changes a person's internal memory and point of reference on the issue once they have a present verbalization of assent to a concept that really should have gone the other way. But let's not get too sidetracked on that point, as I'm probably preaching to the choir.

What To Do?

I remember the days where I attempted to suppress my sexuality altogether. I just wrote [my story on r/RPChristians](#), if you want to read more about it, but the TL;DR of the relevant part is that my wife reasonably didn't want to have sex with me, but her and the church shamed me for use of porn, leaving me with no sexual outlet at all. I was told I was addicted to sex because of how frequently I was using porn at one point. Once I embraced the fact that I was sex starved and not sex addicted, things started changing.

For one, my internal desire for sex is now easily sated. Shortly after discovering RP I would engage in mental masturbation, getting excited about all the sex I would have once I was "man enough." Of course, the time soon came when I could have sex on demand. I found that I no longer wanted it as often as I thought I would when I was in my starved state. I remember fasting for a week once. When the hunger truly set in all I could think about was how much I would eat when the fast was over. Then the fast ended. I loaded up my plate with all kinds of goodies ... then ate half of it and went off to do something else. That doesn't mean I don't want sex anymore - I certainly do. Rather, it means that I can now enjoy my sexuality to the brim and appreciate it for what it is without an insatiable desire that forced me to pedestalize that which could momentarily appease me.

Second, once my desire for sex was sated, I was no longer controlled by my wife's sexuality. This meant that I was now free in my marriage to do what I wanted to do, and when I wanted to do it. If I wanted to have sex, I'd have sex. If I wanted to go to the gym, I'd go to the gym. If I wanted to do something to advance my mission, I'd do that too. My life became mine to control because I no longer demanded her supply; she supplied on my demand ... or more accurately nowadays, I am the supply that she's demanding, and I make sure I'm a commodity she doesn't get or see anywhere else - especially among the other church men.

Third, once I was no longer controlled by my wife's sexuality, she became controlled by mine. Because I didn't *need her* in order to be happy and fulfilled, the balance of power shifted, per Rollo's Cardinal Rule of Relationships: *The person with the most power is the one who needs the other the least*. When I didn't need to bend to her will, she bent to mine - **and she was happier for it**.

As I've noted on RPC often before, women are empaths - and that subject deserves a post of its own. But the basic concept is simply that when a man sacrifices his own happiness for the sake of his wife, she empathically experiences his unhappiness alongside of him and it makes the relationship miserable. When the man pursues his own happiness, even at the expense of his wife's interests, she empathically experiences his happiness alongside him, and it makes the relationship enjoyable for both of them.

Conclusion

Don't pedestalize your sexuality anymore than you pedestalize your wife. Believing society's lie that all men are sex-craved maniacs leaves a power of suggestion that you'd be better off rejecting - and not because you want to prove a counter-point (that you're not a "sex-craved maniac"), but because you have a healthy point of origin about why you crave sex in the first place.

ONEitis is dangerous, whether the object of your affection is a tangible woman or a sexual ideology. If you find yourself sexually hungry, don't become obsessed with your hunger. Accept that either you're not in a time of feasting and embrace the fast (monk mode) or go have sex and curb your appetite. Either way, by re-framing your

thinking away from an addictive mentality and toward a regulated (not restrained) desire can give you a greater sense of control in how you express your sexuality, which both improves your attractive draw and ultimately makes you more satisfied as a man.

Defining the Difference

Sexual addiction is a real thing that affects many men in our country. There are probably a few dozen, at least! Props to these guys for dealing with a very serious struggle. For the rest of us, I'm increasingly confident that what the world shames men for as "addictive behaviors" is really the product of starvation of an important biological imperative. Of course, one can't discern between an addiction and starvation until their desire has been sated.

For example, a true glutton is addicted to food. This is, unsurprisingly, quite common even under the very relaxed psychological standards that try to avoid labeling people as "food addicts." Here's what it really boils down to, though:

- The addict will keep on eating even after he is full.
- The starved person will stop eating once he has been filled.

The same is true for any other biological imperative, including our sexuality.

Many of you may know my background as a Christian through my work on the RPChristians sub. One thing the church is great at doing is shaming men for their sexuality. I can't count the number of men who have told me, "I'm a sex addict," as some big confession for which they're looking for my cure. I'd ask them about their behaviors and it would line up - they'd be thinking about sex constantly, be watching porn constantly, fantasizing about all kinds of things that their wives would never do with them, cheating on their wives, etc. I always ask two questions after I hear their confession: *How often do you have sex with your wife? And is it good sex or duty sex?* Sure enough, "We have sex about once a month, and it's usually duty sex." Hmm ...

These men, and countless others, are controlled by their sexual desires - but they are not addicted. They are merely unfulfilled. This distinction matters.

Why This Matters

We want sex. That's a good thing. Society tells women it's a good thing and that they should embrace their sexuality. Just look at the media, magazines at the checkout line, TV and movies, etc. If you want to get scholarly about it, look up research papers on Sexual Cultural Scripting that focus on media and political influences and have some fun.

In short, if a man misunderstands his own sexual desire as an addiction rather than a starvation, he's likely to buy into the lies that society feeds him, making it harder for him to swallow the pill and embrace some of the best parts of being a man. If society can convince men that their mentality about sex is a disorder, then those men will be compelled to look for a cure. And believe me, there are countless people selling all kinds of "cures" - from physical pills to psychological strategies, and even philosophical ideals that advance someone else's agenda.

People as a whole are easily suggestible. If someone tells you, "You're fat," even if we know it's objectively wrong, some part of us will wonder if there is any truth in the statement. Likewise, if someone says, "You have a problem. I have something that could really help you with that," we're most often curious. If the world tries to tell you you're a "sex addict," at some point you'll probably question whether or not they're right. This type of questioning is good, but the suggestion often lends itself to a particular conclusion. That's why attorneys always ask leading questions on cross-examination: because when you suggest a conclusion that doesn't seem far-fetched, people are more inclined to agree, and this often even changes a person's internal memory and point of reference on the issue once they have a present verbalization of assent to a concept that really should have gone the other way. But let's not get too

sidetracked on that point, as I'm probably preaching to the choir.

What To Do?

I remember the days where I attempted to suppress my sexuality altogether. I just wrote my story on RPChristians, if you want to read more about it, but the TL;DR of the relevant part is that my wife reasonably didn't want to have sex with me, but her and the church shamed me for use of porn, leaving me with no sexual outlet at all. I was told I was addicted to sex because of how frequently I was using porn at one point. Once I embraced the fact that I was sex starved and not sex addicted, things started changing.

For one, my internal desire for sex is now easily sated. Shortly after discovering RP I would engage in mental masturbation, getting excited about all the sex I would have once I was "man enough." Of course, the time soon came when I could have sex on demand. I found that I no longer wanted it as often as I thought I would when I was in my starved state. I remember fasting for a week once. When the hunger truly set in all I could think about was how much I would eat when the fast was over. Then the fast ended. I loaded up my plate with all kinds of goodies ... then ate half of it and went off to do something else. That doesn't mean I don't want sex anymore - I certainly do. Rather, it means that I can now enjoy my sexuality to the brim and appreciate it for what it is without an insatiable desire that forced me to pedestalize that which could only momentarily appease me.

Second, once my desire for sex was sated, I was no longer controlled by my wife's sexuality. For those who are still single, it means you won't be controlled by female sexuality and strategy as a whole. This meant that I was now free in my marriage and life to do what I wanted to do, and when I wanted to do it. If I wanted to have sex, I'd have sex. If I wanted to go to the gym, I'd go to the gym. If I wanted to do something to advance my mission, I'd do that too. My life became mine to control because I no longer demanded her supply; she supplied on my demand ... or more accurately nowadays, I am the supply that she's demanding, and I make sure I'm a commodity she doesn't get or see anywhere else - especially among the other church men.

Third, once I was no longer controlled by my wife's sexuality, she became controlled by mine. Because I didn't *need* her in order to be happy and fulfilled, the balance of power shifted, per Rollo's Cardinal Rule of Relationships: *The person with the most power is the one who needs the other the least*. When I didn't need to bend to her will, she bent to mine - **and she was happier for it**.

As I've noted on RPC often before, women are empaths - and that subject deserves a post of its own. But the basic concept is simply that when a man sacrifices his own happiness for the sake of his wife, she empathically experiences his unhappiness alongside of him and it makes the relationship miserable. When the man pursues his own happiness, even at the expense of his wife's interests, she empathically experiences his happiness alongside him, and it makes the relationship enjoyable for both of them.

Conclusion

Don't pedestalize your sexuality anymore than you pedestalize your wife or the women you want to sleep with. Believing society's lie that all men are sex-craved maniacs leaves a power of suggestion that you'd be better off rejecting - and not because you want to prove a counter-point (that you're not a "sex-craved maniac"), but because you have a healthy point of origin about why you crave sex in the first place.

ONEitis is dangerous, whether the object of your affection is a tangible woman or a sexual ideology. If you find yourself sexually hungry, don't become obsessed with your hunger. Accept that either you're not in a time of feasting and embrace the fast (monk mode) or go have sex and curb your appetite. Either way, by re-framing your thinking away from an addictive mentality and toward a regulated (not restrained) desire can give you a greater sense of control in how you express your sexuality, which both improves your attractive draw and ultimately makes you more satisfied as a man.

Okay, apparently my post on sexual addiction v. starvation drew a lot of men out of the woodwork, especially considering the number of PMs I'm getting about the subject. So, let's address this once and for all.

What Doesn't Work

I've read dozens of books on this subject through my time when I was struggling with porn. Most of them say pretty much the same thing: get accountability partners, put up internet blockers on your computer, memorize certain verses, when you're tempted try praying or reading the Bible instead, etc. These all tend to amount to a brute-force of the will.

Every now and then a resource will get the right answer: the Gospel. But then they'll totally drop the ball and assume that "trust Jesus" is actually a helpful phrase that means something on a pragmatic level. It doesn't. It's vague and nebulous and nobody knows what to do with it. So, let me break this down for you.

GUILT

The first step is to abandon your guilt. Did Jesus bear your guilt on his shoulders or not? If he did, then you don't have it and you shouldn't feel guilty. If you do feel guilty, did you really place your guilt on him?

Contrary to popular belief, guilt is a switch that can be turned on and off at our own will and discretion. It is not merely an emotion we feel; rather, the conscious decision to retain our guilt has emotional byproducts - but the emotion is not the guilt itself.

Guilt is a legal standard of judgment over you. If you have done something wrong, you are guilty. If not, then you're not guilty. It's that simple. So many people say, "But I *feeeeeeeeeellllll* guilty!" No, you feel remorse, shame, anger, hate, whatever. You feel that way because you place yourself in a legal judgment of condemnation for your actions. This legal judgment is incongruent with the Gospel, if in fact you have actually been saved.

If you are in Christ, you are not guilty. If you believe the Gospel and accept that you are not guilty, then why do you experience the emotions associated with guilt? Well, that's usually evidence that someone doesn't actually believe the weight and power of the Gospel. Simple enough, right?

So, Step 1 is to get rid of your guilt. Accept that Jesus bore your guilt on the cross for you so that you no longer stand in condemnation under God. And if God's not condemning you, why would you condemn yourself?

To be clear, this is not to be confused with conviction. Conviction is a positive internal motivator. Guilt is a negative internal motivator. The Spirit convicts us, but does not heap guilt, judgment, and condemnation on us if we are in Christ.

FRAME

Okay, you're past your guilt. Now what? Now you need to get in your own frame. In case you're new around here, a man's frame is his point of origin that shapes the way he perceives and interacts with the world. As Christians, at a technical level, we should all adopt the frame of our spiritual groom: Jesus. My point of origin is his frame and not my own. This is key, but a longer conversation than is warranted in this post.

If you live by others' expectations and standards, you are in their frame and not your own. So, when your attitude about your pornography struggle is influenced by how your wife feels about it, what your Bible study guys might say, worry over how to communicate another failure to your accountability partner, etc. - those are all examples of living in someone else's frame. Your internal frame of reference or point of origin is shaped and defined by their

perception of you - their expectations on your behavior. This is bad and will not lend itself to a sustainable solution. That's why most of the books on this matter that I've read have never reaped consistent results - and to the degree they do, it's only because someone is exchanging the sin of pornography with the sin of idolatry of how others perceive them.

Ideally, you should reach a point where you can tell any of those people in the last paragraph, "I masturbated to porn last night. It was wrong. I repented. I'm fine with it and right with God. Can you pass the creamer?" When you can say this straight-faced with no internal compulsion to Defend, Excuse, Explain away, or Rationalize your behaviors - that is when you will be operating in your own/Christ's frame, unhindered by the expectations of those around you. If you feel compelled to have an emotional reaction to your sin after you have already repented, you're still in someone else's frame and not yours/Christ's.

To be clear, by establishing your own frame as your operating basis for dealing with your pornography, you are creating an internal solution that works for you. You are not doing it *for someone else*, which would then make moot your victory when that person's expectations change or they are no longer in your life. You are creating your own victory. And if your frame is synonymous with Christ's, as it should be, then it is really Christ's victory through you. I can't emphasize enough the importance of frame. The Gospel first, and then this, are the two foundational cornerstones upon which the solution below can actually apply with any longevity.

THE SOLUTION: SPIRITUAL SEX

Once you've accepted the Gospel that Jesus bears your guilt and developed your own frame on the issue, you need to set your mission. This is the real solution to the porn problem. I am 100% convinced of this. A lifestyle of evangelism and discipleship cures a lifestyle of porn. This should be your mission going forward - to gratify your physical desires through your spiritual spouse.

The Empty/Filled House

Suppose someone reads the ever popular *Ever Man's Battle* and finds some victory over pornography in their life. Most often I have found that these victories are short-lived. They were for me. They have been for the dozens of people I know who have also tried these strategies. But the Bible acknowledges that someone *can temporarily kick out an evil spirit*.

In Matthew 12 Jesus tells us that when an unclean spirit leaves a man, it wanders for a time and then returns. If it finds that the house is still vacant, then it re-enters the house, bringing with it many other evil spirits even worse than itself - and Jesus says this person is worse off than he started. That's right: if you follow the wrong way of addressing your pornography problem, even after momentary successes, you will find yourself in an even worse spot than before. Don't screw this up, guys.

As is often the case, the conditional clause here is the operative and critical part of the lesson: **IF** the house is empty, **THEN** you're screwed. Solution? Don't leave your house empty. But what do you fill it with?

Filling the House

There's a lot of debate about this. Some people say to fill it with Scripture memory, prayer, quiet times, and other biblical disciplines. Those are all well and good, but I don't ever read in the Bible about prayer, for example, indwelling inside of us.

When I have searched the Scriptures on this point I have only ever found three things the Bible says indwell within us with any consistency:

- **God's Word:** In Matthew 13 Jesus says that God's Word is the seed planted in us. This seed indwells us.
 - **Jesus:** In John 17 Jesus is praying over his disciples and notes, "I in them and you in me" - that he indwells
-

within us. Colossians 1:27 also calls it "this mystery, which is Christ in you."

- **Holy Spirit:** Acts 1:8 says that God would send the Holy Spirit to "come on" us, and we see other passages describing ourselves as His temple and affirming that He indwells within us.

Notice the pattern here? This is the trinity: the Father, Son and Spirit, in some capacity, are who indwell us.

The Indwelling Compulsion

But what's more significant is the immediate result of this indwelling.

- **God's Word:** That same Matthew 13 passage says that if we are good soil (i.e. saved), when God's Word is planted in us it yields a harvest 30, 60 or even 100 times what was sown (verse 8). That's reproduction.
- **Jesus:** The John 17 passage is all about Jesus commissioning his disciples to carry on the work of discipleship that he started. That's reproduction. That very verse I quoted above (17:23) ends, "Then the world will know that you sent me and have loved them." Also, to give context to the Colossians 1:27 quote: "To them God has chosen to make known among the Gentiles the glorious riches of this mystery, which is Christ in you, the hope of glory" - that is, it's about them spiritually reproducing among the Gentiles.
- **Holy Spirit:** By now I'm sure you could have guessed it, but what does Acts 1:8 say will happen when the Holy Spirit comes on us? "You will be my witnesses."

The conclusion is obvious: when we enjoy an abiding relationship with God, we should see spiritual generations flowing from our lives. We should be engaging in spiritual reproduction and seeing fruit produced as a result of God in us.

Interestingly, Jesus has this weird parable in Luke 13:6-9 where a man wants to cut down his fig tree because it is fruitless. The vinedresser pleads with him to give him one more year to cultivate the land around it and water it and fertilize it. He concludes, "Then if it should bear fruit next year, well and good; but if not, you can cut it down." How many of you are the fruitless fig tree? I am your vinedresser. I pray that God would give me time in the lives of the men he has placed around me - including you all - to cultivate you and fertilize your souls toward bearing fruit. Needless to say, bearing fruit is very important to God.

Why This is Uniquely Sexual

As I will keep refraining on this sub: the physical things of this world were designed by God to parallel deeper spiritual truths that only make sense in the light of the Gospel. Just as physical marriage between a husband and wife parallels a spiritual marriage between Christ and his Church, so also does physical reproduction parallel spiritual reproduction. To be abundantly clear: *Physical reproduction is when a husband enters into his bride, which under natural conditions has the potential effect of producing offspring; Spiritual reproduction is when Jesus (the Church's groom) enters into us, indwelling us as a husband physically indwells his wife, which under natural conditions has the potential effect of producing spiritual offspring.*

When a man struggles with porn, let's face it: he's not compelled by the story. He is usually prompted by a desire for physically reproductive acts. But the Gospel says that the physical things of this earth are satisfied in God to whom we have been reconciled because of Jesus' death and resurrection. So, what you long for in a physical way, Jesus satisfies in a spiritual way. So, instead of looking to physical sex to gratify you, look to spiritual sex.

What is spiritual reproduction? Evangelism. And what is spiritual child-rearing, which the world pretty much unanimously agrees is the ultimate source of joy in life? We call that discipleship - and 3 John 1:4 agrees, "I have no greater joy than this: to see that my children are walking in the truth." When you begin to find your satisfaction in the spiritual source that physical sex was trying to point you toward in the first place, then you will be satisfied in Christ to a degree that you will no longer be enslaved to the physical compulsions of your sexuality. You will be

fully satisfied in them because of what Christ does in your spirit. That is a promise.

CONCLUSION

So, go make disciples. Bear fruit. Don't drop the ball on this one. Just starting this process won't cure you, but running it to completion will. I am very, very confident about this result and it has a proven track record with at least 15 of the 37 guys I've discipled over the years (on my way to the 60 yield!) who are now making their own disciples and seen the freedom that comes with this. Now, that's only 41%, which is solid but not great ... until you realize that of the other 59% of guys I've discipled, most of them never went on to produce disciples of their own, thus they never produced fruit, thus they never reaped the benefits of spiritual reproduction in their own lives (this is a sad reality of many discipleship relationships - especially before I knew how to balance the informational and relational aspects of discipleship) ... *sigh*. So, I'd wager the success rate of this method is probably a lot closer to 85-90% - and it's possible that some of those guys simply hadn't seen enough fruit in their lives when I last saw them, but have since overcome their struggle as they continued making disciples after my time with them. So, maybe the Gospel really does have a 100% success rate. Who knows ...

406 - You are "not guilty" so stop feeling guilty

9 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

This was originally written for [r/TrueChristian](#), but because it jives so well with the spiritual freedom aspects of the 400-series here, and really complements it in many ways, I thought I'd add this here too.

Okay, this issue has come up so much in light of one of my recent posts and from other conversations I've had in the past that I actually decided to look into it today. The basic premise is something like this:

- I'll talk about how our guilt is on Christ, so there's no reason for us to feel anything negative associated with our guilt and that doing so is either a direct rejection of the cross or an internal refusal to allow the cross to work in your life.
- Invariably, someone will respond that guilt is an emotional state that God uses to lead us to repentance.

I disagree. I just went through both the NIV and the ESV and found that out of at least 186 uses of the words "guilt" or "guilty" in the Bible, only 1 of these uses called it a feeling. Hebrews 10:1-2, "The law ... can never, by the same sacrifices repeated endlessly year after year, make perfect those who draw near to worship. Otherwise, would they not have stopped being offered? For the worshipers would have been cleansed once for all, and would no longer have felt guilty for their sins." There are two crucial things to note here:

- First, if there is a sacrifice "once for all," then there's no basis for feeling guilty for our sins, which actually proves once more that the saved have no basis to experience feelings associated with guilt in the first place.
- Second, the Greek word translated as "felt guilty" is used 16-30 other times in the Bible (depending on how specific you want to be with conjugations) and it is translated as "conscience" every single time, including by other translations of this verse. This is a distinct word from the other times the Bible uses the words "guilt" or "guilty."

What does this Mean?

In the Bible, guilt is not a feeling. It is a legal status - a judgment against someone's conduct. You either *are* guilty or *are not* guilty. You don't "feel" guilty. That said, when we have the status of guilt on us, there are negative feelings associated with that - shame, remorse, regret, anger, sorrow.

When a Christian says, "I feel guilty," they are speaking only in a modern colloquial sense. But if we want to know what the Bible has to say about our *guilt* we have to use the Bible's definition of guilt. If someone believes they have the legal status of guilt on them because of their sin, then it makes sense that they would feel the negative emotions associated with and produced by guilt. However, this also shows a clear misunderstanding of the Gospel. If God removed your guilt, you have no reason to feel that way any longer. Christ has set you free.

If, on the other hand, we genuinely believe that we are "not guilty" because our guilt is on Christ and not on us, what feelings would that belief produce? I imagine it would not be shame, remorse, regret, anger, or sorrow.

To put it another way that might make more sense to the guys on this sub: if you let your guilt shape your actions and emotions, then you are living in sin's frame and not your own or God's.

Godly Sorrow

Now, there is a concept known as "godly sorrow," which as a phrase is only used once in Scripture: 2 Cor. 7:10-11, "Godly sorrow brings repentance that leads to salvation and leaves no regret." But again, even this concept is not for the believer, whose foundation for repentance should not be an emotional one, but a spiritual one. Notice that the passage shows a clear progression: godly sorrow --> repentance --> salvation. In other words, it's speaking about the unsaved. This is affirmed by the context of the passage itself. Paul is referencing his prior letter that he knew caused them grief. That letter is 1 Corinthians, where Paul saw great sin within the church and people's salvation was in jeopardy. So, he calls out their sin, declares that they're in a state of guilt, and compels the church to kick out as a non-believer anyone who did not repent (1 Cor. 5). That's not an easy word and Paul says in 2 Cor. 7:8 that he actually regretted writing that for a short time - until he realized that people actually repented and were saved because of his writing that, at which point he shifted to rejoicing, not at their grief but at their repentance! In other words, godly sorrow is to lead people to salvation. There is no biblical use of this concept that the saved are meant to experience.

Conviction

In turn, what the saved are designed to experience in relation to their sin is a sense of conviction. This is what the Holy Spirit compels in us. Conviction is not a negative emotion that drives us away from sin; it is not associated with painful feelings. It is a positive and proactive desire to pursue God and godliness.

- The person who is convicted looks at his life and says, "I am not acting godly. I want to be godly. I think that would be a great thing. Now I will start being godly."
- The person who looks to guilt and the associated feelings says, "I am not acting godly. I'm a horrible person. I don't want to be ungodly. I'm going to try to stop doing ungodly things."

These two ideologies are not as closely overlapped as some might think. Turning away from sin is not the same thing as turning toward God. I have seen countless Christians who have struggled with one sin and their method of conquering it has only led to another. That is because as believers if we look to guilt as our guide, we're never orienting ourselves toward something, only away from something. If we let conviction be our guide, we are orienting ourselves toward God, without regard for the sins we are leaving behind, for they are on Christ and not us.

Repentance

I explained it recently to someone using [this illustration](#) (which was originally created for another purpose, but works well here too). Moving the same direction as Jesus is "not sin." Moving any direction other than the direction Jesus is moving is sin. Simple enough? That means that out of the 360 degrees of motion, there is only 1 degree (or technically 0 degrees - a single directional ray) that is "not sin" and the other 359 degrees are sin.

So, if I'm letter H and darting away from the direction Jesus is going, I'm sinning. But if I do a 180 degree turn ... I'm still not going the same way Jesus is going, so I'm still sinning. That's why I don't like the "repentance is doing a 180 degree turn" analogy. It's not a turning away from sin; it's a turning toward God - which inherently includes "away from sin" as a byproduct. But the goal of repentance isn't to rid ourselves of sin; it's to put on Christ and become godly. This distinction matters and it is far too often overlooked.

CONCLUSION

The bottom line is this: if you're saved, your guilt is on Christ. If you believe that and acknowledge that God has declared you "not guilty" in his sight, then there is an incredible freedom that comes with this - that we don't have to feel the negative emotional ramifications that the guilty experience when they know they've done wrong and their conscience convicts them.

However, this does not mean we are free to sin. Rather, our freedom is away from sin and toward Christ. That is the work of the Holy Spirit: to convict or motivate us toward godliness, not as if "avoiding sin" is an end in itself.---

We are not to define ourselves by our sinfulness, but by our godliness. Guilt makes us look to sin as the standard. Conviction by the Spirit makes us look to God as the standard.

8

UPVOTES

We now have RPC Chat!

9 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

The new subreddit chat feature is still in beta mode, but I have opted in for this sub. So, feel free to join the room and engage in whatever mayhem and discussion you feel appropriate. In order to get in, I do think that you have to switch to the new reddit redesign, but after that you can revert back (which is what I did). Once you're in the chat room, you don't need to keep going to the reddit redesign version to access the chat - that's only necessary for initial joining.

But do note two things:

- All of the rules will be enforced in the chatroom, except Rules 2 and 4. You do not need to share stats up-front; if people want them, it can be asked as part of the ongoing conversation. Also, feel free to engage in off-topic conversation that otherwise wouldn't have been suitable for posting.
- Be warned that this is an open forum. The moderators may not read everything that gets said on RPC Chat. There is also no filter for people to be endorsed contributors. So, don't assume that everything you read is the official position of RPC or is a good suggestion. Test everything against Scripture and if it's an important enough issue, make a post about it on the main sub.

On a separate note, I also updated Rule 2 to account for the fact that stats only need to be provided on threads asking for "relationship" help - not just any help. I think this was in my original post about the rules, but I wanted to make it clearer for anyone new here, who otherwise may have missed that post when it was stickied.

I'm writing this more so I don't forget it, so it's not very well fleshed out, but take what you will from it.

IS v. SHOULD

The church is highly invested in marriages. However, it comes from a misguided framework for understanding marriage. At a very fundamental level, marriage is created and continues successfully through attraction. If you are not attracted to someone, you won't marry them. If you are attracted, the greater the attraction the greater desire to marry them. Likewise, if you're already married but not attracted to your spouse, your desire to stay in the marriage or fulfill your marital role is minimal; but if you are highly attracted to your spouse, you have a large motivation to fulfill your role within that marriage.

The church occasionally (albeit rarely) gets the roles bit right, despite the generally horrible application on that point. But more significantly is the error the church has in its framework on attraction. **The church's position on attraction is not about what actually IS attractive, but on what the various leaders believe SHOULD BE attractive.**

Their conclusion on this point is that men and women *should be* attracted to the qualities that God looks for in a person, setting aside all other more pragmatic factors. That is, the church will tell a man that he is wrong for wanting a beautiful wife, when he should really be concerned with the quality of her heart. There is some wisdom in this on a pragmatic level, but it ultimately fails for a number of reasons.

The Great Mystery

The primary concern is that this view neglects the fact that the spiritual relationship we have with God is paralleled with the physical relationship we have with our spouse. The church suggests that God looks at the heart, and therefore we must look to the heart also and not to the outward appearance. This sounds nice in theory, but if that were the case, we would be cutting off the first half of 1 Samuel 16:7 - not to say that this verse is meant to exalt the way man looks to the outward appearance; rather, it is providing a pragmatic description of reality. More to the point, this type of thinking makes moot the spiritual parallel in the first place.

Imagine if Jesus tried to teach a spiritual concept and his disciples did not understand it. They beg and plead with him, "Give us some parable so that we can understand by analogy what you're talking about." Then Jesus responds to them, "You should not care to look to physical parallels when I'm giving you the spiritual truth. Just keep trying harder to understand without worrying about the physical examples that might otherwise help you." This seems somewhat absurd, especially given the massive number of parables Jesus told. Why did Jesus tell parables? Because he recognizes that people need to understand and experience the physical reality of things before they can grasp the spiritual truth that it reveals, which our eyes cannot see and our ears cannot hear.

To that end, when a pastor says of attraction, "You should only care about the spiritual things that matter to God," he is bypassing the physical things that help us understand why those spiritual concepts matter to God in the first place. He is also putting the spiritual things where they don't belong. Imagine if Jesus told a parable, "A farmer was sowing the Word of God one day. Some Word went onto the good soil ..." and the disciples cut him off: "Don't you mean seed, Jesus?" Jesus answers, "Of course not. The spiritual truth I'm referring to is that God's Word is what is sown, so why should farmers throw seed ever again?" A few years later all of his followers starved to death.

The Church Gets it Wrong

Even in their own game, the church's insistence to look toward the internal qualities of a person lends itself to unhealthy conclusions. Let me be clear: I'm **NOT** saying that the church's suggestions are bad. I **AM** saying that their suggestions are impractical and incomplete.

God does reveal in Scripture what qualities he wants his bride to have. This is abundantly clear. But are those

qualities what attracted God to us in the first place? No. Of course not. Romans tells us, "While we were still sinners, Christ died for us." God's clear plan for having a bride with the qualities he desires has less to do with the selection process and more to do with the sanctification process. That is, God picks people with pretty awful qualities and redeems them the same way that Ephesians 5 instructs a man to purify and redeem the faults in his wife.

I'm not suggesting that men should abandon their standards. I'm saying that Jesus created his bride rather than expecting to find a unicorn in the wild. As a result, when the church says to find a woman with certain characteristics, the more biblical approach is to find a woman you have the hots for and to sanctify her into your likeness - to meet your standards after the relationship begins. In the meantime, Jesus didn't just call anyone willy nilly who seemed eager. The rich young ruler seemed to be an attractive person on a spiritual level. Jesus looked at him and loved him. But he still let the guy walk away. Why? Because he wasn't willing to conform to Jesus's expectations. He would not submit himself to being sanctified to Christ's standard of a follower.

So, (1) find someone you have the hots for, then (2) assess whether or not she is willing to be molded to meet your standard. In my view, this is far more important than finding someone who has certain prefabricated qualities that a few pastors think are important, at the expense of other qualities that are actually important to a man, which the pastor tells him he must sacrifice.

"Look to the Heart" is Impossible

When the church says to "look to someone's heart" to assess their qualities and whether or not they're marriage material, at best what they're saying to do is: (1) ignore what makes you attracted to a woman, (2) study and examine their external patterns and behaviors of living, (3) create a psychological and character profile of the person you're evaluating, (4) select someone whose profile has qualities that lend to things that the pastor thinks are important in a functional marriage (and there's a good chance he's wrong about his list), then (5) hope that your profiling skills are exceptionally accurate or that the other person isn't faking any behaviors that would upset your profile.

This is, of course, insanely complicated and leaves a lot of room for doubt. I like Jesus' approach: First he finds a bride who sees what he has done and is submissive to him because of it. Then he says to himself, "I want her. She wants me. I take her, ravage her, and then sanctify her throughout the course of the marriage." When you're living the lifestyle that lets you **Find the Girl You Can't Keep Yourself From Banging**, this makes a lot more sense.

In the meantime, don't live in your pastor's frame. Live in your own from, which if you are in Christ should also be Christ's frame.

14

UPVOTES

For Singles: Finding the Girl You Can't Keep Yourself From Banging - PART 2!

10 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

I'm posting a lot lately, so I'll try to tame it down next week, but while I've got stuff swimming in my head, let's get this one out. This wasn't meant to be a 2-part post, but after some conversations I've had with people both in open threads and by PM it seems like there could be some benefit to providing more here. So, let me hone in on some ideas that may have been glossed over the first time. I'll stick to the same format so you can supplement appropriately by looking at the two posts side-by-side.

MARRIAGE ORIENTATION

I previously focused on Matthew 6:33 and 1 Cor. 7 as a foundation for placing your focus on God, not on finding a wife. That's not changing. But let me explain on a more practical level why this is essential in the SMP beyond just the biblical foundation.

One of the ways that RPC differs from secular RP is that secular RP has no interest in changing the system, only to figure out how to use the system to work for a man's own advantage. There is great value in this approach. But as Christians we also have a calling by God to the "ministry of reconciliation" (2 Cor. 5), which is the job of redeeming the broken things of this world to God. That's right, it's our duty not just to use feminism to work for us, but actively to fight against it, among many other broken things in this world.

In light of this distinction, traditional TRP praxeology suggests that men chase women to get what they want from them and then tells them how. Their methods are very effective. But at the end of the day, they're still pursuing the women, which gives woman-kind a certain power over them. That's the "submit to the system" mentality of TRP. They rationalize/hamster this by saying, "But if I have an abundance of women, then no individual woman can have power or control over me. I'm not in any particular woman's frame, so what does it matter?" Well, you're still letting feminism be the boss of you and dictate how you pursue women. And this is necessary! ... but only as a temporary measure in the grander scheme. Sometimes you must use the system to fight the system.

But what I advise men to do is **stop pursuing women altogether**. I know, this sounds MGTOW, and in some senses it might be, but as an effective strategy for getting women ... hear me out first. If a woman knows you're actively seeking a relationship, she becomes the supply to your demand. Even a very rudimentary understanding of economics will tell you that the one who controls the supply is the one in power. Either she keeps the supply low and makes those in demand squabble for her affection (fitness testing, playing hard to get, etc.) or she opens the floodgates and becomes wealthy for all the supply she's throwing out (whipping her BB).

When you stop looking for a wife and start looking to God, this is a DHV. You are communicating that you don't need her. You become the supply. At first, you're going to lose a lot of women who might otherwise have been interested in you if you were actively pursuing them, but that orientation of a relationship creates a very shaky foundation that is not sustainable in a healthy long-term marriage. If women know you're actively looking, then they become the judge over you, sorting out whether or not they're interested in the kind of attention you have to offer. Since you're looking for her, she assumes you need her, which gives her power over you.

Having an abundance helps mitigate this harm, but it still places you in a larger female frame. I prefer the approach of leaving the female frame altogether and stepping into God's frame. Stop pursuing women. That's how you're going to get women - and with a healthy foundation for the relationship. I know it sounds weird and backwards, but I'm pretty darn confident about this and it's how I met my wife, so let me be your anecdotal evidence.

5 STEPS TO FINDING A WIFE (by not trying to find one)

In the previous post I focused on the pragmatic aspects of the five steps - the "how to." Now I'm going to go deeper into the underlying premise of "why" this works.

ONE: Find a mission in life. I explained in [108 - Lifepath of a Relationship](#) that if you make your marriage the focal point of your life you will fail. At some point you need something bigger than yourselves. Your mission in life must transcend your wife and kids.

People who make their marriage their mission most often end up divorced. It's not sustainable. You can't go anywhere together if you're only going toward each other. Once you have each other, to keep walking toward each other just causes you to keep clashing into each other. That's painful and each clash causes you to bump away as you recover. Then like idiots you walk into each other again and keep repeating the process ad nauseam until you realize that by pursuing each other you're only creating pain and friction. God didn't design you for that.

You're better off finding something else outside the relationship and walking side by side. When you do this, you are no longer going to clash - you stay in stride and live in harmony. You're both looking to the same destination. Some people like to use the imagery of a triangle where spouses are at the bottom two points and God is at the top - as you both walk toward the same focal point (God), the two of you grow closer together as well. I prefer two parallel lines because that's how every effective craft in motion works and it recognizes the directional nature of following God, not assuming that there is a single destination that we're both trying to reach at which point we have "arrived." Either version is fine though.

TWO: Start living your mission. This sounds very basic, but many people actually miss it. They assume that by articulating a mission their life will naturally be oriented toward the fulfillment of that mission. Then, without any intentional strides, after 10 years roll by they look back and realize that they haven't done squat and the "oh, it'll just happen" approach wasn't so successful.

The mission is pointless and unattractive if it never becomes anything more than a pipe dream. So, if your mission is discipleship, who can you name that you're discipling today? Or who are you going to start discipling tomorrow? If your mission is to plant a church, what are you doing today to lay that foundation? If your mission is to serve the homeless, how many homeless people do you know today by name who you want to serve? If your mission is to start a non-profit in your local community, what steps have you already taken to make that happen?

Most people never take the first step. Even less take the second, then the third, and very few ever actually accomplish their goals. This is unattractive. It tells women that you live in a fantasy land, but that you'll never follow through on your big promises. So, a good mission is attractive, but it loses its attractive power if you don't actually do anything about it.

THREE: Develop orbiters. Last time I talked about the orbiters who will naturally flock to you. This time I'm going to tell you it's okay to be active in seeking them out as well. If you're not a wimp, your mission should be something big enough that you can't accomplish alone. After all, if you could do it alone, why do you need a helper alongside you in the first place? Think big. But because your mission is so big, you're going to need to start recruiting people to get it done.

Every guy starting a company imagines that at some point he'll have to hire workers. Anyone wanting to build a house will need to recruit other builders to help him. Whatever you're trying to accomplish, this recruitment process is what's going to advance your social network. It will give you a context for meeting new people ([even though you should be able to do this without context](#)). Ultimately, this is how you're going to meet the girl you end up marrying.

When you do it this way, your mission becomes the foundation of the relationship, which puts you in a really good spot. If you met her because you were chasing tail, then your pursuit of her is what sits at the foundation of the relationship and you're going to have to do a lot of work to reverse that tide. More to the point: if recruiting her for your mission is how you met, then you already know you're both pointed in the same direction in life, which means that 1,000 foot rope that others experience when there is no common pursuit ... well it just got a lot shorter and you may never have a rope at all in the first place.

Creation v. Adoption

No, I don't mean those words in a theological sense, but this is another concept within the development of "orbiters" for your mission that needs to be addressed.

Most men don't create their own mission - they orbit someone else's mission, then try to cherry pick from the other man's orbiters. The man assumes that because he's following someone else's mission and she is too, that they're already on the same mission together. But this fails because she's not attracted to **YOUR** mission; she's attracted to **HIS**. Chances are that the other guy is married, so she might settle for you instead, but she'll always wish it was him.

A prime example of this is men going to church. They follow their pastor and become one of his orbiters - in a good way, not a weird sexual way. They look around at the other women orbiting him and try to attract them. This is the old, "Go to church to pick up chicks" approach, and on its own it doesn't work. The woman is always going to be attracted to the one who's setting the course and paving the way. In red pill terminology that's called the AMOG.

But a man can internalize a common vision with someone else and utilize "drifting" to make fulfillment of his internalization of that mission easier, while still maintaining his own set of orbiters who see him as the leader. What's drifting? It's a NASCAR term for when one car follows closely behind another car ahead of him. They both recognize a common mission: the finish line. The front car is pursuing that destination and the back car "drifts" behind him so close that he gets to avoid all the wind resistance that the front car has to deal with, saving him gas, improving his traction, and ultimately putting him in a position to hammer down on the pedal and pass the guy. The key with drifting is that you aren't actually following the other car's mission, trying to help him get to the finish line - you're going to that same finish line yourself and you're merely taking advantage of the momentum he's already built.

I believe this is a very biblical concept. God doesn't want a bunch of people who do things just because their pastor said so. He wants people who have internalized the vision and are setting their sights to the finish line. We are then meant to cooperate in achieving that goal. And if someone else can deal with some of the resistance while we figure out what we're doing, all the better. So, if your pastor gives you a mission because you can't see the finish line for yourself, that's all well and good - but if you want to develop your own orbiters rather than cherry-picking from your pastor's orbiters, you're going to have to internalize that mission and pursue it independently, without waiting for your pastor to tell you what to do.

So, if you lack a clearly defined mission for yourself and your pastor says to make disciples, then go start a discipleship ministry. You don't need his help or approval to do it. If your pastor wants to serve the community, go start a service project. You don't need to wait for him to organize a church-wide effort to get this done. **YOU** be the one to organize that church-wide effort, and go to your pastor to help you with recruitment. If your pastor says his goal is to get people involved in small groups, then go start a small group and train other small group leaders to start their own groups too. You don't need the pastor's help to get this started.

This is the concept of drifting: you're making use of the momentum someone else has created, but instead of looking to that person as the end-destination you look to the finish line and utilize the resources that person has put out there in order to aid in your recruitment efforts, which is how you'll develop the social network to meet the girl you one day won't be able to keep yourself from banging. Your pastor is still leading the way, but rather than him being the one recruiting others to follow his execution, you are the one recruiting others to follow the way you're pursuing the vision that your pastor has instilled in you. This is very powerful, especially for guys who haven't figured out their own mission yet (assuming the pastor's mission is actually a good one).

FOUR: Cultivate your orbiters. This is where you're training the people you recruit to actually do what you recruited them to do. Most people skip this training phase. The standard church model is to think, "I have lots of people. I have tasks. Let's assign the people to the task." And that's it. But what if the people aren't equipped and qualified for the task? You have to train them. Virtually every church I've ever been in completely misses the boat

on this "training" concept. They assume that people are just already qualified because they've been sitting in the pew for a decade. Or they assign people who are already naturally bent to the task so that they don't have to do any actual training. This is lazy. Don't do that.

Training is key because it's what gives you the face-time with the people you've recruited to start building the relationships. With other men, this is how you'll find the guys you'll disciple, as you pursue a common mission together - and hopefully someday he'll set his sights past you and start looking to the finish line also, and then he'll use you for drifting. This is a good thing! But when it comes to women, it's a little different. They are designed by God only to look one step ahead and not to the finish line. They don't drift behind you to gain an advantage in the race; they sit in the passenger seat beside you, letting you know when it's okay to change lanes, when to pass, when to take a pit stop, etc. (I really am not a NASCAR guy, but this works, so I'm rolling with it).

As you train the women you've recruited, you'll notice patterns of who is Faithful, Available, and Teachable and who is not. You'll notice who is attractive and who is not. You'll notice who is submissive to your leadership and who is not. And you'll also be setting a stage that they're already used to following your leadership - a wonderful foundation for a relationship. This is the phase where you do all of your vetting and discern what red flags there are and if she's really on board with your mission or if she's only there because she thought you were cute. This is also where you give her concrete evidence that you're a high value man. Either way, your mission is still your priority - not chasing pussy.

As the training happens and your orbiters become proficient, you're both being more effective at accomplishing your mission and you're already living life alongside each other. In this context, attractions form and can be very powerful.

FIVE: Start the relationship. I don't have much to add here beyond what I said last time. At this point you're not single anymore, so you can move on to all the other posts for people in LTRs or marriages. The bottom line is that at some point you'll realize, "Dang, I wasn't even looking for a wife, but this girl's really a good helper to everything I've been doing and she's so hot that I don't know how long I can keep my pants on." So, you press forward and start being intentional about the relationship.

THE LARGER FRAME ISSUE

By following this path, unlike the secular TRP model where you're submitting to a feminist framework, you're creating your own path. You're being a temporary MGTOW until you realize that it's to **YOUR** advantage to lock down a woman whose help and sex are going to advance **YOUR** purposes. Don't supplicate yourself to hypergamy and make hypergamy work for you (although you can do that too if you want); it's better to leave the feminist framework entirely, live in God's framework on a mission for him, and draw other people into that framework. And then when you're horny enough for the people around you, pick one, marry her, and start banging her. And if you never marry, as Paul says, all the better.

Anyway, I know the structure of this post followed the same as the last one, but hopefully it doesn't feel repetitive and you can gain some better insights on following the path that's going to get you a wife with a strong foundation for the marriage and without sacrificing your commitment to God in the process.

20

UPVOTES

[FR] Duty Sex Doesn't Exist

13 August 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill · Archived copy · Reddit

FRAME

Lots of guys post about getting duty sex from their wives on both r/askMRP and r/RPChristians. This used to be a thorn in my side in my marriage. Here's the thing, though: I stopped caring.

Duty sex is just a frame issue: either (1) she's genuinely not into it, or (2) I'm not into it because I perceive that she's not into it. Either way, my enjoyment of sex is defined by my perception of her emotions. Not good.

I concluded that I can have **exciting** sex whenever I want. It only requires two things:

- That I have the physical strength to move my wife's body in a way that pleases me, and
- That my frame is unshaken by my perception of her enjoyment of sex.

I'll add in a bonus one too, which although it's unnecessary it does help a lot:

- That I can get my wife on the verge of an orgasm regardless of whether or not she's into it (sorry to those men who can't - like I said, this isn't necessary anyway).

I've found that with the first two alone, my wife never actually objects - I was only stifling myself based on my perception of how I thought she'd react. "My good Christian girl would never do that!" ... is a total lie that I was believing for too long. If she gives you a hard stop, then stop - no sense getting marital rape charges. But that hard no hasn't actually happened for me since I started this.

EMOTIONAL EMPATH

I have a theory about women being emotional empaths that I haven't done much actual writing on. But the gist is that they emotionally experience whatever their man does. So, when a man sacrifices his happiness to appease her, she's still unhappy because he's unhappy. If he pursues his own happiness even at her expense, she's actually happier as a result - because his happiness empathically rubs off on her.

In my experience, this concept applies in the bedroom too. If I think she's just giving me duty sex and I'm not all that excited about it because of her body language, things she says, etc., then she picks up on my non-excitement and I've just created my own nightmare. If I don't care whether she's into it or not and I'm just excited because I've got a hot naked woman in my bed who's letting me toss her around the room ... well, she picks up on my excitement and suddenly gets excited about it too.

So, are you going to live in her frame and still believe that duty sex is actually a real thing? Or are you going to get her into your frame to start enjoying sex because you enjoy it?

CHALLENGE

I'm really writing this to look for more feedback from guys who want to test this out. Over the last month or two I can't tell if I'm just not getting duty sex anymore or if I'm actually right about all this and duty sex never existed in the first place. So, for you guys who like to complain about duty sex, get in your own frame, go screw around with your wife for a while, then come back and let me know how it went.

Caveat: u/rocknrollchuck appropriately suggested that this might not be a great idea for total newcomers who don't even know what their own frame is, much less how to get out of hers. Fair point. A guy's gotta be somewhat attractive first, I suppose, or that hard no will preclude actual reliable results. Don't go Rambo.

I've debated this concept internally many times and have never come to a conclusion: *Can a Christian man have multiple priorities or should God be his only priority?*

Multiple: The general argument is that God has given us dominion over a number of things. Although our pursuit of Christ should always be our number one priority, it is appropriate to pursue other priorities as distinct and separate from our pursuit of Christ, as Christ has placed us in a position of responsibility over other things than merely our pursuit of Him. For example, when Moses was praying to God, making God his highest priority, God essentially says, "Stop praying to me and go lead the people I gave you!" (Exodus 14:15). A more pragmatic and relevant example would be that it's perfectly appropriate to love and care for one's wife and children simply because our relationship to them, independent of our faith, places this obligation on us, and there is value in such a prioritization, particularly when it is appropriately placed in a subordinate role to our obligation to God.

Single: The theory here is that our motive for anything should be derived from God himself, so no other priority has any value in itself; rather, it only has value to the degree that we do it in the context of serving God as our highest priority. As such, when we provide for our family or go to the gym or watch a TV show, our motivation should always be one of faith for God, the failure of which is sin (Romans 14:23). Accordingly, we shouldn't pursue anything unless our faith compels us to do it, which means that even something as basic as loving your spouse and children is detestable to God if it is done for any purpose other than our faith prompting us to glorify God through such behaviors (Hebrews 11:6; Isaiah 64:6; 1 Cor. 10:31).

I feel like this is the "slice v. pan" distinction. The "multiple priorities" theory assumes that our obligation to God is a slice of the pie - a portion of our life that must be balanced with other practical concerns, like going to work, raising our kids, etc., which are all important for their own sake, but should be subordinate to our obligations to God. The "singular priority" theory assumes that our obligation to God is the pie pan and that all slices of the pie are meant to fit inside of that overarching framework - and that when a slice of the pie is taken out of the pan ... well, it just turns to mush and rarely holds its shape.

The reason I ask is that I often lean toward the singular priority theory, but I get the impression that most people view life in the multiple priority theory. They carve out a slice of life for God and explain away that they can't give much more because there are other "essential" things that "God wouldn't want us to ignore," although their motive isn't necessarily one of doing it *from faith* as it is using faith to *rationalize* why it's okay to have other separate priorities. Then again, there are times when I've been almost convinced of the multiple priority theory - so here's your chance. Convince me. Or don't.

It's likely that I will use feedback from this post as a foundation point for another post sometime down the line about how men and women prioritize things differently and how to lead through proper prioritization (unless someone else would like to beat me to it!)

As many of you know, I'm a writer for gotquestions.com. One of the questions seemed somewhat relevant to many men here who might otherwise struggle with being in a second, third, etc. marriage, so I figured I'd share this one. This is, of course, open for discussion and not a hard-lined stance I take.

QUESTION

Married 2 times, I was unfaithful. I have always believed in Jesus. I'm not a new Christian. Now married a 3rd time from Christian mingle, wife know my past. I have seen sermons on divorce & remarriage & they say if someone divorces & remarries another and was the cheater then they stand under Gods wrath and must divorce the current spouse & remain single or they are not saved. I feel doomed and have seen my pastor at Calvary Chapel. They say I'm forgiven. Before I got remarried I spoke to 2 BSF (Bible study fellowship) leaders and 2 pastors and all 4 of them said I can remarry, so not wanting to fall into sexual sin, I married. I felt that I was never to remarry again from the beginning, even after seeking Godly council. I feel that if I do not divorce my now wife and remain single that I'm doomed to Hell. This have me in horrid fear all day long and I'm a heart patient. I have begged God for his word daily to help me but am confused as there is no answer or there is an answer and I'm not seeing it. I know the attributes of our Jesus and also know that Jesus is not a God of confusion. I need assurance of my salvation but don't have it. If divorce and remarriage is a sin or a continual state of sin...please help

MY ANSWER

"Must divorce the current spouse & remain single or they are not saved"

I want to address this up-front because it is the most important part of your question, if misunderstood. Salvation is only by grace through faith (GTF) in the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. Our works are evidence of our faith, but the works by themselves do not have the ability to grant or disqualify anyone of salvation. Any model that adds to the Gospel is a wrong one. In the present case, these sermons you're listening to are suggesting that Salvation = GTF + not remarrying after divorce. I hardly find any Scriptural passages linking salvation with remarriage after divorce.

I suspect that what they're really getting at is the issue of unrepentant sin. There is a wide debate in Christian circles over whether or not a person can lose their salvation over unrepentant sin or if someone who sins unrepentantly was never saved in the first place. Either way, Hebrews 10:26 stands - If someone continues in willful, deliberate, continual sin without repentance they will be condemned. The question, then, is whether or not remarriage after divorce constitutes willful, deliberate, continual sin without repentance - and if so, whether their sin is justified by God on some other ground.

Divorce and Remarriage

Fault v. No-Fault Divorce

There is a wide debate on the issue of whether or not remarriage after divorce is sinful. In today's culture, divorce is a no-fault, mutual thing. If one person wants a divorce, the other is considered to be engaged actively in the divorce as well. By standard legal practice (I'm a divorce attorney), every divorce complaint that's filed is answered with a counterclaim also seeking a divorce, so even if the first person dropped the divorce, the case would still go on per the other party's filing. It's mutual.

Hebrew culture was different in Jesus's day. There was a difference between divorcing someone and being divorced by someone. Some Jewish scholars at the time believed that a man could divorce his wife over anything and

everything, such as burning dinner even one time, or wearing a dress that he didn't like. The other camp believed there had to be some actual fundamental grounds for the divorce. The latter was the dominant one, and Jesus seems to assume this to be the correct/default position in the way he talks about divorce, although his view may be even more restrictive than any of them. Consider the following passages.

Matthew 5:32 and 1 Cor. 7:10-11

In Matthew 5:32 Jesus says, "Everyone who divorces his wife, except on the ground of sexual immorality, makes her commit adultery, and whoever marries a divorced woman commits adultery."

Interestingly, this passage says nothing about the sinfulness of the one doing the divorcing - only on the status of the woman who has been divorced. It presumes that the divorced woman will eventually find another husband, as Jesus comments immediately on such a man in the same verse, and as also would have been customary in that society where a divorced woman would otherwise have virtually no other means of survival. At first glance, then, one might assume that the "except for marital unfaithfulness" clause would authorize the woman to engage in the second relationship, as if she were not an adulteress in such a scenario. The more textually appropriate reading in the Greek (and even in the English) is that Jesus is referencing whether or not the husband divorcing his wife makes her an adulteress, and not the woman marrying a new man. To that end, the husband who divorces his sexually unfaithful wife does not make her an adulteress because she has already made herself one in the first place. Presumably the same would apply if the gender roles were reversed.

That is, because you committed adultery, if you divorced your wife (or she you), then she has not made you an adulteress because (1) you are under no societal imperative to remarry and, (2) more importantly, you made yourself an adulteress and she did not have to do this for you. I say this not to judge you, but as a matter of fact. Similarly, per the end of that same verse, your subsequent wives were made adulteresses by marrying you.

That all pertains to the status of the person who has been divorced. To understand the sinfulness of the man who does the divorcing in the first place, we look to 1 Corinthians 7:10-11 - "To the married I give this charge (not I, but the Lord): the wife should not separate from her husband (but if she does, she should remain unmarried or else be reconciled to her husband), and the husband should not divorce his wife. When Paul says "should not separate" here, he is clearly referencing a divorce and not what we know today as a "legal separation" - first, because the modern concept of legal separation did not exist in that day, but also because he says immediately after, "she should remain unmarried," making clear that he understands the marriage to be broken, i.e. divorced. The implication, then, is that even in the case of divorce one is meant to remain unmarried and the only person a divorced person can then marry is their former spouse, reconciling their broken relationship.

Matthew 19:8-9

Matthew 19:8-9 also says, "Because of your hardness of heart Moses allowed you to divorce your wives, but from the beginning it was not so. And I say to you: whoever divorces his wife, except for sexual immorality, and marries another, commits adultery." In other words, "That wasn't God's intent, but Moses allowed it anyway." This was not to imply that divorce was somehow acceptable to God; rather, it was a concession made to men by men in order to prevent a greater harm that would have occurred if Moses had not otherwise permitted this. For example, if a man could not divorce his wife to escape a bad marriage, he might have killed her instead. Between the two options, both are sinful, but divorce is the preferable course of action all the same.

As to verse 9, Jesus' comment on "except for sexual immorality" is not a reference to married couples in the way we know them today. When we see the phrase "sexual immorality" today in the context of marriage, we often think of adultery, which is when a married person sleeps with someone who is not his/her spouse. The Greek word for this is *moicheia*. However, in verse 9 Jesus does not say *moicheia*; he says *porneia*, which is the Greek word to reference a variety of sexual behaviors, usually outside of a marriage context, at least as we know marriage today.

Now, it would seem apparent that Jesus is talking about someone who is legally married because he says, "divorces his wife." But that word for "wife" is *gunaika*, which is the same word used to describe Mary while she was

betrothed to Joseph. That is, in Jesus' day, people were called "married" and "husband/wife" upon engagement, which was a much more serious affair than the types of engagements we enter into today that can be broken at the drop of a hat. Similarly, in John 8:41 we see the word *porneia* used to describe the Jewish leaders' accusations of Mary and Joseph having sex without being legally married in order to conceive Jesus. Although we know biblically that this is not true, this insight does further evidence that the type of relationship Jesus was referencing in Matthew 19:9 is not that of a husband/wife as we know them today, but that of two people who were betrothed, where one person calls off the marriage because of the sexual impropriety of the other.

In today's engagements we do not see people as having entered into a covenant or vow, which we only see happening at the time of the ceremony; we see the engagement itself as nothing more than a statement of intention. Engagements in Jewish culture at the time Jesus was alive did involve a clear covenant between two people that simply was not consummated until after the ceremony. Jesus is suggesting in verse 8 that divorce between legally married persons is always wrong. He then follows it up in verse 9, changing gears with the phrase, "And I say to you," and then communicating, "Not only is divorce between married persons wrong, but it's even adultery to break the engagement covenant unless one party has already engaged in a one-flesh relationship with someone else." To be clear, this "engagement period" in Jewish culture would have been virtually identical to the period of time in modern culture between the wedding ceremony where the couple exchanges vows and the wedding night, when the couple first has sex.

Spiritual Marriage v. Legal Marriage

Biblical marriage is defined by two things, and two things only: (1) a covenant, and (2) sex. A covenant is a mutual agreement between two people, much like a modern-day contract. It is a "meeting of the minds," so to say. Biblically, covenants are never to be broken for any reason. Breaking the covenant of the law made one a law breaker. Breaking the covenant of marriage would make one a marriage-breaker, or adulterer.

However, every covenant is consummated by some symbolic act. In modern day, this symbolic act is almost always putting your signature on the contract. In the covenant God had with Abraham, circumcision was the symbolic act that sealed the covenant. In the covenant of marriage, sex is the act that sealed the deal. So, Jesus' exception in Matthew 19:9 for allowing people to break a marriage covenant was only in the case of annulment - when the two had not slept together. This is no different than a modern court nullifying a contract because neither party had signed it.

It's also important to recognize the importance of Matthew 19:6 as the context in which Jesus speaks verses 8-9, which says, "So they are no longer two, but one flesh. Therefore what God has joined together, let no one separate." That is, God places great weight and value on covenants, but it is when two people become one flesh by having sex that God actually joins them together. This is affirmed in Malachi 2:15, which says, "Did he not make them one, with a portion of the Spirit in their union?" That is, the Holy Spirit binds people together through the act of having sex. This is why 1 Cor. 6 and 2 Cor. 6 both talk about the "oneness" that is created through sexuality and that when we become one with a prostitute, for example, we are not only uniting ourselves to her, but everything else that we are one with as well - and also anything that she is one with, as evidenced by 2 Cor. 6:15's comment that it would be like trying to unite "Belial" (the demon/idol with whom she has a oneness bond) with Christ, with whom we share a oneness bond.

In this sense, a person, once married, is never divorced from his spouse if there was a covenant sealed by sex. Although they may divorce each other in a legal sense, they remain spiritually united and nothing can change this. That is why Paul says in 1 Cor. 7 that if a woman separates from her husband she must remain single or otherwise reconcile with her husband - because in God's eyes they are still married.

Conclusion

In short, it is sin both to divorce your spouse and to remarry anyone after divorce. There is no exception where any of these things are "not sin."

Breaking a Covenant

It is no secret that polygamy was practiced by numerous biblical characters in a capacity acknowledged by God as legitimate marriages. This is not to say that God endorses or approves of polygamous relationships, for which there is a substantial case also for demonstrating that polygamy is sinful. Instead, the purpose in acknowledging this is merely to say that covenants to a second wife are legitimate and valid, including through consecration of the marriage vows by having sex.

In Numbers 30:2 we see, "If a man vows a vow to the Lord, or swears an oath to bind himself by a pledge, he shall not break his word. He shall do according to all that proceeds out of his mouth." This is such an intense reality in God's eyes that when Jephthah, in Judges 11, vowed to sacrifice the first thing that came out of his home in exchange for God's help, he ended up sacrificing his own daughter. This is why Jesus gives strong cautions against making oaths or vows in the first place (Matthew 5:33-37), which James echoes in James 5:12.

In short, if you have remarried someone into a covenant relationship and have sealed that relationship with sex, then you have sinned by committing adultery, but the covenant is still binding and you should not break your oath before God to your subsequent wife.

Justifiable Conduct

Although something may be sinful, a particular action may be justifiable in God's eyes. It does not make it "right" or a model that others should follow, as it is still sin, but it is a preferred course of conduct nonetheless. This concept exists because God acknowledges that we are in a fallen state and cannot help ourselves from sinning.

I have already mentioned one example of this. In Matthew 19:8 Jesus says that Moses permitted divorce not because it was "not sin" under certain circumstances, but because of the hardness of a person's heart. Similarly, as has already been alluded to, although polygamy is almost certainly sin (on grounds that would be too off-topic to address here), God allowed it to continue in many Old Testament marriages and even utilized Jacob's polygamous relationships with Leah, Rachel, and their servants to birth the heads of the 12 tribes of Israel.

Even in the New Testament, we see Paul vehemently condemning those who imposed Jewish laws and customs over the non-Jews as being wrong (even wishing they would be emasculated, per Galatians 5:12), but he also concedes in Acts 15 to impose some laws over the Gentiles anyway - not because this is the "right" or best thing to do, but because there was no other way to bring peace between the Jews and the Gentiles. That is, because their hearts were hardened, there had to be a "lesser of two evils" that was chosen.

In your case, remarriage after divorce is sin, but it is justifiable as the "lesser of two evils." Have you done wrong? Yes. But would you have done even greater harm to God's Kingdom and His purposes if you had remained single and been tempted into sexual relations outside of marriage? Most likely. I say this not to condemn you as having a hard heart, but in acknowledging the practical reality that most men, yourself included, once having tasted sex with a woman, cannot return to a life without it in the absence of unique gifting from God that enables them to do so. Rather than letting you commit a great sin in your weakness, permitting you to remarry is the lesser sin that is more appropriate, which is the course of action you have chosen.

Conclusion

Yes, divorce is sin. Yes, remarriage is sin. Yes, it is a continual state of sin. But you are always in a continual state of sin. As long as we are in this flesh, we will always be less than God intended. That is why God gives us a new flesh in heaven. That is why even after being saved and while godly enough to write inspired Scripture, Paul wrote Romans 7:25, saying, "In my flesh I am a slave to sin, but in my mind I am a slave to righteousness." That is not to justify our sinful conduct, as we must always seek to be sanctified, but it is an acknowledgment that we cannot escape sin while in this "body of death," as Paul calls it in the immediate previous verse. Even if you had never remarried at all, your flesh would still be in a continual rebellion against God. Praise God that he looks at the heart and not at our flesh, and that he has renewed our hearts in Christ! Let this be your motivation for living rightly.

As a practical matter, for you to break your covenant with your current wife would be sin, and a far greater grievance against God and His people than remaining in a marriage that was sinful at its inception. This is the reality of living in a broken world: that sometimes we will be caught in a catch-22 where no matter what options appear before us, it is sinful.

But regardless of the technicality of our behaviors and choices, God is more concerned with the orientation of our hearts. Your heart is now oriented toward obedience. The fear of being disobedient to God has caused you great turmoil. This is not a sign that you are not saved; rather, if you were not saved you would have no care about the effects of your sinfulness in the first place. Take comfort in this fact that your heart is not callous and hardened against God and your status before him.

Go have sex with your wife. Whether it was sin for you to marry her or not, God has joined you two together when you became one flesh. Just don't let anyone separate you from your wife ever again - especially not yourself.

10

UPVOTES

RPC is now fully functional with the Reddit redesign. Enjoy!

17 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

Most importantly, all of the rules are now visible on the sidebar of the redesign. In addition, I put up some color schemes and made a quick banner.

For anyone who's using the redesign, you now have no excuses ;)

There's a lot of debate over this topic, especially when contemplating intergender relational dynamics. I don't have much time, so this post will mostly be a collection of thoughts in a rather disorganized fashion. It's meant more to stimulate conversation on a relevant topic than it is to make a clear point.

Here are a few quick thoughts to get the conversation going.

ONEitis is not love. Love is not defined by an infatuated state of heightened emotions. To conflate the two can lead in horrible directions.

1 Cor. 13 lists attributes of love, but does not provide an exclusive or exhaustive definition. Principles we can draw from it, though, include: (1) love is the most important of all virtues; (2) behaviors that we associate with "love" can be done without love (ex. giving to the poor, being a martyr); (3) the identifications of what love "is" do not include emotion language, they include decisions; (4) the identifications of what love "is not" includes both decisions and emotions.

1 John 4:8 says that "God is love." This is the closest thing we have in the Bible to a comprehensive, exhaustive definition of love. Rather than looking to aspects or qualities that describe love, we look to God himself.

More interestingly is the implication that without God there is no love. That is, when secular RP says that a woman cannot love a man, from a secular perspective this is absolutely true: it is impossible for anyone to love apart from God. At best, I have heard it argued that those without God can emulate a shadow of biblical love because of the general grace that God gives over humanity, or because of the broken remnant of his reflection that we bear even after the fall.

Contrarily, if this verse is true in any meaningful sense, then any expression of love between two people inherently must include God in the exchange. That could be in directly sharing Christ with someone through evangelism, but it could also be through relaying the character of Christ to someone in a way that leads them closer to godliness. But if I fail to include God in the exchange, no matter how "good" my behavior toward someone might seem on an outward level, God views it as filthy rags (Isaiah 64:6), and if it isn't produced from faith, it's still sin (Romans 14:23).

John 14:21 gives a prerequisite for loving Jesus: having his commands and obeying them. Jesus did not say, "Whoever has tingly, gooey feelings whenever he thinks of me is the one who loves me."

Matthew 7 lists people who do attempt to do good works, but with whom Jesus denies any actual relationship, making it clear that actions alone are not sufficient to define love.

Matthew 15:8 notes, "These people honor me with their lips, but their hearts are far from me. They worship me in vain; their teachings are merely human rules." This implies again that outward behaviors and expressions of love do not constitute love. So, no matter how many times she professes her undying love for you, don't look at her words. Likewise, no matter how emotional you feel toward her and how many times you've expressed it, don't trust your own emotions either.

Greek words for love are unreliable as a basis for most of Scriptural interpretation. It may be relevant to a few of the epistles that were originally written in Greek, but Jesus was not preaching to a Greek audience, nor did he speak in Greek. We'd be better off looking to the Hebrew, whose language would have been familiar and whose culture was dominant among those Jesus ministered to, or to the Aramaic, which was the language Jesus most likely actually used when saying many of these words (although the Aramaic presents a different problem because we don't actually know which Aramaic words were spoken).

So What is Love?

The best conclusion I've reached is that, in a strict biblical sense, love is *the orientation of our hearts to share what God has given us with someone else*. Here are some more musings on how I reached that conclusion, biblically.

Love is always talked about in the Bible in terms of interconnectivity. God is the only individual person who is said to be love or even "have" love without anyone else - and that is because he is triune (see C. S. Lewis' thoughts on this toward the end of *Mere Christianity*). Even when a person is said to love himself, this is usually an interconnection between his will toward his flesh or his emotional state. In this sense, love always begins in a person's will.

If love originates in a person's will, then we can rightly understand love not as the feelings we experience in our hearts or as the behaviors we commit with our bodies, but as the motivations that cause us to feel or do those things. Perhaps our "intentions" would be a better way to put it, however poorly they may be executed at times. In that sense, love is neither an action nor a feeling, but a motivation or intention.

For example, if I am kind toward someone, if my intention is to be recognized for my kindness, this is not "love" because I have not incorporated a communication of God or godliness to that person with my intentions, only with my outward behaviors. Similarly, as with saving faith, an intention or motivation that never manifests into anything is merely daydreaming and not the genuine article (see James 2, by parallel), thus cannot be "love" if nothing ever comes of it - that is, we are mistaken as to our own intentions because a man follows through with his intentions and his behavior is defined by his true motivations.

If I intend to go to the gym, but end up watching a show instead, this means that my motivation and intention to enjoy the TV show in front of me is of greater weight and importance than my motivation and intention to go to the gym, and the lesser intention is only a farce we pretend exists. When a man says, "I planned on doing x, but y came up so I did that instead," this only communicates that a man never planned on doing x if y was an option. This view works well with the tension we see in the Bible between Jesus' statements about what the one who loves him *does* as compared to the fact that he says many people who do these things *do not* actually love him. That is, he is looking toward the orientation of their heart - the reason *why* they're doing those things in the first place. If the reason is an expression of God working through them, it is love; if it is self-motivated, it is not an expression of love.

If you have been around here for any time, I would hope that you have learned a thing or two about motivation. When a motivation is defined by an intended result, we call that a contract. When that result is an unspoken expectation, it's a covert contract. As such, if your alleged love for someone is conditional on an anticipated response from them, especially when you have not overtly communicated that anticipated response when you initiated your actions, you are, at best, expressing only a shadow of biblical love. One of the attributes we see in 1 Cor. 13 about love is that it never fails. But conditions fail. So, if our love is conditional, it is not biblical love.

But unconditional love is not stupid either. If God is love, then he must be acting in love when he lets people walk away from him to their own destruction (Romans 1:18 et seq, for example). Simply put, if God is love and they are rejecting God, then they don't have love and perhaps the most loving thing to do (i.e. the most God-like thing to do) is to let them walk away and reap the fruit of their rejection.

Too many people make false assumptions about who God is and what loving behavior looks like when they try to impute modern linguistic definitions for the term on what was actually meant by the word in an ancient text. Praise God that "ancient" does not mean irrelevant.

Conclusion

I may pretty up this post someday, but for now I just want to get people thinking. In the meantime, I do stand firm

(however poorly articulated it is here) in my view that love is defined by our internal motivations toward someone, which can only qualify as "love" when those motivations intend to communicate God to someone in some fashion.

To those who differ and believe that your intense emotions define love, or who believe that your actions and behaviors can define love, let's talk.

I'm in a cut phase right now. For those of you who haven't hit 12% or less body fat yet (I'm on my way), I've noticed substantial improvement in the last 2 months on a plan I've tailored to my own psychology.

Most diets, like Keto, Whole30, Atkins, Daniel Diet, etc. are difficult to follow for most people because the temptation to "cheat" is way too high. In essence, where RP uses the word "Rambo" for someone who goes in too far, too fast, that's what most diets expect - that you cold-turkey start eating a brand new way one day.

Intermittent fasting was very intriguing to me for a variety of reasons, but what made it sustainable long-term was that I had a short-term goal to look forward to: I just had to make it to dinner, which was easy when occupied by work. Unfortunately, my body adapted to my new caloric intake levels and eating pattern to a point where I just stopped losing weight or feeling the fat-burn (i.e. intense hunger), no matter how much I worked out or pounded the road. I employed intermittent fasting for the last year and found that after the first few weeks I had normalized and didn't see much improvement from ongoing application after that. I had to supplement with other more hard-core periodic diets (which last year I had done the Whole30 twice).

Rather than doing a more hard-core long-term diet, I decided to compromise and started doing what I'm calling "random interval fasting." I'm sure this is actually a thing that has a real name, but I haven't seen it in my brief researching.

What is it?

Basically, I have "off" and "on" days with regard to food.

- **OFF:** I consume only 500 or less calories + as many vegetables as I want. If possible, my total net calories for the day, after going to the gym is 0 or less, but this isn't necessary. Most days I don't actually end up eating my 500 calories ... I might eat 200 on average, being motivated for better and quicker results.
- **ON:** I eat whatever I normally would have if I wasn't dieting, which is usually around 2,300 calories or 3,000 if I'm hitting the gym hard (i.e. 2+ hours).

I rotate with two off days followed by an on day - but if a life circumstance comes up that would make it inconvenient for a particular day to be an "off" day (ex. a work luncheon, family in town, etc.), then I just switch days or have two "on" days in a row at the expense of an off day. The goal is simply never to have more than two "on" days in a row and to maintain at least a 50/50 ration of on/off days, preferably a 1/3::2/3 ratio.

Why does it work for me?

It gives me incredible flexibility in the dieting process, whereas more long-term diets often lend themselves to people having to "cheat" every now and then, which ultimately causes them to give up the diet.

It also gives short-term goals. I don't have to tell myself I'll never be able to eat pizza or nachos again - I just have to wait 2 or so days. Having this goal in near-sight make it seem immediately achievable.

Compared with intermittent fasting, my overall caloric intake over a week is substantially lower. On weeks with only 2 "on" days (which with my usual rotation is 2/3 of the weeks), if I'm at the gym 4-5 times that week, I can easily have a net-0 or even negative caloric intake for the week, while still feeling fully satisfied from the two days that I'm eating normally, which usually tides me over for the day after as well. Accordingly, the second "on" day is the only day when I really feel hungry, but by then I have the motivation that "tomorrow I can eat whatever I want."

My body is not adapting to the reduced caloric intake (at least not after 2 months). I am seeing steady

improvements every week.

On a psychological level, I believe that this is something that is sustainable. As I approach my target body fat %, I simply have to adjust my ratio of on/off days and keep going, making the diet even easier.

Most useful concept for me when trying to lose weight: *When you feel an intense hunger, that's your body's way of saying it's burning fat.* Those are the times that it should be easiest to avoid eating, not most tempting: because you can literally feel the results working, so why placate and stifle the very thing you're trying to accomplish? Let your hunger be your motivator.

Of course, my traditional struggle with food in the past has been eating out of boredom (which is where intermittent fasting helped a lot), so the hunger itself never became a motivator in the same way.

5

UPVOTES

Question on femdom fantasies.

24 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

I just got this one assigned to me by gotquestions.org. I figured you'd all have some fun with it. Note that the setup is not convenient to asking for clarification or more information so I usually try to answer based on only what I've been given.

Question: I've been a Christian from the beginning and have been baptised with the holy spirit. From my teens I have a femdom(BDSM) fantasy as a slave/submissive to women. I've always tried to suppress and everytime I suppress I hurt myself mentally and physically and seek God's strength. I'm unmarried and I'm not interested in any sexual activities with women but just want to experience the pain and the servitude that I get when I serve a BDSM mistress. What can I do ? Deeply troubled. Is this right for me to have these thoughts being a Christian?

88

UPVOTES

I'm still single ... just married.

27 August 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill · Archived copy · Reddit

I've written several posts and comments about divorce around here. It's literally my day job, so why not? But I think some people get the wrong idea about why I wrote many of those posts and comments in the first place. In most things I do, there's usually a bigger game that I'm working toward than the immediate context would let on. If you can take some general divorce wisdom out of those posts, great, but that's not why they're there.

Someone once asked in one of those posts: "Why are you posting this here? Doesn't this belong on [r/divorce](#)?" Here's the reason: I want men to position themselves in such a way that they are not manipulated in their marriages by the fear of divorce. It's not about helping guys through divorce; it's about helping guys stop being afraid of divorce so they can live in their own frame.

"The Marriage" Doesn't Exist

I'm currently writing a book for [r/RPChristians](#). There's scant little RP content for Christians, so I figure I'll contribute. Whatever. I was writing a section by the same name of this post and believe this is a broader issue than my own little niche of the manosphere.

"The marriage" doesn't exist. "The relationship" doesn't exist. There's you and her. That's it.

I was talking to someone about Negative Inquiry recently. His wife told him, "You never talk with me!" The NI response: "What's wrong with not talking with you?" Her answer: **Because that's what married people are supposed to do.** Do you see it?

Maybe not. Let's give a series of examples:

- "Marriage is about love"
- "Communication is the life blood of marriage"
- "Married people are supposed to ..."
- "I can't do ... because I'm married."
- "Marriage is hard work."
- "My marriage is wonderful/sucks."

See how these phrases personify "marriage" (or for singles: "the relationship") as its own entity? All of these examples aren't pointing to yourself or the other person as the one whose judgment you're trying to satisfy. So, when your wife says, "That's what married people are supposed to do," she really means, "That's what I want you to do" - but she's invoking "the marriage" as some higher authority than herself. Why? Because if she stopped her hamster for a second and recognized that she's only communicating her own personal preference, then that only puts her on an equal footing with you - her preference against yours, and that's not a good way to win an argument. No, she must invoke a higher authority - in this case, one that doesn't actually exist. But as long as she can keep you thinking it does, she can control you. She creates this third metaphysical concept, labels it "the marriage" and then says that you have to keep this non-existent entity happy or else ... and then the "or else" line is never finished in your subconscious, though we can always assume divorce is somewhere in the list. Does divorce scare you? More on that later.

Removing "The Marriage" From Your Frame

When a guy says the phrases above, it communicates to me that he isn't in his own frame. He is in the frame of "the

marriage." That's weird, because "the marriage" never spoke to me to tell me what it expected. It didn't write a book or post online. It doesn't put feelings in your heart to guide you. "The marriage" doesn't exist at all. Anything I learned about "marriage" is really from culture or other people. And if I let their definitions of "marriage" control what I think my "marriage" should look like, guess whose frame I'm living in!

In reality, any comments about "marriage" as its own entity can be boiled down to a series of "If ... then ..." clauses. Ignoring the merits of the phrases themselves, let's go back to each of the above and see what they're really trying to communicate.

- **"Marriage is about love."** What they're really saying is, **"IF** they want to remain together, **THEN** two people in a committed relationship should orient their lives around loving each other" ... and most likely there are a host of expectations on what it looks like to "love" someone. But why this particular IF/THEN in the first place? What if I want my marriage to be oriented around something else, like accomplishing my mission in life? Who's going to stop me? Who in this world is going to say I'm wrong for having a different purpose for my marriage than the next guy?
- **"Communication is the life blood of marriage."** In other words, **"IF** you want to enjoy being in a committed relationship, **THEN** you need to know how to communicate effectively." See how different this sounds? It's not, "I'm married, so I'd better learn how to communicate." It's, **"IF** I want a result, **THEN** I must do something to get that result." This re-wording also opens the door for challenging the concept in the first place: "Now that I think about it, is communication really what produces the result I'm looking for in the first place, or is it something else?" That's how your eyes start opening.
- **"Married people are supposed to ..."** I.e. "You have a moral obligation to act a certain way with and toward your spouse." Says who? This could also be re-written: **"IF** you don't do certain things, **THEN** you are not good at being a married person." If we take out the concept of "the marriage" and accept that we're just two people who have chosen to live around one another, then this really should read, **"IF** you want to get the benefits of the committed relationship, **THEN** certain behaviors are a good idea." That makes more sense, but isn't at all what the original phrase implies.
- **"I can't do ... because I'm married."** What they're thinking is, **"IF** I do ... **THEN** I will have a bad marriage." A bad marriage to who? Your neighbor? What they're really saying is, "People will think I have a bad marriage if I do ..." Now the frame issue becomes clearer.
- **"Marriage is hard work"** turns into **"IF** you want someone else to stay committed to you - and especially **IF** you want to enjoy their being committed to you - **THEN** you'll have to work hard."
- **"My marriage is wonderful/sucks"** ... isn't behaviorally oriented, so there's no IF/THEN clause, but to show a more descriptive statement, this becomes "I really enjoy/hate the fact that I'm committed to being around her and that she's committed to being around me."

I could elaborate more, but I assume you get the idea. There's you. There's her. There's ... nope, that's it. As soon as I bring "society" or "other people" or "the marriage" as a judge over how I should behave, it's no longer "my marriage" anyway.

I'm Still Single

If "the marriage" doesn't exist and is really a colloquial short hand for "in a committed relationship with legal enforcement," then things should change about how you perceive your obligations in the relationship. WISNIFG's Bill of Rights No. 4 says, "You have the right to change your mind." Okay, so the "committed relationship" part is moot, if we embrace this fully. Suddenly the "legal enforcement" part starts to matter. u/weakandsensitive once

explained his position on MRP v. TRP, saying, "I'm not pro-marriage; I'm anti-divorce rape," which opens the door for a unique discussion from what you'd see on TRP. If you can rightly escape the frame of "the marriage" and can minimize the impact of the legal enforcement of your commitment, then what's holding you back anymore from getting what you want out of life?

At that point, you can function independently as your own man. You can set your own goals and achieve them. For the Christians out there, this is why I believe Paul says in 1 Cor. 7, "Those with wives should live as though they had none" (though this requires more explanation, which I'll reserve for the book).

And here's the thing: I've found over and over and over again that women aren't attracted to "husbands" - at least not as that concept is generally understood in society today. Just as "the marriage" doesn't exist, the concept of being a "husband" doesn't either. That's a metaphysical concept or label that people throw around to impute a social stigma on how you should feel or behave. It's usually associated with, "A good husband is/does/should ..." By attaching a moral judgment on such phrases as "a good marriage" or "a good husband," there's an implicit imperative for you to live by the standard that follows or else you're "not good" - or worse: you're "bad." In reality, you're just not living up to someone else's preferences. To that end, if their standard of a "good/bad" husband/marriage/relationship doesn't produce the results that you want, then why not be a "bad husband" or have a "bad marriage" by the meta definition in order to accomplish your own goals? And ... ::GASP:: ... what if the other person in the relationship finds they actually like it more that way too?!?

Let me be abundantly clear: I'm **NOT** saying to **act like you're single**. I **AM** saying that if you remove the concept of "the marriage" or "the relationship" from your frame, **you are single**. When you said, "I do," there wasn't some new entity that was born or created called "the marriage," which you must forever try to appease. You're still you. [This is more nuanced for the Christians crowd, but I'll spare that conversation here, other than to say that instead of creating a new thing, when she enters your frame, she becomes part of you - not you becoming something different alongside her; just as we become part of Christ and Christ doesn't change to become something new when he married the Church.]

... Just Married

You're a single guy who entered into a contract that has three primary clauses (at least in my state):

- **Loyalty** - That you are aligning your interests such that what will be good for one will be good for the other and you will not unreasonably try to harm the interests of the other.
- **Support** - That you have something to contribute and will utilize that contribution in a way that works in tandem with the contributions of the other (ex. one contributes money-earning skills, the other contributes home-making skills).
- **Fidelity** - That you will not have sex with anyone else outside the marriage.

My state's "grounds for divorce" predominantly stem from different ways of violating one of these three contractual clauses. Although these are the operative "obligations" defined in my state's statutes, people don't get married because they want to subject themselves to these obligations. There's another IF/THEN concept at play, which is at least two-fold:

- "If you keep screwing me and doing other stuff I want you to do, then I will remain loyal, supportive, and faithful to you."
- Because of no-fault divorce: "Either of us can break the contract whenever we want, even if nobody violated the contract, and this triggers me giving you half of my stuff and income and you giving me half of your stuff and income." From there, whoever has more "stuff and income" is the loser.

Why would a guy want to subject himself to that type of legal contract? I can think of several reasons (ex. she has

more stuff/income), but that's beside the point of this post. The point is to recognize the "marriage contract" for what it is: a contract. It is not a new entity. It is not a god that acts as judge over you. It's a simple IF/THEN clause you sign with someone else that in the absence of a pre-nup subjects you to the default laws of the state you're in.

To that end, a contract isn't a moral obligation to the terms therein. You can still do whatever you want to do. It simply lays out a penalty for your failure to live up to the terms you agreed to. If you don't want to live up to those terms, then don't - and accept the penalty you signed onto. People do this all the time at law - breaking bad contracts because they are more advantaged to go in a different direction. Do you think two CEOs in a corporate joint venture think to themselves, "I know it's not in the agreement, but I should disadvantage my company's position and make our shareholders mad in order to appease our business partner ... you know, because that's what business partners are supposed to do." I know it's not a perfect parallel because marriage isn't quite like a business, but the point still stands.

Or if you find that the benefit you get from the contract is valuable enough to you, hold up your end and keep the contract alive and going. Just recognize that in the marriage contract the person with less "stuff and income" is under no obligation to fulfill their end, and if they decide to walk away, the person with more "stuff and income" still pays the same contractual penalty as if he were the one to have breached the contract, even if he did nothing wrong.

THRILL OF THE CHASE

I didn't mean to write this section, but it kind of rolled out as I was typing the application section, so I decided to make it its own thing. As I said before: women aren't attracted to husbands (at least the way society describes them). They're attracted to the single bachelor who had his life together before he met her - the guy who did what he wanted, when he wanted, because there were no social judgments compelling him toward a certain lifestyle. She's attracted to the guy who doesn't need her - who could walk away on a moment's notice if he felt like it, and probably be even better off than if he'd stayed.

But it goes deeper than that. Consider the old saying, "Women are the gatekeepers of sex; men are the gatekeepers of commitment." Now also consider how much women enjoy dating around. Let's be honest, **it's not because they're just as horny as men all the time**. Just as a man considers himself to have "conquered" or been "successful" with a woman when he's had sex with her, so also does a woman "conquer" or "succeed" with a man when she's managed to lock down his commitment. Just as a man mistakenly assumes that marriage ends the chase of his wife's sexuality, so also do women mistakenly assume that marriage should end the chase of their husband's commitment. And just as men are polygamous with their desire for sexual conquest, so also are women hypergamous with their commitment conquests, which is what prompts things like branch-swinging. After all, once you've climbed Denali, you just don't feel as satisfied climbing Pike's Peak. You set your sights on Mt. Everest.

But what would happen if she climbed Pike's Peak, then the next day found that some tectonic plates shifted and the mountain's now a few hundred feet taller and harder to climb? Well, now she can't say she's really locked down Pike's Peak. She's going to have to go at it again. What would happen if she locked down her man's commitment and got him to marry her, then she found out that his commitment wasn't as locked down as she once thought? Or what if she had his commitment, but found that there were other parts of his inner-most being that he was holding back - that he hadn't yet trusted her with yet? Surely she would find it a new challenge to get her man to commit even those parts to her, which he otherwise reserved for himself, which is why a man's attractiveness goes up as the woman finds more and more mysterious things about him. It's fun for her to chase after those things, persuading him to unlock them to her.

Just as men love the thrill of the chase of a woman's sexuality and will hop from woman to woman to get it, **in the same way, women love the thrill of the chase of a man's commitment and will hop from man to man to get it**. It's as much of a drug to them as the high a guy gets from all the sexual IOIs he gets from a new woman. When a

man views "the marriage" as a concept in itself, it puts a stop to the chase. It re-frames how men and women relate with each other into an entirely new paradigm focused on intangible standards that make the man and woman assume that "the chase" is over and there are bigger fish to fry. [For the Christian: does "the chase" of Christ stop as soon as you're saved?]

APPLICATION

The way I interact with my wife isn't oriented around "improving the marriage" or "being a good husband." From time to time, it may be convenient to use such shorthand, but looking back I see that this type of language does a serious disservice to any man who is already struggling to live in his own frame. The way I interact with my wife is oriented around meeting my goals. As I pursue my goals, I take a few steps forward. If my wife doesn't walk with me, she gets left behind. This shows her that my commitment is to my own purposes and not to her. That keeps the mountain growing. That keeps her chasing me - because she knows that somewhere along the way, as I keep walking forward she'll be left in the dust and my commitment to her will be little more than a silhouette in the horizon until she earns it back by catching up - and I reward her as she does so. This is fun for her and freeing for me.

Now, my goals aren't antagonistic toward my wife. I don't make it a point to make her miserable just to screw with her, as the blue pill objectors accuse. On the contrary, when I accept the fact that I am my own man, and I have sufficiently mitigated the risks of our "marriage contract" being broken, I am free to be the same guy she first fell in love with - the guy who had a mission that's more important than her, who had options, who didn't cave to social pressures and stigmas about what a "husband" or "marriage" should look like. That's the guy whose wife is constantly striving to help him, to please him, and to keep him committed and who is just as excited to do these things in the marriage as she was when they were dating. That's the guy whose wife is happy. More importantly: that's the guy who's happy.

This is the MRP draft. The full draft is reserved for my eventual book, which would address the more biblical aspects of this concept, which I expect will no doubt come up in the comments anyway.

I've written several posts and comments about divorce around here. It's literally my day job, so why not? But I think some people get the wrong idea about why I wrote many of those posts and comments in the first place. In most things I do, there's usually a bigger game that I'm working toward than the immediate context would let on. If you can take some general divorce wisdom out of those posts, great, but that's not why they're there.

Someone once asked in one of those posts: "Why are you posting this here? Doesn't this belong on [r/divorce](#)?" Here's the reason: I want men to position themselves in such a way that they are not manipulated in their marriages by the fear of divorce. It's not about helping guys through divorce; it's about helping guys stop being afraid of divorce so they can live in their own frame.

"The Marriage" Doesn't Exist

I'm currently writing a book for [r/RPChristians](#). There's scant little RP content for Christians, so I figure I'll contribute. Whatever. I was writing a section by the same name of this post and believe this is a broader issue than my own little niche of the manosphere.

"The marriage" doesn't exist. "The relationship" doesn't exist. There's you and her. That's it.

I was talking to someone about Negative Inquiry recently. His wife told him, "You never talk with me!" The NI response: "What's wrong with not talking with you?" Her answer: **Because that's what married people are supposed to do.** Do you see it?

Maybe not. Let's give a series of examples:

- "Marriage is about love"
- "Communication is the life blood of marriage"
- "Married people are supposed to ..."
- "I can't do ... because I'm married."
- "Marriage is hard work."
- "My marriage is wonderful/sucks."

See how these phrases personify "marriage" (or for singles: "the relationship") as its own entity? All of these examples aren't pointing to yourself or the other person as the one whose judgment you're trying to satisfy. So, when your wife says, "That's what married people are supposed to do," she really means, "That's what I want you to do" - but she's invoking "the marriage" as some higher authority than herself. Why? Because if she stopped her hamster for a second and recognized that she's only communicating her own personal preference, then that only puts her on an equal footing with you - her preference against yours, and that's not a good way to win an argument. No, she must invoke a higher authority - in this case, one that doesn't actually exist. But as long as she can keep you thinking it does, she can control you. She creates this third metaphysical concept, labels it "the marriage" and then says that you have to keep this non-existent entity happy or else ... and then the "or else" line is never finished in your subconscious, though we can always assume divorce is somewhere in the list. Does divorce scare you? More

on that later.

Removing "The Marriage" From Your Frame

When a guy says the phrases above, it communicates to me that he isn't in his own frame. He is in the frame of "the marriage." That's weird, because "the marriage" never spoke to me to tell me what it expected. It didn't write a book or post online. It doesn't put feelings in your heart to guide you. "The marriage" doesn't exist at all. Anything I learned about "marriage" is really from culture or other people. And if I let their definitions of "marriage" control what I think my "marriage" should look like, guess whose frame I'm living in!

In reality, any comments about "marriage" as its own entity can be boiled down to a series of "If ... then ..." clauses. Ignoring the merits of the phrases themselves, let's go back to each of the above and see what they're really trying to communicate.

- **"Marriage is about love."** What they're really saying is, **"IF** they want to remain together, **THEN** two people in a committed relationship should orient their lives around loving each other" ... and most likely there are a host of expectations on what it looks like to "love" someone. But why this particular IF/THEN in the first place? What if I want my marriage to be oriented around something else, like accomplishing my mission in life? Who's going to stop me? Who in this world is going to say I'm wrong for having a different purpose for my marriage than the next guy?
- **"Communication is the life blood of marriage."** In other words, **"IF** you want to enjoy being in a committed relationship, **THEN** you need to know how to communicate effectively." See how different this sounds? It's not, "I'm married, so I'd better learn how to communicate." It's, **"IF** I want a result, **THEN** I must do something to get that result." This re-wording also opens the door for challenging the concept in the first place: "Now that I think about it, is communication really what produces the result I'm looking for in the first place, or is it something else?" That's how your eyes start opening.
- **"Married people are supposed to ..."** I.e. "You have a moral obligation to act a certain way with and toward your spouse." Says who? This could also be re-written: **"IF** you don't do certain things, **THEN** you are not good at being a married person." If we take out the concept of "the marriage" and accept that we're just two people who have chosen to live around one another, then this really should read, **"IF** you want to get the benefits of the committed relationship, **THEN** certain behaviors are a good idea." That makes more sense, but isn't at all what the original phrase implies.
- **"I can't do ... because I'm married."** What they're thinking is, **"IF** I do ... **THEN** I will have a bad marriage." A bad marriage to who? Your neighbor? What they're really saying is, "People will think I have a bad marriage if I do ..." Now the frame issue becomes clearer.
- **"Marriage is hard work"** turns into **"IF** you want someone else to stay committed to you - and especially **IF** you want to enjoy their being committed to you - **THEN** you'll have to work hard."
- **"My marriage is wonderful/sucks"** ... isn't behaviorally oriented, so there's no IF/THEN clause, but to show a more descriptive statement, this becomes "I really enjoy/hate the fact that I'm committed to being around her and that she's committed to being around me."

I could elaborate more, but I assume you get the idea. There's you. There's her. There's ... nope, that's it. As soon as I bring "society" or "other people" or "the marriage" as a judge over how I should behave, it's no longer "my marriage" anyway.

I'm Still Single

If "the marriage" doesn't exist and is really a colloquial short hand for "in a committed relationship with legal enforcement," then things should change about how you perceive your obligations in the relationship. WISNIFG's Bill of Rights No. 4 says, "You have the right to change your mind." Okay, so the "committed relationship" part is moot, if we embrace this fully. Suddenly the "legal enforcement" part starts to matter. **u/weakandsensitive** once explained his position on MRP v. TRP, saying, "I'm not pro-marriage; I'm anti-divorce rape," which opens the door for a unique discussion from what you'd see on TRP. If you can rightly escape the frame of "the marriage" and can minimize the impact of the legal enforcement of your commitment, then what's holding you back anymore from getting what you want out of life?

At that point, you can function independently as your own man. You can set your own goals and achieve them. For the Christians out there, this is why I believe Paul says in 1 Cor. 7, "Those with wives should live as though they had none" (though this requires more explanation, which I'll reserve for the book).

And here's the thing: I've found over and over and over again that women aren't attracted to "husbands" - at least not as that concept is generally understood in society today. Just as "the marriage" doesn't exist, the concept of being a "husband" doesn't either. That's a metaphysical concept or label that people throw around to impute a social stigma on how you should feel or behave. It's usually associated with, "A good husband is/does/should ..." By attaching a moral judgment on such phrases as "a good marriage" or "a good husband," there's an implicit imperative for you to live by the standard that follows or else you're "not good" - or worse: you're "bad." In reality, you're just not living up to someone else's preferences. To that end, if their standard of a "good/bad" husband/marriage/relationship doesn't produce the results that you want, then why not be a "bad husband" or have a "bad marriage" by the meta definition in order to accomplish your own goals? And ... ::GASP:: ... what if the other person in the relationship finds they actually like it more that way too?!?

Let me be abundantly clear: I'm **NOT** saying to **act like you're single**. I **AM** saying that if you remove the concept of "the marriage" or "the relationship" from your frame, **you are single**. When you said, "I do," there wasn't some new entity that was born or created called "the marriage," which you must forever try to appease. You're still you. [This is more nuanced for the Christians crowd, but I'll spare that conversation here, other than to say that instead of creating a new thing, when she enters your frame, she becomes part of you - not you becoming something different alongside her; just as we become part of Christ and Christ doesn't change to become something new when he married the Church.]

... Just Married

You're a single guy who entered into a contract that has three primary clauses (at least in my state):

- **Loyalty** - That you are aligning your interests such that what will be good for one will be good for the other and you will not unreasonably try to harm the interests of the other.
- **Support** - That you have something to contribute and will utilize that contribution in a way that works in tandem with the contributions of the other (ex. one contributes money-earning skills, the other contributes home-making skills).
- **Fidelity** - That you will not have sex with anyone else outside the marriage.

My state's "grounds for divorce" predominantly stem from different ways of violating one of these three contractual clauses. Although these are the operative "obligations" defined in my state's statutes, people don't get married because they want to subject themselves to these obligations. There's another IF/THEN concept at play, which is at least two-fold:

- "If you keep screwing me and doing other stuff I want you to do, then I will remain loyal, supportive, and faithful to you."
- Because of no-fault divorce: "Either of us can break the contract whenever we want, even if nobody violated the

contract, and this triggers me giving you half of my stuff and income and you giving me half of your stuff and income." From there, whoever has more "stuff and income" is the loser.

Why would a guy want to subject himself to that type of legal contract? I can think of several reasons (ex. she has more stuff/income), but that's beside the point of this post. The point is to recognize the "marriage contract" for what it is: a contract. It is not a new entity. It is not a god that acts as judge over you. It's a simple IF/THEN clause you sign with someone else that in the absence of a pre-nup subjects you to the default laws of the state you're in.

To that end, a contract isn't a moral obligation to the terms therein. You can still do whatever you want to do. It simply lays out a penalty for your failure to live up to the terms you agreed to. If you don't want to live up to those terms, then don't - and accept the penalty you signed onto. People do this all the time at law - breaking bad contracts because they are more advantaged to go in a different direction. Do you think two CEOs in a corporate joint venture think to themselves, "I know it's not in the agreement, but I should disadvantage my company's position and make our shareholders mad in order to appease our business partner ... you know, because that's what business partners are supposed to do." I know it's not a perfect parallel because marriage isn't quite like a business, but the point still stands.

Or if you find that the benefit you get from the contract is valuable enough to you, hold up your end and keep the contract alive and going. Just recognize that in the marriage contract the person with less "stuff and income" is under no obligation to fulfill their end, and if they decide to walk away, the person with more "stuff and income" still pays the same contractual penalty as if he were the one to have breached the contract, even if he did nothing wrong.

THRILL OF THE CHASE

I didn't mean to write this section, but it kind of rolled out as I was typing the application section, so I decided to make it its own thing. As I said before: women aren't attracted to husbands (at least the way society describes them). They're attracted to the single bachelor who had his life together before he met her - the guy who did what he wanted, when he wanted, because there were no social judgments compelling him toward a certain lifestyle. She's attracted to the guy who doesn't need her - who could walk away on a moment's notice if he felt like it, and probably be even better off than if he'd stayed.

But it goes deeper than that. Consider the old saying, "Women are the gatekeepers of sex; men are the gatekeepers of commitment." Now also consider how much women enjoy dating around. Let's be honest, **it's not because they're just as horny as men all the time**. Just as a man considers himself to have "conquered" or been "successful" with a woman when he's had sex with her, so also does a woman "conquer" or "succeed" with a man when she's managed to lock down his commitment. Just as a man mistakenly assumes that marriage ends the chase of his wife's sexuality, so also do women mistakenly assume that marriage should end the chase of their husband's commitment. And just as men are polygamous with their desire for sexual conquest, so also are women hypergamous with their commitment conquests, which is what prompts things like branch-swinging. After all, once you've climbed Denali, you just don't feel as satisfied climbing Pike's Peak. You set your sights on Mt. Everest.

But what would happen if she climbed Pike's Peak, then the next day found that some tectonic plates shifted and the mountain's now a few hundred feet taller and harder to climb? Well, now she can't say she's really locked down Pike's Peak. She's going to have to go at it again. What would happen if she locked down her man's commitment and got him to marry her, then she found out that his commitment wasn't as locked down as she once thought? Or what if she had his commitment, but found that there were other parts of his inner-most being that he was holding back - that he hadn't yet trusted her with yet? Surely she would find it a new challenge to get her man to commit even those parts to her, which he otherwise reserved for himself, which is why a man's attractiveness goes up as the woman finds more and more mysterious things about him. It's fun for her to chase after those things, persuading

him to unlock them to her.

Just as men love the thrill of the chase of a woman's sexuality and will hop from woman to woman to get it, **in the same way, women love the thrill of the chase of a man's commitment and will hop from man to man to get it.** It's as much of a drug to them as the high a guy gets from all the sexual IOIs he gets from a new woman. When a man views "the marriage" as a concept in itself, it puts a stop to the chase. It re-frames how men and women relate with each other into an entirely new paradigm focused on intangible standards that make the man and woman assume that "the chase" is over and there are bigger fish to fry. [For the Christian: does "the chase" of Christ stop as soon as you're saved?]

APPLICATION

The way I interact with my wife isn't oriented around "improving the marriage" or "being a good husband." From time to time, it may be convenient to use such shorthand, but looking back I see that this type of language does a serious disservice to any man who is already struggling to live in his own frame. The way I interact with my wife is oriented around meeting my goals. As I pursue my goals, I take a few steps forward. If my wife doesn't walk with me, she gets left behind. This shows her that my commitment is to my own purposes and not to her. That keeps the mountain growing. That keeps her chasing me - because she knows that somewhere along the way, as I keep walking forward she'll be left in the dust and my commitment to her will be little more than a silhouette in the horizon until she earns it back by catching up - and I reward her as she does so. This is fun for her and freeing for me.

Now, my goals aren't antagonistic toward my wife. I don't make it a point to make her miserable just to screw with her, as the blue pill objectors accuse. On the contrary, when I accept the fact that I am my own man, and I have sufficiently mitigated the risks of our "marriage contract" being broken, I am free to be the same guy she first fell in love with - the guy who had a mission that's more important than her, who had options, who didn't cave to social pressures and stigmas about what a "husband" or "marriage" should look like. That's the guy whose wife is constantly striving to help him, to please him, and to keep him committed and who is just as excited to do these things in the marriage as she was when they were dating. That's the guy whose wife is happy. More importantly: that's the guy who's happy.

Should a man be friends with women he doesn't intend to marry? Let's chat.

7 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

There was some discussion on this in RPC chat, but that only accounts for a handful of our members and I wanted to open the floor for more conversation from the broader community: **Should a guy - married or single - be building friendships with women who he has no intention to build a romantic/sexual relationship with?**

The standard church answer is a big fat: **NO!!!** There's wisdom to this answer, but it gives an incomplete picture that for more mature men is very limiting, leading me to reach a different conclusion.

Married or single, I do believe there is substantial value in spending time with other women, even if you have no intent of pursuing a strong relationship with them - but only if you have a strong frame, including an internal orientation that would negate temptation.

ONE: There are legitimate ministry reasons for wanting to build a network of women, who would be more equipped to advance your mission and legacy in ways that other men could not. Don't forget all the times Paul references women who labored at his side - women he had no sexual or romantic relationships with, as evidenced by his determination to remain single.

TWO: Many women need the Gospel and I don't buy into the "only men-men, women-women" ministry model. If a man isn't allowed to be a spiritual leader to other women than his wife unless he's on paid staff (which, by the way, is not suggested anywhere in the Bible), how many women under weak pastors are being left out because (1) they're single and don't have husbands to lead them, or (2) because their husbands are weak and not actually leading them?

Note: Women's ministries might not help as much as you'd think. How many good ones do you think there actually are out there? My wife once said she didn't know what it meant to be "submissive." I was shocked and brought up how men's conferences always center around how a husband should treat his wife. She says, "I've been to dozens of women's conferences, breakfasts, small groups, etc. - but I've never once heard them talk about how a woman should act toward her husband. It's only ever about women's personal issues." That was quite eye opening. The only exception is the Navigators Marriage Conference we attended at the Glen Eyrie, which I do know addressed the concepts in a mix-gender setting.

THREE: Having female friends increases preselection. This can help the single man be more attractive to the woman he wants to attract and also instills passive dread for the married man. Again, that's not to say that you try to make your wife jealous, but if you have an otherwise legitimate purpose for the relationship, there's nothing wrong with receiving an unintended passive benefit.

FOUR: By having relationships with other women, even in a platonic way, you are increasing your social network so that you can meet more people who can help you with your mission, who could be your future spouse, who might be able to help your business/finances/be new clients/whatever, or a million other benefits to having a vast social network. Never underestimate the importance of building a large social network. If you're only networking with men, you're seriously stifling your potential. Additionally, the most beneficial networking relationships aren't the arm's-length social acquaintance types; they're the ones where you are actually invested in the relationship. Most of my referrals (where my money comes from) are from people where I invest substantial time and effort into the relationship even beyond a mere professional context of lunch and coffee.

To be clear, whatever red pill men may want to say about the role of women in the workforce (which I have less qualms with than most others), the fact is that they make up a sizable portion of the working population. This isn't changing. It would be foolish to limit your relationships only to those of your own gender. For that matter, if you own your own business, that kind of attitude could put you squarely at the center of a law suit for gender discrimination.

There are more reasons to mention, but I've got to leave for a deposition soon, so let's just move on. Suffice it to say that anyone who argues, "Men shouldn't build relationships with women" are speaking with broad-brush wisdom on the assumption that a man does not have the frame to maintain his boundaries and avoid temptation to pursue something romantic with her when he shouldn't, or otherwise that he's susceptible to ONEitis.

Assuming a man is already stable in his RP journey, he will have that frame, the ability to resist temptation, and will not be susceptible to ONEitis. Accordingly, there is minimal risk **to him** of having female friends. The issue, then, is whether or not there's a risk **to her**. Even after that, the inquiry must go one step further: *if there IS a risk to her, is HE responsible for that risk?*

Most people mistakenly jump to the assumption that if there's a risk to the woman, then it's the man's responsibility to mitigate the risk. After all, he's the one who decided to befriend her. But let's be real: it takes two to build a relationship. She didn't have to choose to be his friend back. Some people will say, "But men are leaders, so it's his responsibility to lead the relationship in a safe place for her." But he's not HER leader. He's his wife's leader. He didn't agree to lead her. She didn't agree to follow him. Just because men have a tendency to lead and women have a tendency to follow (which is being transformed in radical ways in the modern age of 3rd and post-wave feminism) doesn't mean that men must always assume the mantle of leadership in every intergender relational dynamic.

Now, there very well might be a risk to her in being friends with a man in that she may become emotionally desirous of the unavailable man. Some people assume that "leading her on" is an automatic sin. I don't see that in the Bible. First off, has he actually led her on at all? I don't think a man should be deceptive about his intentions with a woman, but as long as he's not intentionally fostering a belief in her that they have a chance at romance together, whatever she wants to assume is on her own head. More to the point, though: if a man becoming obsessed with a woman is the man's fault for wanting someone he'll never get, why is it still the man's fault when the situation is reversed?

To be clear, this is one of those direct biases between cultural stereotypes between men and women. It's villainous for a man to lead a woman on without actually intending to start a relationship with her. Right? He's dangling commitment in front of her face, but never intending her to have it. But look at the inverse: a woman who dangles her sexuality in front of a man's face, wearing revealing clothes, flirting, etc. even though she never intends to have sex with him is perfectly normal and sometimes viewed as a good thing: "Aww, look how nice she: the hot girl trying to make that loser's day by giving him some pity attention."

Long story short, as long as the guy isn't being intentionally deceptive, any risk of the woman becoming emotionally attached to him as a result of their friendship is her responsibility, not his. To that end, I see no reason we must conclude that men should avoid being friends with women merely because she might become emotionally invested in him. If he's a big boy with a strong frame and isn't deceiving her, and there's mutual benefit to them becoming friends - even close friends - then let them enjoy that benefit.

CAVEAT: As alluded to many times, if he's weak, then all of this changes. Men who are prone to temptation or to break their frame should not put themselves in a place of temptation. But we shouldn't assume that every man is that weak - especially among those who are mature, like Paul, who sent personal greetings to several women who he had clearly befriended in a close capacity.

That's my view. What do you all think? Discuss.

Living in Christ's Frame - Defeating the Anger Stage and Finding Emotional Stability

11 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

The Anger Phase

In response to some conversation in the RPC chatroom, I thought it would be worth doing a follow-up post to [u/lololasaurus](#)'s post on the frame of Christ. The particular user was struggling through the red pill anger phase, feeling like a judgmental prick. Suffice it to say that this is a common enough phenomenon that there are entire posts on TRP to talk about the anger phase - why it happens, what to do with it, how to recover, etc.

I never went through the anger phase. For a brief time it made me feel like an anomaly, especially when guys on MRP would say the anger phase is a "rite of passage" and that "you're not truly red pill until you've passed through the anger phase." They suppose that if you actually knew the truth, every man would be at least a little angered about it at first.

The reason for this is that men in the anger phase are only perceiving the world through their own frame. They look at how the world affects them or how they can affect the world. They don't acknowledge that other people have their own independent experiences. Sure, they know this at a head level, but it doesn't matter to them. It's part of the DNGAF attitude. After all, as soon as they do this, they could be accused of living in someone else's frame - especially if they go past mere acknowledgement and start to care about other people's independent experiences.

The particular user I referenced above brought this all up in the context of a conversation he had with a woman who was acting bratty with typical fitness tests. He pokes fun with her and makes a comment about her dyed hair. She ends up being vulnerable about the insecurities she has about her looks and asks him for validation: "Do I look beautiful with blonde hair?" At that moment he realized that feminism had a negative impact on her too, whether she realized it or not.

Your v. Their Frame

When a man lives in his own frame, the world becomes his playground. He perceives everything in terms of how he can mold them to his will or how the uncontrollable things affect him. When such a man finally accepts the truth about how the world works and how women interact with men, he thinks back on how this has affected his life, usually in negative ways during his blindness. He is right to feel angry about that. Most men are grievously hurt by things like feminism, hypergamy, gynocentrism, etc. Even most red pill men don't understand the half of how these things have negatively affected their lives - especially in the church. That's why we have people like Dalrock to help expose this on a grander scale.

But what if we were to step out of our own frame for a minute? If we consider how our wives are experiencing the world and live in that frame for a while we greatly empathize with their plight and want to help them in any way we can. Don't do that either. It's good to be aware, but if you spend too much time there you'll end up back in your blue pill pool, swimming around head-deep.

The thing is, neither of these options actually matters. At the end of the day - or rather, at the end of days - it won't matter how hypergamy, feminism, patriarchy, or anything else affected me. My frame will die away. Likewise, it won't matter all the ways society puts pressure on my wife and what her experiences are and how I could have helped her more. Her frame will die away.

Know whose frame won't die away? Christ's.

I remember when I first started learning about this, my college discipler was working with me on "self-deception" - how we deceive ourselves by only seeing life through our own eyes.

Example 1

He gave the example of waiting for me in a crowded dining hall to get through the line before meeting up. He already had a table. He saw another guy looking for a table walking toward him. He said, "I immediately perceived the other guy as a threat. He needed a seat and I had one of the few rare open ones. I didn't want him to try to take it. I had other plans for the table and what would happen here. I found myself hoping he would just walk on by. He wasn't a real person to me; he was a threat."

When a man living in his own frame starts seeing hypergamy, feminism, and all that, he perceives it the same way: *it's a threat*. Women become the enemy, bent on doing something to frustrate our purposes. That's why the anger phase seems valid when a man lives in his own frame: it negatively affects him.

Example 2

He also mentioned dropping papers on the sidewalk. Several students walked by and others stopped to help. He thought the ones who stopped to help were being nice. Props for them. "But for those who walked by, I assumed they were low-character jerks. What kind of person doesn't have the common decency to help when they see something like that happen?" And then he caught himself. "What if they were running late for class? What if they're preoccupied thinking about how they found out their mom just died that morning? How can I judge them without even knowing what they're actually experiencing?" Nevertheless, he didn't suggest catering to their experiences either.

When a man living in a feminist frame sees hypergamy, feminism, and all that, he perceives it as they do: *a solution*. They decide for him what his purposes should be and how he should bend his life to those purposes to solve other people's alleged problems using the methodology they want you to use. That's why being blue pill seems valid when a man lives in culture's frame.

Christ's Frame

My discipler's conclusion wasn't merely to stop thinking only of how things affect ourselves, nor was it to think through other people's perspectives. "Walk a mile in their shoes" is a nice sentiment, but it doesn't actually provide any actual benefit. Understanding someone else's perspective might give you a greater respect for that person, but it doesn't help you help them.

The solution he gave was simple: "See others how Christ see them."

Living in Christ's frame means seeing the world and interacting with it through his perception. This is a very difficult thing to do for many people at first. Nevertheless, when a man living in Christ's frame sees hypergamy, feminism, and all that, he perceives it as Christ does: *a mission field*.

- We're not angry because we don't care any longer about how these things affect us. We simply DNGAF about our own lives. We are selfless, in this sense. The world can hate us and screw with us all it wants. It all rolls off.
- We're not supplicating and bending our will to culture's purposes because we realize it's wrong. We DO care about reconciling the world to God through Christ. We are selfless, in this sense. The world can try to manipulate us all it wants. We see through it.

We aren't judgmental of others because before Christ we're no better than them. We're all sinners in need of a savior.

We're not condemning of someone else's sin because we see that only Christ has the authority to condemn.

We aren't angry at women because God loves women and has a plan for them.

We aren't passive in the way we engage the world because Christ is living and active.

We don't play the nice guy to everyone we meet because we support the hard lines that Jesus draws for the world.

We don't supplicate to everyone who has a need because Jesus lets some people wallow in the consequences of their own behavior to draw them back.

When we live in Christ's frame, seeing the world through his eyes, we are finally able to escape the pull to anger (if in our own frame) or being manipulated (if in others' frame) and start living in a way that actually matters.

How Do We Get In Jesus' Frame?

The answer seems all too simple: get to know Jesus.

It's easy to make lots of assumptions about Jesus because *people* tell us all kinds of things and *the media* portrays him a very specific way. But how can you know with any certainty who the real Jesus was? Read the Bible. Start with the Gospels. Study them explicitly. Ask yourself clear questions that are relevant to your own life:

- "I haven't found my mission yet. What was Jesus's mission? Maybe I should adopt that as my mission too."
- "I'm struggling to make disciples. How did Jesus make disciples? Maybe I should apply the same principles and methodology he did."
- "I'm not attractive to women. How did Jesus attract his bride? Maybe I should adopt those same qualities in my own life."
- "My spouse is unhappy in my marriage, maybe even having an emotional affair. How does Jesus handle it when his bride, the Church, does that? Maybe I should handle things with my wife the same way."
- "I'm constantly angry at all the corruption in the world. How does Jesus view the world? Maybe I should adopt his attitude toward it."
- "Women have ruined my life! They're all a bunch of blah, blah, blah. What did Jesus have to say about those who literally ended his life? Maybe I should have the same attitude."

That's you applying Christ's frame to your specific situation. Once you've mastered that and can get out of your own head, take it one step further:

- "Feminism is a sham!" Instead of thinking how it's affected you, ask, "How does feminism affect Jesus? How should I feel about that?"
 - "My wife is constantly belittling me and won't have sex with me." Instead of thinking about how to fix your problem, think, "How does my wife's behavior affect Jesus and his plans?" Chances are, her behavior in your marriage has a lot more harm against Christ than it does against you, hence David saying after committing adultery with a woman and murdering her husband, "Against you, you only, Lord, have I sinned" (Psalm 51:4). Then contemplate, "How can I restore God's purposes in this situation?"
 - "Women aren't attracted to me. I keep getting turned down no matter how hard I try." Instead of thinking about how to get women to like you (i.e. your frame), think, "How does my (lack of a) dating life, pursuit of women, rejection by women, etc. affect Jesus?" Maybe he wants you to get rejected by women so you can go into monk mode and figure out your spiritual life, so it's actually a good thing. But even that is still contextualizing things in your own frame. Think bigger: in the aggregate, how does God feel about people like you getting rejected by women like that? How does that affect God's plans? Is there a way to better serve God's purposes in how you interact with women and deal with rejection or strive for greater success in this area?
 - "That woman's hot. I can't stop thinking about having sex with her!" Instead of thinking about how to make her
-

your wife or how to stop getting aroused so much by her, think, "How does my lust for this woman affect God? How does it influence his purposes? How does it advance or derail his plans for the world, and not just his plans for me?"

- "That woman was a total shrew! I can't believe she thinks it's okay to act that way." Instead of thinking about how upset she made you feel, think, "How does she make God feel? What are his thoughts and attitudes toward her?" Then adopt those thoughts and attitudes in the conversation.

You see, it's not just about adopting the character and perception of Christ as it relates to our own lives. It's about seeing the bigger picture of what God is doing in the world and how even the most mundane details of our lives has an impact on how we reflect Christ to the world.

A Little Secret

What we're really getting at here is a concept that doesn't get talked about enough: amused mastery. Amused mastery is a mental state where a man doesn't get worked up over an issue at hand because he sees the bigger picture. He realizes the issue for its role in the grander scheme, which can often make it seem like a joke. When my daughter is crying her eyes out saying she hates the world and her life is over because her brother picked a show she didn't like ... sometimes I just laugh. This, of course, enrages my daughter at first, to see me laughing at her sorrow, but it also increases her respect for me. She doesn't understand how I could make so little of something so important to her. After the initial burst of rage and yelling, "Stop laughing! It's not funny!" she soon turns around and asks, "Why don't you care?!?" That's when the pressure-flip happens: *Why do you care so much?* The conversation goes on from there.

I could repeat countless examples of this same conversation with my wife. At least she's a little more capable of comprehending things than my 4 year old. But the bottom-line is this: *When we view things from God's perspective, through Christ's frame, the trite things of everyday life stop mattering so much.*

When my wife is blowing her lid about something bad at work, my broader perspective on life is a comfort and reassurance to her. It also gives me the emotional stability to weather the emotional storm she's putting off. Similarly, when she sins or I goof, that's a big deal to her. Having God's perspective about the situation - that we're forgiven and it's just one of the millions of sins we'll ever commit in our lives - makes the Gospel a solid rock that is an unshakable foundation. That's where you want to live.

12

UPVOTES

You're Not Thinking Big Enough

18 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

Despite my incessant droning on and on about the importance of having a mission I'm still seeing lots of guys who give introductions without telling us your mission. I realize this is partly my fault for not including it in Rule 2. Problem solved.

So I'm asking you all to contemplate two questions right now:

- What is your mission?
- Why do you need a woman's help with it?

SINGLES

I disciple a guy who I'll just call Dave. Dave longs for a wife. We've had lots of conversations about how to attract women. He's making progress. Up-front he's told me that his mission is to make disciples, starting with his wife and children. That's a commendable goal. I asked him today: *Why do you need a woman's help with that mission?*

He thought about it for a second and concluded he doesn't. *Right!* So why would a woman want to sign up to be your helper when your mission is so small-minded that it doesn't require a helper in the first place? That's not very attractive.

Your wife is to be your helper. That means you have to be doing something that requires her help. That means your mission has to be bigger than you or her alone. If your mission is too small, a godly woman will never think, "I want to be a part of that!" But consider that you can never ask too much of God. Your mission can never be too big. You may fail at grandiosity, but at least you tried.

MARRIED MEN

I disciple another guy I'll just call Bob. Bob is a married man. He's on the rocks with his wife. He left his job and moved across the country to become a pastor at a local church. Bob loves his wife, but he finds a lot of tension between his work with the church and his home life. They don't blend very well. I asked him what his mission was: "To make disciples who make disciples." That was the motto of the church. *That's a great mission!* I said. *So, what are you doing to invite your wife into that mission?*

He said he hadn't really thought about it. He mentioned some conversations they'd had about pastoral issues and decisions for the church and ways that her insights had helped him. *Do you think those conversations make her feel like she's living your mission alongside you?* "Probably not," he says. *Do you need her help to make disciples in the church?* "I guess not," he says. That's not very attractive.

You're thinking too small-minded, I told him. *If your mission doesn't require her help, and you're not inviting her to participate, why would she feel excited to be living that mission alongside you?*

CHRIST'S MODEL

Interestingly, there are actually two competing yet good answers to the problem of a man with a mission that he doesn't need help on.

First

The first is that their mission is too small. If they were to think bigger, they'd find themselves in more need of help, giving their wives an exciting and fulfilling role to play in her husband's life. She can actually be his follower and

helper. What does a bigger mission look like for Dave and Bob? Jesus actually gives that answer too. They got so caught up in "make disciples" that they forgot about the "of all nations" part.

I used to think pretty small too. I comment from time to time that my mission is disciple-making, but this is just a generalization. My true mission statement is: *To glorify God by advancing His Kingdom into the nations through spiritual generations of workers and laborers living and discipling among the lost.*

In the old days my mind was small. I assumed that by discipling one or two guys at a time locally, somehow the aggregate effect would reach the nations. Indeed, for a time I had 1-2 guys in my spiritual lineage who were making disciples overseas. It was progress, but very slow. At some point I had to make a decision: do I want to be intentional about pursuing something bigger, or am I content with so little?

So, I increased my efforts. I started discipling people who I knew would be traveling overseas, including missionaries. I focused on leaders of larger ministries rather than individuals, knowing they would have a wider influence through which to carry on my legacy. I began ministering to men in other countries directly, investing in their personal, daily lives - including through reddit. Because of these efforts and more I can now count at least 14 countries where there are men living active disciple-making lifestyles because of me. My discipleship book, to my knowledge, despite never having been published, has been translated into 2 different languages and someone from this sub just a week or two ago said he might want to add Portuguese to the list.

But that's just my mission. A dear friend of mine, who I also disciple, recently joined my gym - over a 25 minute drive away for him - so that we could spend more time together, even though he was already a member at a gym 5 minutes down the road from him. I was asking him about his mission a few weeks ago. It was to reach kids in the foster system for Christ. He and his wife recently adopted 2 of the kids they'd fostered. It's beautiful. But he wasn't thinking big enough. He eventually caught on. Without me even having to bring it up today, he's suddenly going on about how God gave him a vision to start a state-wide ministry to train other parents for fostering troubled youth - and also how to share the Gospel with these children and raise them up in Christ (i.e. disciple them) within the bounds of the state foster care system. This is a beautiful mission! He's thinking big. This is a task he can't accomplish without his wife. I love it! He has something to invite her to join him on. This is attractive. His results are proof of that conclusion.

Single men: are you thinking big enough? Is your mission something that will attract a wife to want to follow your lead? Or are you living in a way that doesn't give her a place? Maybe that's a big part of the reason you're still single.

Second

What else can we say to the man who is on a mission for which he needs no help? To spin things in an entirely different direction: Jesus doesn't need our help either.

That's right. Jesus could make disciples of all nations on his own. He doesn't need the church. If we didn't do it, the rocks would cry out! So why does Jesus use the church? Simply put: because he wants to. It glorifies and pleases him to see his bride engaged in the work that matters most to him.

So, husbands, is your wife glorifying you? Is she passionately pursuing the things that are most important in life to you? Are you showing her what these are and how to get involved? Sure, you may not need her to get it done, but do you *want her* to get it done? Do you *want her* to live your life alongside you? When other people see what she's doing, do they revel in what you've done through her life?

SHE'S A HELPER, NOT AN ENABLER

My guess is that most husbands here - especially those with small-minded missions that don't demand much help - are using their wives not as helper, but as enablers. They think, "I have my mission, but I need someone to take care

of the house and kids so I can go out and get stuff done." This is using her as an enabler. She is there merely to enable you to pursue your mission.

Having a helper is quite different, especially if we want to take the model of Christ. Jesus could make disciples of all nations on his own, but he doesn't. He could write it in the stars, but he doesn't. He could use his Spirit to compel all nations to become disciples, but he doesn't. He uses the Church, his bride.

The way Jesus utilizes his bride as his helper isn't merely to tend to the small stuff while Jesus goes out and takes care of business on his own. For that matter, he doesn't even need help with that small stuff. After all, he's omnipotent and omnipresent. He can do it all. Instead, he uses his bride as the primary vehicle through which his mission is ultimately accomplished. Are you using your bride as a vehicle through which your mission is accomplished?

I used to use my wife as an enabler. It didn't go very well for my marriage or my ministry. At one point, while I was trying to start a discipleship ministry through my church, I realized: *If I don't have the capacity to disciple all of these men myself, how much less am I going to be able to build disciple-makers for the women?!?* That was a daunting thought. So, I sent my wife into a women's group to start teaching and training those women. She wasn't the leader, but she knew how to build and utilize influence. How? Because I showed her in my own life. Sure enough, people looked to her for all the answers. She became the model that other women were striving after. One woman commented to me, "I love your wife so much, I wish I could be just like her. I would do anything to have coffee with her and just learn how to become everything that she is." What better opportunity for discipleship than to have it handed to you on a silver platter like that!

Now, part of me thought: *If you only knew ...* But then I realized that my wife was doing exactly what I wanted her doing! She was fulfilling my mission in a way that I could not. She was reaching other women. She was truly helping me with my mission and not merely enabling me to do it on my own. She was bearing my image and bringing it to other women, just as I bear God's image and bring it to other men. This is when I first truly started seeing her as a helper.

CONCLUSION

In short, I want you to walk away from this post asking **and answering** for yourself:

- What is my mission?
- Is it big enough that I actually need a woman's help?
- If not, do I really want her helping me and adopting my mission, and how do I do that in a practical way?

I've been catching up on several of the red man group videos while I do some of the more monotonous things around my house and at work. As much as I love Rollo's intimate knowledge of most subjects, [/u/rian_stone](#) steals the show for me. He makes it practical and down to earth. Knowledge is nothing without application and the two men balance each other well.

In one of their videos, though, they were commenting on the purple pill and it finally struck me why the folks in the secular subs believe Christians are purple pill. For many Christians, they're probably right, actually - and it's no secret that I wear a purple pill badge when I post on MRP. So, let's talk about the purple pill for a second. But first ...

What is the Red Pill?

In short, it is a transformative awareness of the truth behind intersexual relational dynamics.

Christians should be fully versed with what I mean by "transformative awareness." James 2 talks about this in-depth, distinguishing between mere head-knowledge and those who apply it - especially when it is applied so deeply that the person himself is actually changed internally and not merely behaving differently. This is what the red pill can and should do to a person.

What things must a man be aware of and internalizing to call himself red pill? There's too much to list all of them, but here are some fundamentals.

- Hypergamy
- Feminism and the feminine imperative
- Marriage 2.0
- Frame
- Fitness Tests
- Game
- AWALT inclinations
- Blue pill fantasies

Your red pill journey starts when you learn these concepts and begin living your life in a way that accounts for these truths. If you have a question on any of these concepts or what the Bible says about them, PM me or the mods and we'll put a post up about it.

What is the Blue Pill?

If the red pill is a transformative awareness of the truth, the blue pill is a transformation-resisting reliance on ideologies and fantasies about what life *should* be like. It focuses on what someone thinks *should be* true rather than what *actually is* true.

The problem with the blue pill is that we can talk until we're *blue* in the face about what "should" be true. But that doesn't make it true. I can talk all day long about how a wife *should* want to ride her obese, supplicating husband for hours, but that's not actually true. No amount of believing it to be true will make it true.

Another way to conceptualize it is that blue pill men live in anyone's frame but their own - and remember this because I'll bring it up again soon. Whose frame?

- It's usually their wife's.
- But it can also be someone else's, like their mother's. How many times have you known a guy who is willing to say no to his wife like a true alpha ... because his mommy told him to do it? "I'm sorry honey, but Mother said ..."
- Sometimes it's society's frame. He wants to live up to certain expectations that he sees in the media or to fit in with what other people are posting on Facebook.
- Other times it can be no one's frame at all - he just has certain ideologies that he thinks should matter, so he orients his life around them, not even knowing why he's doing it in the first place.

No matter how alpha he becomes, a man remains blue for as long as he continues believing the lies society tells him or tries to fit the truth into his own fantasies. To that end, a man can be aware of red pill truth, but if he tries to use that knowledge to achieve his blue pill fantasies, he doesn't actually get himself anywhere. Such a man mistakenly keeps his red pill awareness as a context for behavioral modification rather than internal transformation.

What is the Purple Pill?

I had to give the above because you can't get to purple without blue and red. Purple is not a primary color. You either start with red and add blue, or you start with blue and add red. Purple doesn't exist naturally on its own.

Blue to Red

Virtually all men in first world countries start out blue. The purple pill is often a necessary (yet ideally short) intermediary phase. You can't void the blue first and then become red. You add the red to the blue, slosh around in purple for a while, and then ultimately kill the blue inside of you, leaving only the red to remain.

- Note: For some high-quality reading on this, Thomas Carlyle's *Sartor Resartus* has some excellent chapters titled, "The Everlasting No" followed by "The Center of Indifference" and then "The Everlasting Yea" (ultimately concluding with "Natural Supernaturalism") which defines this process in the context of salvation. [Here's a link, if you're interested.](#)

I think the reason so many people go through an anger phase is because they hate killing the blue. There is a clear identity change that happens. The old has gone, the new has come. As a result, they merely adopt red pill behaviors, but try to apply them in the context of the fulfillment of their fantasies. This never works.

Red to Blue

The inverse also happens occasionally. A man will become truly red pill, after having killed the blue. But then he may decide that he doesn't like it. Without a higher mission in life, many men can find it shallow and unfulfilling. This is why a man can't pedestalize getting pussy. Many men on TRP suffer from this struggle - even endorsed contributors. Sex is their end-goal. No doubt, it's a good desire to have. But if it's all you want out of life, you'll end up unfulfilled and longing to re-add old blue pill ideologies to give your life meaning again.

Several months ago [I linked to a prominent TRP poster who had mastered the game](#). He was getting all the sex he could ever have want. If his story is to be believed, for a time he was about as red as they come. But at the end of the post he concludes: "Can't we just have enforced monogamy again? ... I became Chad, and the world I was inducted into horrifies me. I want out."

Christianity and the Purple Pill

Many Christians who allegedly swallow the red pill don't actually become red because they refuse to give up the blue. They want to apply red pill knowledge and behaviors in the context of fulfilling external ideologies that they find in the Bible or from the church.

"But that's because the Bible tells us to!" they argue. "We're supposed to do what the Bible says. We have rules for life, moralities to follow, missions to accomplish, etc."

At best, these are the guys who are blue trying to sprinkle some red in their lives, becoming purple. At worst, they're bluer than they realize and think that their behaviors define them. **They don't.** Either way, they may get some shallow results, but their lives are ultimately severely stifled.

I believe this is why the secular crowd assumes Christians must inherently be blue pill. It's why they believe that "religion has no place in the red pill." I can't count the number of times this has been quoted to me on MRP or TRP.

It makes sense from a secular perspective. A man sees God's will and the Bible as outside influences that shape his behavior. He must abandon his own frame to live in Christ's frame. The Bible preaches certain ideologies and the man must believe them. Any red pill awareness he has can only be applied within those ideologies. Sounds pretty purple, right?

The Red Pilled Christian

What the secular crowd doesn't understand is the transforming work of Jesus. They view us from a evolutionary or behavioral psychology perspective. They see our commitment to God and the Bible as external frameworks we're attempting to live within. From that perspective, it comes off as: **They do so that they can become.**

If Jesus truly transforms a person, especially if he is spiritually mature, it is not an external framework we are trying to live up to. It is an internal framework that we are expressing. From that perspective, it is actually: **We are, and therefore we do.**

This is the same for red pill men. Doing red pill things doesn't make you become red pill. But when you internalize what you know, that causes you to live a certain way - to do red pill things and express red pill behaviors. The behavior itself isn't "red pill," but if a man is truly red pill, there are certain behaviors that must automatically follow.

Likewise, as a Christian, I do not behave certain ways to live up to biblical ideals. I do not pursue a particular mission because God told me to. I do not talk to an external God in prayer to figure out his plan for my life and then try to live it out. That would be the definition of the purple pill or blue pill Christian.

The beauty of our faith is that the Holy Spirit indwells within us. He transforms us.

- My mission is my mission, not God's mission that I adopted.
 - My love for my neighbor is because I personally and internally want to love my neighbor, not because God told me to love my neighbor.
 - My faithfulness to my wife is because that's who I am, not because that's what God told me to do.
 - My devotion to reading the Bible is because I am passionately in love with God's Word, not because it's something Christians are supposed to do.
 - My ideas on morality, politics, and life in general are my own, I don't believe something just because God says
-

so.

Internalizing the Truth

Let me repeat that last part: **I don't believe something just because God says so. I believe it because it's in my bones - because it's true and it's intimately a part of me.** Even more: it *IS* me.

When I was saved, I became the truth, just as Christ said, "I am the truth." Ever wonder what he meant when he said that? I think he was referencing this concept. Truth wasn't an external thing to him that he learned from and lived up to. Truth was intimately a part of him. It was in his bones (or perhaps better worded: in his spirit/Spirit). It defined his very existence. And now that I have Christ, I went from embodying the lie to becoming the truth along with Christ.

That's what salvation is: recreating who we are in our innermost being. "The old has gone, the new has come." Just as Rollo says to "kill the blue," Paul says to "put to death" the flesh.

Do you see the difference? Are you trying to live up to an external standard in your faith? So be it. That's better than not trying at all. I'd rather you live up to external Christian ideologies than not pursue them at all. Purple is better than blue. If nothing else, it can be a necessary way-point on the path to becoming red in the first place. But at some point you must become your own man. And if the Holy Spirit is in you, that man will be Christ in you.

- Note: I want to be clear, I'm not saying that all people who are genuinely saved are red. I'm merely saying that the processes of internalizing and digesting the red pill is parallel with the way a person internalizes and digests the Gospel in his own life. As long as either of them is an external thing you're trying to live up to, you haven't really made the leap from one thing to the next.

Sadly, this isn't how it is for most Christians. Their view is, "I'm a sinner. God is perfect. The Bible tells me how to be more perfect. So, I will live up to what the Bible says." This is going to sound like blasphemy, but hear me out: the man I am today doesn't need the Bible. I am the Bible. I am the message, not merely the messenger. The Spirit who wrote the Bible is the Spirit who wrote me and lives in me and is one with me. Does that mean I throw away the Bible? Heck no. It merely means that **the Bible isn't an external thing I try to live up to.** Because of my salvation, **it is an internal thing that I'm constantly exploring and discovering within myself.**

Let me be clear: *it's not just you trying to become like Christ.* Your identities literally intertwine as you become one. In Romans 11 Paul uses the imagery of branches being "grafted in" to a tree. Jesus references the same thing in John 15, saying, "I am the vine, you are the branches." A vine is still a vine and a branch is still a branch. We have our own unique qualities. I am not literally Jesus any more than a branch is literally a vine. But we are still one and the same. You can't look at a vine separate from its branches or vice versa - or if you do, it's because the branch fell off and it's dead. Don't be a branch trying to look like the vine. Be a branch that is on the vine, which gives it life.

Don't do things because the Bible says so. That's no different from doing red-pill-type behaviors because some guy on MRP said so. Do things because that's who you are. Don't leave your frame to go into Jesus's frame. If you're in Christ and on the vine, your frame already is Christ's frame. Start living like it.

APPLICATION

As I always say, knowledge without application is useless. So, what can you take away from understanding the distinction between the Christian Purple and the Christian Red?

1. Stop viewing Christianity or the Bible as an external standard you're trying to live up to. When you read the Bible, treat it as an opportunity for self-discovery. A car owner doesn't read his vehicle manual to tell the car

what it should be trying to do. He uses it to understand what his car already is and how to fix it when it's broken.

2. People are stupid. We don't often understand ourselves, much less other people. Spend some time praying or meditating on who you are and how you can start living like that person.
3. I didn't get into this point much, but the secular world believes we are singular people. This makes sense because their flesh and their spirit are both aligned, creating a singular, unified person. Christians have a dual nature. Our spirit is at war with our flesh. Accordingly, for the Christian the concept of "be your own man" isn't quite as simple as "what do you want to do?" We have competing goals and interests that we don't always understand right away. As such, make a list of any tensions you are experiencing in your life and decide which part of you in each of those dichotomies is going to shape the way you live your life. Then go do it.

You're Not Thinking Big Enough: Part 2

21 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

I was PMing with a guy from RPC about my previous post on developing a bigger vision for your mission. After working with him briefly to refine his mission, I suggested he come up with a practical vision for what it would look like in practice, then to pick 10 things he could do in the next 30 days to advance his mission.

Wisely, he asked if that's a worthy bench-mark to pursue and if I do 10 things a month to advance my mission. Perhaps my reply can be motivating to some of you to be more intentional about how you pursue your mission.

For reference, my mission is: *To glorify God by advancing his Kingdom into the nations through spiritual generations of workers and laborers living and discipling among the lost.*

My practical vision for accomplishing this takes a few forms:

1. Discipling individual guys in my own life to the point where they're discipling others.
2. Developing a discipleship ministry in my home church.
3. Reaching 25 countries by 2025 where people with a vision for discipleship are living and laboring from my spiritual lineage.

Do I do 10 things a month? Yes. Probably close to a few dozen [edit: after finishing the post, I realized it is likely actually in the hundreds].

My mission is the pie pan, my "time slots" are the pieces of the pie that I allocate for different purposes. So, I'm technically on mission 24/7 - every day all the time. I don't stop thinking about it. Even when I'm on the job, arguing to the judge, there's a piece of my mind that's processing my mission and how I can leverage the day for that purpose. I know it sounds neurotic, but that's how important my mission is to me and how passionate I am about it.

As to the individual time slots, some things are directly oriented toward the pursuit of my mission, and others are maintenance to prevent me from being idle about my mission. Making money at my job, for example, doesn't inherently advance my mission (though I certainly at times utilize it as a context for doing so), but it is a type of maintenance I need because without money I would have greater distractions from doing what God called me to do.

With regard to specific time-slots, let's look at just the time-frame of noon yesterday to noon today

1. I had a quiet time - because I can't help others if I'm not being fed first.
2. I met with one of my pastors to discuss developing a discipleship ministry within my church
3. I went to a discipleship conference to learn about how to reach millennials
4. I networked with other disciple-makers at the conference who I could recruit into my efforts - one who is actively interested in partnering with what I'm doing
5. I dropped off two books at my church for one of the pastors to review - one from the Barna Group which talks about the statistics of discipleship in the modern church, and the other giving a narrative account of a church implementing discipleship in a highly effective way
6. i texted with one of the guys I disciple
7. I wrote more in a book that I'm writing that will directly contribute to my discipleship efforts

8. I sent a copy of my discipleship book to someone who asked for it
9. I met with one of the guys I disciple at the gym, lifting weights together and talking about Christ
10. I initiated a conversation with a couple new people, which conversations I can leverage for a relationship later, which can develop into discipleship (advancing your social network is a HUGE part of building a ministry)

Oh ... and that is all the stuff I did WITHOUT including anything from reddit, whether here or on another prominent Christian sub I do a lot of work with (this is actually my alt)

Now, I don't necessarily do this much every day. Most days I could probably only list 4-5 things. But every day I have contact with at least 1 guy I'm discipling, and I'm always having my own time in God's Word for my own growth. That's 2 things right there, so at least 60 things every month - and only if I do nothing else than just that.

I'd wager every month I'm doing hundreds of "time slot" things that directly advance my mission of disciple-making.

I don't say any of this to brag, but hopefully to inspire you :)

What intentional steps are you all taking to advance your mission? Is it just a vague idea in the back of your mind that you hope you'll subconsciously just happen to accomplish one day? Or do you have an active plan? What is that plan? What's your time-frame for accomplishing it? What steps do you need to take to get there? Who's going to do it alongside you? How will heaven be better off for it?

Qualities to look for in the men you spend time with

22 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

I read this excerpt recently and thought it would be worth opening up for discussion. What would you change? What would you add to this list? What would you remove?

What are the characteristics of these good men [who you want to befriend]? Here are the things that I ask all men to aspire to incorporate in their lives. In our present culture, if you can find a man who embodies half of these things, you'd do well to spend more time around him.

1. They're on a mission given by God through Scripture.
2. They know and understand the Bible and are continually spending time with God everyday.
3. They are active, not lazy, giving appropriate attention to their personal responsibilities.
4. They are proactive and not reactive. They take initiative. They look prospectively at what needs to be done and they do it on their own, not waiting for someone to tell them to do it.
5. They do not idolize humility over confidence, respecting the balance between the two.
6. They take care of their physical bodies, not being gluttonous or slothful. They are in good shape and make an active effort to exercise.
7. They have good people skills – one of the most important qualities that many men never learn in their upbringing.
8. They balance meekness with wit and charm, showing you how to make a good impression on outsiders without coming off as arrogant or boastful.
9. They are not swayed by cultural influences and have no problem telling people no.
10. They are active leaders in their homes, not succumbing to passivity, and their wife and children follow their lead with a submissive attitude – not because they must, but because he has proven himself worthy and they trust him.

Married Man Game: The Need for Testing

I have been meaning to write a post series on married man game for quite some time - almost a year even. I'm glad I didn't. Back then, I would have been writing as I was learning, which would have driven the content to be theory-based and anecdotal, at best. Now, a dozen or so months down the road I've lived it long enough to see what patterns work for me and for other Christian men I know in real life who are red pill aware. Thanks to [u/macmeeler](#) and [u/coachdad8](#) for reminding me to come back to this.

The lack of quality content on this subject in the Christian realm - even within the Christian manosphere - is so small that I can't pretend to have universal answers. We could say "AWALT," which holds true in most biological and psychological respects, but we also know that a mature Christian woman will be able to temper her biological and psychological impulses in unique ways from secular women (who are still slaves to sin) that may or may not affect the viability of secular models of game. While the secular world often brags about how easy it is to pull the "good church girls" into bed with them, I have yet to see this play out with an actual mature believer. Is it possible? I'm sure. AWALT. It's certainly possible that I might watch porn again someday too. AMALT. That impulse will always be a part of my biology. Is it likely? Not at all. Because in my spirit I have mastered that part of my flesh. While no woman can truly master hypergamy, just as I cannot kill all sexual desire in myself, as I can conquer the physical expressions of that desire, so do I leave open the likelihood that many spiritually mature women may be able to stifle some of the physical expressions of their innate hypergamous desires.

My point in saying this is simply that there are a lot of variables that are currently unknown. It could be that the secular models fully carry over into the Christian relationships 100% and there's no difference (as has been mostly true in my experience, with limited exception, even with a moderate-to-high spiritual maturity in my wife), or it could be that some of you experience different results - and I don't want to close the door on that and pretend that what gets addressed in this series is the only way. I'm happy to re-write everything if the evidence and field reports come back with more mixed results than the consistency with what I see in my own marriage and observations of those I know in real life.

To that end, please do the following:

1. Read and reflect on each post in this series.
2. Apply and implement it in a controlled environment. Feel free to put your own spin on it, but if you do introduce variables, keep track of them.
3. Keep applying for at least 2-3 months.
4. Start posting field reports about your results.

Introduction to the series aside, let's kick it off with a few fundamentals.

What is Game?

Loosely, I define game as any intentional effort a man makes to escalate attraction with a woman. Passive game would include things like being physically fit, pursuing one's mission, maintaining frame, early levels of dread, and the like. These are all things you do whether or not you're trying to attract a woman. They're just part of who you are.

Active game, on the other hand, is more intentional. Where passive game creates the right conditions for my wife to initiate sex with me, active game is what I do when I want to initiate sex with her (among other possible reasons

for employing it).

There are aspects of who God is that cause us to want to pursue him. We get so excited about *who* our spiritual groom is that we want to tell others about him (spiritual reproduction). But there are also times when we are idle and the Spirit escalates with us, taking a more active involvement in escalating the oneness and unity that we can experience in that relationship. Make sense? Good. Let's move on.

KNOW YOURSELF

Game involves confidence. In fact, the urban dictionary definition of game notes, "You can't have game if you don't know yourself; you can't be confident of what you're ignorant of." So, who are you? Here are some questions to help you figure this out:

- What is your mission? (Yeah, you knew I couldn't write a post without bringing this up; it is the foundation of everything)
- What does the Bible say about who you are?
- What motivates you in life to do things other than watch Netflix?
- What is your testimony? Process the big-3: who you were before Christ, what caused you to embrace Christ, and who you became afterward.
- How would you summarize yourself in 60 seconds or less?
- What things will you never compromise on?
- What are your personal strengths and weaknesses?

After answering these questions (and many more) about yourself, discern how you can portray yourself to others in a way that emphasizes your positive attributes as charming and magnetic, while embracing your less desirable attributes through a display of confidence and playfulness (one of the reasons AA is such a powerful tool).

To be clear, this is not creating a false persona of yourself. It is being up-front about all of you. There's a reason why God emphasized his justice, judgment, and condemnation of sin in his Old Testament parental role, while leaning more on his passion, grace, love, and purpose in his New Testament role as our spiritual groom. God didn't change. The Old Testament still references God's passion, grace, love, and purpose - it just doesn't emphasize them. The New Testament still references God's justice, judgment, and condemnation - and is quite bold in its pronouncements of these things - but it doesn't stress these things as the dominant traits God expresses to those he loves.

In the same way, contemplate how you express the balance of your traits to the one you love. You can't do this until you know who you are first. Consider two men I know:

Example: AJ

AJ is the hot guy that made every woman in college swoon. Even my own wife had a crush on him in college. I roomed with him for a year and he was my best friend during the 4 years we were together - and for years thereafter, even to this day. I was in his wedding earlier this year.

What's he like? He has always been in peak athletic form. He toured the country. He engaged in a variety of jobs that gave him a wealth of experience. He's funny, confident, charming, an incredible conversationalist, and knows the Bible thoroughly. He's also unreliable, biting sarcasm, easily aggravated, and doesn't think before he acts.

AJ didn't know himself until very recently. This is why my wife never actually made herself available to him. After

college, AJ spent nearly a decade without any stable job. He was homeless most of the time he toured the country, living with whatever friends, family, or acquaintances he could pressure into giving him a room for a week or two. While his experiences made for a great story later on, he never had a girlfriend for several years because the possibility of commitment was automatically off the table and he was entirely unreliable. Was he attractive? You bet. Did women want him? The non-Christian girls looking for a quick fling, sure. But no, as hard as he looked, he couldn't find a Christian girl willing to commit. Exciting though it may have been, they didn't want to tour the country with a guy who didn't know why he was doing it or what it might lead to.

He eventually settled in one city and began developing a career as a personal trainer. It wasn't the most lucrative thing ever, but it played to his strengths. It emphasized his physical attributes, his people skills, his wit and charm, his confidence, and gave him an opportunity to use his conversation skills. It also catered to his need for flexibility in life, allowed him to utilize his biting sarcasm as a positive expression of motivation to his clients, and put him at low-risk for making foolish decisions without thinking. See it? His positive attributes were emphasized, whereas his negative qualities were embraced and contextualized in a way that they could be an asset to him. Are you surprised, then, when I say that within weeks of having finished his journey of self-exploration and embracing the conclusions he came to - that is when a hot, single, mature Christian girl came on to him who is now his wife? We often give the "pick 2 of 3" rule - but he got them all.

When AJ was on his decade-long journey of self-exploration, he couldn't find a girl no matter how hard he tried. Once he figured out who he was, discovering his mission and conceptualizing a vision for how it could be accomplished in his life, he became more practical about the day-to-day goals and responsibilities he would have to take on to make it happen. After discovering what he wanted out of life and how to get it, almost immediately he met a girl at the gym he was working at and they married this year. From observing them in public, AJ knows how to game his wife. She knows him intimately and loves the way he teases and taunts her.

While the day he will need it is fast approaching, AJ is not red pill aware. He doesn't know the truth. But he does know himself and who God created him to be. This is the greatest asset he has working for him right now, and I wish him well.

CONCLUSION & APPLICATION

Game involves an intricate balance of playing to your strengths and embracing your weaknesses. AJ's story is about how he found his wife, but that doesn't mean his story irrelevant to married men. What's not attractive to the girl at the bar isn't attractive to the girl with a ring.

What are we to do about this? First off, figure out who you are. Write down whatever notes you come up with. Develop your 60 second self-description speech and make sure your lifestyle is consistent with your life description. For a sneak-peak of a future post: learn how to give that 60 second speech without saying one word.

This may not be popular among a group of guys who get off on circle-jerking about being more alpha all the time, but bear with me. Your goal in a divorce isn't to make your ex have the hots for you. It's to be on good terms with everyone involved so you're more likely to settle or win at trial. Although alpha strategies can work, this post is directed more toward the guys who are married to mentally unstable and highly hostile women.

Beta Divorce Strategy

Society wants to see men be more beta, right? Nice guys are good guys. Alphas are jerks who most people in culture want to punch in the face. Yeah, they're attractive to women, but they're still seen in a negative light by everyone else - including your judge, who can do the legal version of punching you in the face and get away with it. Very few alpha men present well in court. Being confident and articulate is powerful. Being the jerk who always teases his wife, AAs her complaints, says no to fitness tests, etc. will just justify to the judge why she's leaving you in the first place. If you can be the model nice guy - the man all the feminists are trying to create - your judge can only think: "He was everything a woman would want. Sure, he made some mistakes, but he owned up to them and tried to make it right. She's the one who's being a jerk by leaving such a nice guy." This isn't the best strategy for every judge, but it works for a lot of them - 4 out of the 5 judges on my current court.

If you want to save your marriage, maintaining frame and being attractive would be the goal. If you want to win at divorce, be the best beta suck-up you can be until you build the evidence you need - not just to influence the judge with your character, but to screw with her too. She's not going to soften up to Mr. Alpha. Be the pandering fool who begs and pleads for her not to leave and offers to buy her flowers every day for a year and give her chocolates on Tuesday just because it's Tuesday. Let her think she's in the position of power. That's when her guard goes down. That's when she says stupid things in front of the microphone in your pocket.

Also, comment periodically: "I know you hate me. I know you want to prove how horrible a husband I've been to you. I can't stop you if you want to do that, and I'm happy to accept the blame for anything I've done wrong. But I still love you. I don't want this to be a big fight [especially if you have kids, bring up how it could affect them]. I'm trying to get together all the documents you'll need to prove how much money we have, how much I earn, and we can figure out how to settle this in a way that I hope we could still be friends after this is over. And who knows, if after some time things start to cool down and you would want me back, I want to do this in a way that could leave that door open." Of course, she's going to scoff at that last part. But if she's even slightly on the fence about the divorce, what you're doing is nullifying her aggression in the divorce process, increasing your chances of settling on favorable terms by reducing her hostility toward you, and opening the lines of communication so you can try to settle between yourselves rather than paying your attorneys to do that negotiation for you.

Again, this strategy doesn't work on every wife and judge, but when it does work it's the best option possible. The thing is, you can't start with an alpha, hard-ball strategy and move to the beta strategy, but you can always go from beta to alpha in a divorce. Alpha to beta isn't believable. You won't be able to convince anyone that the softness you present is sincere or genuine if you've been a jerk for the first half. It comes off as trying to manipulate the court. But if you start beta and change to alpha later, the court just thinks, "Well, what did she expect? He tried to play nice, she wouldn't have it, she pushed him too it." You can always start with the beta strategy, though, and convert to the alpha strategy if that's not getting you very far. That said, hold out on the beta strategy for longer than you think you should because: (1) she needs to see the first few bills from her attorney before she recognizes the cost of her being the only one to want to fight hard, and (2) because sometimes women will test how sincere your beta-ness is, knowing you might be trying to play her to get a better settlement.

Multi-Lane Divorce Theory

Most mentally unstable and hostile women are preparing for a head-on collision with you in Lane A (Alpha). She's going to play the alpha, hard-ball strategy. If you've got a divorce 2.0 judge, you're not going to win in Lane A if

you try to collide back. Don't fight fire with fire. Switch to Lane B (Beta) and put some road blocks in Lane A.

- Lane A is the direct and traditional emotional way to win a divorce case, which is when each side slings a bunch of mud and tries to convince the court that the other side's mud is worse. Her "mud" will be about how abusive you've been to her (whether it's true or not), how lazy you've been all the marriage, that you've been controlling, and that you've generally been absent and uninvolved. Your mud is going to be similar: she's lazy, has mental health problems, never held up her end of the house care, child rearing, etc. and that she wouldn't seek a (better) job when you urged her to. Statistically, I wouldn't bet a dime on winning in that type of a collision. Men are expected to treat women nicer than women to men.
- Lane B is the indirect and unconventional, yet legally secure statutory way to win a divorce case. Look up your state's statutes and assess the factors, then live by them as perfectly as possible. Alphas ignore the rules and do their own thing. Lane B litigants play exactly by the rules. This makes it very hard for a judge to rule against them and gives the judge easy justification for ruling in his favor because he knows he cannot be reversed for ruling consistently with the statutes. So, while Lane A is an appeal to the judge's emotions, Lane B is an appeal to his sensibilities and the law.

For spousal support, your state will have a list: "The court must consider the following factors: a ... b ... c ... d ... etc." The same thing will be true for child custody, parenting time, asset division, etc. Make sure you're fulfilling those factors better than she is. If your kids have a doctor's appointment, you take them. Talk to the school and make sure your number is the "first to call" on the list and hers is second. Create a spreadsheet that charts your spending for the past year and a half so that you can prove where all of your money has been going - and categorize it as to who spent what. Don't blame her for her excessive spending. Just use the exhibit to address your conservative spending. Let the court look at her column on the spreadsheet on its own. After all, you're not trying to sling mud here. You're simply trying to show that you're a responsible person who does right with his finances, takes care of his home, and is an upstanding parent to his children. Get all of your documents together. Make sure the numbers add up.

If you know she's racking up a lot of debt (or is likely to do so), look up your state's "*de facto* termination date" case law and figure out what factors the court will apply and start building a case for why the court shouldn't use the day of trial as the division date (thereby giving you half of all of that new debt) and should instead use a past date. Typical factors include: leaving on unfriendly terms, when you stopped living together, when you sought legal counsel, when the case was filed, when you started separating your assets, when you started segregating bill obligations between the two of you, whether or not either of you found a relationship outside the home, etc. You have to be able to show that these and other factors started before she started racking up the debt.

This is how you win on Lane B - by showing the court that you're better than she is, not by showing the court that she's worse than you are. In essence, you're proving that you're a high quality man, not that you married a low quality woman. If the judge has eyeballs in his sockets and your wife is even half as crazy and hostile as you think she is, he'll see it and she won't be able to hide it on the stand, as will be evidenced by all the mud she tries to sling - most of which won't be relevant anyway. Don't fight back. You can try to run both lanes at the same time, but it doesn't often go as well as one might think. If you travel on the low road, you're inherently not on the high road anymore. Due to biases, women can do both. You can't. Pick a lane.

Nullification Planning

To nullify her Lane A you simply have to taint any evidence she might throw at you. Now that you know she's recording you, leverage those to your advantage. Record yourself if you have to. Get her on record while she's off-guard acknowledging that she's not afraid of you or that she's looking forward to something you're going to do together soon. Put her in a good mood. Fake it if you have to.

I had a case recently where the wife was crazy. She broke the court order dozens of times. She would send e-mails

to my client acknowledging what she did. But she always ended those e-mails with something like, "I know this may not technically work within our parental plan, but I hope you agree that this is what is best for the children. I only want to do what's in their best interests. If the plan isn't accounting for that, maybe we need to talk about changing a few things." So, when she went back to change the parenting plan and my client wanted to bring up all the evidence proving she was in contempt of court, how do you think that evidence is going to play out? Judge: "Yeah, I can see she violated the plan, but as she said in your own evidence, it's because this plan isn't working. That's why you're back into court. This isn't a contempt issue; it's just evidence that the plan needs to be modified." That was a bitter pill for my client to swallow. Fortunately we had 3 experts all testifying that my client should get custody, so it's a slam dunk on other grounds anyway (order pending).

My point is simply that she did everything she could to nullify and taint any evidence my client would try to present. Every audio recording, every e-mail, every text message, every phone call, etc. They always included in the beginning or the end, something like each of the following phrases, which I encourage you to emulate too:

- "I'm genuinely grieving at the loss of our marriage and that things are going this way. I really do love you and wish that we could cooperate and make peace through all of this."
- "Although we have our differences, I know that you mean well. I hope you can see that I mean well in what I'm trying to do too."
- "I understand why you're so frustrated. I would be too if I only had your perspective. That said, I still think this is what we should do, and I hope you can see from my perspective a little bit as well."
- "I know we're not going to see eye-to-eye, but I hope you know I'm just trying to look out for the best interests of our children."
- "I know you're trying to back me into a corner so you can use these e-mails as evidence. I'm not happy about it, but I understand the strategy you're trying to use. Nevertheless, I have to stick to my principles. This is what I think is best/fair/appropriate and I really hope you would be willing to consider this and work toward resolving our differences rather than building a case for court."
- "I know you are filled with hate for me, but I still love you, even if I know now that it's not going to work out between us."

Most states have a rule that the context of any evidence has to be presented when the other side asks for it. So, if she presents the first two sentences of an e-mail showing how you make stupid decisions or that you admitted to something that looks bad, you can force her to reveal the rest of the e-mail. When the court reads these types of phrases, it often significantly dampens and nullifies the impact of what she's trying to prove because they believe you have a greater genuineness and sincerity behind why you said the other thing in the first place.

It doesn't actually matter if it's true or not, as in the case of the mom I referenced above. One of her conversations was about not taking her son to hockey practice because she had to go to a funeral for a co-worker. My client was unavailable, but offered to have his new wife drive the kid and the mom refused because she didn't like the new woman. Then my client's mom drove in to town (4+ hours) and offered to drive him to practice, but the mom still refused. Instead, the kid sat in after-school-care for 3 hours and missed his hockey practice ... and the mom wrote, "I know you don't understand why I'm not in agreement with what you're proposing. I wish you could see things from my perspective and that we could understand each other like we used to. But until we can learn to communicate better, I think we just need to trust each other that we both want what's best for our kids." It's a very vague statement and offered no actual justification for her idiotic refusal to cooperate, but it sure made my client look like an idiot for making an issue out of it. For the record, she later admitted on cross-examination that she didn't have a good reason for not using my client's wife or mom to get her kid to practice, other than that she simply didn't know them well enough yet.

CONCLUSION

In short, there's value in being alpha if you're trying to attract a woman. But if you're trying to impress someone who lives in blue pill ideologies, like your judge or a guardian ad litem, or even your wife's attorney (and trust me, if her own attorney believes you're a stand-up nice guy, that's a huge advantage) ... sometimes you have to conform to what they want to see in you. You're not trying to convince these people to have sex with you. To that end, being more alpha might be more attractive to your STBE, but obviously you weren't doing it well enough to keep her from divorcing you, so don't expect more of the same to change her opinion about you. Try a different strategy in the divorce.

10

UPVOTES

TRP Has Been Quarantined - Meta Thread

27 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

If you have anything you'd like to discuss about TRP being quarantined, keep it here.

What does it mean that they've been quarantined?

- Officially: That users must read a warning before entering the TRP subreddit, acknowledging that it is "dedicated to shocking or highly offensive content" and redirecting others to a predominantly liberal university.
- Speculatively: This is a precursor to an official ban of the subreddit.

For information on Stony Brook University, check out [these demographics](#). Of particular note in their politics on campus section:

- **What political party do you associate yourself with?**
 - Republican: 7%
 - Democrat: 42%
- **How would you best describe the political beliefs of campus as a whole?**
 - Progressive/very liberal: 11%
 - Liberal: 34%
 - Moderate: 23%
 - Conservative: 1%
 - Very Conservative: 1%

I don't mean to imply that political parties and red pill praxeology are inherently related. That said, it's no secret that the democratic party is the primary supporter and promoter of feminist ideologies, and we are being told that we must learn how to be a man from a predominantly feminist university. Have fun ;)

For those who are curious, the mods have previously discussed possible options for hosting our users. Nothing has been established yet, but the sidebar materials have been secured privately in case we become the target of another wave of attacks.

I do not anticipate that we will be targeted, nor do we intend to begin policing content differently than we have so far. As far as I'm concerned, this sub will continue without change or interruption. Nevertheless, it is wise to be cautiously aware.

"I hate you!" my wife said, hiding a crooked smile behind her hands. I had just pulled another one of my signature pranks: the forgotten child. I picked up the kids from day care and sent them to play in the yard. She gets home a few minutes later and asks where they are. *What? I thought you were getting them today!* Hysteria ensues.

It's easier to have fun with a wife who's extremely gullible. Mine has learned most of my tricks, which only forces me to amp up my acting skills and power of persuasion. It's actually good practice for life skills that help elsewhere anyway. After all, being able to maintain a normal face through an emotionally charged situation is foundational to your frame - only this time you're employing frame on the other end of the emotional spectrum.

Something is Better Than Nothing

Women can't resist a man who can make her feel something. It seriously does not matter if it is deep hatred or abounding joy. Emotions are confusing. There's an old saying that *you cannot hate something that you don't first truly love*. The idea is that you have to be emotionally invested before you can hate. The same concept applies to anger, jealousy, fear, and a host of other negative emotions.

For women, any emotion is better than no emotion at all. It's like a drug to them. It doesn't matter if it's designer weed and high-end pharmaceuticals or some hash a guy grew in his back yard. One end of the spectrum is preferred, but it's all good, regardless.

What a man must really avoid in his relationships with women is indifference. When a woman stops caring about him enough to be either elated or enraged at him, he has lost her attraction.

Push-Pull

Women want to know that their man cares about them. "Does he really love me?" she subconsciously asks herself countless times a day. Unlike men, she doesn't look to objective measures to answer that question. She looks to her own feelings. A woman's perception of the extent of a man's love for her is not defined by the man's behaviors toward her; it's defined by her emotional state. A guy could wrestle a bear to save her, buy her a mansion, or take her on an elaborate cruise - and if her emotions aren't into it she just assumes he doesn't love her. "He must have some other agenda - like getting sex from me," she thinks. That's another of many reasons why it's so important that she live within your frame. That's when your point of origin defines her emotional state.

How do you get her emotionally charged? The push-pull technique is a great one. This is really the broader category behind the art of teasing. The idea is that you want to create an emotionally charged environment by precluding a sense of normalcy and complacency.

- If you push her away all the time, the angst normalizes and just becomes a way of life. It stops helping.
- In the reverse, if you're pulling her toward you all the time, showering her with wonderful gifts, passionate poems, and all the time and attention she could ever want, these wonderful things normalize and stop holding any value. Rather than it being an emotionally charged treat, she just expects it.

That's one of many reasons why the blue pill "nice guy" strategy doesn't work. By creating a destabilized emotional environment, where the dynamic is always changing, a man's bride is kept on her toes, never knowing what to expect. If the fluctuating dynamic is maintained appropriately, her anticipation will be a longing for what he has to offer rather than a fear of what he might withhold.

When I read the Bible, this dynamic is evident in the relationship between God and his people all over the place. The most obvious books to find it are Judges, 1 and 2 Kings, 1 and 2 Chronicles, and the Psalms. In Judges, Kings, and Chronicles we see God constantly shaking up his nation as soon as they become complacent and stop caring about him. At some points we see him blessing them and drawing them toward himself. Other times he pushes them away. The goal is the same either way: to remind the Israelites of their intense need for God and to restore their passion for his ways.

God's no dummy, of course. He patterns his push and pull with the flow of their behaviors, conditioning his people to expect a push when their complacency leads them to reject him or a pull when they have lived long enough in the muck and he sends a prophet to restore them to his glory. This pattern of conditioning his push-pull dynamic on their behavior not only precludes complacency, but also emphasizes the value of obedience and faithfulness.

TYPES OF TEASING

Teasing can be employed in different ways to effectuate a push or a pull. The story I opened with is only one of three main types of teasing. Can you guess which one?

Passionate: The most positive and enticing form of teasing is to unveil a restrained passion - enough to show the person all that's in store, but not enough to satisfy their fill. This is why lingerie is so freaking attractive to most men. Why would adding clothes to raw, naked flesh make a woman more appealing? Because ripping them off is gratifying. Because a little taste leads to a larger hunger. The very existence of lingerie is a form of passionate teasing.

- **Look:** Men can wear forms of lingerie too, but it's rarely quite the same. A better bet is to buy some form-fitting clothes and let your shape shine through. But women aren't nearly as visual as men.
- **Touch:** A better bet is to get her feeling the trickle before the flood. Ever notice how much she loves it when you sneak up behind her and hold her in your arms, kissing the back side of her neck and breathing lightly in her ear? Kino is powerful. It gives her a small taste of the full entree.
- **Talk:** The pen is mightier than the sword. A man's words are more powerful than his *sword*. You could certainly send her a dick pick or grind your crotch on her, but few things will rev her up more than taunting her with thoughts of what you're going to do to her. Women love to fantasize. That's why romance novels are consistently one of the top selling genres. Get her fantasizing about you before you even start.

Playful: This is when a man just has fun with his wife. He's not necessarily foreshadowing his momentarily veiled desire. He's enjoying life at her expense. The effect it has, though, is to bring her out of a state of emotional neutrality toward him. It's not enough that she is emotional at all - she must be emotional about him.

My wife has 4 months out of the year where she works 80+ hours a week. That's major stress. She occasionally comes home in tears (though it's far rarer since I have learned to be her oak). She is emotionally invested in her job. The more invested she gets in her job, the less invested she is in me. This isn't always a bad thing, as there is value in her being invested in her career. But it does preclude me from being able to lead her through the emotional whirlwind that she experiences during these busy seasons. How do I break through? I get her emotionally invested in me again. Rather than her employer's frame, she needs to come back to mine.

Engaging in passionate teasing doesn't work when she doesn't have enough time to be interested. She might want it, but she'll still intentionally avoid it, as work is the higher priority in the moment. So, if I want her emotionally invested in me again during these times instead of her work, I can't use temptation toward sex. Instead, I play with her. I get her riled up over something - or even better: over nothing. I play pranks, make silly jokes, or prey on her gullibility. Sometimes she laughs (pull) and other times she becomes frustrated (push) - but in either case, she's feeling something toward me again. Once I have her emotionally invested I can steer that emotional investment

whichever way I want to lead her - whether into happiness, comfort, joy, or lust.

Piercing: The third form of teasing is that biting form of word-play that's thinly veiled by a light-hearted attitude, usually coupled with AA. For example, my wife once complained about one of her male coworkers being a total douchebag. She went on for about 20 minutes with her story about how frustrating he was being. She was emotionally invested in him. I called her out on it: *Aw, I think you like him.* "No, it's not like that," she insisted. *You want to screw him, don't you?* "Yuck! No." *You think such dirty things, and you won't even admit it.* She punched me in the arm, saying with a smile, "You're so mean!"

My wife has a "good girl, holier than thou" image of herself a lot of the time. Accusing her of being anything less is a blow to her ego. The fact is: she is less. Nobody's perfect. Rather than getting wrapped up in her emotions about this guy, I redirected her emotions to be toward me. I was a little mean ... but also a little playful. She liked it. She'd rather be mad at me than him. At least she trusted me. If I could get her to care about me, she'd stop caring about him. Problem solved - and to my great advantage, as the power play was quite arousing.

You have to be careful here because too harsh a word can leave the realm of teasing and become outright cruel. While that can still get her emotionally invested in you, it's a more difficult emotional investment to steer in a more arousing direction. Of course, once again, any emotion is better than no emotion. There may be times when a straight-up neg is appropriate, though the motivation behind it matters greatly.

Back to the Bible

Do we see God doing this? Well, at least the first two methods I derived straight from Scripture. In writing this post, I asked myself: "How does God keep his people emotionally invested in him?" and the "passionate teasing" and "playful teasing" methods came to mind.

It's not hard to find passages where God shows us hints of his glory to make us desire the full thing - like when he let Moses see his back side. It won't take long to find many other places where God gives a taste of himself to make us long for more.

I could probably also reference several places in the Bible where God had fun with his people, laughing at our idiocy and displaying his dominance. That's one of the many reasons I love our God. He's humorous and playful with us, not some ultra serious prick all the time. Psalm 2 is a great example of this. God looks at those who oppose him and says, "The one enthroned in heaven laughs; the Lord scoffs at them" (v4). Immediately after, in verse 5 God employs the push: "The Lord rebukes them in his anger and terrifies them in his wrath," followed by verse 8 with a pull: "Ask me and I will make the nations your inheritance, the ends of the earth your possession."

Piercing teasing, though? I'm not going to pretend there's a clear Scriptural example for it. I know God uses outright negging in appropriate contexts. There are countless biblical examples where God calls his people out for their faults - Romans 3 containing a nice little compilation, for example. I also know that God's negging is designed to expose those parts of us that we must turn from in order to be drawn back to him.

Does he do this in a playful way too? I can't say from Scripture. What I can say is that when the Spirit convicts me of some of my flaws, I often can't help but laugh. There's a subtle remorse and anger at being reminded that I'm not perfect - and never will be in this lifetime. But it is often overpowered by the fact that God makes me feel silly for not having picked up on it before. The Spirit calls me out in a way that maintains my positive attitude toward God rather than a rage-filled contempt or a hopeless depression. I pray he does the same for you.

135

UPVOTES

Married Man Game Part 2: Teasing

6 October 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill · Archived copy · Reddit

"I hate you!" my wife said, hiding a crooked smile behind her hands. I had just pulled another one of my signature pranks: the forgotten child. I picked up the kids from day care and sent them to play in the yard. She gets home a few minutes later and asks where they are. *What? I thought you were getting them today!* Hysteria ensues.

It's easier to have fun with a wife who's extremely gullible. Mine has learned most of my tricks, which only forces me to amp up my acting skills and power of persuasion. It's actually good practice for life skills that help elsewhere anyway. After all, being able to maintain a normal face through an emotionally charged situation is foundational to your frame - only this time you're employing frame on the other end of the emotional spectrum.

Something is Better Than Nothing

Women can't resist a man who can make her feel something. It seriously does not matter if it is deep hatred or abounding joy. Emotions are confusing. There's an old saying that *you cannot hate something that you don't first truly love*. The idea is that you have to be emotionally invested before you can hate. The same concept applies to anger, jealousy, fear, and a host of other negative emotions.

For women, any emotion is better than no emotion at all. It's like a drug to them. It doesn't matter if it's designer weed and high-end pharmaceuticals or some hash a guy grew in his back yard. One end of the spectrum is preferred, but it's all good, regardless.

What a man must really avoid in his relationships with women is indifference. When a woman stops caring about him enough to be either elated or enraged at him, he has lost her attraction.

Push-Pull

Women want to know that their man cares about them. "Does he really love me?" she subconsciously asks herself countless times a day. Unlike men, she doesn't look to objective measures to answer that question. She looks to her own feelings. A woman's perception of the extent of a man's love for her is not defined by the man's behaviors toward her; it's defined by her emotional state. A guy could wrestle a bear to save her, buy her a mansion, or take her on an elaborate cruise - and if her emotions aren't into it she just assumes he doesn't love her. "He must have some other agenda - like getting sex from me," she thinks. That's another of many reasons why it's so important that she live within your frame. That's when your point of origin defines her emotional state.

How do you get her emotionally charged? The push-pull technique is a great one. This is really the broader category behind the art of teasing. The idea is that you want to create an emotionally charged environment by precluding a sense of normalcy and complacency.

- If you push her away all the time, the angst normalizes and just becomes a way of life. It stops helping.
- In the reverse, if you're pulling her toward you all the time, showering her with wonderful gifts, passionate poems, and all the time and attention she could ever want, these wonderful things normalize and stop holding any value. Rather than it being an emotionally charged treat, she just expects it.

That's one of many reasons why the blue pill "nice guy" strategy doesn't work. By creating a destabilized emotional environment, where the dynamic is always changing, a man's bride is kept on her toes, never knowing what to expect. If the fluctuating dynamic is maintained appropriately, her anticipation will be a longing for what he has to offer rather than a fear of what he might withhold.

TYPES OF TEASING

Teasing can be employed in different ways to effectuate a push or a pull. The story I opened with is only one of three main types of teasing. Can you guess which one?

Passionate: The most positive and enticing form of teasing is to unveil a restrained passion - enough to show the person all that's in store, but not enough to satisfy their fill. This is why lingerie is so freaking attractive to most men. Why would adding clothes to raw, naked flesh make a woman more appealing? Because ripping them off is gratifying. Because a little taste leads to a larger hunger. The very existence of lingerie is a form of passionate teasing.

- **Look:** Men can wear forms of lingerie too, but it's rarely quite the same. A better bet is to buy some form-fitting clothes and let your shape shine through. But women aren't nearly as visual as men.
- **Touch:** A better bet is to get her feeling the trickle before the flood. Ever notice how much she loves it when you sneak up behind her and hold her in your arms, kissing the back side of her neck and breathing lightly in her ear? Kino is powerful. It gives her a small taste of the full entree.
- **Talk:** The pen is mightier than the sword. A man's words are more powerful than his *sword*. You could certainly send her a dick pick or grind your crotch on her, but few things will rev her up more than taunting her with thoughts of what you're going to do to her. Women love to fantasize. That's why romance novels are consistently one of the top selling genres. Get her fantasizing about you before you even start.

Playful: This is when a man just has fun with his wife. He's not necessarily foreshadowing his momentarily veiled desire. He's enjoying life at her expense. The effect it has, though, is to bring her out of a state of emotional neutrality toward him. It's not enough that she is emotional at all - she must be emotional about him.

My wife has 4 months out of the year where she works 80+ hours a week. That's major stress. She occasionally comes home in tears (though it's far rarer since I have learned to be her oak). She is emotionally invested in her job. The more invested she gets in her job, the less invested she is in me. This isn't always a bad thing, as there is value in her being invested in her career. But it does preclude me from being able to lead her through the emotional whirlwind that she experiences during these busy seasons. How do I break through? I get her emotionally invested in me again. Rather than her employer's frame, she needs to come back to mine.

Engaging in passionate teasing doesn't work when she doesn't have enough time to be interested. She might want it, but she'll still intentionally avoid it, as work is the higher priority in the moment. So, if I want her emotionally invested in me again during these times instead of her work, I can't use temptation toward sex. Instead, I play with her. I get her riled up over something - or even better: over nothing. I play pranks, make silly jokes, or prey on her gullibility. Sometimes she laughs (pull) and other times she becomes frustrated (push) - but in either case, she's feeling something toward me again. Once I have her emotionally invested I can steer that emotional investment whichever way I want to lead her - whether into happiness, comfort, joy, or lust.

Piercing: The third form of teasing is that biting form of word-play that's thinly veiled by a light-hearted attitude, usually coupled with AA. For example, my wife once complained about one of her male coworkers being a total douchebag. She went on for about 20 minutes with her story about how frustrating he was being. She was emotionally invested in him. I called her out on it: *Aw, I think you like him.* "No, it's not like that," she insisted. *You want to screw him, don't you?* "Yuck! No." *You think such dirty things, and you won't even admit it.* She punched me in the arm, saying with a smile, "You're so mean!"

My wife has a "good girl, holier than thou" image of herself a lot of the time. Accusing her of being anything less is a blow to her ego. The fact is: she is less. Nobody's perfect. Rather than getting wrapped up in her emotions about this guy, I redirected her emotions to be toward me. I was a little mean ... but also a little playful. She liked it. She'd

rather be mad at me than him. At least she trusted me. If I could get her to care about me, she'd stop caring about him. Problem solved - and to my great advantage, as the power play was quite arousing.

You have to be careful here because too harsh a word can leave the realm of teasing and become outright cruel. While that can still get her emotionally invested in you, it's a more difficult emotional investment to steer in a more arousing direction. Of course, once again, any emotion is better than no emotion. There may be times when a straight-up neg is appropriate, though the motivation behind it matters greatly.

Adapted from a post created for [r/RPChristians](#).

... my neighbor (HB5-ish) told me on Saturday night, standing on my front porch. It was kind of awkward hearing the doorbell ring at 10pm in the first place, not to mention the fact that she was the one woman on my street I've barely had longer than a 2-minute conversation with. She was clearly drunk, though still speaking relatively clearly. To her credit, there are some situations where a sober guy having sex with a black-out drunk chick can legally be considered rape.

She asked to use my phone because her "rapist" stole it and drove off. I let her in, direct her to my garage for some privacy, and went back to putting my kids to bed after a fun night at Chuck-E-Cheese. My wife's came out of our bedroom, confused about who was at the door, so I told her what was going on. Her heart sank as she rushed to the garage to console our neighbor. Putting her crazy work schedule aside, my wife decides this is more important, so she headed over to the neighbor's house to sit with her while she waited for the police. That way she wouldn't have to be alone after ... you know, being raped.

About an hour later my wife comes back in with a disgruntled look on her face: "She was not raped!"

What happened? I asked with a grin, already having suspected this conclusion an hour ago, based almost exclusively on our neighbor's demeanor when she first asked to use my phone. Here's how it went down - noting that my neighbor apparently had excellent memory of everything.

She was tailgating at a bar and got fairly drunk - but not too drunk to forget things. She met a guy. He drove her home. She invited him in. They had sex and cleaned up afterward. She changed the sheets. They cuddle and fall asleep for an hour. He takes a shower while she's asleep (evidenced by the fact that it was dripping when she woke up) and drives off. She can't find her phone.

In her mind, he took advantage of a drunk girl, stole her phone and fled. She cries rape. So, she drives (still drunk) to the police station, but there was no one at the desk. She rings a buzzer a few times before realizing she could be charged with drunk driving, so she leaves and drives back home again. She looks around for her phone, can't find it, then knocks on my door.

Fast forward - my wife's sitting in her house hearing this sob story about how she just got raped and had her phone stolen. She suggests calling the phone to see if anyone answers: no answer. They hop on Facebook on the girl's laptop and message her friends who were still at the bar. Her phone is there. My wife leaves. Police show up 15 minutes later.

"I'm so glad I left before the cops got there!" my wife says.

Why's that?

"Because it would be really awkward trying to tell them everything I just heard and yet listening to her call it rape. She was not raped! That was a total waste of time. She's just a girl who made some bad life choices, had sex with a guy she didn't really know - or even like - and doesn't like dealing with the consequences of those choices. But you know what really ticks me off? How do you think she's going to remember this night? In her mind, this is always going to be the night she was raped. That's just absurd, but God-forbid anyone try to tell her otherwise. And if she ever finds that guy again, who knows how she might try to ruin his life."

I'd never been so proud of my wife.

... my neighbor (HB5-ish) told me on Saturday night, standing on my front porch. It was kind of awkward hearing the doorbell ring at 10pm in the first place, not to mention the fact that she was the one woman on my street I've barely had longer than a 2-minute conversation with. She was clearly drunk, though still speaking relatively clearly. To her credit, there are some situations where a sober guy having sex with a black-out drunk chick can legally be considered rape.

She asked to use my phone because her "rapist" stole it and drove off. I let her in, direct her to my garage for some privacy, and went back to putting my kids to bed after a fun night at Chuck-E-Cheese. My wife's came out of our bedroom, confused about who was at the door, so I told her what was going on. Her heart sank as she rushed to the garage to console our neighbor. Putting her crazy work schedule aside, my wife decides this is more important, so she headed over to the neighbor's house to sit with her while she waited for the police. That way she wouldn't have to be alone after ... you know, being raped.

About an hour later my wife comes back in with a disgruntled look on her face: "She was not raped!"

What happened? I asked with a grin, already having suspected this conclusion an hour ago, based almost exclusively on our neighbor's demeanor when she first asked to use my phone. Here's how it went down - noting that my neighbor apparently had excellent memory of everything.

She was tailgating at a bar and got fairly drunk - but not too drunk to forget things. She met a guy. He drove her home. She invited him in. They had sex and cleaned up afterward. She changed the sheets. They cuddle and fall asleep for an hour. He takes a shower while she's asleep (evidenced by the fact that it was dripping when she woke up) and drives off. She can't find her phone.

In her mind, he took advantage of a drunk girl, stole her phone and fled. She cries rape. So, she drives (still drunk) to the police station, but there was no one at the desk. She rings a buzzer a few times before realizing she could be charged with drunk driving, so she leaves and drives back home again. She looks around for her phone, can't find it, then knocks on my door.

Fast forward - my wife's sitting in her house hearing this sob story about how she just got raped and had her phone stolen. She suggests calling the phone to see if anyone answers: no answer. They hop on Facebook on the girl's laptop and message her friends who were still at the bar. Her phone is there. My wife leaves. Police show up 15 minutes later.

"I'm so glad I left before the cops got there!" my wife says.

Why's that?

"Because it would be really awkward trying to tell them everything I just heard and yet listening to her call it rape. She was not raped! That was a total waste of time. She's just a girl who made some bad life choices, had sex with a guy she didn't really know - or even like - and doesn't like dealing with the consequences of those choices. But you know what really ticks me off? How do you think she's going to remember this night? In her mind, this is always going to be the night she was raped. That's just absurd, but God-forbid anyone try to tell her otherwise. And if she ever finds that guy again, who knows how she might try to ruin his life."

I'd never been so proud of my wife.

... my neighbor (HB5-ish) told me on Saturday night, standing on my front porch. It was kind of awkward hearing the doorbell ring at 10pm in the first place, not to mention the fact that she was the one woman on my street I've barely had longer than a 2-minute conversation with. She was clearly drunk, though still speaking relatively clearly. To her credit, there are some situations where a sober guy having sex with a black-out drunk chick can legally be considered rape.

She asked to use my phone because her "rapist" stole it and drove off. I let her in, direct her to my garage for some privacy, and went back to putting my kids to bed after a fun night at Chuck-E-Cheese. My wife's came out of our bedroom, confused about who was at the door, so I told her what was going on. Her heart sank as she rushed to the garage to console our neighbor. Putting her crazy work schedule aside, my wife decides this is more important, so she headed over to the neighbor's house to sit with her while she waited for the police. That way she wouldn't have to be alone after ... you know, being raped.

About an hour later my wife comes back in with a disgruntled look on her face: "She was not raped!"

What happened? I asked with a grin, already having suspected this conclusion an hour ago, based almost exclusively on our neighbor's demeanor when she first asked to use my phone. Here's how it went down - noting that my neighbor apparently had excellent memory of everything.

She was tailgating at a bar and got fairly drunk - but not too drunk to forget things. She met a guy. He drove her home. She invited him in. They had sex and cleaned up afterward. She changed the sheets. They cuddle and fall asleep for an hour. He takes a shower while she's asleep (evidenced by the fact that it was dripping when she woke up) and drives off. She can't find her phone.

In her mind, he took advantage of a drunk girl, stole her phone and fled. She cries rape. So, she drives (still drunk) to the police station, but there was no one at the desk. She rings a buzzer a few times before realizing she could be charged with drunk driving, so she leaves and drives back home again. She looks around for her phone, can't find it, then knocks on my door.

Fast forward - my wife's sitting in her house hearing this sob story about how she just got raped and had her phone stolen. She suggests calling the phone to see if anyone answers: no answer. They hop on Facebook on the girl's laptop and message her friends who were still at the bar. Her phone is there. My wife leaves. Police show up 15 minutes later.

"I'm so glad I left before the cops got there!" my wife says.

Why's that?

"Because it would be really awkward trying to tell them everything I just heard and yet listening to her call it rape. She was not raped! That was a total waste of time. She's just a girl who made some bad life choices, had sex with a guy she didn't really know - or even like - and doesn't like dealing with the consequences of those choices. But you know what really ticks me off? How do you think she's going to remember this night? In her mind, this is always going to be the night she was raped. That's just absurd, but God-forbid anyone try to tell her otherwise. And if she ever finds that guy again, who knows how she might try to ruin his life."

I'd never been so proud of my wife.

Beta is always bad: Change my mind

12 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

I was skimming some posts from a few days ago that I hadn't gotten to yet and came across [this line of comments](#) and it seemed very off to me - especially given that two of our mods were on board with the idea. I'm not shaming them; I could very well be the one who's wrong. So, let me toss this out for a broader conversation. Think of it like one of those many [Steven Crowder: "Change My Mind"](#) videos, but in text form. Or maybe you agree and don't want to change my mind. Let's hear it either way.

Here's the gist of it: some books like MMSLP will say that a healthy marriage requires a mixture of alpha and beta. The theory is that alpha traits build attraction, whereas beta traits build longevity. In hypergamy terminology, alpha caters to a woman's ovulatory cycle (AF/alpha seed) and the beta traits cater to her luteal cycle (BB/beta need). I think [u/cholomite](#) on MRP once said, "Tingles without fuzzies won't last; fuzzies without tingles are worthless." It sounds like some people think alpha is what produces tingles and beta is what produces fuzzies. I'm not convinced. This view seems to (in my mind, mistakenly) define a person's alpha/beta characteristics from the woman's point of view. If it's attractive to her, it's alpha; if it's meeting her provisional needs, it's beta.

In my view, alpha and beta are descriptors of a man's internal framework, not defined by the woman's perception - and also not merely behavioral classifications. Consider the following examples:

- Having a good job
 - Beta: MMSLP says having a good job is a beta quality in a man because it meets a woman's desire for provision from her man. Does that mean a "true alpha" is impossible for a guy with a good job? If so, then we've taken the meaning of the word "beta" so far that it's no longer useful. Every guy who strives to improve his finances is suddenly part-beta. And when the word applies on such a broad scale, it ceases to have value as a classification metric.
 - Alpha: Many men with "good, stable jobs" are working not out of a source of provision for their spouse (her framework), but because of his own internal drive and imperative (his framework) that he would maintain with or without her. Something in him compels him toward excellence. The fact that he uses his position of financial strength to benefit his wife is not a sublimation to her framework; it's an expression of his strength as a financially dominant alpha who derives enjoyment from utilizing his strength for someone he cares about.
- Buying your wife flowers
 - Beta: Many people would say this is a beta quality. It comes off as pandering to your wife, doing something to make her feel good at the expense of the time and money it took you to buy those flowers. Usually it's associated with a guy trying to get on her emotional good side - whether because she's angry at him or because he wants sex from her later. The beta theory is that a guy is right for doing this because catering to his wife's emotional needs periodically is necessary for a happy, long-lasting relationship, and therefore it's valuable for a guy to buy his wife flowers every now and then.
 - Alpha: Sometimes a guy just wants to buy a girl flowers because it's what he wants to do. There is no internal drive in him that he must keep her happy or cater to her emotions. He loves her. She's been good to him. He rewards good behavior. This is coming out of his operational framework rather than catering to her operational framework.

Frame Mending and Going Rambo

Another way I've phrased this in the past (though I haven't used these terms in a while) is "frame mending." A guy will get in his own frame and get his frame to be stronger than his wife's frame. Their frames will collide and one

will break. If he's "alpha enough," he maintains his frame against hers, so hers starts to falter. After enough times, her frame begins to crumble. She lashes out, frustrated that she has lost her position of power in the relationship, going to more aggressive tactics to tear his frame down and get him back in hers.

If it doesn't work, she finally gives up. There are two directions that the relationship can take from here.

- **Add Some Beta:** Some guys will advise, "You've been going alpha too hard. Tone it down. She needs some beta too." Notice the subtle cue? "She needs" - that's what's defining the advice at this point. It's true, no doubt, and it's important to recognize the needs of those you lead. But the subtlety goes deeper than that: there's an implicit tag at the end of that phrase: "And you need to give it to her." Says who? Now you're letting some ideology define what you "need" to do. Anyway, the result is that when the guy adds back some beta, he starts mending her frame. He looks at all the ways it got broken from colliding into his frame and starts encouraging her and rebuilding her frame so that she's ready for another toe-to-toe a few days later. In the process of bolstering her frame, there are some tricky angles, so he usually ends up having to get inside that frame for a while to hammer the nails where they need to go. Sometimes he forgets to get out before nailing himself in.
 - Interestingly, the "alpha seed, beta need" terminology is usually talked about in the woman's framework: she wants seed from the alpha, but her needs to be provided for by the beta. Unintentionally, the phrase could also work from the man's own framework: that the imperative of the alpha is spreading his seed, but the imperative of the beta is what he "needs" to do or that he is "needy" in general.
 - Let's take that last bullet one point further. Unsurprisingly, this male-framework interpretation of ASBN is also implicit in the spiritual imperative of every Christian. The mature ones who adopt the great commission have a desire-driven compulsion to spread their seed, which is the Word of God (Matthew 13). They do this out of a transformed internal state that naturally desires to do what God created them to do. On the other side, weak Christians are compelled more by their spiritual needs: *I need to read my Bible more, I need to sin less, I need to be a good husband and father, I need to share the Gospel more*, etc.
 - Another thing to note is that some guys would say, "You went Rambo. Don't do that." Rambo doesn't mean "too alpha," though. It means you made too much change too fast and your active behaviors are causing the explosions. It's like you're taking that 1,000 foot rope and yanking on it to make her turn around faster and she's just not ready. That's Rambo. Don't confuse going Rambo with going "too alpha."
- **Invite Her In:** Rather than mending her frame or sprinkling some beta because that's what you "need to" do to "have a healthy relationship," the better option is simply to invite her inside your frame. Jack10 used to talk about a prototypical guy whose frame was littered with barbed wire and broken glass inside. No girl wants to enter that. But if you fill it with fun and comfortable things, she can rest within your alpha-ness in a way that uplifts her - not to take up arms in her own frame again, but in a way that truly enjoys the gift of submissiveness that God has granted to women. What does this look like? It's like the time when my wife got heated at me for not wanting to enroll the kids in a particular activity. I wrapped my arms around her, kissed her forehead and said, "I understand that you're upset, and it makes sense to me why you're feeling that way. But disagreeing with you doesn't mean I don't care about you. I'll be downstairs if you'd like to join me soon." I wasn't conceding anything. In more tactful terms, I simply communicated: *This is my decision. You can embrace it or you can fight me on it. When you're ready to embrace it, we can be at peace again*. More importantly: I'm not reinforcing her ideas or way of thinking that I disagreed with. I acknowledged her feelings, but didn't pretend that her point of view was wiser than it was with some phrase like, "Your idea was really good and I want you to keep coming up with good ideas, even though I may not agree with all of them." That's inviting more frame battles in the future. In reality, I know that she's going to keep coming up with her own way of doing things no matter what. My goal isn't to reinforce her individuality; it's to reinforce my identity in her, just as Christ doesn't reinforce the church's independence, focusing instead on our *dependence* on Him at all times, and our imperative to adopt his way of thinking. And if I'm a good leader, I'm willing to admit when I'm wrong and learn from the input she gives - but do so in a way that doesn't mend her separate frame; rather, it gives her a role and function to fulfill within my frame.

Conclusion: Change My Mind

The way I see it, the notion that "you have to do certain beta things if you want your marriage to last" is total garbage to me. Even if you're not technically adopting your wife's frame to maintain this, you're certainly not staying in your own. You're in the frame of "the marriage" - or more accurately: *philosophical and/or societal expectations of what a healthy marriage requires*.

If a man wants to buy his wife flowers, he does it. If he doesn't, he doesn't. Any provisional, comforting, or protective needs the wife may have are her own business to worry about. When a man meets those needs, it should come from an alpha place: that he wants to - and people will never follow a man who doesn't want to. Alpha men, as leaders of their pack (or family, if you prefer), do all of these things because it suits their own internal agenda, not because they experience a compulsory need to set aside their own agenda and purposes to maintain external standards over their relational structure. If he's cold and heartless to her needs, that's his prerogative (sin issues notwithstanding, per 1 Timothy 5:8), but it also opens the door for her prerogative to walk away. Nobody wants to follow someone like that. Sure, divorcing him would be sin to her, but so is him neglecting her needs. It's all just a bunch of "if, then" circumstances. **IF** you want a wife who follows your lead, **THEN** you must do x, y, and z to achieve that result. But when the "**IF/THEN**" clause turns into "I **NEED** my wife to follow my lead, so I **NEED** to do x, y, and z," that's when we shift into the beta mentality and are no longer operating toward our goals, but out of an internal emptiness that we're trying to fill with her validation.

To that end, a man must always be alpha all the time. The internal "beta" framework is never a good idea. Even external behaviors that are associated with beta men should be performed from an alpha mindset. Change my mind if you think otherwise.

For Women: Getting Your Beta to Man Up

16 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

Modern society doesn't raise up men; it raises little boys in men's bodies. This happens for a number of reasons. I'll briefly summarize a few:

1. As Jordan Peterson notes, there is a responsibility-reward dynamic. Men are taught to bear the responsibility, but they are no longer being given the reward, which has gradually been snatched away by feminism. So, what motive does a man have to keep bearing responsibility anymore? None. So, he revolts and lives in his mother's basement playing video games all day until he's in his 50s, she dies, and he doesn't know what to do with his life anymore.
2. Relational dynamics put an incredible amount of pressure on men to compete for female attention. Per the Pareto Principle, only 20% of men will garner the attraction of 80% of the women. That's stiff competition, so many men just bow out altogether and take the minimum that happens to come along. Unpleased with the fact that they settled rather than competed for a win, they feel no compulsion to thrive as a leader in the household, so they placate themselves with other things instead.
3. Through social scripting, most men are conditioned to adopt blue pill fantasies about marriage and sexuality. When they do get married, they discover that real life is nothing like what the world told them it would be. Disillusioned with their circumstances, they either throw in the towel and become submissive to the active influence of their wives or they keep aspiring to live up to the wrong standard of what they think their wife wants (i.e. unspoken, passive influence) rather than what would actually fix their marriage.
4. Many masculine traits have been associated with criminal conduct so strongly that it puts men at risk to express them. For example, if a man is assertive and dominant in his relationships, as he should be, if she should ever make up false rape or domestic violence charges, there would be a large history of assertiveness and dominance that courts and psychologists would take as evidence of the propensity he has for violence, greatly increasing the likelihood of conviction. So, men are forced to set aside any lifestyle that would allow her to build a case for false charges later on.

I could keep going, but you get the point. This post isn't about how men grow up to become children. It's about what a woman can do when she finds herself in this position.

Why write a post directed at women? Because this is the #1 most asked question I get among women: **"My husband is beta and won't lead. How can I help him become the leader God wants him to be without being a nag or compromising my role as a submissive helper to him?"**

FRAME AND INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY

The most recent person to ask this question to me noted: "this is clearly a period of growth for him and for me **and for us together**" (emphasis added).

The first thing of importance is to recognize that there are only two frames at work: his and hers. There is no "theirs." The "us together" bit doesn't actually exist. When couples talk in "us" and "we" language like that, it has the ability to disassociate personal responsibility from the problem. Consider the following common complaints:

- "We have communication issues." No, one or both of you independently have problems with how you talk. There is no "we" solution to the problem. "We" is not a collective and unified designation, or there wouldn't be a problem in the first place. Who is "we"? In reality, you and him must each individually take responsibility for solving whatever you're each contributing to the problem, whether the issue is in communication skills,

methodology, frequency, expectations, etc.

- "We have a sex problem." No, you have a sex problem. You don't like sex the way he does. He doesn't like sex the way she does. It's not a "we" problem. It's individual preferences colliding. For the longest time, my wife was perfectly content with our sex life while I was frustrated, bitter, and resentful because of it. She didn't have a sex problem. I did. When I termed it as a "we" problem, I was trying to shoulder responsibility on her for my emotional dissatisfaction. When we eventually transitioned to a sex life founded on my expectations and desires, interestingly she still didn't have a problem with our sex life - I just solved my problem. It was never "our" problem in the first place, though. For some people, both people do have a problem, though. My point is that this isn't a "joint" problem - it's mutual individual problems on the same issue.

COLLIDING FRAMES AND THE FAILURE OF COMPROMISE

Any time someone communicates a "we" problem it usually boils down to a frame issue. Two people are crashing their frames into each other. Both frames are breaking, but neither are broken yet. This is perceived as a problem, as both of them insists that the other get into their frame.

The "we" of it is when they try to reach a compromise. Compromise is not always bad. There's a lot of value in compromise. But the core of compromise is that he's conforming his frame to look a little more like hers in exchange for her conforming her frame to look a little more like his. It inherently assumes some degree of breaking frame - unless a person genuinely agrees that the compromise position is better than his/her original position. Then it's just improving one's own frame.

But most marital compromises are not a genuine change-of-heart; they're a partial sacrifice for the "greater good of the relationship" that doesn't actually involve anyone changing their minds on the original point.

In short, stop thinking in "we" terms and recognize that you each have your own frame. Rather than insisting that you try to create a new "marital frame" for you both to live in, recognize that it's his or hers and a decision must be made. Once the decision is made, then it's merely a matter of improving the frame.

Biblically, that decision should be that the woman lives in the man's frame. If the husband lives in his wife's frame, he is no longer leading and she's no longer submitting. At best, she intellectually places him as a figure-head leader above herself to make her feel like she's submitting and fulfilling her biblical role, but in actuality his leadership is dominated and controlled by her emotions, expectations, and behavior in the home, so she's only submitting to someone who has either explicitly or inadvertently been manipulated into making decisions according to her own will and desires anyway.

FAIL TO LEAD

So, if a wife has decided that she is to be in her husband's frame, what is she to do if his frame is weak and does not offer the leadership, strength, comfort, provision, fun, and security that she longs for?

The first option is obvious: she could find another man. Of course, if she's already married, this is sin, so I don't recommend that option for any woman whose faith is more important to her than her marriage. But for non-Christians it is a viable option, which is why *The Journal of Sex Research* found that for the age-ranges 18-29 women are more likely to cheat than men, which is also true of couples whose relationship has gone on for 10 years or less. I could speculate on why the dynamic shifts later in a relationship, but that's not the point right now.

The second option is that a woman can demonstrate to her husband that she is incapable as a leader. Now, this can be a hot-button issue for many women. For one, you might actually be quite capable. If there's a leadership hole in the marriage and you're capable of filling it, why wouldn't you? Makes sense, right? Of course, the answer is: because your husband won't ever live up to that role if it's already being filled.

And why would he? Again, I opened this post with a variety of reasons for why men are already conditioned by society not to step into the dominant, leadership role within a relationship. Why would they fight against the grain of society when there's a willing, active other person who is already taking up that responsibility and letting him skirt around the issues with passivity and laziness as long as he's willing to deal with the nagging? My wife once commented: "I admit that all women are crazy. But if all women are crazy, there's got to be something that all men are. I think it's passivity and laziness." Biblically, I can't argue. Adam's first sin was passivity while Eve ate from the tree of knowledge of good and evil, and he set the pattern for every man to come.

Back on point: from here it's a mere priority game. What's more important: an attractive husband who leads you or making sure things around the house get done? If it's the latter, that's why you stepped up to make sure they got done with all your honey do lists and nagging him to get off his butt. If it's the former, then you might have to accept that things around the house won't get done the way you want - at least not for a while.

Standards and Thresholds

Every person has their own standard of living. For cleanliness of my house, I have a certain expectation of what it looks like. When it drops below my threshold I will clean it up, usually to well-above my threshold so that I have more time before I have to do it again.

My wife also has her own threshold - and hers was much higher than mine for a long time. When the house was between our two thresholds (i.e. below hers, above mine), that was a recipe for disaster. She used to see that as a "we" problem - because "we" weren't "on the same page."

We don't have to be "on the same page," though. Part of the "individual responsibility" section is recognizing that if one person has a problem, they can take personal responsibility for the problem. If we put it on a scale of 1-10 and my cleanliness threshold is 5 and my wife's is 8, then when the house is a 7, if she wants it above 8 again, she can take individual responsibility for cleaning it. She used to get resentful at me for not helping her. But from my perspective, the house was fine. She thought all of her extra work keeping it above an 8 was helping me. It wasn't. I didn't notice the difference between a 7 or 8 or 9. It didn't affect my ability to use all of the house's features. I didn't care about the dust on the TV that's only visible when it's off - because I'm not watching TV when it's off.

Now I'm not saying that women should lower their standards to their man's standards. Or maybe I am saying that - but that's not the point. The point is to decide whether your standards and thresholds are more important than having the type of husband who takes ownership and responsibility for his home. He might not lead the way you want, but at least he'll be leading - and that might just affect his standards and thresholds anyway.

Consider this: when my wife was maintaining the house at her standard of an 8 (and nagging me to help), I never actually experienced life at my standard of a 5. Even if I did, it was for short periods of time, like when she was on a busy season at work (80-100hr weeks for up to 2 months at a time), but I knew that at the end of the busy season she'd be back to her own standards again. I never had a compulsion to evaluate my own standard because the individual responsibility never fell on me to decide that standard in the first place.

Want to know what happened? Here's the flow of how things played out for us:

- First: my wife was leading in the cleanliness of our home and expected me to adopt her standards and thresholds. I didn't. We argued a lot about it. During this phase, my frame was garbage, but I thought it was better than hers purely because of its contrast to her standards, which were the source of our arguments.
- Second: my wife gave up arguing and just started taking individual responsibility for the maintenance of our home. She did not adopt my frame; she just stopped trying to make me get into her frame. This added a lot of stress onto her and resentment toward me. During this phase, my frame was still crappy, but I didn't see it as better or worse - I just didn't have to think of my own standards or thresholds at all because I never had to experience them.
- Third: After repeated stressful busy seasons and not being able to maintain individual responsibility, my wife

finally gave up on trying to maintain her standards and she adopted mine - not with nagging resentment or a defeatist attitude, but with joy and submission. My frame was still garbage, but now I had to live with it.

- Fourth: After seeing how annoying my standards and thresholds were to live in on a long-term basis, I realized things had to change, so I improved my frame and began leading our family to live up to a higher standard than I previously thought necessary. Although my new frame was not exactly what my wife had in mind before (some standards/thresholds were higher, some were lower), of my own volition I had moved to something much closer.

There are three key things to note in this process: (1) My wife stopped trying to lead in cleaning the house, so I stepped up. (2) We never reached a compromise, which I tried many times to do in the past, only to foster bitterness and resentment. My decision to adopt a new standard was not prompted by her persuading me, but by me recognizing a need that she was no longer filling. (3) Rather than reverting to our previous status quo of my wife leading in the housework, I took individual responsibility of the house as a leader who delegates. As a result, my wife was now receiving appreciation from me for dutifully following my lead, even though she was doing essentially the same things (maybe even less) as she was doing before, when she was leading in all this.

Not to leave any confusion: there are many things about our marriage where I have not magically "improved" my frame to what she previously expected. This isn't a recipe for getting a girl what she wants from her man. It's a recipe for getting a girl to get the man she wants, if that's more important to her than all the other stuff. The fact that he may improve his frame to account for her peripheral desires is incidental. That's not the goal itself, but it's a nice bonus when it happens, as in my house-cleaning example.

The point here isn't about house-work. It's about the way that stepping down from positions of leadership and control can invite a man to step up. I've found that, more often than not, when my wife stops trying to break my frame by crashing hers into it, I am more able to focus on continual improvement of my frame. Rather than bolstering the titanium plating on the exterior to protect it from attacks, I can focus on pimping out the interior to make it a more fun and enjoyable place to live.

Leaving Holes

In light of the above, I recommend that women leave obvious holes in their leadership in the home. If you're in a new relationship/marriage, that's going to be a lot easier because you can establish new patterns from the get-go. For those already in long-standing marriages, this can be more challenging because you have preset patterns of who does what and he reasonably assumes you'll keep doing these things.

If you abdicate your leadership role and try to force it on him, that rarely goes over well. You can't say, "You need to take charge of paying the bills from now on" because he would still be doing it under your authority/command that he do so. Yes, he's "taking charge," but only because you delegated that task to him.

A preferable option is to communicate a failure of your ability to function as a leader within the home. Again, you might be perfectly capable of leading to get all this stuff done, but if that leadership is hindering your ability to respect and love your husband in the midst of his failures as a leader that caused you to step up in the first place, then you can honestly say that you are incapable of functioning as a leader in the home *in the context of loving and respecting your husband*. You don't tell him that last italicized part, though, which would come off as little more than a threat for him to do more things or you'll stop loving him - because for all practical purposes, rocky roads aside, he probably does think you respect and desire him just as he is, if he's still living in his blue pill fantasy world.

So, in the example of paying the bills you say: "I know I've been doing this for a while, but I'm really struggling to keep track of which bills are due and when. Do you have any clue? And I can't make heads of tails of how these bills are affecting our budget. I've just been paying things and hoping for the best. Do you know if we're in a good financial spot, or are we under water? I don't know what I'm doing or how to manage this and I've just been pretending for a long time that I've got all this under control."

The goal here isn't to get the bills paid or even to get him to be the one to start paying them. It's to get him to recognize that he is individually responsible for his own household, whereas you have been taking individual responsibility for it in the past (again, no "we" issues here). If you have a late payment for a month or two, so be it. At some point he'll recognize that there's a need - and if you've made it openly obvious to him that you're not in a capacity to meet that need, then he will likely step up and start leading.

The problem that this approach can have is that some people don't communicate the "I'm not good at this" part. The husband assumes the wife will pay the bills like she always has, so if the bills stop getting paid on time, instead of stepping up he simply accuses her of failing at her implicit role. If you just stop paying bills, he gets mad because it's your responsibility. If you tell him you can't, and then you fail, that's his responsibility. You must convey yourself as weak, needy, and submissive. That can be very humbling and even humiliating - but it's also something that I have to do before my spiritual groom (God) periodically in order to re-frame myself as his bride/submissive, and it's something you should be able and willing to do before your physical groom periodically as well.

In America, most men recognize on a societal level that their wives don't actually need them - certainly not the same way women needed their men a couple hundred years ago. That gives many men the excuse not to lead their women anymore and to buy into the cultural lie that women should be able to do it all and don't need men. But if he can rediscover your need for him beyond functioning as an emotional teddy bear to coddle you, that will be a huge step in solving the problem.

REVERSE DISCIPLESHIP/MENTORING

I already listed two options for a woman who's man is not leading: (1) find another man, and (2) fail to lead. Although the second can be effective, there's a third, more preferable option to each of those: reverse discipleship/mentoring.

A direct discipleship/mentoring arrangement would be where you take a position of authority over him to teach him how to get from A to B. In this case, that would be getting him from being a weak, passive man to a dominant leader. The problem with this approach is that it inherently frames you as the leader over him. Not only is this unbiblical, but it also creates a perception that you're training him to lead other people/things and not you personally. But you want him to be *your* leader, not just *a* leader. Also, if he views himself as a leader in the home, however crappy he may be at it, he could confuse your attempt to mentor him with disrespect or an attempt to take over - and it may not actually be confusion at all, regardless of how well-intentioned you may be.

A reverse discipleship/mentoring arrangement works something like this. I have a pastor who has a position of spiritual authority over me (at least within the bounds of our local congregation). I wanted to get him on board with my mission and to begin leading the church accordingly. I could have taught him about my mission/vision and done so persuasively enough that he would look to me for leadership and guidance, but I didn't. I found that when I tried that with our other pastor he never internalized it fully - it was always just another "great idea" that was external to him that he tried to live up to for a short time before moving on to another "great idea." Instead, I asked this pastor to disciple me.

This can also be called a double-reversal. My normal MO is to be the discipler. I reversed it once by asking to be disciplined, suggesting several ways God's Kingdom and I could both benefit from his leadership over me. But I reverse it again by using my status as his follower as a way to guide him in how to lead someone. Here are a few examples of things I did:

- After the first couple meetings I threw out an idea: "When Jesus called his 12, he told them up-front at the very beginning of the relationship what the end-goal would be: 'I will make you fishers of men.' So, can you tell me what your end-goal for me is? You have a 2-year contract at our church. What do you envision me doing 2 years from now as a result of our time together?" I'm teaching him a very important point about intentional disciple-making, while remaining in the submissive role, letting him cast the vision and direct me.

- Comparable questions in a marriage context would be for a wife to ask: "What's your vision for the next x years? What is your goal for me during that time? What do you envision me doing x years from now as a result of our relationship?"
- After the above, he took a couple weeks before settling with an answer. So, I asked him at that point, "Jesus had an intentional plan for how he would make his disciples into fishers of men. If you know where I am now and you know where I'm going to end up 2 years from now, what's your plan for how you're going to get me there?"
 - A comparable question in a marriage context: "If you want me to be [blank] x years from now, what's your plan for getting me there between now and then?" I remember my wife asking me something similar at one point and the question blew me away. I didn't really have a plan. Why not? Because I wasn't leading.
- He usually likes to talk about whatever God's teaching him at the time, which is fine. But it's not an effective way to make disciples, which should be focused more on the needs of the person you're discipling. So, I asked him at one point, "Do you see any character flaws or spiritual weak points in me that I should start working on?" He had no clue and had never even thought that to be an important part of the disciple-making process. So, I asked him to guess at some things that he perceived in me that would be worth us chatting through, then I put my ego on the line (in that I disagreed with some of the things he said) and rolled with whatever his answers were just to give him practice discipling someone through a struggle or issue.
 - Marriage translation: "Husband, are there any aspects about how I live my life that might be getting in the way of your vision for our family? What are they? Can you help me work through those things?" Yes, that's really hard to say - and it wasn't fun listening to my pastor come up with things he thought I was doing wrong or needed to improve on, especially when I was really confident in those areas of my life. But it was dreadfully important - not just for me to improve, but to give him a better framework for what it's like to lead someone. That is, your goal isn't necessarily just to drudge up dirt for him to spew at you; it's to put him in a framework of seeing you as someone whose flaws and weaknesses he is responsible for - especially as those things may affect his leadership within the home. Rather than him ignoring those things to maintain the peace, he should be willing and able to confront you about them.
- Another thing is that Jesus always had a vision that was bigger than the guys he discipled. So, I asked him once, "What's the bigger picture that you're working toward? What's your whole job and Christian life about?" He was amused at the question and didn't have much of an answer, focused more on the day-to-day responsibilities of his job. He verbally processed for a while and finally came up with a make-shift mission that he said he wanted to iron out more later. Then I said, "Jesus had a bigger vision for ministry than merely his 12 - he wanted to reach the whole world. He knew how his disciples would fit into that vision and he trained them specifically for that task. How do you see me helping you carry out your vision for the church, and what would you need to train me to do in order to help you accomplish that goal?" At one point my pastor asked in the reverse what I wanted to accomplish at the church. I had a clear answer, but it would not have been helpful in training him to lead if I gave it, so I had to be evasive: "I don't really know what my goals are with the church. I don't have anything concrete in mind. I'm not in charge of leading the church, so my goals wouldn't matter anyway. You're one of our leaders, so I want to support what you have to offer."
 - Marriage translation: "Husband, what are your life goals? Do you have any life goals for me? I have things that I'd like to do with my life, but as my husband I'm more interested in what you have in mind for me. What skills and concepts should I be learning about and practicing to help me fulfill your goals and expectations both in your own life and mine?" Now, a true beta husband is going to encourage you to set your own goals and expectations and say he wants to support you in those. So, even if you do have things in mind, for now you need to keep saying, "I don't know. I'm looking to you as my leader, so I want to support what you have to say rather than make up my own thing, which could potentially drive us apart if we're going two different directions" (for the record: that's one of the main things that caused my parents to divorce: two different directions in life).

You'll note that in each of these examples, I'm not giving him answers. I'm just asking questions, prompting him to lead me. Now, I know where I want him to lead me and he doesn't always come to the same conclusion - and that's okay. If he goes down a different path, I follow and entertain that path. And if it turns out that path isn't helpful, I just ask more questions about why we're going down that path and about what Jesus did and let him draw his own conclusions and decide if he wants to keep going that way or back track to try a different thing altogether. I don't try to convince him it's a bad path. I don't ask my questions rhetorically, as if I'm trying to prove a point. I'm just putting out feelers and communicating a lack of understanding.

Without compromising my role as a submissive under him, he has grown incredibly proficient at disciple-making because of the way I let myself be a test dummy - and one who knows how to ask targeted questions to most effectively lead me. I recommend wives do the same: ask your husband to lead you. Don't tell him how to lead you. Ask questions that assume basic leadership concepts:

- Do you have a vision for where you're going/taking me?
- Do you know how to evaluate where I am right now?
- Do you have a plan to get me from where I am right now to where you want to take me?
- Is the vision for where we're going something that actually matters?

That's leadership in a nut-shell. Everything else is just filling in the details.

THE SPIRITUALLY IMMATURE MAN

This is another inevitable question for many Christian women: "What if my husband is less spiritually mature than me?"

- *The Husband Who Asks You to "Sin"*

You're still his wife. You're still his helper. You're still his submissive. You still follow. Ultimately, it is him who will have to answer for how he led in the relationship and you who will have to answer for how you followed. If he asks you to do something that's obviously sinful, like killing a person, I'd say not to do it. But if it's merely questionably sinful and violates your personal convictions, there are a couple ways you can process this before God on Judgment Day:

1. I felt like it was wrong. I also know that refusing to submit to my husband is wrong. Stuck between what felt like two wrongs, I decided it was better to uphold my personal feelings and convictions rather than my biblical imperative to submit to my husband.
2. I felt like it was wrong, but you gave me a clear obligation to my husband in Scripture, so I followed Scripture by submitting to my husband, even at the expense of my own feelings and convictions.

Which one do you think God is more likely to honor and respect in a wife?

- *The Husband Who "Won't Pursue Me"*

Some women have told me about times that they get in fights and their husband just walks away - and this infuriates them. "He's being so immature!" she cries out. "If he was a real Christian he would know he's supposed to try to pursue me at all times." Uh huh. She argues, "If I'm right, he should be humble enough to admit it and not get frustrated and walk away. If I'm wrong, he needs to show it to me and help sanctify me, not walk away." Sounds air-tight, right? He's always got to go to her, right? Wrong.

I remember when my pastor got into a fight with his wife and asked me about how to handle it.

I asked him, *How does Jesus respond when his bride acts the same way she just acted?*

His answer: "He withdraws himself and leaves us to our sin until we're ready to repent." We also looked at a few passages that show God/Jesus doing exactly that. He stops to think, then continues, "But that can't be what God wants in a marriage. What if she ends up leaving me and I could have done more? I want to be able to stand before God on Judgment Day and say that I tried everything I could to make things right with my wife, rather than walking away from her."

I said: *Oh, so you want to tell God, 'I was willing to try everything, except the one thing that you modeled for us.' How do you think that will go over? Also, if she leaves you, is that your sin or hers for God to judge? As far as arguments on Judgment Day are concerned, which do you think God will be more sympathetic to: 'I did everything I possibly could to pander to my wife to reconcile with her' or 'I saw what Jesus does and tried to do likewise, but she still left me'?*

I include this here because many women see this as a sign of spiritual immaturity. Indeed, a spiritually immature man may do this - refuse to pursue his wife or pander to her - but that is not what makes him spiritually immature and it doesn't mean that his reaction is in any way wrong. When we sin, it is not God's obligation to chase us down, but our obligation to seek after him with repentance. If your husband perceives that you have sinned against him and his leadership in the home in some way - whether he is right or wrong - the model that Jesus shows us with his bride, the church, is an expectation for us to confess and return to him. You may not always agree with everything he says and does (see the section above on the husband who asks you to "sin"), but he is your leader nonetheless. Don't get fooled into thinking that he is spiritually immature because of his failure to pursue you in the midst of conflict.

- *The Worldly/Unsaved Husband*

A third prototype of an immature husband is the one who isn't even saved in the first place (or perhaps he is saved on a technical level, but doesn't live it out). This is perhaps the most difficult type of husband to remain married to. In actuality, there may not be much you can do to win him over - that's God's job to save people. But God does use his people as instruments toward the fulfillment of that purpose, so you're not without your role in the process. I've seen many men who have come to Christ because of the faithfulness of their wives.

1 Peter 3:1-6 addresses this issue directly. The first thing it compels of women is to submit to their husband anyway. Obviously he's not leading you toward Christ, but that doesn't remove your obligation to submit to him. Jesus says, "No one can serve two masters," but here you're now in a position where you must. It's difficult. Refer to the first section on the husband who asks you to sin for more information on how to deal with that conflict.

The passage also suggests that "they may be won over without words by the behavior of their wives, when they see the purity and reverence of your lives." Know what that means? **Stop preaching to him or beating him over the head with the imperative to go to church with you.** I'm not saying never to share the Gospel with him, but not to nag him about it.

Many women do this. I knew a girl whose husband wasn't saved and she tried to preach to him all the time. It drove him away until he finally divorced her. I knew another girl whose husband wasn't saved. She nagged him incessantly until he went to church and joined a Bible study. Know what happened? He's still not a Christian to this day - but he thinks he is because he's doing what his wife told him. Now she's got a husband who is still worldly, but knows how to use his husbandly authority over her because he's talked about it with his Bible study guys and knows the right verses to quote (though they didn't mean to use them in that context, that's just how he took it, as an unsaved man).

The better alternative is to let him know that you're a Christian, to love him as you would Christ, and let him build the relationship between your love for him and your love for Christ - a bridge that Paul makes more clear in Ephesians 5:22, "Wives, submit to your own husbands, **as to the Lord.**" When he sees the character within you and the way that it blesses his life, this is what the Bible says is most likely to win him over to Christ - not nagging and preaching. I know, it's counter-intuitive, but isn't the Bible often that way.

- *The Spiritually Weak Husband*

Some men are genuinely saved, but still so immature that they are ineffective as leaders in a home and relationship. They want to follow God and excel in their spiritual life, but they don't know how and keep failing.

The principles above still apply in this situation. But there is something more you can do to help your husband want to excel in his spiritual walk. You can ask him questions.

Most men don't realize this, but I have found it a consistent principle throughout countless marriages that what a man experiences with his wife is what God experiences with him. If I notice my wife failing me a certain way, it's often that I'm failing God the same way and my wife is a projection of my leadership - how I'm modeling myself as a follower of God for her to follow me the same way. Likewise, when things are well in my marriage, I notice that my wife is living up to the same positive virtues that I am experiencing with God. And the same goes with my leadership: as God teaches me things, I practice the same thing in my role as leader over my wife.

To help your husband realize this connection and spark his spiritual growth through your marriage and submissiveness to him, try asking him: "Does God do for you what you do for me?" That question can go a long way. "You have given our family a purpose. Did God give you a purpose or did you come up with that concept on your own?"

In essence, the way you encourage his relationship with God is by being the type of wife/submissive to him that models the type of bride/submissive to God he was designed to be - and then ask pointed questions about his role as your husband/leader to connect that to his relationship with God as his spiritual husband/leader.

- *The Emotionally Weak Husband*

Some men are riddled with anxiety, depression, loneliness, hopelessness, fear, and the like. Virtually every time, when the husband expresses these traits, the wife experiences them as well. However, most women in this situation have the misperception that they shouldn't burden their husband with their emotions because it might make things even worse. This is wrong.

By not expressing your own fears or anxieties with him, you're taking the position of leadership in the relationship. You both have struggles; he isn't managing his well, so you've decided you're going to be the one to manage yours well in order to protect him. You're making that judgment call, not him. You're taking the position of strength, not him. This is backwards.

You're also missing an opportunity to experience a true empathy that few women get to know in their marriages: feeling the same thing at the same time. My wife often wants emotional empathy from me more than anything. When I get stressed out from time with my kids (which is incredibly rare) she becomes overjoyed - not at my stress, but at the fact that I have just experienced something she experiences everyday. She loves that I, in that moment, can empathize with her as she expresses her stresses alongside me.

So, if you share your feelings with him, one of two things will result: (1) you'll both be mooney or anxious together and get to share in each other's sufferings, or (2) he'll recognize his need to lead you through your emotional storm, then step up to solve his own issues so that he can lead you through yours.

- *The Stay At Home Dad*

Some women have asked how they can respect their husband if he's a stay at home and she's the one working to provide for the family. In the reverse, how can he feel like a leader if he's the house-husband?

I'm not as married to the economic roles that some people here are. Those people believe that men should always be the primary financial earners in the family and that a failure to do so is a failure of leadership in the home. It is true that economics can often translate to power and leadership, but it doesn't have to.

A man once brought up his role as stay-at-home dad and complained that he didn't know how to maintain

leadership when his wife held all the financial power. He admitted to seeing himself as a nanny to her kids (who were also biologically his), a housekeeper to her house, a repairman to her car, a handyman to her deck, etc.

I suggested a different frame for him: "This is my house, my kids, my car to fix, my deck to build, my household to manage, and my family to lead. She's the girl who gets me my money so I can get stuff done."

Now, that sounds crude to most women. Most women don't like feeling like they're just a piggy bank - and they'd be right to feel that way if their husband was a weak leader with a weak frame. But I think this is the attitude most women really long for their husbands to have - not because you want him to view you in a degrading, one-dimensional manner, but because that's the frame that will guide him as the leader you want him to be.

And with that I've mostly filled up the character limit for posts. Lots more to say, but it'll probably be a while before I direct another post toward women, so this will have to suffice for now. I'm happy to address more in the comments - including any discussion on the appropriateness of what I've said. I know this isn't likely to go over well with some people, but the issue has come up enough in private that I figured it's worth finally saying something more public about it.

Moses had 10, Poon has 16. I was reviewing these once again after listening to one of [u/redpillcoach](#)'s videos on the subject and realized we'd never talked about this. So, here goes.

I. Never say 'I Love You' first

God modeled this first. The Bible certainly communicates God's love for us before we communicate it to him, but this is in a corporate sense. "For God so loved the world" is tantamount to telling a woman, "I love chicks," and not, "I love you, specifically." Is a woman going to get butterflies and goosebumps at the thought: "I'm a chick, so that means he must love me!"? No. That's idiotic.

In our own personal relationship with God, God draws us to himself, but it is our profession of love for him that he seeks. As I have often said on this sub (most notably in the [109 post](#)), the Bible communicates vastly more often about our imperative to pursue God than his pursuit of us, which is most often reserved for stragglers who are already in his fold, yet happen to wander away.

God's profession of love in response to us is most often through his actions and not his words. While God does clearly love us, our individual experience of God's love is not something communicated very often in the Bible - and certainly not in a post-prophetic world (not that I reject the concept of minor prophecies, but none that rise to the level and mass-applicability as Scripture). As I have noted from time to time, the Bible seems more concerned with God's corporate relationship with his people than an individual one.

Someone will invariably note (appropriately) that God really does only have a singular bride, though. Each person is like a cell in that bride's body, and each cluster of cells is a specific part of the body. So, perhaps when God speaks corporately toward his church, one could argue that he is still professing his love toward his bride. Fair enough. But notice the time-frame in which this happens. God's profession of love in John 3:16 is toward the whole world - not just his bride. All of "chick-kind." It is only after we make our profession of love and faith toward him that we become part of the church, after which his professions of love in Scripture apply to us.

There's also a line of theology that differentiates between groups of people God loves and those he doesn't, suggesting that God only loves those who have received the Gospel by grace through faith. While one branch of theology suggests that God's love is extended to all and it is merely for us to accept or reject it, another prominent branch suggests that God does not love non-Christians at all - that his love doesn't invoke toward us until after we have been reconciled to God through Christ. So, there's that.

II. Make her jealous

God did it first. Heartiste notes: "The partner who harnesses the gale storm of jealousy controls the direction of the relationship." Interestingly, God does not have to "make" anyone jealous - his very existence and supremacy places this as the default state for the church.

As Christians, it is our active goal and desire to cause others to seek and find Christ - but we do this in the context of them becoming part of God's bride: the church. So, our jealousy is not over incorporating non-Christians as Christ's bride.

But we are jealous nonetheless. First, we are jealous among each other. There are countless sects and denominations, all claiming a special and intimate knowledge and relationship with God - some even so self-deluded as to deny the authenticity of the relationship Christ has with any other sect/denomination, despite a commonality in a basic understanding of the Gospel.

Second, we are jealous of God's favor toward those outside the church. We believe that God somehow must have blessed "those outsiders" more than us, so we get countless Christians who struggle to please God on the basis that they want him to treat them the same way they believe he is treating others. Of course, a faithful husband is only *teasing* these other women, just as God teases non-Christians from time to time (Ecc. 2:26, for example, which says that God teases non-Christians with monetary blessings only to make them hand it over to his bride anyway).

Third, we are jealous of other's alleged connection with God. While our groom is actively faithful and has promised his faithfulness, something in us doesn't believe it. Nothing gets a dutiful Christian up-in-arms more than a non-Christian claiming to have a special relationship with God. Mormon? Muslim? Eastern Lightning? The extremity to which many believers despise such groups transcends mere righteous indignation at how they defame the truth of our God - there is utter contempt at the thought that our God might actually entertain these other groups with the kind of bond he has with his church.

In all three of these we note that our jealousy is what prompts us to love, appreciate, and pursue God more diligently.

- Our jealousy at God's relationship with other sects of believers often gives us an inordinate amount of pride and dedication to the task God has given our own particular sect of the faith.
- Our jealousy at the way God blesses non-believers causes us to repent of our rejection of him and redouble our commitment to living in his frame in order to be on the right side of the countless "if ... then ..." clauses that God sets out in the Bible.
- Our jealousy against other religious groups who claim a special relationship with God invariably (seriously, like 99% of the time) gives us an uncontrollable compulsion to start spraying our seed all over them (in a Matthew 13 way, of course). That is, we feel compelled toward spiritual reproduction with God toward those groups becoming born again. There is nothing that compels us to crave spiritual reproduction with God more than being approached by someone who claims a special yet unbiblical relationship with God.

In all of this, God doesn't need to "make" us jealous because his inherent glory compels it of us in the first place. To that end, I do not encourage men to take active efforts to make their wives jealous; rather, their gloriousness as men is what can and should cause this to happen as a passive byproduct - one that every wife actually longs to feel.

III. You shall make your mission, not your woman, your priority

By now this one should go without saying: God said it first. Even as to married couples, "Let those with wives live as though they had none" (1 Cor. 7:29). Why? "I would like you to be free from concern. An unmarried man is concerned about the Lord's affairs - how he can please the Lord" (1 Cor. 7:32). He's referencing a man's mission.

There are countless other verses (not the least of which are Matthew 28:19-20, John 13-17, and Matthew 6:33) and I've beaten this issue to death on this sub, so we'll just leave it at that.

IV. Don't play by her rules

God said this first. Many of you are already aware of my [trichotomy between philosophy, science, and theology](#). This distinction points out that "man's wisdom" is found in philosophy and science, whereas God's wisdom is found in theology.

1 Cor. 2 spends a great deal of effort differentiating between man's wisdom and God's wisdom. Paul's conclusion is that we should not play by man's rules. He affirms this in Galatians 1:10, "Am I now trying to win the approval of human beings, or of God? Or am i trying to please people? If i were still trying to please people, I would not be a

servant of Christ." That is, God expects us to play by his rules, not by others'.

But even at that, God himself refuses to stoop to our level. In isaiah 55:8-9, God says, "My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways ... As the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways and my thoughts than your thoughts." Imagine telling that to your wife! (I have: it didn't go over so well ... but I was also pretty blue pilld and obscenely arrogant when I did it).

If you're looking for more, just read the last several chapters of Job. The first three dozen or so chapters are spent trying to rationalize God's conduct into a human framework. In the last several chapters God essentially rebukes everyone, saying in no uncertain terms: "I don't play by your rules."

V. Adhere to the golden ratio

God did it first. This is the bane of most Christians' lives today, actually. How many believers do you know who have said, "I keep seeking and seeking and seeking, but God's just not responding"? Now, there are many reasons for this beyond merely the golden ratio. But I'd wager God's "golden ratio" is actually far less than 2/3 (i.e. 67%) - and especially the 80% standard [u/redpillcoach](#) reports as Gottman's finding.

Heartiste notes, "The idea behind the golden ratio is twofold - it establishes your greater value by making her chase you." Check. The 109 post (linked above) already addresses that.

Heartiste adds the second: "and it demonstrates that you have the self-restraint to avoid getting swept up in her personal dramas." If that doesn't shout "God!" I don't know what does. Matthew 6:33 is again on point - that God expects his interests to be primary and anything else is secondary. James 4:3 notes that "you ask, you do not receive, because you ask with wrong motives" - assuming that God should bend his will to our desires and expectations.

The entire book of Job is another great example, demonstrating that sometimes God has a purpose that transcends anything we've got going on and he sits silent for 37 chapters, then enters the final 5, opening with: "Who is this that obscures my plans with words without knowledge? Brace yourself like a man. I will question you and you shall answer me." That's a 5/37 ratio.

At this point I don't know if I'm talking about the golden ratio (i.e. "bids for attention" per [u/redpillcoach](#)) or STFU (probably the latter), so I'll just stop there and let you decide.

VI. Keep her guessing

God's been doing this all along. God values faith over knowledge. [u/ruizbujc](#) actually just did a write-up on this [over here](#) - it's worth a read. His conclusion is, essentially, that God has no intention of giving clear knowledge of his existence or the specifics of his plans or intentions for any one person. Instead, he wants us to proceed on faith, which is a higher virtue in the Bible than knowledge.

While God does provide enough information for us to reach a conclusion of faith (Romans 1:19-20), he has also left the majority of the relationship outside the bounds of human wisdom and knowledge (1 Cor. 2).

Heartiste notes, "She thrives when she has to imagine what you're thinking about her, and withers when she knows exactly how you feel." Is that not the exact mindset of most Christians whose devotion to God is defined by the mystery of his disposition toward him? And how many people enjoy a false security in God's pleasure toward them - foolishly believing that they *know* "because of the Bible" that God is always pleased with them - who are then lazy, unproductive, and unfruitful in their faith because of this belief?

Heartiste further notes: "When she has displeased you, punish swiftly, but when she has done you right, reward slowly. Reward her good behavior intermittently and unpredictably and she will never tire of working hard to please you." Indeed, heaven notwithstanding (which is quite predictable), as far as earthly blessings go, God's rewards

often measure up. And this makes sense! Why? Because God's goal while we're on earth is not to give us stuff - it's to get us to obey. The tactic that Heartiste has discovered is effective. That's why God has been employing it for millennia.

VII. Always keep two in the kitty

God does not do this. Of course, he doesn't need to. Heartiste notes: "A man with options is a man without need" - but God already had no need. And he also has options. If we didn't cry out for his glory, the rocks surely would (Luke 19:40) - not that he even *needs* that in the first place.

Heartiste's rationale is, essentially, that a woman "withdrawing all her love and her body in an instant will rend your soul if you are faced with contemplating the empty abyss alone." God, of course, does not have to worry about this. First, God is not alone - he is triune. If you want to call this one an affirmative command, God's "two in the kitty" are Jesus and the Holy Spirit. But these are less of a backup plan and more of an active part of the relationship in the first place, so it's not quite the same. The bottom line is that there's no situation where God will be broken up if the church rejects him.

As for us humans, this isn't necessarily one of those things we can emulate in God. Instead, the Christ-church relationship is the best image we have, in which Christ doesn't have any back-up options. Instead, he has abundance, knowing that he could have other options in a heart-beat if he wanted to (Luke 19:40, again). After all, this rule is really about a technique for maintaining abundance. As I often say, the roadmap is fairly pointless once you've reached the destination.

VIII. Say you're sorry only when absolutely necessary

God doesn't do this. Again, he doesn't need to. He's God. To that end, God emulates the heart and core of this command: to say sorry as infrequently as possible.

The first biblical premise here is that we are to do few things that we would ever need to apologize for in the first place. The second is that even when we do things that would warrant an apology, we own it instead of groveling. In our relationship with God, it is quite appropriate to apologize. After all, we are the submissive in that relationship.

But when God acts in a displeasurable way toward us, how often does he apologize? Never. First, because as the leader in the relationship it's his prerogative to determine the framework within which we operate, and therefore he has a prerogative to be unapologetic about his decision-making framework. That is, he owns it.

Second, because an apology is inherently an acknowledgment that you failed to live up to someone else's expectations - their frame. Interestingly, David says in Psalm 51:4, "Against you, you only, have I sinned." He says this after causing Bathsheba to commit adultery and then killing her husband, resulting in their child dying. That's 3 people's lives that were radically changed - destroyed, even - and yet David says his sin is against God only and not any of them. Why? Because the only person's frame he owes an obligation to is God's. He doesn't owe anything to Bathsheba's expectations over his life and actions. He does have an obligation to God, though. Think about that before the next time you apologize.

About once every 6 months this situation will rear it's head, so it's worth asking about to me. Yesterday was another one of those times - almost like clockwork. I believe it's probably tied to situational depression, as it usually comes up in one of two situations: (1) within the first couple months after my wife gives birth, which should now be over, as our last kid is over a year old and I'm snipped, and (2) within a few weeks after she finishes a busy season at work, as she works 80-100 hours/wk during these times and there are 2 busy seasons a year spaced about 6 months apart. She just finished one on October 15.

Unfortunately, the stress of her busy season work life pales in comparison to the level of stress she experiences at home, dealing with the kids. She does not handle motherhood well at all. Yet she's dead-set that she wants to be around the kids more and more and that she hates working. This is part of the "conscious craziness" that she experiences - knowing that she prioritizes motherhood above her career, but that she hates the way she feels when she's around the kids for longer than 2 hours, yet can be at work for 16 hours and be happy. I could get into a lot of psychology about why I believe this is the case, but it's not worth it.

Moving on: on the way home from church yesterday she says she wants to talk about her work hours. I said "OK," knowing that she most likely wants to ask me for permission to shift from a 100% load down to 85% or 50% (I usually prefer her at 50% post-busy-season). She got upset that I just said "OK" and didn't follow-up with more. [She later said, "All you needed was to say, 'Okay, let's talk about it soon.' But no, you just said 'OK.' And that means you don't care."] I set a boundary: "The kids are in the car. I don't want to have that conversation in front of them. Let's feed them lunch first." We enter the driveway and just sit in silence for 2 minutes (I was answering a work e-mail). I ask if she's ok and she doesn't answer, so I get the kids out of the car and start cooking them lunch.

She comes in 5 minutes later screaming her head off about how I'm not supportive of her. Now, I knew she was upset, but at the time couldn't discern why (and didn't really care to), so I use some negative inquiry to avoid making assumptions: *What did I do that was unsupportive?* Her answer: "You just said OK." NI again: *What's wrong with agreeing to have a conversation with you about your hours?* She had no answer and spits back: "I know I'm being crazy and I have no rational basis for feeling this way. I just know I don't feel like you're supporting me right now." I fog and self-disclose: *You're right, I'm not supporting you right now. I have no intention of supporting bad behavior.*

Of course, she got even more heated after that, so I just STFU for about 5 minutes and let her talk. It's all "you this" and "you that." The last one was, "You're so mean!" That one actually made me laugh, so I put a hand on her shoulder and said, *You're right, I'm the big bad wolf. Want me to start huffing and puffing?* She rants for another 2-3 minutes about her feelings and that I'm not doing enough to coddle her. I STFU, smile, and nod. That set her off: **"You're so manipulative. You have this power over me. It's all one big power play and you're just flaunting that you have all the power. I hate it. You know I have no power over you, but when you just stand there like that, it's like you're waving all your power in front of my face."**

Now that was bizarre to me, as I hadn't said anything in something like 3 minutes (the wolf comment). So, I employ some more negative inquiry: *What did I just do to manipulate you?* Her: "That look. You just act like everything's normal. This is not normal!" Me: *I'd be happy to smile some more to brighten the mood.* Her: "No way. I know that smile. I hate it when you smile while I'm feeling like this." Me: I shrug and say, *Fair enough. But I'm not going to yell and scream at you either. That wouldn't help anything. And apparently having a positive attitude or just being normal are manipulative. So, there's no way to win. Conclusion?* I smile: *If I can't win, I'm just going to do whatever I want and you can come back whenever you're ready.* Then I went back to making the kids lunch.

She storms out of the house saying she's heading to the mall to buy some new work clothes. I don't chase after her.

Note: I used to chase after her when she did that. Then I stopped and she'd get furious that I didn't chase after her anymore. Now she knows this as the norm.

Literally two minutes after storming out, she comes right back in, acting much softer. Her vernacular changed gears. Instead of "you ... you ... you" it becomes "I ... I ... I." Once she started describing how she was feeling (comfort tests), I walked over, held her in my arms, kissed her forehead, and said, "Everything's going to be fine. Just trust me. I got this." Honestly, I have no idea what "this" is that I said I "got," other than life in general. It didn't matter. She just needed to hear some catch-phrase that sounded emotionally uplifting. That was the end of it. She was happy and fine the rest of the day - cuddly even (though she had to get on a plane to Chicago, so no sex that night).

She made a comment later on about how she knows how frustrating it can be to deal with someone who is emotional without any rational basis. She cited her mom as an example: "Everyone knows my mom is crazy except for her. It drives everyone up the wall, but she doesn't have a clue how ridiculous she is. **I know that I'm crazy sometimes. I make a hard effort to be conscious about when I'm acting crazy and not. But even when I know I'm being crazy and totally absurd with how I'm feeling, I can't stop it and I just keep feeling it anyway, whether it makes sense or not.**"

Questions:

1. I know I probably didn't handle the situation ideally. Suggestions?
2. What's the best way to deal with someone who *consciously knows* that she's acting crazy and irrational, but continues to do it anyway? That is: maintain frame and let her emotions run wild for a while, or treat the fitness tests as if they're comfort tests in an effort to calm her down?
3. "Watch what they say, not what they do" notwithstanding, is it at all problematic if my wife has caught on to the notion that maintaining frame and playful banter in the midst of her emotions is a "power play" and that she perceives it as "manipulative"? [I recognize that she may say she hates it, yet her behavior and attitude toward me *ex post facto* may indicate otherwise.]
4. Any other thoughts on dealing with this 6-month recurrence?

I used to criticize the guys at MRP for the ever persistent refrain: "STFU, lift, sidebar." I've changed my mind and now see the value in this approach better than ever. You all know that I'm a thinker/analyzer - but that only has value in its proper place. That place is for guys who are already past the basics or who can't even comprehend the basics at all (which is what the sidebar is for).

A user recently offered to let me make a case study of him, so I'm going to take him up on that offer - just not in the way he meant. He wanted me to explain his situation and share the details of what happened and an analysis of what he did right and wrong for the community to learn from. That would be a waste of everyone's time in this case. What he was really looking for was another opportunity to live in the past and engage in some mental masturbation over things that don't matter anymore. He got emotionally invested in a situation and just can't let it go (or hopefully he has now ... I doubt it).

To that end, here's what I wrote in reply, which I believe may benefit many of you to remember.

I think a case study would only encourage you to dwell on this more. You have already learned everything you need to from this situation: don't be some girl's beta orbiter and don't date nonchristians. If you're looking for more than that, you're losing your own frame and living in the frame of social psychology. Don't do that.

Find your mission and pursue it. Go to the gym. Eat healthy. Develop confidence and alpha behaviors. Get a good job or career path. All of these are more important than trying to milk a few more nuggets out of the past few months.

Until you're earning 75k+, benching 250+, under 12% body fat, and have at least 2 guys you're discipling, you have no business analyzing all this other stuff. The simple reality is that if you had all these other things in order, the last few months would have played out very differently.

Figure out the basics first. Only after you've mastered the basics should you be worrying about the minutia.

I'm reminded of my high school days when I asked a girl to the Freshman Formal and she turned me down. "I didn't word it right," I thought. Or, "I bet she really wanted some other guy to ask her." Or, "What if I asked again, but approached it this other way instead?" Or, "Maybe I can find out from her friends what would work with her."

I was an obese nerd. The thought never crossed my mind: "Maybe I should lose weight, gain muscle, do something important and valuable with my life, and get a spine." Don't wonder about the small crap until you've got the basics figured out first. Period.

Can I jump over two or three guys like I used to? No. Am I as fast as I used to be? No, but I still have the fundamentals and smarts. That's what enables me to still be a dominant player. As a kid growing up, I never skipped steps. I always worked on fundamentals because I know athleticism is fleeting. ~Kobe Bryant

Success is neither magical nor mysterious. Success is the natural consequence of consistently applying the basic fundamentals. ~Jim Rohn

What people don't realize is that professionals are sensational because of the fundamentals. The sensationalism has taken over the professionalism. ~Barry Larkin

Higher Education must lead the march back to the fundamentals of human relationships, to the old discovery that is ever new, that man does not live by bread alone. ~John Hannah

AXIOM 2: The greatest way to excel is by mastering the basics ~Me in 301

Best Man Speech at My Brother's Wedding

26 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

I had several people tell me it was the best wedding speech they'd ever heard, and one person from RPC in my family who suggested I share it here, so here goes. This was for my brother's wedding. I outlined it in about 10 minutes the morning of the wedding and mostly wung it (i.e. followed about 60% of my outline, made up the rest). Note that virtually nobody at the wedding (afaik) is red pilled, so I had to walk a fine line. While the headers were not part of the speech, I'll include them anyway, for easy reference and reading. I'll also note a few of the times the crowd reacted to give some context, as tone of voice was almost as crucial in delivering this speech successfully as the words themselves.

FACING YOUR FEARS

Hello everyone. I'm glad to be here to celebrate with my brother and his new wife. Jordan and I go way back. In fact, I've known him all his life. [Laughter] In all that time, I remember at least one defining moment for him: the time he had to, in his word, "face my feewas" [emulating his childhood pronunciation] [Laughter].

We used to vacation at Niagara Falls frequently and there was a haunted house that terrified him. For years he would refuse to go in, staying outside with our mom while the rest of us had fun. Then one year, realizing he was old enough, he decided it was time to face his "feewas." He went through that haunted house and something changed in him.

Since then, I've seen him face a number of other fears - his fear of getting sick; his fear of spiders; clearly his fear of asking out a beautiful girl. [Aww's] Just this past summer he got over his fear of snakes. There was a 7-footer he spotted hanging out right next to the pool at our dad's house, so we went out and killed it together. Oh wait ... that was my 6 year old son. Jordan was hiding behind [Bride's name], screaming every time the thing snapped and hissed at me. Don't worry, Jordan, we'll work on that one. [Laughter]

As many fears as you have conquered so far, there are many more yet to come: the fear of your marriage failing; the fear of having kids and how that will change everything; the fear of not being able to pay the bills. Knowing you, you'll likely be afraid to tell your bride no. [No crowd reaction] For that matter, on occasion you'll be afraid of what it means to bear the responsibility in the times you know it's right to tell her yes. [Laughter] But you must continue overcoming these fears.

1 John 4:18 says, "There is no fear in love, but perfect love drives out fear. The one who fears is not made perfect in love." So, how do you continue conquering fear?

Some people suggest it's through courage and bravery. Certainly these two attributes can help, but let me propose two alternatives that might be easier to get started with.

AMUSED MASTERY

The first comes from something my wife's grandmother told me on my wedding day. I asked her if she had any advice for a newlywed. She smiled and said, "Learn to laugh it off." *Laugh what off?* I asked her. "Everything."

It reminds me of a movie my wife and I watched recently. Each year we try to go through the Harry Potter series during winter - and this is the first year we've made it past the third movie. In that third movie there's a point where Harry is in class learning how to deal with a Boggart - a creature that manifests as the worst fear of whoever is looking at it. They learn a spell to deal with it: wave their wand, picture something absurd, and shout: *Riddikulus!* [Several crowd members joined with me in saying it]

One person was afraid of spiders. The boggart turns into a giant one. *Riddikulus!* There are skates on every leg and it can barely stand. Another is afraid of their teacher, Professor Snape. *Riddikulus!* - and the teacher is wearing his

grandmother's clothes.

You see, when you have the right perspective - an eternal perspective, the way God sees the world - you can look at all the trite little things that would otherwise trigger your nerves and just laugh them off - whether it's an argument with your wife, stress at work, or naughty children. They'll be, in a word: *riddikulus*.

MISSION

Even more important than humor and perspective - and perhaps the single greatest piece of marriage advice I have ever learned - is the value of living on a mission. You see, Harry Potter was able to conquer his fears throughout the series not just by making them seem riddikulus, but because he was doing something important for the world that was bigger than himself. The same can be said of virtually every great protagonist on an epic journey - and of most great biblical figures as well. Great and godly men are committed to something that matters, and no amount of fear will stand in their way. [Amens]

Now, anyone sitting here who knows me would be shocked if I didn't bring this up, but let me suggest a mission for you and your bride: make disciples. [Laughter from several]

I'm actually going to give you an easy way to remember the role of this mission in your life, and that's the acronym GOD. Every time you hear or speak the word "GOD" I want you to remember the three great things that God wants for you:

- Love G: God - the greatest command
- Love O: Others - the second greatest command
- Make D: Disciples - the great commission

These are the "Three Greats" in the Bible. It's impossible to do any one of these three without also doing the other two - and a failure at one is a failure of all three.

I want you to start by applying this in your own home. Make God the foundation for your leadership within the home. Love your wife as Christ loved the church - not only that he sacrificed for her, but that he used the Scriptures to teach, train, rebuke, and correct her, as we see in 2 Timothy 3:16. To that end, I ask you to disciple your wife. Lead her and train her to be the helper to you that God designed her to be on the mission he has prepared in advance for you. [This paragraph provoked the most comment afterward.]

And then - beyond merely applying these in your own home, I want you also to take them into the whole world, loving God by the way you love others and make disciples of all nations.

You see, if you want a healthy marriage, you have to be doing what God designed for your marriage in the first place. Malachi 2:15 says, "And why did the Lord God make them one, with a portion of his Spirit in their union?" That's a great question, isn't it? And I'm glad the verse answers the question, giving us the definition of marriage: "to produce godly offspring." While you should be doing it too, that verse doesn't mean just to have a lot of sex. [Laughter]

Adam and Eve filled the earth in number. Some people estimate that at the time of the flood there were hundreds of billions - or even trillions - of people on the planet. But God wiped them all away, making clear that he didn't want just any offspring to fill the earth. He wanted godly offspring. And Ephesians 5 tells us that the physical marriages we have on earth are meant as a parallel to help us understand our spiritual marriage to Christ. That is, more than mere physical offspring - though I do hope for many more nephews and nieces from the two of you - God designed your marriage for the purpose of producing spiritual offspring. Will you accept that purpose with your bride alongside you, helping you get the job done?

That's how you're going to conquer fear: by having a mission in life more important than your fears, and the perspective of life in light of your mission that you can laugh off whatever troubles and anxieties may come your

way.

ADDRESS TO THE BRIDE [I'd only met her a couple times]

[Bride], I'm glad you're joining our family. Following my brother's lead won't be an easy task. I hope you're up for the challenge - even when he inevitably makes some stupid decisions that you don't agree with. [Laughter]

I've spent a lot of time talking about Jordan's fears and how to conquer them, but I haven't the slightest idea whether or not fear is one of your struggles. Maybe it's not. I really don't know. But even if you're not afraid right now, to quote one of Jordan's favorite movies: [Yoda voice] "You will be." [Laughter]

THE TOAST

So, let's all toast together - to conquering our "feewas" ... to doing God's work of making disciples of all nations ... to maintaining an eternal perspective in light of our present troubles ... and to the bride and groom, who will have to embody all of these things, just as we should all do as well. To Jordan and [Bride]!

It's been some time that I've wanted to come back to the post series - and I had wanted to start with something more practical to intergender relational and sexual dynamics ... but this is what I believe God laid on my heart for you all instead.

In 309 I explained that there are clear stages of growth toward spiritual maturity, each with their own distinctive need:

1. All people start as non-believers and need the Holy Spirit. The process of helping a non-Christian grow toward Christ is called evangelism.
2. On accepting the Gospel, they become new believers who need leadership in order to grow in their newfound faith. The process of helping a new believer grow is called establishing.
3. Once established, a believer can call himself a disciple - one whose heart is innately oriented toward following Christ - but he still has no vision. A more mature believer uses the equipping process to cast that vision, then give him tools to accomplish it.
4. Once equipped, the believer then lives in light of the vision for disciple-making by reproducing the entire process within others - and training those he disciples to do the same. One who goes beyond even this is a leader among disciple-makers, organizing their efforts in a common pursuit. The relationship between him and the disciple-makers under his care is one of a mutual entrusting, addressing their joint need for accountability toward staying strong in the mission God gave them.

Given that it's been almost a year since I added to this series, I thought it best to give that recap. 301-308 already covered the evangelism and establishing processes. That leaves equipping and entrusting. But before going there, I wanted to give a more significant word of motivation to my fellow men on a concept that is often overlooked in the church: leaving a legacy.

A GOD OF LEGACY

Our God is not one who leaves loose ends to dangle. He has a plan. We are part of that plan - and his plan spans across the universe and time. Acts 17:26-27 says, "From one man he made all the nations, that they should inhabit the whole earth; and he marked out their appointed times in history and the boundaries of their lands. God did this so that they would seek him and perhaps reach out for him and find him, though he is not far from any one of us."

This verse is talking about all of humanity throughout all of time - yet, in the present tense, he is never far from any of us. God began with Adam and knew ahead of time every person who would ever be born. That's incredible to me - not just that he knows us, but that he sees the entire connectivity of every person on the planet from Adam to now and onward.

God always intended men to leave a legacy.

- He used Adam as "a pattern of the one to come" (Romans 5:14), who would be his legacy.
- God's great promise to Abraham was not riches or fame throughout the world. It was the legacy he would leave behind - a legacy that he would never live to see while on earth, but which he trusted God would give him all the same. That promise was a great motivator for him.
- Moses allowed an entire generation of people die in the desert and was forbidden from entering the promised land. But his legacy was that he got them there all the same, even if he was never to see the fruit of his 40 years

of wandering with his own eyes while alive.

- Rahab was a prostitute of no significance in a land that was about to be conquered, yet for one act of faith God honored her with being an ancestral mother to Jesus.
- David was a man after God's own heart, and it was given to him as his legacy that the Messiah would be born of his line.
- God devotes an entire book of the Bible - Numbers - to the importance of the lineage from one man to the next as a testament to the importance of the legacy that a man is to leave in the world.
- The succession of Kings, as explained in 1/2 Kings and 1/2 Chronicles, is a testament to the way men can leave their legacy for good or for bad - and we will be remembered for the impact we make by the degree we make it.

A man cannot read the Bible and miss the fact that God does not often work with people in isolation; rather, he works with them in light of the legacy they will leave behind - whether he uses their life as a foreshadowing of greater things to come, or by including them in direct lineage to something vitally important.

And now that Christ has come and the veil is torn, it is not merely for the select few prophets who had a direct connection with God who could leave a legacy, but for all of us. While Abraham may have been the only one who was to be made into a mighty physical nation, we all have the opportunity to be the patriarchs of a line of succession in a spiritual nation.

PERSONALIZE IT

What is your legacy? Or more accurately: **WHO** is your legacy? Who is your firstborn - the one to carry on your name and continue the work that you started? Are you blessed with dozens of spiritual children or wondering if you're shooting blanks?

These questions matter. Someday you will be gone. Will anyone remember you? Will you have made a difference on the earth beyond a mere hope in the butterfly effect (which won't even tell you the quality of the difference you've made)? Does your life even matter?

Unless Christ comes back, you'll be gone someday while this world carries on. Don't you want to have made your mark in it?

SPIRITUAL STERILITY

But here's the thing: *what if you create a next generation that's sterile?* David's lineage to Christ would have been cut off if Solomon was sterile. Yet we know that David raised his son to enjoy women ... perhaps a little too much ;)

Think about that for a moment. How many men are as good as sterile today because their fathers weren't setting the right example or leading them properly? How many fathers today look toward the days they will one day have grandchildren, yet have done nothing to train their sons in how to attract a woman to have those grandchildren with in the first place? The exceptions do exist, but most men want the legacy without putting in the work to ensure their sons will carry on the family line. The best they can do at that point is sit back and pray for a miracle.

Not at all ironically, but by extension: this is exactly what most people do in their spiritual lives as well. They pray desperately to God to use them to change the world ... yet when it comes right down to it, they're not willing to train up a next generation to know how to spiritually procreate. So even the ones who do have children are still left without a true legacy. Their lineage dies with them. What will happen to your spiritual legacy if you make the same mistake?

In one of his talks, **Dawson Trotman** explains that there are 3 main reasons why a person might be sterile:

- He's immature. His body hasn't physically grown enough that his pieces and parts start working to where they can reproduce.
- He doesn't have a spouse to procreate with.
- He has some disease or deformity that prevents him from procreating, such as ED, castration, actual sterility, etc.

Spiritually, the causes are not so much different:

- If someone is spiritually immature, he will not actively share his faith with other believers. Fortunately, spiritual maturity does not depend on time, but on character. Paul says in Philippians 3, "All of us who are mature should take such a view of things and if on some point you think differently, that too God will make clear to you. Only live up to what we have already attained. Join with others in following my example, brothers, and take note of those who live according to the pattern we gave you." This is, of course, discipleship - modeling one's own life for others to follow in. And Paul says that this is the mark of a spiritually mature man.
- If someone is a non-believer, he has no spiritual spouse. Christ is not his groom. There is no ability to reproduce for God.
- Any other reason for not reproducing is unnatural - a disease or affliction, just as any other reason a believer might give for not spiritually reproducing is an unnatural spiritual disease or affliction. That could be sin; it could be bad theology; it could be any number of things. Just don't let it happen to you.

Men were created to have sex. That sexual urge was meant to inspire us toward multiplying and filling the earth through generations that would flow from our loins. It was also meant to inspire us toward understanding our spiritual mission toward disciple-making - and not merely that we make disciples, but that we leave a legacy.

APPLICATION

I always like to bring it back to something you can walk away with, and this one is simple - a question I've asked dozens of times here: *Where's your fruit?*

Jesus says, "By their fruit you will recognize them." So, where's that fruit? Who is your man? And if your fruit falls to the ground and dies and never grows into a fruit-bearing tree of its own ... did you produce good fruit or a dead tree? That's a pretty big question, if you're reading Matthew 7 and Luke 13.

Dawson Trotman says in his talk **Born to Reproduce**: "If I were the minister of a church and had deacons or elders to pass the plate and choir members to sing, I would say, 'Thank God for your help. We need you. Praise the Lord for these extra things that you do,' but I would keep pressing home the big job - 'Be fruitful and multiply.' All these other things are incidental to the supreme task of winning a man or woman to Jesus Christ and then helping him or her to go on."

- Who's your man? If you don't have one yet, your application is to find him.
- If you have found him, who's his man? If he doesn't have one yet, is it because he's immature, a non-believer, or something's just screwed up?

Let me leave you with something my college discipler once shared with me. He asked the very first time we met: "Do you know why I'm discipling you?" I answered something obvious: *To help me grow toward Christ*. "Sure, that's a secondary goal, but it's not my primary purpose. I'm here not just for your benefit, but for the benefit of the

people you'll disciple one day." Do you have that attitude about the people God has placed in your life? Are you a good steward of those relationships? Are you living your life in a way intentionally designed to leave a legacy, passing on what God has entrusted to you to other reliable men? (2 Timothy 2:2)

32

UPVOTES

We've done it, guys. "Traditional Masculinity" is now officially deemed "harmful" by the American Psychological Association. High-five to culture!

11 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

Here's the article:

<https://www.foxnews.com/health/american-psychological-association-deems-traditional-masculinity-harmful-could-lead-to-sexual-harassment>

Apparently traditional masculinity is defined by "stoicism, competitiveness, dominance and aggression" and they are "on the whole, harmful." "Traditional masculinity is psychologically harmful" and can "result in gender role strain and gender role conflict and negatively influence mental health and physical health" ... you know, because lifting weights and gaining muscle is harmful to a person's physical health, and having confidence is psychologically damaging.

Traditional masculinity is also defined by "masculinity ideology" which is "defined by the APA as ... 'anti-femininity, achievement, eschewal of the appearance of weakness, and adventure, risk, and violence.'" Obviously it's bad to want to achieve anything, and taking risks is never worthwhile. Oh yeah, and there's never an excuse for violence, even when dangers are present.

Oh yeah, and "masculine boys may put their energy toward disruptive behaviors such as homophobia, bullying, and even sexual harassment rather than strive for academic excellence."

Goodness ... I can't go on. Have fun, everyone.

"I feel worthless," Alex told me recently. *Why's that?* I asked. "Because my wife doesn't love me." *That's an awful thing to feel. Why don't you think she loves you?* "She's just not excited when I walk in the room anymore."

I asked Alex several more questions about his relationship with his wife. They were having regular sex. She was respectful of his requests and things she asked him to do. She fulfilled her responsibilities around the home and they maintained a reasonable budget with an exceptional income. They didn't argue very often. For all practical purposes, from the outside looking in, a casual onlooker would have assumed they had the perfect, American-dream marriage. But Alex was broken. Why? Because his wife didn't *feel* excited about him. His sense of self-worth was completely dictated by his wife's feelings rather than his own accomplishments, life purposes, motives, etc.

Validation is one of the core issues underlying every aspect of human existence. I have yet to meet a single person who doesn't require any validation. As a Christian, I believe that God has intentionally placed a longing in our hearts for something beyond ourselves (Ecc. 3:11; Genesis 2:18), but even if you want to take an evolutionary psychology approach, we have been conditioned for millennia to be an interdependent species, needing community and relationships to advance, and those in isolation and outside of community fall victim to "survival of the fittest."

Validation-seeking is not unique to men, but the way we are meant to engage with it is certainly distinct from women. Biblically, men are to find validation from God and not their wives, but women are designed to find their validation through their husbands. I'll let the evolutionary psychologists among you figure out how this plays out in the secular world. Suffice it to say that *men don't need women; we just prefer to have them around, for a vast multitude of reasons*. Women, on the other hand, *do need men* - whether you want to say this is because of how God created the world or to satisfy their biological hypergamous drive, I don't care (they're really the same thing, from my view). The point is that women will always seek validation from men, and we can't (maybe even shouldn't?) change that; but for men there are both proper and improper ways to approach validation and seek it from others.

HEALTHY VALIDATION

Validation is the product of evaluation. It presumes a judge over your identity. In the absence of perfect faith or a mental health disorder, I believe validation-seeking is at least subliminally present in virtually everything we do as a species.

For most of the world, the best form of validation-seeking is when we are able to function independently, setting up standards of self-evaluation and letting ourselves or our self-created goals be the judge over our sense of self-worth and accomplishment.

A man who sets no goals, merely scathing by in life, will (appropriately) feel as though he has nothing to offer his world, creating a negative feedback loop that then discourages him from setting any goals. This is my brother, still living in my dad's house at 32, drinking beer and playing video games every night until 5am, having given up on women since his ONEitis left him several years ago.

On the other hand, my friend Dan is self-motivated. He doesn't care about how the world judges him; but he does have an internal drive to succeed. There's a stirring within him that won't let him sit idly, so he sets goals and experiences internal fulfillment when he accomplishes them. He is validated by self-created objectives. I suppose a man could experience self-validation even in the absence of external objectives that he creates, simply liking himself for who he is regardless of any other judgments on him, but even that becomes dangerous, lending itself to a feminist mentality: "You're perfect just as you are," which often translates to: "You don't need to improve or have ambitions - you just need to be placated in your place in life, and not challenge anything I try to do to you and our country."

For the Christian, the answer is similar. God sets the goals, but there is an incredible biblical latitude we have in the

way we go about accomplishing them or how we evaluate our successes, and there is even greater grace from God in the evaluation process than we might otherwise give ourselves if we were self-evaluating. This creates an exceptional balance in that grace gives us freedom to fail, thus we can remain objectively validated by God through our efforts to grow and accomplish even when we fail from time to time - which is furthered by the fact that God is perfect and stable, so we know the standard he sets is reliable, unlike other people whose standards over us are imperfect and unstable; and having an external standard from God also prevents us from being lazy with our goals and squandering our lives, overcoming the trap that many people like my brother fall into.

There are other ways that validation-seeking can be helpful as well. For example, if you want a promotion at your job, you're going to want to seek the validation of your boss, as he is the judge over your qualification for the position. If you want to win a court case, you must seek validation from the judge about your arguments, honesty, and competency, for the judge is the actual judge over your case. It's appropriate for him to validate your arguments, honesty and competency. The difference is that he is not evaluating you as a person - in both cases, they are evaluating your behaviors and what you produce.

HARMFUL VALIDATION

I opened this post with a brief snapshot of a conversation I had with Alex - and that is a shining example of harmful validation-seeking. He allowed his sense of self-worth to be dictated by something external and didn't allow any room for grace in his failure to live up to the self-imposed judgments he created on his life. He didn't merely look to his wife for validation on certain behavior patterns he had; rather, he extended it to his internal sense of identity.

And that is a significant thing to consider. Harmful validation seeking is not merely letting someone else be the judge over your life, identity, and sense of self-worth. In most cases, the person from whom we seek validation never signed up for that role. We are voluntarily giving them that job, often-times not even telling them we are - and then they don't communicate validation because they never knew that was their job in the first place.

Men, this is a significant thing in your marriage and it's the reason why I started with the difference between men and women in validation seeking. **Your wife needs validation. If you want to have a successful marriage, you must validate your wife when she acts appropriately within your judgment, because she has allowed you to be a judge over her. This is healthy and appropriate.**

But a man should never voluntarily allow his wife to become a judge over him. Doing so is grossly inconsistent with biblical theology, the history of any successful society, and basic principles of underlying evolutionary psychology. Men are conditioned by God or by time to set goals outside the home and strive to accomplish them. Making your home your goal sounds nice, but we're not here to be Nice Guys - and Nice Guys are the biggest validation-seekers, and one quick glance at NMMNG will show you how that validation-seeking can ruin a man's life.

MANIFESTATIONS OF VALIDATION

So here is a non-exclusive list of different forms of validation-seeking that can get your wheels spinning to help you recognize when you're in that rut or if you're on the right track. If you're having trouble feeling a sense of wholeness as a man, look to see if you fit the bill in any of these areas.

- **OVERT:** When my 5 year old daughter shares her candy with her siblings, she runs up to me and says, "Daddy, I just shared my candy. Wasn't that so nice of me?" This is an obvious and overt example of validation-seeking. She is directly asking for my validation of her behaviors. Sometimes it goes even further and my son will ask: "Because I did this, doesn't that mean I'm a good person?"
 - **SUBTLE, INVALID:** Picture a husband who plays video games all day while his wife is away. She calls and says she'll be home in 10 minutes. He continues playing for 8 minutes, then turns off the game and starts
-

cleaning the house. She comes home and sees him cleaning, which he timed so that she would be impressed with him. He's not overtly asking her for validation, but he's implying it. It's invalid for two reasons: (1) because it's false validation; her being impressed by him isn't for his actual character, but for an image he fabricated for her to see; and (2) because this demonstrates an internal insecurity in him that he must impress his wife or that she is somehow a judge over him. Her feelings toward his behaviors becomes the judge over how he acts and behaves. What's interesting to note is that the man doesn't care to actually be a valid person under his wife's standard, otherwise he would have been cleaning the house the entire time she was gone. Instead, he only cares that she perceives him in a way that validates him, as evidenced by the fact that he only lives up to that character when she is watching.

- **SUBTLE, BUT VALID:** I've already mentioned that there are healthy forms of validation-seeking. Unlike the man above, the case of the employee or the attorney show us that we can do things without directly asking for approval, yet knowing that our superior's validation of us can have a positive impact on our own agendas. So, if a man sets a goal to have a certain level of income, seeking the validation of his boss to get that raise by exceptional performance in front of his boss is perfectly appropriate. If a man is wise, he has incorporated into his own goals the prerequisites of external interpersonal dynamics necessary to achieve those goals.
- **COVERT:** Alex's story is a great example, and this is the most common form of validation-seeking. This is when a man's emotional state is dependent on how his wife (or anyone else) feels about him or acts toward him, and he may not even have processed himself the connectivity between his emotional state and her feelings and behaviors. Getting butthurt is a clear and obvious sign that a man might struggle with covert validation - because if he were self-validated, then her feelings or behaviors toward him that caused him to get butthurt would otherwise have rolled off like water on wax. He doesn't need her to feel or behave in a certain way toward him in order for him to experience fullness in his life, so her negativity doesn't diminish his fullness either.
- **COMPARISON:** When one person's validation comes not from how someone feels or behaves toward them, but from their superiority to them. A sports team feels validated in their skills and accomplishments when they win a game against another team. Similarly, the losing team feels de-validated at the loss. In marriage, one person's sense of validation may come from feelings of superiority over their spouse, and this can lead to significant troubles when the allegedly "lesser" spouse either (1) accomplishes something that threatens this superiority, and therefore he cannot rejoice with his wife or empathize with her successes, or (2) attacks the superiority of the validation-seeker by criticizing aspects of his life that validated his feelings of superiority. He will then do things to re-establish his superiority as a means of seeking to re-validate himself. Note: the "I am the prize" mentality doesn't mean a man should seek validation in the fact that he is better than his wife; rather, it is a simplified way of communicating confidence, independent of validation-seeking, that cuts out a lot of the nuance.
- **PERCEPTION:** When a person's validation comes not from who they are, but in how they think and what they know. A philosopher may recognize that he is of little value in the grand scheme of the universe, but finds validation in the fact that he understands how that universe functions. When something challenges his understanding and perception of how the world and people function, he must argue against them to maintain his sense of validation - that he was right and they are wrong. This can also apply not only to one's perception of the external world, but also a self-perception. An athletic man who looks to his physical accomplishments as the foundation of his identity will lose that sense of validation when: (1) even though he is still athletically successful, a higher priority in life comes along that stretches his sense of self into an area where he is less successful (ex. he has a kid and realizes he is failing as a father), or (2) he is no longer able to compete with other athletes, such as due to age or injury, and thus he has to redefine his sense of self and identity.
- **CONTROL:** Some people find validation in life through power and control. They don't care if they're better than someone or not, or if their wife loves them or not, or if their perceptions are right or wrong. If someone else is better, that's fine - as long as they can control that better person. It doesn't matter if his wife loves or cares

about him, as long as he has adequate assurances that she'll behave the way he wants her to. As long as he is in control of his world and anything that might threaten his world, he is happy. If something happens that is beyond his control, either he emotionally unravels or he takes measures to regain control.

- **PURPOSEFUL:** When a person looks to an external objective and allows the accomplishment or failure of that objective to be the source of validation in his life. This can either be healthy or harmful, depending on the appropriateness of the objective. It would be harmful if a 4-foot-tall white man sought validation in his mission in life to be an NBA star. It would be perfectly appropriate if that same man sought validation in his mission to become a partner with a major national law firm.
- **NEGATIVE/INVERSE:** When a person takes on the victim mentality and refuses to be happy, despite opportunities for happiness that are thrown their way. They refuse to feel or accept any suggestion of validation over their lives, determined to live in the view that they are invalid, worthless, broken, unloved, or the like. If someone tells them they're beautiful, they snap back and honestly believe, "No, I'm hideous." If you tell them they're successful, he replies with sincerity, "No, I'm a failure." It's virtually impossible to convince them otherwise. Why? While they may seem to reject any validation-seeking on the surface by their direct denials and refutations, they are actually trying to find validation in their own self-perception. That is, they care more about being right about their worthlessness than they do about finding value in their lives, and thus they feel validated when something else goes wrong for them, as it proves their perceptions right. This is where many people with depression, mood disorders, bipolar disorder, or borderline personality disorder live.

This is, of course a non-exclusive list, and many of these things overlap one another. They're just common ones I see among my clients and people and general.

OVERCOMING VALIDATION-SEEKING

I'm sure there are a multitude of strategies for dealing with harmful validation-seeking. Here's my suggestion out of those options, but do what works for you.

FIRST: Figure out when you're validation-seeking and when you're not. Look for signs of emotional instability, a controlling nature, an internal *need* to win debates, a desire to show off your accomplishments, etc. are all indications (though not de facto criteria) that someone is validation-seeking. The list of indicators can be very large and wide because, as I said above, validation-seeking is inherent in the motivation for most human behaviors.

SECOND: Once you've identified when you're validation seeking, figure out if it's helpful or harmful to your life and mission. Is it increasing your power, wealth, influence, etc. over your environment and those around you? Continue doing it. Is it causing you to become emotionally volatile, unattractive, and destroying your sense of self-worth? Cut that crap out.

THIRD: Once you've identified the negative forms of validation-seeking, two things can work in-tandem for you to overcome them:

1. You must find another source of validation. No one can be functional in the world without any validation at all. The primary safe sources are God (for Christians) or oneself (for everyone else).
2. Second, you must experience failure in your destructive validation-seeking tendencies in order to shift your psychological foundation from the old source to the new source. That is, you must see, experience, and understand that the new source of validation is sufficient for you even when the old source fails.

In order to accomplish these, I recommend specifically placing yourself in situations where you know you may not get the validation you seek. For example, if a guy sees his wife's attraction to him as a source of validation (covert,

perception, subtle, etc.) he should initiate sex with her a lot. For one, he will likely actually end up having more sex that way. Second, it will also give him an opportunity to recognize that he can be stable and hold frame on the inevitable times that she turns him down, thereby learning to rely on his newly found internal sources of validation.

CONCLUSION

In all of this, remember that Thoreau is not the model man we should all be striving to become. We should not all be leaving society to become hermits in the middle of the woods. For some, if that's your goal, go for it. But the majority of people are rightfully interdependent with others. We cannot isolate ourselves from all relationships. And interdependency brings with it an inherent drive for validation from others, lest we be involuntarily cut off from the community and forced into the Thoreau life.

In his book *Understanding People*, Dr. Larry Crabb hypothesized that all men have two core longings: (1) relationships with others and (2) to make an impact on our world. If he is right, and I believe he is, we will always be finding some way to look for validation in these aspects of our lives.

What I propose is that we take control of the means by which we experience validation, not placing it in the hands of our wives, friends, or societal perception, but by recognizing that we are in control of who we allow to judge our lives and placing the degree of validation we seek from different sources with the appropriate sources and in the appropriate weight - validation in our work performance from our boss, validation in our sense of identity and self-worth from ourselves (or, for Christians, from God), etc.

"I feel worthless," Alex told me recently. *Why's that?* I asked. "Because my wife doesn't love me." *That's an awful thing to feel. Why don't you think she loves you?* "She's just not excited when I walk in the room anymore."

I asked Alex several more questions about his relationship with his wife. They were having regular sex. She was respectful of his requests and things she asked him to do. She fulfilled her responsibilities around the home and they maintained a reasonable budget with an exceptional income. They didn't argue very often. For all practical purposes, from the outside looking in, a casual onlooker would have assumed they had the perfect, American-dream marriage. But Alex was broken. Why? Because his wife didn't *feel* excited about him. His sense of self-worth was completely dictated by his wife's feelings rather than his own accomplishments, life purposes, motives, etc.

Validation is one of the core issues underlying every aspect of human existence. I have yet to meet a single person who doesn't require any validation. As a Christian, I believe that God has intentionally placed a longing in our hearts for something beyond ourselves (Ecc. 3:11; Genesis 2:18), but even if you want to take an evolutionary psychology approach, we have been conditioned for millennia to be an interdependent species, needing community and relationships to advance, and those in isolation and outside of community fall victim to "survival of the fittest."

Validation-seeking is not unique to men, but the way we are meant to engage with it is certainly distinct from women. Biblically, men are to find validation from God and not their wives, but women are designed to find their validation through their husbands. I'll let the evolutionary psychologists among you figure out how this plays out in the secular world. Suffice it to say that *men don't need women; we just prefer to have them around, for a vast multitude of reasons*. Women, on the other hand, *do need men* - whether you want to say this is because of how God created the world or to satisfy their biological hypergamous drive, I don't care (they're really the same thing, from my view). The point is that women will always seek validation from men, and we can't (maybe even shouldn't?) change that; but for men there are both proper and improper ways to approach validation and seek it from others.

HEALTHY VALIDATION

Validation is the product of evaluation. It presumes a judge over your identity. In the absence of perfect faith or a mental health disorder, I believe validation-seeking is at least subliminally present in virtually everything we do as a species.

For most of the world, the best form of validation-seeking is when we are able to function independently, setting up standards of self-evaluation and letting ourselves or our self-created goals be the judge over our sense of self-worth and accomplishment.

A man who sets no goals, merely scathing by in life, will (appropriately) feel as though he has nothing to offer his world, creating a negative feedback loop that then discourages him from setting any goals. This is my brother, still living in my dad's house at 32, drinking beer and playing video games every night until 5am, having given up on women since his ONEitis left him several years ago.

On the other hand, my friend Dan is self-motivated. He doesn't care about how the world judges him; but he does have an internal drive to succeed. There's a stirring within him that won't let him sit idly, so he sets goals and experiences internal fulfillment when he accomplishes them. He is validated by self-created objectives. I suppose a man could experience self-validation even in the absence of external objectives that he creates, simply liking himself for who he is regardless of any other judgments on him, but even that becomes dangerous, lending itself to a feminist mentality: "You're perfect just as you are," which often translates to: "You don't need to improve or have ambitions - you just need to be placated in your place in life, and not challenge anything I try to do to you and our country."

For the Christian, the answer is similar. God sets the goals, but there is an incredible biblical latitude we have in the

way we go about accomplishing them or how we evaluate our successes, and there is even greater grace from God in the evaluation process than we might otherwise give ourselves if we were self-evaluating. This creates an exceptional balance in that grace gives us freedom to fail, thus we can remain objectively validated by God through our efforts to grow and accomplish even when we fail from time to time - which is furthered by the fact that God is perfect and stable, so we know the standard he sets is reliable, unlike other people whose standards over us are imperfect and unstable; and having an external standard from God also prevents us from being lazy with our goals and squandering our lives, overcoming the trap that many people like my brother fall into.

There are other ways that validation-seeking can be helpful as well. For example, if you want a promotion at your job, you're going to want to seek the validation of your boss, as he is the judge over your qualification for the position. If you want to win a court case, you must seek validation from the judge about your arguments, honesty, and competency, for the judge is the actual judge over your case. It's appropriate for him to validate your arguments, honesty and competency. The difference is that he is not evaluating you as a person - in both cases, they are evaluating your behaviors and what you produce.

HARMFUL VALIDATION

I opened this post with a brief snapshot of a conversation I had with Alex - and that is a shining example of harmful validation-seeking. He allowed his sense of self-worth to be dictated by something external and didn't allow any room for grace in his failure to live up to the self-imposed judgments he created on his life. He didn't merely look to his wife for validation on certain behavior patterns he had; rather, he extended it to his internal sense of identity.

And that is a significant thing to consider. Harmful validation seeking is not merely letting someone else be the judge over your life, identity, and sense of self-worth. In most cases, the person from whom we seek validation never signed up for that role. We are voluntarily giving them that job, often-times not even telling them we are - and then they don't communicate validation because they never knew that was their job in the first place.

Men, this is a significant thing in your marriage and it's the reason why I started with the difference between men and women in validation seeking. **Your wife needs validation. If you want to have a successful marriage, you must validate your wife when she acts appropriately within your judgment, because she has allowed you to be a judge over her. This is healthy and appropriate.**

But a man should never voluntarily allow his wife to become a judge over him. Doing so is grossly inconsistent with biblical theology, the history of any successful society, and basic principles of underlying evolutionary psychology. Men are conditioned by God or by time to set goals outside the home and strive to accomplish them. Making your home your goal sounds nice, but we're not here to be Nice Guys - and Nice Guys are the biggest validation-seekers, and one quick glance at NMMNG will show you how that validation-seeking can ruin a man's life.

MANIFESTATIONS OF VALIDATION

So here is a non-exclusive list of different forms of validation-seeking that can get your wheels spinning to help you recognize when you're in that rut or if you're on the right track. If you're having trouble feeling a sense of wholeness as a man, look to see if you fit the bill in any of these areas.

- **OVERT:** When my 5 year old daughter shares her candy with her siblings, she runs up to me and says, "Daddy, I just shared my candy. Wasn't that so nice of me?" This is an obvious and overt example of validation-seeking. She is directly asking for my validation of her behaviors. Sometimes it goes even further and my son will ask: "Because I did this, doesn't that mean I'm a good person?"
 - **SUBTLE, INVALID:** Picture a husband who plays video games all day while his wife is away. She calls and says she'll be home in 10 minutes. He continues playing for 8 minutes, then turns off the game and starts
-

cleaning the house. She comes home and sees him cleaning, which he timed so that she would be impressed with him. He's not overtly asking her for validation, but he's implying it. It's invalid for two reasons: (1) because it's false validation; her being impressed by him isn't for his actual character, but for an image he fabricated for her to see; and (2) because this demonstrates an internal insecurity in him that he must impress his wife or that she is somehow a judge over him. Her feelings toward his behaviors becomes the judge over how he acts and behaves. What's interesting to note is that the man doesn't care to actually be a valid person under his wife's standard, otherwise he would have been cleaning the house the entire time she was gone. Instead, he only cares that she perceives him in a way that validates him, as evidenced by the fact that he only lives up to that character when she is watching.

- **SUBTLE, BUT VALID:** I've already mentioned that there are healthy forms of validation-seeking. Unlike the man above, the case of the employee or the attorney show us that we can do things without directly asking for approval, yet knowing that our superior's validation of us can have a positive impact on our own agendas. So, if a man sets a goal to have a certain level of income, seeking the validation of his boss to get that raise by exceptional performance in front of his boss is perfectly appropriate. If a man is wise, he has incorporated into his own goals the prerequisites of external interpersonal dynamics necessary to achieve those goals.
- **COVERT:** Alex's story is a great example, and this is the most common form of validation-seeking. This is when a man's emotional state is dependent on how his wife (or anyone else) feels about him or acts toward him, and he may not even have processed himself the connectivity between his emotional state and her feelings and behaviors. Getting butthurt is a clear and obvious sign that a man might struggle with covert validation - because if he were self-validated, then her feelings or behaviors toward him that caused him to get butthurt would otherwise have rolled off like water on wax. He doesn't need her to feel or behave in a certain way toward him in order for him to experience fullness in his life, so her negativity doesn't diminish his fullness either.
- **COMPARISON:** When one person's validation comes not from how someone feels or behaves toward them, but from their superiority to them. A sports team feels validated in their skills and accomplishments when they win a game against another team. Similarly, the losing team feels de-validated at the loss. In marriage, one person's sense of validation may come from feelings of superiority over their spouse, and this can lead to significant troubles when the allegedly "lesser" spouse either (1) accomplishes something that threatens this superiority, and therefore he cannot rejoice with his wife or empathize with her successes, or (2) attacks the superiority of the validation-seeker by criticizing aspects of his life that validated his feelings of superiority. He will then do things to re-establish his superiority as a means of seeking to re-validate himself. Note: the "I am the prize" mentality doesn't mean a man should seek validation in the fact that he is better than his wife; rather, it is a simplified way of communicating confidence, independent of validation-seeking, that cuts out a lot of the nuance.
- **PERCEPTION:** When a person's validation comes not from who they are, but in how they think and what they know. A philosopher may recognize that he is of little value in the grand scheme of the universe, but finds validation in the fact that he understands how that universe functions. When something challenges his understanding and perception of how the world and people function, he must argue against them to maintain his sense of validation - that he was right and they are wrong. This can also apply not only to one's perception of the external world, but also a self-perception. An athletic man who looks to his physical accomplishments as the foundation of his identity will lose that sense of validation when: (1) even though he is still athletically successful, a higher priority in life comes along that stretches his sense of self into an area where he is less successful (ex. he has a kid and realizes he is failing as a father), or (2) he is no longer able to compete with other athletes, such as due to age or injury, and thus he has to redefine his sense of self and identity.
- **CONTROL:** Some people find validation in life through power and control. They don't care if they're better than someone or not, or if their wife loves them or not, or if their perceptions are right or wrong. If someone else is better, that's fine - as long as they can control that better person. It doesn't matter if his wife loves or cares

about him, as long as he has adequate assurances that she'll behave the way he wants her to. As long as he is in control of his world and anything that might threaten his world, he is happy. If something happens that is beyond his control, either he emotionally unravels or he takes measures to regain control.

- **PURPOSEFUL:** When a person looks to an external objective and allows the accomplishment or failure of that objective to be the source of validation in his life. This can either be healthy or harmful, depending on the appropriateness of the objective. It would be harmful if a 4-foot-tall white man sought validation in his mission in life to be an NBA star. It would be perfectly appropriate if that same man sought validation in his mission to become a partner with a major national law firm.
- **NEGATIVE/INVERSE:** When a person takes on the victim mentality and refuses to be happy, despite opportunities for happiness that are thrown their way. They refuse to feel or accept any suggestion of validation over their lives, determined to live in the view that they are invalid, worthless, broken, unloved, or the like. If someone tells them they're beautiful, they snap back and honestly believe, "No, I'm hideous." If you tell them they're successful, he replies with sincerity, "No, I'm a failure." It's virtually impossible to convince them otherwise. Why? While they may seem to reject any validation-seeking on the surface by their direct denials and refutations, they are actually trying to find validation in their own self-perception. That is, they care more about being right about their worthlessness than they do about finding value in their lives, and thus they feel validated when something else goes wrong for them, as it proves their perceptions right. This is where many people with depression, mood disorders, bipolar disorder, or borderline personality disorder live.

This is, of course a non-exclusive list, and many of these things overlap one another. They're just common ones I see among my clients and people and general.

OVERCOMING VALIDATION-SEEKING

I'm sure there are a multitude of strategies for dealing with harmful validation-seeking. Here's my suggestion out of those options, but do what works for you.

FIRST: Figure out when you're validation-seeking and when you're not. Look for signs of emotional instability, a controlling nature, an internal *need* to win debates, a desire to show off your accomplishments, etc. are all indications (though not de facto criteria) that someone is validation-seeking. The list of indicators can be very large and wide because, as I said above, validation-seeking is inherent in the motivation for most human behaviors.

SECOND: Once you've identified when you're validation seeking, figure out if it's helpful or harmful to your life and mission. Is it increasing your power, wealth, influence, etc. over your environment and those around you? Continue doing it. Is it causing you to become emotionally volatile, unattractive, and destroying your sense of self-worth? Cut that crap out.

THIRD: Once you've identified the negative forms of validation-seeking, two things can work in-tandem for you to overcome them:

1. You must find another source of validation. No one can be functional in the world without any validation at all. The primary safe sources are God (for Christians) or oneself (for everyone else).
2. Second, you must experience failure in your destructive validation-seeking tendencies in order to shift your psychological foundation from the old source to the new source. That is, you must see, experience, and understand that the new source of validation is sufficient for you even when the old source fails.

In order to accomplish these, I recommend specifically placing yourself in situations where you know you may not get the validation you seek. For example, if a guy sees his wife's attraction to him as a source of validation (covert,

perception, subtle, etc.) he should initiate sex with her a lot. For one, he will likely actually end up having more sex that way. Second, it will also give him an opportunity to recognize that he can be stable and hold frame on the inevitable times that she turns him down, thereby learning to rely on his newly found internal sources of validation.

CONCLUSION

In all of this, remember that Thoreau is not the model man we should all be striving to become. We should not all be leaving society to become hermits in the middle of the woods. For some, if that's your goal, go for it. But the majority of people are rightfully interdependent with others. We cannot isolate ourselves from all relationships. And interdependency brings with it an inherent drive for validation from others, lest we be involuntarily cut off from the community and forced into the Thoreau life.

In his book *Understanding People*, Dr. Larry Crabb hypothesized that all men have two core longings: (1) relationships with others and (2) to make an impact on our world. If he is right, and I believe he is, we will always be finding some way to look for validation in these aspects of our lives.

What I propose is that we take control of the means by which we experience validation, not placing it in the hands of our wives, friends, or societal perception, but by recognizing that we are in control of who we allow to judge our lives and placing the degree of validation we seek from different sources with the appropriate sources and in the appropriate weight - validation in our work performance from our boss, validation in our sense of identity and self-worth from ourselves (or, for Christians, from God), etc.

[Note: I wrote this draft in a way that could be feasible on both MRP and RPC, so that means including some references to the Christian perspective, but not bogging it down with biblical quotes and context. Feel free to engage in conversation on the biblical foundation of any of this, if you like. Galatians has a lot to say on these topics, so it might be a good place to start for further reading.]

21

UPVOTES

Counterproductive Desire and the Fallacy of Unconditional Love

14 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

I've written before about how **women will be more interested in sex when they feel sexy, and that her husband's desire for her is what fuels her feelings of sexiness**. But there's a point where it becomes counterproductive. I was reminded of this in someone else's post, where he noted: "I now see the respect of my wife (and her sexual attraction to me) as something to be earned."

LOVE AND DESIRE

Men innately want respect and sex. These do not come automatically, otherwise there would be no red pill - every blue pill man would have his fantasies fulfilled. No, they must be earned - and they are earned much the same way. As a man increases his attraction through maintaining his physical appearance, dressing appropriately, having a certain social status, etc., his wife respects him more, and that increased respect increases her sexual responsiveness to him.

Women innately want love and desire. These are distinct, but just like respect and sex, they are meant to be earned through many of the same mannerisms, usually being displays of femininity. The problem is that most women are not earning them. Here's why.

LOVE

Christians are taught that we are to "love unconditionally." This concept isn't actually biblical. To be fair, God might have an internal love for all people that he directs toward us, giving us an opportunity to receive his love (Romans 5:8 and all). But he does not let everyone receive and experience the benefits of that love he has for them without condition. If he did, then there would be no need for Jesus. Or to put it another way: acceptance of the Gospel is a condition God places on being able to receive and experience the benefits of his love. If you do not accept the Gospel, you don't get the benefit of his love either.

Moreover, the Bible is chock full of conditional "if ... then ..." statements, whether direct or implied. Consider:

- Genesis 4:7 - If you do what is right, will you not be accepted? But if you do not do what is right, sin is crouching at your door.
- Exodus 19:5 - If you obey me fully and keep my covenant, then out of all nations you will be my treasured possession.
- Psalm 91:9-10 - If you make the Most High your dwelling ... then no harm will befall you, no disaster will come near your tent
- Matthew 6:14-15 - If you forgive men when they sin against you, your heavenly Father will also forgive you. But if you do not forgive men their sins, your Father will not forgive your sins.
- Matthew 21:22 - If you hold to my teaching, you are really my disciples
- John 11:40 - If you believed, you would see the glory of God
- John 13:35 - By this all men will know that you are my disciples, if you love one another.

The list could go on. Countless things that we assume are unconditional are not. God has express conditions on the terms of the relationship. And yet Christian men are taught to lavish their wives with love, gifts, attention, and service without condition. This is not what Jesus does as a groom. It should not be how we do it either.

So let me ask: if you were to create your own list of "if/then" statements for your household, what would that look like? Consider that an application point, if you struggle in this area. I strongly recommend you do a study on "if/then" statements made between God and his people and let your list mirror in a human context what Christ did for us in the spiritual context.

But more to the point: what does it do to your marriage if you are lavishing your wife with the benefits of your love when she doesn't deserve it? I don't mean to stop loving your wife when she doesn't deserve it. I do mean to stop letting your love be unconditional, except when you want it to be.

DESIRE

Let me preface this section: in the secular RP world, we are taught to treat a wife's attraction to us as the determining factor in our sexuality, and therefore we focus on our own attractiveness above all else. There is significant value in this. However, RPC goes one step further, acknowledging that it is not enough to do our own part; that we must also hold others who have been entrusted to us accountable. Where secular RP merely seeks to make the most of a bad situation, RPC seeks to reconcile all things to God (2 Cor. 5) - restoring the bad situation (all that the feminine imperative entails) to righteousness. While this task, per Revelation, may never be fully complete on a global scale, we can certainly apply it in our own homes.

With that being said, women innately assume they are desired by their husbands. I see people blaming society for this all the time - online dating, social media, movies, music, etc. that all reaffirm that even fat, lazy, ugly women are still beautiful and should be cherished just as they are. Husbands, it starts in your own home.

I remember when my wife told me years ago that she wasn't attracted to me. That left a mark that eventually led me to the red pill: learn how to be more attractive. How many of you are not attracted to your wife? Or how many believe your wife doesn't do enough to make herself attractive for you? How many of you have had the gall to tell your wife, "I'm not attracted to you anymore"?

I know, I know ... we're on an RP forum and everyone here has to pretend his wife is a 9, right? My wife can be ... but most days she's probably a 6. Why? Because for a long time she didn't feel the imperative to doll herself up for me or maintain her physique. Why? There are at least two possible answers:

1. The standard RP answer is: *Because you weren't leading her. If you don't take care of yourself, she'll follow in your example and not take care of herself either.*
2. The lesser discussed answer: *Because you keep telling her how beautiful she is and she knows you want to have sex with her.*

This second point gets left out of the conversation almost entirely. Rollo will talk about this on a societal level, but nobody really addresses this dynamic within the home itself. Let's break this down briefly:

Honey, You're Always Beautiful to Me

This cheesy line gets played up in chick flicks and romance novels all the time - the girl who gets spotted by her man in sweats without any makeup on and her hair undone, yet he is enamored with her anyway. Some guys are so sex-starved that it might actually be genuine, like when something mediocre tastes delicious right after a fast. Other guys just put on rosy blinders and are willing to fantasize that anything can be attractive if they can get sex out of it.

When you tell your wife this, or when you affirm her looks when they shouldn't be affirmed, you are giving her an excuse to keep looking that way. She wears sweats around the house one day and you decide to be the nice guy and affirm her ... then after a week of it you complain, "You never dress up anymore," and she answers, "I thought you found me beautiful this way."

Even if you were honest and do find her beautiful even in sweats, shouldn't she at least have some base compulsion

to want to be *more beautiful* for her husband?* No, because ...

I Want to Have Sex With You All the Time

It's easy for women to get sex. They can literally walk into a bar, say, "Who wants to have sex with me?" and know they can head out 5 minutes later with a guy - even obese or ugly women could pull this off with reasonable rates of success. For a long time, my wife had the same impression: she could walk in the room whenever she wanted, simply say, "Let's have sex," and I'd be chasing behind her to the bedroom.

Now, secular RP teaches never to turn down a wife who initiates sex. You can turn down bad sex, but don't discourage her from initiating. I'm not sure how to reconcile that with some of my more recent experiences, so I'll let you all decide for yourselves.

What I've found is that this over-affirming behavior gives my wife no incentive to try to seduce me. If she can get sex from me whenever she wants without having to put in any effort to get me in the bedroom, why would she ever put in the effort? Just like: if she can get affirmation from me about her beauty even when she's not dolling herself up, then why would she ever care to get dolled up?

EARNING LOVE AND DESIRE

My wife was not *earning* the love and desire I was giving her. When we give love and desire without condition, we reinforce that the conditions on our relationships don't matter to us. As a result, women won't live up to the conditions we place on the relationship - they're hollow and unenforceable. So how do we start reinforcing these conditions?

Non-Reinforcement

The most obvious way is simply to communicate your expectations openly. She can't live up to expectations she doesn't know exist. If the expectations are implied, she has plausible deniability in failing to live up to the expectations, even if she *should* know what they are. As soon as you're open about it, she has to make a choice: respect or defy the boundary.

Another basic RP strategy is simply to condition your attention and availability to her on her conformity to your expectations. The secular crowd misses the boat by limiting this as a useful device only to those situations where she is exhibiting bad behavior, such as when she's being bratty or employing excessive fitness tests. But what about when she's simply failing to exhibit good behavior? This side of things often gets left out, but can be significant. Remember: Jesus didn't say the tree with the bad fruit gets cut down; it's the tree that fails to produce good fruit that is thrown into the fire.

A simple, practical measure is not to communicate any thoughts of love or desire toward your wife until she actually does something to earn it. She puts on cuter outfit that day, "I like that one, babe. You look good." She wears her normal clothes and asks how she looks? "You look normal."

Another way is to adjust your sexual initiation patterns.

- **She Initiates:** By some theories, regardless of how poor an initiation it is, initiating sex is good behavior that should be rewarded, and you don't want to condition her not to initiate. The concept is generally: *Never turn down sex; only bad sex; and you have to be having sex to know if it's bad.* That said, if you're going to her every time she calls, doesn't that teach her the same lesson as the girl who walks into the bar and says, "Who wants to have sex with me today?" Solution: add conditions. "Sure, I'll go to the bedroom with you. Let me grab a drink while you put on some stockings and the black lacy bra." What happens if she tells you no? Go read the sidebar.
- **You Initiate:** MMSLP hits the nail on the head with this one: just tell her up-front what you plan on doing. "We're going to head upstairs in 10 minutes. You're going to wear the purple corset and I'm going to bend you

over the dresser before throwing you onto the bed and thrusting you from above." It's overt, displays dominance, and puts her in a position of deciding consciously if she's going to respect or defy you, rather than causal or subtle or implied initiations where she can deflect without feeling like she's actually telling you no. The goal here is that you're giving her a set of expectations about how she should behave when you have sex.

Can you initiate when she isn't dressed up or behaving to your expectations? Sure. Just incorporate your expectations into the initiation. You can, of course, decrease your sexuality if you think it would be more effective; I'm simply saying you can still make progress without having to.

Positive Reinforcement

When she's behaving appropriately, reward her - let her know that you appreciate the extra effort she made to put on makeup just to go to the grocery store together, or that you really liked the lingerie she wore for once. In fact, especially if gift-giving is a love language for her, don't generalize the gifts; give gifts that reinforce your expectations - lingerie, new perfume, jewelry, a color of nail polish you really enjoy.

The early stages of dread are also valuable here. You should be doing these by default anyway, but exaggerate your expression when she puts in extra effort. If she used to scroll social media all day, but suddenly she cleans the house and cooks you a meal, "Great job today, babe. That freed up some time for me to fix the cracked tile by the front door." If she puts on a dress for date night, instead of jeans and a nice polo that you'd normally wear, you step it up to slacks and a button-up. She gets her hair cut and styled a way you like: "That's a great idea. I think I'm going to get my hair done tomorrow too." Don't make her feel like you're just following whatever she does; but show her that upping each other's game is a mutual thing, not a one-sided thing. In theory, she should already be doing this in response to your initiation. If she's initiating in these areas before you even start, that's a bigger problem.

Negative Reinforcement

Secular RP suggests the later stages of dread. If your wife won't conform, go attract someone else who will. When your wife knows you could get a woman who would meet your desires, maybe she'll step up her game and start doing so too ... and if she doesn't you can always just go be with that other woman instead. Although most would just call it "doing whatever I want," by calling it a form of intentional or active dread, the implication is that you're trying to create an emotional threat or pain in your wife that will inspire her to conform her behaviors. I do not endorse later stages of dread, and there's already content on the sidebar here as to how to process the levels of dread.

To be clear, non-Christians have later stages of dread because they really don't see another way. Christians do have another way that's specifically prescribed to us: Matthew 18. You discuss the matter in private, then escalate it to get witnesses involved, then escalate it to church leadership. Most Christian women would be mortified to have their sex-life talked about openly, especially if another man is included in the conversation - and even worse is if it's talked about in a way that's not favorable to them. That is, she might chat up with her girlfriends about a great night you two had, but tell her you're bringing Bob and Jen in to discuss her sexual issues and she just might crack. Non-Christians can't effectively employ this because they have no context for it; it just comes off as an intentional effort to be highly offensive against a woman. But the Bible gives us a context. A wife should reasonably know that if she is in sin, there's a biblical process for handling that, which mitigates her reaction to the disciplinary measure. And even if she does blow it up, you at least know you're on biblical grounds and can rest in your own frame, whereas the secular man attempting such a thing has no such security in the wisdom of the decision.

CONCLUSION

Women need to be loved and desired. Society gives them artificial love and desire for free, but if they want the real deal they look to their husbands. If you give her the benefit of your love and desire when she hasn't earned it, you are conditioning her to believe that she always deserves your love and desire. As a result, she will only improve _____

herself to meet your expectations when she feels like it or when she thinks she's rewarding you for your behaviors, as if you're on her leash.

The better way to handle the situation is to create a framework within the household where she has to work to earn your love and desire, just as you have to work to earn her respect and attraction. You can do this by communicating your expectations openly, but at some point you need teeth to enforce those expectations if she's ever going to listen.

The best way to enforce your expectations is to put her in a situation where she must choose whether to respect or reject what you communicate to her. For Christian women, who know they are to respect their husbands, this can go a long way, as many Christian women don't like it when their disrespectful behaviors are brought to a conscious level - they prefer to pretend they're not disrespectful and maintain plausible deniability when you point it out. You can also reinforce their good behaviors with rewards, whether by your own personal behaviors or by targeted gift-giving, or services that enhance your expectations (ex. making the bed on a day you plan on initiating sex). You can also employ the Matthew 18 process as a negative reinforcement mechanism, if you believe her behavior warrants it - just make sure to find people whose standards you know to be biblical and who you can trust.

Counterproductive Desire and the Fallacy of Unconditional Love

14 January 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill · Archived copy · Reddit

The Problem

Women are generally more interested in sex when they feel sexy. Blue pill men seem to understand this, but make the irrational next step: "Let's just make them feel sexy all the time and hope this makes them want sex all the time." It doesn't work. At some point, a husband's expression of desire for his wife can work against him.

Someone on RPC recently noted: "I now see the respect of my wife (and her sexual attraction to me) as something to be earned." Shouldn't the reverse be true too? Just as a man wants respect and attraction, women want to be loved and desired.

Rollo does a lot of writing on the way society artificially feeds into these areas for women - online dating, social media, movies, music, etc. are all sources of positive reinforcement for women. But men do the same thing in their own homes. She's wearing normal clothes or business attire and asks how she looks: "Fantastic!" Right? The chick flick trope is when the girl rolls out of bed in ugly pajamas, her hair a mess, and no make-up on and her man is making breakfast without a shirt on, showing off his rippling abs, telling her how beautiful she looks, even on her worst days. It's so magical.

How many men here would have the gall to tell their wives - not as a joke or in a goofy way, but being serious: "I'm not attracted to you." I remember years ago when my wife had no remorse in saying that to me. Now, I know, I know ... we're on an RP forum and everyone here has to pretend his wife is a 9, right? My wife can be in the right circumstances ... but most days she's probably a 6-7. Why? Because for a long time she didn't feel the imperative to doll herself up for me or maintain her physique (thin, but not fit was her MO). There are a couple reasons for this that come to mind:

1. The standard RP answer is: *Because you weren't leading her. If you don't take care of yourself, she'll follow in your example and not take care of herself either.* That was true for a time, but even after I got fit it took a long while for things to catch on. While the "1,000 foot rope" analogy might explain this, there's another explanation that you can actually do something about ...
2. The lesser discussed answer: *Because you keep telling her how beautiful she is and she knows you want to have sex with her.* While Rollo may bring up this point on a societal level, the implications within a single household are still powerful and relevant.

Think about it for a second. Even ugly girls could walk into a bar and say, "I want sex. Who's coming home with me?" and she'll likely find *someone*. Societally, there's no imperative for women to improve themselves, except to find a better guy. Now take that to your own bedroom: your wife calls you into the bedroom. That's her way of saying: "I want sex. Are you coming?" She has no lingerie, no makeup, she's just lying in bed with social media on her phone waiting for you to get her aroused. Are you giving her the same reinforcement that society gives to the single girl at the bar?

Now, the single girl at the bar may have some base desire to improve herself to get a better man if she realizes that the quality she ends up with is fairly low. While all women will have that innate desire, within marriage many women are willing to balance that with a competing desire to make their marriage work. For some, those desires are balanced in completely lop-sided ways, so you get women who are ready to leave at the drop of the hat, and women who for any number of reasons (kids, vanity, money, etc.) will stick it out through 30 years of hell before divorcing her husband.

The point is that if she feels like she's "off the market" for whatever reason, she won't be competing for the better guy - she's only competing for the love and desire of her husband. When the husband gives this freely, she no

longer feels any need or compulsion to put in the work to earn these things (gravitational cores aside, which may be the subject of a future post). If she's gorgeous in his eyes even when she's in sweats with unkempt hair and no makeup, there's really no imperative to doll herself up. "I am gorgeous!" she thinks, rather than, "I can be gorgeous!" That's a big difference.

The Solution

Until about a year ago, my wife wasn't actively trying to earn my love and desire. She assumed from the history of our marriage that she just always had it for free. Then I started doing things to re-shape that dynamic and she has since improved her attractiveness to conform to some of my desires. There's still room for improvement, but here are some things I've found to have worked.

Positive Reinforcement

This should go without saying. When she behaves well, reward her. I have found it most helpful to tailor the rewards to things that encourage similar behavior. If she wears lingerie to bed, buying her flowers the next day doesn't quite cut it. Buying her another pair of lingerie is both rewarding and behaviorally reinforcing. If she does a great job cleaning the house, go for the flowers - it reinforces the decor of the home. If she cleaned the house when you really just wanted a crazy night in bed, buy her the lingerie anyway and not the flowers.

Negative Reinforcement

Calling out her negative behaviors as they happen can be helpful. Employing active/intentional dread can also be effective, communicating: "If you don't live up to my expectations, I can find someone else who will." Withdrawing your time and attention fall into this category as well.

Non-Reinforcement

Communicate your expectations up-front. Put her in a position where she must make an active choice to respect or reject what you tell her. Most women prefer plausible deniability, and thus skirt around overt conversations, sometimes even overtly saying, "I don't want to talk about this." As long as you never tell them something explicitly, they can find a reasonable excuse for not doing what you never told them.

To be clear, if she knows you always want to have sex with her, she may not care about whatever expectations you set around sex because she knows she can always get sex from you when she wants. It's often suggested that a man should never turn down his wife's sexual initiation, no matter how poor - reinforce that good behavior. But what if she's in that unkempt, social-media scrolling mode when she lazily says, "Do you feel like coming in here?" Is that behavior we want to reinforce? No. Solution: Rather than turning her down, say, "Sounds great. You get on some stockings while I grab the whipped cream." You're now communicating a clear expectation that she must either respect or reject, setting a higher standard for what sex will be like rather than the laziness she was anticipating.

Another option is simply not to provide any positive or negative reinforcement to neutral behaviors. If you give positive reinforcement to neutral behaviors, she assumes it's a positive for you. For example: my wife shows me a new outfit to wear to a work conference. I'm not into work clothes on women, but I recognize the appropriateness of the outfit given the occasion. Instead of telling her she looks fantastic, I say, "It looks like you're going to a work conference," pat her on the back, and carry on.

RESULT? - Instead of a 6-7 her default has upped to a 7-8 in less than a year. Progress.

For any Christians, there's additional biblical information on the [r/RPChristians](#) version of this post.

Many guys start with an irrationally large degree of trust in women ... until they find the red pill. Any time spent on TRP or MRP and you'll be familiar with phrases like, AWALT, "she's not yours, it's just your turn," and branch swinging. Many people seem to know what these terms mean, but they don't understand what to do with that meaning. Why? Because (especially on TRP) the "don't trust women" card is played too much and without much explanation. Result? ...

- The first group of guys will discover these things, exaggerate them beyond rational thought, and become incredibly controlling, believing that because they're aware of these behaviors, they can somehow stop a woman from exhibiting them. When their wives are then faithful for any appreciable length of time, they pat themselves on the back for a job well done, while she's secretly waiting for the right moment to dart.
- The second will see these behaviors and become paranoid. They start snooping and spying, constantly on the lookout for whether she's cheating, if she's flirting with a co-worker, or disrespecting him to the kids when he's off at work. They hear "trust, but verify" and spend too much time on the "but verify" part, never letting go.
- A third group will give up on women entirely, assuming there's no point in being with them if they're always going to prove untrustworthy.
- A fourth group will take these concepts to be broad generalities and spend their entire lives looking for the unicorn that beats the mold.
- A fifth will behave normally and rationally, but emotionally limit himself from fully enjoying his present circumstances for fear of what might happen in the future if/when she expresses these traits.

Unless you're on the brink of divorce and you know it, it really doesn't matter if you trust your wife or not. Blind trust will get you into trouble, and complete distrust works against you and isn't useful. You can figure out for yourself where in that blend you actually want to exist.

The point of these tidbits of RP lingo is not to convince you to distrust women. It is to get you to a point where you do not rely on your trust in women. That is, you'll be just fine even if she is behaving in an untrustworthy manner. Be mindful of the cautionary tales, but don't bend your entire life around them. If you do that, you're letting fear, caution, and distrust make your frame instead of you making it yourself.

- Suspect your girlfriend is cheating on you? No biggie, you've got 3 other girls you've been priming who are all into you.
- Wife is threatening divorce over something stupid, like not taking out the trash? Oh well. You've got amused mastery, so you recognize how childish she's acting and don't get wound up in her emotional hurricane.
- She won't follow your lead? No worries, you've got a mission more important than her that you can spend your time on instead, and you'll spend your time with whoever happens to be working that same mission with you.
- Wife actually divorces you for a younger millionaire? Sure, it sucks, but you'll bounce back on your feet in no time. Besides, you've been actively involved in raising the kids, prepared for this possibility, so you know you'll get equal rights and she can't use that against you.

"Don't do this" and "Don't do that" type of advice can only get you so far - including, "Don't trust women." Cautionary tales are great, but the end of the day, what you *do* matters more than what you *don't do*. Focus on that, being mindful of the "don't"s, not the other way around.

Many guys start with an irrationally large degree of trust in women ... until they find the red pill. Any time spent on TRP or MRP and you'll be familiar with phrases like, AWALT, "she's not yours, it's just your turn," and branch swinging. On RPC you may even hear Ecclesiastes 7:28 thrown around periodically. Many people seem to know what these terms mean, but they don't understand what to do with that meaning. Why? Because (especially on TRP) the "don't trust women" card is played too much and without much explanation. Result? ...

- The first group of guys will discover these things, exaggerate them beyond rational thought, and become incredibly controlling, believing that because they're aware of these behaviors, they can somehow stop a woman from exhibiting them. When their wives are then faithful for any appreciable length of time, they pat themselves on the back for a job well done, while she's secretly waiting for the right moment to dart.
- The second will see these behaviors and become paranoid. They start snooping and spying, constantly on the lookout for whether she's cheating, if she's flirting with a co-worker, or disrespecting him to the kids when he's off at work. They hear "trust, but verify" and spend too much time on the "but verify" part, never letting go.
- A third group will give up on women entirely, assuming there's no point in being with them if they're always going to prove untrustworthy.
- A fourth group will take these concepts to be broad generalities and spend their entire lives looking for the unicorn that beats the mold.
- A fifth will behave normally and rationally, but emotionally limit himself from fully enjoying his present circumstances for fear of what might happen in the future if/when she expresses these traits.

Unless you're on the brink of divorce and you know it, it really doesn't matter if you trust your wife or not. Blind trust will get you into trouble, and complete distrust works against you and isn't useful. You can figure out for yourself where in that blend you actually want to exist.

The point of these tidbits of RP lingo is not to convince you to distrust women. It is to get you to a point where you do not rely on your trust in women. That's a significant difference. Avoid the "to trust or not to trust?" game entirely. That is, you'll be just fine even if she is behaving in an untrustworthy manner. Be mindful of the cautionary tales, but don't bend your entire life around them. If you do that, you're letting fear, caution, and distrust make your frame instead of you making it yourself.

- Suspect your girlfriend is cheating on you? No biggie, you've got 3 other girls you've been priming who are all into you.
- Wife is threatening divorce over something stupid, like not taking out the trash? Oh well. You've got amused mastery, so you recognize how childish she's acting and don't get wound up in her emotional hurricane.
- She won't follow your lead? No worries, you've got a mission more important than her that you can spend your time on instead (like making disciples), and you'll spend your time with whoever happens to be working that same mission with you.
- Wife actually divorces you for a younger millionaire? Sure, it sucks, but you'll bounce back on your feet in no time. Besides, you've been actively involved in raising the kids, prepared for this possibility, so you know you'll get equal rights and she can't use that against you.

"Don't do this" and "Don't do that" type of advice can only get you so far - including, "Don't trust women." Cautionary tales are great, but at the end of the day, what you *do* matters more than what you *don't do*. Focus on

that, being mindful of the "don't"s, not the other way around.

40

UPVOTES

Why the Church misunderstands Jesus and how this screws up your view of leading your wife.

11 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

I was chatting with /u/warriorjesus1915 the other day and I thought a portion of our conversation was necessary to share more broadly - and in far greater depths that I discussed it with him. The question arose: *Why does the church have such a beta view about Jesus, and how do they miss the mission of disciple-making?*

The answer is quite simple: **The Church looks at what Jesus said, not what he did.**

That is, the church doesn't look at Jesus' life as something to be modeled; they only look at his teachings as something to be obeyed. If we only focus on what Jesus and the apostles taught rather than on what they did, it makes sense that the church would get hung up on things like the beattitudes, fruit of the Spirit, giving, service, etc. and totally miss the larger implications of the mission of Kingdom-building that Jesus was living. Jesus' teachings are excellent, but the life he modeled is the context we're meant to apply those teachings in. If we try to apply his teachings while ignoring the proper context in which they apply, we ultimately negate the value of their application.

It's as Paul says in 1 Cor. 13, "If I have the gift of prophecy and can fathom all mysteries and all knowledge, and if I have a faith that can move mountains, but do not have love, I am nothing." In the same way: "If I obey Jesus's commands to love my neighbor, to pray for others, to be a generous person, etc., but I lack the purposes in life that drove Jesus to do all of these things in the first place, I am nothing."

JESUS AS A MODEL

I find this willful ignorance of Jesus' missional lifestyle particularly bizarre because Jesus himself says that the real focus is on his actions. In John 13:15 he says, "I have set you an example that you should do as I have done for you. Most people mistakenly assume that this is only a reference to washing each other's feet - or more broadly: serving each other. But Jesus precedes this with a simple question: "Do you understand what I have done for you? ... You call me 'Teacher' and 'Lord,' and rightly so, for that is what I am." This is what sets the context for the passage, noting that just as he fulfilled these roles in their lives in the way he disciplined them, they were to go off and do the same for others.

It's worth noting that the word for "teacher" in this passage is *didaskalos* - the same word Jesus uses in Matthew 28:19-20 in the great commission: "Make disciples of all nations, *teaching them* to obey everything I have commanded you."

Back to John 13, later on in the passage (v. 34-35) Jesus once again sets his lifestyle toward the disciples as the model: "A new command I give you: love one another; as I have loved you, so must you love one another. By this all men will know that you are my disciples if you love one another." The command to love one another already existed in Deuteronomy. There was nothing new about that. The "new" part is that we are to do it "as I have loved you," in Jesus' words. He didn't say, "As I have loved the crowds who listened to me teach" (or else we must all be called to be mass-preachers) - he said to the 12 in private during his last supper, "As I have loved **you**." How did he love them? By disciplining them.

He then spends the rest of chapters 13-17 explaining the ministry of disciple-making that he had been doing in them and the fruit that he wanted to see them bear. All of this culminates in John 17 when Jesus concludes the meal with a prayer: "As you [Father] have sent me into the world, I have sent them into the world ... My prayer is not for them alone. I pray also for those who will believe in me through their message" (v. 18-20). This was Jesus' goal the entire time - that his **lifestyle** would be a model for how we should live toward others, not merely his words.

Yet despite this clear focus on living as Jesus lived, the church prefers to pretend that none of this is in the Bible so that they can think to themselves, "If only I can be generous and kind and humble and patient, then I will have lived

like Jesus lived." Certainly Jesus expressed these qualities, but his instruction was that we live the way he lived toward the 12 and not just his general character attributes.

THE APOSTLES AS A MODEL

In 1 Cor. 11:1 Paul lives up to Jesus' words in John 17:18-20 - "Follow my example, as I follow the example of Christ." Paul took Jesus's words to heart, carrying on for others the same things that Jesus did with his 12.

Note how often people want to read Ephesians and Galatians and look at the *words* of what was said, but completely ignore the context in which those words were said. In 1 Cor. 11:1, for example, Paul is writing a letter to the Corinthians and then says, "By the way, do what I do." That is, Paul was actively following-up with people he had discipled! If Paul says, "Follow my example," and he discipled people and wrote letters to stay in touch with them to continue helping them grow even in his absence (Philippians 2:12), shouldn't part of living out 1 Cor. 11:1 mean that we are also keeping in touch with people that we're helping to grow in Christ?

Paul even uses this concept as the sign of maturity - not that people merely obey his words, but that they live in the model he established. In Philippians 3:15-17 he says, "All of us, then, who are mature should take such a view of things. And if on some point you think differently, that too God will make clear to you" - and I want to pause here to clarify the emphasis that Paul is giving to this passage. He's saying that he's about to reveal the rubric for determining spiritual maturity. If you claim to be mature, you have to agree with him on this, and if you don't then you must not be mature. And he even says, "Oh, by the way, if you think I'm wrong, don't worry - God himself will prove to you that I'm right about this."

Continuing the passage: "Only let us live up to what we have already attained; join with others in following my example, brothers, and take note of those who live according to the pattern we gave you."

That's right. The "secret" to being spiritually mature is not in obeying what the letters say, but in living as the apostles lived. They set their lifestyle as a pattern for everyone to follow in. Their letters of instruction were not merely about the points they were teaching; they were part of the model of how we should be teaching others. That is, it's not enough to obey the commands; rather, as Jesus said in Matthew 28:19-20, we now have a responsibility to pass all of this on through the disciple-making process to others as well. We are not merely to teach God's Word to others; rather, we are to live an example that someone else can say: "I want to be just like u/Red-Curious because I can see that he's trying to be just like Christ."

Can you insert your name in there?

A NECESSARY DISTINCTION

For the record, all of this is crucial in properly understanding the New Testament. Per 1 Cor. 11:3, there are two contexts we can view Jesus' lifestyle in:

1. How Jesus interacted with God as the Father's follower.
2. How Jesus interacted with the church as the church's leader.

Everything Jesus did falls within not just one or the other of these two categories, but both of them. In the same way, you as a man have two contexts within which you should understand your actions: (1) How you interact with Jesus, and (2) How you interact with your bride (or if you're single, toward those who might become your bride). We do not distinguish which behaviors fall into which category by saying, "Here are the things I do for my wife, and those are the things I do for Jesus." No, all behaviors are a reflection of both, in some form or another. The distinction is not about balancing these two categories appropriately, but about learning the proper order of following and leadership so that we can be effective followers and leaders just as Christ was both.

Jesus' actions were founded on what he saw his Father doing (John 5:19). That is, it is as if Jesus was saying, "I am

following the Father. You need to know how to follow someone, so I'm going to show you how to do that by the way I follow God." He didn't go off-script or make up his own plans for his life. He knew what his Father's agenda was and he showed us how to live out a master's agenda by living out His Master's agenda.

In this sense, we should look at the ways Jesus followed God in order to describe how we should follow him. This is often overlooked, as we only ever want to look at the ways Jesus interacted with people here on earth. We say, "Here is how Jesus treated his bride, so that's how we should follow Jesus." But this ignores the distinction above and gets everything backwards. We ignore the position Jesus had as a follower and only ever focus on his position as a leader over the church.

It then makes even more sense why the church has misunderstood how to follow Jesus. Why? Because they only look at Jesus as a leader over the church and not as a follower to God. When we fail to see the way Jesus modeled following for us, and how that affects our leadership, we lose the context for the life that Jesus lived, and his mission of disciple-making is forgotten - because that mission was the hallmark of his status as a follower. God gave him a mission and he followed the mission God gave him. Neglect Jesus as a follower and we neglect the mission behind his teachings.

WHY SHOULD THIS MATTER?

As I said above, we should live in such a way that someone can say of us: "I want to be just like u/Red-Curious because I can see that he's trying to be just like Christ." If you can't insert your name in that sentence, you are not following Christ rightly. And if you are not modeling being a good bride to Christ, how can your wife learn to be a good bride to you? Or how can the girl you're interested in know what you expect from your future bride?

It has been said many times that women are designed by God to be followers. They are clay that their men will mold, whether they realize it or not, just as we are all clay that God molds, whether we realize it or not. **If you want your bride to be good to you, the answer is not to be good to her - it is to be good to Christ. You want to show her how a follower should treat their leader.**

Some people will mistakenly plop "servant leadership" concepts in here. They argue, "If you want your wife to serve you, you must show her how to do so by serving her first." There's nothing wrong with serving your wife this way, but it does not teach her the lesson these people think it will. It teaches her that a husband should serve his wife, or a leader should serve her followers. So, if she looks at the Christ/Church relationship, she will live spiritually as if God exists to serve her needs. How does such a theology play out in real life?

- I know countless women who believe God is meant to keep them emotionally satisfied. When they are emotionally dissatisfied in their relationship with God, they become apathetic toward their faith, or otherwise abandon it entirely. Why? Because they have a backwards view of how leaders and followers are supposed to interact.
- Other women will say they're looking for God's provision, but are really expecting God to maintain their consumeristic lifestyle that exceeds what they're willing to put in the work to earn, and then whine and complain to their small groups about how they can't make their next credit card payment. Why? Because they assume the leader exists to serve their purposes, not the other way around.

I'm sure you get the idea at this point. It's okay to serve your wife in appropriate contexts. But that service must come from a position of sharing out of your strength and not out of obligation. 1 Cor. 11:3 is clear enough: Jesus followed the example the Father laid out for him, and men are to follow Jesus' example and lifestyle, just as women are to follow their man's example and lifestyle. The example the wife is to follow is not in how her husband treats *her*, but in how he *interacts with and for God*.

FOR EMPHASIS

To be absolutely clear: many men may lead their wives by treating them a certain way, thinking that they're training them on how to interact with themselves. But what they're really doing, if we follow the 1 Cor. 11:3 flow of leadership, is teaching our wives how to interact with others, not with ourselves. We're saying, "I as your leader and acting this way toward you," and she receives, "So when I am leading others, that's how I should act toward them." The concept of "do unto others as you would have them do unto you" may apply in a peer-peer context, but in a leader-follower context the message is received very differently.

If you want to teach your wife how to interact properly with you, don't focus on the context of your interactions with her; focus on the context of your interactions with Christ. As she watches you follow Christ, that will show her how to follow you. If we confuse these two contexts, we fail to see the pragmatic mission-orientation of Jesus's daily life (his frame), and we will also preclude our wives from having a model to look toward on how to be a follower (within our frame).

CONCLUSION

1. Yet another way that pastors prove their beta mind-set is that they only look to what Jesus said, forgetting also to contemplate what he did and why he did it.
 2. Jesus was not only a teacher and leader; he was also a follower - and the way he followed God is the way we should follow him.
 3. We should not confuse the way Jesus treated the church for the way we should follow him; rather, the way he interacts with his bride is the way we should interact with our bride - and we must take a Scripturally complete view of this and not isolate the passages that the church likes to focus on.
 4. We should not lead our wives by focusing on how we relate with them; rather, we should lead them by showing them how we follow Christ.
 5. The way Jesus followed God was by adopting his Kingdom-building mission and living out the specific ways God wanted him to contribute to that mission. The way we follow Jesus is identical: adopting his Kingdom-building mission and living out the specific ways Jesus wanted him to contribute to that mission. The way our wives should follow is us identical: adopting our Kingdom-building mission and living out the specific ways their husbands want them to contribute to that mission.
-

APPLICATION: I'm sure you can think of a dozen, but the simplest one I want you to start with for now is that you begin leading your wife by showing her how you follow. Find 1 new way this week to contribute to God's mission of Kingdom-building - and do it in a way where your wife is able to observe the way you followed God in that area, either because she saw you do it (like introducing yourself to someone new at church and inviting them to a small group you're leading), or because you told her about it afterward (like sharing the Gospel with a co-worker and telling her the story when you get home).

Perhaps the most common complaint I hear about RPC is that we're manipulative. This often comes in comments or PMs, but a [recent post](#) brought this up yet again, so let's talk about this for a minute.

I want to begin by noting, if you are one of the objectors: **DON'T LOOK AT THE CASUAL COMMENT OR POST. LOOK AT WHAT THE MODS SAY. WE DO NOT ENDORSE EVERYTHING POSTED HERE; RATHER, WE OFTEN ALLOW BAD CONTENT TO STAY UP BECAUSE THE CONVERSATION IN THE COMMENTS - ESPECIALLY FROM THE MODS - IS WHAT ADDS VALUE TO THE COMMUNITY, NOT THE BAD POSTS THEMSELVES.**

That being said, the mods have also discussed switching from a self-flair model (which does not get used often) to mod-assigned flair. Look forward to this in the coming months, as that will help newcomers and objectors to filter quickly if they're objecting to the same content that endorsed people would object to.

The Hater's Perspective

First, I find that most people who maintain these objections are: (1) single, (2) young, or (3) stagnant.

SINGLE: Single guys have no experience in actual marriage. They only know what they see in other people's marriages. To all you single guys out there: when was the last time a married couple invited you over to their home to watch them fight about sex? When was the last time a married couple invited you over to watch them escalate from casual conversation to foreplay? It probably hasn't happened. You have no experience either personally or through observation.

So what replaces this observation and experience? Theory and hypothesis. Instead of first-hand knowledge, these people think about how marriage and relationships *should function* without regard for how they *actually function*. This degree of ignorance is dangerous.

"But I hear things from people I trust!" Right, but you don't see it. You're trusting in what people say, not in what is actually happening. I remember people looking to me for marriage advice when I was in the midst of an 18 month dead bedroom and my wife threatening divorce. You know what I did? I gave it to them! How awful is that?! I had no idea how to have a good marriage. I only had theory of what I thought should create a good marriage. It turned out all of my theorizing was wrong. Why? Because it isolated out a few verses away from their context and seemed to jive with what the mainstream church said, so people ate it up. Nobody should have trusted me in those days, yet I was hailed by pastors and elders as the model to look at and my wife and I were asked to teach classes on this stuff!

What's even worse is that I didn't realize how bad my situation was at the time until I actually got out of it. I had these rosy glasses that told me: "She'll never actually divorce me or cheat on me. If she would only get more spiritually mature, then she'd want to have sex with my fat tub of lard just as much as I want to with her." I convinced myself that it was perfectly normal and healthy to have sex once every month or two, and that's just how marriage is in the real world, as opposed to the hyped-up fantasies that people have about marriage involving sex every day or two. Haha!

Simply put: if you're single, you don't know what you're talking about. Reality trumps theory every time. And before you start trusting your friends about how to have a great sex life in marriage, get the details on how great their sex life actually is. When I started asking that to guys who I thought had great marriages, I found that they were genuinely positive-spirited about the relationship, but only because they were placating themselves, learning to treat ramen noodles once a month as if it's a glorious feast to celebrate the monthly time of eating.

YOUNG: I also find that many of the objectors, even if married, are still very young or newly married. They are

still living in the honeymoon phase of their marriage, or haven't gotten to the point where difficulty truly sinks in. I spoke about this in greater detail in [208 - Life Path of a Relationship](#), so I won't rehash too much here. Suffice it to say that the honeymoon phase tends to last between 6 months and 2 years after the wedding day.

Here's something worth noting, though: most guys assume that because they're past the honeymoon phase, they finally "get it." They don't. Even after the honeymoon phase ends, it usually takes another 5 years before the bitterness and resentment formed from a covertly dysfunctional relationship finally sets in, which is why the "7 year itch" is a thing. I can't count the number of divorces that I have processed for couples between 6-8 years or marriage, yet I can use my fingers to tally the number of divorces I've done for couples under 4 years of marriage. Surely NRE (new relationship excitement) has worn off by then, so their eyes should be opened, right? No. Because the bitterness and resentment doesn't start building until after the honeymoon phase ends, and then it must build to a particular critical mass (different for each couple) before they even realize there's a problem.

STAGNANT: The last group are people who are not internalizing any actual improvement in their lives. They may learn and apply a few things here or there, but they are predominantly behavioral modifications. They have not grown as a man; they have only practiced a few new skills. This is where the "RP is a toolbox" metaphor breaks down. You pick up a hammer when you need a hammer. If you don't like using hammers, you can use the side of a wrench. Sure. But at some point you have to move beyond just picking up and using tools when it suits your purposes. You have to internalize and become the tool.

Ever see Terminator 2? Yeah, there's that weird T-1000 guy who can turn his hand into a sword or blade or hammer or whatever he wants. He doesn't need to pick up a hammer - he IS the hammer. Of course, he's not always a hammer. He only expresses his hand as a hammer when it's appropriate to do so. But it's a part of him, not an external thing.

Many men never internalize the things they learn. As a result, they believe they are only using strategies and practices to achieve an intended result. This is very different from improving yourself, and then being yourself and finding that this happens to get you what you want out of life naturally. "Be yourself" is great advice for guys who have a great self. It sucks for everyone else who is stagnant in life and not growing. If your goal is to hammer a nail into a board and you're a screwdriver, at some point the advice has to come: "Don't be yourself; be a hammer." Once you are a hammer, then when you look at nails in boards you can say, "Cool, I'm just going to be myself." And when you see a screw in the board, then you say, "Cool, because I'm a screwdriver too, when I need to be."

BOTTOM LINE: Most people who object aren't qualified to make the objection. Don't listen to the objections of people who have no experiential basis for their objections, unless the theological basis of their objection is air-tight. If an objector does present a seemingly valid theological objection, present the question to the community. I promise: if the Bible tells us to teach or do something differently, this sub will always adapt to what the Bible actually teaches. We are growing and evolving. New ideas are a welcome point of discussion. That's okay. But don't just assume a particular interpretation until you've studied and researched it and discussed it with those here who can be trusted.

"INSTEAD OF MANIPULATING HER, GO TO COUNSELING"

When an objector hates the presented model, but also recognizes that they don't have the qualification to give a useful replacement model, rather than admitting that they might be wrong, they defer to those who are allegedly more qualified: marriage counselors. The post I referenced above seemed to think that counseling was the solution to marriage and sexuality problems. This is extremely common. Go to any RP objector and ask them what their solution is, rather than applying what we teach here at RPC. The majority will suggest one of two things: (1) give up and get divorced, or (2) "Go to marriage counseling."

Marriage Counseling is a Joke

Now, this is something of a joke. There are a million different strategies and theories on marriage counseling, none with a consistently proven track record, otherwise all counselors would be using that strategy, right? The thing is, there is a counseling strategy that works. It's what we teach here at RPC. The problem is that counselors can't use these strategies with their patients because it is politically incorrect. Can you imagine how fast a marriage counselor would lose his or her license or be boycotted out of business if she started telling her female clients that the Bible says their husband is to lead the family and the wife must be submissive toward him?

Also, bear in mind that counseling is primarily a position of teaching. You're exposing people to new understandings about themselves and their relationships and helping them apply this new knowledge in a productive way. That's teaching. Now, most marriage counselors are women. These women, of course, then, believe that it is perfectly appropriate for women to teach or have authority over men. In a secular world, that's just fine, but what if she's a biblical marriage counselor? If she's not using the Bible as her source, then you shouldn't trust her secular conclusions anyway. And if she is using the Bible as her source, then she's going to insert herself as a woman leading men toward improving their marriages by telling them that women shouldn't lead men. Do you know how effective that cognitive dissonance will be? Not. At. All. "So just find a male biblical marriage counselor." Good luck. More on that below.

Another reason marriage counseling is a joke is that I know countless marriage counselors through my profession who habitually encourage their patients to get divorces! What kind of marriage counseling is that?!? They just give up because nothing in their secular wheelhouse can solve the problem they see. Even worse is that this remains true for the vast majority of Christian marriage counselors too, who see themselves as counselors (read: secular strategies) first who happen to be Christians and allowed to talk about their faith. Even those who let their faith inform their model of counseling, the Bible is a big book and there's a lot of one-sided misinformation and willful ignorance from the feminized church about how to interpret the bits about marriage, so even these Bible-centered counselors get it wrong.

What was most hysterical to me about the post from the user I referenced above is the fact that he's on a Christian forum suggesting that counseling is the answer (without even specifying "biblical counseling"), rather than pointing to the Bible. What this tells me is that he hasn't been focusing on the biblical foundation of what we teach here; rather, he mistakenly assumes (as do most) that RPC is a recitation of secular principles that try to find a few verses to support them. I have said it before and I will refrain again: **I draw nothing from the secular RP subs as an authority. I only reference them for ease of communication with men who are already familiar with their terminology. The Bible is our only foundation. It just happens to be that the reality the secular world observes is consistent with what the Bible says. Duh.**

Biblically, marriage involves two whole people becoming one whole person. Not $1 + 1 = 2$. Not $1/2 + 1/2 = 1$. $1 + 1 = 1$. That's why we can't "math" our way to a great marriage - because it doesn't make mathematical sense. But you must each be one whole, unbroken person before you can create one whole, unbroken marriage. That's why we treat the man, not the marriage. While the secular subs exclusively work with men, I'm not opposed to posts that try to help women become whole either. I openly welcome them - and we have had a few. Women are an essential component of the marriage "equation" and I believe, biblically, that it is perfectly appropriate for the men here to be able to provide input to women on how to be better wives. This is because God has designed men to lead in this way, just as Paul and Peter wrote instructions to women in their epistles. But at the end of the day, if we are trying to help people return to living out God's design for marriage, we must help them live out God's design for themselves first. Most forms of marriage counseling or even individual therapy, even from "bible-based counselors," doesn't do this. They want to address the psychological issues without contemplating the spiritual causes, or even the input that the Bible gives to psychological issues on their own accord.

Suggesting Counseling is Hypocritical

It also needs to be pointed out: RPC is all about giving men tools necessary to improve their marriages. This is often called "manipulation" because we are showing guys how to think, feel, and behave in ways that are not natural to

them in order to achieve a desired result. We get accused of being cult-like with the way we push men to internalize the things we teach and make it a part of them, forever changing their internal character.

What do you think counselors do? They help people see things from new perspectives, then give them tools to think, feel, and behave in *different ways* from what they've been doing in order to help them achieve better results in their lives. The main goal of most forms of therapy is not merely to change the patient's behaviors, but to cause him to internalize a better way of perceiving their world and interacting in it. The assumption of counseling is that if we can get a person to internalize a new sense of understanding over their life and circumstances, then the behaviors will follow - and often-times the behaviors are a starting point to facilitate that internalization process.

Sound familiar? Right. Because that's exactly what we do.

The difference is that we're not counseling through secular means. We are studying and researching the Bible in order to discern what it says and how we can apply it in ways that cause us to be more godly, which has the byproduct of improving marriage and sexuality as well. Who would have thought: when people in a marriage are acting as God intends them, then their sexuality will be as God intends as well.

ADDRESSING THE ACCUSATION

To now, I've mostly focused on why we shouldn't trust many of the people who make the claim that RPC is bad because it promotes "manipulating women." While most such objectors may not have adequate standing to make the objection, let's entertain the notion itself anyway, as hypothetically someone who is qualified to make that claim might come along one day. Are we guilty of "manipulating women"?

Sure. We're about as guilty as God is guilty of manipulating us. He has lots of plans that he doesn't tell us about - plans that influence our behaviors without our awareness, or which cause us to relate with him in ways that we wouldn't have chosen on our own. I mean, heck, if it were just up to me I probably wouldn't have entered into a covenant relationship with God in the first place. Total depravity and all, right? God had to do something to my *will* to enable me to choose him.

But nobody objects to this type of "manipulation." It's a very broad type - the kind where a mastermind "manipulates" or rearranges moving parts in order to achieve his own intended result. The kind of manipulation that most people object to is that which is malicious toward the person being manipulated. Consider:

- If I manipulate my kids, for example, by employing reverse psychology or other strategies of causing their behaviors to conform to healthy boundaries that I set for them, I am hailed as a good parent with lovely, obedient children. Chip Ingram once wrote that the primary purpose of parenting is to teach children obedience - if they can obey their parents now, they will be disciplined to obey God later. Technicalities aside, I can appreciate this thought.
- If I manipulate my kids into giving me all of their Halloween candy so that I can eat it myself, such as through a guilt trip ("If you don't give me all your candy, it must mean you don't love me"), then suddenly I am an evil scoundrel.

Which kind of "manipulation" or "influence" are we employing at RPC? Clearly the first - and I challenge any objector to find a single post by any endorsed contributor (i.e. right now, a mod) that indicates otherwise, or where a mod hasn't stepped in to correct the person.

Now, most people will see these different ways of applying what we learn from the Bible (in RPC) or evolutionary psychology (as the secular RP forums focus on) in terms of whether or not they harm the interests of one person for the advantage of themselves. So, to that I must ask: if a guy finds ways of causing his wife to be attracted to him and desire sex with him, is he manipulating her in this negative, harmful way? Here are the facts:

- She isn't attracted to her husband and doesn't want to have sex with him.
- She has sex with him.

What bridges the gap between these two is what characterizes the integrity of the strategies employed? - and much of what is taught here is, by our own acknowledgment, sexual *STRATEGY*. The gap, at least from the perspective of the objector, is in the emotional disposition of the person being "manipulated." If they suddenly want to do it, it is "persuasion" or a "change of heart" or just "good." If they never want to do it, but are influenced to do it against their actual desire, then it continues to be negative. What we propose should sit between those two phrases is this:

- He interacts with her in a way that causes her to want to have sex with him.

Is this malicious manipulation? I think not. I'll write more on this in another companion post. For now, suffice it to say, no woman ever complained that her husband became so attractive that it made her horny for him. At least I've never heard that complaint. And if the person you allege is being manipulated actually likes what's happening, what business do you have telling him to stop making her happy?

But you see, that's just it: feminists (especially the male variety) believe it's their imperative to tell others how they *should* be happy. It infuriates them that women are attracted to men who dominate them, who don't take their whining and complaining seriously, and who have a mission that doesn't include pedestalizing them. They believe that all women should be so self-empowered that, "If you only knew how he was manipulating you into being so happy and gaga over him, you would despise him like I do." See how ridiculous that sounds? "He's taking advantage of your cultural conditioning in order to make you happy, when you should be happy the way I'm happy, instead!" ... is what they say with giant pointed eyebrows and angry faces, unable to remember the last time they genuinely smiled. Don't let any person else tell you how you or your wife should be made happy. Let God tell you. He tells you how this can happen in the Bible. We teach the Bible. It's that simple.

CONCLUSIONS

If you want to object to what we teach at RPC, we welcome your objection. But I'd like to start learning in these posts: (1) are you single? (2) are you young? (3) have you internally changed as a person recently? I welcome contrary evidence, but it must be supported by results and not theory alone.

If you are any of these, ask yourself honestly: *how does this aspect of myself affect the way I'm perceiving my world and content that I disagree with?* I would also urge you to ask a more critical question: *Does the fact that I don't like what's being taught here change the fact that it's causing men to be more godly and women to be happier in their marriages to those men?* and *Is that something I really want to oppose?*

If men internalize what we teach here, incorporating it into your default character and not some strategy you employ to get a result, then there is no manipulation. You're just being a better version of yourself than when you started. That's not manipulation. That's improvement. It might mean improving your physical characteristics, which the objectors often find acceptable. But it also means improving your communication skills and emotional stability, which is where the objectors creep up. They don't like people who aren't easily manipulated by them and who can think for themselves. They use shame and emotional outbursts as their tools to get us to conform to their way of thinking. What does that sound like to you? And yet what do they do? Accuse us of being the ones who are manipulative. Easier to avoid getting caught with contraband if you hide it in your brother's room and blame him for having it. Your little secret will never get found out, right?

Long story short: the Bible tells us what marriage is meant to be. If you are unsatisfied with your marriage, it's probably because you're living outside God's design for marriage. Secular counseling can't help with this. Biblical counseling drawn from misinterpretations of the Bible made by feminized churches can't help with this. We can help with this. But always be a Berean (see Acts 17). Don't just take our word for it. Test it against Scripture. Tell

us what you found. Test it in your own marriage. Tell us what the results are. Let's veer away from being a community that focuses on questions and teachings. Let's start focusing on the field reports. I am calling all men here to start sharing stories about how the things you've been applying have worked or not worked. If it's not working, we can all learn from this. If it is working, we can all learn from this. It's a win-win.

Addressing the Blue Pill Hate: Objectifying Women, 1 Peter 3

20 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

While not is common as the accusation of manipulation, I have seen a consistent pacing of comments from new guys and objectors on other forums attacking this sub - and really any man who thinks that a woman's looks should be at all important.

"You're objectifying women," they say. "Women aren't just sex toys for you to ogle over all day." You get the gist.

The big bazooka that always gets pulled out and aimed our way is 1 Peter 3:3-4. Fortunately, it's filled with duds. To the unsuspecting man, he may still get hit by the shell and get hurt, but if you're paying attention and step aside, there's no explosion. It just falls flat.

1 PETER 3:3-4

What They Say

Let's look at the text of the passage itself, just to get started.

Your beauty should not come from outward adornment, such as elaborate hairstyles and the wearing of gold jewelry or fine clothes. Rather, it should be that of your inner self, the unfading beauty of a gentle and quiet spirit, which is of great worth in God's sight.

Very cool stuff there! But you can see how easily the blue pill church can misuse this passage, right?

- "Women shouldn't have to dress up and do their hair to look good. We should love them just as they are."
- "Men shouldn't evaluate a woman by her looks, but by her character."
- "Women, your heart is all that should matter. God can see that. If the man you want can't see that, then he doesn't see you the way God does, and you shouldn't want an ungodly man anyway."
- "If a man won't date a girl because she's not 'hot enough' for him, he's sinning and violating 1 Peter 3. He should only be evaluating her 'inner self.'"

I have heard all of these statements before, some word-for-word. And from a cursory reading of just those verses, this makes sense, right?

What the Bible Says

Remember those 7 basics on the sidebar? Bible study is one of them. Let's loosely follow the structure I laid out in [the 302 post](#).

Background

Let's start by adding some context. Peter opens chapter 1 by praising God and calling all believers to live holy lives. He quotes: "Be holy because I am holy," emphasizing that we are to be a reflection of God's character to the world. He suggests that the evidence of this is that we "love one another deeply, from the heart," akin to Jesus' command in John 13:34-35.

In chapter 2 he explains that sin is a barrier to our holiness. He says that Jesus died for us to give us a purposes - that we would be building something with our lives. That "something" is God's Kingdom, but sin can get in our way from doing what we were designed to do, so we should "abstain from sinful desires, which war against your soul." He says the way we withstand the oppression of that war is to our credit. He uses the example of slaves and says to "submit yourselves to your masters, not only to those who are good and considerate, but **also to those who are**

harsh" because this is how they will be commended by God.

Chapter 3 then opens with a compulsion for wives to submit to their husbands, even unbelieving ones - just as slaves must submit to their masters, **even unbelieving ones**. He gives the above quote about inner beauty and says this is how unbelieving husbands can be won over - by adopting the character of the godly women of the past. He also says that husbands should be considerate of their wives and respect the fact that they are the "weaker vessel" and co-heirs with us. He goes on to say that the world can be oppressive toward us, but that we must repay their evil with our good and that if we are going to be persecuted either way, "it is better, if it is God's will, to suffer for doing good than for doing evil."

In Chapter 4 he talks about the ways the church will be persecuted by the world and suffer for Christ. Then in Chapter 5 he commissions the elders of the church to live as models for others to follow - not because they have to, but because they want to. That is, that their ministry should flow from the desire of their heart and not mere external obedience.

Observation

There are countless observations I can draw from the background and the text of the passage itself. Here are a few.

Contextual Observations

- Peter's big theme throughout the entire book is communicating the value of suffering.
- He uses three key examples of commendation in the midst of suffering: (1) slaves and masters, (2) husbands and wives, and (3) Christ's suffering under worldly authorities.
- The suffering is always commended when done from a right heart and not merely out of rote obedience. The suffering has no value if it is deserved because of our disobedience.

Passage Observations on 3:3-4

- Peter makes no reference to how a man ought to evaluate a woman.
- His only reference to the inner v. outer beauty is focused on the woman's attitude.
- The context of the woman having such an attitude is while she endures hardship, such as from an unbelieving husband.
- The stated goal in a woman's expression of internal beauty over external beauty is to win the spirit of an unbelieving spouse or to find worth in God's sight.
- There is no statement of whether or not other expressions of beauty might be useful for different end-goals.
- He does not say that women shouldn't wear jewelry or do up their hair; nor does he say that these things aren't beautiful; he only says that this should not be the source of their beauty.
- The "source" of a woman's beauty, or in Peter's terms: where it "comes from" is to be her inner self.
- A gentle and quiet spirit that submits to even an unbelieving husband is what he suggests is a sign of a woman's beauty and is valuable in God's sight.

Interpretation

To address the issue often raised by those who cite this passage: Peter is not saying that men should only look at a woman's internal beauty. He is saying that women in difficult and potentially oppressive situations can find solace in the way God values their inner beauty in the midst of their hardship.

This is evidenced by the fact that wives are lumped in a trio with slaves having oppressive masters and Jesus being oppressed by worldly authorities. We also see this in the character traits used to define inner beauty. He doesn't list the fruit of the spirit from Galatians or the aspects of love from 1 Cor. 13. He says specifically: "A gentle and quiet spirit." These are the two things that would be most effective at keeping her from being harmed by an oppressive unbelieving husband and also to win his favor. It seems clear enough that Peter has isolated these two aspects of "inner beauty" not because they form an exhaustive list, but because he's addressing a specific issue in a specific context that leads to the greater theme that he is attempting to convey throughout this book.

It would seem grossly inappropriate to extend the context of this passage to say that every woman in every situation should abandon all thoughts of external beauty and only focus on her internal character, just as it would be absurd to argue that a "gentle and quiet spirit" are the only possible signs of "inner beauty." This also wouldn't be consistent with other passages that encourage us to take care of our bodies as God's temples, or to discipline our bodies and not give way to laziness or gluttony - which are also things that affect a woman's internal beauty.

Application

What are we to do with this? As men, relatively nothing. These verses are intended for women, so our best application of these limited verses is to (1) teach them to our daughters and other women who may one day find themselves in a difficult marriage, (2) notice and appreciate women who express these qualities despite the difficulty of their marriages, and (3) as we are to reflect Christ to others, we can communicate to women who embody these traits in this context the value that God has for their inner beauty.

Beyond that, we should not take as an application that men must re-evaluate every God-given impulse to appreciate the external features of a woman's beauty as well. That conclusion simply isn't in the passage.

THE REAL ISSUE: OBJECTIFICATION

A Nebulous Accusation Without Meaning

Now that we know what the Bible really says - within its own given context - let's turn to the real object of the ridicule: alleged objectification.

Let me start by saying that words have meaning. What does it mean to "objectify" a woman? The dictionary has an answer: "Degrade to the status of a mere object." Presumably a "mere object" is a thing without sentient thought or feelings. In short, "objectification of women" could be understood as the practice of treating women as if they don't have thoughts or feelings, and therefore we only view them through the lens of how they may exist to benefit us without regard to their will in the matter.

I want to be clear that this is different from devaluing one's thoughts or feelings. Someone with an antisocial personality disorder doesn't objectify everyone he meets. He recognizes that they are sentient with thoughts and feelings. He just doesn't care. Other's thoughts and feelings don't hold any value to him. His own thoughts and feelings matter so much that there's no room for consideration of anyone else's.

Most people who accuse us of objectifying women don't even know what they mean by objectification. They hear catch-phrases like, "She's just a sex object to you," and see that the word "object" is in there and relate it to objectification. They then develop this misimpression that we all have gender-selective antisocial personality disorders, as if we're too self-centered to recognize that women are real people too.

How We View Women

We love women. In fact, the problem with most guys here isn't that they love women too little, but that they love women too much! Loving anything too much can be destructive to your health and relationships. Our goal is not to devalue women; it's to devalue the dependence that men have on the validation-seeking relationship they have with women.

Simply put, I love my wife. She loves me. Biblically, she is not my highest goal in life. I have higher purposes than her, and I will set her aside for the sake of my mission from God every time, if they ever conflict. This is what attracts her to me. Her feelings in the relationship are honored - not despite the fact that I have higher priorities than her, but *because* I do.

Why? Because she's my helper. The fact that I have a purpose higher than her gives her something to do - a role to fulfill, a purpose to live out, and a place to belong: at my side. God created her to long for this place in life and it would be grossly inconsiderate of her feelings if I were to ignore her God-given longings and role in life simply to fulfill my own culturally conditioned philosophies of what a relationship should look like, right?

By recognizing the role God has given women and encouraging men to develop their marriages so that their wives can live within God's intended design for them, we are doing a great service for woman-kind. It is a service that ungodly women despise, but from God's perspective they're actually the ones doing the disservice to women by encouraging them to live outside the scope of their intended design.

I love my wife because of the way she helps me - the way she fulfills what God designed her to do. And she loves me not merely because of the way I live in my role, but because of the way I invite her to partake in hers as well. It's one thing for a man to live out his mission and it's an entirely other thing for him to invite his wife along to help him. This sub proclaims the latter, not the former, and that is why we value the role God has given women.

Does this mean I don't want to have sex with her? Of course not. Why wouldn't I want to have sex with my wife? After all, sexual oneness is one of the roles God has assigned to both spouses for each other. Let's live in that role too - and when it is broken, let's figure out how to fix it. This isn't objectification. It's common sense.

The Objector Point of View

But the objectors often reject common sense ...

The secular crowd uses the word "autist" from time to time. I used to think it was an insult. For some, I'm sure it was. But for many, they were trying to draw a parallel to show the incongruity in the way he processed the information that he was reading on an RP forum. He might read a post on employing kino, then before hitting the gym and right after an argument where his wife threatens divorce, he's trying to grab her boobs to "apply what I just learned." There is simply no common sense to this type of approach. You can't read one post at the exclusion of all of the other content, which is why we see the constant refrain: "sidebar and lift." This displays a clear dysfunction in how their brain is processing the information they're reading because they cannot translate it into reality or apply it to interpersonal relationships.

Unfortunately, this is the same way many objectors reach the conclusion that we objectify women. They read an isolated post that discusses sexuality within marriage and assume: "They only care about their wives to get sex out of them!" Right. And if I read an article in the NY Times about a political race, I'd be right to accuse them of only caring about politics and nothing else, right? Of course not. I have to take that one article in the context of everything else they write about - sports, entertainment, economics, science, etc.

More to the point: they assume that because one post talks about women one way, that this is the only way we view women and that all interactions are filtered through that one lens. This is simply absurd. We are all real people.

While it may not be true of everyone, I at least know that our mods (and soon to be endorsed contributors) employ common sense. Common sense - especially for the Christian - dictates that when someone genuinely needs help, you help them. Just because we teach men to be comfortable saying "no" to their wives doesn't mean they must always say no to every inclination of need for help she may ever have. Or when someone genuinely mourns, you mourn with them or comfort them. Just because we suggest some strategy like AA or AM in one context doesn't mean you start making jokes when your wife's mother dies.

I'd say, "Give us some credit," but if they did that, our objectors wouldn't be able to build all those straw men the

love making out with.

To all objectors: *Actually read our sidebar before coming to conclusions, and recognize that we have common sense just like everyone else - and check in the comments how we respond when someone lacks common sense.*

APPLICATION

- Always study your Bible. Don't just take verses out of context and be duped by the one peddling them.
- Love your wife for the ways she lives out the role God gave her. One such role is sexual. Love having sex with her. Another such role is to join and assist you on your mission. Invite her to do just that. Don't merely live your mission independent of her, or assume that her "help" is by taking care of the other things so you can go off and do it on your own.
- Have common sense in the way you apply what you learn, and recognize that we all have common sense too. If you're curious how a post jives with common sense, don't start applying it in idiotic ways. Ask for clarification. After all, that's the "common sense" thing to do, right?

16

UPVOTES

A Reply: Yes, the church and Christian writers really say these ridiculous things.

22 February 2019 · r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

NOTE: I AM NOT SAYING THAT A MAN SHOULD PRIORITIZE EXTERNAL BEAUTY OVER INNER BEAUTY. I AM ALSO NOT SAYING THAT MEN SHOULD ONLY DATE HOT WOMEN. YOU DO YOU. I AM ALSO NOT SAYING THAT AN UNATTRACTIVE WOMAN HAS DONE ANYTHING WRONG OR SINNED, UNLESS GLUTTONY, SLOTH, ETC. ARE INVOLVED IN THE REASON FOR HER UNATTRACTIVENESS. I AM SIMPLY POINTING OUT THE IDIOTIC THINGS THAT ARE TAUGHT TO MEN AND WOMEN IN THE CHURCH.

AN OBJECTOR IN MY POST ABOUT OBJECTORS

With the above cautionary in mind, in one of my recent posts, I paraphrased things I have personally heard from pastors and church leaders alike. They are as follows:

- "Women shouldn't have to dress up and do their hair to look good. We should love them just as they are."
- "Men shouldn't evaluate a woman by her looks, but by her character."
- "Women, your heart is all that should matter. God can see that. If the man you want can't see that, then he doesn't see you the way God does, and you shouldn't want an ungodly man anyway."
- "If a man won't date a girl because she's not 'hot enough' for him, he's sinning and violating 1 Peter 3. He should only be evaluating her 'inner self.'"

This was in a post addressing the objections that blue pill haters throw our way. Ironically, one such objector spoke up. If I'm right about who he is, he ticks off all three boxes I mentioned in [this post](#): **young, single, stagnant**. He challenged:

Lol, who said any of these things ... Can you actually show one link or comment where someone says anything like what you've said above ... or even attempted to say something along that line?

I'll give 5 that I found in less than 5 minutes. But let's sidebar that for now and stick with this appetizer.

/u/Deep_Strength gave a fantastic reply pointing out his experience hearing and reading similar phrases both in real life and on /r/Christianmarriage. u/SeaRegion, a mod at r/ChristianMarriage stood in defense of his sub by acknowledging the truth that people do say these things, but qualifying advocates of these views to single guys who don't have active or biblical sex lives. Point well taken! And that may be true on reddit. But note two things:

1. This doesn't change the fact that these people are often vocal and expressive with their views and even outside of r/ChristianMarriage these views are taught openly and widely.
2. There are also countless married men and women who teach these things from a public platform with wide audiences as well, as I'll get to in a minute.

u/SeaRegion further notes: "In terms of the church, I have never once been exposed to the idea that women (and men) shouldn't care for their physical appearances." I agree. It will never come with that language. Here's why:

- To be clear: every church recognize that we should care for our own bodies. Everyone is on the same age: we are God's temple, so care for your own body.
- The issue isn't how much we care about our own physique, but whether or not it's okay to have any concern for the attractiveness of our (potential) spouse. That's where the problems arise.
- There's always a communication gap between what is said and what is heard. "You should care more about a woman's inner beauty than her outer beauty" without a stipulation: "It's okay to want your wife to be hot too" leaves the audience with the impression: "Got it. I shouldn't care about outer beauty." This is what I call *tactful misrepresentation*. There's a reason many of my posts include "notes" and "caveats" that people joke with me about. This is the exact reason why I use them. Teaching partial truths leads to unbiblical conclusions.
- Every preacher and author knows that they'd be faced with numerous objections if they communicated their point plainly: "It's sin to care about a woman's looks." So, instead, they couch the issue in numerous peripheral phrases that imply this conclusion without saying it. They don't have the balls to say what they're really thinking, and hope that plausible deniability will cover their butts against anyone who tries to take them at their word.

Now for the meat of this post. Let's take a look at some actual Christian resources and bloggers chock full of real and authentic quotes.

THE GOSPEL COALITION

First up is an article from [The Gospel Coalition](#).

They commend a man for saying, "I don't care what she'll look like ... I'll love her for who she is inside." They say: "Marital love involves valuing your spouse's body. But this isn't exactly the same thing as finding it attractive, at least not in the way we typically think of finding something attractive."

Contrary to common sense, they also say that you can change what you're attracted to, if you don't find a worthy candidate attractive. "We are more capable than we often recognize of directing our preferences. We should not presume that our initial aesthetic sensibilities are unchallengeable law within us. We have some level of direction over them." Sure, this is why we say no girl is actually a 10. Because that last step from 9-10 is based on personal taste - and there's always 1 point to adjust for this. But he's basically saying that I could learn to get a hard on for morbid obesity if I just try hard enough.

Also: "Husbands and wives should be attracted to one another because they value the whole person, not because they happen to like olive skin or a firm body. Those things change, but physical attraction need not. Attraction is more a matter of *my* commitment to value the full breadth of who my spouse is ... This is a far more stable basis for physical attraction in marriage. And it makes for better Valentine's Day cards." Right, because I'm going to marry a woman based on how Hallmark can make more money.

Their ultimate conclusion? **"Perhaps this means that singles should be willing to direct their affections toward potential spouses they may not initially find attractive."** His rationale? **We need to be willing to challenge our own preferences regarding physical attraction in light of the greater principle that attraction stems from valuing a person."**

Translation? "Men shouldn't evaluate a woman by her looks, but by her character."

FIERCE MARRIAGE

Or what about [this article from fiercemarriage.com](#)? This sounds like a strong, masculine website. Fierce! Yes, let's see what they have to say.

"Selena [the author's wife] must be my ultimate standard of beauty ... Shifting our standard of beauty and placing our wives at it's [sic] center will profoundly and positively impact our marriages."

What does this mean? "Here's how it works. Take your wife as she is - height, weight, hair color, eye color, voice, mannerisms, everything - and set her apart in your mind. Now instead of comparing her to other women, compare other women to her. The less they look like her, *exactly as she is*, the less attractive they are. In other words - your wife is the ultimate example of beauty, one that can *never* be matched" (emphasis in original).

How does this play out in his own life? "Selena has brown hair - so I love brown hair! Selena is 5'4", so I love 5'4"!" The list goes on. Interestingly, he doesn't mention her weight, but you get the point.

For bonus points: "When we truly love our wives, we have a singular discriminatory focus on her. She is your object of affection, **your ultimate prize**" (emphasis added). In God's relationship with his people, did he say we were his reward? No, he said, "I am your very great reward" (Genesis 15:1). So, who is the prize? (Hint: Isaiah 54:5)

PROJECT INSPIRED

Those are both articles from men. Let's see what a woman has to say from [Project Inspired](#).

"Because men are attracted to feminine beauty, their very first reaction - as Feldhahn says - is to be instinctively drawn to it. But godly men recognize that instinct isn't always the right choice. Beauty has a divine definition, and that's the beauty they seek to embrace."

She recognizes the hard reality that guys still want their women to be attractive, but couches it in the view that only attractive guys want attractive women. "The simple truth is that a guy who takes care of his 'temple' will look for that in a potential spouse. There is a big difference between a guy looking for someone who exemplifies cultural standards and a man who wants a partner whose priorities echo his own." In other words: *Don't worry, if a guy doesn't take care of his body, he should find you beautiful even though you don't take care of your body either*. While I agree that the scrawny or obese man doesn't have much room to complain, the explanation isn't all wrong. It's not that fat guys suddenly find fat girls hot and attractive. They're settling.

Here's the clincher, though: "Above all else, a man who truly loves and follows the Lord is looking more at the heart of a woman than at her body. ... the man who walks in the redemptive grace of Christ will always place spiritual unity and emotional maturity a his first priorities in a mate - as should you!" Okay, nobody is questioning this. But are you really insinuating that a godly man shouldn't care about a woman's looks as long as she's a godly woman?

Her ultimate conclusion? "Be God's woman, and God's man will appreciate all you have to offer." So, yes. Yes, that's exactly what she's insinuating.

FROM THE STUDY

I was at first encouraged by [this article](#) from a guy who affirms that these attitudes are, in fact, prevalent. I thought I randomly stumbled across a guy who "gets it" as I read the first few paragraphs. So sad that this one led down the same path as all the others ...

"I am regularly asked if it is important for a Christian man or woman to be physically attracted to the person they are dating. As I've asked this question in the past, I've found that counsel usually comes in one of two basic answers. One answer is that no, physical attraction isn't important and shouldn't be part of one's initial consideration; rather, a person's godly character should be the paramount factor. Another answer suggests that

while godly character should be the primary factor, physical attraction is important and should also be part of the equation." He goes on to say that neither of these common answers are satisfactory to him. Excellent! I don't like them either.

He notes his own experiences: "I've observed situations, however, where godly, well-intentioned and otherwise wise men have counseled single brothers to not let the lack of physical attraction keep them from pursuing a godly woman." He adds: "When a young man asks me, 'Do you believe I should be physically attracted to my girlfriend,' I answer, 'Yes!'" Sounds good, right? Yes. So far, so good. He's going to start explaining why physical attraction is an essential component in a healthy marriage, right?

Then he starts going cockeyed.

- "When we have a clear view of what we truly deserve - an eternity enduring God's righteous judgment against our sin - that simple, godly girl we've known for the past couple years begins to appear very attractive, almost irresistible. A man *should* be attracted to the woman he is pursuing, but pride will often keep many a man from appreciating the beauty of the women already in his midst." Translation: **If you don't find unattractive yet godly girls beautiful, then you're probably sinning with pride.**
- "Attraction his [sic] holistic, and it [sic] possible that physical attraction is lacking in a man if he is not placing enough emphasis on a woman's character which will, over time, serve to adorn her physical beauty in his eyes ... [these men are] better served if they were told that physical attraction can and should grow when proper weight is given to a woman's inner beauty." Translation: **You're wrong for not giving enough weight to inner beauty, and if you did you'd suddenly find her attractive.**
- "We are also taught to value physical beauty supremely and treat a woman's inner beauty as secondary. This mindset is devastating to our relationships and our hope for marriage ... When we are walking in humility and pursuing the right things, it is possible to be physically attracted to many different kinds of women, not merely those who appear on the magazine cover." Translation: **If you're not physically attracted to plain Jane, you're not walking in humility and pursuing the right things. Ergo, you're sinning.**

I was about done with this article at that point. But for bonus points, let's keep reading.

- "God has created the man to be the pursuer and the one who woos and wins his wife." Right. Has he studied this in the Bible at all? Who is the pursuer between God/Christ and his people? I've done that study - I read every single verse that ever said "pursue" or "seek" or "chase." Know what I found? For ever 1 instance of God seeking us, there are at least 20 (might have been a 1::22 ratio) instances of the imperative for us to seek God. Should husbands pursue their wives? In select circumstances, as God models to us, sure. I'll concede that. But I challenge you all to find me one sermon where it is preached that it is primarily the wife's obligation to seek and pursue her husband's affection. I tried once and didn't have any luck. Maybe you all are better at internet research than me. Best I could find was general "following" and "submissiveness," which are incredibly different from the attitude that is conveyed when we read: "Seek after me" or "seek first my kingdom" or any of that stuff.
- "As a man pursues a woman, she often naturally grows more and more physically attracted to him as she is able to perceive his godly character and intentional leadership." Huh? This doesn't make any sense to me. How is he leading her if he's pursuing her? She's in front but ... somehow ... following behind him? As to the underlying sentiment, to his credit, for the first couple months this might ring true - because women love the validation of a new man showing interest. That's why so many people get fooled by this thinking. Brand new relationships do seem to give off this vibe. But this thinking always fails in longevity. A man's pursuit of a woman will, in time, always cause her to lose interest, just as many men often lose interest in a woman after having sex with her several times. While there are ways to keep this active, once he feels like he has "sexually conquered" her, his interest wanes, just as women's interest in a man wanes when she feels like she has "relationally conquered" him

(see Genesis 3 for more).

- He cites several reasons why men and women may not find someone else attractive: "The reasons [physical attraction] may be lacking in some women can be similar to the reasons it is lacking in men: pride, not enough attention given to man's godliness, concern about the lack of euphoric romantic feelings, a wrong standard of male handsomenesses, same-sex attraction, and, now more than ever, pornography." Notice he didn't say: "Perhaps attraction is lacking because the other person is obese, hasn't showered in a week, wears shoddy clothes, etc." No. This Christian man would ever insinuate that such people are unattractive. It must be a failure to see the inner beauty.

BIBLE.ORG

For fun, I decided to check [out one of the numerous study materials available on bible.org](#). They often have good things to say, and a lot of people rely on it, so let's check it out. Forewarning: it's a VERY long post. I'll cut to the relevant parts. And I'll note that not all of it is bad. There's good content too. But when they start talking about appearances ...

"The Christian home is not superficial, concerned with the outward appearance. The are not consumed with the external appearance in their clothes, makeup, or skin." This is an example of an author trying to *pull a fast one*. Notice the word choice? First it's that we're not concerned at all, then it's that we're not consumed by it. Which is it? Because if we say we're not "concerned" with it, then we shouldn't be considering it as a factor at all. But by changing words to "consumed" later, he creates plausible deniability.^a

"Let it be known that this focus on the outward appearance is a major struggle for many families including Christian ones ... The godly home is totally consumed with the inside ... The godly home is all about the inside ... How can Christian marriages protect themselves from this shallow focus on the external?" Combine this with the fact that there is no affirmation: *It's okay to want to marry someone you find attractive*, and do you see how easily these teachings can lead men astray?

LET'S PROCESS THIS

I used the following two searches:

- "Dating for attractiveness, Christians"
- "Should Christian men care about looks?"

The results I gave were on the first page of Google for each search. They are not some podunk blog that only gets read by the author's family members.

While most authors are cautious enough to avoid saying bluntly: "You should find fat girls hot if they're godly," (because they'd have to deal with the obvious back-lash) they do everything in their power to convey this idea without actually saying the words. They say the principle without being willing to address the obvious implications and questions that arise:

1. TGC: "Husbands and wives should be attracted to one another because they value the whole person, not because they happen to like olive skin or a firm body." - What if there is a WHOLE lot of her person? Is that just all the more of her to love? Or is it okay for me to pass on a godly woman because she's not attractive to me?
2. FM: "Now instead of comparing her to other women, compare other women to her" - Okay, I did. And what if in doing that I still think, "Yep, when measured against the standard of my wife, that other girl is still more

attractive"?

3. PI: "Be God's woman, and God's man will appreciate all you have to offer" - So does that mean if I don't find my wife attractive and I don't appreciate the way she looks or has failed to take care of her body, that I am somehow not "God's man"?
4. "A man *should* be attracted to the woman he is pursuing, but pride will often keep many a man from appreciating the beauty of the women already in his midst" - So if a godly woman asks me out and I don't find her attractive, does that mean I'm prideful and arrogant? Am I allowed to have standards, or is that sinning?
5. B.O: "How can Christian marriages protect themselves from this shallow focus on the external?" - Does this mean I'm shallow and ungodly if I actually care what my girlfriend or wife looks like?

All of these authors wanted to make a point, but they're not willing to grapple with these questions. If they did, they'd have to find themselves back-pedaling and finally adding in the qualifiers that they refused to include.

All of these authors create false dichotomies, acting as if attraction is either internal or external. In reality, they function as a scale. While a woman might be an 8 at physical attraction, perhaps her inner beauty is only a 4. I would not personally date such a person. But if a woman were a 9 at inner beauty and only a 2 in physical beauty, I probably wouldn't date her either - **AND THAT IS NOT SIN!**

The TGC article actually said my exact thoughts on this issue, then dismissed it as *sarcasm*: "You can make a pretty girl spiritual, but you can't make a spiritual girl pretty." In the article, I get the impression that everyone laughs this away as a joke, but it's the truth. I can take a girl who is physically a 9 and disciple her from a spiritual 3 to a 10. I cannot take a spiritual 10 and improve her looks from a 3 to a 10. If she's truly a spiritual 10, I might be able to get her in great physical shape and lead her in the right clothes to wear, etc. to bump up a few points, but there's still always going to be a cap that just can't be crossed, including personal taste. I can't teach a girl to have a different natural chest size (implants don't do it for me) or to have a different ethnic presence about her that turns me on. So, why not give that youth pastor some credit?

CONCLUSION

Yes, the church absolutely teaches that men shouldn't care about what a woman looks like, and that internal beauty should somehow make her seem hot to him, regardless of what her external features may be. This is absolutely absurd. It sickens me just writing this post. I'm not even going to finish this conclusion. I'm so done with this.

20

UPVOTES

Flair System Update

25 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

Hi all!

After some conversation among the mod team, as this sub has grown a lot since the flair system was initially employed, we decided it best to switch to mod-assigned flair.

Why?

1. Some users were assigning inappropriate or intentionally misleading flair to themselves.
2. The old format was more designed to answer the question: "Who are you?" We've decided it's more useful if flair answers the question: "Can I trust you?" While advantageous on a relational level, the previous flair system didn't turn out to be conveying useful information to ascertain a person's reliability on relational, sexual, or theological matters. As a result, people may have been unintentionally misled into believing someone's advice was reliable simply because they had a long-term marriage, or because they were also living the single life as a Christian. A proven track record matters more to us than demographics.
3. Mod-assigned flair gives us the opportunity to honor and endorse contributors who have a proven track record showing not only the degree of their investment in this sub, but also the reliability of the advice they give and the way they attempt to practice it. It also gives us the ability to provide a cautionary note for those who have a track record for being untrustworthy or who have acknowledged they follow a different system of beliefs.
4. Newcomers need a quick system of discerning which posters and commenters can be relied up for representing this sub's views. While we have incredible tolerance for what gets posted here, many newcomers have been led away by the fact that they believed a random poster was representative of this sub's views, despite the fact that all of the mods (and more) rallied against the content. An endorsement system can clear this up for newcomers very quickly.
5. Because some of the flair can add personality and life to a conversation, and - especially for those with positive endorsement - should have the intended effect of compelling them to live up to the endorsement, rather than trying to fake their way into sounding smart in an online impersonal world.

What endorsement DOES NOT mean?

First: *Being endorsed does not mean they always have the right answer.* **No one is perfect.** Just because someone is endorsed doesn't mean they won't ever make mistakes. We're all sinners. We're all still learners. You will not be able to argue to God someday, "But that guy was endorsed, so I followed his advice!" No. Read Acts 17:11 - they didn't even trust Paul, the most "endorsed" of all believers of that time, whose words even Peter was calling Scripture before it was canonized as Scripture.

Second: *It doesn't mean that all other endorsed people will think the same way.* **We all disagree.** I have strong disagreements with every single person on the mod team, ranging from theological positions to relationship advice. I'm okay with that. Just because one endorsed person says something doesn't mean the mods agree either, or even that we agree among ourselves. Don't impute one person's words to another person's views. Our differences give us perspective, and will not make us weak so long as we maintain unity through them rather than being broken apart because of them.

Third: *It doesn't mean that they're getting special treatment or friends with the mods.* **We don't play favorites.** I have turned down personal friends and long-time reddit buddies for mod positions, and have also declined to endorse them today, after updating our flair system. I don't like saying no to my friends, but I don't feel bad about it either.

Either you have the track record or you don't. There are no favorites here - and you must answer to all of the mods and not just me.

What endorsement DOES mean.

First: *It means that you have proven your commitment to this sub.* There are some people who are reliable who have sought higher positions on RPC. Interestingly, none of the mods have ever sought this position - and even u/RedPillWonder turned down the position for months before I was able to persuade him to join us. The reason he turned it down? Because he wasn't in a position to commit. The reason I've turned some of the seekers down? Because they haven't shown a consistent investment in the people of this community.

Second: *It means that their advice is, on the whole, reliable.* Nobody is perfect, but some people are generally more reliable than others. If you're asking a question and want to know which answers to trust, go with the endorsed contributor first before trusting the random Joe Schmo.

Third: *It means that the mod finds their contributions both (a) Scripturally sound and (b) relationally/sexually wise.* There are many people who are wonderful theologians and can discuss Scripture eloquently. I would have loved to endorse such people. But I can't do that if they haven't proven their ability to be wise in their relationships. There are other people who are relationally and sexually at the top of their game, but who lack the biblical understanding to back it up. Neither of these types of people are endorsed. Endorsed people are those who we believe have both, or who are at least making significant progress.

Other than "endorsed," how did you decide what flair to give to other users?

There are several people who gave self-assigned flair from the previous system, which I did not delete, and some unique cases that were added. They fell into three categories:

1. Women - It can be valuable to know whether you're speaking with a dude or DEERING to a wife and mother. At least for now, I happily welcome female participation on this sub. Unlike the secular subs, I believe marriages can be improved not only by men being better men, but by women being better women too. As we follow Christ, they can learn to follow us. And while I stand by 1 Timothy 2:12, even without her trying to teach me, I still learn a lot about how I treat Christ by the way my wife treats me. There's something to be said for the conversation-starters some of the women here do prompt.
2. Non-Christians - While I don't mean to insult anyone who is of another belief system or has chosen to remain agnostic, the fact that their comments and posts are grounded in either philosophy or science instead of theology is worth being aware of up-front.
3. Unique Flair - As something of a catch-all, there are some users who, while not fully endorsed, deserve some credit. Whitified, for example, is our "Blue Target Bazooka" - if he smells any blue in the air, he'll blow it up, and there's nothing soft or subtle about it. That's why we love you, whitified! Weakandsensitive has also posted here from time to time - and we openly welcome his participation. While not a Christian, he is a mod on MRP and I've learned a lot from my conversations with him, so it's worth giving him that credit. I labeled "squizzo" as a disciple-maker because while I know relatively little about his relational life, I've spoken with him enough to know he's fighting the good fight for Christ and I'd gladly encourage anyone to listen to what he has to say about sharing the Gospel and raising up godly believers. Keep your eyes out for these types of unique flair and discern whether they're speaking in their element.

I should also note that we have not yet assigned "woman" or "non-Christian" flair to anyone. The people you see presently are those who have openly self-identified as such.

Can I ask for a certain flair to be assigned to me?

Yes, but that's not a guarantee that you'll get it. As a general rule, I plan to comply with any requests to assign flair that would distinguish someone as either a woman or non-Christian. So, if you want that flair assigned to you, even with a special quirk (ex. See Willow Girl's, which I have left in-tact), just let us know and we'll almost certainly make it happen. While it may cause some to lose respect for you, perhaps others with the same belief set as you may find they're not alone when they browse here.

However, if you're seeking to be endorsed, that does not come easy. You have to prove yourself first. I've had people who before ever making a single post or comment had already asked to be a mod. The answer to that question will always be no. We need to know who you are first, and if you're reliable - and only the endorsed will be considered for mod positions, should the need arise.

Can I get my flair removed if I don't want it?

You can appeal to the mods and we'll make a decision. For some people who may have negative flair, identifying them as untrustworthy, you're going to have to show some significant signs of change, and it will likely take time and consistency to prove that change. If you're labeled with something innocuous, like "Christian wife" or "LDS" we're going to want to know why you want to conceal this aspect of yourself from the rest of the community. If it's with an intent to deceive others and gain greater influence, the answer is no. But if you can come up with a good reason, we're all ears.

Any more questions? Post in the comments.

A user recently asked about how to find and build relationships with other believers when most of his friends are non-Christians. Hopefully this can answer his question and also apply more broadly to anyone in this community who lacks healthy relationships with both believers and non-believers alike. Especially for married men, I know it's difficult to have any relationships outside your own family. Know that it is absolutely essential for the health of your marriage, being attractive, and advancing your mission to have solid relationships outside the home.

FIRST: Don't Abandon Your Old Friends.

Many brand new Christians make the mistake of coming to Christ and thinking, "I have to get rid of everything to do with the secular world." They conclude that their non-Christian friends either don't share the same values, and therefore cannot understand them and provide relational value, or they believe that the non-Christian friends will bring him down into sinfulness and neglect of his newfound faith.

If they actually do lead you into sin, then by all means walk away. But there is a greater purpose to be served by remaining friends with the non-believers you're in relationship with. Foster those relationships into something that can lead them to Christ. For more information, read *The Insider*, by Mike Shamy.

TWO: If you're going to leave, do it FOR Christ, not because of Christ.

Suppose you decide you really do need to separate from your non-Christian friends to find others who are saved and can walk alongside you in the faith rather than lead you astray. What's the best way of making this transition?

Share Christ with your non-Christian friends. If you're already planning on the friendship ending, this can only be a win-win.

- If they reject you and don't want to hang out with you anymore, oh well. That's what you were planning on doing to them anyway - rejecting them as friends for not being Christian-enough (see how bad of an idea that sounds in the first place when you phrase it that way?). Why be afraid of being rejected by people you were planning on rejecting? That's just nonsense.
- If, however, they are willing to follow Christ, then you have won them over and they can become the people who follow Christ alongside you. This has incredible Kingdom value and is a way to leverage the things God was doing in your relationships before Christ for the Gospel in your life with Christ.

THREE: Don't pick friends based on false maturity.

If you are going to find new Christian friends, don't fall into the trap of evaluating their maturity and positive influence in your life on the wrong factors. There are three key traps that many Christians fall into when assessing maturity - and don't fall into these traps yourself, either, otherwise you might be disqualifying yourself as a viable long-term friend to other people:

- **Less Sin:** Most people think that the less someone sins, the more mature they must be. This is like saying someone must be an incredible financial investor because he has never made a bad investment ... while the fact is that he's never made any good investments either. Maybe he's a financial incompetent who hasn't invested at all, or maybe he just always runs in the middle of the road. Christians are not defined by how much or how little they sin. Sin is not a master over us and is not part of our judgment.
- **Morality:** Another mistake people make in assessing maturity is to look at a person's good deeds and positive moral character. The more they talk about right from wrong and can recognize the error in other people's sinful ways and seem to rise above it, this must prove that they are mature, right? Wrong. Jesus talks in Matthew 7 about people who were doing not just regular good works, but incredible good works - casting out demons,

performing miracles, and prophesying in Jesus' name - and yet Jesus says he never knew them and casts them aside.

- **Emotionalism:** There's this view in the church that the more emotional a person is in their faith, the more mature they must be. Because of this, I often call this the "popular Christian myth" - because the most emotional people tend to be the most popular in churches. But neither emotionalism nor popularity among other church-goers are an indication of spiritual maturity.

If you spend all your time with people who are focused on not sinning, you're going to do a great job eradicating sin from your life. If your friends are highly moral, you will become highly moral. If you hang with the popular and emotional crowd, you'll learn to be emotional and will become popular too. These are good things and should be encouraged in any relationship. But they are not the foundation of spiritual maturity - and making such people who focus on these areas to the exclusion of the next item your primary friends will likely distract you from becoming spiritually mature.

FOUR: Spend time with mission-minded Kingdom-changers.

Jesus put us here for a purpose. Paul says in Philippians that this purpose is to share the Gospel with the world and to raise up new believers into maturity - and he defines maturity in that book by a pattern of disciple-making where one person follows Christ and another follows him and another follows that guy, and so on. He literally says in Philippians 3, "All of us who are mature should take such a view of things, and if on some point you think differently, that too God will make clear to you."

That is: maturity comes from those who are living in a pattern of disciple-making, which means that a person is following the example of another trustworthy and godly man and models his own life to be that trustworthy man for others to follow after - and intentionally establishes these relationships rather than passively hoping that it happens naturally. This is what Jesus did. Jesus followed God. The disciples followed Jesus the same way Jesus followed God. Their disciples followed them the same way they followed Jesus, and so on until you are the latest link in the chain.

Incidentally, people who do this naturally tend to sin less, be highly moral, and have a deep, emotional connection with Christ. They just don't rely on their sinlessness, morality, or emotionalism to define their maturity. They allow their faithfulness to the mission Christ gave them to be that rubric.

FIVE: How to find these people.

It's hard to find these people. So, my first conclusion is always to raise them up. Some of my closest and most trusted friends who are mature believers, following Christ and making disciples today, are people who started as non-Christians and who I have raised up to become mature believers. There's a guy I brought to Christ just last year who I discipled and am meeting with regularly now, who encourages me and pours into my life as well. These mutually-beneficial relationships are born not from finding unicorns in the wild, but from molding clay in others around us.

If you do want to find someone in the wild (or at least someone more malleable than others), local congregations are a great tool for finding these people.

- **Mini Rant:** I don't like calling these "churches" anymore because they're so full of bloat that they no longer resemble the core essentials of what Christ established. Are those essentials there? Sure, to some degree. But they're so lost in the midst of everything else those congregations are doing that it becomes side-lined. It's like calling Apple a computer company. Sure, they may still build computers - and some of those computers are much better than the first ones they were building in the 70s. But few people know them for their computers, which are now more of a side product. Dell is a computer company. Apple is not, despite the fact that making computers is a part of what Apple does. The apostles made churches. Modern pastors do not, despite the fact that biblical church requirements are a part of what modern pastors do. Apple is identified by their phones, _____

tablets, and a litany of other devices and accessories. If the church's job was to make money, like Apple, then this focus-shift is certainly a wonderful venture. But that isn't the church's goal.

My point is simply to say that you can go to a congregation to try to find mission-minded people, but only about 5% of that crowd will be what you're looking for, and it's rarely the people you'd expect. They're often not the ones in church leadership or running ministries - they're the ones actively sharing the Gospel outside the church and discipling individuals rather than trying to get face-time in front of the masses or cozy up to the pastor. Mission-minded people look outside their congregation to do God's work. Institutionally-minded people look inward toward their congregations to do God's work. This isn't bad, and certainly building up the congregation you're with can be helpful to your external mission, but most church leaders and ministry members stop there - and even when they do go outside the church, it's less about sharing the Gospel and more about serving a need. Good luck with that crowd.

Another more effective way to find fellow mission-minded disciple-makers is simply to start doing it yourself. The more you make disciples the more other disciple-makers will naturally be drawn to you. I can't explain it, and I don't think there's a logical reason this works, but God miraculously draws mission-minded people together. I can't count the number of times - even in the last 2 weeks alone - where I have found random pockets of other disciple-makers from other churches not because I was looking for them, but because I'm living it out and happened to get into a conversation with a stranger who was doing the same thing. How did we bump into each other? How did we get talking about that subject? I don't know. God just pulls people together when the need arises - but only after you've already started being faithful to living it out yourself.

SIX: What to do once you've found them.

First, just be friends. This is so under-valued in modern church culture. The lack of genuine, authentic friendships being formed is shocking to me. I can't count the number of Christians who will call each other friends, yet when they want to go to the movies or have a game night, it's not others in their church or small group that they're calling, it's their friends from other churches or people they knew from college or their long-standing non-Christian friends.

Don't get me wrong, I absolutely encourage being social with these people. Go back to my first point: keep hanging out with your non-Christian friends. But there's something sorely wrong when congregations are failing to foster *koinonia* oneness bonds among believers in their community.

I tested this once by asking a couple dozen people who their friends were in the church. Many people could name at least 7 distinct people/couples. That's great! So, then, I asked when the last time was that they had done anything just for fun - movies, TV show, board games, lifting, going for a run, hiking, vacationing, playing cards, etc. - that wasn't related to a church-organized activity with any of these people. Crickets. Of the 2+ dozen people I asked, only 2 people could identify anything like this. That's shocking and shameful to me.

Conclusion: Be friends with the Christians you meet, not arms-length ministry partners who you enjoy seeing from time to time whenever the pastor calls.

SEVEN: What to do after you're friends.

I suppose the last step is to start ministering together. Most congregations reverse the order - they start by doing ministry together in the hope that this will foster authentic relationships. It doesn't. Instead, what I find is that when you start as friends, ministry is far more effective and the bond of "having the same love, being one in spirit and in purpose" (Philippians 2:2) is formed.

That same purpose, of course, should be the common mission of making disciples. It might mean you're discipling these friends, or that you're being discipled by them. It also might mean that you're just friends who talk about your disciple-making efforts together. I don't care. Just make sure your friendship is growing toward a common mission. And this, no matter how small the group, is the church without the bloat.

Core 3: What Purposeful Friends Do.

I should note here that the most effective model of evangelism I have ever found is what I call the "core 3." I developed and practiced it in college and have still found it useful even in the "real world."

You start with two close friends. You get them all on the same mission. You do everything together - eat, lift, go grocery shopping, pray, go to the movies, Bible study, church, listen to stand-up, etc. These are your real homeboys. You're always looking forward to the next time you can hang out, and when one guy puts an offer out, everyone is quick to snatch it up. I don't see local congregations fostering this - they confuse transparency and vulnerability with relational bonding.

Once you and two other guys have that bond, you invite a non-Christian to hang out with you. He sees the bond you have with each other and really enjoys feeling "in" with the crowd. This is a little awkward for you all because you have an outsider in your core - but you're purposeful about it, so you make intentional efforts to include him and explain the inside jokes and jib jab with each other. After 5-6 times hanging out, he becomes another one of the guys. He sees that you're all Christians and wants to start doing the Christian things you do together too. He becomes saved.

Now you have a Core 4. So, you add a 5th guy. Guy 4 is now highly instrumental in connecting with Guy 5 because he was skeptical as the new-guy for a while too, but he vouches for the group and guy 5 is pulled in. Then the Core 5 adds a 6th, but it gets too big, so you split back to a Core 3 with a strong interconnectivity between the two groups and the process continues.

I know from a recent conversation with u/squizzo_rad that he is doing something similar with a new believer joining his group of friends. /u/warriorjesus1915 has done the same. I'm doing it now with a new guy who I asked to start working out with me and another friend at the gym (Core 2 expanding to Core 3 - not quite as effective as a Core 3 to 4, but it's all flexible). You can try it too.

Underground Church

Interestingly, this is surprisingly close to the "church" model proposed by Brian Sanders in his book, *Underground Church*. He started a brand new and ancient method of "doing church" that removed the cultural bloat from mainstream congregations. He formed micro-churches, which were as small as 3 people and as large as hundreds, though most stick to a house-church size. They're all based on friendships and shared passions rather than sermons and singing songs weekly. Some of these "micro churches" do have sermons, others don't. Some have worship and others don't. Some run it as a small group, others run it as an outward ministry. Some do only one of these things, others change from week to week what they do together. He has thousands of people in the Tampa area who are predominantly mission-focused, and it's still growing - and all this in only 10 years from the ground up.

The important thing is that they exist to pursue a common mission on the foundation of friendship, not to amass numbers in a building. His team that started this looked to Scripture to figure out the bare-minimum components of "church" the way Jesus and the apostles established it - all cultural influences aside - and they came up with the EXACT same three things that I came to: (1) more than one person, (2) with a common mission of making disciples of all nations (he left off the disciple-making part, but it's inherent in his model anyway), (3) with the goal of glorifying God (he uses "worship" instead, which I find misleading when you look at the expanse of what he means by that word).

In theory, what we're doing here at RPC is a "church" of sorts. We're more than one person (the active users) on a common mission (raising up men committed to the great commission) intended for God's glory. While there's nothing "micro" about us, we are virtually indistinguishable from the micro-churches he's forming. Instead of organizing around the mission of disciple-making in the context of homeless ministry or feeding starving children or reaching doctors or running an animal shelter, etc., our context is a shared passion for growing in and living out

biblical masculinity and valuing the sexual dynamic God has given us, and occasionally even broaching socio-political landscape of the church.

What are ways that you can continue to branch out and develop a new "micro-church" in your own locality born from the relational network that you've been fostering and that this post is designed to help you learn how to create?

Married Man Game Part 3: Sexting

5 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

My wife decided to snoop on my computer last week and managed to find this account. Hi, babe! The first post she read was [The Consciously Crazy Wife](#). Yikes! Haha. "I knew you were hiding something, and I just wanted to know *all of you*," she said. It was a clear invasion of privacy, and I called her on that, but women are gonna do what women are gonna do. So, I ask her with a smile if she'd read [my OYS comment about enjoying her dripping wet juices](#). She had, and we laughed together, though she was a bit embarrassed.

I think she likes being a bit embarrassed when it's just between the two of us. She'd never admit it openly, but her behaviors in those moments don't lie. Another thing that I haven't done often, but also gets her embarrassed, is sexting. So, I figured I'd write a post on it. Let's see how embarrassing this can get ;)

WHAT DOES THE BIBLE SAY?

I've often heard of the Bible itself referred to as "God's love letter to us." That's a sweet sentiment, though it's so much more. What strikes me as most interesting is the reproductive themes throughout Scripture. The first command was to "be fruitful and multiply, fill the earth in number." That is: have lots of sex. The great commission is to make disciples of all nations, which is the same as saying: "be spiritually fruitful and multiply, fill the earth in number of spiritual offspring." That is: reproduce spiritually, not just physically. I've said before that Malachi 2:15 as much as affirms this as the whole point of marriage.

One of the primary themes of the new testament is the way that Christ raised up a bride for himself. He found nobodies who were totally unqualified. If he were vetting for the ideal discipleship candidate, the 12 he chose would not have been at the top of the list. But he raised them up anyway. And why did he do this? He says it in his prayer in John 17 at the last supper: "Just as you sent me into the world, Father, now I am sending them." He wanted them to be spiritual reproducers. How would they do this? When the Holy Spirit would come on them, they would become his witnesses (Acts 1:8). For more on this, check out [this post](#) by a buddy of mine, which goes into the ways that God's indwelling in us (like a husband enters his wife) results in spiritual reproduction.

When I read the New Testament and the way that Christ is constantly building up the church and encouraging her toward reproducing - whether in his teachings, his parables, the way he modeled his own life, and in the disciples he commissioned to carry on his work - it makes me think what that should mean for us when it comes to living out our physical lives. That is, the entire New Testament is God's written word designed to entice us to engage in spiritual reproduction with him.

Shouldn't we also use the written word to entice our bride to engage in physically reproductive acts with us? That's ultimately what sexting is: the physical manifestation of what significant parts of the New Testament is designed to accomplish on a spiritual level. Just as reading the book of Acts should make your spirit all warm and tingly toward the idea of engaging in spiritually reproductive activities by sharing your faith with the world, your written conversations with your wife should make her physical body all warm and tingly toward the idea of engaging in physically reproductive activities by having hot, steamy sex with you.

SEXTING FRAME

Texting is only for logistics, right? As a general rule, yes. But there are times, especially for married men, where it can be advantageous to rev up the engines even before you get home from work or while one of you is away on business. I do not sext very often. But when I do, I really enjoy it. It's a fantastic experience. Sometimes she seems to get into it, whereas other times she's quite dismissive. Unless she's sexting right back, it's not always easy to gauge how she's receiving it, but I'm not as interested in that, as the stage it sets is usually quite fruitful when we're

back together again.

What makes it difficult to gauge is that you have no behaviors to observe. All you get is what she says, which isn't always reliable. While a particular line might make her feel warm and blush, she could very well respond: "Stop it. This is uncomfortable." Or she might say, "Aw, that's cute. Are you picking up the kids today?" and totally dismiss what you said until you get home and she's ready to go. Other times she may play along. If all you get are her words, you have no idea what's really going on in her head.

Conclusion? Sexting is less about how it makes her feel and more about how it makes me feel. I simply enjoy talking sexy to my wife. It shows confidence and dominance, especially in those times that she doesn't engage. It sets a plan and expectations for how the night is to go. It makes me horny all day so I'm rock hard by the time the kids are in bed.

Now, I'm married to a reserved "good Christian girl" type. Any form of "naughty talk" makes her feel awkward and uncomfortable. Just taking a selfie showing some cleavage is groundbreaking for her. As a result, her ASD is remarkably high when it comes to these types of things. So, it's automatic for me not to expect or look for any validation in her responses (not to say she doesn't give it). But I still do it anyway. Why? Because I find it fun. And it's great when she does respond anyway.

DEVI

I'm sure there's a lot of nuance based on the particulars of each person, but bear with me. While I'm a lawyer by trade, I love writing in my spare time. I've written both fiction and non-fiction books - but fiction writing has been particularly helpful to me. When I'm thinking about how I want my night to go, it doesn't just run through my head like a scene in a movie that I'm watching. As with writing fiction, I can place myself in the scene and experience the fullness of the moment yet to come. That's what makes sexting come alive for me - it's not just imaginative foreplay; it's a whole new world of anticipatory gratification. Instead of wishful expectation, I find myself immersed in a world of my own making and inviting my wife to join me there.

Even beyond the principles you'll find below that I draw from my experience as a writer, there are some basic concepts that are valuable to making sexting a fun and enjoyable experience for me, and hopefully for you too, and which can set a solid stage for evening activities. I have found Daniel Rose's "DEVI" system quite helpful in creating a framework for me to really get into it, which I hope and often find gets her into it as well.

- **Dominance:** Sexting works best for me when it comes from my frame as something I'm leading for my enjoyment and I'm inviting her along for the ride. I set the stage, she follows. I push boundaries and make her feel uncomfortable. I'm in charge of the conversation and say what I want, free of restraint.
- **Emotion:** I have to be feeling it. My emotional state matters most. If I'm into it, she can get into it. To transfer my enjoyment into her, I must target her feels, which is when reciprocation is most likely to occur. With no emotional transference, while I may be having fun, she'll ultimately write me off and not engage back. This is where I screwed up the most recent time I tried this - I hopped in too far too fast and didn't get her feeling it right away. When she wants it, she'll play along.
- **Variety:** I'm sure you can imagine what a boilerplate sext conversation looks like. I'm a lawyer and even I hate reading boilerplate, no matter how interesting the document is otherwise. If she doesn't know where you're going to go with the conversation, it leaves room for anticipation of what might come next.
- **Immersion:** This is the single most important aspect of sexting for me. It's what makes it most enjoyable. When actually having sex, immersion often happens naturally. When sexting, it takes a lot of work to leave your environment and feel in the moment. Why? Because you're looking at a screen with the lights on and not actually experiencing anything that's being said. Yet romance novelists are able to create immersion for women

in airports, coffee shops, and even public restrooms all the time. It's doable. But it requires creativity and stage-setting. I have found myself so immersed in these types of conversations that I must step away from my office desk to make sure I'm not leaking in my pants.

With those principles in mind ...

PRACTICAL TIPS

Of the list below, take what works for you and leave the rest behind. These are just things that have been helpful to me in maximizing my enjoyment of sexting with my wife.

Be Authentic. What makes sexting most enjoyable for me is that I authentically want to do everything I'm texting. That doesn't mean I can't embellish, but my words are coming from raw, genuine desire and expressing parts of my intentions that often go left unsaid. And they usually should go unsaid if you're not at a distance. Do, don't say. But there's still value in saying it from time to time and expressing your sexuality in a different way. Besides, if you're not authentic and just screwing around, she'll see through it and it ruins the experience.

This is Not a Joke. While you can joke, don't let the entire exchange become a joke. There's sometimes a temptation (especially if sexting is brand new to your relationship) to maintain plausible deniability by doing something in a way that it can be played off as a gag.

Example of what not to do: Take a dick pick. She responds shocked and confused rather than engaging the way you hoped, so you say, "Yeah, that was funny. Can you imagine if we actually did those things like other people do? Haha. Glad we're not like those weirdos." No. Don't do that. Own it. Again, be authentic.

Strategically Limited Use of Emojis. I prefer to avoid emojis whenever possible. However, sometimes the situation calls for it. The best use of emojis seems to be for transitions. You're having a serious conversation about who's getting the kids to practice, then you transition with a wink to change gears from logistics to flirting with a transitional phrase.

Example: "Thanks for taking care of that. I'll have to reward you later :)"

Saying this with a straight expression, no emoji, some people might not get the hint. Once you use this singular emoji, because the context of the conversation has already changed you shouldn't need to overdo it afterward. She should recognize the suggestive nature of your speech.

Be Different. Abuse the impersonal and tone-deaf nature of texting by acting out of character. If you're normally a serious, straight-shooter, add some humor and light banter to your sexting. If you're usually a comedian in the home, imagine your persona as that of a secret agent trying to get a Russian spy into your hotel room. This change of character adds an air of mystery that's a little exciting. Even if she doesn't know you're doing this, it can also give you slight hints of role-playing if you've never yet introduced that into your marriage.

Ex. You're typically a funny guy in the home. While you can incorporate humor into your sexting, maybe you shift from humorous flirtation to serious. "I want you. Against the wall. I'll look you dead in the eye. My left hand will hold your face. You can't look away as my fingers slide inside you. I want to see that moment in your eyes."

The reverse should apply as well. If you're typically a straight shooter, try to add a bit more humor and light-heartedness.

Use Strategic Pauses. Long paragraphs are great for novels, but they don't let her linger on the moment. Sexting should build over time and take time. Novels can get a girl going because there's enough content for her to read for an hour straight to keep the tingles alive. When you're texting, you can't type that fast. You have to let her linger from phrase to phrase, waiting for what comes next. Put periods in sentences that you'd otherwise string together.

Ex. "I want you against the wall so I can look you in the face while I slide my fingers inside" becomes the example in the previous point, broken up with a new text where every period is, maybe leaving 10-20 seconds between texts.

Make Her Feel Like the Perverted One. ASD may cause her to present as sweet and innocent, maintaining her self-image (particularly true among Christian women). Nevertheless, if you ignore her self-perceived innocence and act like she's making the dirty comments, this can open up the atmosphere for further conversation. If she feels like you already think she's a little kinky, she has the freedom to feel a little kinky and engage in-kind.

Ex. After the "I'll have to reward you later ;)" text (above), my wife replies: "Flowers? :D" Total ASD. She knew what I meant. So, I respond: "Hmm ... props for being creative. I never thought about using flowers that way before."

Lead by Example. If you want her to say something flirty, be flirty first; if you want her to say something dirty, say something dirty first; if you want her to send a naughty picture, send a naughty picture first. Just don't run faster than she's willing to go if you're expecting her to respond in-kind. Pace the escalation.

Ex. I was once flirting with my wife while she was in an air port and I was at work. I was escalating to the point of exchanging pictures. She was shy and unwilling to show cleavage. So, although my ordinary tone of texting is serious (and therefore I'm employing more humor in the banter), I take a pic of myself pulling my work-shirt down with my pecs pressed together, making a kissy face. "See how easy that was?" It made her laugh and she returned in kind.

Use Additional Technology. I have Google Home and Amazon Firesticks set up in my house, each linked to my Spotify account. While at the office with my wife working from home, in the midst of sexting my wife I pulled up Marvin Gaye's "Let's Get it On" and remote-casted it to one of the devices in my house. Apparently it scared her at first (note: check your volume levels before you leave the house), but got her to laugh and pulled sexting out of her phone and into her ears.

Don't Ask or Beg. "Can you send me a nip pic?" is not cool. "C'mon. Just do it. You know you want to." Even worse.

Do Give Instructions. "Tell me ..." or "I'm going to do ... then you're going to send me a picture of your ..."

Don't Tell. Show. Not just with pictures. Craft a narrative. Think of details that are highly suggestive without saying what you actually mean. The imagery of "pants around your ankles" is far more titillating than telling her you want to pull her pants down. The small details are what make the experience come alive for the imagination - not just for her, but for you as well.

Don't Be a Poet. The offset of the previous point is not to go crazy with metaphors and grandiose language. It destroys authenticity. When you evoke her brain, you ruin immersion. You want your brains to be shut off from the fact that this is all text and living in the scene you're setting.

Use Your Senses. Don't just talk about what she looks like. Consider your five senses in the way you paint a picture.

- What do you see? How are her clothes resting on her body? Are they sliding down her shoulder? Are they in a heap on the floor as you walk over them? Are her nipples standing upright? Are her breasts clenched together? What does she see? Is she staring into your gaze? Are her sight and thoughts lost in the black behind her eyes? Are the lights on or dim or off?
- What do you feel? Are there goosebumps? Does a rush of cold air blow over you? What does the room smell like? Are you imagining lit candles? Clean bedsheets?
- What do you hear? Is she moaning? Is the ceiling fan gently humming? Is there a sexy playlist on in the background? Are the springs creaking?

- What do you taste? How delicious is it for her body to run across your tongue? Are you toying with strokes of sweet strawberries or frigid ice across her tongue?
 - What do you smell? Are there candles in the room? Does your nose catch the scent of her southern aroma? Is she riding you so hard that you can smell the energy dripping off her skin?
-

You have any other tips that have worked for you? I'd love to hear them. While I've immensely enjoyed my experiences with sexting, especially as one of the few areas where I get to express my writing prowess with my wife, I recognize that I don't do it often and would love to hear more about what works and what doesn't. Given the fact that my wife travels quite a bit for work during busy seasons, this is an art I'd like to continue enhancing and practicing more frequently when the situation calls for it.

My wife decided to snoop on my computer last week and managed to find this account. Hi, babe! No, I'm not creating some stupid throwaway account or changing my profile. The first post she read was [The Consciously Crazy Wife](#). Yikes! Haha. "I knew you were hiding something, and I just wanted to know *all of you*," she said. It was a clear invasion of privacy, and I called her on that, but women are gonna do what women are gonna do. So, I ask her with a smile if she'd read [my OYS comment about enjoying her dripping wet juices](#). She had, and we laughed together, though she was a bit embarrassed.

I think she likes being a bit embarrassed when it's just between the two of us. She'd never admit it openly, but her behaviors in those moments don't lie. Another thing that I haven't done often, but also gets her embarrassed, is sexting. So, I figured I'd write a post on it. Let's see how embarrassing this can get ;)

SEXTING FRAME

Texting is only for logistics, right? As a general rule, yes. But there are times, especially for married men, where it can be advantageous to rev up the engines even before you get home from work or while one of you is away on business. I do not sext very often. But when I do, I really enjoy it. It's a fantastic experience. Sometimes she seems to get into it, whereas other times she's quite dismissive. Unless she's sexting right back, it's not always easy to gauge how she's receiving it, but I'm not as interested in that, as the stage it sets is usually quite fruitful when we're back together again.

What makes it difficult to gauge is that you have no behaviors to observe. All you get is what she says, which isn't always reliable. While a particular line might make her feel warm and blush, she could very well respond: "Stop it. This is uncomfortable." Or she might say, "Aw, that's cute. Are you picking up the kids today?" and totally dismiss what you said until you get home and she's ready to go. Other times she may play along. If all you get are her words, you have no idea what's really going on in her head.

Conclusion? Sexting is less about how it makes her feel and more about how it makes me feel. I simply enjoy talking sexy to my wife. It shows confidence and dominance, especially in those times that she doesn't engage. It sets a plan and expectations for how the night is to go. It makes me horny all day so I'm rock hard by the time the kids are in bed.

Now, I'm married to a reserved "good Christian girl" type. Any form of "naughty talk" makes her feel awkward and uncomfortable. Just taking a selfie showing some cleavage is groundbreaking for her. As a result, her ASD is remarkably high when it comes to these types of things. So, it's automatic for me not to expect or look for any validation in her responses (not to say she doesn't give it). But I still do it anyway. Why? Because I find it fun. And it's great when she does respond anyway.

DEVI

I'm sure there's a lot of nuance based on the particulars of each person, but bear with me. While I'm a lawyer by trade, I love writing in my spare time. I've written both fiction and non-fiction books - but fiction writing has been particularly helpful to me. When I'm thinking about how I want my night to go, it doesn't just run through my head like a scene in a movie that I'm watching. As with writing fiction, I can place myself in the scene and experience the fullness of the moment yet to come. That's what makes sexting come alive for me - it's not just imaginative foreplay; it's a whole new world of anticipatory gratification. Instead of wishful expectation, I find myself immersed in a world of my own making and inviting my wife to join me there.

Even beyond the principles you'll find below that I draw from my experience as a writer, there are some basic concepts that are valuable to making sexting a fun and enjoyable experience for me, and hopefully for you too, and which can set a solid stage for evening activities. I have found Daniel Rose's "DEVI" system quite helpful in creating a framework for me to really get into it, which I hope and often find gets her into it as well.

- **Dominance:** Sexting works best for me when it comes from my frame as something I'm leading for my enjoyment and I'm inviting her along for the ride. I set the stage, she follows. I push boundaries and make her feel uncomfortable. I'm in charge of the conversation and say what I want, free of restraint. I also don't place pressure or expectation on her to respond a certain way. My sexual energy directed toward her through text is not dependent on her approval. I can just be me.
- **Emotion:** I have to be feeling it. My emotional state matters most. If I'm into it, she can get into it. To transfer my enjoyment into her, I must target her feels, which is when reciprocation is most likely to occur. With no emotional transference, while I may be having fun, she'll ultimately write me off and not engage back. This is where I screwed up the most recent time I tried this - I hopped in too far too fast and didn't get her feeling it right away. When she wants it, she'll play along.
- **Variety:** I'm sure you can imagine what a boilerplate sext conversation looks like. I'm a lawyer and even I hate reading boilerplate, no matter how interesting the document is otherwise. If she doesn't know where you're going to go with the conversation, it leaves room for anticipation of what might come next.
- **Immersion:** This is the single most important aspect of sexting for me. It's what makes it most enjoyable. When actually having sex, immersion often happens naturally. When sexting, it takes a lot of work to leave your environment and feel in the moment. Why? Because you're looking at a screen with the lights on and not actually experiencing anything that's being said. Yet romance novelists are able to create immersion for women in airports, coffee shops, and even public restrooms all the time. It's doable. But it requires creativity and stage-setting. I have found myself so immersed in these types of conversations that I must step away from my office desk to make sure I'm not leaking in my pants.

With those principles in mind ...

PRACTICAL TIPS

Of the list below, take what works for you and leave the rest behind. These are just things that have been helpful to me in maximizing my enjoyment of sexting with my wife.

Be Authentic. What makes sexting most enjoyable for me is that I authentically want to do everything I'm texting. That doesn't mean I can't embellish, but my words are coming from raw, genuine desire and expressing parts of my intentions that often go left unsaid. And they usually should go unsaid if you're not at a distance. Do, don't say. But there's still value in saying it from time to time and expressing your sexuality in a different way. Besides, if you're not authentic and just screwing around, she'll see through it and it ruins the experience.

This is Not a Joke. While you can joke, don't let the entire exchange become a joke. There's sometimes a temptation (especially if sexting is brand new to your relationship) to maintain plausible deniability by doing something in a way that it can be played off as a gag.

Example of what not to do: Take a dick pick. She responds shocked and confused rather than engaging the way you hoped, so you say, "Yeah, that was funny. Can you imagine if we actually did those things like other people do? Haha. Glad we're not like those weirdos." No. Don't do that. Own it. Again, be authentic.

Strategically Limited Use of Emojis. I prefer to avoid emojis whenever possible. However, sometimes the situation calls for it. The best use of emojis seems to be for transitions. You're having a serious conversation about

who's getting the kids to practice, then you transition with a wink to change gears from logistics to flirting with a transitional phrase.

Example: "Thanks for taking care of that. I'll have to reward you later ;)"

Saying this with a straight expression, no emoji, some people might not get the hint. Once you use this singular emoji, because the context of the conversation has already changed you shouldn't need to overdo it afterward. She should recognize the suggestive nature of your speech.

Be Different. Abuse the impersonal and tone-deaf nature of texting by acting out of character. If you're normally a serious, straight-shooter, add some humor and light banter to your sexting. If you're usually a comedian in the home, imagine your persona as that of a secret agent trying to get a Russian spy into your hotel room. This change of character adds an air of mystery that's a little exciting. Even if she doesn't know you're doing this, it can also give you slight hints of role-playing if you've never yet introduced that into your marriage.

Ex. You're typically a funny guy in the home. While you can incorporate humor into your sexting, maybe you shift from humorous flirtation to serious. "I want you. Against the wall. I'll look you dead in the eye. My left hand will hold your face. You can't look away as my fingers slide inside you. I want to see that moment in your eyes."

The reverse should apply as well. If you're typically a straight shooter, try to add a bit more humor and light-heartedness.

Use Strategic Pauses. Long paragraphs are great for novels, but they don't let her linger on the moment. Sexting should build over time and take time. Novels can get a girl going because there's enough content for her to read for an hour straight to keep the tingles alive. When you're texting, you can't type that fast. You have to let her linger from phrase to phrase, waiting for what comes next. Put periods in sentences that you'd otherwise string together.

Ex. "I want you against the wall so I can look you in the face while I slide my fingers inside" becomes the example in the previous point, broken up with a new text where every period is, maybe leaving 10-20 seconds between texts.

Make Her Feel Like the Perverted One. ASD may cause her to present as sweet and innocent, maintaining her self-image (particularly true among Christian women). Nevertheless, if you ignore her self-perceived innocence and act like she's making the dirty comments, this can open up the atmosphere for further conversation. If she feels like you already think she's a little kinky, she has the freedom to feel a little kinky and engage in-kind.

Ex. After the "I'll have to reward you later ;)" text (above), my wife replies: "Flowers? :D" Total ASD. She knew what I meant. So, I respond: "Hmm ... props for being creative. I never thought about using flowers that way before."

Lead by Example. If you want her to say something flirty, be flirty first; if you want her to say something dirty, say something dirty first; if you want her to send a naughty picture, send a naughty picture first. Just don't run faster than she's willing to go if you're expecting her to respond in-kind. Pace the escalation.

Ex. I was once flirting with my wife while she was in an air port and I was at work. I was escalating to the point of exchanging pictures. She was shy and unwilling to show cleavage. So, although my ordinary tone of texting is serious (and therefore I'm employing more humor in the banter), I take a pic of myself pulling my work-shirt down with my pecs pressed together, making a kissy face. "See how easy that was?" It made her laugh and she returned in kind.

Use Additional Technology. I have Google Home and Amazon Firesticks set up in my house, each linked to my Spotify account. While at the office with my wife working from home, in the midst of sexting my wife I pulled up Marvin Gaye's "Let's Get it On" and remote-casted it to one of the devices in my house. Apparently it scared her at first (note: check your volume levels before you leave the house), but got her to laugh and pulled sexting out of her phone and into her ears.

Don't Ask or Beg. "Can you send me a nip pic?" is not cool. "C'mon. Just do it. You know you want to." Even

worse.

Do Give Instructions. "Tell me ..." or "I'm going to do ... then you're going to send me a picture of your ..."

Don't Tell. Show. Not just with pictures. Craft a narrative. Think of details that are highly suggestive without saying what you actually mean. The imagery of "pants around your ankles" is far more titillating than telling her you want to pull her pants down. The small details are what make the experience come alive for the imagination - not just for her, but for you as well.

Don't Be a Poet. The offset of the previous point is not to go crazy with metaphors and grandiose language. It destroys authenticity. When you evoke her brain, you ruin immersion. You want your brains to be shut off from the fact that this is all text and living in the scene you're setting.

Use Your Senses. Don't just talk about what she looks like. Consider your five senses in the way you paint a picture.

- What do you see? How are her clothes resting on her body? Are they sliding down her shoulder? Are they in a heap on the floor as you walk over them? Are her nipples standing upright? Are her breasts clenched together? What does she see? Is she staring into your gaze? Are her sight and thoughts lost in the black behind her eyes? Are the lights on or dim or off?
- What do you feel? Are there goosebumps? Does a rush of cold air blow over you? What does the room smell like? Are you imagining lit candles? Clean bedsheets?
- What do you hear? Is she moaning? Is the ceiling fan gently humming? Is there a sexy playlist on in the background? Are the springs creaking?
- What do you taste? How delicious is it for her body to run across your tongue? Are you toying with strokes of sweet strawberries or frigid ice across her tongue?
- What do you smell? Are there candles in the room? Does your nose catch the scent of her southern aroma? Is she riding you so hard that you can smell the energy dripping off her skin?

You have any other tips that have worked for you? I'd love to hear them. While I've immensely enjoyed my experiences with sexting, especially as one of the few areas where I get to express my writing prowess with my wife, I recognize that I don't do it often and would love to hear more about what works and what doesn't. Given the fact that my wife travels quite a bit for work during busy seasons, this is an art I'd like to continue enhancing and practicing more frequently when the situation calls for it.

BIO

Calvin Coolidge was America's 30th president. He got his start practicing law in Massachusetts with the philosophy that the best way he could serve his business clients was not to fight diligently in court, but to keep them out of court in the first place. He worked hard and his solo practice boomed as a result. He met a teacher named Grace in 1903 and they were married two years later. Despite their financial successes, Coolidge insisted on living a frugal life, often preferring to rent over purchasing his own house.

After being elected to city council, solicitor, and the clerk of courts, he eventually rose to be elected to the state house of representatives. After his second term, he returned home to grow his family and run for mayor of his hometown of Northampton. In a single year he upped teacher salaries, decreased the city's debt, and still managed to lower taxes. He was persuaded a year after that to become a state senator. In his third term he became president of the state senate, then ascended to lieutenant governor and eventually governor of Massachusetts.

In 1920 he was selected to run as vice president alongside Warren G. Harding. While Harding campaigned from his hometown, Coolidge toured the northeastern states, attracting a crowd who appreciated the brevity and potency of his speeches. They won.

After Harding passed away, Coolidge was awoken to press at his door in the middle of the night. He put on his clothes, said a prayer, accepted the oath of office, then went back to bed. During the next election cycle, after placing his name on the ballot, his son died. Due to his grief, Coolidge chose not to campaign hard. While his opponent ran in the fashion of many modern politicians today, Coolidge refused to run a smear campaign or even mention his opponent by name, instead focusing all of his speeches on his theories of government and what is best for the country. He won.

Coolidge's presidency resulted in massive economic growth known as the "Roaring Twenties." His administration imposed almost no regulations on businesses, deferring virtually all legislation over businesses to the states, allowing capitalism to thrive.

He also had some of the biggest tax cuts in history. By 1927 only the wealthiest 2% of taxpayers paid any federal income tax at all. He believed, as evidenced by the economic growth the nation experienced during his tenure, that a reduction in taxes provided more money for the purchase of goods, which helped businesses who could use those funds to hire more workers, and on and on. Despite cutting taxes so severely, he didn't have to decrease the federal budget - it remained flat. Yet he was also able to pay off 1/4 of the national debt - a remarkable accomplishment.

Ronald Reagan, hailed as one of the greatest economic leaders in American history and founder of what we now call "Reaganomics" for the great success he had while in office, acknowledged that his success came from the model Calvin Coolidge had established.

LIFE LESSONS FROM SILENT CAL

Calvin Coolidge was the master of STFU. Dorothy Parker, a celebrity at the time, was once seated by Coolidge at a dinner party. She informed him that she had made a bet that during the course of the meal she could make him say more than five words. He only ever gave her two: "You lose."

- How often does your wife intentionally try to rile you up and get you talking? How often do you end up saying something stupid in those moments?

He often sat through entire social events without uttering a word. When asked of this behavior he replied, "If you don't say anything, you won't be called on to repeat it."

- How many times has your wife tried to repeat things you have said, in the midst of an argument? Would you have been better served if you'd just kept your mouth shut?

In one of his early positions he was required to run through several meetings every day. Somehow he always left at 5pm. One of his colleagues, who was often there until 9pm, once asked him: "Look, you and I have the same job. We talk to the same number of people. Yet you leave at five every day and I'm here until nine. How come?" Coolidge answered, "You talk back."

- How much time in your day is wasted from chit chat that you don't even want to be having? Are the conversations you're having actually advancing your mission and social influence, or are they idle words that accomplish very little?

As a vice president, he attended every cabinet meeting, but it's said that unless someone asked him a question directly he never opened his mouth, despite listening and absorbing every detail. He later said, "You can't know too much, but you can say too much." It wasn't through dominating the conversation that Coolidge learned what he needed in these meetings in order to later become a successful president - it was by STFU.

- Are you actually paying attention to what's going on in your home? Are you learning from what you observe, or are you too busy talking all the time that you miss what's actually happening?

Even when he decided not to run for a third term as president after the death of his son, one article notes: "He did not talk about his feelings. Instead, he simply wrote a note to reporters saying: 'I do not choose to run for President in 1928.'"

- How often are you quick to talk about and express your feelings rather than limiting your words to those which actually need to be said?

On his death, Coolidge's will was administered, being only one sentence of 23 words long: "Not unmindful of my son, I give all of my estate, both real and personal, to my wife, Grace Coolidge, in fee simple." Now, as an attorney he should have known that this is not ideal (no executor, no succession plan if his wife predeceases him, etc.), but it certainly highlights his character for simplicity.

- When you give instructions about how your house is to be managed, do you fill it with a lot of bloat, or do you get right down to the point?

SEXUAL HUMOR

This deserves a section of its own. Coolidge and his wife were touring a government farm and went on separate tours. Passing by a prize rooster, a farmer noted that among the rooster's many talents was that he had sex multiple times a day. Mrs. Coolidge said, "Be sure to tell that to Mr. Coolidge when his tour comes by."

When it was his turn at that end of the tour, the farmer delivered the message. Calvin asked, "Is it with the same hen every time?" The farmer answers, "Oh, no. It's with a different hen each time."

"Be sure to tell that to Mrs. Coolidge."

LEADERSHIP AND LEARNING

What fascinates me most about Coolidge is that he proved that STFU doesn't just work on an individual level, but even on a global and economic scale. He believed that the best way of leading was not by speaking, but by doing. His system of governance was based on enabling the states under his headship rather than stifling them through additional rules and boundaries from federal regulation. He did not demand that others follow his ideals; rather, he

redirected the momentum that they already had into purposes that suited his greater vision.

It was said of him, "Calvin Coolidge believed the least government was the best government; he aspired to become the least president the country had ever had; he attained that desire." Sound familiar? Matthew 19:30.

Many men believe that the best way to run a household is to set clear boundaries and enforce them. Certainly there is a need for boundaries, but I often find men with way too many rules and regulations. I met with one guy who became upset with his wife because she faced the dishes in the dishwasher one way instead of 90 degrees the other way. Seriously?!

The mark of a good leader, as I have often found, is not that he tries to control his subjects; rather, it is that he points them in the right direction and empowers them. I say this not merely because I know that my wife might be reading, but because it is true: I am proud of the work that my wife does. She has many great ambitions, though she rarely feels like she lives up to her own expectations. My goal has never been to stifle her ambitions, as if that would somehow make me feel superior to her (a la the 4th quote below). I have always wanted to point her in the right direction - a direction that furthers the purposes God gave me over our family - and encourage her in that path.

That is what I see in Calvin Coolidge's presidency. He communicated his vision to the states for what they could be (ex. his [Have Faith in Massachusetts speech](#)), then ran his office in a way so as to empower them to live out that vision in the manner they are each individually called.

I mentioned in a previous post Brian Sanders' book *Underground Church*, which adopts a substantially similar model of church governance: rather than trying to support church leadership through keeping people in the seats, we must empower the empowered within the church to go out into the world. Rather than defining and bolstering the boundaries of a singular congregation, he minimized the pressures from the headship (akin to federal authority) over the people and empowered the micro-churches (akin to states) to do what Christ was calling them to do, after pointing them in the right direction. This is a wonderful lesson we must all learn.

Coolidge also believed in a system of self-governance, as America was founded on. There exists a wide chasm between the "us" of the people and "them" who are the leaders of our nation. Coolidge had a different impression of this dichotomy, noting: "We draw our Presidents from the people. It is a wholesome thing for them to return to the people. I came from them. I wish to be one of them again." He recognized the importance of self-governance and also that "self government means self support."

Imagine if our churches understood this in leadership? That the pastor is not the "them" of leadership, but one of "us" - one of many in a mass of royal priests called to carry on the good work that Jesus started! There are countless additional principles that can be learned from his leadership, but these are the ones that strike me the most.

COOL(idge) QUOTES

Men do not make laws. They do but discover them.

This is, of course, what we do here. We do not decide what is true for ourselves; rather, we search the Scriptures and observe relational praxeology and discover what is true.

Courts are established, not to determine the popularity of a cause, but to adjudicate and enforce rights.

If only the masses protesting the Kavanaugh hearings understood this.

Nothing in this world can take the place of persistence. Talent will not; nothing is more common than unsuccessful men with talent. Genius will not; unrewarded genius is almost a proverb. Education will not; the world is full of educated derelicts. Persistence and determination alone are omnipotent. The slogan Press On!

has solved and always will solve the problems of the human race.

I have often tried to coast on my talent, genius and education. It doesn't work. Coolidge is right about the value of persistence.

Don't expect to build up the weak by pulling down the strong.

... contrary to popular liberal philosophy.

It takes a great man to be a good listener.

2/3 or 80/20 rule.

Our government rests upon religion. It is from that source that we derive our reverence for truth and justice, for equality and liberty, and for the rights of mankind. Unless the people believe in these principles they cannot believe in our government ... Of course we endeavor to restrain the vicious and furnish a fair degree of security and protection by legislation and police control, but the real reform which society in these days is seeking will come as a result of our religious convictions, or they will not come at all. Peace, justice, humanity, charity - these cannot be legislated into being. They are the result of divine grace.

Amen.

It is much more important to kill bad bills than to pass good ones.

Reminds me of Deep's and OZ's recent posts on the importance of killing unattractive behaviors as a higher priority than adopting attractive ones.

We cannot do everything at once, but we can do something at once.

Got it. Don't go Rambo, do start applying.

I have noticed that nothing I have never said ever did me any harm.

STFU.

I want the people of America to be able to work less for the government and more for themselves. I want them to have the rewards of their own industry. This is the chief meaning of freedom.

I've written in the past that "the marriage" doesn't exist, yet so many people live to serve "the marriage." u/redpillcoach's videos talk about how most marriage counselors focus on "the relationship" as some higher entity that must be fixed or gratified for the couple to be happy, but that Gottman and the red pill subs recognize this as a falsehood - that it is the people in the marriage who make up the marriage, and we must take individual responsibility for our life pursuits and how we behave. We must be whole on our own before we can be whole together.

We do not need more intellectual power, we need more spiritual powoer. We do not need more of the things that are seen, we need more of the things that are unseen.

A solid reminder of our focal priority.

Don't you know that four fifths of all our troubles in this life would disappear if we would just sit down and keep still?

Again: STFU.

They criticize me for harping on the obvious. If all the folks in the United States would do the few simple things they know they ought to do, most of our big problems would take care of themselves.

A la Deep's latest post and my post on [the importance of the basics](#) and the sidebar content on the 7 basics of following Christ.

The only way I know to drive out evil from the country is by the constructive method of filling it with good.

As in the 400-level content.

CONCLUSION

The length of this post notwithstanding: STFU.

Obviously there's a time and a place for talking. Being a talented conversationalist has significant value and should be employed in its time. If I had to boil down the lessons I take from this post - and maybe you find more - it would be these four:

- Yes, talking is what draws a crowd to you.
- STFU is what will keep them from walking away.
- Action is what will keep them following you.
- Empowering them to carry on your vision without micromanagement is what will make them effective in their following.

Over on /r/RedPillWomen someone just posted [a question about how to be more submissive](#). I thought this might be useful for any women who may be around, so I figured I'd put my reply up here.

Specifically, I recently made [this post](#) addressing 1 Peter 3 from the man's point of view - that it doesn't say we should ignore a woman's looks, and I gave a thorough analysis from the context of the passage of what it really meant. In this comment I break it down piece-by-piece to address how women should read the passage.

I always teach that the best qualities a man should look for in a woman are:

Faithful - That she is diligent with her responsibilities and puts into practice the things she learns, whether from her own self-improvement efforts, things her man tries to share with her, what she learns from life experience, etc. If a woman is not faithful to practicing what she preaches or what she learns, she is not submissive and is only interested in expressing herself rather than respecting others' expressions toward her.

Available - She has to have time to feed into the relationship. In an ideal world, the captain is steering the ship and the first officer makes herself available to him. How backwards would it be if, for example, Spock refused to show up on the bridge when Kirk called, instead expecting Kirk to change his shifts around to suit Spock's needs? If your man is on a mission beyond his pursuit of you - and he's not a good one if he's not - you should be willing to adjust your schedule to meet his needs, not demand that he meet yours. This is a point that many women miss out on, as most women are so self-entitled and flooded with male attention that they're used to the idea that men should bend over backwards to be with them. Healthy relationships are not built this way.

Teachable - Simply put: let your own beliefs be challenged and be willing to admit when you're wrong. Even if you're very confident in your belief, recognize that you might only be 98% confident and not 100% confident and respect the fact that there's still a 2% chance that you're wrong. I'd play the lottery a lot more if I had a 2% chance of winning every time. It's improbable, but still significant. Being teachable doesn't mean you cave all of your beliefs to whatever he teaches. It does mean that you're willing to give him the benefit of the doubt, entertaining his ideas and trying to understand them from his perspective **BEFORE** you start arguing against his points - and then, if you still disagree, believe and behave as you will. But if you insist on your own way all the time and are never willing to change your views to account for his perspective and a broader view of the world than your own individual view can see, this will be a serious hindrance and make a guy feel like he has no real authority in the relationship and that you don't respect his views or opinions.

Beyond those three core virtues, whether you believe everything it says or not, the Bible does have some good lessons to teach on the subject of submissiveness. While it's talked about in several places, I'll break down just one passage into bite-size sections, and hopefully this meets your request for a "set of points/ rules/ instructions." This is from 1 Peter 3:1-7.

Wives, in the same way submit yourselves to your own husbands

While this passage is only binding on the married, men often won't marry a woman who isn't displaying wife-like qualities before marriage as well, so there's a message here for single women too.

so that, if any of them do not believe the word, they may be won over without words by the behavior of their wives

Most women use the phrase "strong personality" a sugar-coated way of saying they talk too much, much like the

saying: "women don't sweat - they glisten." Sweat is sweat. Talking too much is talking too much.

Most often, the reason "strong personality women" talk too much is that they have an agenda and they want to persuade others of that agenda. This passage is suggesting that a better way to persuade a man is through your actions, not your words. Sound familiar? Basic RP concept: *Watch what they do, not what they say.*

[Bonus Points on doing over saying: Matthew 21:28-32]

when they see the purity and reverence of your lives.

That is, the specific behaviors that are going to win a man over to you are purity and reverence. Purity, in this context, does not mean sexual purity - after all, he's talking to wives who absolutely should be having sex with their husbands. He means a purity in the way their lives are clean. If you talk with crass words constantly, or smoke a pack a day, or grind with numerous random dudes on the dance floor - while you're welcome to do these things, instead of communicating "I'm soft and submissive" it communicates "I'm bold and edgy." Bold and edgy might be a way to get a guy interested in you in the first place, as it can set you apart from other women and certain bold, edgy traits can accentuate your SMV - but it's not going to keep him on the hook for very long, and you just might find yourself more likely to hook up over one night stands than attract a viable candidate for a long term relationship.

As for reverence, this is talking about the way you honor others around you. If you try to dominate the conversation or be the center of attention all the time (some of the time is fine), it reeks of self-centeredness and entitlement and often shows little respect for those around you. Rather than stepping over others to dominate the floor, try empowering others. Two key things that can really help show your reverence for others:

- When you have an opinion you want to share, 2 out of 3 times try stopping yourself, pick someone else in your group of friends, and ask that person: "What's your thought on that subject?" Bonus points if it's someone who doesn't share as much as others in the group.
- Learn to manage your silence threshold. Everyone has one. It's the length of time a conversation can stay silent before you feel compelled to break the silence with your own talking. For some people it's 2 seconds. If they hear 2 seconds of pause, it feels uncomfortable for them, so they just speak up, feeling like they're keeping the conversation going. But if someone else has a threshold of 5 seconds, that person will rarely ever speak up because the 2-second person keeps interjecting before the 5 second person ever feels there's enough room in the conversation to share her thoughts. This used to be a big problem for me, as my threshold was 1-2 seconds for a long time. I intentionally started counting to 10 before answering questions in group setting in order to become better at listening. Surprisingly, while I thought that my "charismatic conversation skills" were winning people over to me through wit and banter (and it did), I had even better relational results when I started employing this technique, as others in the conversation felt like I respected and revered them rather than as if I was trying to impress them.

Your beauty should not come from outward adornment, such as elaborate hairstyles and the wearing of gold jewelry or fine clothes.

That's not to say these things are bad - they're wonderful. But if you rest too heavily on these things, it comes off as vanity.

Rather, it should be that of your inner self, the unfading beauty of a gentle and quiet spirit, which is of great worth in God's sight.

Again, this doesn't mean you should ignore physical beauty. It simply means that if you have no inner-beauty, your physical beauty won't get you very far. You'll be setting yourself up for a string of one night stands, never managing

to maintain a guy in a relationship.

Inner-beauty here is defined as a gentle and quiet spirit. The whole "silence threshold" concept is one tactic of developing a quiet spirit. Avoiding coarse, demeaning, or insistent language is a way to develop gentility in how you communicate.

But even beyond talking, a gentle and quiet spirit is communicated best through mannerisms. Are you constantly waving your arms around or nudging people or making faces or rolling your eyes? Or are you respecting others' physical boundaries, maintaining composure through conversation, even when you hear things you don't like, and using softer means of physical contact? For example: if you sense that someone needs a hug, do you shout out: "Aw, come in here. You need a hug!" and then bear hug them, or do you walk quietly over, wrap your arms around and say, "It's okay, I'm here for you"?

For this is the way the holy women of the past who put their hope in God used to adorn themselves.

That is, this is a time-tested and proven tradition for female behavior.

They submitted themselves to their own husbands, like Sarah, who obeyed Abraham and called him her lord. You are her daughters if you do what is right and do not give way to fear.

In more historically remote cultures, they would have used the term "lord" instead of "captain" - the concept is the same. You ever watch a movie about King Arthur or Game of Thrones? You see this all the time: wives saying, "Yes, my lord" to their husbands. It is an acknowledgment of the authority structure in the home, communicating reverence for his leadership. I don't know many women who would even be willing to say, "Yes, my husband," with a straight face, much less "lord" or even "captain." But this was commonplace years ago - an aspect of historical culture that is lost in a modern feminized world.

More interestingly, though, is the final comment - that you must not only "do what is right," but also: "do not give way to fear." This is where most women slip up and start taking control. Instead of trusting their man to meet their needs, they feel they must take the reigns and get it done themselves. The idea of putting one's entire life on the line in order to "submit" to someone else's plan and trust for their provision is quite daunting. What fears are we talking about?

- Can he put food on the table and pay the mortgage without you insisting on maintaining your career?
- Will he ever actually take out the trash if you don't nag him?
- Will he really treat you well if you choose not to reward yourself?
- Will he provide for your emotional needs if you don't remind him to?

I'm sure you can think of many more, but I'm out of space. Hopefully this helps some.

Whose Responsibility Is It?

This is a much needed reminder for many guys, as I see this issue come up a lot. ~~Men~~ Little boys often get in fights with their wives about the allocation of chores around the house. "She does do the majority of the work," they say, "so I really should start chipping in more." "She has a valid point." "A good captain, should listen to his first officer. That's all I'm doing."

Guys, guys, guys ... whose house is it?

The husband's job is to be the manager over his family and household. 1 Timothy 3:5, Ephesians 5:22, 1 Cor. 11:3, 1 Peter 3:1-7, Genesis 2:20-24 and 3:16. Need I go on? It's YOUR HOUSE.

It's YOUR kitchen to clean. YOUR deck to build. YOUR car to fix. YOUR bathroom to scrub. YOUR bed to make. YOUR living room to pick up.

It's also ... YOUR career to advance. YOUR mission to fulfill. YOUR bills to pay. YOUR social influence to develop.

When God created women, he did not say, "Some things are her responsibility, and other things are the man's responsibility." He said, "I'm giving Adam the mission, but he's going to need someone to help him do it." Let me emphasize this so you can't miss it:

- **YOU DO NOT HELP HER WITH HOUSEWORK; SHE HELPS YOU.**

How Can I Do All That Myself?

Got it? "Yep, I should be doing all the housework too. But that seems impossible. I can't do EVERYTHING."

Idiot. No. You can't do everything. Gee ... if only God thought about that. If only he'd said something like, "It's not good for man to be alone. I shall create a helper suitable for him." Wouldn't it be nice if God gave men a helper to get all this stuff done that he's responsible for?

Just because you're responsible for doing something doesn't mean you must personally do it yourself. Is a CEO responsible for making sure his company's product gets sold? Of course! How else is he going to get the company to succeed? But is he the one actually going out on the sales calls and dialing the phone to the customers? No. He has a sales team that does that.

Field Report: A Solution

When I first started my RP journey I tried something bold in my house. **I wrote it up here**. My wife used to stress over all the things that needed to get done around the house. This stress only existed because she felt responsible for getting them done. She felt responsible for getting them done because I wasn't taking that responsibility. If I wasn't going to do it and she wanted it done, by default it falls on her. Then it became an argument over the fact that she couldn't do it all by herself. So, she would nag me to help her with things on her list of chores. Sound familiar?

- She was doing the exact same thing to me that I'm suggesting you, as men, should be doing in the reverse.

So, one day I spoke plainly to her: "For the next few days, I'm going to be responsible for everything that needs done around the house. I'm going to give you a list of chores to do and when you're done, you can do whatever you want. Go shopping. Watch TV. Crochet. Hang out with friends. I don't care - whatever you feel like. You are to do

nothing else productive - not even think about being productive - unless it's on my list. If something needs to get done and it doesn't get done, that's on me, not you."

Then I gave her a list of all of the exact same things she was already doing regularly anyway. Result? She was no longer stressed. Suddenly we were having sex again. And all the chores got done the same as before. Very quickly, I was able to stop micro-managing. I didn't need to give her clear lists because she understood the general allocation I was giving her.

Why did this work? First, because women are more stressed thinking about what needs to be done than by actually doing it, so I took the thinking part out of the equation. Second, when the weight of responsibility was off her shoulders and onto mine, that pressure relief felt great to her. Third, because I *actually took responsibility* instead of just leaving responsibility into limbo while pretending to take responsibility. I legitimately started thinking about what needed done and kept track and made sure attention was being given to things that were often neglected. Sometimes this meant adding more things to her list, other times it meant doing it myself. But that balance was entirely up to me, and she gladly helped with whatever I asked, rather than her nagging me to help her.

A LAW OF ATTRACTION

No woman wants to be married to a husband. Weird concept, I know. "Husbands," in a cultural sense, are not generally portrayed in very attractive ways. I started watching *Workin' Moms*, a Netflix original show, and it provides a prime example. Three husband archetypes are shown:

- Kate's husband is a typical beta. Even though he seems to have a decent job of his own, he exists exclusively to be his wife's yes-man. What she says goes, even when he obviously disagrees. She acts totally dismissive toward him.
- Jenny's husband is a stay at home dad/wanna-be writer who is appropriately paranoid that his wife constantly wants to cheat on him with her new boss.
- Anne's husband is a go-with-the-flow guy who we pretty much never see because he's so irrelevant to anything going on. She rolls her eyes and ignores him.
- Bonus points: Frankie's "husband" is an actual woman (lesbians) and they're not doing it either.

Lots of sexual dysfunction. This is how the media portrays husbands. The show also appropriately notes that these women are totally unattracted to their husbands. If that's what the media says it means to be a husband, no wife wants a husband.

Instead, the only attraction-based sexual tension that exists is from the girl who's into her bachelor boss. Girls like bachelors. Your wife was attracted to you when you were still a bachelor. You were sexually available and weren't the type of guy who was pinned down to whatever list of chores a woman was telling him to do. Even if you met your wife while you were still married to another woman (and therefore you weren't a bachelor), the fact that you were with her showed that you DNGAF about your wife's rules and boundaries, which certainly would not have included an allowance for cheating on her.

Women want bachelors - but not just any bachelor. They want a guy who has his crap together. I've never met a single woman in my life who would say, "I've got it all together." Every woman I've ever met would say, "I don't have it all together, but somehow those people seem to. Why can't my life be more like theirs?" They meet a bachelor with a decent job, a well-managed home, and hobbies that keep him entertained. She thinks: "I don't have it all together, but he seems to. Maybe I can leech off of his togetherness." So, she moves in (presumably after marriage) and lives it high for a couple years before she realizes that he's a beta who no longer has it all together because he became the guy who's pinned down by a woman's expectations on his life. See how that works?

APPLYING THE LAW

If you want your wife's genitals to well up for you the same way as when you were a bachelor, you've got to become a bachelor again. When you were dating, she came over to your house and used your kitchenware to cook with your food from your cupboards. She may even have used your vacuum to clean your carpets or folded your laundry and put it in your drawers.

Then she started testing boundaries, right? She wore her sweater and left it on your floor. So, you put her sweater in your drawer until she comes back. Then she leaves her lipstick on your dresser. Then she has a pile of her things in your house, so she asks for a drawer. Now she keeps her stuff in ~~your~~ her drawer in your house. Then you get married and she puts her body in ~~your~~ her house that she calls "our" house - "our" because it's hers, but she needs to convince you that you have an interest in taking responsibility too.

Notice all the "your ... your ... your" here? That's what I was conveying in the first section, above. Go re-read it with the bachelor-mentality in mind and see if that makes more sense to you now. Does she have a drawer in her dresser, or does she have her own dresser drawers that you're not allowed to encroach on? Try putting a few of your shirts in her drawers for a few weeks and see what she does. She might tell you to stop a few times first, then finally blow up at you when you don't. "Honey, it's my dresser. If I want to put my clothes in my dresser, I'm going to do it." You DNGAF.

Simply put, start acting like a bachelor again. Hopefully you weren't a slob of a bachelor who left dirty underwear on the living room floor for days. Make her feel like she is a guest in your home, not a co-owner of the home. This is a huge frame-shift, but if you pull it off properly you get to be king of your castle once again and she'll swoon at the opportunity to help you take care of your stuff and to help you raise your kids.

Field Report 2: Asking For Help

Should you go around acting all possessive over everything and telling her "mine ... mine ... mine" like a 2-year-old? No. Don't be an idiot. Just start taking on the responsibility and ask her to help you. I remember the first time I tried this out. I bought a golden honeydew melon. I was heading off to the gym and asked my wife to have it cut up for me by the time I got home. It was so weird. It was the first time in 8 years that I'd ever asked my wife to do something for me that she wasn't already going to do for herself anyway. Like the Nice Guy I was, I thought that asking for help would be off-putting and make her not want to have sex with me. "She already has enough on her plate," I told myself. "I shouldn't add more things to her to-do list." And I was right. She didn't like it ... at first.

But as I often say, if you're not satisfied with the life you're living, it's probably because you're not living the life you were designed for. She was designed to be a helper. How much would it suck be to be a wife in a marriage where your husband never asked you for help? You literally could never do your job. You could never feel fulfilled or satisfied. At best, you could guess at what would be helpful to your husband, but never actually know. That would be depressing.

And to stick on that point for just a second: this is something I need to work on too. I rarely verbalize the ways I need help from my wife. The things she innately does are often the helpful things I'd ask her to do anyway. But because I didn't ask, she doesn't know if I find it helpful or not. Indeed, when she can't do them, I do it myself anyway and everything's just fine. So, do I really need her? Is she really helpful? Does she have a role in our marriage? Those are the questions that fish through her head. Don't leave the "ask for help" part off the table like I have for too long. Why?

- If you don't ask for help and just let her decide on her own how she's going to be "helpful," you might not get the type of help you want.

- She may not feel helpful, and you'll be left wondering why she's unsatisfied and feels worthless in the relationship, affecting her sexuality as well.
- By asking for help, you are subliminally communicating that you're in charge - you're the responsible party and she's the helper, establishing an appropriate biblical framework for the marriage and displaying dominance.
- By asking for help, you're breaking your nice-guy habits and developing a spine, which will eventually get your household more on-track with your vision as you become comfortable asking for help not just in basic areas that she's already doing, but in more mission-oriented areas that actually matter to you.
- When you ask for help, even if you don't need it, you're mirroring Christ in the way he asks us to do things on his behalf, even though he could make the rocks cry out if we refused. God doesn't need our help, but he asks for it anyway - and you can reflect God's character in your marriage by doing this.

CONCLUSION

It's your house. You take responsibility. Ask for help you when you need it. Don't let her be the one to decide how she's going to help you. Mirror the image of Christ, who asks us for help, even though he could do it all by himself too.

24

UPVOTES

Solving a Foundational Problem on This Sub: Enabling Closet Bloops

15 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

I have failed this community. I have lost sight of one of the most important and fundamental aspects of biblical red pill praxtheology. Let's take a moment to get back on track.

Tag

I remember playing tag once. I was chasing another kid around the field. No matter how fast I ran, he was faster. I kept chasing and chasing, but he kept evading and evading, always a few steps ahead. Eventually I said, "I give up. Let's go back." He nodded and came over to walk with me.

You'd think my next words would be, "Tag, you're it!" Right? It was all a ruse just to win the game, wasn't it?

No. I actually stopped playing the game. If there was any hint that it was just a ruse, he would have been more on guard. You'd better believe he wouldn't have trusted me next time I wanted to quit, even if I was genuine. This could have destroyed my ability to get him to walk by my side in that context ever again.

The only way to achieve consistent results - getting him to stay within arm's reach of me - was to stop chasing him. I had to stop playing the game. As long as my goal was to tag him - especially if he knew that was my goal - I would have to work really, really hard to stand a chance, and still would rarely ever get him.

The Problem

I haven't been paying as much attention lately to differentiating when a man is blue or red. I have simply been identifying the man's goals and responding with thoughts and questions that may help him achieve those goals. The implicit and mistaken theory behind this conduct is that if a man is setting appropriate goals and achieving them, then he will become red pill, or will somehow become a more godly man. This is false.

The problem is: most of the time those goals are counter-productive to his ability to achieve them - and they're often misguided goals in the first place.

I know, it's a catch-22. You want to have a "happily ever after" marriage - but this very desire is what precludes you from ever having a "happily ever after" marriage. A goal only has value if progress toward it can be measured in some capacity. That measurement, then, becomes a judge over us. By making a goal of it, we let our sense of identity, validation, and self-worth become tied to the degree of progress we make. When we help others focus on progress in these goals, we enable them to continue allowing the metric established by the goal act as a judge over them.

I have been guilty of this enabling behavior. This forum has, in some respects, departed ways from biblical red pill praxtheology and turned into a "try this trick" advice-help forum. It's still better advice than you're going to get in any other Christian forum, but it is tainted advice. We are ignoring the fact that men here have maintained their blue pill ideologies and merely want to use the red pill as a series of strategies to accomplish their goals. Maybe I'm being too harsh, but this is what I'm seeing all the same.

Manifestation of the Problem

What, exactly, am I talking about here? What is this community doing that's so wrong?

We are divorcing the underlying truth from the byproduct behaviors.

Consider:

1. A man wants to fix all the fighting in his marriage. We tell him he must Agree & Amplify and practice amused

mastery, fog, etc.

2. A man wants to go out with a new girl. We give him conversational strategies, tell him to be confident, and send him on his way.
3. A man is trying to get his wife to respect him. We teach him about frame and how to maintain it, then have him adopt a mission and send him on his way.

What we're not recognizing here is:

1. A man wants to fix all the fighting in his marriage.
2. A man wants to go out with a new girl.
3. A man is trying to get his wife to respect him.

See it now? These are blue pill ideological goals. These people have a notion of what "happily ever after" will look like for them - even if it's a mildly realistic notion - and that's what they're really seeking. This is how the problem manifests here.

Before going much further, stop and think for a minute: *What does it really mean to be red pillled? Am I really red pillled if these are the things I'm seeking?*

Uprooting the Foundation

Are any of these bad things? No. Of course not. Should we keep making an intentional effort to solve these problems? Hmm. That's the question that gets more dicey. Let's start asking the more foundational questions:

1. Why do you want to fix the fighting in your marriage? Because you can't emotionally handle it? Because she might leave you if you keep fighting? Because your idea of "happily ever after" doesn't involve fighting? Because it's hindering you from your mission, the advancement of which is your real ultimate aim in all of this?
2. Why do you want to go out with a new girl? Because you just really want to get married someday so, so bad? Because you can't stop thinking about sex and you're hoping a hot wife - particularly this girl - might curb your craving? Because you've been conditioned by society to just assume you should get married and don't know what else to do with your life? Because someone in your life would be displeased if you don't get married someday? Because God gave you a seemingly impossible task to do alone and you need help and the girls helping you are so hot that you're going to end up sinning if you don't ask out and marry one of them?
3. Why do you want your wife to respect you? Because you can't feel validated in life if she doesn't? Because it embarrasses you to all your friends when she acts disrespectful in front of them? Because it keeps reminding you that you don't have the "happily ever after" you always wanted? Because your wife's respect is like the oil in an engine that keeps your ship running smooth in the direction God pointed you?

With any of these, will getting your short-term goal met actually result in any progress toward your long-term goal of making disciples of all nations? If not, why is it your goal? If so, is your mission part of the reason this is your goal or do you segregate them as separate issues in your mind? Or are you using your mission as a cop-out to "legitimize" these lesser goals as being your present highest priority to get solved?

"I really want to fix my dead bedroom marriage ... you know, but it's not just about the sex ... it's because it'll make more disciples ... and if you give me 5 minutes I'm sure I could find some way to rationalize why that makes sense." Don't be that guy.

If you are using "red pill strategies" (a somewhat oxymoronic phrase) to accomplish blue pill goals, you are blue. Purple, at best. In 5 days it will have been 6 months since I'd written [this post, about the Christian purple](#). Six months from now I hope not to have to write it a third time.

What Does the Bible Say

Paul talks about "unity" a lot. It's a big theme for him. Most of Ephesians is about this concept. 1 Cor. 12, among other places, talks about being a united body made up of many parts. Philippians 2 clarifies that our unity means we are to have "the same love, being one in spirit and in purpose."

- There is only one love: God.
- There is only one spirit: the Holy Spirit.
- There is only one purpose: Jesus' model of making disciples.

Nothing else matters. Let me provoke you: **Even married men should not strive to have better marriages.** "Let those with wives live as though they had none," Paul says. "Seek first God's Kingdom and all these things will be added to you as well," Jesus says. Let's live like these aren't just pieces of advice, but as if they are commands! Are these passages truly a part of your theological framework?

A Call to a Solution

What's going on here is that we're enabling men to use red pill strategies to gratify blue pill goals. On MRP I occasionally see the phrase in a derogatory context: "Sprinkle some alpha on it." We don't want to sprinkle alpha on our lives and marriages. We want to be alpha. We don't want to add a dash of Jesus in our life. We want to be Jesus - both to ourselves and to the world.

So, I'm calling you all to do three things:

1. After reading this post, (re-)read [this post](#).
2. Make a decision that you're going to adopt a one-track mind about your mission in life, that you're going to develop a VERY clear vision for how it will be accomplished, and then take 1 step toward that goal in the next 3 days.
3. Call out blue pill ideologies when you see them, addressing the ultimate core of each other's problems, rather than giving them a few more alpha techniques to sweep the issue under the rug with.

Let's stop making "better marriages" or "finding a great helper" our goal, stop enabling people who do make these things their goal, and get back down to the foundation of our praxtheology. This cannot happen merely by offering what the red pill has to say. We must identify the blue, call it out when we see it, and eradicate it to make room for the red. While not the same context, Matthew 12:43-45 somehow feels on-point here. Let's not invite Christ into a house inhabited by evil, nor the red into a house inhabited by the blue.

I'm reading a book titled Emotionally Healthy Spirituality. No, my title is not a mockery of the book - that's the title of the first chapter. That's as far as I am, but I'm hopeful that this book, which is the centerpiece of a teaching series in a small group I'm co-leading, will end up being valuable. That said, I wanted to share the 10-factor test he gives for "emotionally unhealthy spirituality," as it does overlap with some of what we discuss here.

1 - Using God to Run From God

These are Christians who don't nurture their own time with God. They're so focused on churchy-activities that they neglect their own time in the Word, prayer, scripture memory, etc. If your emotional stability is built on anything other than your validation in Christ, it will come toppling down. That includes activities that you say you're doing for Christ, when in reality you're doing them to try to prove yourself. This performance-based mentality of faith is not a healthy foundation for spirituality. Examples the author gives:

- Do God's work to satisfy me, not him
- Do things in God's name he never asked me to do
- Demonstrate "Christian behaviors" so significant people think well of me
- Use biblical truth to judge and devalue others
- Exaggerate my accomplishments for God to subtly compete with others
- Make pronouncements like, "The Lord told me I should do this," when the truth is, "I *think* the Lord told me to do this."

2 - Ignoring Anger, Sadness, and Fear

Christians are masters at sweeping things under the rug. We are told that certain negative emotions are ungodly, therefore we should not experience them. If we do, we must ignore them until they go away. I'm reminded of the hysterical musical, *The Book of Mormon* in the song **Turn it Off**, where they sing: "When you start to get confused because of thoughts in your head, don't feel those feelings. Turn it off instead. Turn it off, like a light switch. Just go 'click!' It's a cool, little mormon trick. We do it all the time!" Christians are trained to do the same things, quite often.

While the author doesn't encourage embracing these emotions, he does suggest we must deal with them rather than ignoring them or letting them control us.

3 - Dying to the Wrong Things

Some people read Luke 9:23 and take it too far. They deny themselves any actual pleasure. They feel guilty whenever they enjoy the things of this life. To quote the author: "God never asked us to die to the healthy desires and pleasure of life - to friendships, joy, art, music, beauty, recreation, laughter, and nature. God plants desires in our hearts so we will nurture and enjoy them. Often these desires and passions are invitations from God, gifts from him. Yet somehow we feel guilty unwrapping these presents."

Sound familiar to the way the church handles sex?

4 - Denying the Impact of the Past on the Present

Some people believe that becoming Christian means that all their baggage is gone. The burden of sin is certainly

removed, but we still carry with us the influences of our past. He talks about how he was counseling a couple on the brink of divorce. He had them talk about their parents' marriages, using several one-word descriptors to paint a picture of what they saw in their parents and how marriage was modeled for them. Surprisingly, the couple was surprised at the fact that the words they used to describe their parents' marriages were the same struggles they were experiencing. Shocking, I know. We follow in the mistakes of the people who raised us.

That's why we talk about girls with daddy issues and how men need other positive masculine figures in their lives, especially if they didn't get this from their fathers.

5 - Dividing Life Into "Secular" and "Sacred" Compartments

If you go to church on Sunday and are cussing at the poor driver on Monday, you've got a problem. Some people treat "congregation time" (I still try to avoid calling these churches, as they're not) as an opportunity to unload the baggage they've built up through the week so they can go back and rake in more the next. After listing some stats, the author points out: "The data suggests that in many crucial areas evangelicals are not living any differently from their unbelieving neighbors."

This is a truly crying shame - and one of the reasons why we call men here to be different. To lead different. To model a new kind of life for the rest of the world to follow, and to begin that modeling through individual discipleship relationships.

6 - Doing FOR God Instead of Being WITH God

This one seemed a repeat of the first to me. Maybe he had to add it to hit an even 10-number. So, I'll just quote something he put in this section: "Work *for* God that is not nourished by a deep interior life *with* God will eventually be contaminated by other things such as ego, power, needing approval of and from others, and buying into the wrong ideas of success and the mistaken belief that we can't [aren't allowed to] fail ... we become human 'doings' not human 'beings.'"

7 - Spiritualizing Away Conflict

Rather than facing conflict head-on, some people find ways to avoid it and rationalize that they're just trying to be peace-makers. Isn't that what God wants? Of course not. That's not making peace, that's covering up war. He gives several indications that this is happening.

- Say one thing to people's faces, then another behind their back
- Make promises we have no intention of keeping ("I'll pray for you")
- Give people the silent treatment
- Blame, attack, be sarcastic, act passive-aggressively
- Give in because we are afraid of not being liked
- "Leak" our anger by sending an e-mail containing a not-so-subtle criticism
- Tell only half the truth because we can't bear to hurt a friend's feelings
- Say yes when we mean no
- Avoid and withdraw and cut off [i.e. robot-mode butthurt]
- Find an outside person with whom we can share in order to ease our anxiety [especially if this emotional ease makes you comfortable enough that you're not willing to re-engage in the conflict after the meeting is over]

How many of these do you do in your marriage/relationships?

8 - Covering Over Brokenness, Weakness, and Failure

Same thing as the "ignoring anger, sadness, and fear" one, except he picked 3 new things this time. We talk here about OYS. Own Your Struggles. Own Your Shortcomings. Own Your Self. Own Your Stuff. I don't care what you call it. Don't hide your weaknesses like Nice Guys. Own up to it. If you're hiding it, it shows signs of emotional immaturity because you can't cope with the fallout of honesty about these areas of your life.

9 - Living Without Limits

We must be willing to set boundaries and enforce them. He gives the example of a guy who complained, "I spent two hours on the phone listening to this guy and it still wasn't enough for him - it makes me want to run away." He references that Jesus "did not heal every sick person in Palestine. He did not raise every dead person. He did not feed all the hungry beggars or set up job development centers for the poor of Jerusalem. He didn't do it, and we shouldn't feel we have to. But somehow we do. Why don't we take appropriate care of ourselves?" That's a good word.

10 - Judging Other People's Spiritual Journey

We all get the concept of judging. Yes, we may judge those within the church for the purpose of reconciling them to God (not blank condemnation), whereas we have no business judging those outside the church - God can do that. The problem the author notes is when "we often turn our differences into moral superiority or virtues. I see it all the time. We judge people for their music (too soft or too loud) We judge them for dressing up or dressing down, for the movies they watch and the cars they buy. We create never-ending groups to subtly categorize people:

- 'Those artists and musicians. They are so flaky.'
- 'Those engineers. They are so cerebral. They're cold as fish.'
- 'Men are idiots. They're socially infantile.'
- 'Women are overly sensitive and emotional.'
- 'The rich are self-indulgent and selfish.'
- 'The poor are lazy.'

The list goes on. These types of judgments show an insecurity on our own part - something that we're trying to compensate for by condemning others. This is the old "Hitler Excuse." "Yeah, I have my problems, but at least I'm not as bad as Hitler." Or, "At least I'm not as bad as those guys." This shows emotional immaturity - that we would need this form of validation in the first place.

From what I gather, this chapter was mostly about how to avoid validation-seeking and to own up to the negative aspects of your life. He's soft in the way he presents it, but the message is a good one all the same.

How do you all stack up? Here's my breakdown:

1. I used to be more committed to my mission than I was to my Master. I've got that fixed now. My mission is a byproduct of my relationship with Jesus, not a replacement for it.
2. I don't ignore anger, sadness, and fear anymore. I respect these feelings as they come, but it's also pretty rare to need to feel them in the first place if I've got God working for me.
3. I don't have a problem with dying to the wrong things - biblical RP has taught me that it's okay to "eat, drink, and find satisfaction in my work, for this too I see is from the hand of God" (Ecc. 2).

4. I do deny the impact of the past on my present. This might be the one area that I over-ignore. Perhaps it's because I've already recognized and overcome the major negative influences I had in my upbringing - like the way my dad's cold approach to serious conversations caused me to believe I was shy, and that I became quite extroverted when I learned to overcome this. But there may still be more lingering that I simply haven't considered yet.
5. I don't have any problems compartmentalizing my life into "secular" and "sacred" bits - it's all "sacred" and my mission is always on all the time, no matter what I'm doing.
6. *Practice the Presence of God* really helped me master the art of being with God at all times - whether I'm doing things for him or not. I highly recommend it.
7. Developing biblical RP qualities precludes me from feeling like I must avoid conflicts. Amused mastery gives me the perspective to laugh them off and be okay with it when it happens.
8. OYS again - no need to cover over brokenness and failures here, though I certainly had that issue in the past.
9. I also know how to set clear boundaries and enforce them. Thanks again to biblical RP disciplines.
10. I suspect many guys will struggle with the judgmentalism. It's inherent in the anger phase. I never went through the anger phase. Instead of judging women, as OZ recently wrote in his letter to an incel, I'm okay with embracing them as they are. Instead of burning with rage at the thought of blue pill pastors and incel church leaders, I see them as an extra mission field - people who need God's guidance, and that I might be a vehicle to give it.

All in all, I feel pretty emotionally healthy right now. No surprise there - I've been red pillled for a couple years now, and most of the journey is about developing emotional health. I couldn't have said the same before then. I would have failed most of these. Hopefully this list can give you all some basic metric for self-evaluation and new fodder for posting in the OYS threads!

As I mentioned in my last post, I'm co-leading a class on the book "Emotionally Healthy Spirituality" (not my pick). The second chapter is about knowing yourself. After we split the group, my half of the class was struggling to even understand what I meant by the question: "Who are you?"

I'm not surprised, many people can't answer that question, or they give wrong answers. And **YES**, despite what liberal media will tell you, there is a wrong answer to that question.

So, I decided to break it down for my half of the class. They were so deeply moved and impacted by the way I approached the topic that they all pushed me to write up a summary of what I had shared with them so they could take it to others that they suddenly wanted to start discipling. I figured if I'm going to write it up anyway, I might as well post it here for you all too.

WHO AM I?

Most people don't know who they are. If you ask them, they will list off things that they like to do or values that are important to them and identify with those activities or values to the degree that they practice them. "I'm a soccer player because it's my favorite thing in the world to do." "I am an honest, hard-working, goal-driven conservative." Would you have answered something like this?

One woman in our group wisely noted: "I'm a daughter of the Living King." Excellent. This is a true identity - and we rightfully should get our identity through our Father. This is why children always take their father's name (if he's in the picture). But there is another life-changing event where a person can lose their parent's name - especially women - and take on a new identity. Do you know what that is? That's right: marriage. But let's hold that thought for now.

False Sources of Identity

The author of *Emotionally Healthy Spirituality* notes from looking at the temptation of Jesus that there are three things that people wrongly look toward as their identity. While I can't remember which 3 P words he actually used, the concepts are the same:

- **Performance.** Satan told Jesus, "If you are really God, prove it by turning this rock into bread." He was trying to get Jesus to prove his identity through his performance. This is the mistaken "I am what I do" mentality that many people fall into.
- **Perception.** Satan told Jesus to jump from the temple so that the angels would save him. This would have occurred in front of everyone and proved the Scriptures to them about Jesus' divinity. But Jesus didn't feel compelled to prove himself. This is the mistaken "I am what others think I am" mentality.
- **Possessions.** Satan finally offered the entire world to Jesus if Jesus would worship him. Jesus declines, saying he will only worship God. This is the false belief that we are defined by our possessions or life successes - by our capacity to live up to the American dream (or whatever motivations your country gives you toward success).

Part of knowing who we are starts with knowing who we are not - at least getting the big 3 out of the way. Does an elephant stop being an elephant because it learns to dance (performance)? No, it's still an elephant. Does a donkey become a zebra because it paints some stripes on itself to fool some people (perception)? No, it's still a donkey. Does a pig stop being a pig when it wears a gold ring in its snout (Proverbs 11:22) and adorns itself with robes and a scepter and a crown (possessions)? No, it's still a pig.

True Source of Identity

There's another P that the author failed to mention, and it's the actual source of identity: **Purpose**.

Have you ever read a book? Sure you have. If I held one up and asked you what it is you'd rightly say: "It's a book." But what if I took all of the words and letters out of it. What is it then? Is it still a book? No. It's a stack of paper glued together. What makes it a book? The fact that you can read it. The author of a book creates words. He designed the pages for a purpose. If they're not fulfilling that purpose and the words can no longer be read, it's no longer a book.

Have you ever seen a TV? Sure you have. If I pointed to one and asked what it is you'd rightly say: "It's a TV." But what if it stopped telecasting any signals. Suppose the screen died and it only shows black forevermore. What is it then? Is it still a TV? No. It's a hunk of metal and wires. What makes it a TV? The fact that it televises a signal through its screen. If it's not fulfilling that purpose because it can't televise anything, it's no longer a TV.

Have you ever seen a human? Sure you have. If I pointed to one and asked what it is you'd rightly say: "It's a human." But what if it stopped ...

Get the point?

The Point

If we are defined by our intended purpose, we must ask what that purpose is. There are two angles to discern this, both which lead to the same conclusion.

Creation

The first and most obvious approach is to look to God's intentions through creation. In the beginning God created man and woman. This was on the final day of creation and the very first command he gave them was this: "Be fruitful and multiply. Fill the earth in number." Great. Adam and Eve multiplied their lives through their children, their children's children, and through the chain of lineal descendants onward. By the time Noah was on the earth, the earth was a pretty fully place. **Some people estimate there could have been as many as 10 trillion people on the planet at the time** (I agree this is doubtful, that's not the point to argue here). Even conservative estimates suggest that there were at least billions - likely more than we have on the earth today. Yet God wiped them all away with a flood.

Why would he do that? If his primary purpose for creating humanity was to fill the earth in number, why would he kill off all of those people? "Because they were wicked," someone appropriately always says. But when we give that answer we're presuming God had a different purpose for humanity in Genesis 1:28 than merely populating the earth. And they're right!

Malachi 2:15 affirms this when it explains the purpose of marriage: "Why did the Lord God make them one with a portion of his Spirit in their union? **To produce godly offspring.**" Before Noah, the world was missing the "godly" part in "godly offspring." People were just producing offspring - but that's never what God intended. It was never about filling the earth with those who are physically alive; it was always about populating the planet with those who are spiritually alive.

How does one become spiritually alive? He must be "born again," as Jesus put it to Nicodemus. That is, he must be saved. As Paul says in Romans 9, it is not those who are the physical descendants of Abraham who were God's true people, but those who were the descendants of the promise of Abraham - those who were of the same faith. That is, the true purpose of humanity is to fill the earth with believers who are part of God's Kingdom - his holy church. How do we do this? Malachi 2:15 uses the imagery of a husband and wife with their child. That is, they must have a child first, then they must raise him to be godly. Or in the spiritual sense, we must work toward someone being born (again) first, then raise them to be godly. In more common terminology, we call this evangelism and discipleship.

Commission

With the above in mind, it's not hard to see the second way we can understand the purpose of humanity. If we look at the Bible from a big-picture perspective we see that God is always at work toward one primary goal: building a kingdom for himself. In the old testament he used the nation of Israel as the physical model or example of the type of kingdom he would be building. In the new testament, Romans 9 reveals that it was never the physical kingdom that God intended, but the spiritual kingdom that he would claim as his own - that is, the church. Just as the entire old testament was about the rise and fall of the physical kingdom, the new testament is entirely about the rise of God's spiritual, eternal kingdom.

The King's glory is found in the size and quality of his Kingdom. God will accept nothing less than perfection as to quality - and through Christ we are being made perfect, as we will be when we are in heaven for eternity. That leaves the quantity component. It's our job to bring people into God's Kingdom, as God desires everyone to be saved (2 Peter 3:9).

When Jesus began his earthly ministry he called the 12, saying, "Follow me and I will make you fishers of men." He told them their purpose up-front: you're going catch people and draw them in to my Kingdom. That is, you're going to make disciples. He spent his entire human ministry discipling them. That's why they were called his disciples. He lived out this purpose for them to see. When he ascended he commanded them: "Go, therefore, and make disciples of all nations."

It should be beyond question that Jesus' mission in life was to make disciples - and that his death and resurrection was the ultimate vehicle through which those disciples could enter into God's Kingdom and be made perfect. If that is Christ's mission and we are Christ's bride, what does that say about our mission?

Why was Eve created? To be Adam's helper. In the Garden God had given Adam clear tasks - name the animals, care for the plants, etc. God gave him Eve as a helper to accomplish his mission - but the commands were always given to Adam. If Christ is our groom - our Adam - then we, as his bride, are meant to be a helper to him on his mission. Given that Christ's mission is to make disciples of all nations, bringing His Gospel to all people, then this is our purpose as well.

What does it mean to make disciples?

It's not enough to understand vague words about our purpose. The word "discipleship," for example, means a lot of different things to a lot of different people. The mainstream church today uses a definition that is so vague that it lacks any appreciable value: "following Jesus." To be frank, I don't care what the mainstream church means by the word. I care what Jesus meant by it. When he commanded us to "make disciples of all nations" he didn't mean only the result - that people in all nations would be following him; he also meant the process. He had a very clear image in his mind about what he was communicating, proved by the fact of his life preceding his ascent. He's telling the disciples: "What I just did with you for the last 3 years - I want you to go do that for the rest of the world." That understanding behind Jesus' commission carries a much greater weight than what most people understand today, but when we put ourselves in the disciples' shoes, it seems so obvious!

So if evangelism and discipleship (two halves of the same spectrum) are our mission, what do they mean? How can we live them out?

Evangelism is the process by which we, Christ's bride, unite with our groom to produce new spiritual life - that someone else may be "born again" because of the way God works through us. As a side-note: ever wonder why Jesus doesn't just display the Gospel in the stars for all to see? It's because reproduction is always meant to happen between a bride and groom. We are the bride through whom new believers will be born, which begins with the seed of the Gospel planted in us by our groom.

After evangelism a new "spiritual infant" is born, as Paul would put it (1 Cor. 3:1-2). Discipleship is the process of helping that infant grow into a mature adult. I more commonly define discipleship as: *Intentional and purposeful relationships designed to use one's own life as a model to produce spiritual generations of disciple(r)-makers into the nations.* That is, parents are meant to:

- Be intentional about raising their kids, not passively hopeful
- Give them a purpose, letting them know that their lives can matter for good (I don't buy into the silly liberalized notion that every life matters; every life CAN matter, but not every life does - especially in a positive sense)
- Communicate that purpose through a relationship, not classes
- Model what it looks like to live out that purpose so they can learn from their parents' lifestyle
- Prepare their children to birth future generations of grandchildren, great-grandchildren, etc.

Conclusion

No matter how you look at it, the purpose of humanity is to make disciples of all nations. Jesus modeled his particular method of disciple-making by his lifestyle - not only in what he taught, but in what he did. 1 John 2:6 does not say that we must merely obey the teachings of Christ; it says, "Whoever claims to live in him must live as Jesus did." Jesus' life was oriented around making disciples. If that is how he lived, that is how we must live.

If we are not making disciples, then like the book without words or the TV that can't show a picture, we are broken and can no longer call ourselves human. At best, we are broken humans. The point of humanity is to fill the earth with other godly people. The earth is already filled; now we must make them godly. The human identity is that of disciple-maker (or if you want to take a more accurate look at the great commission: discipler-maker).

If you want to know yourself, you must know what you were created to be. You were created to make disciple(r)s. That is your identity.

Corporate Commission

As noted above, we derive our identity as disciple(r)-makers from the fact that we are the bride of Christ. But this is a corporate identity. Christ does not have many brides - he has one: the church. Just as a physical bride has many parts of her body, so also does Christ's bride have eyes, feet, hands, etc. We, individually, are a singular part of the collective body of Christ.

While we share a collective mission to make disciples of all nations, the way we express this mission in our daily lives is unique to our designed function. The purpose of a nose is to smell. The purpose of eyes are to see. The purpose of ears are to hear.

So, then, our individual identities are defined by the way we are uniquely created to contribute to the purpose of our corporate mission of disciple(r)-making. This is most often understood in the context of our individual spiritual gifts (or if you're a cessationist, through the roles that God assigns each person in life, such as pastor, apostle, evangelist, teacher, prophet). How does this work in the varying gifts and roles people have?

- Those with the gift of hospitality will make disciples by inviting others into their home and making them feel welcome, as they intentionally use the model of their life to impart the purposes of Christ to their guest.
 - Those with the gift of mercy will be drawn to the lowly and burdened to assist them, as they intentionally use the model of their life to impart the purposes of Christ in those to whom they are showing mercy.
 - Those with the gift of teaching will look among their students for prospective disciples, intentionally modeling their life to impart the purposes of Christ to those under their tutelage.
 - Those with the gift of giving will meet people to whom they want to be generous, modeling their life to impart the purposes of Christ to those who would be the benefactors of their generosity.
-

Note in all of these the definition of discipleship: *Intentional and purposeful relationships designed to use one's own life as a model to produce spiritual generations of disciple(r)-makers into the nations.* Teachers don't make disciples merely by teaching them. The hospitable don't make disciples merely by showing hospitality. Givers don't make disciples merely by giving. That would be an irrationally passive approach - expressing our individual gifts in the *hope* that it would have the effect of building up God's Kingdom. Parents are never meant to be this passive in raising their children (whether their own by birth, or by adoption).

Paul teaches in Ephesians 4:11-13 that the gifts are to be intentionally directed toward the edification of the body of Christ - his church, the Kingdom that we're building, and co-members of the bride of Christ alongside us. There is nothing passive about it. Jesus was not passive in the way he made disciples, nor should we be. It is not enough that the teacher teaches or the giver gives or the merciful show mercy - we must be active about using these gifts to build up the body both as to its quantity (size: through evangelism) and quality (helping spiritual infants grow into maturity, adopting the same purpose and vision: discipleship). These gifts/roles are all the vehicles through which we meet and relate with those who we will disciple, not the primary function of our lives in themselves.

To tweak a previous example: even if a book has letters and words and is more than a mere stack of paper, it is not useful to the author if it holds all the wrong words and shares a different story from the one the author wrote. It must show the words the author gave it for it to have use to the author. It may still be a book, but it's the wrong one. Even a TV that casts a signal is not useful to its owner if it televises the wrong shows and won't play the right channels. It may still be a TV, but it's a useless one. It's not enough that you know what your spiritual gifts are and how to use them - you must also use them consistently with the purpose for which we were created, which is to make disciple(r)s of all nations.

SUMMARY

You are not:

- What you do.
- What others think of you.
- What you own.
- What your spiritual gifts are.
- What you want to be.
- What you think you are.

You are:

- What your creator designed you to be.

You are designed to be:

- A part of the bride of Christ.
- As Christ's bride, you are designed to help him fulfill his mission.
- Christ's mission is to build his kingdom by making disciples of all nations.
- The way Christ modeled for his bride to do this is through a lifestyle of disciple(r)-making.
- Jesus' model of disciple(r)-making can be defined as *intentional and purposeful relationships designed to use one's own life as a model to produce spiritual generations of disciple(r)-makers into the nations.*

- As a singular part of the collective body of Christ, you have your own unique function, which you are to use to advance your disciple(r)-making efforts.

Who are you? Hopefully you have an answer now. Here's my answer:

- I am Christ's bride, designed to help him make disciples of all nations by intentionally building relationships with those I teach, counsel, and exhort, or who Christ otherwise leads me into relationship with, giving them a clear purpose of becoming the next generation of disciple(r)-makers, which I accomplish by the way I model my life for them to follow.

If you are a married woman reading this, your answer may change slightly to read something like:

- I am my husband's bride, as he also is the bride of Christ; and I am designed to help my husband help Christ make disciples of all nations. His purpose is to be intentional about building relationships with those he , , and ____, giving them a clear purpose of becoming the next generation of disicple(r)-makers, which he accomplishes by the way he models his life for them to follow - and I follow in his example by doing the same for the women I meet through the use of my unique gifts and roles from God, as well as for those my husband leads me into relationship with.

Can these be simplified down? I'm sure. But summaries are only helpful after you already understand and live out the whole picture.

Materialist Hypergamy in the Church

4 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

I was just writing a comment to someone that I figured would be worth a larger discussion. What are your thoughts?

CONTEXT: I made a comment about how Jesus' physical absence makes it easier for his bride (the church) to hamster rationalizations for idolatry (i.e. spiritual adultery), just as a wife who goes away from her husband for long periods of time is prone by hypergamy toward adulterous thoughts, and often even likely to act on them. He suggested the feminine imperative invading the church as one form of idolatry and asked about others. Materialism is what came to my mind. The rest of stream of conscious thinking off that subject.

Materialism

How many mega churches do you see with massive projectors, stages, huge buildings, etc.? Ironically, the churches with the most resources are the most prone to operate on a scarcity mentality - while they have lots of resources, they have lots of expenses as well, catering their services away from the mission of the Gospel and toward what keeps the money flowing so they can maintain their massive budgets.

This is one of the things I'm talking about often with my red pill pastor (executive pastor, not head pastor), as he believes the church should switch to an abundance mentality built through crowd-sourcing rather than asset-accumulating, much like the difference between Uber and Taxi companies.

- Taxi: Must purchase lots of cars. Must pay lots of employees. Fulfills their mission to make money only on the net after expenses are paid, using their own company's assets and manpower, which it must acquire first.
- Uber: Doesn't own a single car. Drivers not official employees. They fulfill their mission to make money by using other people's assets and manpower.

Back to the church:

- Modern "Successful" Churches: Owns buildings. Pays lots of staff. Remodeling projects constantly. Pays for coffee bars, etc. - all in order to bring people to a focal center each week. Fulfills its mission of filling the seats by spending lots of money to make people want to come.
- Networked/Crowd-Sourced Church: Core, central leadership team works on a minimal budget (office space rent) with no significant expenses and fewer needed staff members (no huge congregation/building/projects to maintain). Utilizes existing leaders by giving them a vision and sending them out to build their own communities of believers (i.e. "micro" churches) in their homes, at coffee shops, public parks, at the gym, etc., essentially repurposing the expenses people are already paying to be used for God's purposes as well, thereby crowdsourcing the expense without actually increasing anyone's bottom-line by much at all. The money that is tithed, after covering the salaries of the reduced staff, goes toward actual needs like world missions, assisting the poor, caring for orphans, funding foster parents, a benevolence fund for people in the church network in need, etc. rather than remodeling a foyer or buying new fancy chairs.

I've mentioned it before, but the book *Underground Church* references this networking church idea, as the author is actually living this out in Florida right now, having thousands of people within the church network. When they need to meet corporately, they rent a space or find a public location able to accommodate them (like a park) rather than paying millions of dollars on a mortgage to maintain a building to accommodate everyone.

Long story short, the modern church has bought into the materialism of first world countries by assuming we must be fancy and impressive in order to accomplish God's work. In reality, this merely placates people and forces the great commission from:

- "GO make disciples of all nations"

to

- "Hope all the nations come to you to be made into disciples."

DISAPPOINTMENT IN THE SPIRIT

Sadly, a lot of this stems from the fact that the church is disappointed with the mission Christ gave us and the help the Holy Spirit gives. Most people don't really see value in the Holy Spirit. It's not sexy to them. They want Jesus returned to earth - someone we can see with our eyes and touch with our hands.

While many churches give lip service to the Holy Spirit and his work in our hearts, it often comes off as an idealistic notion of what they believe the Holy Spirit is like, rather than the actual Spirit we know and understand from Scripture.

- "The Holy Spirit told me today ... [something that I was already thinking about anyway, but I assume it must have been from God]"
- "The Holy Spirit moved me ... [when I felt an emotional experience that even non-Christians would have felt]"
- "The Holy Spirit convicted me ... [when I did something that everyone knows is wrong anyway]"
- "The Holy Spirit gave me a spiritual gift ... [that I'm going to use in absurd and often-times unbiblical ways]"
- "I saw this [normal, every day occurrence that was slightly coincidental] and just knew it had to be the Holy Spirit]"
- "The Holy Spirit gave me a vision - an image for you ... [that is really just the first thing that popped in my head, but I can't stop thinking about it, so it must be Him]"

The Holy Spirit certainly can and does do all of these things - but we often over-spiritualize the trivial in order to do one of two things:

1. Convince ourselves that we're spiritual, because Spiritual people hear from God all the time, so we have to assume the things we hear all the time are from God
2. Give some credit to the Spirit for something because we otherwise don't really know who he is or what he does, so we just make up things that we think must be him

In relational terms:

1. The first is like a self-conscious wife who wants to keep doing whatever feels right to her, but looks for a way to rationalize this as honoring her husband. "He would have wanted me to do these things. I don't know if he actually said it, but I bet he wanted it, and he probably implied it somewhere. See? I'm really doing this for him and not just myself."
2. The second is like the wife who is disappointed with her husband. She doesn't know who he is or what he does around the house. But she's talking with her friends and **doesn't want to lose the comparison game**, so she starts making up things about her husband and how great he is in order to rationalize to herself that she really is with a wonderful guy and other women should be jealous ... but secretly isn't attracted to him, so she keeps hamstering ways to try to convince herself, but it never quite works.

How many times have you heard someone say something like, "I just can't wait to see Jesus someday!"? That's quite an odd phrase to me. I bet people said that about God in Jesus' day. They knew the story of Moses seeing God, and

probably thought quite similarly, "I wish I could see God like Moses got to!" What was Jesus's response to this? "Anyone who has seen me has seen the Father" (John 14:9). Why? He answers in the next verse: "I am in the Father, and that the Father is in me." And he reiterates it in the verse after that. I bet the Jews were utterly disappointed with this explanation. "You're not really the father. You know what we meant. We want the REAL Father."

So when someone says they can't wait to see Jesus, how many of you could confidently say, "You're looking at him!"? Later on in the same conversation from John 14, by John 17 we see Jesus saying that he is in us (v. 21-26). Colossians 1:27 also affirms that Christ is in us. The same way we can see the father through Christ because they are one, others can see Christ in us because we are one - just as people should be able to know me without ever personally meeting me if they meet my wife - because I am in her, both physically and spiritually as one. A good wife should rightly be able to say, "You don't need to meet my husband because I am a reflection of his mission, character, values, and attributes. I am molded to his likeness. By getting to know me, you should know my husband too." If someone is shocked when meeting me after knowing my wife, there's a problem.

Interestingly, despite the incredible weight and value we have in Christ and the incredible blessing it was to the earth to have him walk around in bodily form, Jesus (in that same conversation above, John 16 this time) says, "It is to your advantage that I go away, for if I do not go away, the Helper will not come to you. But if I go, I will send him to you." That is, Jesus says that having the Holy Spirit will be EVEN BETTER than having Jesus walking the earth in our presence right in front of us. Yet for some reason we seem disappointed with the Holy Spirit's presence and linger only on the hope of Jesus's return. This baffles me.

Yes, we should be excited about Christ's return. And yes, some churches do recognize some value in the Holy Spirit. But most people I come across - even in charismatic circles - just don't get it. Their focus in applying the Holy Spirit is seldom on Acts 1:8, which is the true reason the Holy Spirit is given to us: to be God's witnesses, fulfilling the mission Jesus gave us to make disciples. Even when they do want to "tap into the power of the Spirit" to "do God's work," it's more about feeling super-powered and impressive than the mission itself. They care more about what the Holy Spirit can do for them than what the Spirit is meant to enable us to do for Christ. Which brings us to ...

HYPERGAMOUS ENTITLEMENT

Anyway, back on point: I believe money is the biggest idol of the church - and the directive the church applies in how it spends that money is toward bringing others to themselves. "Come and see," as Rick Warren often puts it. "I don't want to go to you. You come to me."

And it's no surprise. What's the feminine imperative right now? Women just sit back and wait for men to come running over. In a beta-filled world, that's how the sexual marketplace works today - a very backwards pursuit structure. And how often do we see the bride of Christ say, "Jesus, come to us, join us, fill us with your presence here in this place"? All the stinkin' time. We treat Jesus like our beta bux.

In reality, the bride is meant to **GO** to her husband and the purposes he calls her. Will Jesus show up sometimes? Sure. I walk through my living room when my wife is there, and she may take notice and use the opportunity to relate with me. That does happen as a matter of chance while I go about my business.

How idiotic would it be if I told my wife to give the kids a bath and she sits in the living room and says, "Kids, come here so I can give you a bath"? Even worse - what if the kids don't want a bath? They're not going to come. The bath isn't going to get done. My wife is going to end up yelling and screaming because they can barely hear her when they're in the basement or playing in their rooms. I'm going to confront her about it and say, "Why haven't you given them a bath yet?" She's going to say: "Didn't you hear me? I've been shouting at them all day to come here so I can wash them, but they're not coming. This job you gave me is hard work, and I'm trying my best."

That's what the church is doing to Jesus. I would, of course, tell my wife: "If they don't come to you, then go get them!" That's the easy, obvious answer. But it's an answer the church isn't willing to take. "Don't bring them to the

living room to get a bath. Take them to the tub." Church buildings are like the living room - that's not where sanctification happens. It might be where people get motivated to be cleansed, but the cleaning actually happens out in the world, as we live out the work God starts in us. At best, even if my wife did get the kids to come to her in the living room, she could only take off their clothes and get them ready for the bath ... at some point she still has to leave her comfy chair.

1

UPVOTE

Initiation and Denial | Discussion: Is it okay to masturbate to thoughts of your wife?

5 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

u/Icy_Reference made a good post on a question that has often plagued me - one that I have never definitively answered in my mind. Rather than derailing his post and the feedback he needs to get, I thought it better to create a separate post for you all to weigh in on the more theological nature of the issue. The original post can be found [here](#). My reply is below.

Please reply to the original thread with direct advice to the unique situation OP was in. Comments on the more theological nature of the question should be discussed here.

I'm considering periodic masturbation ... Thoughts?

The Bible doesn't reference masturbation as a sin. It does reference lusting (covetous intent) after someone as a form of adultery. From here, there are two primary camps:

- You can't commit adultery with your wife, so some people assume that masturbating to thoughts or images of your wife is not adultery, and therefore there's no sin in that form of masturbation. To be absolutely clear, Matthew 5:28 says "that everyone who looks at a woman with lustful intent has already sinned," right? NO. Jesus DOES NOT say this. He says, "has already committed adultery with her in his heart." The sin is adultery, not lust. This is a huge distinction. If it's impossible to commit adultery with your wife, then there's no sin in lusting after her.
- Others argue that you're lusting after your own ideology of your wife - an image of her you've concocted in your head that may or may not be the actual woman you married, and therefore it's like watching hentai. It's not technically "another woman" because the woman you're lusting after doesn't exist, but it's not your wife either. A person trying to draw a technical distinction between people-porn and hentai is looking for a fine-line distinction in the law to justify their behaviors for essentially the same conduct, showing that his heart is disposed toward sin and he's only looking for an excuse. In this sense, even if the law did justify him on this one point, it would condemn him on countless others, making this type of rationalization a futile effort and ultimately resulting in such a person's condemnation. Likewise, trying to justify using artificial imagery of your wife in your head that doesn't accurately reflect her reaches the same conclusion.

Some people will rebut this second point: "But what if I'm masturbating to memories of actual things my wife and I have done together and not an image of what I want her to do to me? Now it's my actual wife, not a made-up girl that simply looks like my wife." And the common response is: "No, because your actual wife won't have sex with you now, and this image in your head will. That alone is proof that she's different. And those memories are not about who your wife is today, but about who she was back then."

That then brings in the conundrum: what if a guy's wife was a stripper or prostitute, like Gomer was when Hosea married her. She turns her life around, finds Jesus and completely changes her demeanor toward sexuality. She gets so engrossed in church culture on the topic that she actually becomes sexually reserved because sex is such a source of guilt and shame for her that she loathes the thought of the things she used to do! Now she denies you sex because of that - you look back on her stripper/prostitute days when you met her (likely when you were a non-Christian too) and use that as fuel for masturbation. It's stuff that she actually did, but it's a gross extreme away from who she is today, and it's certainly not a reflection of who Christ wanted her to be any more than her present withdrawal. How do we handle that situation?

Most people conclude that it wouldn't be godly to take advantage of your memories of her sinful conduct to get off ... and I can't help but agree. So if *actual memories* of your *actual wife* can still result in use of such imagery to be sinful when masturbating, then where is the actual line? Why would it be okay to use memories of you and your wife having sex, but not the guy whose wife used to be a prostitute? The only possible explanation is that the question has shifted from its original form into: "Is it wrong to get aroused by and masturbate to thoughts of someone else doing sinful acts?"

That answer is much more obvious than whether it's wrong to get aroused by and masturbate to thoughts of what your wife has done in the past - and this thought experiment does nothing to answer that question because a more obvious superseding sin answers the question for us. It's like asking: "Is it wrong to murder someone because I'm really angry at him?" The focal point of the question is the anger, but it's eclipsed by the fact that the anger was expressed through murder. So in this situation, yes, the anger was definitely sin - but that doesn't do anything to tell us whether or not anger is sinful in other situations.

Back on track, this is all a bloody mess. I don't care much for messes, and there are no clear answers on these types of arguments. So, let's cut straight to the heart of it:

- In Romans 14:14 Paul says that anything can be done without sin - that it's the disposition of our heart that makes something sinful.
- In Romans 14:23 Paul swings the pendulum to the other side by saying, in essence, "While everything CAN be done without sin, everything AUTOMATICALLY IS sinful if it's done for any other reason than that your faith prompted the action."

At that point we must ask:

- Does your faith prompt you to think lustfully about your wife?

Absolutely it does! Otherwise we would have no application for the entire book of Song of Solomon.

- Does your faith prompt you to masturbate as a result of those thoughts?

That's a much harder question. The fact that "the Bible never calls masturbation sin" doesn't mean that masturbation isn't sinful. Most people would say that preaching the Gospel is inherently good and non-sinful, yet Paul still talks about how people do it in a sinful manner (Philippians 2:20 et seq.). Why? Because they weren't doing it as a product of their faith, but as a product of their own envy, rivalry, selfish ambition, etc. (though it's still better to preach Christ with a wrong motive than not at all).

Similarly, even if the Bible said, "Masturbation is great. Do it all the time!" - that would not mean that every expression of it would be "non-sin," and how much more when the Bible never says this at all.

The only real reference we get to masturbation (outside miscontextualized interpretations of Genesis 38:9-10) is Leviticus 15:16-17. Most people say that this is talking about nocturnal emissions because the first 15 verses clearly address this (although "unusual discharge" does not likely reference the unusual timing of the discharge, but the fact that there's something weird about it that indicates an illness, despite the assumption that it happens in bed). However, verse 16 starts a new series of laws and would be unnecessarily redundant and contradictory to the previous 15 verses if we assumed it was a continuation of the same.

In essence, verse 16-17 says, "If you ejaculate, clean up after yourself." Verse 18 says, "If you have sex, clean up after yourself." Verse 19, "If a woman is on her period, she's unclean until it's over and she can clean up after herself." You can see how this is rattling off different sets - and none of these imply that anyone is actually doing something sinful; just that you have hygiene issues that need to be addressed, just as there's no reference to the nocturnal emission being sinful either - only that everything needs to be cleaned up after we're sure the illness is

gone.

Long story short, the Bible doesn't say that masturbation is sin - but that doesn't mean it can't be done in sinful ways. Surely I can masturbate to get myself hard while having sex with my wife, but if I were to do the same thing while having sex with a prostitute, that would be sin.

Back to the real point:

- 1 Cor. 10:31 - How is masturbating to thoughts of your wife bringing glory to God? Maybe it is. Maybe it is maintaining your sexual integrity so that you don't otherwise have sex with your hot co-worker, which the whole reason to get married in the first place (per 1 Cor. 7). But maybe you're at no risk of other forms of sexual sin and you just feel like pleasuring yourself and feeding your lust - is that to glorify God now? I don't know. I can't see a man's heart - only God can (1 Samuel 16:7).
- Romans 14:23 - How does masturbating to thoughts of your wife advances the purposes of your faith? How does it reflect the image of God in your life? Jesus is married to the church - does he ever masturbate? That is, does he engage in reproductive acts that will never produce spiritual offspring and without working through the church or any of his people? I can't think of a time when he does that - but maybe he does and I'm just not thinking hard enough. I don't know.
- Galatians 5:22-23 - Self-control is a fruit of the spirit. Is your masturbation coming from a lack of self-control (in which case it would be less likely to say it's a product of your faith if there's a stronger compulsion - and faith would merely be used as a rationalization for your behavior), or is it coming from a place of a steadfast will that is merely determined that this is what God wants you doing at that time?

These are the things to be thinking about ... but I haven't found any clear answers yet.

Discussion: Is it okay to masturbate to thoughts of your wife?

5 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

u/Icy_Reference made a good post on a question that has often plagued me - one that I have never definitively answered in my mind. Rather than derailing his post and the feedback he needs to get, I thought it better to create a separate post for you all to weigh in on the more theological nature of the issue. The original post can be found [here](#). My reply is below.

Please reply to the original thread with direct advice to the unique situation OP was in. Comments on the more theological nature of the question should be discussed here.

I'm considering periodic masturbation ... Thoughts?

The Bible doesn't reference masturbation as a sin. It does reference lusting (covetous intent) after someone as a form of adultery. From here, there are two primary camps:

- You can't commit adultery with your wife, so some people assume that masturbating to thoughts or images of your wife is not adultery, and therefore there's no sin in that form of masturbation. To be absolutely clear, Matthew 5:28 says "that everyone who looks at a woman with lustful intent has already sinned," right? NO. Jesus DOES NOT say this. He says, "has already committed adultery with her in his heart." The sin is adultery, not lust. This is a huge distinction. If it's impossible to commit adultery with your wife, then there's no sin in lusting after her.
- Others argue that you're lusting after your own ideology of your wife - an image of her you've concocted in your head that may or may not be the actual woman you married, and therefore it's like watching hentai. It's not technically "another woman" because the woman you're lusting after doesn't exist, but it's not your wife either. A person trying to draw a technical distinction between people-porn and hentai is looking for a fine-line distinction in the law to justify their behaviors for essentially the same conduct, showing that his heart is disposed toward sin and he's only looking for an excuse. In this sense, even if the law did justify him on this one point, it would condemn him on countless others, making this type of rationalization a futile effort and ultimately resulting in such a person's condemnation. Likewise, trying to justify using artificial imagery of your wife in your head that doesn't accurately reflect her reaches the same conclusion.

Some people will rebut this second point: "But what if I'm masturbating to memories of actual things my wife and I have done together and not an image of what I want her to do to me? Now it's my actual wife, not a made-up girl that simply looks like my wife." And the common response is: "No, because your actual wife won't have sex with you now, and this image in your head will. That alone is proof that she's different. And those memories are not about who your wife is today, but about who she was back then."

That then brings in the conundrum: what if a guy's wife was a stripper or prostitute, like Gomer was when Hosea married her. She turns her life around, finds Jesus and completely changes her demeanor toward sexuality. She gets so engrossed in church culture on the topic that she actually becomes sexually reserved because sex is such a source of guilt and shame for her that she loathes the thought of the things she used to do! Now she denies you sex because of that - you look back on her stripper/prostitute days when you met her (likely when you were a non-Christian too) and use that as fuel for masturbation. It's stuff that she actually did, but it's a gross extreme away from who she is today, and it's certainly not a reflection of who Christ wanted her to be any more than her present withdrawal. How do we handle that situation?

Most people conclude that it wouldn't be godly to take advantage of your memories of her sinful conduct to get off ... and I can't help but agree. So if *actual memories* of your *actual wife* can still result in use of such imagery to be

sinful when masturbating, then where is the actual line? Why would it be okay to use memories of you and your wife having sex, but not the guy whose wife used to be a prostitute? The only possible explanation is that the question has shifted from its original form into: "Is it wrong to get aroused by and masturbate to thoughts of someone else doing sinful acts?"

That answer is much more obvious than whether it's wrong to get aroused by and masturbate to thoughts of what your wife has done in the past - and this thought experiment does nothing to answer that question because a more obvious superseding sin answers the question for us. It's like asking: "Is it wrong to murder someone because I'm really angry at him?" The focal point of the question is the anger, but it's eclipsed by the fact that the anger was expressed through murder. So in this situation, yes, the anger was definitely sin - but that doesn't do anything to tell us whether or not anger is sinful in other situations.

Back on track, this is all a bloody mess. I don't care much for messes, and there are no clear answers on these types of arguments. So, let's cut straight to the heart of it:

- In Romans 14:14 Paul says that anything can be done without sin - that it's the disposition of our heart that makes something sinful.
- In Romans 14:23 Paul swings the pendulum to the other side by saying, in essence, "While everything CAN be done without sin, everything AUTOMATICALLY IS sinful if it's done for any other reason than that your faith prompted the action."

At that point we must ask:

- Does your faith prompt you to think lustfully about your wife?

Absolutely it does! Otherwise we would have no application for the entire book of Song of Solomon.

- Does your faith prompt you to masturbate as a result of those thoughts?

That's a much harder question. The fact that "the Bible never calls masturbation sin" doesn't mean that masturbation isn't sinful. Most people would say that preaching the Gospel is inherently good and non-sinful, yet Paul still talks about how people do it in a sinful manner (Philippians 2:20 et seq.). Why? Because they weren't doing it as a product of their faith, but as a product of their own envy, rivalry, selfish ambition, etc. (though it's still better to preach Christ with a wrong motive than not at all).

Similarly, even if the Bible said, "Masturbation is great. Do it all the time!" - that would not mean that every expression of it would be "non-sin," and how much more when the Bible never says this at all.

The only real reference we get to masturbation (outside miscontextualized interpretations of Genesis 38:9-10) is Leviticus 15:16-17. Most people say that this is talking about nocturnal emissions because the first 15 verses clearly address this (although "unusual discharge" does not likely reference the unusual timing of the discharge, but the fact that there's something weird about it that indicates an illness, despite the assumption that it happens in bed). However, verse 16 starts a new series of laws and would be unnecessarily redundant and contradictory to the previous 15 verses if we assumed it was a continuation of the same.

In essence, verse 16-17 says, "If you ejaculate, clean up after yourself." Verse 18 says, "If you have sex, clean up after yourself." Verse 19, "If a woman is on her period, she's unclean until it's over and she can clean up after herself." You can see how this is rattling off different sets - and none of these imply that anyone is actually doing something sinful; just that you have hygiene issues that need to be addressed, just as there's no reference to the nocturnal emission being sinful either - only that everything needs to be cleaned up after we're sure the illness is gone.

Long story short, the Bible doesn't say that masturbation is sin - but that doesn't mean it can't be done in sinful ways. Surely I can masturbate to get myself hard while having sex with my wife, but if I were to do the same thing while having sex with a prostitute, that would be sin.

Back to the real point:

- 1 Cor. 10:31 - How is masturbating to thoughts of your wife bringing glory to God? Maybe it is. Maybe it is maintaining your sexual integrity so that you don't otherwise have sex with your hot co-worker, which the whole reason to get married in the first place (per 1 Cor. 7). But maybe you're at no risk of other forms of sexual sin and you just feel like pleasuring yourself and feeding your lust - is that to glorify God now? I don't know. I can't see a man's heart - only God can (1 Samuel 16:7).
- Romans 14:23 - How does masturbating to thoughts of your wife advances the purposes of your faith? How does it reflect the image of God in your life? Jesus is married to the church - does he ever masturbate? That is, does he engage in reproductive acts that will never produce spiritual offspring and without working through the church or any of his people? I can't think of a time when he does that - but maybe he does and I'm just not thinking hard enough. I don't know.
- Galatians 5:22-23 - Self-control is a fruit of the spirit. Is your masturbation coming from a lack of self-control (in which case it would be less likely to say it's a product of your faith if there's a stronger compulsion - and faith would merely be used as a rationalization for your behavior), or is it coming from a place of a steadfast will that is merely determined that this is what God wants you doing at that time?

These are the things to be thinking about ... but I haven't found any clear answers yet.

13

UPVOTES

Post cut rebulking

18 April 2019 · /r/askMRP · Archived copy · Reddit

I was bulking while working toward a 300lb bench. I got it to just past 90 degrees, but could only do 295 to my chest. Oh well. Weight got pretty high in the process. I've been cutting for reasons and back down 12+ lbs so far. Obviously lifts are starting to suffer ... struggling to hit the 5th rep at 275 now.

I want to drop another 10lbs before bulking again. Anyone know how long it will take to rebuild to previous lifts again or am I capping myself by cutting now?

App Review: BodBot - Two Thumbs Up

22 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

We all know that **Lifting Is Not A Suggestion**. It's the easiest way for a man to start to see gains in his interpersonal relationships and sex life. It's a craft worth the continual effort to hone. So, for various reasons, I decided to try a personal training app called BodBot. I had seen ads for it on my phone and was intrigued. Here's what I've found after trying it out for a bit.

FEATURES

The app begins by asking a bunch of questions to orient itself to your specific needs. Here are the main categories:

- **Goals:** Do you want to lose fat, gain muscle, improve overall health, enhance your sexual health, increase strength, train for football, basketball, soccer, baseball, etc., train for a marathon or triathlon? It tailors your workout plan to best suit these goals.
- **Body:** You input your present stats to help the app figure out how many sets/reps you should be doing.
- **Muscles:** You can click on a picture as to which muscles you want to target on a specific day. You can also select if you want to target only those muscles, or all muscle groups with an emphasis on the selected muscles.
- **Schedule:** This gives you the option to let the app decide how long you work out and on which days, or if you'd prefer to schedule the workouts yourself and just have it tell you what to do when you get started.
- **Adaptive Progression:** This feature enables feedback options after each set where you indicate how hard it was and the app will adjust your weight/reps to account for the feedback you give to make sure you're doing the right amount.
- **Fitness Tests:** You can go through a series of exercises to test your present degree of fitness, helping the app calibrate what exercises, weights, reps, etc. you should be doing in future sessions to enhance your goals.
- **Equipment:** You can let the app know what options you have available on a given day so that it can tailor your plan accordingly. If you tell it you're at the gym, it will include bench pressing, squats, etc. If you say you're at home, and you don't select any equipment, it will adjust to give a list of exercises/lifts that focus on natural body resistance.
- **Exercise Preferences:** You can indicate on a scale how intensely you want to work out or if there are any particular types of exercises you don't want to populate (ex. if you have an injury)
- **Supersets & Circuits:** You can tailor the program to alternate between muscle groups in order to maximize the down-time between two same-muscle-group sets, or circuit them so that you do one set of each exercise in a row before doing the second set, or if you just want to take the default order given, which may pair similar muscle groups on the assumption that you don't want to risk losing your spot on a machine if the gym happens to be busy.
- **Joints:** I don't know what this does, but it lists several of them, presumably to advise the app if you want to be cautious with a particular joint.
- **Recovery Assessments:** Between workout sessions the app may ask you how you're feeling and if any muscle groups are sore, for example, which can help tailor future workouts.
- **Connect Health Data:** The app can download information from your FitBit or from Google Fit to track your progress and account for your sleep and activity patterns throughout the day to tweak your workout regimen each day.

- Nutrition: The app also has a feature that helps you track your eating to make sure you're staying on your goals.
-

HOW IT WORKS

It's pretty simple: once you're appropriately calibrated, it sets up a uniquely tailored routine to meet your needs. Part of the fun in going through the above categories is that the app shows a bar at the bottom with all of your workouts for the day. As you change the options, you can watch which exercises were added, deleted, or modified based on the new selection you made, allowing you to see how certain selections affect the routine, and also which exercises are more likely to have a stronger impact on the options you're selecting.

The actual routine can take some time if you follow all of the rest timers, so I found myself skipping many of them if I was jumping from one muscle group to another. For reference, my at-home routine today was:

- 3 sets of 18 reps of handstand pushups
- 3 sets of 12 reps of declined pushups
- 2 sets of 6 reps of assisted one-leg squats (I didn't have assistance, so I used a table to help stabilize me)
- 2 sets of 8 reps of hip thrusts
- 3 sets of 6 reps of hand-together pushups
- 2 sets of 20 seconds EQI push-up holds
- 3 sets of 12 reps of door frame rows
- 1 set of 50 seconds each side of side bridges (sideways elbow plank)
- 1 set of 50 seconds each side of straight arm side bridges (hand on ground instead of elbow)
- 1 set of 20 reps of 3 second alternating sides (i.e. 6 seconds for 1 rep) of straight arm side bridges
- 2 sets of 20 seconds of isometric no-equipment bicep curls
- 3 sets of 8 reps of 3 second lateral arm shrugs
- 1 set of 20 reps of one-legged donkey calf-raises
- 3 sets of 20 pushups
- 2 sets of 25 pike presses

All of this combined took me about an hour, even with skipping several of the cool-down timers or cutting them short if I felt refreshed (hard to gauge exactly because I did have to stop at one point to put my kids to bed).

While showering afterward I noticed my muscles swollen in a way I hadn't seen since my early days doing SL 5x5 almost a year ago. Even now, hours later, I can still feel significant tenseness in muscle-groups that the SL5x5 or GreySkull might hit, but don't specifically target the same way this routine might.

Tomorrow's routine will be at the gym and includes:

- Barbell overhead press
- Dumbbell overhead presses with both arms

- Dumbbell overhead presses, alternating arm
- Assisted chin ups
- Pull downs - shoulder-width, underhanded grip
- Pull downs - wide overhanded grip
- Dumbbell pullover
- L-Raise to external rotation
- Pull down - wide underhanded grip
- External rotations - side lying with dumbbells

When doing initial sets, it puts an "X" for how much weight you're doing. Click on that and you can update the number and based on your feedback it will adjust the weight, reps, etc. for you in the future.

OTHER COOL STUFF

Reading through the list of exercises, I had no clue what several were. No fear - there are handy pictures every time an exercise pops up, which gives you a general idea. Still confused? Click the info button and it'll play a quick video/gif of someone doing it so you can see exactly what the right form and motions look like.

Don't like a particular exercise for any reason? No worries, just delete it from your list and the app will never suggest it again.

Want to add a particular exercise that isn't included in your routine for the day? There's a button for that too.

FREE v. PAY

Most of the app is free. There are several features that require a paid subscription. If you pay for a year, it amounts to \$5/mo - easily affordable for most people, but still not necessary, as the free version is going to give you substantially similar plans, just with slightly less ability to tweak and tailor things. 3 months is at a rate of \$10/mo.

The nutrition feature is pay-only. I haven't paid yet, so I don't know much more about that.

The ability to connect with Google Fit seems free, but FitBit requires a subscription.

The app also gives you the ability to skip the warm-up/cool-down part of the routine, which I admittedly ordinarily do skip.

FINAL THOUGHTS

I'm highly impressed with the way the app has uniquely tailored my workout routine. I'm even more impressed at the way I'm feeling muscles start to swell up that were never triggered heavily in my SL or GS routines.

While I haven't tested it for heavy lifting purposes, during my cut this seems to create a somewhat ideal regimen for me that I'm hopeful will prevent much muscle loss, while also toning up the peripheral groups that might be the supplements needed to up my maxes when I'm ready to bulk again.

I'm also pleased that it includes cardio and off days (one day was just to walk for 30 minutes), but doesn't force cardio into the main sessions. Most routines I see like this try to balance body resistance with cardio-type exercises,

and this one seems to ignore that strategy - though this could be primarily because of the options I chose.

While it's not perfect, and I've only been using it for a short while, I'm pleased enough to give it my recommendation - especially for anyone who happens to be cutting (my present context) or wants to develop a familiarity with lifts beyond the basic SL/GS routine and how different muscle groups can be triggered to supplement the core SL/GS lifts that I still don't intend to leave behind.

A lot of the things I see this app recommending are the same things I see personal trainers doing with their clients at the gym. I used to look down on some of this, as I hammered away on the bench press. After spending time diversifying my routine through this app, I can say I have a new appreciation. While I doubt this app is a substitute for an actual personal trainer (I've never used one, but have worked out alongside friends who are PTs), it's not a bad option if you don't want to shell out the cash.

We all know that **Lifting Is Not A Suggestion**. It's the easiest way for a man to start to see gains in his interpersonal relationships and sex life. It's a craft worth the continual effort to hone. So, for various reasons, I decided to try a personal training app called BodBot. I had seen ads for it on my phone and was intrigued. Here's what I've found after trying it out for a bit.

FEATURES

The app begins by asking a bunch of questions to orient itself to your specific needs. Here are the main categories:

- **Goals:** Do you want to lose fat, gain muscle, improve overall health, enhance your sexual health, increase strength, train for football, basketball, soccer, baseball, etc., train for a marathon or triathlon? It tailors your workout plan to best suit these goals.
- **Body:** You input your present stats to help the app figure out how many sets/reps you should be doing.
- **Muscles:** You can click on a picture as to which muscles you want to target on a specific day. You can also select if you want to target only those muscles, or all muscle groups with an emphasis on the selected muscles.
- **Schedule:** This gives you the option to let the app decide how long you work out and on which days, or if you'd prefer to schedule the workouts yourself and just have it tell you what to do when you get started.
- **Adaptive Progression:** This feature enables feedback options after each set where you indicate how hard it was and the app will adjust your weight/reps to account for the feedback you give to make sure you're doing the right amount.
- **Fitness Tests:** You can go through a series of exercises to test your present degree of fitness, helping the app calibrate what exercises, weights, reps, etc. you should be doing in future sessions to enhance your goals.
- **Equipment:** You can let the app know what options you have available on a given day so that it can tailor your plan accordingly. If you tell it you're at the gym, it will include bench pressing, squats, etc. If you say you're at home, and you don't select any equipment, it will adjust to give a list of exercises/lifts that focus on natural body resistance.
- **Exercise Preferences:** You can indicate on a scale how intensely you want to work out or if there are any particular types of exercises you don't want to populate (ex. if you have an injury)
- **Supersets & Circuits:** You can tailor the program to alternate between muscle groups in order to maximize the down-time between two same-muscle-group sets, or circuit them so that you do one set of each exercise in a row before doing the second set, or if you just want to take the default order given, which may pair similar muscle groups on the assumption that you don't want to risk losing your spot on a machine if the gym happens to be busy.
- **Joints:** I don't know what this does, but it lists several of them, presumably to advise the app if you want to be cautious with a particular joint.
- **Recovery Assessments:** Between workout sessions the app may ask you how you're feeling and if any muscle groups are sore, for example, which can help tailor future workouts.
- **Connect Health Data:** The app can download information from your FitBit or from Google Fit to track your progress and account for your sleep and activity patterns throughout the day to tweak your workout regimen each day.

- Nutrition: The app also has a feature that helps you track your eating to make sure you're staying on your goals.
-

HOW IT WORKS

It's pretty simple: once you're appropriately calibrated, it sets up a uniquely tailored routine to meet your needs. Part of the fun in going through the above categories is that the app shows a bar at the bottom with all of your workouts for the day. As you change the options, you can watch which exercises were added, deleted, or modified based on the new selection you made, allowing you to see how certain selections affect the routine, and also which exercises are more likely to have a stronger impact on the options you're selecting.

The actual routine can take some time if you follow all of the rest timers, so I found myself skipping many of them if I was jumping from one muscle group to another. For reference, my at-home routine today was:

- 3 sets of 18 reps of handstand pushups
- 3 sets of 12 reps of declined pushups
- 2 sets of 6 reps of assisted one-leg squats (I didn't have assistance, so I used a table to help stabilize me)
- 2 sets of 8 reps of hip thrusts
- 3 sets of 6 reps of hand-together pushups
- 2 sets of 20 seconds EQI push-up holds
- 3 sets of 12 reps of door frame rows
- 1 set of 50 seconds each side of side bridges (sideways elbow plank)
- 1 set of 50 seconds each side of straight arm side bridges (hand on ground instead of elbow)
- 1 set of 20 reps of 3 second alternating sides (i.e. 6 seconds for 1 rep) of straight arm side bridges
- 2 sets of 20 seconds of isometric no-equipment bicep curls
- 3 sets of 8 reps of 3 second lateral arm shrugs
- 1 set of 20 reps of one-legged donkey calf-raises
- 3 sets of 20 pushups
- 2 sets of 25 pike presses

All of this combined took me about an hour, even with skipping several of the cool-down timers or cutting them short if I felt refreshed (hard to gauge exactly because I did have to stop at one point to put my kids to bed).

While showering afterward I noticed my muscles swollen in a way I hadn't seen since my early days doing SL 5x5 almost two years ago. Even now, hours later, I can still feel significant tenseness in muscle-groups that the SL5x5 or GreySkull might hit, but don't specifically target the same way this routine might.

Tomorrow's routine will be at the gym and includes:

- Barbell overhead press
- Dumbbell overhead presses with both arms

- Dumbbell overhead presses, alternating arm
- Assisted chin ups
- Pull downs - shoulder-width, underhanded grip
- Pull downs - wide overhanded grip
- Dumbbell pullover
- L-Raise to external rotation
- Pull down - wide underhanded grip
- External rotations - side lying with dumbbells

When doing initial sets, it puts an "X" for how much weight you're doing. Click on that and you can update the number and based on your feedback it will adjust the weight, reps, etc. for you in the future.

OTHER COOL STUFF

Reading through the list of exercises, I had no clue what several were. No fear - there are handy pictures every time an exercise pops up, which gives you a general idea. Still confused? Click the info button and it'll play a quick video/gif of someone doing it so you can see exactly what the right form and motions look like.

Don't like a particular exercise for any reason? No worries, just delete it from your list and the app will never suggest it again.

Want to add a particular exercise that isn't included in your routine for the day? There's a button for that too.

FREE v. PAY

Most of the app is free. There are several features that require a paid subscription. If you pay for a year, it amounts to \$5/mo - easily affordable for most people, but still not necessary, as the free version is going to give you substantially similar plans, just with slightly less ability to tweak and tailor things. 3 months is at a rate of \$10/mo.

The nutrition feature is pay-only. I haven't paid yet, so I don't know much more about that.

The ability to connect with Google Fit seems free, but FitBit requires a subscription.

The app also gives you the ability to skip the warm-up/cool-down part of the routine, which I admittedly ordinarily do skip.

POTENTIAL ADDED BONUS

Most women I know are more interested in following a yoga video on TV than going to the gym. They're often not motivated enough to research workout routines that best suit their goals. As with many other ares of life, they'd rather have someone in front of them telling them what to do, how to do it, and how many times to do it. I believe this is why yoga videos, cycling classes, zoomba lessons, personal trainers, etc. are all so popular among women.

The fact that an app like this minimizes the need for independent research and thought into one's exercise routine can be very tempting for women. While my wife is away on business for the time being, I wouldn't be surprised if she saw the simplicity of me doing it and decided to take it up herself - something that doesn't follow as naturally

when she's seen me working out at the gym without anyone showing me what to do, which intimidates her. So, while it has yet to be seen, I suspect this could be an easy tool for guys to invite their wives to join in on.

FINAL THOUGHTS

I'm highly impressed with the way the app has uniquely tailored my workout routine. I'm even more impressed at the way I'm feeling muscles start to swell up that were never triggered heavily in my SL or GS routines.

While I haven't tested it for heavy lifting purposes, during my cut this seems to create a somewhat ideal regimen for me that I'm hopeful will prevent much muscle loss, while also toning up the peripheral groups that might be the supplements needed to up my maxes when I'm ready to bulk again.

I'm also pleased that it includes cardio and off days (one day was just to walk for 30 minutes), but doesn't force cardio into the main sessions. Most routines I see like this try to balance body resistance with cardio-type exercises, and this one seems to ignore that strategy - though this could be primarily because of the options I chose.

While it's not perfect, and I've only been using it for a short while, I'm pleased enough to give it my recommendation - especially for anyone who happens to be cutting (my present context) or wants to develop a familiarity with lifts beyond the basic SL/GS routine and how different muscle groups can be triggered to supplement the core SL/GS lifts that I still don't intend to leave behind.

A lot of the things I see this app recommending are the same things I see personal trainers doing with their clients at the gym. I used to look down on some of this, as I hammered away on the bench press. After spending time diversifying my routine through this app, I can say I have a new appreciation. While I doubt this app is a substitute for an actual personal trainer (I've never used one, but have worked out alongside friends who are PTs), it's not a bad option if you don't want to shell out the cash.

Who should disciple women?

8 June 2019 · r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

I was just reading [this Dalrock post](#), in which he concludes that women should not preach or teach doctrinal issues even over other women. Assume I'm persuaded. Dalrock concludes:

What seems to have happened is somewhere along the line conservative Christians caved on this issue without ever really putting up a fight, and now everyone knows this is what the Scripture means without understanding just what they are buying into. Piper, Grudem, and the CBMW are at best moderates in the fight against Christian feminist rebellion, and when they ceded this ground there was no one left who was willing to point out the gaping holes in the feminist reinterpretation of this Scripture.

There is however another issue here aside from conservative Christians caving on the question of whether women are permitted to preach [or teach doctrinal issues] to women. Just as important is the question of what a lack of prohibition in this regard means. Conservative Christians haven't just rolled over on whether having women to preach to women is prohibited; they have jumped far past that to the claim that women must preach to women.

Under this framework - that women should never teach doctrinal issues to other women, who is left to disciple women?

There are a few contexts we can talk about here.

MARRIED/DATING WOMEN - Certainly a married woman should be disciplined by her husband. I have no qualms there. I would include women in pre-marriage romantic relationships as well. No reason a boyfriend can't disciple his girlfriend. I encourage it.

SINGLE WOMEN - But what do we say of women who don't have a man romantically involved in their lives? Are they excluded from the life-on-life, modeling example of discipleship that Jesus presented? Surely not, as Jesus had women who followed him around just as with his 12.

This context is the one where I have my greatest pet peeves with mainstream churchianity on the issue. Most ~~pastors~~ congregational leaders automatically assume a man should never disciple a woman outside of marriage. I have never found a single one who can give a biblical case for this conclusion. They always default to, "It's unwise." Why is it unwise? "Because it's inevitable that romantic feelings will develop and they can fall into sexual temptation." But isn't that the very context that 1 Cor. 7 says is a good reason to reason to marry? How would the 1 Cor. 7 "burn with passion" situation ever come up for a man if he limits his disciple-making efforts only to other men?

"But what about married men?" someone inevitably asks. "It's too much temptation for the married man to cheat." My gut reaction is simply to note that polygamy wasn't outlawed throughout biblical times as it is in most first world countries today ... so that's a problem the Bible never meant to address because it's a problem we created for ourselves. Not that I do endorse polygamy today, but that's a longer conversation you can read in this sub's history that I don't want to rehash.

My secondary reaction is simply to say that this "too much temptation" argument **ASSUMES MEN ARE WEAK**. What if we raised a breed of men who are not weak? What if we disciplined men to be firm in the faith to withstand temptation and take ground from the enemy?

You see, mainstream ~~churc~~h congregation leaders simply can't fathom a man so strong of faith that he could disciple a woman and not succumb to sexual temptation for her. This is the true crying shame.

QUESTIONS

1. Do any of you have a **SCRIPTURAL** argument for why women should be allowed to teach doctrinal issues to other women?
2. If women are not allowed to teach doctrinal issues to other women, is there any other solution as to who may disciple women other than men?
3. Do you believe it's possible for men - **EN MASSE** - in today's culture to grow mature enough to disciple women without succumbing to sexual sin?
4. If this is possible, what needs to happen to raise up men **EN MASSE** to pass on from being spiritual teenagers (rebellious brats who think they're mature because of what they know, but lack actual wisdom, discernment, and self-control) into spiritual men?
5. Are you still a spiritual teenager? Or younger? If not, what helped you grow into a spiritual man?

BONUS APPLICATION QUESTIONS

To put your money where your mouth is, if you do believe women should not teach doctrinal issues to other women (and therefore women discipling women would be limited to the Titus 2:3-5 life skills type issues), are you willing to disciple a single woman who doesn't have a husband to disciple her? If so, are you married, or would being married affect your decision on that point? Why would being married affect your decision? Is there a biblical foundation for your explanation or just your own personal non-biblical philosophy?

I am married, and I have enough men in my life who need disciplined that I don't have time for women other than my wife and daughters. Even if I ran out of men to disciple, I don't know that I'd be willing to make that leap yet. But I can't find a biblical reason why not. The only real explanation I've heard from other believers is: "Your wife's frame wouldn't like that very much." I suppose that's part of the reason I'm asking about this in the first place. What do you all have to offer on this issue? Or is the underlying premise incorrect altogether - that it really is okay for women to teach doctrinal issues to other women?

As I've observed numerous relationships in the last couple years, I've noticed an interesting phenomenon. I call them gravitational centers. These are relational norms that people tend to gravitate toward without even realizing it - and they can work either for or against you.

These are pretty obvious when taking a bird's eye view of how most men see progress in their MRP journey - both relationally (respect) and sexually (seduction). Understanding how gravitational centers work would have helped me break covert contracts early on, as well as staying motivated in my MAP, because it gives a framework for accepting the reality that women will sometimes refuse to respond to your improvements the way you think they should.

To make it easy to visualize, I've created a [simple graph](#) that should show you how this works. For easy reference:

- Red means the woman has given up. She is repelled by her husband.
- Orange means she has no interest in working on herself. She gravitates away from her husband, but watches to see what happens.
- Gray means there is no gravitational pull at all. You're just existing.
- Green means the wife is responding to her husband by improving herself, following his lead in the self-improvement venture.
- Dark green is where the wife feels the need to impress her man and that the onus for self-improvement is on her to keep up with where she perceives he already is.

This is far from a perfect graph, and the slopes certainly need a lot more readjusting - but heck, I only had an hour and a half to put this post together, so deal with it.

BOB'S STORY

A lot of what's written on MRP is targeted content, addressing a single event or discussing one concept. Reading the broader case studies that tracked the whole of a man's journey often helped me stay motivated, so let's start with a common RP story in the broad picture to show how the various gravitational centers affect sexual responsiveness: nuclear to bliss. I'll use a case study from a guy I've discipled for the past 2 years. For the sake of anonymity, let's call him Bob and his wife Jane. Bob, feel free to out yourself if you think it'd add to the conversation.

NUCLEAR: Bob's wife, Jane, threatened divorce a couple years ago. They were in the *red* zone. She wasn't getting any tingles or fuzzies. Bob was 100lbs overweight and had no clue what a clit is, much less how to find it. He was more interested in the latest Netflix Original than walking out the front door, and his mission was dictated to him by an NPC on his computer screen.

He responded to the threat of divorce by promising to improve. He did improve. He dropped 20lbs in the first few weeks and started contributing to chores. Did Jane see this improvement and reward him for it? No. If anything, she backed away even more, still repulsed by him.

Why would she do that when he's making progress? I hear this story all the time among my clients who are shocked when their wife files after they made the changes they promised her. It's because Jane rooted herself into a view of Bob that she could not pull away from. It was as though he was on a bungee cord - the further he tried to pull away from Jane's view of him and the relationship, the more tension existed that, in her crazy rationalization, only reaffirmed that they were in a bad, tense marriage and she wanted out.

SURVIVING. At some point, the bungee cord stretched like a mangled slinke. It's still all connected, but even if you let go, it wouldn't recoil all the way. There's extra slack in the line to work with. When Bob crossed that threshold, Jane was willing to give him a chance. Bob's still pretty darn blue because he's doing all of this *for Jane* at the time, but at least the weight keeps going down and he's starting to take ownership of his own home and life responsibilities. He mistakenly makes Jane his purpose, but at least it's better than his previous mission of making as much time for games as possible.

Jane's still skeptical and gravitating toward divorce, but at least she's willing to let things play out before pulling the trigger. She's gone from red to *orange*. There's a line ahead of her and she sees it. She wants Bob to succeed and cross that threshold, but expects him to fail. She herself still feels no compulsion to improve.

GRAY ZONE 1. After enough stretching, the cord finally snaps. Jane is now more interested to see how far Bob will go than she is in looking up attorneys online. In stead of being repulsed by him, she's intrigued by him. She's obviously not going to be chasing after him or try to improve herself yet, but she's not pulling away either. There is no pulling force. Life just exists here.

Jane was willing to call Bob her husband again, rather than "that scumbag I'm planning on divorcing." She acknowledges her marriage to Bob ... it's just an unhappy one.

PULL UP TO CENTER. At some point, Bob crossed another threshold. He started dressing nicer, and his clothes were actually fitting. He began wearing cologne. He's initiating sex again. Jane sees the possibility that their marriage can shift from unhappy to normal.

In this first green zone, Jane sees hope for what their relationship could become. Suddenly she's willing to work on herself. She believes that a little improvement on her part will continue encouraging Bob in his efforts to improve as well. She's manipulating him, but in her mind it's for the best. All the same, Jane's becoming sexually responsive to Bob again, so things are looking up.

CENTER. At some point their lives just kind of normalize. This is the second status quo. Just as there was a bungee cord in the bottom left when Jane wanted to divorce Bob, now there's a bungee cord in the dead-center. They aren't unhappy, but they're not excited every time the other one walks in the door either. They're perfectly neutral. Things in the relationship feel balanced, which at first sounds good, but then it means no one is yearning.

If Bob were to have faded downward a bit, Jane would have been motivated to get things back to center. Instead of Bob thinking 300lbs was just his normal weight, suddenly 230 is normal. If he pops up to 240 for a time he feels it and something in him causes him to gravitate back to 230 again. The same thing with his lifts - if they slack, he feels a drawing force back to what he was lifting at this center line. This applies to his efforts at leading in the relationship or taking ownership of his home - as he slacks, he sees the negative impact and is motivated to re-stabilize on that normal line.

PULL DOWN TO CENTER. But Bob's not okay with neutral. He keeps improving. It's harder than it was now. In the lower left sections, Bob first just wanted to avoid divorce, then he saw a "normal marriage" as some light at the end of the tunnel he was striving for. Now he's got what he believes all his friends have. Is it really worth it to keep going? He gravitates back toward the center and must have an extreme will-power to keep going up.

Jane also became comfortable with neutral. She put in a bit of effort. She dropped 10lbs. It's nowhere near the 70lbs Bob lost, but she had less to lose in the first place, she thinks. She smiles more than she used to in the gray first gray zone, and that should be enough for Bob. Yeah, he can keep improving, but he should be grateful for all the ways she's been improving. She puts the cap on the toothpaste now. Shouldn't that mean something to him? *I've already put in the effort, she tells herself. I'm good now. I'll be Bob's cheerleader as he keeps going while I sit right on this line.*

GRAY ZONE 2. After deciding that "normal" wasn't enough, he keeps going. Now he's developing his social game. He's working on his Keno. He's trying new things in bed. He's getting too far ahead of her, so Jane finally

agrees to meet him where he's at. She crosses into the gray zone with him. They reach a new status quo.

Unlike the first status quo, they're not "unhappily married" (default in most sitcoms), nor are they the second status quo of neutrality (where we just assume other people always are). Now they are "happily married." There's no pull up or down, left or right - they're fine just where they're at.

THRIVING. But then Bob keeps improving. He's not doing it *for Jane* anymore. He's doing it because the further he gets from his former unattractive slob self the happier he is with his life - and he wants to see just how far that road will take him.

He's no longer one of the "better guys" anymore. Now he's one of the best guys. He went from fat slob to respectable hunk. Other girls are taking notice of him and Jane sees it. At first she's mad and wants to pull him back to that center-line, but part of her likes it. If she want it to continue, she realizes she'll have to improve herself just to keep up. Now she's not doing it to motivate Bob - she's doing it because Bob has motivated her.

Jane sees another green light - a need to improve herself. Even if Bob stopped improving, just by being one of the "best guys" around, Jane constantly feels on her toes - a persistent pressure to keep Bob happy and make a real effort in the relationship. She's initiating sex more than he is. She takes care of the household responsibilities - without him even having to ask. She buys him little fun surprises when she's at the mall. Life is good.

BLISS. Now, making gains at some point becomes difficult. It's like building a house. One day the foundation is laid. Then the next couple days the structure is up. "Wow, you got all that done in a day?" Then the utility lines are installed, and a day after that the insulation and siding are put in. "Wow, look at that progress! This is going faster than I thought." Then the flooring is installed in a day. The dry wall in another day. Then the amenities are put in (stove, toilets, etc.). All this massive progress in the span of a few short weeks. But something bizarre happens. You stop seeing progress. The workers are there for hours painting baseboard and nailing it in. It takes two whole days for one of the guys just to tile the shower. It's a week for painting and caulking and detailing. What's taking so long?

Bob finally got a foundation laid and structure put in place. He had all the amenities to make Jane swoon, but the detailing would take much longer. Bob's still working on that.

But from other relationships with the most high-end guys, I see an even *greener* zone than in the thriving relationships. They live in bliss - true excitement. I expect this can't be maintained perpetually and indefinitely (at least I haven't been able to), but when the guy lives in this peak, the wife seems to feel the full weight of dread on her shoulders and will put in whatever effort it takes to keep her man focused on her instead of the neighbor who's always trying to chat him up. As a man lives in this zone, his wife is drawn toward impressing him. She gravitates toward him, not toward any status quo.

CAVEAT: In this particular story, (sorry Bob) Jane didn't start off as a very attractive woman (though she got there by the end), so it's not like she had several Chads sweeping in to steal her away while Bob was just getting going. If that had been the case, she may have stayed in the "I'm better off just divorcing him" phase much longer - or actually have gone through with it. Again, you can't always predict how a woman will act at any given time, though there are certainly broad trends that are generally reliable.

CONTEXT

It's important to note that the entire context of viewing this graph is looking at the man's attractiveness, value, improvements, etc. as the decisive factor of his own ability to achieve sexual and relational satisfaction - whether with his wife or otherwise. If Jane wouldn't have responded this way for Bob, a litany of other women likely would have.

In that sense, while we use the man's status on two of these axes as the premise for everything, the colors show

generally how women are likely to respond - not a predictor of how Jane specifically should be expected to respond (no covert contracts). So, you can think of this graph as a picture of female sexuality.

For the mathematically inclined, you're welcome to imagine the colors as a topographical indication on a third axis sticking into or out of the page as the general "female" variable - I just thought it'd be easier to interpret this in terms of color than a 3-dimensional graph (which would have taken far more effort to figure out how to do than would be worthwhile). But the picture would be far more complete with an into/out of the page dynamic happening in this hole process.

EXTENDING THE GRAPH

You'll note that I extended the "fuzzies" section beyond the basic square. This is because you can always add more fuzzies to a relationship ... but after a certain point it forces attraction downward.

The further away you get, the less sexually interested the woman becomes and ultimately couldn't care less about the man.

GRAY ZONES

It's interesting to note that there are two extremes in the gray zone:

- Extremely attractive people with no depth to the relationship. These are your CEOs, biker gang leaders, and meat heads at the gym. The woman really has no long-term interest in the guy, but somehow she's in his bed for years and years. She's not going anywhere. She knows she doesn't love him, but the sex is too good - how could she leave it? They have reached a status quo - albeit not an ideal one, but it's comfortable enough to live in.
- Then there's the supreme beta bux. The guy who isn't attractive at all, but will do anything and everything for his wife. She wants a back rub? There he is. A new house they can't afford? He'll make it happen somehow. Her friend has a cute puppy? He gets her a cuter one. There are water spots at the bottom of the sink after he finished the dishes? "Don't worry honey, I'll dry them up so you don't have to see them anymore." She's not going anywhere, but she's certainly unfulfilled. Again, not an ideal status quo, but one she's willing to live with.

Between the extremes are areas where a guy sacrifices a bit in one area, but makes up for it in another.

CAPS

Now, I hear some guys complain that they're not naturally attractive, therefore they must be doomed. "Black pill ... yadda yadda ... I hate women." Suppose even with all the alpha confidence, amused mastery, etc., he still caps out at about a 7 on the attraction scale. You'll note that it's unlikely the 7 will ever have to worry about divorce ... just remember that these rankings are perspective-based - a 7 to the girl at the bar might still be a 4 to his wife if he's not gaming and attracting her the same way.

What hope does he have for a successful marriage once he's hit his attractiveness peak? He'll never be as attractive as Chad. Of course, most Chads don't give her the fuzzies. So, the 7 becomes an oak. Instead of relying on his attractiveness (A-game) to maintain a healthy marriage, he ups his B-game and finds himself in the green, where his wife gravitates toward him and her default position is to improve herself for him rather than rest in the neutral gray zone.

Note that the "fuzzies" he improves here are not about serving or pedestalizing her, as that would actually decrease his attraction down from a 7. Instead, it is about passing comfort tests and decorating the interior of his frame to be

a desirable place that any woman would want to live in, rather than steel and barbed wire that make up the border. The same is true in the reverse. Some guys just lack the capacity to build a comfortable frame. Comfort tests aren't natural for them. They might hit a 7 and peak there. What's he to do? Up his attractiveness game.

A balanced guy will have a steady pace moving from phase to phase, but if a guy is imbalanced, he has to put an incredible amount of work on his strong point to make up for a mild/moderate lacking in his weaker aspect.

GREEN-ORANGE REVERSAL

It's also interesting that there is green on the "unhappy" half of the graph and orange on the "happy" half. Shouldn't all the orange be on the unhappy side and all the green on the happy side? Why would a woman start responding positively to her man when she's unhappy and respond negatively after he's improved?

That's the whole point of the gravitational centers. When she's unhappy, but has hope, she gets in the game. When she's happy, but thinks even more happiness isn't worth the effort (usually because she can't visualize it or doesn't believe the improvements will last), she pulls away.

This confounds lots of men I meet with who saw some early gains in their sex life, but then realize that continued improvement was counter-productive. I believe this is why.

ANOMALIES

Now, there's actually an updated version of the graph for you to enjoy: [right here](#). I add 3 significant zones.

BROWN - The brown zone is the murky area where about 95% of men live. They're not elephant-man ugly, but far from attractive. They make up for it by being good beta-bux to their woman, but aren't perfect. That big brown hole is your average guy. It's not a great place to live, but I guess "not great" describes the average marriage today anyway. Most women really don't like having sex with a guy in this zone - and might even say it's painful to have to deal with him there, which is why these types of guys face constant rejection from their wife.

CENTER PINK - This is the "sweet spot" for women. Whereas men most often live in the brown zone, married women are most comfortable living in the pink zone - leaning slightly more toward the attractive end of the spectrum, but overall not seeing a compelling need to supremely excel on either axis. And why would they? By being average, they can already get whatever they want from most men. Of course, they don't want to slack too much either, as that would compromise the social advantage they have and their ability to find another man easily if her husband does turn out to be a flop. It's not a sexual peak for them, but it's a comfortable place for them to be all the same. Nevertheless, most guys seem to think women should be sexually excited to be in this "normal" zone, and it just doesn't work like that.

What zone on the graph is most likely to get a woman sexually excited? ...

UPPER PINK - This is the exciting place for women and where sex happens most for them. For most women, this really is their peak sexual place on the graph. They can't resist a guy who's extremely attractive, even if he's pretty low on the fuzzies axis. One night stands, bar hook-ups, the CC - it's all because of this particular zone for women. But even within this zone, stroking her feelz even a little bit has more impact than that extra bit of attraction, so I marked off the right-most section of that pink area as the best spot even within that zone.

Enjoy, fellas!

As I've observed numerous relationships in the last couple years, I've noticed an interesting phenomenon. I call them gravitational centers. These are relational norms that people tend to gravitate toward without even realizing it - and they can work either for or against you.

These are pretty obvious when taking a bird's eye view of how most men see progress in their MRP journey - both relationally (respect) and sexually (seduction). Understanding how gravitational centers work would have helped me break covert contracts early on, as well as staying motivated in my MAP, because it gives a framework for accepting the reality that women will sometimes refuse to respond to your improvements the way you think they should.

To make it easy to visualize, I've created a **simple graph** that should show you how this works. For easy reference:

- Red means the woman has given up. She is repelled by her husband.
- Orange means she has no interest in working on herself. She gravitates away from her husband, but watches to see what happens.
- Gray means there is no gravitational pull at all. You're just existing.
- Green means the wife is responding to her husband by improving herself, following his lead in the self-improvement venture.
- Dark green is where the wife feels the need to impress her man and that the onus for self-improvement is on her to keep up with where she perceives he already is.

This is far from a perfect graph, and the slopes certainly need a lot more readjusting - but heck, I only had an hour and a half to put this post together, so deal with it.

BOB'S STORY

A lot of what's written on MRP is targeted content, addressing a single event or discussing one concept. Reading the broader case studies that tracked the whole of a man's journey often helped me stay motivated, so let's start with a common RP story in the broad picture to show how the various gravitational centers affect sexual responsiveness: nuclear to bliss. I'll use a case study from a guy I've discipled for the past 2 years. For the sake of anonymity, let's call him Bob and his wife Jane. Bob, feel free to out yourself if you think it'd add to the conversation.

NUCLEAR: Bob's wife, Jane, threatened divorce a couple years ago. They were in the *red* zone. She wasn't getting any tingles or fuzzies. Bob was 100lbs overweight and had no clue what a clit is, much less how to find it. He was more interested in the latest Netflix Original than walking out the front door, and his mission was dictated to him by an NPC on his computer screen.

He responded to the threat of divorce by promising to improve. He did improve. He dropped 20lbs in the first few weeks and started contributing to chores. Did Jane see this improvement and reward him for it? No. If anything, she backed away even more, still repulsed by him.

Why would she do that when he's making progress? I hear this story all the time among my clients who are shocked when their wife files after they made the changes they promised her. It's because Jane rooted herself into a view of Bob that she could not pull away from. It was as though he was on a bungee cord - the further he tried to pull away from Jane's view of him and the relationship, the more tension existed that, in her crazy rationalization, only reaffirmed that they were in a bad, tense marriage and she wanted out.

SURVIVING. At some point, the bungee cord stretched like a mangled slinke. It's still all connected, but even if you let go, it wouldn't recoil all the way. There's extra slack in the line to work with. When Bob crossed that threshold, Jane was willing to give him a chance. Bob's still pretty darn blue because he's doing all of this *for Jane* at the time, but at least the weight keeps going down and he's starting to take ownership of his own home and life responsibilities. He mistakenly makes Jane his purpose, but at least it's better than his previous mission of making as much time for games as possible.

Jane's still skeptical and gravitating toward divorce, but at least she's willing to let things play out before pulling the trigger. She's gone from red to *orange*. There's a line ahead of her and she sees it. She wants Bob to succeed and cross that threshold, but expects him to fail. She herself still feels no compulsion to improve.

GRAY ZONE 1. After enough stretching, the cord finally snaps. Jane is now more interested to see how far Bob will go than she is in looking up attorneys online. In stead of being repulsed by him, she's intrigued by him. She's obviously not going to be chasing after him or try to improve herself yet, but she's not pulling away either. There is no pulling force. Life just exists here.

Jane was willing to call Bob her husband again, rather than "that scumbag I'm planning on divorcing." She acknowledges her marriage to Bob ... it's just an unhappy one.

PULL UP TO CENTER. At some point, Bob crossed another threshold. He started dressing nicer, and his clothes were actually fitting. He began wearing cologne. He's initiating sex again. Jane sees the possibility that their marriage can shift from unhappy to normal.

In this first green zone, Jane sees hope for what their relationship could become. Suddenly she's willing to work on herself. She believes that a little improvement on her part will continue encouraging Bob in his efforts to improve as well. She's manipulating him, but in her mind it's for the best. All the same, Jane's becoming sexually responsive to Bob again, so things are looking up.

CENTER. At some point their lives just kind of normalize. This is the second status quo. Just as there was a bungee cord in the bottom left when Jane wanted to divorce Bob, now there's a bungee cord in the dead-center. They aren't unhappy, but they're not excited every time the other one walks in the door either. They're perfectly neutral. Things in the relationship feel balanced, which at first sounds good, but then it means no one is yearning.

If Bob were to have faded downward a bit, Jane would have been motivated to get things back to center. Instead of Bob thinking 300lbs was just his normal weight, suddenly 230 is normal. If he pops up to 240 for a time he feels it and something in him causes him to gravitate back to 230 again. The same thing with his lifts - if they slack, he feels a drawing force back to what he was lifting at this center line. This applies to his efforts at leading in the relationship or taking ownership of his home - as he slacks, he sees the negative impact and is motivated to re-stabilize on that normal line.

PULL DOWN TO CENTER. But Bob's not okay with neutral. He keeps improving. It's harder than it was now. In the lower left sections, Bob first just wanted to avoid divorce, then he saw a "normal marriage" as some light at the end of the tunnel he was striving for. Now he's got what he believes all his friends have. Is it really worth it to keep going? He gravitates back toward the center and must have an extreme will-power to keep going up.

Jane also became comfortable with neutral. She put in a bit of effort. She dropped 10lbs. It's nowhere near the 70lbs Bob lost, but she had less to lose in the first place, she thinks. She smiles more than she used to in the gray first gray zone, and that should be enough for Bob. Yeah, he can keep improving, but he should be grateful for all the ways she's been improving. She puts the cap on the toothpaste now. Shouldn't that mean something to him? *I've already put in the effort, she tells herself. I'm good now. I'll be Bob's cheerleader as he keeps going while I sit right on this line.*

GRAY ZONE 2. After deciding that "normal" wasn't enough, he keeps going. Now he's developing his social game. He's working on his Keno. He's trying new things in bed. He's getting too far ahead of her, so Jane finally

agrees to meet him where he's at. She crosses into the gray zone with him. They reach a new status quo.

Unlike the first status quo, they're not "unhappily married" (default in most sitcoms), nor are they the second status quo of neutrality (where we just assume other people always are). Now they are "happily married." There's no pull up or down, left or right - they're fine just where they're at.

THRIVING. But then Bob keeps improving. He's not doing it *for Jane* anymore. He's doing it because the further he gets from his former unattractive slob self the happier he is with his life - and he wants to see just how far that road will take him.

He's no longer one of the "better guys" anymore. Now he's one of the best guys. He went from fat slob to respectable hunk. Other girls are taking notice of him and Jane sees it. At first she's mad and wants to pull him back to that center-line, but part of her likes it. If she want it to continue, she realizes she'll have to improve herself just to keep up. Now she's not doing it to motivate Bob - she's doing it because Bob has motivated her.

Jane sees another green light - a need to improve herself. Even if Bob stopped improving, just by being one of the "best guys" around, Jane constantly feels on her toes - a persistent pressure to keep Bob happy and make a real effort in the relationship. She's initiating sex more than he is. She takes care of the household responsibilities - without him even having to ask. She buys him little fun surprises when she's at the mall. Life is good.

BLISS. Now, making gains at some point becomes difficult. It's like building a house. One day the foundation is laid. Then the next couple days the structure is up. "Wow, you got all that done in a day?" Then the utility lines are installed, and a day after that the insulation and siding are put in. "Wow, look at that progress! This is going faster than I thought." Then the flooring is installed in a day. The dry wall in another day. Then the amenities are put in (stove, toilets, etc.). All this massive progress in the span of a few short weeks. But something bizarre happens. You stop seeing progress. The workers are there for hours painting baseboard and nailing it in. It takes two whole days for one of the guys just to tile the shower. It's a week for painting and caulking and detailing. What's taking so long?

Bob finally got a foundation laid and structure put in place. He had all the amenities to make Jane swoon, but the detailing would take much longer. Bob's still working on that.

But from other relationships with the most high-end guys, I see an even *greener* zone than in the thriving relationships. They live in bliss - true excitement. I expect this can't be maintained perpetually and indefinitely (at least I haven't been able to), but when the guy lives in this peak, the wife seems to feel the full weight of dread on her shoulders and will put in whatever effort it takes to keep her man focused on her instead of the neighbor who's always trying to chat him up. As a man lives in this zone, his wife is drawn toward impressing him. She gravitates toward him, not toward any status quo.

CAVEAT: In this particular story, (sorry Bob) Jane didn't start off as a very attractive woman (though she got there by the end), so it's not like she had several Chads sweeping in to steal her away while Bob was just getting going. If that had been the case, she may have stayed in the "I'm better off just divorcing him" phase much longer - or actually have gone through with it. Again, you can't always predict how a woman will act at any given time, though there are certainly broad trends that are generally reliable.

CONTEXT

It's important to note that the entire context of viewing this graph is looking at the man's attractiveness, value, improvements, etc. as the decisive factor of his own ability to achieve sexual and relational satisfaction - whether with his wife or otherwise. If Jane wouldn't have responded this way for Bob, a litany of other women likely would have.

In that sense, while we use the man's status on two of these axes as the premise for everything, the colors show

generally how women are likely to respond - not a predictor of how Jane specifically should be expected to respond (no covert contracts). So, you can think of this graph as a picture of female sexuality.

For the mathematically inclined, you're welcome to imagine the colors as a topographical indication on a third axis sticking into or out of the page as the general "female" variable - I just thought it'd be easier to interpret this in terms of color than a 3-dimensional graph (which would have taken far more effort to figure out how to do than would be worthwhile). But the picture would be far more complete with an into/out of the page dynamic happening in this hole process.

EXTENDING THE GRAPH

You'll note that I extended the "fuzzies" section beyond the basic square. This is because you can always add more fuzzies to a relationship ... but after a certain point it forces attraction downward.

The further away you get, the less sexually interested the woman becomes and ultimately couldn't care less about the man.

GRAY ZONES

It's interesting to note that there are two extremes in the gray zone:

- Extremely attractive people with no depth to the relationship. These are your CEOs, biker gang leaders, and meat heads at the gym. The woman really has no long-term interest in the guy, but somehow she's in his bed for years and years. She's not going anywhere. She knows she doesn't love him, but the sex is too good - how could she leave it? They have reached a status quo - albeit not an ideal one, but it's comfortable enough to live in.
- Then there's the supreme beta bux. The guy who isn't attractive at all, but will do anything and everything for his wife. She wants a back rub? There he is. A new house they can't afford? He'll make it happen somehow. Her friend has a cute puppy? He gets her a cuter one. There are water spots at the bottom of the sink after he finished the dishes? "Don't worry honey, I'll dry them up so you don't have to see them anymore." She's not going anywhere, but she's certainly unfulfilled. Again, not an ideal status quo, but one she's willing to live with.

Between the extremes are areas where a guy sacrifices a bit in one area, but makes up for it in another.

CAPS

Now, I hear some guys complain that they're not naturally attractive, therefore they must be doomed. "Black pill ... yadda yadda ... I hate women." Suppose even with all the alpha confidence, amused mastery, etc., he still caps out at about a 7 on the attraction scale. You'll note that it's unlikely the 7 will ever have to worry about divorce ... just remember that these rankings are perspective-based - a 7 to the girl at the bar might still be a 4 to his wife if he's not gaming and attracting her the same way.

What hope does he have for a successful marriage once he's hit his attractiveness peak? He'll never be as attractive as Chad. Of course, most Chads don't give her the fuzzies. So, the 7 becomes an oak. Instead of relying on his attractiveness (A-game) to maintain a healthy marriage, he ups his B-game and finds himself in the green, where his wife gravitates toward him and her default position is to improve herself for him rather than rest in the neutral gray zone.

Note that the "fuzzies" he improves here are not about serving or pedestalizing her, as that would actually decrease his attraction down from a 7. Instead, it is about passing comfort tests and decorating the interior of his frame to be

a desirable place that any woman would want to live in, rather than steel and barbed wire that make up the border. The same is true in the reverse. Some guys just lack the capacity to build a comfortable frame. Comfort tests aren't natural for them. They might hit a 7 and peak there. What's he to do? Up his attractiveness game.

A balanced guy will have a steady pace moving from phase to phase, but if a guy is imbalanced, he has to put an incredible amount of work on his strong point to make up for a mild/moderate lacking in his weaker aspect.

GREEN-ORANGE REVERSAL

It's also interesting that there is green on the "unhappy" half of the graph and orange on the "happy" half. Shouldn't all the orange be on the unhappy side and all the green on the happy side? Why would a woman start responding positively to her man when she's unhappy and respond negatively after he's improved?

That's the whole point of the gravitational centers. When she's unhappy, but has hope, she gets in the game. When she's happy, but thinks even more happiness isn't worth the effort (usually because she can't visualize it or doesn't believe the improvements will last), she pulls away.

This confounds lots of men I meet with who saw some early gains in their sex life, but then realize that continued improvement was counter-productive. I believe this is why.

ANOMALIES

Now, there's actually an updated version of the graph for you to enjoy: [right here](#). I add 3 significant zones.

BROWN - The brown zone is the murky area where about 95% of men live. They're not elephant-man ugly, but far from attractive. They make up for it by being good beta-bux to their woman, but aren't perfect. That big brown hole is your average guy. It's not a great place to live, but I guess "not great" describes the average marriage today anyway. Most women really don't like having sex with a guy in this zone - and might even say it's painful to have to deal with him there, which is why these types of guys face constant rejection from their wife.

CENTER PINK - This is the "sweet spot" for women. Whereas men most often live in the brown zone, married women are most comfortable living in the pink zone - leaning slightly more toward the attractive end of the spectrum, but overall not seeing a compelling need to supremely excel on either axis. And why would they? By being average, they can already get whatever they want from most men. Of course, they don't want to slack too much either, as that would compromise the social advantage they have and their ability to find another man easily if her husband does turn out to be a flop. It's not a sexual peak for them, but it's a comfortable place for them to be all the same. Nevertheless, most guys seem to think women should be sexually excited to be in this "normal" zone, and it just doesn't work like that.

What zone on the graph is most likely to get a woman sexually excited? ...

UPPER PINK - This is the exciting place for women and where sex happens most for them. For most women, this really is their peak sexual place on the graph. They can't resist a guy who's extremely attractive, even if he's pretty low on the fuzzies axis. One night stands, bar hook-ups, the CC - it's all because of this particular zone for women. But even within this zone, stroking her feelz even a little bit has more impact than that extra bit of attraction, so I marked off the right-most section of that pink area as the best spot even within that zone.

Enjoy, fellas!

15

UPVOTES

The Second Kiss of Death

18 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

There is a saying in the manosphere that is so notorious that it has been labeled by some as the "kiss of death" to a marriage: ILY, BINILWY. "I Love You, But I'm Not In Love With You." This is usually directed from a woman to a man. It's an expression of her hypergamy and hamster brain at its finest: "I'm not a bad wife. I still love my husband. But someone else is giving me the tingles. That's reasonable, right?" 9 times out of 10, when you hear this phrase, it's over. Only the top men will figure out how to recover from this - and doing everything you can to make her happy isn't the answer because that's what got you into that mess in the first place. But this isn't the only "kiss of death" out there - it's just the only one that gets verbalized.

As many of you know, I see a lot of broken marriages. It's my day job. I've noticed another kiss of death, and this one is usually directed from a man to his wife. It doesn't roll off the tongue as nicely, but here goes: IH, BINHIFY. "I'm Horny, But I'm Not Horny For You."

THE PEOPLE

Women talk. Men do. Women are willing to say ILY, BINILWY. Rarely will a man communicate IH, BINHIFY.

For these men, their wife is willing to have sex with him, but has no personal desire. She wears jeans and a t-shirt everyday. She spends all her time on social media, primping her house (because you know it's not really his), or binging Netflix. She may have been attractive at one point, but she no longer feels the need to put in the effort.

The men themselves are boring. They waver between work and vegging out. They don't have a mission. They don't employ kino. They're not hitting the gym. They may have been attractive one point, but he no longer feels the need to put in the effort.

THE PROBLEM

What's unique here is that these guys have willing wives. How do I know? Because the thought of not having sex with her doesn't cross his mind until she actually offers and he realizes he's not interested. After that it delves deeper to the point where he's not interested in initiating either.

If she's willing, what's the problem? The problem is that he's not attracted to her, which is closely related to the fact that she's not attracted to him. If she was, she'd see his disinterest and try to spark interest again. Married men have standards too. When talking about SMV, most men size up a woman by her looks, but most of us agree that this isn't based on the raw material alone (weight, symmetry, etc.):

- How she dresses. This is a part of her looks. An attractive woman who hides what she's got isn't attractive anymore. To pick on an easy example: have you seen **Jennifer Lopez in sweats?** Not bad. But **have you seen her in actual sweats?** No thanks. Outfit matters.
- Makeup. This is also part of her looks. We've all seen **before/after pics of celebrities without makeup**. Dear goodness, most of them look ... normal? Some women can pull off normal and still make me want to screw them. Others can't.
- Posture/Pose. This is all about how she presents her looks. It's the difference between **"There she is on her phone again"** and **"Dang, I gotta get her off that phone again!"**
- Seduction/Attitude. This is less about how she looks and more about sexual behavior, speech, mannerisms, etc. When you talk, does the conversation go **like this?** Or a little more **like this?**

There are more I could go into (hair style, skin tone, muscle toning, accessories, etc.), but you get the point. Having a hot wife doesn't mean squat if she's only hot on Friday nights when you happen to have a babysitter, and even then only if she feels like it. Yes, I've been there.

Ironically, his non-attraction to her often makes her feel more validated in her sexuality within the marriage, not less. Her hamster spins, "I'm ready and willing. All he's got to do is initiate. He must be the problem, not me. I'm fine." How can she get away with this false-validation? Because he's too big of a pussy to tell her plainly: "Screw off, woman. I don't cum on to just anyone. I have standards," or even, "I'm horny, but I'm not horny for you."

MISTAKES/SUCSESSES

Now, when a man actually has this conversation with his wife, it rarely goes well. I tried that in the past. My wife is naturally attractive, but doesn't always put in the effort I like to see. Progress is progress, but here are some mistakes from my past.

- "You should wear more tank tops and skirts. I think they look really sexy on you." ... didn't result in her wearing more tank tops and skirts. It's good for her to know what I like, but simply telling her didn't cut it.
- She's riding me, but I'm not even close. I tell her to bite her lip and moan. Mistake. She goes off about how she's not going to fake it, and she already finished and just wanted to be done because she was getting sore. Blah, blah, blah.
- I've also tried outright saying "No" to sex when she initiated, giving a clear cold shoulder and explaining that I'm just not feeling horny toward her in the moment. Huge butthurt moment. No, this did not inspire her to start perking her chest when I walked in the room from then on in order to make me horny.

Want to know what did work?

- Buying her a skirt. She wore it.
- Making her moan in bed, then sticking my dick in her while she was still moaning.
- Initiating sex in a way that made her feel sexy and want to keep feeling that way.

See the difference between how "saying" failed, but "doing" can succeed?

TEMPORAL HOTNESS

Now I'll note, this is still something of an ongoing struggle with my wife. Every now and then I catch myself thinking, **"What's the point of having a hot wife if I don't get to see her being and acting hot?"** Then I remember that "hot" is not just about a woman's *potential for hotness*, but about her *actual hotness in the moment*.

To that end, my wife was not hot yesterday. There were a couple days last week when she was hot, though. See how that works? Yesterday she was a harpy. There are other days when she's an incubus. Some days she's all business, other days she's all play.

RETENTIVE ATTRACTION

The degree to which I am attracted to my wife isn't temporal, though. Guys seem to have a weird lingering subliminal memory for how we view women. About once every 6 months I'll go on Facebook and see pictures of people from high school. My ONEitis from back then looks fine today, but for some reason I still see her as a goddess. My wife is 11 years older and 10lbs heavier than when we married, with stretch marks from 4

pregnancies, but there's a part of me that still sees the girl I dated when I look at her.

Yet my attraction toward her does waver. Why? Because I see the dissonance between my memory of her hotness and the present reality in front of me, when they're not aligned. But instead of a sharp spike in attraction from day to day, it's more of an average. If she's hot 6 days in a week, I'm still horny for her on the 7th, regardless of how she's wearing her hair, posing her body, or that she's not wearing make-up. But if she's only hot 1 day in a week, suddenly I'm more interested in the girl with the tight midriff walking down the street. Did my wife's facial features change? Did her weight take a massive hike that week? No. But in those times she does make it hard to visualize the hotness my memory wants to recall.

WHY DOES THIS MATTER?

For guys out there whose wives already make them horny 7 days a week, it doesn't. For that matter, if you're the type of guy who would bang a brick of cheese to get off, it probably doesn't matter for you either.

For those of us who find ourselves sexually disinterested from time to time, acknowledging when you're not horny for your wife makes a difference. For some guys, this is the "kiss of death" in the relationship that leads them toward divorce. They've given up before they even started. However, instead of cutting off hope of things getting better, this recognition can give a guy motivation to take action to improve things - especially if you're the kind of guy whose mission and MAP includes keeping her around.

IMPROVE THE MAN

We talk a lot here about "fixing the man" and general self-improvement. That's great. But in my experience, a guy's self-improvement doesn't *automatically* make his wife start improving all on its own. It does increase her attraction to him, but if he wants to be more attracted to her, she's got to make some changes too. Her being more attracted to him might give some underlying reason to improve, that reason doesn't manifest into action until there's something prodding the action. Remember, women are told all their lives that they're perfect and any guy would be lucky to have sex with them. If you keep positively reinforcing her through your expression of your sexuality toward her, all she thinks is: "This is awesome! I'm getting a better husband and I don't need to do anything at all, except have sex more often with a more attractive man."

This is one of the greatest shortcomings I see in MRP. I completely get that "you can't change her, only yourself." I also get that self-improvement is foundational. I also get that there aren't to be any covert contracts: she may never actually improve. But none of this is a license to ignore all conversation about how to get her to improve beyond "improve yourself first." What after that? The imbalance of content on MRP in favor of male-improvement leaves the implication that men *shouldn't* nudge their wives to improve themselves because we're so used to reading, "Just work on yourself and if she responds, great; if not, leave. Abundance, blah, blah, blah." The posts about how to "train up your slut" are either incredibly narrow in focus or otherwise extremely rare. I'm not saying to make this a 50/50 - but 90/10 is better than 99/1. Improving the man is only the starting point.

THEN IMPROVE THE WOMAN

Last week I made [this post about "gravitational centers"](#), which tracked a common journey from "ILY, BINILWY" to bliss. Bob had thought "IH, BINHIFY" toward his wife before. But Bob's wife didn't improve all on her own. It wasn't some magical thing in her that she suddenly decided to do when she saw him making progress. He was inviting her to improve with him all along the journey.

- "I'm going to the gym. Want to join?"
 - "I need a new suit. Want to go shopping together? You can do a fashion show for me in the dressing room."
 - "I'm going to cook a new meal. Want to help?"
-

He led by example. Instead of affirming her, he stretched her.

Most wives don't ever realize "IH, BINHFY" is a thing a guy thinks from time to time. I remember my wife at one point thinking that sex was just about ejaculating and that it didn't matter how she acted, which outfit she wore, etc. "I'm naked. Why aren't you hard yet?" She had to be taught that guys don't get hard on command. I remember a radio host doing a prank call with a woman, sharing embarrassing stories, who commented, "This girl must be hot because apparently she grew up believing guys were always hard. She'd never seen a naked guy in front of her who wasn't!" The sad thing is: in today's culture where just saying "Do you want sex?" *actually will* make a dozen men nearby hard, there's not a lot of reason for women to believe otherwise.

That's why dread is so powerful. You've got to be high enough quality to make her want to keep you happy. But even after that, you've still got to nudge her to work on herself too. It's not enough to tell or show her what makes you happy: you have to make it an express expectation.

SUGGESTIONS

How do you do that? A few things I've tried to get the conversation rolling:

- Buying clothes that I like to see her in. I actually went to an "adult superstore" recently, for the first time. It wasn't as absurd as my pious sensibilities were expecting. I bought a pair of leggings, looked around for a while at some lingerie and toy options, and left. (Funny: I commented to my wife about how I heard the store was going out of business and she replies: "Good. Less of that kind of sin to worry about." She'll get there).
- I also downloaded a free app that offers sexual ideas and matches them between partners (Kindu, if you're interested). Every now and then she'll do one of their "packs" [of options] and press the "wink" button, which sends me a signal that she wants to try it. This gave her some inspiration to start working with.
- Instead of averting my eyes as soon as my wife sees me glancing at another girl, I let her see me linger. She doesn't like it, but it tells her what catches my attention. It was easy to start with steamy scenes in a show, then move everyday life.

Figure out what works for you. But don't just assume that self-improvement by itself is going to get her on the self-improvement track too. It might give her the energy to change, but you've still got to make clear that you *expect* her to change. If you all have any more tips, feel free to share.

CHRIST AND THE CHURCH

"And this is a great mystery: I am talking about Christ and the church."

That's right, this is all a spiritual metaphor. We talk a heck of a lot about how Christ is the most attractive man the church could ever hope for - pre-and-post-resurrection. Money, power, fame, confidence, leadership - he has it all. But what about our attractiveness to him?

Yes, the farmer in the parable sows seed indiscriminately throughout his field. But he's also not an idiot. Even in those days people were skilled enough at farming to see a good plot of soil and say, "Yes, that's the place I'm going to spill my seed!" While some seed may have fallen on the bad forms of soil (and nothing came of it), a good farmer looks for good soil because he knows it's going to be fruitful, just as Deep talks in his books about how the qualities men tend to find attractive in women are those which indicate an ability to produce healthy offspring. Yes, it's always about multiplication and disciple-making with me.

How many of us are quick to think toward Jesus, "I love you, but I'm not *in love* with you"? I see this all the time on other Christian subs. It's rooted in the emotionalism that I press hard against regularly. "I just don't *feel* close to God. What can I do to get that *feeling* that Christians are *supposed to have*?" Feelings are great, but our faith is not

about *feeling* a certain way. It's about *being* a certain way. This emotionalism is a form of communal hypergamy that seeks to place ourselves above Christ in the relationship.

- **The Church:** "Jesus, I want to feel close to you. Shower me with your grace. Let me live in the light of your joy for all my days!"
- **Jesus:** "I want to go make more babies. I've got an entire kingdom to fill. So let me come inside you so we can reproduce."

Yes, this is a typical groom/bride dynamic. Just as many men aren't horny for their wives ... are you doing much to make Jesus "spiritually horny" for you? Yes, I know that phrase sounds cheesy and weird, but it's a serious question nonetheless. What are you doing to make yourself an attractive bride for Christ? What are you doing to show him how your spiritual features and proportions are uniquely designed for producing offspring? Are you hiding those features or flaunting them in public?

Seriously: 1 Timothy 2:9 notwithstanding, how many of you guys wish your wives were *less modest* when you went out in public? When it happens, all I can think is: "I can't wait to get you home and put the kids to bed." And yes, there are ways to be sexy and modest at the same time. "Less modest" for most Christian women means "stop being a frigid prude." Spiritually, most people are equally prudish in the way they express their interest in spiritual reproduction. If you don't want your wife to be that to you, don't be that to Jesus.

FAST and EASY

You should all know my old acronym for qualities to look for in a wife: *Faithful, Available, Teachable*. But "FAT" just didn't seem like a good way to characterize wifey material. So, I added the S - she's got to be "Saved." So you want a FAST woman:

- Faithful
- Available
- Saved
- Teachable

Indeed, fast women do make for good longevity in a marriage, but it doesn't necessarily mean sexual attraction will be abounding. It could be a boring marriage. Many unattractive women could meet those criteria. So, I joked with some guys want that you also want a woman who's EASY:

- Elegant
- Alluring
- Submissive
- Young

As single men, you still have the principle of selection working for you. Those of us who are married must train our wives to be this way. It starts with being an even higher quality man than you expect her to be as a woman - so get working on yourself first. But from there, you can't expect her to just figure this all out on your own. Take action that lets her know what you want her to become.

121

UPVOTES

The Second Kiss of Death

18 June 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill · Archived copy · Reddit

There is a saying in the manosphere that is so notorious that it has been labeled by some as the "kiss of death" to a marriage: ILY, BINILWY. "I Love You, But I'm Not In Love With You." This is usually directed from a woman to a man. It's an expression of her hypergamy and hamster brain at its finest: "I'm not a bad wife. I still love my husband. But someone else is giving me the tingles. That's reasonable, right?" 9 times out of 10, when you hear this phrase, it's over. Only the top men will figure out how to recover from this - and doing everything you can to make her happy isn't the answer because that's what got you into that mess in the first place. But this isn't the only "kiss of death" out there - it's just the only one that gets verbalized.

As many of you know, I see a lot of broken marriages. It's my day job. I've noticed another kiss of death, and this one is usually directed from a man to his wife. It doesn't roll off the tongue as nicely, but here goes: IH, BINHIFY. "I'm Horny, But I'm Not Horny For You."

THE PEOPLE

Women talk. Men do. Women are willing to say ILY, BINILWY. Rarely will a man communicate IH, BINHIFY.

For these men, their wife is willing to have sex with him, but has no personal desire. She wears jeans and a t-shirt everyday. She spends all her time on social media, primping her house (because you know it's not really his), or binging Netflix. She may have been attractive at one point, but she no longer feels the need to put in the effort.

The men themselves are boring. They waver between work and vegging out. They don't have a mission. They don't employ kino. They're not hitting the gym. They may have been attractive one point, but he no longer feels the need to put in the effort.

THE PROBLEM

What's unique here is that these guys have willing wives. How do I know? Because the thought of not having sex with her doesn't cross his mind until she actually offers and he realizes he's not interested. After that it delves deeper to the point where he's not interested in initiating either.

If she's willing, what's the problem? The problem is that he's not attracted to her, which is closely related to the fact that she's not attracted to him. If she was, she'd see his disinterest and try to spark interest again. Married men have standards too. When talking about SMV, most men size up a woman by her looks, but most of us agree that this isn't based on the raw material alone (weight, symmetry, etc.):

- How she dresses. This is a part of her looks. An attractive woman who hides what she's got isn't attractive anymore. To pick on an easy example: have you seen **Jennifer Lopez in sweats?** Not bad. But **have you seen her in actual sweats?** No thanks. Outfit matters.
- Makeup. This is also part of her looks. We've all seen **before/after pics of celebrities without makeup**. Dear goodness, most of them look ... normal? Some women can pull off normal and still make me want to screw them. Others can't.
- Posture/Pose. This is all about how she presents her looks. It's the difference between **"There she is on her phone again"** and **"Dang, I gotta get her off that phone again!"**
- Seduction/Attitude. This is less about how she looks and more about sexual behavior, speech, mannerisms, etc. When you talk, does the conversation go **like this?** Or a little more **like this?**

There are more I could go into (hair style, skin tone, muscle toning, accessories, etc.), but you get the point. Having a hot wife doesn't mean squat if she's only hot on Friday nights when you happen to have a babysitter, and even then only if she feels like it. Yes, I've been there.

Ironically, his non-attraction to her often makes her feel more validated in her sexuality within the marriage, not less. Her hamster spins, "I'm ready and willing. All he's got to do is initiate. He must be the problem, not me. I'm fine." How can she get away with this false-validation? Because he's too big of a pussy to tell her plainly: "Screw off, woman. I don't cum on to just anyone. I have standards," or even, "I'm horny, but I'm not horny for you."

MISTAKES/SUCSESSES

Now, when a man actually has this conversation with his wife, it rarely goes well. I tried that in the past. My wife is naturally attractive, but doesn't always put in the effort I like to see. Progress is progress, but here are some mistakes from my past.

- "You should wear more tank tops and skirts. I think they look really sexy on you." ... didn't result in her wearing more tank tops and skirts. It's good for her to know what I like, but simply telling her didn't cut it.
- She's riding me, but I'm not even close. I tell her to bite her lip and moan. Mistake. She goes off about how she's not going to fake it, and she already finished and just wanted to be done because she was getting sore. Blah, blah, blah.
- I've also tried outright saying "No" to sex when she initiated, giving a clear cold shoulder and explaining that I'm just not feeling horny toward her in the moment. Huge butthurt moment. No, this did not inspire her to start perking her chest when I walked in the room from then on in order to make me horny.

Want to know what did work?

- Buying her a skirt. She wore it.
- Making her moan in bed, then sticking my dick in her while she was still moaning.
- Initiating sex in a way that made her feel sexy and want to keep feeling that way.

See the difference between how "saying" failed, but "doing" can succeed?

TEMPORAL HOTNESS

Now I'll note, this is still something of an ongoing struggle with my wife. Every now and then I catch myself thinking, **"What's the point of having a hot wife if I don't get to see her being and acting hot?"** Then I remember that "hot" is not just about a woman's *potential for hotness*, but about her *actual hotness in the moment*.

To that end, my wife was not hot yesterday. There were a couple days last week when she was hot, though. See how that works? Yesterday she was a harpy. There are other days when she's an incubus. Some days she's all business, other days she's all play.

RETENTIVE ATTRACTION

The degree to which I am attracted to my wife isn't temporal, though. Guys seem to have a weird lingering subliminal memory for how we view women. About once every 6 months I'll go on Facebook and see pictures of people from high school. My ONEitis from back then looks fine today, but for some reason I still see her as a goddess. My wife is 11 years older and 10lbs heavier than when we married, with stretch marks from 4

pregnancies, but there's a part of me that still sees the girl I dated when I look at her.

Yet my attraction toward her does waver. Why? Because I see the dissonance between my memory of her hotness and the present reality in front of me, when they're not aligned. But instead of a sharp spike in attraction from day to day, it's more of an average. If she's hot 6 days in a week, I'm still horny for her on the 7th, regardless of how she's wearing her hair, posing her body, or that she's not wearing make-up. But if she's only hot 1 day in a week, suddenly I'm more interested in the girl with the tight midriff walking down the street. Did my wife's facial features change? Did her weight take a massive hike that week? No. But in those times she does make it hard to visualize the hotness my memory wants to recall.

WHY DOES THIS MATTER?

For guys out there whose wives already make them horny 7 days a week, it doesn't. For that matter, if you're the type of guy who would bang a brick of cheese to get off, it probably doesn't matter for you either.

For those of us who find ourselves sexually disinterested from time to time, acknowledging when you're not horny for your wife makes a difference. For some guys, this is the "kiss of death" in the relationship that leads them toward divorce. They've given up before they even started. However, instead of cutting off hope of things getting better, this recognition can give a guy motivation to take action to improve things - especially if you're the kind of guy whose mission and MAP includes keeping her around.

IMPROVE THE MAN

We talk a lot here about "fixing the man" and general self-improvement. That's great. But in my experience, a guy's self-improvement doesn't *automatically* make his wife start improving all on its own. It does increase her attraction to him, but if he wants to be more attracted to her, she's got to make some changes too. Her being more attracted to him might give some underlying reason to improve, that reason doesn't manifest into action until there's something prodding the action. Remember, women are told all their lives that they're perfect and any guy would be lucky to have sex with them. If you keep positively reinforcing her through your expression of your sexuality toward her, all she thinks is: "This is awesome! I'm getting a better husband and I don't need to do anything at all, except have sex more often with a more attractive man."

This is one of the greatest shortcomings I see in MRP. I completely get that "you can't change her, only yourself." I also get that self-improvement is foundational. I also get that there aren't to be any covert contracts: she may never actually improve. But none of this is a license to ignore all conversation about how to get her to improve beyond "improve yourself first." What after that? The imbalance of content on MRP in favor of male-improvement leaves the implication that men *shouldn't* nudge their wives to improve themselves because we're so used to reading, "Just work on yourself and if she responds, great; if not, leave. Abundance, blah, blah, blah." The posts about how to "train up your slut" are either incredibly narrow in focus or otherwise extremely rare. I'm not saying to make this a 50/50 - but 90/10 is better than 99/1. Improving the man is only the starting point.

THEN IMPROVE THE WOMAN

Last week I made [this post about "gravitational centers"](#), which tracked a common journey from "ILY, BINILWY" to bliss. Bob had thought "IH, BINHFY" toward his wife before. But Bob's wife didn't improve all on her own. It wasn't some magical thing in her that she suddenly decided to do when she saw him making progress. He was inviting her to improve with him all along the journey.

- "I'm going to the gym. Want to join?"
 - "I need a new suit. Want to go shopping together? You can do a fashion show for me in the dressing room."
 - "I'm going to cook a new meal. Want to help?"
-

He led by example. Instead of affirming her, he stretched her.

Most wives don't ever realize "IH, BINHFY" is a thing a guy thinks from time to time. I remember my wife at one point thinking that sex was just about ejaculating and that it didn't matter how she acted, which outfit she wore, etc. "I'm naked. Why aren't you hard yet?" She had to be taught that guys don't get hard on command. I remember a radio host doing a prank call with a woman, sharing embarrassing stories, who commented, "This girl must be hot because apparently she grew up believing guys were always hard. She'd never seen a naked guy in front of her who wasn't!" The sad thing is: in today's culture where just saying "Do you want sex?" *actually will* make a dozen men nearby hard, there's not a lot of reason for women to believe otherwise.

That's why dread is so powerful. You've got to be high enough quality to make her want to keep you happy. But even after that, you've still got to nudge her to work on herself too. It's not enough to tell or show her what makes you happy: you have to make it an express expectation.

SUGGESTIONS

How do you do that? A few things I've tried to get the conversation rolling:

- Buying clothes that I like to see her in. I actually went to an "adult superstore" recently, for the first time. It wasn't as absurd as my pious sensibilities were expecting. I bought a pair of leggings, looked around for a while at some lingerie and toy options, and left. (Funny: I commented to my wife about how I heard the store was going out of business and she replies: "Good. Less of that kind of sin to worry about." She'll get there).
- I also downloaded a free app that offers sexual ideas and matches them between partners (Kindu, if you're interested). Every now and then she'll do one of their "packs" [of options] and press the "wink" button, which sends me a signal that she wants to try it. This gave her some inspiration to start working with.
- Instead of averting my eyes as soon as my wife sees me glancing at another girl, I let her see me linger. She doesn't like it, but it tells her what catches my attention. It was easy to start with steamy scenes in a show, then move everyday life.

Figure out what works for you. But don't just assume that self-improvement by itself is going to get her on the self-improvement track too. It might give her the energy to change, but you've still got to make clear that you *expect* her to change.

If you all have any more tips, feel free to share. I'm far from an expert on the *how* of this, but given how little conversation I see on the subject (other than "improve yourself and see what happens"), I bet there are some good answers to go around.

10

UPVOTES

Meta Frame

1 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

Our resident black pill objector (Bobby/Robert McGee, and most recently: ThrowAwayRP10101) has harped on a point that I have seen pop up enough to know it's worth addressing. Most significantly, I know /u/thechristianalpha has had the same question and tried asking Rollo about this before:

- "Isn't all of RP about appeasing female frame because we're catering to their sexual taste preferences in order to get more sex?"

It makes sense from a purely logical viewpoint. RP forums ultimately are a look at what makes vaginas wet, and therefore vaginas dictate what a man does to make them wet. Women have vaginas, therefore women set the broader frame and are ultimately in control of what RP men tell each other to do. Right?

Wrong. This only makes sense if women could decide what did or didn't make them wet.

ROLLO'S VIEW

While I had my own answer ready, I wanted to get Rollo's thoughts, so I did a brief search and found Rollo's post on meta-frame ([literally the first link that came up](#)):

If women control the larger social dynamic as to how men will define every term of engagement, up to and including men's own existences (to say nothing of sexual strategies) then they are not acting or thinking 'genuinely' as Real Men® should. This is a MGTOW classic now, and it's a tough hurdle for most of them to get past. The more militant will say that any engagement at all with women is acquiescing to the female meta-frame. I think some distinction needs to be made between an individual woman insisting on her own dominant Frame and the larger, meta-social narrative that women in general should always expect to have men relinquish Frame because it is women's correct and entitled position.

This was pretty affirming in my own view: **There is a distinction between individual frame and a collective, societal frame.**

I think his last phrase is not a reference to his own views of what women *should* do, but about what society tells women they should do. And why not? Women do have an entitled position in society today. Be mad about it if you want - that's not the point. The point is that this entitlement comes with benefits that it'd be idiotic not to use. If someone says, "Here's \$1,000,000 just for being you," would you throw that in the trash? Most people would say: "You *should* use that money." Society at large tells women, "You can get men to bend over backwards for you. That's an incredible power and you *should* use it." Some will suggest using it for some greater moral good, others for self-pleasure, and others to advance some communal agenda.

But that's all beside the point. The fact is that this broader social-narrative does exist, but is it what we mean when we talk about "frame"?

MY VIEW

"Frame" is a product of conscious thought. **If it's not sentient, it can't have a frame.** It's that simple.

Biology doesn't have a frame any more than a lamp does. We should never confuse psychological pressures with biological conditions. Can you will yourself not to have a penis? Can you concentrate hard enough to make your body not bleed when it's cut open? Can you think your way out of ever going to the bathroom again?

While there may be psychological influencing factors, female sexual responsiveness is not a frame issue. It's a "fact

of life" issue. It has been this way for thousands of years and will continue being this way for thousands to come, if Judgment Day doesn't come first. Don't treat vaginas as if they're sentient. The women who have them certainly have thoughts - and those conscious thoughts can certainly have a frame. But a woman cannot use her conscious thoughts to change what makes her vagina wet. At best, she can consciously think of things that already make vaginas wet. You can't negotiate attraction. Try telling your penis to get hard at the sight of broccoli. Good luck.

In this sense, red pill discourse on enhancing one's sexuality is not a matter of ceding to the "female frame," but of understanding how a non-sentient vagina works, just as we all do well to understand how a lamp works so we can turn it off and on when we like.

What is the "Female Frame"?

The female frame, insofar as sexual dynamics are concerned, is what a sentient woman wants a man to believe about how her vagina works.

Note that these don't have to line up - and they often don't. This topic could warrant a whole post of its own, but suffice it to say that there are a few primary approaches to female sexual frame:

- Timing - when can a man get into her pants?
- Method - how does a man have to go about getting into her pants?
- Standards - what type of man will she let in her pants?
- Conditions - does something have to happen before she'll let him into her pants?

There are more. But let me note that nowhere on this sub has a mod or endorsed contributor (to my knowledge) ever recommended finding out your wife's thoughts on these things and using that information to enhance your sexuality. That would, by definition, be living by her frame.

What is "reality"?

The reality is that an attractive man can:

- Timing - get a woman horny when he wants her horny, even if she wasn't planning on it
- Method - get a woman horny in ways that she never would have expected
- Standards - make her feel tingles even if he's not the type of man she says she wants
- Conditions - make her want him even without those conditions met

Now, this reality doesn't always translate to a close. It's a two-branch system. Congress can give the green light and the senate the red and nothing will happen. Her mental frame is the gate, but her vagina controls her desire. If a woman's vagina is begging for it, but her mental will-power is strong enough, she can deny her urges. Similarly, if her will-power is there, but her vagina just isn't feeling it, starfish is about the best you're going to get. That is, you can get in her pants, but you can't get her horny.

Of course, the desire component is far more powerful than the filter. People have a tendency to do what (and who) they want to do, if they really, really want to do it. If she's "queen of her own castle," the more she wants the traveler to enter her doors, the more she'll rationalize away her own frame (timing, method, standards, condition, etc.) to get him in the doors. Instead of negotiating what the queen can get from the traveler to let him in, the gatekeeper begins negotiating what it will give to get him to come through this particular gate instead of him finding some other castle to hang out in.

SOCIAL SCRIPTING

Social scripts are a subject I've been doing a lot of research on, as they will be somewhat relevant in my eventual book. To keep it simple, a social script is a boundary society causes us to operate in, whether we're conscious of it or not. The fact that we go to school for 13 years is part of a social script. The presumption toward marriage in society is part of a social script. The fact that you get a job to earn a living is part of a social script.

Rollo's quote above describes these as "social narratives." I prefer to avoid calling it a "narrative" because "narratives" are stories that are spun to be persuasive. A social script isn't the way a story is told - it's a fact of life, the rote plot mechanics themselves. Yes, you can defy the script, but there are generally harsh consequences if you do so. If you don't get a job, you will end up homeless. If you don't go to school, you won't get a good job. If you don't get married, you can be viewed as a social outcast. The narrative associated with the script is what dictates the consequences. If you can change the narrative, you can change the script - and yes, there is often enough flexibility in scripting that someone who is meta-aware of the scripting he lives in can function within his own narrative. When enough people have caught on and prefer their own narrative separate from the social narrative that's being spun to enforce the prevailing script, then the people revolt, a new script is drafted, and the narrative then works to support that script until another insurgency begins.

Much of the growth of the manosphere over the past years is tied to an effort to change the social narrative (spinning "positive masculinity" instead of the way it's negatively narrated), while giving up on trying to change the script itself. It's like a director telling the writer: "I want control over how the setting is framed, but I'll still follow your basic plot" because he knows he's powerless to force a script-change, especially if the producers are not on board.

As Christians, our producer is God. Our script is the framework society has laid out for the world since the fall. Our narrative is what we're conditioned to believe about how the script is to be interpreted. If you haven't read it, Margaret Atwood's "Happy Endings" is the epitome in short story form of demonstrating how the same plot can be cast in different lights through different narrative style ([It's only 2.5 pages](#)). Consider a similar exercise:

- Script - Bob meets Jane. They each have decent careers. They fall in love. They get married. They have 4 children. They retire. They died.
- Narrative 1: Bob was a real estate novelist who never had time for a wife. He loved his career so much that the thought of finding a woman seemed to be an unwelcome distraction. But when Jane came through the doors one Sunday morning he was knocked on his feet. They were married in months and had a kid less than a year later. Then another ... and another and another. After many years they set sail on Bob's boat and one day die in each other's arms.
- Narrative 2: Bob had a true passion for writing, but it didn't pay the bills, so he got his realtor license. Trying to fulfill his dayjob and passion at the same time made it difficult for him to commit to a relationship, and he gave up on even trying, settling for one-night stands. One Sunday morning Jane swung Bob's door open, knocking him off his feet. His fling from a few nights before was pregnant and her daddy had a shotgun. They married in months, before the child was born. Deep down, Bob truly did love her, and she him, but he always felt trapped. He took his frustrations out in the bedroom. Jane was afraid of being alone and childless, so she stopped taking birth control, hoping that more kids would keep Bob around. After all, he wouldn't want to pay all that child support, right? After the kids were grown, Bob found out how Jane had been deceiving him all this time. When a nosy neighbor overheard his altercation with Jane, she threatened to call the cops, so Bob killed her. Nerve wracked, Bob liquidated his life savings, bought the cheapest boat he could afford, and set sail to hide from the authorities across international waters. Unfortunately, the boat was only worth what he paid. When Jane went for the only life-raft, seeing that it could only support one, Bob went after her. She stabbed him in the heart with a knife, but he clutched onto her so tightly that they both went down with the ship.

Same plot. Two extremely different takes on who the characters are, how an audience should view them, what the author thinks of them, etc.

There are aspects of social scripting that you cannot change. Even though they are created by the collective beliefs and expectations of numerous sentient people, social scripts do not have their own "frame." The script itself is not sentient. While you can certainly choose to go off script, it is not breaking frame to follow the script.

What would be considered a break of frame would be to let someone else spin the narrative of how you view your life - and how you project your life to those around you. Your life story is your own. You decide how to tell your own narrative. No one knows what happens behind closed doors. They can make assumptions, but the way you present yourself, your mannerisms, tone of voice, word choice, beliefs and opinions, and all that other good stuff are what influence the narrative of your life to those around you.

Have you ever seen a co-dependent relationship? They're interesting, especially if they're non-romantic in nature. This is most obvious through the mother who tries to live vicariously through her daughter, or the BFFs where one feeds off the life drama of the other like a parasite. If you see yourself as the supporting character in your wife's story, you're in her frame. If you see yourself as the lead role, but are worried that other people see you as your wife's supporting character, you're not necessarily in your wife's frame, but you are in her friends' frame - and if she has influence over her friends' views, then you're vicariously in her frame too.

Similarly, if you're concerned about how society at large views you, and you let that control how you behave ... well, then you're just an idiot. Society doesn't have conscious thoughts and emotions. When this is your mental state, you're really concerned not about "society's frame," but about the frame of every random stranger, social acquaintance, or even friend and family member who might develop an opinion of you that you don't care for. You're not in "society's frame," but in the frame of the hypothetical person you've created in your mind who you believe will judge you. Most often, that person doesn't actually exist - and if they do, they're not likely actually judging you - and if they are, they're not necessarily judging you the way you think they are.

CONCLUSION

In short, meta-frames don't exist. Social scripts do, whether you abide by them or not. You CAN create the narrative for your own life for how your script is to be told, and there are as many ways to tell the story as there are directors in Hollywood - and more!

You're not in the "female frame" or "feminist frame" or "feminine imperative frame" by learning how to get a woman sexually attracted to you and tailoring your approach to ways that actually work. Figuring out attraction triggers is no different than figuring out how a lamp works. You're only in her frame if you orient your efforts at developing attraction around what she tells you will attract her. She may be honest and uniquely self-aware, and therefore her advice is good advice. But if you're doing it *because* that's her advice, then you're in her frame. If you're doing it because you know what actually attracts women, then you're in your own frame regardless of the fact that she suggested the same thing you independently decided to do anyway.

6

UPVOTES

Jekyll and Hyde

2 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

Here's my latest question on gotquestions.org - I thought you all might have some interesting insights worth adding to my reply.

Greetings in the Name of Lord Jesus the Christ! At this morning's men's Bible study, some were talking about their wife's being, more or less, Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, because of their hormones. How does Scripture discuss this feature happening with females?

25

UPVOTES

116 - God is a jerk.

25 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

I mean, come on ...

- He ordered war after war with countless nations throughout the books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles.
- He ordered women, children, and even animals to be put to death. 1 Samuel 15:3-4.
- He sent 2 bears to maul 42 kids for calling Elisha "baldy." 2 Kings 2:23-25
- He won't let handicapped or ugly people go near his altar. Leviticus 21:16-23
- He struck a man dead for trying to keep his Ark safe when the ox stumbled. 2 Samuel 6:1-7
- He asks people to follow him, knowing that it's going to get them beaten and killed in horrible ways.

You get the idea. God is a jerk to a lot of people.

But he's good.

Good God and Nice Men

Goodness sometimes includes choices that make you look like a jerk. God does these things for the benefit of the people he loves - even when he does these things TO the people he loves. Hebrews 12:6 and all. God doesn't play nice when he does any of these things, but he's still good through all of them.

Being a strong man doesn't mean never being nice. It means being strategically nice. Sometimes there's advantage to playing nice in order to reap a greater reward later. Joining a new job? Don't be a jerk right off the bat. Figure out the social dynamic before swinging your big assertive dick around. Trying to sell some widgets? Figure out who your customer is before you start laying on the pressure.

Guys usually need to be told to stop being nice because they're so used to being nice all the time by default. But playing nice is actually a wise strategy for most social interactions until you can devise a better way to get your intended result from a person. The one exception is dating, where playing nice will get you blown off from the get-go. I'd say marriage, but hopefully you're not marrying someone you just met.

The key in knowing when to play nice is in understanding how relational dynamics work so that you're not creating false expectations about what will happen for you if you play nice. That is, the underlying motive for most guys in playing nice is because they believe they will get love, affection, or even sex in response, or that people will somehow respect them for being such a nice guy. These are rarely the outcome. But being nice *can* produce cordiality, keep you under a harsh authority's radar, help in social politics at times, and generate a host of other reactions that can benefit a man's mission. In short, it can help a man become socially acceptable in situations where social acceptability actually matters. Just remember that social acceptability rarely *actually* matters.

Socially Acceptable

One guy recently told me: "I don't want to be controlling." I ask: *Why not?*

We're indoctrinated to believe that characteristics like "controlling" and "manipulative" and "aggressive" are negative attributes that should be avoided. Take a look at [this article from the American Psychological Association](#), which goes into the history of male psychology, saying of today, "The main thrust of subsequent research is that traditional masculinity - marked by stoicism, competitiveness, dominance and aggression - is, on the whole,

harmful." Their rationale? Because men with these traits are less likely to go to a doctor or psychologist. I kid you not. "Men who bought into traditional notions of masculinity were more negative about seeking mental health services." Hysterical. They're not making money on masculine guys, so they feminize us to get us in the door.

But here's the real point: **whenever you're concerned about living up to a societal norm, ask yourself: "How's that working out for society?"**

Is living the "socially acceptable" life working out for the world today?

- Is "socially acceptable" getting wives to sleep with their husbands or ramping up the divorce rate to almost 60%?
- Is "socially acceptable" keeping families together or sending 28 million kids into single-family homes?
- Is "socially acceptable" encouraging people toward healthy lifestyles or teaching America to accept, love, and embrace its 40% of people who are obese? **Relevant.**
 - Ironically, the same "scientists" who ding masculine behaviors for being unhealthy are usually evolutionists who should also be thinking about increased reproduction capacity for the continuation of the species. But that's a much longer conversation not worth getting into here.

The fact is: being socially acceptable has not reaped good results for the rest of the world, so why would you assume it should for you? A common cliché is that one type of insanity is "doing the same thing over and over, but expecting a different result."

Interestingly, NMMNG talks about the way Nice Guys believe that if "being nice" doesn't solve all their problems, then it must be because they're not nice enough. Similarly, as the world compels everyone to be nicer to everyone and be more and more "socially acceptable," and yet we get negative results ... they blame it on the fact that there are still people who won't conform to social standards. The increase in social acceptability results in a decrease in social life standards, and somehow this translates to: "We just need EVEN MORE socially acceptable people" instead of recognizing that the current mode of social acceptability isn't working.

Social acceptability is not a goal to pursue. For a long time, my wife's life-goal was to be socially acceptable. She still has that compulsion. If you want to be a woman, you can have the goal of social acceptability too. Otherwise, recognize that socially acceptable behaviors are a tool in your pocket, not a standard to meet. Make wise use of that tool, but don't use a hammer to pound in screws. In fact, with nail guns, staple guns, screws and drills, hammers are far less necessary today than you'd think. There are better tools to get the job done.

Benevolence

The same guy from above also asked, "How do I balance assertive, strong 'alpha' behavior, while being loving and respectful in relationships? I don't want to be an insensitive jerk."

That's like saying, "How do I eat ice cream while also tasting something sweet in my mouth?" The ice cream IS what causes the sweet taste. Being assertive and strong IS what causes people to love and respect you, if they're going to love and respect you at all. Some people just won't and you have to deal with that.

The answer to his question should be obvious: **be a benevolent leader** - the kind of person who does what's best for the people he cares about, even if they disagree with him about what's best for them. We sometimes call this the "oak" - the man who can make the tough calls, but comfort his people through the difficulty when it comes.

The reason most people never reach this conclusion is that they're more interested in getting people to *perceive them as good* rather than actually *being good*. This is validation-seeking. God doesn't care if you see him as good. He's just good. If people hate him along the way for the good things he does, he takes it and continues being good all the same.

I used to spend months at a time researching all the things people complained about God for - some of which were on the list at the beginning of this post. I wanted to rationalize ways that God could do these things and still be called "good." At one point I realized I was wasting my time. I found that "good" wasn't some metaphysical, super-divine concept that transcended God as a judge over him. When people challenged these parts of the Bible, saying God wasn't "good," they just meant that God didn't meet their standard of "socially acceptable." Once I got past that hurdle, the rest of the Bible - and every vicious thing God ever did - suddenly made sense.

God is a jerk. But he's also good. He works all things for the good of those who love him, even if it's in ways they don't want him to work. God is not socially acceptable - and society today is making that clearer and clearer. But "socially acceptable" was never his goal. Weeding out the wheat from the chaff has always been his goal, and a day of reckoning is on its way. His mission matters more to him than his people's perception of him. Learn from that example.

Yeah, this isn't r/RPChristians - but I don't feel like editing out the "God" stuff just to appease your comfort levels. Even if you believe God is fiction, we learn from fiction all the time. The concepts should still hold value on their own.

God is a Jerk

I mean, come on ...

- He ordered war after war with countless nations throughout the books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles.
- He ordered women, children, and even animals to be put to death. 1 Samuel 15:3-4.
- He sent 2 bears to maul 42 kids for calling Elisha "baldy." 2 Kings 2:23-25
- He won't let handicapped or ugly people go near his altar. Leviticus 21:16-23
- He struck a man dead for trying to keep his Ark safe when the ox stumbled. 2 Samuel 6:1-7
- He asks people to follow him, knowing that it's going to get them beaten and killed in horrible ways.

You get the idea. God is a jerk to a lot of people.

But he's good.

Good God and Nice Men

Goodness sometimes includes choices that make you look like a jerk. God does these things for the benefit of the people he loves - even when he does these things TO the people he loves. Hebrews 12:6 and all. God doesn't play nice when he does any of these things, but he's still good through all of them.

Being a strong man doesn't mean never being nice. It means being strategically nice. Sometimes there's advantage to playing nice in order to reap a greater reward later. Joining a new job? Don't be a jerk right off the bat. Figure out the social dynamic before swinging your big assertive dick around. Trying to sell some widgets? Figure out who your customer is before you start laying on the pressure.

Guys usually need to be told to stop being nice because they're so used to being nice all the time by default. But playing nice is actually a wise strategy for most social interactions until you can devise a better way to get your intended result from a person. The one exception is dating, where playing nice will get you blown off from the get-go. I'd say marriage, but hopefully you're not marrying someone you just met.

The key in knowing when to play nice is in understanding how relational dynamics work so that you're not creating false expectations about what will happen for you if you play nice. That is, the underlying motive for most guys in playing nice is because they believe they will get love, affection, or even sex in response, or that people will somehow respect them for being such a nice guy. These are rarely the outcome. But being nice *can* produce cordiality, keep you under a harsh authority's radar, help in social politics at times, and generate a host of other reactions that can benefit a man's mission. In short, it can help a man become socially acceptable in situations where social acceptability actually matters. Just remember that social acceptability rarely *actually* matters.

Socially Acceptable

One guy recently told me: "I don't want to be controlling." I ask: *Why not?*

We're indoctrinated to believe that characteristics like "controlling" and "manipulative" and "aggressive" are negative attributes that should be avoided. Take a look at [this article from the American Psychological Association](#), which goes into the history of male psychology, saying of today, "The main thrust of subsequent research is that traditional masculinity - marked by stoicism, competitiveness, dominance and aggression - is, on the whole, harmful." Their rationale? Because men with these traits are less likely to go to a doctor or psychologist. I kid you not. "Men who bought into traditional notions of masculinity were more negative about seeking mental health services." Hysterical. They're not making money on masculine guys, so they feminize us to get us in the door.

But here's the real point: **whenever you're concerned about living up to a societal norm, ask yourself: "How's that working out for society?"**

Is living the "socially acceptable" life working out for the world today?

- Is "socially acceptable" getting wives to sleep with their husbands or ramping up the divorce rate to almost 60%?
- Is "socially acceptable" keeping families together or sending 28 million kids into single-family homes?
- Is "socially acceptable" encouraging people toward healthy lifestyles or teaching America to accept, love, and embrace its 40% of people who are obese? **Relevant.**
 - Ironically, the same "scientists" who ding masculine behaviors for being unhealthy are usually evolutionists who should also be thinking about increased reproduction capacity for the continuation of the species. But that's a much longer conversation not worth getting into here.

The fact is: being socially acceptable has not reaped good results for the rest of the world, so why would you assume it should for you? A common cliché is that one type of insanity is "doing the same thing over and over, but expecting a different result."

Interestingly, NMMNG talks about the way Nice Guys believe that if "being nice" doesn't solve all their problems, then it must be because they're not nice enough. Similarly, as the world compels everyone to be nicer to everyone and be more and more "socially acceptable," and yet we get negative results ... they blame it on the fact that there are still people who won't conform to social standards. The increase in social acceptability results in a decrease in social life standards, and somehow this translates to: "We just need EVEN MORE socially acceptable people" instead of recognizing that the current mode of social acceptability isn't working.

Social acceptability is not a goal to pursue. For a long time, my wife's life-goal was to be socially acceptable. She still has that compulsion. If you want to be a woman, you can have the goal of social acceptability too. Otherwise, recognize that socially acceptable behaviors are a tool in your pocket, not a standard to meet. Make wise use of that tool, but don't use a hammer to pound in screws. In fact, with nail guns, staple guns, screws and drills, hammers are far less necessary today than you'd think. There are better tools to get the job done.

Benevolence

The same guy from above also asked, "How do I balance assertive, strong 'alpha' behavior, while being loving and respectful in relationships? I don't want to be an insensitive jerk."

That's like saying, "How do I eat ice cream while also tasting something sweet in my mouth?" The ice cream IS what causes the sweet taste. Being assertive and strong IS what causes people to love and respect you, if they're going to love and respect you at all. Some people just won't and you have to deal with that.

The answer to his question should be obvious: **be a benevolent leader** - the kind of person who does what's best for the people he cares about, even if they disagree with him about what's best for them. We sometimes call this the "oak" - the man who can make the tough calls, but comfort his people through the difficulty when it comes.

The reason most people never reach this conclusion is that they're more interested in getting people to *perceive them as good* rather than actually *being good*. This is validation-seeking. God doesn't care if you see him as good. He's just good. If people hate him along the way for the good things he does, he takes it and continues being good all the same.

I used to spend months at a time researching all the things people complained about God for - some of which were on the list at the beginning of this post. I wanted to rationalize ways that God could do these things and still be called "good." At one point I realized I was wasting my time. I found that "good" wasn't some metaphysical, super-divine concept that transcended God as a judge over him. When people challenged these parts of the Bible, saying God wasn't "good," they just meant that God didn't meet their standard of "socially acceptable." Once I got past that hurdle, the rest of the Bible - and every vicious thing God ever did - suddenly made sense.

The key is disassociating jerk-like qualities that God himself has modeled from moral absolutism. Sometimes killing is immoral, like if I were to murder someone. Other times killing is good, like when we stopped Hitler from ongoing genocide. Sometimes watching child porn is evil, like the Subway guy. Other times watching child porn is good, like the FBI analyst who is forensically reviewing it for clues to catch the guy. As Paul says in Romans 14:14, "I am convinced, being fully persuaded in the Lord Jesus, that nothing is unclean in itself; but if anyone regards something as unclean, then for that person it is unclean." In essence, with appropriate buffer from Romans 14:23 (a few verses later), this is Paul's way of saying, "You do you" (with the v23 clarification: "as long as it's coming from your faith").

God is a jerk. But he's also good. He works all things for the good of those who love him, even if it's in ways they don't want him to work. God is not socially acceptable - and society today is making that clearer and clearer. But "socially acceptable" was never his goal. Weeding out the wheat from the chaff has always been his goal, and a day of reckoning is on its way. His mission matters more to him than his people's perception of him. Learn from that example.

54

UPVOTES

More Than Marriage: How churchianity has screwed up friendships too

29 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

The "church" does a great job talking about the importance of fellowship. But when it comes to relationships, the quantity of conversation on the topic certainly doesn't amount to any quality conversation.

POOR RELATIONSHIPS

According to a [survey by Cigna](#):

- Nearly half of Americans report sometimes or always feeling alone (46%) or left out (47%).
- 27% rarely or never feel as though there are people who really understand them
- 43% feel that their relationships are not meaningful
- 18% feel like they have no one they can talk to
- Living with your children doesn't have a statistical impact on the degree of loneliness you feel
- **Adults aged 18-22 are the loneliest generation to date** and also happen to have the worst health of all prior generations

That last one is a real kicker. What's a ~~church~~ congregation to do? Well, clearly these statistics focus on the degree of openness and transparency people aren't feeling in their relationships, so we should focus on those qualities, right?

Wrong! Churchianity has long been holding out this idiotic notion that emotional vomit is somehow healthy. They tell us that we should all connect with a small group where we can be completely open and share all of our deepest, darkest secrets, our greatest life struggles, etc.

Women talk. Men do. Despite what our feminized society would have you believe, men are better at building healthy relationships than women. For example, [this article from PsychologyToday](#) notes:

- "According to substantial research, women across all ages and lifestyles report higher levels of loneliness than men do. [Ironically:] Except, perhaps surprisingly, in one subset of people - single people. **While married women inch out married men for the lonelier group, single men vastly outweigh single women as the lonelier bunch.**"

Notice the language here? **Substantial** reserach. **All** ages. **All** lifestyles. Men are better at building relationships (unless you're a single omega).

And yet we're taught that everyone should build relationships like women.

And yet the research is showing that this advice is producing the loneliest generation of people ever. Go figure.

NEGATIVE RELATIONSHIPS

Notice how all of those seem to be negative things? Churchianity assumes that talking about good things in life is the norm, but that talking about the negative things are where it "gets real." Again, they're wrong. I've attended a ton of small groups in my lifetime, and have talked to leaders and participants of countless more. I always get the same feedback: that people will share surface-level praise reports **TO** the group, but will focus more on sharing **WITH** the group all of the harder things to talk about.

This is no different than social media. Anyone can go on Facebook for people to share **TO** them how great everyone else's life is. But commenting on someone's status update, "That's so great," is no different than being at a small group, giving a polite nod and saying, "That's so great!" in person. They don't *feel* your joy with you. Yet when you speak negatively, suddenly people are empathizing, laying hands on you, and communicating heart-felt concern. We're following the command to "mourn with those who mourn," but forgetting how to "rejoice with those who rejoice."

When we only ever connect intimately with people on negative things, relationships feel very heavy and burdensome. Yes, it's better than no relationship at all. But they're far from fun and enjoyable. I have never known someone to describe negative-only relationships as "best friends." It's rare to find them even called "genuine friends" at all - they're more the people you call your "friends" just so you feel like you have friends, but in reality you only ever see each other in very select contexts.

CONTEXTUAL "FRIENDS"

True friends enjoy living life alongside each other. I remember watching *How I Met Your Mother* with my wife while we were dating. She made a comment, "I would love to find friends like that - people who just hang out with each other all the time, not because they have an agenda, but just because they like being around each other."

Contextual friendships are friendships with an agenda. They're the people in your small group, on a ministry team with you, co-workers, family members, etc. Countless times I've seen people leave a congregation and suddenly all those people they were "so close to" are now acquaintances they only see once every few months, or when they randomly bump into each other at the store. How genuine were those friendships if they can't survive a change in context? Not at all.

I have work friends. But I've never hung out with my co-workers outside of the office. I'm okay with that. But I did just leave my congregation of 7 years. My wife is connecting with a girl from that congregation to sort kid clothes. Another girl asked her for coffee last week. I've had numerous phone calls with different guys and have meetings scheduled with 3 of them - not sterile conversation-only settings, but things like playing frisbee golf, going swimming, or watching *The Boys* together. We're having another couple over for dinner next week. We changed contexts, but the relationships are continuing. Why? Because we build genuine friendships within our congregation - things that survive context. This is the rarity, and it only happens for me because I have made an intentional point of doing it.

This is particularly bad for people who are in full-time ministry positions or heavily involved in ministry activity in a ~~church~~ congregation. They place a heavy degree of importance on the context of why they're connecting with each other - making a difference for eternity - and think that this trumps everything else in the relationship (and they're right). So, all of their interactions focus on talking about the Bible, or planning the next event, or refining their ministry process. Even when they "go deep" with each other, it's for the purpose of praying together, sharing each other's burdens, and helping each other find freedom, as "good servants of Jesus Christ" should do. But at the end of the day, they have no connection with each other outside of their own context. This is where they've gone wrong, not realizing that the lack of authentic relationships among each other is negatively impacting their ability to make a difference for eternity.

I once asked a guy who his top 5 best friends were in the congregation he was attending. He listed off 5 people by name - and actually knew all of their last names, so that was a good sign. I asked him how often he called them up randomly just to chat. Never. I asked him how often he saw any of them outside of a ministry-related function or conversations that ended up being primarily about ministry. Never. I asked him if he felt comfortable calling any of those guys up to see a movie with him that night. None. Guess what: they're not real friends.

AUTHENTIC RELATIONSHIPS

Some people mistakenly believe that being intentional means being inauthentic - that relationships are only genuine if they happen *naturally*. This is just idiotic. The fact that I plan to have close friendships doesn't mean it's impossible for me to have close friendship. The fact that I plan to save up for retirement rather than just naturally and accidentally having enough money when I want to retire doesn't mean I'm not really retired. It means I was wise about investing my money toward a goal. Be wise about investing your relational efforts toward a goal.

Remember that women are focused on finding a *natural*. They don't want to feel duped by some guy who only pretended to be a confident alpha. They want to bag the real deal. So, there's a stress against anything that may seem inauthentic, and being intentional about a thing makes them feel inauthentic. But this isn't true for broader friendships. The feminization of our understanding of relationships is what created that impression in the first place. Leave it behind and you'll find that being decisive and intentional about how you go about building friendships is also completely appropriate - and perhaps even a more masculine way of doing things.

POSITIVE RELATIONSHIPS

Speaking of the feminization of relationships, have you noticed another thread throughout this post? That's right: all of the focus on relationships is your emotional connection to someone else. We're taught that building healthy relationships comes from fostering deep emotional connections, which happens through conversation about deeply emotional things going on in our lives. Even the women I've known in my life haven't formed real friendships this way - how much less men!

I once went on a campaign asking people, "Who are the best friends you've ever had in your life?" Take one guess how many listed a spiritual mentor or counselor as their answer. None. Virtually everyone listed someone they knew in high school or college.

I then asked them what aspects of their relationship made them such great friends. How many do you think listed "open, transparent communication about our deepest life struggles" as their main criteria? None. Instead, virtually everyone talked about "that time we went white water rafting" or "we just loved hanging out with each other a lot" or "we really enjoyed going to concerts together." It was all about the things they enjoyed doing together that build their best relationships, not the transparency of their life issues.

You want real, healthy friendships that last for a lifetime? **Go out and have fun with people.** That's really the answer.

SEXUAL DYNAMICS

Why am I writing this on an RP sub? Let's get to the real point of this post.

The church obviously misunderstands male/female relationships horribly, but it doesn't stop there - they also misunderstand basic friendship relationships too. Don't trust what you hear from your ministry leaders. Build authentic relationships, where authenticity isn't defined by how open and honest you are with each other, but by how much you enjoy being around each other.

Is it at all surprising, though, that most Christian women look for communication, transparency, openness and honesty as the hallmarks of a good marriage? After all, this is what churchianity tells them to look for in a good friend - and Christian women are told that their husband should be their "**BEST** friend." So doesn't that mean that he should be *even more* open, honest, and transparent with her than anyone else? Isn't that how their marriage can soar into the heights of emotional bliss?

No. Because relationships don't thrive on these things. Transparency, honesty, and openness - even vulnerability - are tools that can help a relationship move from a bad place to a good place. But they are not the foundation of the relationship itself.

Attraction is the foundation of all good relationships - even friendships. For the sake of friendship, it's about charismatic attraction. You don't want to spend time around people you don't like spending time around. Duh. But when there is a charismatic draw to being around someone - because they're really funny, or show great leadership qualities, or have a lot you want to learn from, or simply because you want the life they have - those are the people you love spending time with.

For marriages to function properly, there must be both a charismatic attraction and physical attraction. There are some truly hot women who I would never want to spend more than a few seconds around because their character is so vile that there's no charisma when I talk to them. There are plenty of other women who have great personalities that I really enjoy being around, but I'd never marry them because I'm not physically attracted to them. A good marriage requires both.

This is particularly true for **YOU, MEN**. If you put on that stiff military face all the time, thinking you're being "stoic," you're probably really coming off as non-charismatic, cold, and unattractive. Have some fun in life. Be funny, a great leader, a wise teacher, or the guy who has the life your wife wishes she had. Leave her thinking, "I wish I could be more like him." And keep going to the gym. Be more physically attractive too.

This is how you're going to build a healthy relationship. And, as noted above, healthy relationships are found more on what you *do* than on what you *say*. People remember their best friends by what they did together, not by what they talked about together. Even girls won't say, "Shaundra was my best friend because we talked about my divorce all night." She will say, "She was my best friend because we had sleepovers, played truth or dare, did each other's nails, etc." Even when it is about talking, like, "We loved talking about boys together," the connection that formed less about the content of the conversation (i.e. what they were saying about the boys) or the insight they were getting into the other's taste in men, thereby creating some "emotional connection" ... and more about the *activity* of talking about boys, regardless of which boys came up.

In the same way, if you want your wife more attracted to you and desiring you sexually, focus less on talking together and more on doing things together. And no, Netflix and chill doesn't count. That's what you do to wind down after you're done doing things together. But yes, having sex is definitely *doing* something that enhances relational connectivity. If you're reading, [here's a fascinating research analysis that uses lots of fancy scientific words](#) to explain that sex actually has a positive impact on relational bonding beyond just feeling good in the moment. Duh.

But don't get sucked into the lie that good relationships are built on "going deep" with the negative things. Penis shaped things, sure. Positive things as well. But not negative. Marriage counselors love pushing this agenda because that's their entire job: digging into pains and struggles, negative things in your lives, and opening up conversation and transparency, and creating vulnerability in those places. Their entire career is about developing emotional stability in people, so it's not surprising that their advice is all about emotional aspects of relationships. Indeed, for some people who have never dealt with their emotional issues, this can be a valuable tool. But don't let it be a replacement for the authentic types of relationships that will leave you with memories that will carry on into eternity.

While not the best example, and I take issue with aspects of the sentiment, there is some truth to the old adage:

- *A good friend will bail you out of jail. But your best friend will be standing next to you saying, "Dude, that was totally awesome!"*

This came up on the RPC chatroom, but I figured it was worth a post, as we don't talk about it often, though a lot of guys likely think about it.

THE EVENT

A "main event" is a conversation in a marriage that results in an ultimatum: *fix this, or we're getting a divorce/legal separation*. The closest I've referenced this in my writings is in [108 - Life Path of a Relationship](#), specifically the lower-right quadrant. And yes, I spent a great deal of time talking in that post about the ways the conversation can go. To summarize:

- You can get divorced.
- You can regress, by expending life resources you've accumulated to return back to happier days.
- You can get on board with a joint mission and proceed forward with actual purpose driving your relationship.

But that doesn't say much about the conversation itself - only what needs to happen after the conversation to get back on track.

THE CONVERSATION

ILY, BINILWY

MRP talks about the conversation as having one of two directions. Either she hosts the main event by telling you, "ILY, BINILWY." At this point, the man has to decide whether he's going to become more attractive or let her walk away so he can find someone else.

For those of us who believe the remarriage after divorce is sin, it's easy to feel trapped by this conversation because your "only option" for sexual release seems to be running full speed in the opposite direction. There's been lots of conversation on this topic, but for these types of guys, if you cannot control your sexual urges, I do believe it is better to sin through remarrying than sin through repeated extramarital sex. At least remarriage itself can be viewed in a spiritually polygamous context, which may not actually be sinful at all - but that's a much larger conversation.

FMOFY

The other way the conversation can come up is when you hit a high enough dread level that you finally blurt out: "FMOFY" (F- me or F- you). Athol Kay talks about this in MMSLP, and it gets discussed on MRP a fair bit with new guys who Rambo their way to a main event pretty quickly.

I'm about 95% persuaded that the FMOFY conversation doesn't actually work over the long-term. Rather, it's an option to buy a guy some time. It creates hysterical bonding, if the woman is afraid of losing her husband, which is not the same as genuine attraction. It is an attraction of immediate compulsion to cling to the familiar and have one's needs met and avoid the confusion that a divorce would bring about. Hysterical bonding is also caused by the intense emotions that a woman feels when she fears losing her husband - and strong emotions (even bad ones) are always better for a woman than no emotions at all, and can make her more sexual overall.

In my experience with my divorce clients and some friends who have experienced it, I get the impression that hysterical bonding lasts 2-4 weeks. But I've also heard stories of it lasting 2-3 months. Eventually this will fade. The value isn't in the great sex you get during this time, but in that it lowers your resentment levels toward your spouse while you're getting great sex for long enough that you can unscrew yourself from the way you screwed yourself up in the first place.

That is, hysterical bonding is a sabbatical from the sexual resentment so that you can get your head on straight, hit the gym, and start developing some frame with limited fear of rejection to stand in the way. After the hysterical bonding wears off, either you're rejuvenated enough that you can keep pounding away at self-improvement until you can develop genuine attraction, or you didn't get anywhere, slide almost immediately back into old patterns, and you're back on the road to divorce.

GHGO

In my [Second Kiss of Death](#) post I referenced a third way that a main event could start, and it's more of a male counter to ILY, BINILWY than FMOFY is: *I'm horny, but I'm not horny for you.* "This can be simplified even further: Get hot or get out.*

This conversation comes about when a guy has already made substantial improvements and he can pull much hotter, more submissive women than his wife - even after accounting for the "grass is greener" mentality that makes us think other women are better than they are. Despite his improvements, his wife refused to jump on the bandwagon of self-improvement and continues to be a lazy porker who puts no effort into her sexuality toward him. Sure, he can probably get her to have sex with him, but he just doesn't want her in the first place, so he stops initiating due to his lack of attraction toward her.

COVERT CONTRACT PARADOX

These conversations usually only creep up when resentment hits peak levels. But where does that resentment come from? Unrealized expectation. This means that a guy has to expect a certain degree of responsiveness from his wife in order to feel resentment when those expectations aren't met.

The paradox of it is that we call this a covert contract and often tell guys not to have them. Remove the expectations, otherwise you're not outcome independent. But these concepts are really only meant to apply to individual attempts, not broad-based patterns of interaction.

- **Individual:** A guy cleans his house and expects his wife to have sex with him. This is a covert contract.
- **Broad:** A guy makes significant improvement and expects his wife to be more sexually responsive than she was before. This is not a covert contract. It is a boundary.

We often think of boundaries as things that keep something out. You don't want your wife to act like a harpy? You set a boundary that says: "That type of behavior will not happen in my house. Get it out." But this assumes she's in your boundary and it's the bad behavior that needs to go.

What if she's out of your boundary? What if your boundary is being married to a 7 and she's a 4? Now she's not in your boundary. She herself is what you're bumping out - and you won't let her back in until she has improved herself.

But boundaries also keep things in. Suppose she's in an acceptable boundary now, but she's slacking. She starts gaining weight, stops wearing lingerie, etc. She's heading outside your boundary - so you set a boundary that lets her know you will not accept her movement in that direction any further than whatever point you set. The boundary is now a way of showing her how to stay in a healthy relationship with you - and yes, that requires effort on her part just as much as all the effort you put in to becoming attractive as well.

Establishing clear boundaries and expectations for the relationship from a bird's eye view is healthy. Becoming invested in your expectations on isolated incidents is unhealthy and will lead to incredible disappointment and losing frame.

FRAME PARADOX

Another aspect of this that makes things somewhat paradoxical is that a guy with a strong frame shouldn't get resentful toward anyone in the first place. Right? That's what we tell each other, at least. He remains positive, upbeat, and emotionally stable at all times.

I believe this is actually a misconception about frame. Your "frame" is not the totality of everything you feel and experience in life. It is the way you project yourself to others and impose your perspective on those around you.

A guy doesn't have a strong frame because he never experiences emotional pain or turmoil. He has a strong frame because he can experience those things and still engage with his world with the same degree of wisdom, perspective, and insight as he always has, as if the painful event had not occurred.

So, yes, a guy can have a strong frame and still develop resentment.

Does that mean, though, that initiating a "main event" conversation is a break of frame? If you're doing it out of anger, absolutely. If you're doing it because your boundaries have been crossed and they need reestablished, then this is actually frame-fortifying, not frame-breaking.

THE SIN PARADOX

But isn't a "main event" always a communication of sin? What real recourse does a guy have? Even in the case of legal separation, this goes against Paul's message in 1 Cor. 7 that separation should only be for a short time and for the purpose of prayer. Legal separations are technically permanent, and if you're only planning it to be a short time, why make it legal at all? As a lawyer, I have several scenarios where that would make sense - but that's off topic.

The bottom line is that you're still telling your wife that you intend to act in a manner inconsistent with the Bible. So, is it ever right for a Christian to initiate a "main event" conversation in the first place, or do we just have to suck it up and keep dealing with it?

The fact is that the alternative to a main event conversation is letting the resentment boil you so hot that it erupts in another avenue - like actually cheating on your wife, or perhaps murdering her (hey, it happens). Those are worse alternatives.

Now, in the secular world a guy would just cheat on his wife before ever needing to get to this point in the first place - that's an acceptable release, especially on MRP. Otherwise, he could use the main event as a means of warning his wife that he's going to cheat so that he doesn't feel as bad about it later - he can hamster that it's her fault for not stepping up when he gave her the chance.

As a biblical matter, cheating is still sin. That's not changing. But the practical reality is that guys are going to be sexually tempted regardless. So, a main event conversation is an appropriate admission of spiritual immaturity to a degree that you lack sufficient self-control over your own sexual urges to the point that cheating, divorce, murder, or some other extreme eruption is inevitable. Yes, this is an admission of weakness. Yes, it's an admission of spiritual immaturity. Yes, it would be better if you could just will-yourself into perfect self-control. But the fact is that self-control is a discipline that must be trained and not something that all guys have at excellent levels whenever the need arises.

I've actually had this conversation with my wife. "I don't want to, and I know it's wrong, but it's just a matter of time before I cheat on you." No, she didn't take it well. But yes, it did produce some changes. No, the changes were not permanent - they faded. Like I said, it created short-term hysterical bonding and not genuine attraction. It actually undermines attraction because you're displaying low value due to your poor self-control and spiritual immaturity. But these are things that can be recovered during the sabbatical you get from sexual rejection as you

continue to improve.

CONCLUSION

Main event conversations are a display of low value, but this is offset by the hysterical bonding that follows. You just have to be willing to OYS with your own spiritual immaturity and lack of self-control. Once you're having a main event, the goal is not to communicate your feelings. You're not a girl. It's to set clear boundaries as to what you will and will not accept going forward in the relationship.

If you are not willing to follow through with enforcing those boundaries, you will undermine every effort you make at self-improvement thereafter. Accordingly, **NEVER** initiate a main event unless you're willing to follow through with the consequences of the ultimatum you give. Yes, this is sin. Yes, she's in sin for not following your lead. There's sin going around everywhere. That's why a main event is a last resort, not a kick in the butt you give her when you think she needs to step up her game. Using it out of turn can permanently cripple the strength of your frame.

This post is probably going to tick off a lot of people because it's such a wide-spread and over-popularized myth. But I'm okay with stepping on some toes. I often hear people say:

My goal in life is to grow closer to God every day.

The Bible actually talks very little about this concept. There are a small handful of passages that talk about drawing near, but they're few and far between - at least compared to some other larger concepts that create a better framework for relating with God. Consider:

- I love my kids, but when I tell them to clean their room I get upset when they hang all over me wanting to spend more time with me. They think they're loving me. I think they're being disobedient brats.
- God did this to Moses in Exodus 14:15 - "Then the LORD said to Moses, 'Why are you crying out to me? Tell the Israelites to move on.'" Basically, "Stop spending time with me and start doing what I told you to do."
- Jesus tells us, "Go, therefore, and make disciples of all nations." Instead, we focus on having more quiet times, praying more, singing more songs, attending more services, etc. In essence, we focus on getting "closer to God" and spending more time with God than actually doing the things he told us to do.

Christian culture over-glorifies the relational aspect of our faith to the point that we think getting "closer to God" is the most important thing. That's not surprising. Society tells us that relational closeness is one of the most important things to have in life, and we impute this psychological trend into our theological framework. The result is that we end up like clingy kids that hang all over our parent's neck because it makes us feel good to be near them, but we never actually clean our room, which just makes them angry at us instead.

Then we get all confused, wondering: "How can I be focusing on God so much and yet still feel so distant and my life feel so screwed up?" Duh.

And yet my kids rationalize it: "But I just want to be with you all the time," as if this profession of their emotional joy toward me is somehow a substitute for obeying me and following my leadership in the home. Don't rationalize your relationship with God like a child unless you are a spiritual child. Instead, take Paul's advice in 1 Cor. 13 - "When I was a child, I talked like a child, I thought like a child, I reasoned like a child. When I became a man, I put the ways of childhood behind me" - and all this in the context of understanding what it really means to love someone.

That's why Jesus said in John 14:21, "The one who has gushy feelings and spends lots of time with me is the one who loves me," right?

10

UPVOTES

Warnings for a People Not Listening to God

15 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

... is the title of a daily devotional by Walter A. Henrichsen, a former Navigator who also wrote what I hear is a stellar book titled: **Disciples are Made, Not Born.*"

My red-pilled ex-pastor is going through this devotional and sent me this blurb from Day 68.

LEADERSHIP

"And the angel came in unto her, and said, Hail, thou that art highly favoured, the Lord is with thee: blessed art thou among women." Luke 1:28

God spoke to Mary, the mother of Jesus, only once through the angel Gabriel. After this, God communicated His will regarding Mary and Jesus through Joseph.

- First, when the angel of the Lord appeared to Joseph in a dream telling him to take Mary as his wife.
- Second, when the angel again appeared to Joseph in a dream telling him to take the family to Egypt.
- Third, when the angel told Joseph to return to Israel from Egypt.
- And fourth, when God instructed Joseph to move the family to the area of Galilee.

Even in the life of this remarkably blessed woman God led her and her Son through her husband. As Paul writes, "Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church: and he is the Savior of the body. Therefore as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in every thing."

Peter also addresses the leadership of men in the home. "Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him lord. And you are now her children if you do right and let nothing terrify you." When was the last time you heard a woman address her husband as "lord?" God designates the husband the leader in the home.

I'm usually not a fan of daily devotionals ... but I might be picking this one up.

I was writing a post on tests, but it got too long and this content seemed to stand apart as a post of its own. Remember this when I put up the next post. It'll come in handy.

We often tell guys to "fake it til you make it." But this only makes sense if the way you fake it actually leads to making it. Consider ...

Examples of What Not to Do

Fake It

1. Your wife is out of town. You goof off the entire time. She calls when her plane is landing. You clean up the entire house just before she gets home and pretend you're husband of the year because you can run a clean ship without her.
2. You talk to a ~~pastor~~ congregation leader about your mission. In order to persuade him you start making up stories that prove the success of what you're proposing, relying on the lie to sell it to him. You convince yourself that it's better to get him to start doing things your way than not at all, so it's worth the falter in your integrity.
3. Your wife is really struggling with the kids. You're struggling too, but you act like you're super dad and they respect you all the time, even though they don't. She feels inferior and neither of you feel compelled to seek actual answers to improve your kids' lives because you both think you have it under control.
4. You're in a circle of people and they all seem to be really comfortable with each other, but you feel like you're the odd one out. You make up stories to sound impressive.
5. You're screwing around on Reddit at work and your boss walks in. You frantically pull up some spreadsheets to make it look like you were doing actual work.

These are all examples of faking it that will never lead to making it.

Make It

1. Your wife is out of town. You finally get the chance to see how you'd run the house without her. You really want to goof off the entire time, but you decide to keep things in order and set boundaries for yourself as to when you'll goof off and when you'll upkeep things. You hate every minute of it and want to break your own boundaries. You're faking your way through. You haven't made it - and the fact that you have to set boundaries for yourself in the first place proves this. But you do it anyway, and you become a little more disciplined as a result.
2. You've never disciplined anyone before, but you're pumped to try, so you decide to tell your ~~pastor~~ congregation leader about it all anyway. He's not fully sold on it, so you put your money where your mouth is and tell him who you're going to start disciplining and that the growth in this guy over the next 6 months will be the proof of the effectiveness of what you're proposing. Then you hop to it, even though you have no clue what the heck you're doing. You're faking it. You're not a competent disciple-maker. But you learn by diving in head-deep and eventually make it, rather than being the guy who never gets started because he wants to wait until he's "ready" or "mature enough."
3. You want to look like super-dad to your wife, but the honest reality is that the kids are just as defiant with you as they are with her. You devise a new approach to parenting and tell your wife you've got the situation under control and that she just needs to follow your lead. You don't actually know how this new approach will turn out.

You're faking it. But you're going to learn from the effort and refine your process until something does work.

4. The circle of people you're in are chatting up a storm and laughing at each other's jokes. You're an incredible social introvert and generally horrible with conversations. You step into the circle with a big grin on your face and say something totally stupid that you thought would be funny. They laugh at how stupid the joke was. You haven't made it. You faked your confidence. But now you've learned something that doesn't work and have an opportunity to practice various techniques at recovering in a social dynamic like that. Or maybe it did work and boosted your confidence a bit more until you become comfortable hopping into conversations from being an outsider.
5. You're not disciplined at work at all. You screw around on Reddit, but decide that you need to at least look like you're working from time to time. So, every now and then you tell yourself you're going to pull up a TPS report and look it over. You have no idea what the heck a TPS report is in the first place. You're faking it. But after eventually seeing a few dozen of them, you're starting to realize where the important bits are and how they connect to other stuff that you actually do know what to do with. You just might make it after all, and you've disciplined yourself at the office in the process.

Counter-Productive Game-Play

Lots of guys think that playing the part of the alpha will get them the results they're looking for. Think again. The "I'm the alpha game" is actually incredibly counter-productive. Consider the following scenarios that would cause a guy to play the "alpha" game.

If you are playing the alpha to "fix your marriage," you're living in the frame of your marriage. By definition, living in any frame other than your own is "not alpha." In [this old post](#) (which will most certainly come up in my book), I focus on the way "the marriage" is personified in culture to control men. This is particularly true in churchianity because women know they don't have biblical grounds to boss their husband around, so instead they have to adopt concepts, give those concepts transcendent authority over their husbands, and then tell their husbands they must meet those mysteriously transcendent standards because "that's what married people are supposed to do" - even though no one can explain exactly *why* married people are *supposed to do* any of that stuff. It's not technically your wife's frame, but it's a conceptual frame that's not your own, and she gets to tell you what that frame's boundaries are.

If you are playing the alpha to fix things with your wife, you're living in your wife's frame. Let's be clear: this scenario involves pretending to be something you're not because you think that's what someone else really wants from you. In this case, that someone else is your wife. And you're trying to give her what she wants in order to get what you want in return. This is a covert contract. It's also at the very essence of the blue pill mentality.

If you are playing the alpha because a group of guys on the internet told you it's a great way to get your wife to sleep with you, and it's not quite working, but they keep telling you it's just that you're doing it wrong ... well, now you're living in the frame of a bunch of guys on the internet. That includes me. Sure, my frame is big enough to have you - but I'm here to empower men to do God's work, not take them under my wing indefinitely. Get out of my frame. Go be your own man.

What's the alternative? Actually becoming the best version of yourself. Your best physical shape. Your best emotional stability. Your best charm. Your best mental fortitude. Your best financial prospects. Most importantly: your best determination to fulfill a mission that actually makes a difference for eternity. Your frame needs to be *your* best self. Not the "perfect husband." Not your wife's dream-guy. Not what I tell you to be. Your best self. Nothing less.

You see, when you do things for other people's sake, you can never be the genuine article. You will always be a

fake. When the tests come, you will ultimately fail. You can cheat for a while and make it look like you're a great success. That's what we do here in our advice threads: we become your cheat-sheet. But at the end of the day, you've got to get to the point where you can stop looking to the guy next to you for what he'd do and figure out for yourself what you're going to do. Yes, you need to learn what strategies work first, and then figure out how you personally will implement them. But it has to be uniquely you. The teaching and field report threads are showing you what the genuine article looks like - not giving you some boilerplate stereotype of which your life is just a lame spin-off.

I was writing a post on tests, but it got too long and this content seemed to stand apart as a post of its own. Remember this when I put up the next post. It'll come in handy.

We often tell guys to "fake it til you make it." But this only makes sense if the way you fake it actually leads to making it. Consider ...

Examples of What Not to Do

Fake It

1. Your wife is out of town. You goof off the entire time. She calls when her plane is landing. You clean up the entire house just before she gets home and pretend you're husband of the year because you can run a clean ship without her.
2. You talk to a ~~pastor~~ congregation leader about your mission. In order to persuade him you start making up stories that prove the success of what you're proposing, relying on the lie to sell it to him. You convince yourself that it's better to get him to start doing things your way than not at all, so it's worth the falter in your integrity.
3. Your wife is really struggling with the kids. You're struggling too, but you act like you're super dad and they respect you all the time, even though they don't. She feels inferior and neither of you feel compelled to seek actual answers to improve your kids' lives because you both think you have it under control.
4. You're in a circle of people and they all seem to be really comfortable with each other, but you feel like you're the odd one out. You make up stories to sound impressive.
5. You're screwing around on Reddit at work and your boss walks in. You frantically pull up some spreadsheets to make it look like you were doing actual work.

These are all [personal] examples of faking it that will never lead to making it.

Make It

1. Your wife is out of town. You finally get the chance to see how you'd run the house without her. You really want to goof off the entire time, but you decide to keep things in order and set boundaries for yourself as to when you'll goof off and when you'll upkeep things. You hate every minute of it and want to break your own boundaries. You're faking your way through. You haven't made it - and the fact that you have to set boundaries for yourself in the first place proves this. But you do it anyway, and you become a little more disciplined as a result.
2. You've never disciplined anyone before, but you're pumped to try, so you decide to tell your ~~pastor~~ congregation leader about it all anyway. He's not fully sold on it, so you put your money where your mouth is and tell him who you're going to start disciplining and that the growth in this guy over the next 6 months will be the proof of the effectiveness of what you're proposing. Then you hop to it, even though you have no clue what the heck you're doing. You're faking it. You're not a competent disciple-maker. But you learn by diving in head-deep and eventually make it, rather than being the guy who never gets started because he wants to wait until he's "ready" or "mature enough."
3. You want to look like super-dad to your wife, but the honest reality is that the kids are just as defiant with you as they are with her. You devise a new approach to parenting and tell your wife you've got the situation under control and that she just needs to follow your lead. You don't actually know how this new approach will turn out.

You're faking it. But you're going to learn from the effort and refine your process until something does work.

4. The circle of people you're in are chatting up a storm and laughing at each other's jokes. You're an incredible social introvert and generally horrible with conversations. You step into the circle with a big grin on your face and say something totally stupid that you thought would be funny. They laugh at how stupid the joke was. You haven't made it. You faked your confidence. But now you've learned something that doesn't work and have an opportunity to practice various techniques at recovering in a social dynamic like that. Or maybe it did work and boosted your confidence a bit more until you become comfortable hopping into conversations from being an outsider.
5. You're not disciplined at work at all. You screw around on Reddit, but decide that you need to at least look like you're working from time to time. So, every now and then you tell yourself you're going to pull up a TPS report and look it over. You have no idea what the heck a TPS report is in the first place. You're faking it. But after eventually seeing a few dozen of them, you're starting to realize where the important bits are and how they connect to other stuff that you actually do know what to do with. You just might make it after all, and you've disciplined yourself at the office in the process.

These are all ways I adjusted the initial failures I had at various points in my life to start developing actual character - and I'm still going.

Counter-Productive Game-Play

Lots of guys think that playing the part of the alpha will get them the results they're looking for. Think again. The "I'm the alpha game" is actually incredibly counter-productive. Consider the following scenarios that would cause a guy to play the "alpha" game.

If you are playing the alpha to "fix your marriage," you're living in the frame of your marriage. By definition, living in any frame other than your own is "not alpha." In [this old post](#) (which will most certainly come up in my book), I focus on the way "the marriage" is personified in culture to control men. This is particularly true in churchianity because women know they don't have biblical grounds to boss their husband around, so instead they have to adopt concepts, give those concepts transcendent authority over their husbands, and then tell their husbands they must meet those mysteriously transcendent standards because "that's what married people are supposed to do" - even though no one can explain exactly *why* married people are *supposed to* do any of that stuff. It's not technically your wife's frame, but it's a conceptual frame that's not your own, and she gets to tell you what that frame's boundaries are.

If you are playing the alpha to fix things with your wife, you're living in your wife's frame. Let's be clear: this scenario involves pretending to be something you're not because you think that's what someone else really wants from you. In this case, that someone else is your wife. And you're trying to give her what she wants in order to get what you want in return. This is a covert contract. It's also at the very essence of the blue pill mentality.

If you are playing the alpha because a group of guys on the internet told you it's a great way to get your wife to sleep with you, and it's not quite working, but they keep telling you it's just that you're doing it wrong ... well, now you're living in the frame of a bunch of guys on the internet. That includes me. Sure, my frame is big enough to have you - but I'm here to empower men to do God's work, not take them under my wing indefinitely. Get out of my frame. Go be your own man.

What's the alternative? Actually becoming the best version of yourself. Your best physical shape. Your best emotional stability. Your best charm. Your best mental fortitude. Your best financial prospects. Most importantly: your best determination to fulfill a mission that actually makes a difference for eternity. Your frame needs to be *your* best self. Not the "perfect husband." Not your wife's dream-guy. Not what I tell you to be. Your best self.

Nothing less.

You see, when you do things for other people's sake, you can never be the genuine article. You will always be a fake. When the tests come, you will ultimately fail. You can cheat for a while and make it look like you're a great success. That's what we do here in our advice threads: we become your cheat-sheet. But at the end of the day, you've got to get to the point where you can stop looking to the guy next to you for what he'd do and figure out for yourself what you're going to do. Yes, you need to learn what strategies work first, and then figure out how you personally will implement them. But it has to be uniquely you. The teaching and field report threads are showing you what the genuine article looks like - not giving you some boilerplate stereotype of which your life is just a lame spin-off.

CONCLUSION

Faking it is ...

1. Going to fail if you do it in a way that you're not actually internalizing anything from the process, and
2. Going to undermine all of your efforts if your underlying goals in doing this are still tied up in someone else's frame.

Focus on internalization and stick to your own frame - which if you are abiding in Christ is synonymous with his frame. Yes, that means making disciples.

1

UPVOTE

No stupid questions; only stupid people. has been created

26 August 2019 · /r/askRPC · Archived copy · Reddit

The range of questions and discussion topics addressed here is intentionally broader than what's permissible on RPC proper, though not boundless. Questions must relate to our faith OR red pill praxeology in some way. It doesn't have to be both, and we'll try to be relaxed with the scope of how tangentially related the question may be.

Politics? Culture? Sociology? Random theological question that has nothing to do with the red pill? Go for it. Just follow the rules and be respectful.

The range of questions and discussion topics addressed here is intentionally broader than what's permissible on RPC proper, though not boundless. Questions must relate to our faith OR red pill praxeology in some way. It doesn't have to be both, and we'll try to be relaxed with the scope of how tangentially related the question may be.

Politics? Culture? Sociology? Random theological question that has nothing to do with the red pill? Go for it. Just follow the rules and be respectful.

We may even allow completely off-topic things from time to time, if the question is worth anyone's time. Want to know how many guys here prefer dark beer over edible urine? Who knows. Just ask the question and don't pout if it gets taken down.

- Questions on politics from a red pill lens? Go for it.
- Theological curiosities, [r/TrueChristian](#) style? Right on.
- New idea you want to flesh out before posting on RPC proper? Let's hear it.
- Just want to get to know guys in the community better? I'm up for simulated fellowship.
- Feel like bashing on the feminine imperative? Follow the rules and you now have a platform.

However ...

- Here to screw with people or just to puff up your ego? Get out.
- Repeating a topic that's already been addressed ad nauseam? Go comment in the other thread.

Going forward, RPC proper will be reserved for:

- Substantive content that incorporates BOTH red pill and faith-based elements.
- Field Reports
- Serious advice threads (no mental masturbation on hypotheticals)

THE PURPOSE OF RPC

As I'm sure many of you have noticed, there are some bizarre and off-the-wall conversations that get started here. Many of them get removed so that you don't even see them in the first place. I have had countless users comment on their appreciation for the high quality of the content produced here at RPC from a variety of sources, and we want to remain committed to producing quality material. As such, the main sub will start being a little stricter about the quality of material posted and staying on-topic.

To be clear, that "topic" has and always will remain on the sidebar. **Discussion of problems, solutions and insights on relationships, sex, and biblical masculinity according to biblical principles.** We do permit political, sociological, and cultural conversation as well, to the degree that it affects any of these areas directly.

Accordingly, RPC proper will now only allow posts regarding the following:

1. Substantive content that incorporates BOTH red pill and faith-based elements (or is otherwise sufficiently high enough value on either one alone to be warranted).
2. Field Reports - we ALWAYS want more field reports.
3. Serious advice threads where the content of the responses will likely hold great value for others reading (no mental masturbation or hypotheticals).

WHY A NEW SUB?

In remaining committed to high-quality content, we realize there are a host of other topics people want to ask about without having a good place to discuss them. For example: if someone wants to ask about transsubstantiation, where's the best place to ask that? Hyper-(theologically)-liberal r/Christianity run by atheists? r/TrueChristian, which (while better) is predominantly influenced by cultural mainstream conservative churchianity?

Until now, there really hasn't been a place for red pill Christians to ask questions exclusively to other red pill Christians that were too off-topic or low-quality to warrant posting on the main sub. For example, with the election cycle coming up, we're expecting a huge wave of political posts. Some of these posts will be perfectly appropriate and high-value enough to warrant posting here. Others ... won't be.

As mods, we explored various options to let people have a voice on these matters, while not allowing content here to be diluted. The two prime options were to allow a weekly sticky post for off-topic conversation, another for political discussion, etc. However, most comments in these threads get overlooked and don't receive the attention they deserve, even though still too off-topic to warrant attention on the main sub. The other was to start r/askRPC - a concept that was discussed when RPC was first created, but we did not have the user-base to justify its existence.

In light of all of this, rather than silencing conversation or forcing people to get their answers from questionable sources (feminized churchianity or non-Christians), we've decided to open the doors to these types of questions, conversation topics, and teaching points to be addressed by other like-minded individuals, which this main sub has historically been closed to - and also raise the bar on the quality of posts placed here.

FAQ

Does that mean I shouldn't post here if I feel I have something important to say?

No. It means your post might get taken down with a request that it be moved to askRPC instead. We don't want to discourage people from posting here or to decrease the opportunity for good content here; we only want to filter out the weaker content.

What if I don't know which sub I should post it on?

Message the mods, especially if you already have a draft in the works. Feel free to PM me too.

Are there any limits on what can be posted on askRPC?

There's a welcome post already up that outlines this. The limits will be extremely broad, but trolling and completely worthless garbage will still be prohibited.

Can women post there?

Sure. While this is a contentious issue, we do ask that women flair themselves appropriate. I recognize that we have not set up flair there yet, and it will likely be at least a week before I can get to that, due to a major trial I have coming up on Friday.

What if this sub dies down because most of the conversation moves there?

I'm okay with that. I would rather have 1 quality post a week than 2 low-quality posts a day. I view RPC proper (especially now that r/askRPC is up) as more of a wiki that encourages ongoing contributions. If those contributions aren't made, the existing content provides ongoing value and that's enough.

Let me be clear: **we, as mods, do not need the validation of numerous posts to feel like our sub is "successful."** This is a quality sub, not a quantity sub. The bar for that quality has just gone up. This may mean that content is less frequent. We're okay with that.

Because r/askRPC is among other like-minded people, does that mean I can trust the answers I get there?

Don't be an idiot. Be an Acts 17 Berean. Never take someone's word for it. Always research Scripture yourself. There will always be ignorant people who comment, those who think they're red pill'd but aren't, those who are trolling, etc. The quality of responses will be significantly less moderated than here, and it's much less likely that you're going to get mod or endorsed responders to every question over there.

But as soon as able, we will try to put together a flair system that allows for endorsement to reliable individuals. Feel free to nominate anyone for endorsement who you believe has a consistent pattern of high-quality content in their posts and comments in order to help us identify these people, as the mods currently don't have time to read every post and comment that gets put up.

Any further questions? Just let us know. We encourage all existing users - especially the endorsed ones - to subscribe over there as well. The value of askRPC will be limited by the quality of people willing to post there.

12

UPVOTES

Thoughts on the fall from my RPEP

5 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

As many of you know, one of my recent pastors was red pill before ultimately being fired for wanting to make disciples like Jesus did (huh?!? true story). Most of what I've written here over the last 14 months has been inspired by conversations with him. He's moved to the other side of the country, but we still text, and here's a snippet of one of our conversations today:

Him: I've also learned that Eve was deceived, but Adam disobeyed. I think Eve wanted a "better" Adam, better offspring. Interesting how trees played into that one

Me: Very interesting! Why do you say a better Adam? An Adam more like God?

Him: You are on it! I think woman has a built in desire to reproduce "strong." You taught me this: *Alpha f-, beta bucks*. So Adam, the perfect man, was both? I suggest he was balanced, like Jesus. Eve wanted more alpha.

Me: Eve gives the fruit to Adam. He doesn't just take it on his own. Interesting.

Him: The curses coincide with: you will always want more alpha. And Adam, you will never be the alpha you wanted to be. Eve's thinking: Forget this depend on God stuff, I want more MAN! Let's get my man to be like God! (A really good deception!) And Adam thinks: Heck ya, if this turns Eve on ...!

To be clear, when he says "balanced, like Jesus," from our past conversations he doesn't mean half-alpha/half-beta. He means 100% both - the complete embodiment of both strength, leadership, confidence, DNGAF, OI, OYS, etc. and also a provider, protector, comforter, servant, loving, kind, patient, etc. Two interwoven spectrums, not one end of the same spectrum. I isolate this because I don't want the conversation to get hung up on whether or not Jesus was "balanced" or "beta too."

I have more thoughts, but am curious what you all think.

You ever feel a weight fall off your shoulders? Between two closely scheduled trials, the last month has been insanely busy. My wife's also in her busy season at work. Even though she's at 70% instead of full-time, the stress was more from the nature of the work and the fact that even at 70% she's working over 60 hours a week.

On Wednesday the judge realized she had a scheduling conflict and decided to continue next week's trial. Woohoo! I'm ecstatic. My wife ... less so. "I'm quitting my job." "I hate my life." "I just can't do this anymore." "By not letting me quit - **that's abuse. I am being abused.**" She was mad. I don't blame her. She hadn't seen me for the last 48 hours because I was working until after 2am each night, so she's dealing with her busy season, horrible clients, and our 4 kids all on her own for 2 days straight.

My joy at the alleviation of my schedule was confronted directly against her rage, stress, fury, hopelessness. It had gotten so bad that she actually hung up on her boss mid-conversation. She's expressing all of this hate toward me. I'm standing in a puddle of tears. Let's go with the typical comfort maneuver: hug, hand on her cheek, look her in the eyes with my forehead on hers, tell her everything's going to be fine. "Everything's NOT going to be fine. I hate my life." Yeah, the usual wasn't going to cut it this time.

But she couldn't bring me down even if she had the equivalent of an emotional bazooka. **My best was pitted against her worst.** I won.

"Babe, I can see the stress in your face. The problem is, it's stuck there and not coming out. Open your mouth for a second." She did. "Yep, it's in there alright. Hmm ... what are we going to do about that?" So, I picked her up, held her upside-down and started shaking her like a bottle of ketchup. "Get that stress out. Open your mouth. Let it pour." She starts laughing hysterically. "Is it all gone yet? No? Okay, let's keep going, I know there's a little more in there." The kids thought it was hysterical: "Do it to me too, Daddy!" So I start taking turns with each of them one by one.

I look back at my wife: "Well now you're just empty. I suppose I gotta fill you up. How about I give you some of my joy?" So, I start kissing her in front of the kids. Magically, she's happy again. Or maybe it wasn't magic but ... you know ... the power of frame.

Your BEST against her WORST - whose emotions win that battle?

If you're feeling funny and she's mad, do you stop cracking jokes to deal with her anger? That's emotional compromise - you tone your humor down, she brings her attitude up. You're joyful and she's depressed. Do you empathize with her depression to cheer her up? That's emotional compromise. You drop your joy, she ups from her depression. Emotional compromise has its place - empathy can be a powerful tool in the right circumstance.

Settling for a tie is also acceptable. You keep being happy, she keeps pouting in anger. That's her prerogative, if she insists.

But I've found much more success getting my wife into my frame through unstoppable emotional inertia than through emotional compromise or even settling with a tie (though I do that at times too).

As a man, you are strong. Your emotions are stronger than hers. **Women believe that because they are more emotional, somehow emotional acuity is their forte. It's not. Emotional volatility is,** and those aren't the same thing. Men have strength not only to control their emotions, but to express them as well. If your emotional strength is greater than hers, you will win. This is how you draw her into your frame.

In this situation, my wife wanted two things: (1) for me to cave and let her quit her job, and (2) for me to experience the weight of her pain and frustration alongside her - to empathize with her (emotional compromise). I

wasn't having either because she doesn't know what she wants. While she didn't realize it, she really wanted to have fun, so I gave her fun. I had more fun with a fun wife than with a harpy wife. Win.

I'm a bit of a junkie for musicals - they're partly what pulled me out of the emotionally robotic crappy frame I grew up with. If you want to see what unstoppable emotional inertia looks like, watch [The Schmuell Song](#), from *The Last Five Years*. Anna Kendrick slams the door after a bad day, huffing and puffing, repulsed at Jeremy Jordan's efforts to cheer her up. But he's a writer and is excited about his latest story, so he's going to tell his story instead of screwing around with trying to fix his harpy. Cue the video.

While pseudo-fiction (the play is closely based on the author's own marriage/divorce), it's the best visual example I've seen of maintaining frame and drawing a woman in, if guys don't know what this looks like. It's much closer to a realistic picture (minus the singing, unless you're me) than what you'll find in other works of fiction where it just seems forced.

83

UPVOTES

[FR] Unstoppable Emotional Inertia

13 September 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill · Archived copy · Reddit

You ever feel a weight fall off your shoulders? Between two closely scheduled trials, the last month has been insanely busy. My wife's also in her busy season at work. Even though she's at 70% instead of full-time, the stress was more from the nature of the work and the fact that even at 70% she's working over 60 hours a week.

On Wednesday the judge realized she had a scheduling conflict and decided to continue next week's trial. Woohoo! I'm ecstatic. My wife ... less so. "I'm quitting my job." "I hate my life." "I just can't do this anymore." "By not letting me quit - **that's abuse. I am being abused.**" She was mad. I don't blame her. She hadn't seen me for the last 48 hours because I was working until after 2am each night, so she's dealing with her busy season, horrible clients, and our 4 kids all on her own for 2 days straight.

My joy at the alleviation of my schedule was confronted directly against her rage, stress, fury, hopelessness. It had gotten so bad that she actually hung up on her boss mid-conversation. She's expressing all of this hate toward me. I'm standing in a puddle of tears. Let's go with the typical comfort maneuver: hug, hand on her cheek, look her in the eyes with my forehead on hers, tell her everything's going to be fine. "Everything's NOT going to be fine. I hate my life." Yeah, the usual wasn't going to cut it this time.

But she couldn't bring me down even if she had the equivalent of an emotional bazooka. **My best was pitted against her worst.** I won.

"Babe, I can see the stress in your face. The problem is, it's stuck there and not coming out. Open your mouth for a second." She did. "Yep, it's in there alright. Hmm ... what are we going to do about that?" So, I picked her up, held her upside-down and started shaking her like a bottle of ketchup. "Get that stress out. Open your mouth. Let it pour." She starts laughing. "Is it all gone yet? No? Okay, let's keep going, I know there's a little more in there." The kids thought it was hysterical: "Do it to me too, Daddy!" So I start taking turns with each of them one by one.

I look back at my wife: "Well now you're just empty. I suppose I gotta fill you up. How about I give you some of my joy?" So, I start kissing her in front of the kids. Magically, she's happy again. Or maybe it wasn't magic but ... you know ... the power of frame.

Your BEST against her WORST - whose emotions win that battle?

If you're feeling funny and she's mad, do you stop cracking jokes to deal with her anger? That's emotional compromise - you tone your humor down, she brings her attitude up. You're joyful and she's depressed. Do you empathize with her depression to cheer her up? That's emotional compromise. You drop your joy, she ups from her depression. Emotional compromise has its place - empathy can be a powerful tool in the right circumstance.

Settling for a tie is also acceptable. You keep being happy, she keeps pouting in anger. That's her prerogative, if she insists.

But I've found much more success getting my wife into my frame through unstoppable emotional inertia than through emotional compromise or even settling with a tie (though I do that at times too).

As a man, you are strong. Your emotions are stronger than hers. **Women believe that because they are more emotional, somehow emotional acuity is their forte. It's not. Emotional volatility is,** and those aren't the same thing. Men have strength not only to control their emotions, but to express them as well. If your emotional strength is greater than hers, you will win. This is how you draw her into your frame.

In this situation, my wife thought she wanted two things: (1) for me to cave and let her quit her job, and (2) for me to experience the weight of her pain and frustration alongside her - to empathize with her (emotional compromise). I wasn't having either because I knew better. She doesn't know what she wants, but I do. She really wanted to have

fun, so I gave her fun. I had more fun with a fun wife than with a harpy wife. Win.

I'm a bit of a junkie for musicals - they're partly what pulled me out of the emotionally robotic crappy frame I grew up with. If you want to see what unstoppable emotional inertia looks like, watch *The Schmuell Song*, from *The Last Five Years*. Anna Kendrick slams the door after a bad day, huffing and puffing, repulsed at Jeremy Jordan's efforts to cheer her up. But he's a writer and is excited about his latest story, so he's going to tell his story instead of screwing around with trying to fix his harpy. Cue the video.

While pseudo-fiction (the play is closely based on the author's own marriage/divorce), it's the best visual example I've seen of maintaining frame and drawing a woman in, if guys don't know what this looks like. It's much closer to a realistic picture (minus the singing, unless you're me) than what you'll find in other works of fiction where it just seems forced.

12
UPVOTES

Have some fun this weekend. Here's a comic strip for you all.
20 September 2019 · /r/askRPC · Archived copy · Reddit

<https://adam4d.com/help-im-trapped/>

Not perfect, but it addresses most of the comments made about us on the recent SubredditDrama post that was made about us.

I don't have time to refine this, nor do I care to, so here's some stream-of-conscious. Have fun.

THE BASICS

AWALT is an essential concept to understanding intersexual relational dynamics. Rollo has said a number of times that "hypergamy is everything." I agree. But hypergamy only matters if we also agree that AWALT. Otherwise, we're left asking: are 10% of women hypergamous? 50%? 90%? If your wife is one of the non-hypergamous ones, then we might as well throw everything we know out the window.

Now, let's get foundational here:

- AWALT does not mean 100% of every woman who ever lived. There are outliers. To pick an easy example: mental health issues can create clear exceptions to any claim of 100% infallibility when it comes to human thought processes and behaviors.
- AWALT is not meant to describe the behaviors of women, but the underlying biological and psychological impulses that influence their behaviors. Some women are more disciplined than others and therefore won't express AWALT traits, but the underlying desire is still there.
- A few ECs on MRP have worded it: "Don't be *surprised* if your wife is like that too. Just because she doesn't act like that now doesn't mean she won't later."

BIBLICAL FOUNDATION

It's been brought up on reddit and in other Christian circles that "AWALT" as a concept is offensive to any reasonable interpretation of Scripture. Most of this stems from a misunderstanding, but their main rationale is a very liberal notion that everyone is unique and broad classifications over entire people groups is either sexist or racist. The Bible doesn't actually paint such a picture. God doesn't have any problem lumping entire people groups together:

Romans 3 is a great place to start, as Paul lumps all of humanity into an "All People Are Like That" framework: "There is no one righteous, not even one; there is no one who understands; there is no one who seeks God. All have turned away, they have together become worthless; there is no one who does good, not even one." He's not speaking in hyperbole or exaggeration here. He literally means (while quoting OT) that every single person is like that.

Genesis 18 is another great example. There was an entire city of Sodom that God intended to condemn. Abraham argues against God, saying, "Surely NOT All Sodomites Are Like That, right?" He keeps pleading, "What if there are only 50? 45? ... 10? righteous people in Sodom?" God says, "For the sake of the 10 righteous, I would spare the city," yet God blows it sky high anyway. Why? Because All Sodomites Are Like That.

We could keep going throughout the times of the Judges and the Kings. God orders entire nations to be slaughtered. Surely we can't judge entire people groups by the bad eggs among them, right? And yet God does exactly that - and then he calls his people to be the ones to execute his judgment.

Or consider creation itself: Genesis 1. God creates men and women. Categorically, with limited exceptions for birth defects, have a head, a brain, two eyes and a nose, feet and hands. Men have penises. All Men Are Like That. Women have boobs. All Women Are Like That.

Then we go to Genesis 3 and see God intentionally setting categorical patterns in place:

- The serpent is cursed to crawl on his belly - and not him only, but every snake who ever lived after that.
- Adam is cursed with having to work hard and by his sweat to produce food for his family - and no man since then has ever had it as easy as in Eden.
- Eve is cursed with greater pains in child-bearing - and every woman since then has had to face this (pain-killing medication notwithstanding).

Are we truly shocked, then, when we see that Eve's desire for control over Adam would be extended to all other women as well? And yet just as a man can cut off his foot, and therefore consciously deviate himself from his natural state, so also can women choose to reign in those tendencies. But just as a Christian determined never to sin again is always still tempted, so a wife determined never to act on her hypergamous nature still has a hypergamous nature.

What Are AWL?

I've never seen anyone actually list out the AWALT traits that get talked about. It usually comes up piecemeal when someone sees a commonality. So, let's figure this out. Feel free to add to my list.

- **Illimitable Men** includes hypergamy, solipsism, Machiavellianism, and immaturity as underlying principles which prompt such behaviors as branch swinging, blame shifting, and emotional impulsiveness.
- **Rational Wiki** uses words like: manipulative, abusive, sociopathic, destructive, drama-oriented liars. Yikes!
- From reading MRP for as long as I have, I pick up traits like: hypergamy, emotional impulsivity, illogical thought processes, attraction toward bad boys, drying up to betas, being self-absorbed, conformity to strong leadership, etc.
- Interestingly, after Googling around for a bit, the fullest list I was able to find was from our very own /u/Deep_Strength's blog: [check it out](#).

Regardless of what any sector of the manosphere might think, we can at least reliably contemplate the things the Bible says. Deep listed many of them, but off the top of my head, here are the ones I believe I could biblically support:

- Basic anatomical commonalities
 - Sinful with an innate sinful nature
 - Hypergamy
 - Idolization of being in a relationship
 - Subconscious preference for being a follower
 - Overt impulse to control the man she's with
 - Imperative to have babies with a strong man
 - Emotional impulsivity
 - Comparative weakness (though the interpretations on this vary)
 - Nurturing
-

If we allowed anecdotal evidence from Scripture to be representative, we could add to this list with things like opportunistic, materialistic, manipulative, etc. - but I don't want to over-reach here. It's important to note that not only is this list non-exhaustive, it's also non-exclusive. These traits are not necessarily exclusive to women. Men might share some of these traits also, either *en masse* or *ad hoc*.

+/- APPLICATION

It's important to note when contemplating AWALT traits that there are both positive and negative traits on the list. Even more fascinating is that many of the allegedly negative traits can have positive application or function in a relationship. After all, there's a reason men are designed to desire women and not other men (of course, I'm not going to address homosexuality here). Let's take a look at a few of these, so you can see what I'm talking about.

- **Hypergamy:** The sexual dynamic of the red pill is to make hypergamy work for you. And it can! It's not bad that women are hypergamous; you just need to know how to make hypergamy work for you. Guns aren't bad - they can be incredibly valuable to a person, but it takes handling them properly to make them work for you instead of landing you with a prison sentence.
- **Overt impulse to control the man she's with:** Yeah, this one's a pain in the butt. But it's also what forces men to become better men - not because he strives to live up to her expectations, but because he must eventually develop an emotionally dominant frame to stand up to her in order for him to find peace. And for thousands of years this worked perfectly, until the feminine imperative shifted from uplifting women to also include weakening men - now to the degree that men can be thrown in jail for merely emotionally upsetting his wife enough to make her concoct a story of how she has somehow been abused (not to be confused with actual abuse cases).
- **Imperative to have babies with a strong man:** Be that strong man and this means lots of sex.
- **Emotional impulsivity:** Trigger her emotions and unbridled passion erupts in the bedroom too.

You see, as much as MGTOW and other guys may complain about some of these qualities, they're also part of what makes women women - and I, personally, love women a lot. Take these traits away to make her more man-like and suddenly we're either not attracted or we find ourselves leaning a little more gay.

MY EXPERIENCE

Many of you know my own story with this. I thought I'd found a unicorn. My wife seemed perfect to me with all those rosy colored glasses I had on at the time. I used to call her Mary Poppins - "practically perfect in every way." Then she admitted years into our marriage that she had faked a lot of it just to get me to marry her. Turns out she was like that too.

In the reverse: when I first started posting on MRP, explaining what had gone on in my marriage, I was told that my wife was an outlier and that even the red pill didn't hold hope for me - that I needed to leave her and move on. A few short weeks later, turns out they were wrong - AWALT stretched even to someone the red pill community thought was an outlier.

The reason it's so easy to be fooled is because AWALT describes the subconscious tendencies of a woman toward certain attraction patterns and behavioral choices. Many women act overtly on these subconscious proclivities, whereas others have been conditioned to hide them. Those who have been conditioned to hide them often have conscious paradigms in which they operate that affect their overt thinking, producing the subconscious repression of their AWALT tendencies. When this occurs, if you never trigger one of their AWALT traits, you'll never notice the suppressed tendencies at all, reasonably believing your wife is NAWALT. But if you do trigger one of them -

such as being cocky/funny toward her when she says she can't stand cocky men - you'll notice the dissonance between her speech and her physically reactive cues ... hence the saying: *watch what she does, not what she says*.

MAKING IT WORK FOR YOU

Now, as I've been saying, if you think your wife is a special little snowflake, you need to think again. She's not. She hasn't avoided AWALT. She's like that too. She just hasn't acted on it ... yet. Or maybe "yet" never comes. But even if she goes her entire life without expressing AWALT traits, that doesn't mean the core desire and impulses aren't there. And if they're there, what do you do with them? You make them work for you.

I knew a guy whose wife was neck-deep in churchianity culture. Okay, I know a lot of guys like that. Let's call this particular guy Bob. Bob's wife was hard-core "NAWALT," so he thought. His wife never once contemplated divorce as an option - no branch swinging. She refused to spend any time with men who were not her husband. She was against all the liberal feminists and totally believed in things like biblical headship and male-led church structures. She didn't gossip. She didn't use Facebook for validation. She wasn't prone to hyper-emotional outbursts and was overall logical and even-tempered. She didn't boss Bob around or place harsh expectations over him. When she was wrong, she owned up to it. She was constantly focusing on others' needs, even at her own expense. That's how she was raised to be.

Of course, Bob wasn't happy with his sex life. So he asks me how he can make it better. I start sharing with him some concepts we've talked about here. "Oh, no. She'd never go for that," Bob snaps back. "My wife has always hated muscular guys. She's more interested in stimulating conversation. She also doesn't like dominant men. When she sees guys acting alpha on TV shows it disgusts her."

Brother, she's fitness testing you! He was clueless. Every time she says she doesn't like alpha guys, she wants to know if you're going to beta-up to try to appease her, or if you're going to do your own thing. And you wonder why your marriage is sexless. "No, you don't get it. She's being serious. I'd totally push her away if I tried that. Things would get even worse." *Even worse than what? No sex at all? What's worse than no sex? You already said she didn't consider divorce an option.*

Bob believed his wife was NOT AWALT. She was the exception to the rule, in his mind. But I persuaded him to start acting on some basic principles anyway. What did he have to lose? Surprise, surprise: sex started returning to their marriage. What happened? I thought she was NAWALT?

- **Bob discovered that his wife was merely suppressing her innate desires because they were in conflict with her present reality. When her husband changed to start triggering her innate tingles, she suddenly shifted from subconscious suppression of her AWALT tendencies to overtly embracing them.**

MADONNA/WHORE

This probably deserves more time than I'm going to give it, but suffice it to say that many Christian men suffer from the Madonna/Whore Complex. This is when a man polarizes his view of a woman to place her in one category or the other without seeing the possibility of the opposite traits in her. Consider two somewhat extreme cases:

- He might look at an actual prostitute and see her only as a sexual object without understanding who she is as a person and that she desires love, relationships, and all those fuzzies as well.
- In the reverse, he may see a nun and contemplate her as a source of emotional comfort, empathy, and an overall uplifting spirit, all the while not realizing that she also has sexual urges and all kinds of kinky tingles as well.

What makes it most problematic is not the lack of awareness, but the impossibility in the man's own mind of seeing

the reality in this. A man might fantasize about having sex with a nun who wants to get dirty, but if he were to meet a hot nun in real life, he'd never try to pick her up the same way he would a girl at the bar. And yet her vagina doesn't work any differently than any other woman's - he merely thinks he must approach her uniquely.

And this is how many Christian (and non-Christian) men see their wives. They are so used to her NOT being a sexual person that they forget that she IS a sexual person. So, even after they make a few basic improvements to their lives, they're either not willing to initiate with her properly or not willing to experiment toward the sexual lifestyle they want with their wives because they believe "she won't go for that." But AWALT - the prostitute wants fuzzies (BB) and the nun wants sex (AF), even though they have publicly repressed those aspects of their hypergamous nature.

Ultimately, a man must understand both the madonna and whore in his wife and the spectrum of AWALT tendencies that aren't fully expressed in their relational context before he can have both a happy marriage and a satisfying sex life.

BACK TO THE BIBLE

Now, I couldn't reasonably end without going back to the underlying theological premise of everything I teach here at RPC: that our human relationships are parallel with our spiritual marriage with Christ.

How does Christ view the church? Does he see us as dirty, nasty sinners, like the whore, whose only redeeming function is that we can spiritually reproduce more disciples for him? I think not. Does he see us as an upright, holy body that is lovely and pleasing and glorious in his sight, and would never degrade in reproductive passions? Of course not. Christ sees us as pure and holy [here's the kicker] **BECAUSE** of himself - Christ - in us. Our holiness is a byproduct of our groom indwelling us, which is what makes Christ love the church so doggone much, even though we are so doggone filthy all the time. And he also sees our spiritually reproductive capacity and desires to use it to create more holiness.

Now, you know biblically that Christ sees both your holy and whore-ish attributes. All people are sinners and all Christians are holy. A ChristiansALT - and as Christ's bride, it's not too far off, in the parallel, from saying AWALT. But in practice, my guess is that you believe Christ views you as one or the other, and that's affecting how you relate with him. Do you believe God sees you as holy and upright already, and therefore has no need for using you as a tool for his spiritually reproductive purposes? Or do you see yourself as an object of his use, failing to recognize the delight he takes in the holiness you have through him? These questions matter. They will affect what your mission is, or what's holding you back from living it out.

And if you struggle with how you believe Christ views you (not to mention how you view him on this dichotomy), there's a good chance that you project the same thing onto your wife, and that this is equally holding you back from experiencing the relational and sexual fullness you could have in your marriage.

127

UPVOTES

[FR] Initiate Often, Confident Always

14 October 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill · Archived copy · Reddit

Most of my life I had no confidence. Whenever I would reach out to people, they'd reject me and I'd take that as validation of my self-perception that I was socially inept. My confidence was further broken - but I embraced this because I was a validation-seeker at that time, and even negative validation of my own self-perception was still validation all the same. This happened in my marriage over years as I would initiate with my wife. Rejection after rejection broke my confidence that I would ever succeed, until I eventually gave up and welcomed a long dead bedroom.

Fast-forward a couple years. Shortly before finding the red pill, I started working out initiating sex again, expecting that because of some of my peripheral improvements I should see a changed response from my wife. I didn't. This was a covert contract: "I improve myself, she responds sexually." But I hadn't really improved myself. Sure, my physique got better from the tub of lard I'd been, but what I thought were improvements to my frame were actually hollow projections of what I had not yet become. What I thought were confident initiations due to my external behavior was really an internal way of dabbing my toes in the water. It was feigned confidence. Because I was merely playing games at confidence, when it didn't work I took that as further validation of my being a sexual failure.

After swallowing the pill, I realized a subconscious shift in my interpretation of rejection.

- Before: Frequent initiation and rejection validated my perception that I was a failure, **killing my confidence**.
- After: Frequent initiation and rejection immunized me from the pain of rejection, **improving my confidence**.
- Now: Confidence is authentic, rejection is rare.

I had given up on initiating sex with my wife for a year and a half at one point - all due to the pain of rejection. When that pain had become severe enough, I developed a natural DNGAF attitude. I had hit rock-bottom so hard that her rejection no longer mattered to me. It was another drop in the ocean. When I started getting affirmation again, there was a brief temptation to salivate at the carrot dangled in front of me, hoping not to get the stick again ... but the next rejection quickly reminded me that I couldn't trust my wife with my emotions any more than I would trust a teenager with my financial portfolio. It's a bad investment.

Here's where I screwed up: more recently, I've stopped initiating. I didn't feel like I had to. After all, she was doing most of the initiation for a while anyway. So, after a couple weeks, I caught myself asking: "Why isn't she initiating like she used to?" Now, I start rationalizing that it's because she worked over 90 hours last week due to a busy-season deadline. Probably some truth there. But there were also openings I didn't take. At the end of the day, the answer to my question was simple: *Because she's a woman*. Women are primarily sexually responsive. I had stopped giving her anything to respond to.

What's more interesting is the small voice in the back of my head that used to be a dominant air-horn, now whispering: "She just worked 17 hours today. If you initiate, you'll get rejected, so it's pointless to initiate." Tell that voice to screw off. I stopped initiating, my anti-confident thoughts started returning.

In reality: *so what if she rejects me due to her 17 hour work-day?* First, maybe some sexual release would be good for her to relieve the stress - but even that is still in her frame. Better just to initiate and either (1) end up having hot stress-relief sex (is that a thing?), or (2) get rejected, making it clear to my subconscious that it's pointless to try taking away my confidence because rejection is not a fear that cripples my confidence, but an invitation that bolsters it.

Axiom: If you develop confidence through successes, your confidence only lasts while you are successful. If you develop it by immunizing yourself against failure, the confidence can never be broken.

Most of my life I had no confidence. Whenever I would reach out to people, they'd reject me and I'd take that as validation of my self-perception that I was socially inept. My confidence was further broken - but I embraced this because I was a validation-seeker at that time, and even negative validation of my own self-perception was still validation all the same. This happened in my marriage over years as I would initiate with my wife. Rejection after rejection broke my confidence that I would ever succeed, until I eventually gave up and welcomed a long dead bedroom.

Fast-forward a couple years. Shortly before finding the red pill, I started working out initiating sex again, expecting that because of some of my peripheral improvements I should see a changed response from my wife. I didn't. This was a covert contract: "I improve myself, she responds sexually." But I hadn't really improved myself. Sure, my physique got better from the tub of lard I'd been, but what I thought were improvements to my frame were actually hollow projections of what I had not yet become. What I thought were confident initiations due to my external behavior was really an internal way of dabbing my toes in the water. It was feigned confidence. Because I was merely playing games at confidence, when it didn't work I took that as further validation of my being a sexual failure.

After swallowing the pill, I realized a subconscious shift in my interpretation of rejection.

- Before: Frequent initiation and rejection validated my perception that I was a failure, **killing my confidence**.
- After: Frequent initiation and rejection immunized me from the pain of rejection, **improving my confidence**.
- Now: Confidence is authentic, rejection is rare.

I had given up on initiating sex with my wife for a year and a half at one point - all due to the pain of rejection. When that pain had become severe enough, I developed a natural DNGAF attitude. I had hit rock-bottom so hard that her rejection no longer mattered to me. It was another drop in the ocean. When I started getting affirmation again, there was a brief temptation to salivate at the carrot dangled in front of me, hoping not to get the stick again ... but the next rejection quickly reminded me that I couldn't trust my wife with my emotions any more than I would trust a teenager with my financial portfolio. It's a bad investment.

Here's where I screwed up: more recently, I've stopped initiating. I didn't feel like I had to. After all, she was doing most of the initiation for a while anyway. So, after a couple weeks, I caught myself asking: "Why isn't she initiating like she used to?" Now, I start rationalizing that it's because she worked over 90 hours last week due to a busy-season deadline. Probably some truth there. But there were also openings I didn't take. At the end of the day, the answer to my question was simple: *Because she's a woman*. Women are primarily sexually responsive. I had stopped giving her anything to respond to.

What's more interesting is the small voice in the back of my head that used to be a dominant air-horn, now whispering: "She just worked 17 hours today. If you initiate, you'll get rejected, so it's pointless to initiate." Tell that voice to screw off. I stopped initiating, my anti-confident thoughts started returning.

In reality: *so what if she rejects me due to her 17 hour work-day?* First, maybe some sexual release would be good for her to relieve the stress - but even that is still in her frame. Better just to initiate and either (1) end up having hot stress-relief sex (is that a thing?), or (2) get rejected, making it clear to my subconscious that it's pointless to try taking away my confidence because rejection is not a fear that cripples my confidence, but an invitation that bolsters it.

As this is the RPC version of this post, let me simply ask rhetorically: When Jesus wants to spiritually reproduce through us and we reject him, do you believe his confidence is shaken? Does this kill his abundance mentality? Does that stop him from inviting us to spread the Gospel with him?

20

UPVOTES

Killing the Blue

28 October 2019 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

If the red pill is knowing the truth about intersexual dynamics, it's not enough merely to embrace the truth. We've got to cast off the lies as well. Otherwise we're going to rationalize some compromise between competing principles that were never meant to reconcile. I believe Rollo calls this "killing the blue."

I was reminded to write this post earlier today when my wife became huffy that I didn't get out of the car to pump the gas when she gave me the silent look of expectation. She huffed, "For as much as you try to teach other guys about how to be a man, you're not man enough to pump my gas? That's the man's job." Uh huh. Keep telling yourself that.

Here is a list of blue notions that I've had to overcome in my thinking.

TRUTH

- *Honesty is the foundation of marriage.*

Wrong. Honesty is a useful tool, but there's nothing foundational about it. If anything, I'd suggest sex is the foundation of marriage. As is often said among those who aren't having it: "Without sex, we're really just roommates."

ARGUING

- *If an argument comes up, it's the man's job to resolve the conflict and make it right.*

Wrong. The man decides what his job is or isn't. If he doesn't want to resolve the conflict, that's his business. Perhaps it's more valuable to him to spend his time doing something else than let his wife victim puke all over him.

MONEY

- *If she handles the money, she calls the shots.*

Wrong. This phrase is usually implied in relationships where the wife is the heavier earner or is the one who handles the household finances. Not surprisingly, I find it uncanny how often the woman is in charge of the household finances. I was just chatting about this with a friend the other day. His wife handles all the bills and will constantly tell him what he can/can't spend, but then goes off and breaks her own rules. "We have \$200 to get us through the next week" - then she goes and buys \$300 in groceries, saying, "We'd need it eventually," and they can't pay one of their utility bills. As for women-workers, money is certainly tied to power, but I have seen many men who are capable of leading from a SAHD position. If she makes more, it is certainly more difficult to earn and maintain her respect, but far from impossible. A woman will do anything for a highly attractive man - including work her butt off to keep him from pressing on her fear of abandonment. While a man's career may affect her attraction toward him, it can be made up through a number of other factors.

EMPATHY

- *Good husbands are always, with their wives, ... empathetic, kind, patient, humble, understanding, etc.*

Wrong. These are all tools that are useful in their own place. When a wife characterizes what a "good husband"

does she is placing her own moral judgment on his behaviors, often without a solid foundation for that judgment beyond her own preferences or societal norms. This sentiment also leaves off the context associated with the behavior. It presupposes an endorsement of the notion that a man should love a woman for all of her, including her flaws (or at the very least, despite her flaws), not recognizing that sometimes the most loving thing to do is help her overcome her flaws, which often requires casting off some of these more palatable virtues.

HELPER

- *Society expects a lot from women, so husbands should help their wives by carrying part of the load.*

Wrong. Society does expect a lot from women. But this is because men aren't taking personal responsibility for the things that need to get done in their own lives, so women step up and take over. The more attractive framework isn't that a woman is burdened with responsibility and needs a man's help, but that a man embraces being responsible and invites his woman to help.

EXPLANATION

- *If she asks, a man owes it to his wife to explain his behaviors so she can understand what he does and why he does it.*

Wrong. You owe her nothing. Over-explaining yourself, even on her request, takes away the mystery of who you are. A lack of mystery and intrigue as to the inner-workings of your mind simply makes you predictable and boring.

ROLES

- *It's a husband's job to ... shovel the driveway ... fill the gas tank ... mow the lawn ... etc.*

Wrong. A man should set his own framework for what his responsibilities will be in his own home. Appealing to an amorphous standard of gendered stereotypes takes the power and authority from the man and forces him to live in society's frame - a frame that so happens to benefit women more often than men. Always challenge these statements (even if only to yourself) with the negative inquiry: "Why is it the man's job to ... ?" or "Where did the idea come from that it's a man's job to ... ?"

PURSUIT

- *Men should pursue women; husbands should pursue their wives.*

Wrong. This is a trope used to compel men to put more work into relationships than women, rationalizing their own selfishness. It's based on gross misconceptions of historical/traditional relationships and a mixing up of the concepts of "initiation" and "pursuing." The orientation of the pursuit in the relationship is a reflection of the power dynamic. The one who pursues the other is the weaker one in more desperate need of what the other has to offer. The one being pursued is the prize. When the man is the prize, his pursuit should be his mission, not his wife, and she should pursue him.

UNCONDITIONAL

- *Marriage requires unconditional love.*
-

Wrong. Marriage is inherently a conditional contract. That's what a covenant is. If love were an emotion, it would be impossible to persist unconditionally. If love is a choice, it would be foolish to employ it without conditions. To take away all conditions on any behavior makes you a slave to that behavior and the one to whom you allegedly owe it.

SACRIFICE

- *It's a man's job to make sacrifices for the good of his wife.*

Wrong. It's each person's responsibility to decide what they will and won't do and if the benefit of a particular course of action justifies the cost. This phrase is utilized by women to compel men to ignore common sense in evaluating this dynamic. There are certainly times where a sacrifice will be more beneficial to a man's long-term purposes, but not every time, as is often implied when this statement is used (especially among guys in the church).

SYNERGY

- *Marriage is about synergy and teamwork, and through mutual cooperation they create one greater whole.*

Wrong. While there are benefits to having a teammate, you are still two separate people. Losing your sense of individual identity can be extremely dangerous in the long-term, re-enslaving you to the expectations that come with a synergistic mentality, which almost always come from society or her relationship philosophies. There are times when it is effective to do things independently from each other, not as a team. If she feels like you're always harmonious as a team, there's little room for dread.

YIELDING

- *In order to resolve conflict, the husband must yield his position to his wife as an act of service and display of his love.*

Wrong. This is a gross misrepresentation of concepts of servant leadership. While a man should certainly own up to his faults, that doesn't mean he should always yield in conflict or let his wife think she's never at fault. Rather, he should tactfully address her faults through displays of attractive behaviors, such as AM, AA, teasing, etc.

PRIORITIES

- *A husband's highest priority should be his wife and kids, not his career, friends, etc.*

Wrong. Men can have whatever priorities they want. If she doesn't like it, she can leave. He can account for the value of keeping her around when setting his list of priorities, which he is free to change or rearrange at any time he so chooses.

OMISSION

- *You should never hide anything from your spouse. Omitting the truth is the same as lying.*

Wrong. Omitting the truth is everyone's way of life. Compulsory honesty would force the disclosure of incredible quantities of irrelevant information, and nobody does this because it's pointless. Instead, we only disclose when we know it has value. The argument for compulsory honesty is that it is always more valuable for a man to disclose

than not. When framed this way, it's much easier to recognize that you can discern this balance for yourself in any given moment to decide what you will and won't say. Now, if there's an actual duty to disclose, that's a different story (I'm an attorney, so this duty comes up a lot). But in a general relational context, that duty almost never exists.

UNCOMPROMISING

- *Marriage is about compromise.*

Wrong. Compromise weakens both positions. When a balance needs to be sought, compromise is a valuable tool. However, the situations where compromise is the most effective tool are far fewer than you might imagine.

NEGOTIATION

- *If a man wants sex from his wife, he should give her something to get it.*

Wrong. Desire cannot be negotiated. This attitude, at best, leads to duty sex. At worst, it leads to claims of rape when the negotiation is implicit and the sex is undesired. More commonly, it's just a covert contract that doesn't get held up and leads to resentment.

DIFFICULTY

- *It's hard enough being a woman; it would be selfish for a man to add more burdens on his wife than she already puts on herself.*

Wrong. This rationale is used to make men feel guilty for asking anything of their wives. In reality, if a husband never asks anything of his wife, she never knows what she does that's of value to him. She can only live on her own self-validation or his feigned attempt at validation that she often sees through. Women require authentic validation from others and cannot have it until they actually know what others expect of them. This is particularly true and potent within marriage.

INFATUATION

- *Love is an emotion that married couples should experience with each other.*

Wrong. The word "love" means countless things to various people. The most useful definition I have found is that love is a choice relating to how you will act toward someone else. The most common associated emotion is infatuation. Others include lust, happiness, serenity, etc. Emotions come and go. If emotions were a viable definition of love, a woman could rightly claim to still love her ex while slashing his tires. This is not love.

TALKING

- *Communication is the life-blood of marriage.*

Wrong. Attraction is the life-blood of marriage. I've known countless horrible communicators who get on just fine. Why? Because they each find value in the other due to their mutual attraction. I have also known immaculate communicators who end up in divorces. Why? Certainly not for lack of communication, but for lack of attraction. Those who are highly attracted to each other will keep coming back to the same disastrous affair with each other over and over and over again no matter how much it's ruining their lives. Never underestimate the power of

attraction as the true life-blood of relationships.

FLAWS

- *A good man will love a woman for all of who she is, including her flaws.*

Wrong. If a man claims to care about the good of the woman he is with, he'd do better to help her overcome her flaws rather than enable them.

FIGHT

- *A man must fight to keep his woman - emotionally, physically, and spiritually.*

Wrong. A man can do whatever he wants. Failing to fight for a woman doesn't make him less of a man. It simply indicates she wasn't worth the fight. All of those "chase her down at the airport" scenes in chick flicks only make sense if she adds enough value to his life to warrant the gesture - and not merely emotional value, as emotions are fickle, but pragmatic value.

FAN

- *A good husband is his wife's biggest fan.*

Wrong. This gets brought up on social media and dating apps all the time. This puts her in the spotlight and you as the one on the sideline cheering her on. Guess whose frame you're in when that happens. Women claim they want to be the center of attention, but when they have it they often find they're unhappy. Why? Because it sucks being married to the side-liner rather than the star. She'll be much happier cheering you on.

I'm sure there are countless more concepts we've told ourselves that could be added to this list, which we'd be better off unlearning - and I'd love to hear them! But, I'm getting tired for the night. So, I'll leave it to you all to share some of the blue pill ideologies you've had to overcome. Consider this a collaborative effort.

93

UPVOTES

Killing the Blue

28 October 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill · Archived copy · Reddit

If the red pill is knowing the truth about intersexual dynamics, it's not enough merely to embrace the truth. We've got to cast off the lies as well. Otherwise we're going to rationalize some compromise between competing principles that were never meant to reconcile. I believe Rollo calls this "killing the blue."

I was reminded to write this post earlier today when my wife became huffy that I didn't get out of the car to pump the gas when she gave me the silent look of expectation. She huffed, "For as much as you try to teach other guys about how to be a man, you're not man enough to pump my gas? That's the man's job." Uh huh. Keep telling yourself that.

Here is a list of blue notions that I've had to overcome in my thinking.

TRUTH

- *Honesty is the foundation of marriage.*

Wrong. Honesty is a useful tool, but there's nothing foundational about it. If anything, I'd suggest sex is the foundation of marriage. As is often said among those who aren't having it: "Without sex, we're really just roommates."

ARGUING

- *If an argument comes up, it's the man's job to resolve the conflict and make it right.*

Wrong. The man decides what his job is or isn't. If he doesn't want to resolve the conflict, that's his business. Perhaps it's more valuable to him to spend his time doing something else than let his wife victim puke all over him.

MONEY

- *If she handles the money, she calls the shots.*

Wrong. This phrase is usually implied in relationships where the wife is the heavier earner or is the one who handles the household finances. Not surprisingly, I find it uncanny how often the woman is in charge of the household finances. I was just chatting about this with a friend the other day. His wife handles all the bills and will constantly tell him what he can/can't spend, but then goes off and breaks her own rules. "We have \$200 to get us through the next week" - then she goes and buys \$300 in groceries, saying, "We'd need it eventually," and they can't pay one of their utility bills. As for women-workers, money is certainly tied to power, but I have seen many men who are capable of leading from a SAHD position. If she makes more, it is certainly more difficult to earn and maintain her respect, but far from impossible. A woman will do anything for a highly attractive man - including work her butt off to keep him from pressing on her fear of abandonment. While a man's career may affect her attraction toward him, it can be made up through a number of other factors.

EMPATHY

- *Good husbands are always, with their wives, ... empathetic, kind, patient, humble, understanding, etc.*

Wrong. These are all tools that are useful in their own place. When a wife characterizes what a "good husband"

does she is placing her own moral judgment on his behaviors, often without a solid foundation for that judgment beyond her own preferences or societal norms. This sentiment also leaves off the context associated with the behavior. It presupposes an endorsement of the notion that a man should love a woman for all of her, including her flaws (or at the very least, despite her flaws), not recognizing that sometimes the most loving thing to do is help her overcome her flaws, which often requires casting off some of these more palatable virtues.

HELPER

- *Society expects a lot from women, so husbands should help their wives by carrying part of the load.*

Wrong. Society does expect a lot from women. But this is because men aren't taking personal responsibility for the things that need to get done in their own lives, so women step up and take over. The more attractive framework isn't that a woman is burdened with responsibility and needs a man's help, but that a man embraces being responsible and invites his woman to help.

EXPLANATION

- *If she asks, a man owes it to his wife to explain his behaviors so she can understand what he does and why he does it.*

Wrong. You owe her nothing. Over-explaining yourself, even on her request, takes away the mystery of who you are. A lack of mystery and intrigue as to the inner-workings of your mind simply makes you predictable and boring.

ROLES

- *It's a husband's job to ... shovel the driveway ... fill the gas tank ... mow the lawn ... etc.*

Wrong. A man should set his own framework for what his responsibilities will be in his own home. Appealing to an amorphous standard of gendered stereotypes takes the power and authority from the man and forces him to live in society's frame - a frame that so happens to benefit women more often than men. Always challenge these statements (even if only to yourself) with the negative inquiry: "Why is it the man's job to ... ?" or "Where did the idea come from that it's a man's job to ... ?"

PURSUIT

- *Men should pursue women; husbands should pursue their wives.*

Wrong. This is a trope used to compel men to put more work into relationships than women, rationalizing their own selfishness. It's based on gross misconceptions of historical/traditional relationships and a mixing up of the concepts of "initiation" and "pursuing." The orientation of the pursuit in the relationship is a reflection of the power dynamic. The one who pursues the other is the weaker one in more desperate need of what the other has to offer. The one being pursued is the prize. When the man is the prize, his pursuit should be his mission, not his wife, and she should pursue him.

UNCONDITIONAL

- *Marriage requires unconditional love.*
-

Wrong. Marriage is inherently a conditional contract. That's what a covenant is. If love were an emotion, it would be impossible to persist unconditionally. If love is a choice, it would be foolish to employ it without conditions. To take away all conditions on any behavior makes you a slave to that behavior and the one to whom you allegedly owe it.

SACRIFICE

- *It's a man's job to make sacrifices for the good of his wife.*

Wrong. It's each person's responsibility to decide what they will and won't do and if the benefit of a particular course of action justifies the cost. This phrase is utilized by women to compel men to ignore common sense in evaluating this dynamic. There are certainly times where a sacrifice will be more beneficial to a man's long-term purposes, but not every time, as is often implied when this statement is used (especially among guys in the church).

SYNERGY

- *Marriage is about synergy and teamwork, and through mutual cooperation they create one greater whole.*

Wrong. While there are benefits to having a teammate, you are still two separate people. Losing your sense of individual identity can be extremely dangerous in the long-term, re-enslaving you to the expectations that come with a synergistic mentality, which almost always come from society or her relationship philosophies. There are times when it is effective to do things independently from each other, not as a team. If she feels like you're always harmonious as a team, there's little room for dread.

YIELDING

- *In order to resolve conflict, the husband must yield his position to his wife as an act of service and display of his love.*

Wrong. This is a gross misrepresentation of concepts of servant leadership. While a man should certainly own up to his faults, that doesn't mean he should always yield in conflict or let his wife think she's never at fault. Rather, he should tactfully address her faults through displays of attractive behaviors, such as AM, AA, teasing, etc.

PRIORITIES

- *A husband's highest priority should be his wife and kids, not his career, friends, etc.*

Wrong. Men can have whatever priorities they want. If she doesn't like it, she can leave. He can account for the value of keeping her around when setting his list of priorities, which he is free to change or rearrange at any time he so chooses.

OMISSION

- *You should never hide anything from your spouse. Omitting the truth is the same as lying.*

Wrong. Omitting the truth is everyone's way of life. Compulsory honesty would force the disclosure of incredible quantities of irrelevant information, and nobody does this because it's pointless. Instead, we only disclose when we know it has value. The argument for compulsory honesty is that it is always more valuable for a man to disclose

than not. When framed this way, it's much easier to recognize that you can discern this balance for yourself in any given moment to decide what you will and won't say. Now, if there's an actual duty to disclose, that's a different story (I'm an attorney, so this duty comes up a lot). But in a general relational context, that duty almost never exists.

UNCOMPROMISING

- *Marriage is about compromise.*

Wrong. Compromise weakens both positions. When a balance needs to be sought, compromise is a valuable tool. However, the situations where compromise is the most effective tool are far fewer than you might imagine.

NEGOTIATION

- *If a man wants sex from his wife, he should give her something to get it.*

Wrong. Desire cannot be negotiated. This attitude, at best, leads to duty sex. At worst, it leads to claims of rape when the negotiation is implicit and the sex is undesired. More commonly, it's just a covert contract that doesn't get held up and leads to resentment.

DIFFICULTY

- *It's hard enough being a woman; it would be selfish for a man to add more burdens on his wife than she already puts on herself.*

Wrong. This rationale is used to make men feel guilty for asking anything of their wives. In reality, if a husband never asks anything of his wife, she never knows what she does that's of value to him. She can only live on her own self-validation or his feigned attempt at validation that she often sees through. Women require authentic validation from others and cannot have it until they actually know what others expect of them. This is particularly true and potent within marriage.

INFATUATION

- *Love is an emotion that married couples should experience with each other.*

Wrong. The word "love" means countless things to various people. The most useful definition I have found is that love is a choice relating to how you will act toward someone else. The most common associated emotion is infatuation. Others include lust, happiness, serenity, etc. Emotions come and go. If emotions were a viable definition of love, a woman could rightly claim to still love her ex while slashing his tires. This is not love.

TALKING

- *Communication is the life-blood of marriage.*

Wrong. Attraction is the life-blood of marriage. I've known countless horrible communicators who get on just fine. Why? Because they each find value in the other due to their mutual attraction. I have also known immaculate communicators who end up in divorces. Why? Certainly not for lack of communication, but for lack of attraction. Those who are highly attracted to each other will keep coming back to the same disastrous affair with each other over and over and over again no matter how much it's ruining their lives. Never underestimate the power of

attraction as the true life-blood of relationships.

FLAWS

- *A good man will love a woman for all of who she is, including her flaws.*

Wrong. If a man claims to care about the good of the woman he is with, he'd do better to help her overcome her flaws rather than enable them.

FIGHT

- *A man must fight to keep his woman - emotionally, physically, and spiritually.*

Wrong. A man can do whatever he wants. Failing to fight for a woman doesn't make him less of a man. It simply indicates she wasn't worth the fight. All of those "chase her down at the airport" scenes in chick flicks only make sense if she adds enough value to his life to warrant the gesture - and not merely emotional value, as emotions are fickle, but pragmatic value.

FAN

- *A good husband is his wife's biggest fan.*

Wrong. This gets brought up on social media and dating apps all the time. This puts her in the spotlight and you as the one on the sideline cheering her on. Guess whose frame you're in when that happens. Women claim they want to be the center of attention, but when they have it they often find they're unhappy. Why? Because it sucks being married to the side-liner rather than the star. She'll be much happier cheering you on.

I'm sure there are countless more concepts we've told ourselves that could be added to this list, which we'd be better off unlearning - and I'd love to hear them! But, I'm getting tired for the night. So, I'll leave it to you all to share some of the blue pill ideologies you've had to overcome. Consider this a collaborative effort.

This post is going to tick off some people. I'm okay with that. I know it requires a lot more qualifying language than I'm actually going to give it (I'm low on time). But I think this is a necessary message right now anyway.

No, this is not a defense of porn use as if it's not sinful. It is sin. But, I'm going to defend the use of porn insofar as it has been used as a tool of condemnation over men by the church in their marriages. Why would I do this? Certainly not to encourage porn use. Instead, my premise is that when men blame porn for their marriage troubles, they fail to see the actual issues and become so obsessed with quitting porn that it becomes the proverbial "pink elephant" they can't stop thinking about and ultimately interferes with their ability to live on mission for Christ.

Does Porn Actually Ruin Marriages?

Churchianity tells us that watching porn ruins marriages.

- *Does it, though?*

Seriously. Ask that question and dwell on it for a bit. This comes up all the time in Christian books and movies. There's only one way that I have noticed an appreciable impact on my marriage: *When I would curb my desires through porn, I was less interested in initiating with my wife, and then I blamed our lack of sex on her denial rather than my lack of initiation and developed resentment against her for it.*

Notice that this isn't actually a porn problem. This is an initiation issue. If I were to have initiated with my wife as often as I wanted sex, one of two things would happen: (1) we would have sex and I'd have no need for porn (or if I did, it wouldn't be in a resentment-building way); or (2) she would deny me, we wouldn't have sex, and HER DENIAL would build my resentment against her - and this would be true even if I didn't watch porn afterward.

My point here is simple: the act of watching porn and masturbating is not, in itself, what causes the problem, as the resentment that builds is independent of the actual porn use, which is really more of a coping mechanism to abate the resentment. Dare I say it? In many cases, I've met clients and fellow churchgoers who would have divorced their wives long ago if they hadn't had porn to abate the impact of their bitterness. In some of these cases, it's entirely possible that watching porn is what saved their marriage as it gave them an outlet to relieve their frustration against a sinfully denying wife rather than letting their bitterness continue to grow until it erupted into a divorce.

Does that make it right? Absolutely not. But if we're not accurate about what the problems are in marriages, we're not going to be accurate in finding solutions either. If we keep blaming "all those horrible men who are addicted to porn" for marriages falling apart, like in the *Fireproof* movie, we're only ever going to get fictionalized rationalizations for what the answer might be, while the real answers (i.e. everything else we teach here) are hidden and left unaddressed. As long as churchianity keeps blaming porn for more than its actual role in marriages falling apart, there will be no motive or reason for its leaders to look for alternative, more biblical cures for broken marriages and sex lives.

A Perfect Example

I'd been planning on writing this post for a couple weeks now (no, I don't actually get the chance to write every post idea that comes to mind), but was finally triggered to do so by [this post](#) by /u/carelessbowler5. He writes about his failure to overcome his porn use. Props for your honesty, brother! But here's what's most telling about the situation:

- I know what it looked like in my BP days. I spilled my guts and she just kinda looked at me blankly, not feeling bad, sorry, sympathetic, or anything (never any rage or anger like other wives). Usually a somewhat indifferent,

"Uh... I forgive you."

Where I think he's mistaken is when he says "like other wives." I've counseled a lot of guys through porn issues. I've also seen a lot of them go through confession with their wives. This response seems pretty standard. With their words, many will say, "Thank you for your honesty. I forgive you. You're always welcome to tell me anything and I'll do my best to help you." With their actions and mannerisms, they're implicitly communicating: "Why are you telling me this? I don't want to know. I think I do, but in reality it just makes me less attracted to you and more pessimistic about our relationship. I can't resolve that cognitive dissonance on my own, so you're going to have to resolve it for me by not telling me in the first place."

Now, some guys confess for stupid reasons, like hoping it will make their wives more sexually interested in them. After all, "If I'm struggling with porn and she realizes just how serious it is, maybe she'd be more inclined to help me by having sex with me so I don't have to go to porn." That's not been my experience or the case among men I've counseled. It usually results in a one-time (maybe one-week) adjustment before returning to life as usual.

Refuting Churchianity

As I've written before ("**Sex Addicted v. Sex Starved**"), most guys don't actually have an addiction problem. They just have sinfully denying wives. The majority of men I meet have no problem saying no to porn within 48 hours after having sex with their wife (i.e. the time it takes for his balls to refuel completely). If they're at all close to a representative of the whole of men who use porn, what does this implication say on the impact of porn on marriages?

Let's look at some of the most common arguments Christians use for why porn kills marriages and see if the rationale makes as much sense as they think it does. For this fun exercise, I'm going to use [this article](#) from the Christian blog, thrivingmarriages.com.

- **1. Porn kills your ability to get aroused by "just" your spouse.**

This was not my experience in my porn days. I know the author claims (without citing) that there's "science" to back this up, due to "brain re-wiring" that often gets discussed. For those with an actual, genuine addiction, this may be true. But the fact that most men can become aroused by "just" their spouse (even if she's unattractive) after merely a few days off porn is also very telling. When actual addictive issues are at play, the brain's reward centers are certain re-wired - that part is true. But the re-wiring also causes a modicum of permanent change that cannot be completely reversed. So, for every guy who has overcome his alleged porn addiction and found himself attracted by "just" his wife again, either God is doing a literal physical miracle every time by undoing physical brain damage, or these guys were never really addicted in the first place, and the "re-wired brain" argument holds no weight except in the most severe, extreme cases.

More likely, if a guy can't get aroused by "just" his spouse, it's not because he's watching porn, but because she's not trying to arouse him. I would LOVE to hear from these men: (1) what kind of physical shape is she in? (2) how's her fashion sense? (3) does she use seductive mannerisms around him? (4) how often does she put on that lingerie? Women expect men to get aroused just by her saying the word "sex." Interestingly: for many men, they're right! But the fact that most allegedly porn-addicted men would jump on their even unattractive wives at any showing of her willingness is only further evidence that their brains have not actually been re-wired.

More to the point, if there is any re-wiring going on, it's that men's brains have been re-wired to believe having an attractive wife with decent fashion sense who occasionally acts seductive or wears lingerie from time to time is somehow an unrealistic expectation of sex. That's the real dangerous "re-wiring."

- **2. Porn Kills Your Libido ...** "when it comes to making love to your spouse."

I love how the author misleads the title by putting the qualifier in the body of that section rather than the title. No,

porn does not kill your libido. His argument is that men would rather watch porn than have sex with their wives - that he gets e-mails from women in their twenties complaining that sex has somehow dropped off after marriage, which he presumes is because the guys are watching porn instead. First, I'd love to see how many more men are concerned with this post-marriage sex-loss phenomenon than women. But more to the point: the fact that these guys are still watching porn shows that their libido is not, in fact, killed at all. Yes, it's "killed ... when it comes to making love to your spouse," but there's no evidence here that the porn is what killed it. More likely than not, she killed it through being a nagging harpy or by denying him repeatedly or by getting fat. Or perhaps it's the more general phenomenon that sexual attraction is highest during anticipatory phases of a relationship, and since he's talking about people who were virgins until marriage, once that build up is gone post-marriage because they're actually having sex, the anticipatory tension is released and it's just not as exciting anymore.

This is the problem when women talk about how their wedding day should be the "best day of my life!" If you've already hit the climax at that point, everything after that will, by definition, be disappointing. For couples who view sex as a destination that has been "achieved" in a relationship, ongoing sex afterward is a let-down. Instead, sex should be viewed as a journey with new territory to explore and lots of old ground to rediscover.

• 3. Porn Makes You Sexually Lazy

The author's rationale is that you are allegedly trained to believe that people are just always "turned on" and ready to go, and therefore you're less interested in foreplay. This could easily be undermined by arguing back: "Okay, so from now on I'll just watch porn that does involve a lot of foreplay and a slow build" ... as if that doesn't exist. For those who don't, though: I'd be shocked if there's any truth in this statement at all. Most men obviously realize that it takes time to build arousal. The problem here is that they're waiting until post-initiation to begin building arousal rather than building arousal throughout the day pre-initiation. The author clearly doesn't understand that - and if we assume that arousal can only start post-initiation, then I might be inclined to believe what he's saying. But if he doesn't understand something as basic as this, what's he doing writing on a blog about marriage and sexuality in the first place? Well ... I guess the same could be said of most Christian authors on sex, so there's that.

My personal experience is quite the opposite of what the author said. Porn did not make me sexually lazy. Rather, I have always been highly aroused and turned on by the foreplay period of building arousal with my wife, even if it's entirely post-initiation. This was constant even during the times when I was using porn the most. To get a bit too graphic, there were times I had masturbated to porn - sometimes even multiple times - before hopping into bed to my wife unexpectedly initiating with me, and the fact that I'd been on porn before made me MORE inclined to slow-build, because I needed that time also.

Also, watching porn immediately before having sex with my wife made me less "sexually lazy" because it filled my head with things I'd like to try with my wife. Things that, you know, most "Christian" authors would say are "unrealistic expectations" ... because, well, apparently anything other than missionary or cowgirl is totally unrealistic in marriage. Right? Haha. No. Watching porn can motivate a man into avoiding the lazy slump of doing the same things over and over again by showing him there are other fun options out there. Again, I'm not rationalizing porn use as a good thing. Don't do it. I'm just saying that the "let's make up arguments for why porn is damaging" fad comes up with bad information that isn't consistent with most logical frameworks for high-libido men, who will be sexually interested in their wives and not lazy in the slightest, even despite their porn use. If the man is low-libido, then porn-watching probably isn't so much the issue.

• 4. Porn Kills "Making Love" and Turns It Into a Foreign Concept

He argues that "intimacy doesn't happen with porn." Again: what if a guy commits only to watching the type of porn that involves intimate and romantic build-up? Would that make him feel better? The fact that this porn exists once again completely undermines the point, as he assumes that all porn involves a plumber taking off his pants within 30 seconds of walking into a girl's house.

What's really going on here, though, is that what the author means by "intimacy" is actually validation-seeking.

Sure, this is straw-manning, but if you ask him (or most people) what they mean by *sexual* intimacy (as opposed to other kinds), what they will answer is: "The feeling you get when you know someone else desires you and wants to be close to you and that you're totally focused on each other." In other words, the author is arguing that porn makes you stop seeking validation from your spouse. The mistake here is in thinking this is a bad thing. Sure, we can enjoy validation when it comes, but seeking it out is actually harmful to marital sexuality.

Of course, the fact is that most men on porn are using it **BECAUSE** they're not getting sexual validation from their wives already. They still want that validation. Porn hasn't killed their need for validation, as evidenced by how many blue pill men there are in the world. Porn just teaches men that they don't need to *rely* on their wives for that validation. This is actually a good conclusion - the problem is that they're going to porn to get it instead of God.

- **5. Porn Makes Regular Intercourse Seem Boring**

Apparently wanting more than starfish is a bad thing now. I'm curious of the author's own sex-life. I get the impression that the entire article is a way for him to hamster/rationalize that his missionary/cowgirl framework is really the only proper Christian way to have a sex life in marriage.

He says: "most is very violent, extremely degrading, and very ugly." Unless there have been massive changes to the porn industry in the last 3-4 years, this is not at all my understanding of what's out there. Does that exist? Absolutely. But it was always categorized in its own subset, separate from the majority. He also says, "'Regular' intercourse is actually not depicted that often in porn." Again, it's been a few years, but my recollection is that "regular" intercourse was the norm and made up the vast majority of videos out there. Or perhaps, again, his idea of "regular" is limited to two positions and anything outside of missionary or cowgirl is "extremely degrading" or "very ugly."

The fact is, virtually every blue pill guy I meet (and that's the majority of them), including the ones on porn, is excited about ANY sex with his wife. Even if their sex is objectively boring, he's excited by it because he's having it with a real person.

- **6. Porn Kills Your Ability to Be Tender When You Have Sex**

Now he's just stretching. Seriously? First off, who says that sex is supposed to be tender in the first place? Has he not seen the statistics on rape fantasies? How many women want to be dominated sexually? For most guys, they're **SO OVERLY TENDER** that they **NEED** someone to teach them how to go rough a bit. This aspect of porn isn't killing marriages; it's probably helping overly tender guys get a small taste of what women actually want in the bedroom. But even at that, as with many of his other points: there's plenty of porn out there that involves tender caresses.

- **7. Porn Trains You to Have Immediate Gratification and Have a Difficult Time Lasting Long**

That's funny. Most guys I know who watch porn will watch it for hours at a time, edging themselves to maximize their gratification. This statement is ignorant.

- **8. Porn Gives You a Warped View of What Attractive Is**

I love this line: "If a woman gains even ten pounds, then, she's no longer attractive, and the porn user has an honest to goodness difficult time getting aroused, because he associates only a certain body type with arousal." Yes, because apparently guys can will-power themselves into being sexually aroused by fat people.

This is worth a post in itself, but just as I occasionally cite women having retroactive emotions, I find that most men have an inverted condition with regard to imprinted attraction attraction. It's a weird phenomenon that creeps up again and again and again - especially among blue pill guys. With the wife, her present emotional state projects onto how she emotionally felt in the past. If she's mad today, the extremely fun vacation they took 2 years ago suddenly wasn't so fun - it was a nightmare that she didn't enjoy at all, and she was just pretending to enjoy for his sake ... until tomorrow when she's feeling good again and that vacation was the best trip she'd ever been on.

For guys, they imprint a past image of a woman on their brain and often still see her in that image when they look at her today. Their perception of the present is skewed by that early imprint so that when a wife actually gains weight or changes her personality or mannerisms, etc., he still sees her just as she was when they started dating. This may not be your experience, but I've found it true of countless guys who still desire sex with their spouse not because of how attractive they are today, but because of how attractive they remember her being and their brains still see those attractive features underneath the excess flab and harpy attitude. I'm getting off-track here, but suffice it to say that my observations of men's attraction toward attraction-decreasing changes in their wives is completely inconsistent with what the author cites.

- **9. Porn Makes Sex Seem Like Too Much Work**

This is just a recitation of the "makes men lazy" argument. No need to readdress. Suffice it to say that when a man is actually aroused, it doesn't matter how much porn he watches. He'll still work hard to get off, and usually to get her off too.

- **10. Porn Kills Selflessness**

Again, this depends on the type of porn a guy watches. A guy who used to disciple me while I was in law school and first married once commented that different men become aroused by different aspects of sexuality. For him, it was the shape of a woman's body that turned him on. For other guys, it's the idea of his own ejaculation. For me, it's always been watching the female orgasm that's most arousing and gives me the best orgasms. While there are others out there, to stick with mine: my infatuation with watching a woman orgasm as the peak of my own sexual excitement has the exact opposite impact of what he talks about. I guess in a weird way, you could call it selfish - that I would behave sexually selfless toward my wife in order to increase my own pleasure in sex. But the fact is that watching porn or other women orgasming wasn't killing my selflessness - it was reinforcing it, encouraging me to continue seeking my wife's sexual pleasure in the bedroom.

Also, how many porn-addicted, blue pill betas are actually selfish toward their wives? The majority are serving at her every beck and call, doing everything they can to prioritize her happiness. So no. Porn is not making them less selfless. At least not in their behavior. More accurately, it's a reward mechanism these guys use. "I was selfless toward her and she didn't reward me with sex, so I'll reward myself with porn." In this sense, porn is what's keeping them selfless. When I gave up porn and still didn't have a healthy sex life from my wife, that's when I first started becoming selfish in my marriage - and that was also the start of what saved my marriage.

A SIGNIFICANT DISTINCTION

This really needs to be emphasized, so I'm making it its own section. When I was on porn, one of my go-to categories was amateur videos that were reflective of actual sex lives. It's pretty obvious when people are faking or there are filters over the lenses or the production team edited or mastered the video a certain way, or the cameras shift from one angle to another repeatedly so you know there is a whole crew right there with them, breaking the immersion. It's clear when the couple is using various positions just to put on a show, rather than because it's what they actually want to do in the moment.

I was into this more "realistic" type porn at the time because it was believable - it was representative of what I could actually be doing with my wife, and that connection to seeing myself with my wife in the video doing what those people were doing is what turned me on. So, for a guy like I was, who focused primarily on this type of porn, virtually all of the author's arguments are moot. That type of porn was not killing my image of sexuality or my view of my wife or making me think sex with her would be boring or any of those things. It was making me desire more from her what I realistically should have been getting, but wasn't.

Whenever porn can be used in a way that doesn't cause the problems he's bringing up, then **he is no longer making an argument against porn - he's only making an argument against certain types of porn**. I might cede that

certain types of porn, if watched in excessive quantities, could cause a lot of the marriage-killing problems he references. But that claim can't be made about ALL porn.

And if it's not true of porn itself, as a broad category, then porn itself isn't the problem; rather, it's the types of porn guys should watch. Would the author reasonably argue, then, that porn is okay as long as it's limited to certain types that won't cause these problems? Of course not. And nor should he! My point is more that **churchianity is always going to make the porn problem out to be worse than it is because it keeps the blame on men rather than looking at the actual dynamic in marriages and what's causing the sexual-break-down. Porn has become an easy scape-goat to avoid figuring out where the problems really exist.**

What about contextual use?

Another assumption this guy makes is that all porn use is done in secret/private and on an ongoing, consistent basis. Given that virtually all effects of porn use are reversible when a guy stops using porn ...

- What if a guy's wife is going on a business trip? He uses porn to curb his desires while she's gone. He stops a couple days before she gets back. Those couple days are more than enough to let his sperm rebuild and he's just as eager for his wife as before she left. He's using porn in a highly contextualized situation. Virtually all of the author's arguments against porn use are now moot.
- What if a guy's wife is constantly denying him sex, so he uses porn to curb his desires in the face of nowhere else to turn? Is the porn use really what's killing the marriage in that situation?
- What if a guy or his wife has a legitimate physical deformity or psychological issue preventing them from having a healthy sex life, so he uses porn to help solve the problem?
- What if a couple decides they like watching porn together to get in the mood, and this makes them feel more bonded with each other by doing something together that most people would only ever dare to do in secret by themselves?

I'm not saying any of these are good reasons to use porn. I'm just saying that these types of uses of porn completely undermine the arguments the author makes - and by extension, most of churchianity who puts out the same arguments.

What Does Any of This Have to Do With Marriage?

As it turns out, not very much. The guy titles the article "10 ways porn kills a marriage," but then goes on to talk not about marriages dying, but about the impact porn has on a man's brain. He never connects that impact to divorce. At best, he tries to connect it to sexual disunity between spouses. The funny thing is - he didn't have to give these 10 reasons. All he had to say was, "If you're getting off with porn, you're not getting off with your spouse" and in a single sentence would have proved that point. But even then, there's no evidence that this connects to divorce or even emotional dissatisfaction in a marriage - especially when the wife has no idea the guy is on porn.

In this sense, one could easily read this article and conclude: *Okay, as long as I limit my porn to realistic scenarios that reinforce my desire to see my wife orgasm, and my wife never finds out, there's no problem with porn.* Because his arguments only really waged war against other types of porn. **Which is the EXACT PROBLEM with using philosophical or scientific reasoning to make a THEOLOGICAL point.** Silly churchianity. Why are you always so committed to thinking the way the world thinks?

A more theological approach to this whole situation is to look at the example Jesus gave us. Jesus has one bride, who are described as "good soil" and which produce "good trees" when the Gospel springs up in us. Jesus also says

that no good tree produces bad fruit, meaning Jesus will not spiritually procreate through anyone who is not his bride (though he may use them as external tools in his purposes all the same). We don't see Jesus salivating over his desire to procreate through anyone who isn't part of his bride. He either draws them into becoming his bride or he turns his head and walks on. The use of porn by a Christian man in light of the fact that we are the image of Christ implies that Jesus has some bizarre longing to indwell and reproduce through anyone other than his own church with no intention of making the person part of his church (the same way a man has no intention actually to marry the woman on his computer screen). Because there's no Scripture to that indicates this, it creates a false image of Christ in our lives, which is damaging to the name of Christ if communicated to the outside world.

A Closer, Red Pill Look

Back on point, though, let's look again at these sections in his article and consider two questions in brief: (1) Knowing the truth about intersexual dynamics, is his proposed "harm" really a "harm" at all? and (2) Are these issues actually "killing marriages"?

1. Porn kills your ability to get aroused by "just" your spouse

(1) The author assumes men should be easily aroused by unattractive women, if he happens to be married to one. If that's the case, the fact that she let herself go is probably more of an issue to their sex life than his ability to influence what he finds arousing. This notion is intended to give women a free pass to let themselves go while keeping the responsibility on the man to be attracted to her. In reality, the impact porn will have on a man's attraction toward his wife is likely relatively small and unlikely to result in his sexual disinterest toward her.

(2) Many people remain married indefinitely with relatively little physical attraction. Yes, we could call these "dead" marriages. But if there is a lack of attraction, it's likely more because the people themselves are not attractive, not because someone has psychologically conditioned himself to find an attractive person unattractive.

2. Porn Kills Your Libido

(1) Objectively this is false. It satiates your libido and in most cases increases it. More to the point, though: even if true, many guys are a huge turn-off to their wives because of how sexually needy/clingy they get. When his libido for his wife is no longer controlling his behaviors with her, it creates the perception that he doesn't need her, which can actually increase her sexual responsiveness toward him - whether through actual attraction or in-the-moment adjustments to take responsibility for driving him to porn in the first place.

(2) Even if a guy's libido toward his wife is actually negatively impacted, this only hurts the marriage if his wife isn't getting the sex from him she wants. If she was already a denying harpy, she's probably relieved that he's not initiating anymore and doesn't have to put up with his him touching her. This likely actually improves the marriage dynamic as neither of them has to worry about forcing sex between them and he gets to use porn to placate his desires.

3. Porn Makes You Sexually Lazy

(1) The author assumes each spouse is responsible for the other's orgasm. If a woman takes responsibility for her own orgasm, her enthusiasm increases. As her sexual enthusiasm increases, his will also - and this will almost certainly outweigh any initial laziness he might get from porn, if there's any at all in the first place.

(2) If there is any gender known for being sexually lazy, it's women. How many men complain about star fish sex? Duty sex? Denial and rejection because she's "too tired" or "doesn't feel like it"? Even if there is an impact on a man's sexual effort with his wife, this is grossly outweighed by the sexual laziness most women express. So no, a man becoming sexually lazy is likely not the thing that's "killing the marriage" - her laziness is almost certainly a much, much larger contributor.

4. Porn Kills "Making Love" and Turns It Into a Foreign Concept

(1) Who ever said sex was about "making love" in the first place? The church really screwed this one up. Yes, love and intimacy CAN certainly be a part of sex, but there's no biblical mandate that it MUST be. They're tools to increase the sexual experience in certain concepts. But if you use the same tools and techniques over and over and over again, it actually ruins sexuality. Sometimes married couples need to screw, not "make love."

(2) For as much as women may want to call sex "making love," the amount of "duty sex" or starfish sex they put out comes off as incredibly unloving. Again, the degree to which porn may affect a guy's capacity to "make love to" instead of screw his wife is not likely the lynchpin on their marriage in comparison to the impact of the typical wife's "love making" capacity in the bedroom. Notice also that the imperative for "making love" is always from the man to the woman. Churchianity never discusses what it would look like for a wife to "make love" to a man in the bedroom.

5. Porn Makes Regular Intercourse Seem Boring

(1) That's because regular intercourse IS boring. It's like eating tofu then having some steak and saying, "Stop eating steak or you won't like your tofu as much." Duh. But does this actually cause harm? No. While it might initially make sex SEEM boring, by learning new things, sex actually becomes less boring. Again, that doesn't justify how the new things are learned; I'm merely addressing the author's point as a bogus one.

(2) It's very possible that some men who perceive their sex lives as boring will file for divorce over it. I have had these clients. But 99% of the time it's not because porn made him think his sex life was boring ... it's because his wife's refusal for any form of sexual exploration was ACTUALLY boring.

6. Porn Kills Your Ability to Be Tender When You Have Sex

(1) Most women are turned off when guys are too tender all the time during sex. Again, it's not about "making love" all the time. It's about screwing each other hard. Even if porn causes this result (which I dare say it objectively does not), it's likely an improvement to their sex life.

(2) How many couples are getting divorced because "He just wasn't tender enough with me in the bedroom"? I'd wager the number of women who ask for more sexual aggression greatly outweighs those asking for more tenderness. This isn't killing marriages; it's putting guys in the statistical majority for satisfying their wives.

7. Porn Trains You to Have Immediate Gratification and Have a Difficult Time Lasting Long

(1) Nevermind the absurdity of this statement, even if we stupidly assume it's true, this really only matters in two situations: (a) we assume that sex must always end in simultaneous orgasms (which is not the norm), or (b) the guy doesn't have the stamina or interest to build up for round 2. In the case of a, if we don't assume simultaneous orgasms, then what's the big deal if he blows his load early? He can still be sexually available to her afterward - especially if he's willing to build up to a round 2.

(2) I've seen people not get married because "he wasn't long enough," but I've never seen a marriage end because "he didn't last long enough." How is immediate gratification going to "kill a marriage"? The author offers no explanation because there isn't one. What if the guy likes getting off fast? What if the wife likes quickies so she doesn't have to deal with prolonged physical contact with a guy she can't stand touching in the first place? Maybe his premature ejaculation is making sex more tolerable for her, thereby saving their marriage! Yes, I realize how absurd all of this sounds in the grander scheme, but I've also known women to have said things along these lines about their husbands and sex lives.

8. Porn Gives You a Warped View of What Attractive Is

(1) No, it shows you what you already find attractive. You can't change what you're attracted to/not, and it's unlikely that porn can do so for you. It plays on preexisting fetishes or letting people discover attraction triggers that they didn't know they had until they saw it.

(2) I do see marriages die because people are not attracted to each other. This is probably the single biggest cause of

divorce that gets rationalized as other things frequently. However, I have never seen attractive people claim that porn cause them to lose attraction for each other. The couples getting divorced due to lack of attraction are doing so because they are **ACTUALLY UNATTRACTIVE**, not because porn convinced them that the other is unattractive.

9. Porn Makes Sex Seem Like Too Much Work

See the lazy problem above.

10. Porn Kills Selflessness

(1) Selflessness usually kills attraction. A guy developing a dab of selfishness in his spine is likely to help, not hurt.

(2) I'd love to see the comparison between female selfishness and the component of male selfishness attributable to porn.

CONCLUSION

At the end of the day, watching porn isn't likely the reason marriages are dying. If a wife doesn't know about it, she has no reason to be upset with him, unless it's causing him to be sexually defiant against her. And let's be honest here: how many guys who watch porn are actually denying their wife's initiations? Extremely few.

At best, their sex-life has been hindered by his porn use. But even at that, go ask guys who have successfully conquered porn in their lives and see if their wives are somehow magically more receptive to sex when their husband has quit something she didn't know he was doing. I've disciplined several guys in this position and while they are relieved to have stopped using porn, their reports of the futility in their sex lives were unaltered by this change. If anything, they desired their wives more, but their wife's receptivity to their sexual advances remained unchanged, increasing the stress, friction, and resentment in their marriage. Yes, quitting porn has actually made some people's marriages worse.

On the other hand, if the wife **DOES** know about it, how many of them are actually filing for divorce when they discover their husband's use? Very few. I have yet to find a single case where that was the reason a woman (or man, for that matter) gave me for why they wanted the divorce, even though allegations of porn use do come up constantly - just never in terms of why they want the divorce. Instead, they begin seeing their husbands as sexual beings. Yes, this can have a negative impact on a marriage if the wife isn't attracted to her husband because now she has to come face to face with the fact that she doesn't want to be sexual with a man who is sexual. But at that point, the harm isn't caused by the porn use. It's caused by the wife's sexual disinterest. And if the wife is sexually attracted to her husband, then her perception of him as a sexual being improves their sex life by her realization that he has these desires and hasn't been able to control them without her.

Are there situations where porn kills marriages? Absolutely. But those situations are few and far between. The porn problem is **NOWHERE NEAR** as destructive as churchianity makes it out to be. Instead, pornography gets used as a catch-all scapegoat to blame men for everything that goes wrong because it's too risky to blame women for the behaviors that drive men to porn in the first place.

Yes, watching porn in 99.9% of contexts is sin. Don't do it. But don't beat yourself up over it either, as if you're ruining your marriage. Chances are that your porn use is having very little impact on your marriage *directly*.

Epilogue: So Why Stop Watching Porn?

Even if it doesn't have a direct impact on your marriage, it does have a direct impact on your ability to live out your mission, if it's a godly one. While you should still make disciples even if you struggle with porn, stopping your porn use will increase the respect other men have for you and give you additional influence in their lives. There's plenty enough in Scripture that discusses sin - and that is all sin, not just porn use (sexual denial, for example) - as a

hindrance to one's relationship with God and ability to work through someone. I take this as a theological conclusion, not a philosophical one.

Additionally, the time you spend watching porn is time not spent advancing your mission. When I was on porn, it was usually at night after my family went to bed. Now my evenings are spent talking to guys I disciple, working, commenting on reddit, writing articles for gotquestions.org, studying the Bible, working on the house, or any other number of productive activities. Admittedly, sometimes I'm just watching TV instead too :p

Also, the time you spend watching porn is time not spent initiating with your wife. Sure, she can always initiate with you when she feels like it, so you're not necessarily denying her your marital duties. But it is counter-productive if you desire a healthier sex life with her. It may not be a devastating relational break-down the way churchianity makes it seem, and it's not likely to prompt you to file for divorce. But if "normal" requires sin and "better" doesn't, why not go for better?

There are plenty of other reasons I could give here, but my guess is you've already been drilled enough with the benefits of quitting porn (even if some of them are technically misguided) that I don't need to spend too much more time on this.

CONCLUSION 2

In all of this, remember that my goal here is not to rationalize watching porn. It's to get you to realize that the rationalizations often given against it are false and will lead to equally destructive sexual patterns in a marriage and on your mission for Christ as a whole. My hope is that you'll walk away from this post not encouraged to watch porn, but feeling less guilty over it. Too many people think "guilt" is a good thing that drives people toward repentance. It doesn't. It coerces behavioral compliance, not heart-change. Live on mission instead.

A quick note: most of my theology, including everything I write on RPC, is rooted in the imperative to "walk as Christ walked." One of the ways churchianity has failed at this is in the area of service.

Most congregations take the view that it is up to the various congregations to seek out opportunities to serve. To get their people serving, they organize group outings, solicit opportunities within the community, and look for chances to help others. Let me be clear: *there is nothing inherently evil/wrong/bad about doing this.*

However, I don't see Jesus doing this.

Instead, I see Jesus making disciples. Those disciples became so excited about how they were growing under Jesus' leadership that they brought more and more people to follow him. As his following grew, many of these people needed help, so they asked and he gave it. This seems to be the prevailing framework for how Jesus helped people. He didn't seek people to heal or cast demons out of; they found him while he was out and about doing what Jesus does: make disciples.

The dynamic difference here is that Jesus focused on his mission and helped when needs found him. Churchianity focuses on service in the hope that this will somehow lead to a fulfillment of its mission. This is backwards.

This is also why congregations today fail so heavily at building up true spiritual leaders. In stead of making leaders (by discipling them), they are making push-overs in the hope that eventually they'll met leaders who can help. Result? Natural, godly male leaders out in the wild are like unicorns who don't actually exist on their own, so they either (1) find and steal away someone that was trained up by someone else, or (2) we get leaders who only understand a weak, unbiblical framework for ministry that consistent with how they found churchianity and not necessarily consistent with how Jesus meant to run it.

- Should we serve? Absolutely.
- Should we make the search of service opportunities a higher priority in our lives than Jesus made it in his? Absolutely not.
- Should we raise up leaders so gifted that their following naturally invites those in need of service to ask for it? Of course - and then is when we should respond.

But also note that Jesus COULD NOT do many miracles in his own hometown. Did he lose his divine power due to some mystical force in that place? Of course not. The Bible says it was because they did not believe. The implication here, then, is that Jesus was serving those who believed, not those who did not. Or he served those who would believe because of his service, not necessarily anyone and everyone regardless of their disposition toward him - and the evidence of his hometown shows that God intentionally withdraws his assistance from those who aren't oriented Christward in the first place. And how will we know if those we serve are oriented Christward if we do not first give them an opportunity to demonstrate their heart toward Christ? By making service the forefront of ministry effort, we are abandoning our filter in exchange for an "anyone and everyone, whether they ask for it or not, and regardless of their disposition toward Christ" model of ministry vastly disparate from what Jesus showed us.

20

UPVOTES

A Series of FRs

12 January 2020 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

Hi all. Been a while. I've been MIA for a few months - spent October taking over my law firm, began running it in November, spent a week in TN over Thanksgiving, billed like crazy until Christmas, then I've been out of town ever since - visiting family, Disney World trip with the kiddos, etc. It's been a busy, yet fulfilling 3 months.

In this time, I've observed a lot that would be worth sharing. Let me boil it down to short summaries as best I can.

BEST QUOTE: "When did women become so entitled?" ~My mom, after sharing 3 different stories of "Christian" women she observed over the last couple months who left their husbands because they "weren't feeling fulfilled." She added to the quote: "Last I checked, not being happy in your marriage wasn't biblical grounds for divorce."

Amanda

I've got a cousin who we'll call Amanda. She's a Christian raised in a churchianity culture/home. Amanda is *very* attractive but has clear psychological issues that show up every few months, thus has trouble finding a "good man." She ends up finding wimps who she can boss around. In early 2019 she was engaged to one such man, but he was a scrawny pushover. It didn't work out. By Thanksgiving she was engaged to another slightly less scrawny guy with better income prospects. All Thanksgiving she bossed him around like a slave. Amanda's dad said they couldn't get married until he found a job and had 3 months in. She started planning the wedding anyway, so he switched it to a year. She blew up into one of her psychotic episodes. Her fiance saw the crazy and left ... well, for a few days. He came begging for forgiveness because ... you know, breaking off an engagement with a crazy girl is apparently morally repugnant now.

Betty

Betty and Bob have been married for decades. They always seem in love - cuddling, telling stories of their lives together, etc. They're both very vocal about their faith - especially Betty. I had a great time chatting with them last week on my way to Disney. A couple days later, Betty trickle truths to Bob that she spent more money on their daughter's wedding than she originally told him ... 3 times as much! That's right: tens of thousands above budget. Bob is upset, but makes plans to fix the budget.

Betty texts Bob a couple days ago: "Don't be surprised if all the furniture is gone when you get home." She follows up a few minutes later, "Don't worry, the new stuff is coming in on Thursday." Bob calls her and says to get the old furniture back. She texts him later, "You don't have to worry about the new furniture. I've redirected it somewhere else." She's not there when he gets home. She then argues that she wants the house, even though a substantial portion of his income is tied to the music studio in their house. Apparently all of this is Bob's fault because "You don't know what it's like living with him."

Carla

Carla is a high school student whose dad (my cousin) is one of the coolest people I've ever met ... but he's also an alcoholic and spent most of his youth in a rebellious phase. Her mom is also a (former?) meth addict, so her dad has custody. He works all the time. She's living out through her teenage years the same rebellion her father modeled for her while she was growing up.

Debbie

Debbie is a tattooed rebel in her 20s. She got married several months ago to a bad boy. She also separated from her husband several months ago and they're processing the divorce papers. She's smokin' hot. The emotions didn't last. She thinks she can do better.

Evalyn

Evalyn's marriage has crossed the 7 year hump. They're still happy together and have such great attraction for one another that ... let's just say I try not to eat at their kitchen table anymore. Evalyn is known for commenting at Bible study occasionally, "I think we really need to say a prayer of appreciation and blessing over our husbands for all they do for us." She's also on the record saying, "Sometimes I ask my husband to do things for me just to hear him say no because it excites me."

Fiona

Fiona is Debbie's sister. She's even hotter (if that's possible). But she also sticks to biblical principles. I hung out with her and her husband on my way to Disney. He's fit and jumps right into the fun. She's submissive and supportive. They seem very happily married.

Georgia

Georgia's father is a hard-core male-oriented preacher - more extreme than I am (ex. forbids women from going to school). He has instilled concepts of male headship and submissiveness in her. I spent Thanksgiving with her and she spoke wonderfully of her husband and how happy she was. He's not particularly good-looking, but she did note her appreciation of his confidence and the way he takes initiative in leading their lives in a number of different ways she went on to describe. She also noted that he won't put up with her crap. Interesting.

NOTES

It's probably worth mentioning that there's a lot more going on in these stories than I bothered to mention. But the facts I gave were at least enough to point out these nuggets that wouldn't otherwise be affected by the missing information.

1. Amanda had no interest in staying with unattractive men when bumps came along - even when they pined over her. Her bossiness and controlling nature didn't help.
 2. Betty was never satisfied with what she had and her thirst for more blew things apart. Bob got blamed.
 3. Carla is a recreation of her father. Men have more influence over their daughters than they think - but it's in what they do, not what they say.
 4. Debbie is a walking model of hypergamy.
 5. Evalyn lives in the biblical role God gave her - and both she and her husband are reaping the reward (in more ways than one).
 6. Fiona shows that even the hot ones can stay captivated with a high value man.
-

7. Georgia demonstrates that biblical practices work and that even a physically unattractive guy has a chance if he's got the more controllable attributes of his SMV in order.
-

BONUS: "I am completely baffled at how so many of my coworkers can be, to be blunt, very ugly women, but they have these ridiculous expectations of how hot a guy has to be before they'll date him. I think to myself, 'They're never going to find anyone like that who's interested in them.' But what is even more mind-boggling is that every one of them will somehow end up with attractive men one after the next. I simply don't understand how things like this happen." ~My mom.

It's called hypergamy and polygamy, Mom.

20

UPVOTES

The Happiest Millionaire

27 January 2020 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

Stoney loves to cook and has worked that passion into his model for helping men. I do too, but there's no sense copying when I have other passions - like musicals. *The Happiest Millionaire* is one of the first musicals I fell in love with as a kid. I remember watching it on my grandmother's couch every time I'd visit her for a weekend. My kids now sing the songs and it's both humorous and a delight to my ears. More relevant to you: the (inspired by a true story) movie holds a lot of information that's truly valuable for men like you. In fact, it's perhaps the most Red Pill **Christian** movie I've seen.

If it helps, this is absolutely a safe movie to watch with your wife. Not that it should be your motive, but she might even be impressed by it. (Unfortunately, despite it being a Disney movie, it's not on Disney Plus yet). She might learn a thing or two about how women should behave toward a man (just don't tell her that's why you want to watch it with her). So, let's dive in.

SYNOPSIS - As a brief overview, the movie is based on two real families in the 1910s (Biddles and Dukes), but fictionalizes many aspects. It centers around Anthony Biddle, a rich patriarch of the Biddle family. He's a fitness buff whose highest priorities in life are loving his God, leading his family, and serving his country. While pseudo-fictional, he projects a clear model for a red pill Christian man. He has a clear mission in life that he pursues relentlessly, but is also humble enough to let it evolve as he learns new things. I like the way Wikipedia describes his wife: "[she] stands quietly by, accepting his eccentricities with a sense of pride and class." His story reflects issues many of us may deal with, while also demonstrating firm leadership and biblical characteristics in the midst of it all. His daughter, Cordy, is a dominant woman who longs to be the submissive wife, but has yet to meet a man who can tame her. She meets Angie, a mama's boy who is generally beta and uninteresting to her until he shows that he has a mission beyond what his mother planned for his life. It takes Anthony's influence for Angie to figure out how to be a man and lead a relationship.

With that framework in mind, let's go through the songs, some notable lyrics, and a general life lesson from each. If you choose to watch the movie for yourself, keep these in mind.

FORTUOSITY - The movie opens with a poor immigrant, John Lawless, fresh off the boat and applying to be a butler with a rich family. While his life may not be great yet, he maintains an **amused mastery** over every situation - so much so that he dances about with a smile and created his own word for finding amusement in the midst of bad situations: Fortuosity.

- "Sometimes castles fall to the ground, but that's where four leafed clovers are found"
- "I don't worry 'cause everywhere I see that every bit of life is lit by fortuosity"
- "I keep smiling 'cause my philosophy is do your best and leave the rest to fortuosity."
 - **Lesson:** John's attitude toward life is very much the one I take as well. His frame is positive and upbeat. He doesn't let it shatter when difficulties come his way. In fact, he finds them funny and dances in the face of them. This song is often a reminder to me when I'm having a bad day that I can choose to be happy anyway. Notable verse: Romans 8:28 - "God works all things for the good of those who love him."

WHAT'S WRONG WITH THAT? - John walks in the front door to some chaos before he can even start his interview. Enter the rich patriarch, Anthony Biddle (played by the fantastic Fred MacMurray) who has just been

bitten by one of his pet alligators. Yes, that's how awesome he is. He communicates **boundaries and expectations** for his family, noting their role at his side as a response to his role as their provider and protector. His daughter, Cordelia (Cordy) joins in and affirms the importance of one's duty not only to their family, but also to God and their country.

- "I'm a good-hearted husband, I'm generous and kind. No wife could have a life as free of cares. So when a good-hearted husband has been bit, it's only right that his wife should share the agony he bears. What's wrong with that? I want my wife to share my life, what's wrong with that?"
 - "The flag above, the Bible and love - what's wrong with that?"
 - **Lesson:** Anthony's family knows what his priorities are because he has made it clear through the way he leads them. His daughter does come to his side and reaffirms his values. We should do the same. This song also sets a good example for the broader biblical concepts of headship and support in the family between a husband/father and his wife/kids.
-

WATCH YOUR FOOTWORK - After the alligator mess is sorted out, a suitor arrives for Cordy, who has been trained by her father as a boxer. Her brothers tease the suitor about **her unlady-like dominance**, attacking men who cross her boundaries. They eventually knock him out. When he comes to, he runs off and Cordy is upset.

- "Remember Harry Applegate? ... Thought he was a Romeo. Tried to kiss our sis and, oh! Harry ducked, but too late. Father bought him an upper plate."
 - "Archie Baxter came here twice ... Second date, it was a dance. He grabbed her tight, this was his chance. Cordy only bruised that sport. Father settled it out of court."
 - "Say! Do you remember Harvey Drew? ... While rowing Cordy 'round the lake, a crude advance did Harvey make. A gruesome scene. It happened so fast. Next week they removed the cast."
 - **Lesson:** Learn what you can about a woman's family situation and life history before getting too close. Be wary of the masculine women, even if they are otherwise physically attractive.
-

VALENTINE CANDY - Cordy laments over the lost suitor and the fact that she can't keep a boyfriend while punching them all out. **She wants to be sweet and submissive**, but the dominance and aggression keep coming out when a guy gets too close.

- "Is a boy meant to spar with, or gaze at a star with? Should you kiss him or blacken his eye?"
 - "Will you someday be someone that somebody loves? Are you valentine candy or boxing gloves?"
 - **Lesson:** Cordy can't reconcile feminist empowerment with her unhappy love life. She knows that men want sweet and submissive women, but her hypergamy calls for a man who is stronger than she is, who can actually tame her. Will she ever meet this man? This is the predicament many women are in today.
-

STRENGTHEN THE DWELLING - The patriarch uses his boxing/fitness class as an opportunity to teach people about God and the **importance of physical fitness**.

- "Strengthen the dwelling of the Lord. Fashion the framework board by board. Here in his image now we stand. Building His fortress long and grand."
-

- "It is written that the body and mind of mortal man should walk in the spirit of His master plan. So we must strengthen the dwelling of the Lord, fashion the framework board by board."
 - **Lesson:** Anthony models that his motive for staying physically fit is not to keep his wife sexually attracted to him (her frame), but because it is God's dwelling and we owe it to him who owns our bodies (which are not our own) to keep them in good condition. I'm reminded here of the way Israel lamented at the way Jerusalem and its wall fell apart during their captivity in Babylon and that of all possible priorities, when they had the chance in Nehemiah the restoration of their home - particularly strengthening its walls - was their highest priority. Will you let your souls/God's Spirit's dwelling wither the same way?
-

I'LL ALWAYS BE IRISH - John, the butler, shares with the family that his American identity doesn't take away from his Irish heritage. Once again, amidst the difficulties of working with this family, he maintains the same positive attitude he had in his first song.

- "I'll wear the greens on Patty's Day, and yet for all of that: I'll be truly as American as Casey At The Bat."
 - "If I went to Paris for the rest of me days, and ate bread and cheese in sidewalk cafes - lived in a garret, wore a beret - what would I be? An Irishman!"
 - **Lesson:** This song is more comical interlude, but it does remind me of the way we share a common identity in Christ, yet we all have our own unique makeup that defines us as well. Just because we may, under 1 Cor. 9, adapt to a culture to reach the culture, our core identity in Christ remains in tact, even though we also identify with our neighbors inside our own cultural context.
-

BYE-YUM PUM PUM - Anthony had always raised Cordy in the home through private tutors and trainers. After seeing her distress and loneliness he is persuaded to send her off to boarding school to meet new people. Of course, she shares her boy troubles with her new roommate, who decides to teach her how to seduce a man.

- "You must slink across the floor as if it's a dreadful bore."
 - "The men in college always acknowledge a girl who dances in a trance. So bye-yum until the dawn as if you're about to yawn."
 - "For when you're oh so misterioso the men will grow so entranced with you, as you secretly conceal the tingly way you feel."
 - **Lesson:** There are so many truths about how women engage the sexual marketplace in this song. Perhaps the most emphasized aspect here is the way they conceal what's really going on in their head to get a man on their hook.
-

ARE WE DANCING - Cordy takes her newfound skills of seduction to a ball, where she meets Angie. He takes Cordy outside for a private dance. He has major oneitis while they sing a duet, setting a bad precedent for the relationship. Cordy, of course, is excited enough just to have *someone* that **new relationship excitement** takes over.

- Angie: "Are your eyes confessing things I alone can see? Or is my imagination flying away with me?" (the latter)
 - Cordy: "Is this feeling something real, or will it disappear?" (questioning if she really likes a guy like this)
 - **Lesson:** This song is a perfect example of oneitis and embodies everything you should avoid in the start of a
-

new relationship. It's not surprising that immediately after this the relationship gets rocky, barely before it even starts.

WHAT'S WRONG WITH THAT? (REPRISE) - Back at the Biddle mansion, Anthony, the patriarch, sees World War 1 coming and decides the country is unprepared, so he adds to his mission that he's going to be the one to train the US Marines to fight.

- "I believe in this country, but our country's unprepared. Our defenses aren't worth a hill of beans. So when a man loves his country should he sit back and complain or call out the United States Marines?"
 - **Lesson:** I'm always impressed at Anthony's insistence to take matters into his own hands. He doesn't read the news and complain to his wife about how the country is falling apart. He makes a plan and does something about it. Do likewise.
-

DETROIT - Cordy quickly realizes that her boyfriend is a loser mama's boy. She presses him about what he's passionate about in life. He says he just assumed he'd take over the family business that he hates. Cordy presses him again and suddenly he starts singing about starting an enterprise in the automobile industry in Detroit.

- "Golden sparks light up the skies there like a thousand fourth of Julys there. How I want to stake a claim and roll up my sleeves and make my name in Detroit!"
 - "Oh, if I could be there I'd be free there, standing on my own two feet. I'd invent new motors, design new rotors. I'd be in the driver's seat. I'd make all my dreams realities."
 - "Others are giving their dreams a try. If others can dream there, why can't I? Oh, you see where the rainbow ends for me is known to the world as F.O.B. Detroit."
 - Cordy: "If you hear it humming, see it coming - that's the place where you must go. But to make your name there you must stake your claim there and let no one tell you no." Angie: "And my dreams of golden chariots in Detroit can all come true *for you hear it humming, and you see it coming and YOU want to be there too.*"
 - **Lesson:** The most fascinating part of this song is to see Cordy's demeanor toward Angie change as he starts to develop a life mission. She's excited, but also immediately tests his alphaness. Unfortunately, he's still too stuck in her frame to take ownership of the dream for himself. In my view, this is the central song of the entire movie and shows the utter importance of having a mission.
-

WHAT'S WRONG WITH THAT (REPRISE 2) - Cordy's education and relationship with Angie takes her away from home a lot and Anthony is sad to see his daughter fading from his life for another man. He doesn't quite trust Angie as being man enough to care for his daughter.

- "When a man has a daughter, she's always in his heart; her happiness is part of all his prayers. When a man has a daughter, he wants her life to be as smooth as satin ribbons that she wears."
 - "I want her home, where she's free of care. I miss her footsteps on the stairs. What's wrong with that?"
 - **Lesson:** I'm not afraid to admit that I (to make another "musical" reference) shed "**A Single Man Tear**" at this song. Why? I have 3 daughters and identify with exactly what is expressed here. It reminds me of what I want to see in their husbands and that, as their father, it is my responsibility to look out for their future spouse the same way Anthony ultimately makes it his responsibility to teach Angie how to be a man for his
-

daughter.

THERE ARE THOSE - Excited by his newly discovered ambitions, Cordy agrees to marry Angie. Unfortunately, Angie lets his mom run the wedding planning process and ultimately tells him he can't go to Detroit because he has to take over the family tobacco business. Cordy is disgusted. Angie's mom and Cordy's aunt get in a fight over which family is better - Cordy's family having inherited/established wealth and Angie's family being among the nuevo riche. John, ever fluent in **amused mastery**, inserts his wisecracks to create humor in the conflict.

- Angie's Mom: "There are those who grace the pages of the blue book." Aunt: "Never heard of it. Is it a new book?" Angie's Mom: "Certainly anyone who is anyone is listed." Aunt: "Oh, you mean the New York Telephone Directory."
 - Aunt: "There are those whose names predate the constitution." Angie's Mom: "Yes, and some of them opposed the revolution."
 - **Lesson:** There really isn't one, other than to appreciate John's playfulness in the midst of a tense situation, which is a passable example of both maintaining frame and amused mastery (though not necessarily in a romantic relational context).
-

LET'S HAVE A DRINK ON IT - After discovering Angie's submission to his mother, Cordy calls off the wedding. Angie is depressed and goes to a bar. Anthony sends John to keep Angie out of trouble. Angie keeps threatening to run away to another country, so John, while getting him drunk, helps Angie realize they're all half-baked bad ideas to run away from his troubles, not his real mission/passion. As Angie is about to leave, John tricks him into getting into a bar fight to get him arrested so he can't actually run away.

- Angie: "Well, well, well, let's have a drink on it. Here's to China across the bay - to them darling little oysters and the pearls they give away. A man could make his fortune there. I will somehow! No shilly-shallying, no dilly-dallying. I'm off to China now!"
 - Bar: "Well, well, well, one last drink on it, then you're on your merry way." John: "What do you do when your sampan springs a leak in China Bay?" Bar: "When the truth is nobly spoken, it's respect you've got to pay." John: "If Oriental pirates come to take your pearls away?!" Bar: "So fill your cup and lift it up and clink, here's how! No shilly-shallying, no dilly-dallying. Let's have a drink on it now."
 - **Lesson:** The point of the song is that life can screw you over no matter what you try to do - go into the army, run away to China, or even try to live a simple, common life in America. John explains all of this to trick Angie out of making any drastic decisions, but ultimately we have to realize that the possibility of things going wrong shouldn't keep us from actually making a plan and carrying it out or else we'll be left with no options left in life at all.
-

ENDING/FINALE - Angie gets visited in prison by Cordy and her dad, Anthony. Anthony speaks with Angie privately, uses some reverse psychology, and eventually explains to him how to be a man and **pass a fitness test**. This is the scene where the patriarch's wisdom finally gets through to Angie, who becomes his own man, commits to his mission, and carries Cordy off with him (literally). The conversation is too good - I have to give it in its entirety.

- Anthony: "Young man, it's time that you woke up to your responsibilities. Now I want you to get this marriage over, and your honeymoon in the Ozarks, then report back to your desk in New York."
-

- Angie: "What?"
- Anthony: "You may think you want other things for yourself. You may have some dreams of your own. But you have to get over all of that the way other people do."
- Angie: "Huh? You didn't get over it."
- Anthony: "There are few like me." [The "I am the prize" mentality is just oozing in this scene!]
- Angie: "Now you listen here, Mr. Know-It-All-Biddle. No one is going to run my life for me. I've decided that much. [Feeling his head] Hangover or no hangover."
- Anthony: "Is that so?"
- Angie: "Yes, that is so."
- Anthony: "Alright, Mr. Duke. The [jail] door is open. Let's see you have a try at running your own life. Let's see how far you can go. Hangover or no hangover."
- Angie (getting determined): "I am going to ask Cordy to elope with me today!"
- Anthony: "Now wait a minute."
- Angie: "And don't you try to stop me!"
- Anthony: "Let me tell you one thing. If you ask Cordy to elope, she won't."
- Angie: "Then I'll tell her."
- Angie's Mom: "Angie!" with her arms open wide for him.
- Angie: "Hello, Mother," walking right on by. "Cordy, you and I are going to elope."
- Angie's Mom: "Over my dead body!"
- Angie: "Only if absolutely necessary, Mother. Cordy, we'll stop by your house and pick up your things."
- Cordy: "No."
- Angie: "Why?"
- Cordy: "Because I think he talked you into it," pointing to her dad.
- Angie: "Cordy, I love you and want to marry you and he's got nothing to do with that."
- Cordy: "I'm not so sure about that."
- Angie: picks Cordy up over his shoulder and walks right out of the prison. "So long everybody, we'll write you!"
- Angie's Mom: "Oh, Angie, where are you going?"
- Angie and Cordy (still being carried over his shoulder) reprise his song "Detroit"
- Angie's Mom: "You know, for a minute, he reminded me of his grandfather - started the whole Duke thing."
- Anthony: "Well, if he's half the man I think he is this won't be the end of the whole Duke thing either."
 - **Lesson:** I hope this one's obvious. If not, just **watch it for yourself**. The scene starts at 3:30.

EPILOGUE/IT WON'T BE LONG 'TIL CHRISTMAS - With the kids out of the house, Anthony and his wife reflect on having an empty house. He misses his children as his wife consoles him that children are meant to grow up and become their own people, but they will still be a part of the family and come home for Christmas.

- Anthony's Wife: "Little birds were born to fly. Not until they roam can they miss their home"
- Anthony: "The years go by and every night you say, 'Sweet dreams. Sleep tight.' Then comes the day you have to say, 'Don't forget to write.'"

Lesson: This song is a powerful reminder of an essential foresight in the family-building and discipleship processes. Your goal is not to draw people to your side forever, as is the common pastoral model of leading others in the faith. Rather, it is to send them out after you've raised them to be mature adults.

CONCLUSION

While there are many great movies out there that can show you snapshots of what it means to be a red pill man, there are few that incorporate the Christian element as well. I recommend this movie not as a perfect example (certainly there are flaws throughout), but as a solid starting point and good conversation starter with your spouse, who might see by example rather than your verbal explanation, a happier way of living if we stick to biblical boundaries and principles for our marriages today.

QUESTION

Dear GotQuestions, I searched your site and could not find the answer to my question. My in laws recently got into financial problem from over-investing. Now they cannot pay for the remaining installments of 3 homes they purchased, cancer medications for my mother in law, & bank debts. It takes all 3 sons including my husband to help them pay & all of us combined may not have enough to cover everything. We have been helping with the medications but now we are expected to lend more to pay off the installments, bank debts & upcoming cancer treatment. My husband has lended 85% of all the cash we have which I agreed to & it's done, but now he wants to lend more from our future earnings while I want to keep 50% for our own security, because they don't know when they will pay us back. They plan to sell some assets to pay us back but it can take between 1 to 2 years or more before anything gets sold. What should I do? The Bible says to lend and not expect it back, but how much should we lend, do we really need to leave just 15% for ourselves when we don't have anything else to fall back on? Please, I need to know what is the right thing to do as a Christian wife. Thank you very much, God bless.

ANSWER

While it may not be a popular answer in many countries, the biblical answer is that you are to submit to your husband's decisions. Ultimately, he will answer to God for the way he led you and your family, and you will answer to God for the way you followed your husband. That does not mean that you must sit idly by and let him do however he pleases. You are certainly within your rights to voice your concerns and propose alternative plans that may be better than the plan he is proposing. However, once you have voiced your concerns and he acknowledges his understanding of them, you support whichever decision he makes. This form of "support" is not "I'll go along with it, but secretly be resentful" or "I'll obey, but be passive aggressive toward him to show him my disapproval." After all, should we treat God this way when he asks us to do things we disagree with? And 1 Cor. 11:3 notes that the wife is to follow her husband as he follows God.

At this point, it sounds like the discrepancy between your plan and his is that his is one that places his parents' needs above his own and yours is one that would place each of your needs equally. There is nothing directly stated in Scripture as to which of these options is "more godly." Rather, it is circumstantially dependent. If his plan will make you homeless to meet their needs, that would certainly be unwise. But if you do have funds to live off of under his plan and it is merely a lack of financial "security," as you put it, that makes you uneasy, then perhaps it is perfectly appropriate for him to move your family beyond your comfort zone for the sake of radical generosity and honoring his father and mother.

Clearly I do not have all of the facts. Are you so wealthy that giving away 85% of such great wealth is no problem because the remaining 15%, while uncomfortable, simply means a maintenance or downgrade in your quality of living? Or are you so poor that giving 85% of your income means you will most certainly default on your own bills? Or are you somewhere in-between? I honestly do not know. There is nothing in the Bible that obligates you to give or lend this money, but there is also nothing in the Bible that prohibits it, unless it prevents you from providing for your own household.

Perhaps the most relevant verse for you at this time is 1 Timothy 5:8 - "But if anyone does not provide for his relatives, and especially for members of his household, he has denied the faith and is worse than an unbeliever." You see, there is a clear obligation for your husband to provide for his family. However, there is also a clear prioritization of the members of his own household as his primary obligation beyond those outside his own household. Now, this passage was also written in a time when there was no governmental assistance for the poor. Most countries have some social welfare programs whereby the state will ultimately cover the cost of various types

of medical bills, food expenses, etc. If your in-laws qualify for any such programs, even if it means depleting their own wealth to do so, then they should look into such benefits options prior to your family being put out; otherwise, it is money lost to the family merely to save the government from what they have already obligated themselves to pay anyway. An alternative way to put it: if the government paid all of your in-laws' bills because a law obligated them to do so, would you voluntarily write them a check to reimburse them?

FOLLOW-UP QUESTION

Dear [Red], Thank you so much for taking the time to reply. So ultimately I'm to follow my husband's decision with genuine acceptance, but I can object if that decision means neglecting our own family. To give you further information, I'd like to elaborate on the following: Our church advises that husband & wife should agree on major decisions. If one goes ahead without the other's consent, it may hinder some blessings for our family. From my understanding, everything we have from God we are to navigate/steward together, so when he one-sidedly decided to lend most of our future earnings, I felt I was completely dismissed. I feel by agreeing to keep lending half and not 3/4 or more of future earnings on top of the 85% of savings we already lended (we are in our 40s, have been saving to invest for years, but now his parents use that savings), I have honored his parents. I still want to provide for my parents, too. So when my husband insists to do things his way, I feel that when it comes to his parents, nobody else matters. To answer your question, lending 85% of our savings does not make us unable to pay the bills or go into debt. But if a large medical emergency occurs, we won't be able to pay & we don't have medical insurance. 1 Timothy 5:8 says we should provide for our relatives; I would like to reiterate that we have paid for 1 year worth of medications, paid off some of their debts, hence the 85% savings used, plus monthly installment of one of the 3 homes that we've now started to pay for. So it's not that we haven't provided for them, but the question is to what extent. Lastly, the government won't cover my in laws' expenses, and they have no medical insurance. They are far wealthier than us 3 children combined, but their money is tied in assets they keep accumulating. They overspent and didn't plan wisely around their own security. My mother in law has been taking medications since 2011 but they don't think they need to leave some cash reserve for medical emergencies, and spend it all on investment opportunities instead. Beside overspending and miscalculating, they have also used funds from an organization that has entrusted them as treasury for personal use, which is due some time next year. I find all these very irresponsible. So initially I was on board to help them with medications and a few other payments as explained above, but more obligations keep showing up and I find it hard to deal with the constant surprises and the knowledge that this is all happening because they wanted to make more money by going on shopping spree on homes (they are in their late 70s and are already wealthy) not within their means and now the children must pay. Thank you again for your time in reading my long reply, I would appreciate any advise you may still have for me.

FOLLOW-UP ANSWER

So ultimately I'm to follow my husband's decision with genuine acceptance

Correct.

but I can object if that decision means neglecting our own family

You can object even if it doesn't involve neglecting your own family. Just understand that your objection is meant to be in an effort to help him understand your concerns, not as an authority as if he must do whatever you say. Just because you object doesn't mean he is obligated to listen to you. He may be in sin for failing to do so, but ultimately he will answer to God for his own behaviors and you will answer to God for the way you follow your husband's leadership.

Our church advises that husband & wife should agree on major decisions

Absolutely. This is preferable whenever possible. But it is also not always possible.

If one goes ahead without the other's consent, it may hinder some blessings for our family

True. But sometimes, when an agreement is not possible, then a decision has to be made regardless. In this case, one will always have to proceed in a direction without the other.

everything we have from God we are to navigate/steward together

What you're describing is called "egalitarianism." It is the view that God created husbands and wives to have equal authority in marriage relationships and the lack of equal authority that existed for millennia was not by God's design, but by cultural practices that are now outdated. This view has only crept up in extremely recent history relative to the thousands of years since God created the world and the over 2,000 years since the church had been established. Specifically, secular concepts of egalitarianism didn't first arise until 1880 and the first time any Christian organization began advocating for this view was in 1984. Their view is, in essence, that every Christian and follower of God for thousands of years have been misinterpreting the Bible and that in 1984 they have finally discovered a "correct" interpretation. The concept gained much ground in the church not because of the viability of the interpretive model used to reach such conclusions (even the most avid egalitarians recognize that they cannot derive their view from Scripture itself); rather, it grew in popularity because culture had shifted toward feminist ideologies (some good, some bad) and a number of congregations wanted to stay culturally relevant. As a result, a line of "liberal theology" took root that decided that the Bible should be re-interpreted to suit changing cultural norms, and therefore if culture decided to change, God's views on sin, marriage, church structure, etc. should all change too.

Many people disagree with egalitarianism, preferring to stick to the more direct interpretations of Scripture that have been well established for millennia, which is that God loves men and women equally, but has given each gender different authoritative roles within the home, yet both being equally necessary and valuable. This is called complementarianism. It is not an easy view to preach in modern culture because the rise of feminist ideologies throughout the world makes it uncomfortable for pastors and preachers to say plainly, "Women, your husband is the head of your house and you must submit to him." However, this is ultimately what the Bible communicates.

And that conclusion should be obvious from the way the apostles and even Jesus himself reference the Church as the bride of Christ. If we are married to Christ, as is constantly noted throughout the new testament (and even at times in the old testament), does it make any sense to argue that the Church has equal authority over Christ as Christ has over us? Or do we accept that our spiritual groom is our authority, and therefore our physical marriages should reflect the image of Christ in the way we interact between husbands and wives?

I felt I was completely dismissed

I am sorry that you feel this way. It is unfortunate. However, it's worth noting that a husband's biblical obligation to love his wife and to lead his family is not synonymous with an obligation to make her feel any certain way. Ultimately, each person is responsible for their own feelings. If he did weigh and consider your opinion appropriately before choosing to do something different than what you recommended, then your feelings are unfounded: you were not dismissed. If he tuned you out while you were sharing your opinions and completely ignored what you were saying because he wanted to do things his way without interruption from you, then you are right to feel as if you were dismissed - because you were (if that is the case) - but your feelings do not change your obligation to your husband. A pastor and his wife once commented during a small group I attended: "It's not submission until you disagree. If you agree anyway, you're still just doing things your own way."

I feel by agreeing to ... I have honored his parents

I believe that you feel this way. But he does not feel the same way. Do you believe that your feelings are more important than his?

I feel that when it comes to his parents, nobody else matters

You might be right about that. This could very well be a sin on his part. But the fact that your husband sins does not give you an excuse to sin by refusing to submit to his authority within the home. As I may have mentioned in a previous response, beyond Paul's passages on submission by a wife, 1 Peter 3 also addresses the issue - but specifically in the context of a wife submitting to an unbelieving husband. Certainly, as an unbeliever, everything he does is sinful. He does not have God's interests at heart. Even more so, the context runs this form of submission in parallel with a slave's obligation to submit to his master and Christ's submission to the government that crucified him. Certainly these are very harsh and extreme examples of submission, yet they create the context both before and after the wife's calling to submit to an unbelieving husband. How much more should a wife submit to a believing husband who she merely has a difference of feeling and opinion with!

To answer your question, lending 85% of our savings does not make us unable to pay the bills or go into debt

Then your family is still provided for under your husband's plan.

But if a large medical emergency occurs, we won't be able to pay & we don't have medical insurance

Then it sounds to me as if your husband trusts that God will protect your family in response to his generosity to his parents. I also cannot speak as to how the laws work in your country, but I do know that under American laws and medical administrative regulations, it is relatively easy to work out payment for medical emergencies when you don't have funds on-hand. This would not be on my list of concerns if my family were in a comparable financial situation.

So it's not that we haven't provided for them, but the question is to what extent

I agree. That question is not directly answered in Scripture. But let's look at tithing and alms-giving, for example. There is plenty of historical precedent for a 10% tithe and some amount of charitable giving to those in need. This would leave most people throughout Israel's history with between 80-90% of their income to live off of. Yet when Jesus meets the rich young ruler, he tells him he must sell ALL of his possessions and give the money to the poor, right? Could the rich young ruler sell 99% of his possession, save 1% for himself, and then tell Jesus, "I already give this and gave that, and sold this and that. It's not that I haven't given a lot, but the question is to what extent"? No - because Jesus asked him to sell ALL of it. Ananias and Sapphira are another great example, from Acts 5:1-11. They sold a piece of property and decided to be generous in giving it to the apostles. But he decided to keep part of the money for himself. As a result, God struck him and his wife dead. Does God expect total surrender and submission or does he every say that partial surrender is "good enough"?

They are far wealthier than us 3 children combined, but their money is tied in assets they keep accumulating

Then it is very probable that you will be paid back in full. It may not be in your timing, but how do you know that when your in-laws' situation resolves, if you have a similar need, they will not sell assets to return the favor?

I find all these very irresponsible

They very well might be irresponsible practices (I don't know all of the details, so I cannot say). But are you their judge? What makes your judgment over them the deciding factor in any of this?

So initially I was on board to help them with medications and a few other payments as explained above, but more obligations keep showing up and I find it hard to deal with the constant surprises and the knowledge that this is all happening because they wanted to make more money by going on shopping spree on homes (they are in their late 70s and are already wealthy) not within their means and now the children must pay

What I see happening here is that your husband is, essentially, financing an investment opportunity through his parents. That is, they believe the investments will pay off, and you and your husband will reap the reward if/when it does - and you seem to acknowledge that it will pay off eventually, by recognizing the degree of their wealth. But in order to seize the investment opportunity when it arose, they had to become cash-poor. Rather than forcing them to lose the investment opportunity by selling the assets themselves to pay for their own bills, your husband has decided to fund their immediate cash needs in order to keep the investment opportunity active so that you can reap the reward later.

At this point, the question has relatively little to do with your in-laws and it would be the same as if you were asking: "My husband wants to give 85% of our cash and income to an investment. I agree that the investment is likely to pay off in the end, but it will make us cash poor. Is this a good enough circumstance to warrant fighting against my husband instead of submitting to him?" In this type of a scenario, the answer seems to be clearly no - not only does this seem to be "not sin" to me, but it could ultimately prove to be a wiser outcome. In the meantime, it can also provide an opportunity for you and your entire family to be willing and able to live on less, as many others in the world do, and to share in the concerns of those who are less fortunate (like the anxiety over potential medical bills), and in so doing you could be better able to witness to those around you.

CONCLUSION

Let me be clear: I understand your concerns and empathize. You like having security in your life, as do most people - especially wives (men are more prone toward risk than women). I also recognize the possibility (though given the new information you have provided, this possibility seems quite low) that your husband is being sinful in the way he is managing your family's finances. You have every right to feel the way you do about these things. However, you also have an obligation to submit to your husband's authority. Even if the investment falls apart and you end up not recovering your money on it, you must know that God is in control and works all things for the good of those who love him (Romans 8:28). I have seen that verse play out in my life and among those around me so frequently that it is impossible to deny. Accordingly, just as your husband ought to trust God with his finances, you ought to trust your husband with his, for just as "the head of every man is Christ ... the head of the woman is man, and the head of Christ is God" (1 Cor. 11:3). I assume your marriage vows included that you would stick by him "for better or worse." If this turns out "for worse," then your obligation has not changed, simply because you would prefer "for better."

QUESTION

Does the Bible mention anything about sex having the power to "brainwash" someone? When I was applying for my job recently, one thing I had to agree with is to never form an intimate relationship with a coworker. I didn't quite get why that was a big enough deal to write it as a legal obligation, but my boss claims sex can and sometimes is used as a form of bribery. She used the term "brainwashing" because she believes once you sleep with someone, you lose part of your mental capacity to them and become much more vulnerable to and more easily controlled by that person. I've never slept with anyone, so this just all sounds so bizarre to me. I figured a much simpler and easier reason to avoid sleeping with your coworkers is because it's completely unnecessary and a sin against God. Is any of this "brainwashing" accurate to something God has written, or is this mostly just speculation?

ANSWER

There is nothing in the Bible that says sex creates brainwashing. The Bible says that sex is a good thing created by God. That said, as with all good things, it can be used inappropriately in sinful ways. For example, giving to missionaries is good, yet when Ananias and Sapphira sold their house and gave a portion of the proceeds to the apostles they were struck dead because they were not giving from a right heart and were deceptive about it (Acts 5:1-11). In Matthew 6 Jesus gives a series of examples like this - that while outwardly doing good things, people can still sin in the way they give to the poor, pray, or fast. Sex is the same way. It is a good thing, but when the people having it are unmarried, it is sin.

With this in mind, when your boss notes that sex is "used as a form of bribery," this is one of the sinful ways sex is often used. Sexual attraction can be very powerful. When someone becomes fixated on that attraction toward a specific person, opportunity for an exchange comes up, especially if the object of that attraction can find benefit from the person who is attracted to him/her. Typically, this looks like a boss who is attracted to one of his workers, and the worker agrees to have sex with the boss, believing that it will lead to a possible promotion, raise, leniency in the workplace on various issues, etc. Other times it is because the person fears getting fired if they don't accept the sexual advances. When an employee is inappropriately pressured to accept the sexual advances, this is called sexual harassment and it is illegal everywhere in America and many other countries (I'm not sure which country you live in). Many companies would go bankrupt over even a single sexual harassment lawsuit, making it a grave risk that must be regulated.

The "brainwash" effect your boss is referencing is not directly referenced in the Bible, though it is not difficult to find examples in Scripture where sexual attraction has caused people to do seemingly absurd things. For example, Jacob was attracted to Rachel and agreed to work 7 years to marry her, only to be given Leah instead, after which he worked 7 additional years to marry Rachel. If sexual attraction did not have an extremely powerful influence over our life choices, Jacob never would have agreed to commit 14 years of his life in the pursuit of a single woman. This influence can be good at times, but it can also be very destructive in a variety of contexts.

What I believe you're really referencing, though, is a psychological and bio-chemical process called "pair bonding." Pair bonding is when a person feels a strong connection toward another person in a manner that can influence their decision-making and judgments. Pair bonding is a good thing in the proper context. If we did not have pair bonding, nobody would ever marry because there would be no desire to remain connected and loyal to anyone else. Interestingly, when people have numerous sexual partners, their brains become numb to the pair-bonding effect. As a result, those with higher quantities of sexual partners are far more likely to wind up divorced - often multiple times. The conclusion we can take from this is that in the absence of healthy pair-bonding, people are quick to leave their marriages. This has been well-established in the way the sexual revolution has correlated with the sharp

increase in divorce rates over the last 50 years.

That is, beginning in the 1960s the laws regarding sexual activity began changing, including the institution of no-fault divorce in America, which allowed people to engage in extramarital sexual relationships without risking such things as spousal support or rights to marital property. Common law marriage also began to be abolished, which allowed people to engage in sexual activity with whomever they wanted, and even live with people, without creating marriage bonds that would then subject them to divorce laws. As a result, the legal institution of marriage has become little more than a formality to establish tax benefits and estate planning vehicles - and it is primarily the collective social belief structures surrounding marriage that give it more weight than that, as it is now so easy to create and break marriages that it is only in our cultural psychology that we actually find any moral value in the institution of marriage. Because of all this, marriage has essentially become a non-issue when it comes to sexual relationships, causing the amount of non-marital sex people were having to skyrocket, which eroded many people's ability to pair bond, which then upped the divorce rates, the number of children born out of wedlock, the increase of sexually transmitted diseases, and a host of other problems. Accordingly, the ability of two people to form and maintain a pair-bond is extremely important, and can also be extremely powerful.

However, as we've already said, even good things can be used sinfully. For example, bi-lateral pair bonding (i.e. both people are bonded to each other) can cause people to stay in very unhealthy, destructive relationships - even before marriage (noting that getting married doesn't actually have a noticeable impact on pair bonding). Very strong pair bonding (as is usually most common during the first year or two of a new relationship) can also cause two people to focus so heavily on each other that they tend to ignore other aspects of their lives, which could significantly affect their work performance. Alternatively, when pair-bonding occurs unilaterally, it creates an opportunity for exploitation. Two common stereotypes are: (1) when a woman is unilaterally bonded to a man (i.e. he is not bonded back to her), the man often exploits the relationship for sex without offering any form of commitment in return, which is what she really wants from him; or (2) when a man is unilaterally bonded to a woman (i.e. she is not bonded back to him), the woman often strings him along, using his hope to have sex with her as a way to earn a variety of other favors such as gifts, taken out on fancy dates, or (if they are co-workers) raises/bonuses/better hours/etc. - all without ever having any actual intent to have sex with him, which is what he really wants.

In this way, pair bonding can certainly be seen as a form of "brain washing" in that it can get people to do things they would ordinarily not do, all for the sake of someone that they feel a strong urge or connection toward. But pair bonding doesn't merely lead to sex - it is often caused by it too, and in the most powerful ways. The human brain has various pleasure/reward centers that cause a person to feel good when certain hormones/chemicals pass through them. Among the most powerful are vasopressin, dopamine, and oxytocin. These three chemicals are all known to affect "pair bonding" in very powerful and unique ways. (1) Vasopressin produces a desire for longevity and commitment in a relationship; (2) dopamine produces direct pleasure, almost like being on drugs (as many drugs trigger the brain's dopamine receptors); and (3) oxytocin is known to deepen feelings of attachment and closeness, also causing contentment, calmness, and security. All three chemicals are known to be produced in increasing measure in various phases of a relationship and can begin even from purely psychological sources, such as talking to someone you're attracted to. This effect increases when skin-to-skin contact is initiated, such as holding hands or hugging. When people have sex, their brains are flooded with these hormones for a short time, and the more they have sex the more their brains become re-wired to condition those feelings toward a specific person, which is when pair-bonding is at its strongest. In this way, the "brain washing" effect your boss says sex can create can be viewed very much like one person supplying cocaine to another, and then being in control of that supply - the person who is addicted to the cocaine will do just about anything to get more. While not necessarily a perfect example, the parallels are close enough that you should understand that this effect is very real and serious.

While the Bible doesn't say much about hormones, brain chemical receptors, pair bonding, etc., it certainly does have a lot to say about how we control our bodies and use them for God's purposes. 1 Peter 5:8 compels us to "be sober-minded." In 1 Cor. 6:12, Paul notes his attitude that he will not be mastered by anything - and a few chapters

later (11:1) he says that we should follow in his example, as he follows in the example of Christ. That is not to say that we should avoid being pair-bonded to anyone. In fact, we want to experience this type of relationship with Christ most of all. Remember also that God is the one who created the human brain and such chemicals as vasopressin, dopamine, and oxytocin to function in us the way they do - and he is the one who caused pair bonding to occur in us the way that it does. However, he created it for the purpose of drawing people into loving, committed marriages in which sex can occur frequently and freely. The way sexual attraction and pair bonding functions today, predominantly used like a drug for immediate gratification, is a product of the fallen nature of the world.

With the above in mind, to address a few specific points from your question:

...one thing I had to agree with is to never form an intimate relationship with a coworker.

It's important to note here that "intimate relationships" with a co-worker don't necessarily mean sex. Often-times it includes dating in the workplace. Many workplaces prohibit dating and not just sex because even dating alone can have the effects I described above. The theory many employers operate on is that if they can convince their employees that sex with co-workers is off-the-table, then they won't allow themselves to become emotionally involved. It's a big risk to put your job on the line. The higher the cost, the less likely you will be influenced inappropriately. If there was no such prohibition, then it opens the door to sexual harassment and manipulation in the workplace. Also, the hostility in the workplace in the event of a breakup could affect job performance. As such, the best solution is simply to shut down these types of relationships before they even get started, which is accomplished by giving the prohibition your boss has given to you.

I figured a much simpler and easier reason to avoid sleeping with your coworkers is because it's completely unnecessary and a sin against God.

That is, of course, a much simpler reason. However, most organizations are not "Christian" in the sense of being committed to biblical principles. If your employer operates his business as a general business instead of being founded on the Bible, it would be irrational to expect him to utilize the Bible as his rationale. Even if your boss happens to be a Christian - or even if all of the owners of the company are Christians - they may still have non-Christian employees and need to provide additional reasons for their management practices that don't rely on the Bible, as non-Christians will not take the Bible as an authority over them.

Is any of this "brainwashing" accurate to something God has written, or is this mostly just speculation?

It is neither. God had not written anywhere in the Bible that "sex causes brainwashing." God has also not written anywhere in the Bible that $2+2=4$, yet we know it to be true and not "just speculation." The effects of vasopressin, dopamine, and oxytocin have been well-studied and documented. They are very real. Pair bonding and the things that it can cause a person to do have been well-established through a number of repeated scientific studies, and can be seen in a variety of biblical stories, such as the Jacob and Rachel story I referenced above. While the addictive nature of pair-bonding is not always as strong as something like cocaine (though at times it can be), the influence it can have over a person's decision-making is certainly significant enough that an employer would be justified in wanting to avoid risk that it negatively affect the business he's trying to run. The fact that intimate relationships (even non-sexual ones) massively increase the chance for a sexual harassment lawsuit is, even by itself without any other factor, substantial enough of a risk to warrant prohibition of such relationships.

While many companies do not have comparable prohibitions, a failure to regulate intimate relationships among coworkers is incredibly unwise and only makes sense for those companies that are either so small that the risk of a sexual harassment law suit is very small or for companies where intimate relationships are incredibly unlikely to form or affect job performance in the first place (example: traveling sales positions where coworkers are unlikely to have much interaction with each other).

It's certainly easy to get angry when we realize we've been lied to our whole lives about intersexual relational dynamics. That anger is understandable. Who wouldn't have an emotional reaction to finding out that people you've trusted have led you astray? Your parents. Your friends. Your pastor. Social media. Actual media. They've all put out a message that placated you for years until you started figuring out that you could make decisions for yourself and didn't have to answer to someone else's emotions or expectations. It's easy to get infuriated.

But it's also pointless. Everyone vies for power in some form or another. Whatever our motive for wanting that power, it's easiest to get it from other people rather than manufacturing it for ourselves or discovering it innately from within. So, it's not surprising that the media, pastors, parents, or anyone else would try to get people on board with their way of doing things. The more people who are committed to their way, the more power they have, the more they can accomplish their goals. Those goals may be noble goals, but they're still inherently theirs - whether they adopted them from someone else (i.e. God/Bible/another pastor/whatever) or came up with them independently.

Many people don't realize you can have our own internal point of origin. People often feel in our youth that we are simply cogs in a machine that must turn - and that death is the only out. While there are certainly some structures you are beholden to (gravity, genetics, etc.), you were the one who decided to give power over your life to others and their way of observing and understanding the world. Maybe it was reasonable that you did this. After all, children don't know much better. We had to conform to our parents' way in order to survive, and it's hard to deviate from some things once they're ingrained in us. Part of me thinks this is why God created the teenage rebellion phase most people experience: to create a natural detachment from parental influences so that people can learn to develop their own internal point of origin. If only we were wiser in how we used that ability. Instead of taking power over our own lives back for ourselves during this phase, we simply steal it from parents to give it to our friends, rock stars, or other people we idolize.

In this sense, idolatry in every sense involves living in someone else's frame. It's a beautiful thing that our God doesn't merely say, "Live in my frame," or, "Idolize me." He says, "I have made you like me and I will make you like me again so that YOUR OWN internal point of origin - your own frame - is already what I would have you do in the first place, because I am in you and we are one." This is sanctification and it is much, much deeper than the mainstream churchianity concept of behavioral modification, which is little more than Judaism 2.0.

In reality, these people are just doing what people do. Men will be men. Women will be women. Sinners will be sinners. Expect people to act in their sinful nature, and be well-pleased when they don't. When you hold this expectation, you'll find it easier to think for yourself, always discerning whether what someone tells you is true or not, as did the Bereans, who were commended for not taking Paul's word for it, but by challenging what he said against Scripture (Acts 17). This is PAUL we're talking about. The guy who wrote most of the NT - and yet they were commended for not trusting him. Why would you trust a pastor? Or even worse: the secular media, propaganda, non-Christian friends, etc.?

As soon as you realize that the responsibility for your trust in them is on you and not on them (for they're just doing what people do), you can finally enter into your own frame and begin moving forward.

As long as you're blaming someone else for your actions, you are inherently succumbing to the view that they have a power over you which they do not. This power keeps you in their frame. Even when you defy them, you only do it BECAUSE of them. Instead, you need to stop thinking about their thoughts and judgments of you altogether and figure out what you want for yourself.

Example: Imagine my kids act out. I plan to discipline them by doing X. Before I get the chance, my wife says, "You need to discipline them by doing X." If I act on it, she's going to think it's her idea. Do I change X to Y instead, just to show her she doesn't control me? No. That's idiotic. Do I try to explain that I already had that idea

so that she'll realize I'm doing it for myself and not her? Of course not. I just do what I was going to do anyway and let her think whatever she wants. Why? Because my life isn't defined by what my wife thinks. If she wants to think I acted on her idea, let her. If she figures out on her own that I probably already planned X anyway, that's fine too.

In the same way, don't react to the people who were running your life before. Don't get mad at them - that anger will only keep you in their frame even longer. Don't even separate ties with the person/organization/whatever. Instead, utilize the position you've already got to advance your own purposes, whatever they may be. It's tempting to start fresh once you learn to be your own person for the first time, but starting over also means giving up advantages you've built where you already are. Don't make such a decision lightly. For example, when people become Christians they often want to give up all their non-Christian friends and "start fresh" by finding a bubble of other believers to surround themselves with. How, then, will you ever reach the lost? How will you ever transform your church leadership? How much longer will it take for you to find those with whom to share the Gospel and begin discipling? Coming into YOUR OWN frame is powerful, but you lose much of that power when you remove yourself from the context of people who still assume you're in THEIR frame.

It's like in spy movies. When you figure out there's a spy among you, you don't call them out. You let them keep thinking business will continue as usual. But you start operating in a way that utilizes the truth that you now know - and this can be far more beneficial to your overall purposes than separating from the situation entirely. Luke 16 and 1 Cor. 9, of course.

The Wife Who Truly Loves You

4 March 2020 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

A few days ago, Blarg wrote a fantastic post on MRP, which I just got around to reading (it challenges even my ineptitude at brevity). Someone commented:

he seeks not compliance or submission by his wife to his frame, but a wife with her own strong, independent frame that's well aligned and compatible with his.

... to which Blarg replied: "Exactly."

This is explained in his "black box" section - that MRP often views wives as a mechanical input where you act a certain way and get a certain response, but we ignore what happens inside the black box to get that response ... because, you know, trying to figure it out requires entering the frame(work) of the black box. He proposes, instead, that wives should be understood as independent entities who are viewed as more than a series of inputs - that a man can maintain his strength, if he has already developed it, even while elevating his wife's status beyond "slave to bio-psychology and genetics."

The entire post is fascinating and I recommend you read it - but only AFTER you figure out the basics.

What I really want to comment on here, though, is the way this concept is much easier understood if operating from a biblical foundation. Before reading his post, I'd just put up another one where I noted:

It's a beautiful thing that our God doesn't merely say, "Live in my frame," or, "Idolize me." He says, "I have made you like me and I will make you like me again so that YOUR OWN internal point of origin - your own frame - is already what I would have you do in the first place, because I am in you and we are one." This is sanctification and it is much, much deeper than the mainstream churchianity concept of behavioral modification, which is little more than Judaism 2.0.

It was ironic, then, to read immediately after this someone attempting to convey the same concept from a secular world-view. But I think it is worth expanding on, for those who require the biblical foundation.

Judaism 1.0 - Old Covenant

Judaism 1.0 operates under the old covenant, which is, in essence: "Obey my laws and I will bless you." Beginner-level red pill teaching inherently begins with an old covenant mentality. Just as the old covenant treated God's relationship with his people on very clear black box terms (as Blarg references), defined by a series of inputs and outputs, so also does beginner-level MRP instruct men to begin understanding the basic inputs and outputs of intergender sexuality. Most of Rollo's work, for example, is dedicated to establishing what those inputs and outputs are - and this is ESSENTIAL to know. Likewise, just as God decided that the old covenant was a necessary precursor to pave the way for the new covenant, so also will I continue to tell men in the early phases of their red pill journey that they must first become fluent with and implement in their homes the basic concepts in this "old covenant" view of relationships: know and master the basics of what triggers female sexuality before trying to go much further. Young Christians will always need to know the law and how to live under it before they can comprehend what it means to be free from it.

Judaism 2.0 - Old Covenant Plus Jesus

But some so-called believers never actually live as ones free from the law - in part because they don't understand what happens inside the black box and it's too confusing to figure it out, so they prefer to stick by the series of

inputs and outputs they've come to rely on. They just change the terminology to make it palatable to a cursory skim of NT Scripture. That is, they acknowledge that Christ died to save us from the consequences of the law, but somehow believe that they are not free from the obligation to the law. Instead of Mosaic Law, they look to "New Testament Commands." The letter of the law is replaced with the principles of the law. Instead of blessing being tied to obedience, it's God's love tied to Jesus (which is right, until we add), but we can't say we love Jesus if we don't obey his commands, so John 14:21 is misused to re-up the idea that our obedience is still somehow tied in some way as a condition to our relationship with God.

In this view, just as the OT Law was an **EXTERNAL** code of conduct, so also does the entirety of the Bible (particularly the NT, or principles from the OT) become an **EXTERNAL** source of dictating behavior for how a "good Christian" *ought to live*. In this view, "grace" is added as a means of giving us flexibility when we still end up breaking the commands in the Bible.

In MRP terms, if this is how God interacted with his bride, then we would say that a wife's behaviors toward her husband are what define whether the relationship is good or bad. If she is submissive, helpful, sexually satisfying, etc. then we call her a "good wife," even if we are ignorant of her internal motives. If she is not these things, then she is a "bad wife." Our assessment of her is directly tied to her outputs - her behaviors.

Christianity 1.0 - New Covenant (and I don't expect there to be a 2.0 - ever)

Judaism 2.0 is, of course, a silly notion when we look at all the passages that explain how we are no longer under the law, and that we are no longer slaves to sin. The guy who discipled me wrote up a more thorough post on this on [r/TrueChristian \(right here\)](#). In short, Hebrews 8:13 makes clear that the old covenant is obsolete, as there's a new covenant in place. Jeremiah 31:31-34 prophesied about this new covenant, saying, "For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, declares the Lord: I will put my law within them, and I will write it on their hearts. And I will be their God, and they shall be my people." So why do people still try to treat the Bible (**EXTERNAL**) as a source for mandating behavioral conformity? That's not how the Bible was intended to be used. In short, the new covenant is that instead of operating on **EXTERNAL** behavioral modification in conformity to the law, we have an **INTERNAL** compulsion fueled by love that comes from the fact that God (who is love) is one with us in Christ with his Spirit.

This is the essence of the Gospel. We were originally created in God's image. The fall shattered the image of God in us. The law proved to us that we could not be restored to that image on our own from external means and effort. Because of Jesus, we are free from the external law (old covenant) and are sanctified toward internally becoming like Christ because we are one with Christ (new covenant). Ezekiel 36:26 summarizes this nicely: "I will give you a new heart and put a new spirit in you; I will remove from you your heart of stone and give you a heart of flesh." Instead of trying to manufacture internal change for ourselves through behavioral modification, we let internal change from the Spirit project outward through our behaviors (hence verses like Galatians 3:3). While many people under a Judaism 2.0 mentality will agree with this on technical terms, they will still, in practice, quote verses at people as if the external commands are still somehow a judge over them.

New Covenant in Practice

Notice in this new covenant mentality that God is not merely after our obedience. He is after our hearts - and this not merely as to the emotions we feel toward him, but our devotion to the entirety of who he is, what he stands for, and what he intends to accomplish on this earth. For instance, he has told us plainly that it is his goal for us to make disciples of all nations. Having his heart and Spirit within us inherently means a compulsion toward fulfilling his purposes, and not merely avoiding the things he doesn't like. That is, if God's Spirit is in us and our Spirit is conformed to his likeness, then our natural desire will be to make disciples of all nations (and, along with it, a broader disinterest in the sin that would hinder this purpose).

Those who live under a Judaism 2.0 mentality will argue that obedience is what shapes our hearts. The new

covenant responds that our hearts are what shape our obedience. But that "new heart" is one of a baby who has freshly been born again. As with all muscles, it must be fed and exercised before it is strong enough to function independently. This is the sanctification process. This is what I meant when I quoted myself saying, "This is sanctification and it is much, much deeper than the mainstream churchianity concept of behavioral modification, which is little more than Judaism 2.0." And when this sanctification progresses, we see that when God's Spirit meets our autonomy, rather than doing things to keep God happy, we do things because we want to do them ... and it just so happens to be that because we are one with God, as a husband is with his wife, the things we want to do are the exact things that please him. This is not "living in God's frame" (though at times it is easier to explain things in those terms). This is living in your own frame out of the "new heart" that God gives us.

NC - Going Deeper: The Judaism 2.0 people will argue, "I do operate out of desire. My desire is to please God. I look to the Bible to see what pleases God, then I do it." This is still living by an external code. There's a difference between:

- OC: "I hate doing x, but I love pleasing God, so I'll do x anyway," and
- NC: "Because God is in me and God loves x, I strangely find that I love doing x also, even though I used to hate doing x when I was a non-Christian/younger believer." And as we move into sanctification, we find that "x" encompasses more and more aspects toward the totality of our lives, which will be made complete in heaven.

Notice that in Judaism 2.0, the operative aspect of the "heart" is toward God without any actual change in the disposition of one's heart toward the things of God. That is, the person isn't actually becoming more like Christ in their heart/spirit. They are simply conforming their behaviors to look like Christ while claiming that their heart is in the right place because they profess a motive of wanting to "please God," generically. On the other hand, one who is being transformed by the Gospel increasingly loves the things of God and the purposes he has for the world, independent of the commands God gave about them. At this point, *the commands serve primarily as a guide and confirmation of the direction we should be moving, not some static picture we're trying to live up to.* [u/Deep_Strength](#) is known for emphasizing this point quite well - and I recommend you all skim through his comment history, as he talks about it here a LOT, as this is something many guys here seem to miss.

Christian-MRP 1.0

To take the "Christian 1.0" bit and explain this in MRP terms, we get a beauty like Blarg's post. We reach the conclusion that we do not truly desire a wife whose behaviors are merely conformed to our expectations. Even battered wives will conform their behavior while hating their spouse. Some will argue, "Who cares, as long as the sex is good?" And to each their own. But my guess is - whether it's innate drive from God or blue pill conditioning that hasn't yet been eradicated, I really don't care - most of you probably prefer a wife who genuinely loves you, if you could have one, over one who merely obeys you. Such a wife doesn't do things merely because it keeps you happy and she likes to see you happy. She does it because she has lived in your frame *and LOVED it* long enough that as she grows and matures as a wife she develops her own internal sense of self that flows harmoniously with all that you are. [Notice again that this takes time and is not something to start with.]

I am firmly persuaded that those who live merely by what they *ought* to do are no better off than those live by what they should *not* do. If we look at sin the way [u/ruizbuja](#) references in the post I linked above, taking the Romans 14 approach to understanding how God now works through our heart and motives instead of our rote behaviors, we recognize that our *desires* are what define the relationship we have with God and Christ, as their bride (Isaiah 54:5; 2 Cor. 11:2, for example). And the beauty in this, then, becomes what every MRP man projects toward his wife: **"Make me your greatest desire and I'll give myself to you"** (Psalm 37:4).

Non/Young-Christian Christian-MRP 1.0

Now, there's one more aspect that's ESSENTIAL to applying any of this, which Blarg appropriately hit on: once you open yourself up to your wife and embrace the notion that she is an actual person with thoughts and feelings and cognitive capabilities that go far beyond slavery to her bio-psychology - after this, you must be willing to accept the reception you get.

Notice that God gave Jesus as the light who shines over everyone (John 1:9), yet many reject him. Even among believers, he freely gives his Spirit to all, and not in partial measure, yet many people never progress in their faith or choose to allow him to sanctify them. Others will move at a much slower pace. Still others will have significant periods of growth and regression.

In other words, what Blarg described as the risk - that your wife may not immediately do with your gift of yourself (your spirit) to her what you'd like, and you have to be unshaken by that - is the same risk God readily embraces among non/young-believers who ignore/reject the gift of himself (his Spirit) and young believers who won't consistently follow him (when prompted by his Spirit), and yet God is unshaken by this.

How many of you like it when you work your butt off and your wife responds by initiating sex that night? Now, let's be honest: how many of you had that experience early in your path of improvement, but sooner than you were expecting to see such results? "This RP stuff really works!" you're probably quick to conclude. After all, you've been married for over a decade and it's only been a month or two and you're already seeing her respond. "She must be in my frame because I'm getting what I want."

In reality, there's a good chance you haven't made any actual progress *with her* at all. Sure, you've made progress on your lifts. You've improved your attitude. You're being more productive. But at this point, it's far more likely that you're just finally reaping the benefits of her frame.

HER FRAME

Women aren't nearly as complicated as the world would have you believe. For one example, they all suffer from a disease I call "Next-Thing-itis." They won't be happy until they get that "thing" they really want. And once they have it, they're not happy and can't possibly be until the "next thing" gets done - and then the next, and the next, and the next. I have never met a woman who didn't have this innate compulsion.

- **A woman's frame is ultimately defined by whatever that thing is and what it takes to get it. If you are not that thing, she's not in your frame.**

Is she begging for more of you ... or for you to fix the leaky pipe, or buy her that outfit she really wants, or to go on the vacation she's been dreaming about? Now, let me be clear about one more thing. That "next thing" she wants might be you-oriented. She might want you thinner, better groomed, nicer dressed, handier around the house, more responsible with chores, etc. In this situation, **YOU** are not her "thing." *What you can do for her* is her "thing." This is what we mean when we say that women love *opportunistically*.

A note on this: often-times, the reason she wants you to be more attractive is not so that she will desire you more, but so she doesn't feel so embarrassed showing you off to her friends. After all, you're not just "unattractive right now" - you **ARE** unattractive to her. Period. She doesn't expect her attraction to you to change because her hamster refuses to admit she's currently that shallow. If you getting more fit, nicer dressed, better groomed, etc. actually made her more attracted to you, then that means she's shallow for not being attracted to you without those things. We can't have that. So, instead she tells you she might be more attracted to you if you make those changes, hoping to use that as a sexual lure for you (that she likely won't actually fulfill), yet she's really only concerned with her own public appearances and not being embarrassed to show you in public, branding her as the girl who married the slob who calls himself a man.

YOU IN HER FRAME

Many men spend many years of marriage living to satisfy that "next thing" for her. This is the epitome of being in her frame. She may call you the "head of the household" as verbal homage to an ideological concept, but the reality is that she's the one setting the course one "thing" at a time, and you're her work-mule helping her get it done.

Now, maybe you're not all that interested in getting it done. Some guys get that far on their own. But they also find her responsive attitude enough of an annoyance that they try not to trigger her, so they'll do the minimum to appease her so they can get back to video games and football. She's still controlling your decisions/actions, so you're still in her frame.

HER ATTITUDE

Now, if you've ever been that second guy, you know how it always turns out: she wants you to help her get that next "thing," and she's not getting it, so she uses her nagging attitude as her primary method of getting you off your butt and onto her goals. Or maybe it comes in the form of whining and complaining. Or perhaps she acts depressed and sad, crying all the time. One way or another ...

- **A woman's primary tool for getting you to do what she wants is her attitude - an external display of emotion meant to show disapproval of your present state.**

In psychological terms, this is what's called "negative reinforcement." This is the primary mode women operate on. After she gives you enough attitude, maybe you do start making some changes. You finally hit the gym - not because you want to take care of yourself, but because she keeps making you feel ashamed for what you look like. You start doing things around the house not because you want a working toilet, but because you want her to shut up about it. Her attitude has worked. She gets what she wants from you, and she didn't have to whore herself out with sex to do it. After all, she's a woman and women are too pure to use sex to get what they want ... if they don't have to ;)

YOUR REWARD

Now, in the above case, virtually every woman knows when her man is just placating her. It's usually a longstanding enough pattern that it's obvious things will return to normal. Sometimes it's just assumed. Even if he does make certain permanent improvements to his life, she doesn't believe it will last. But at some point she might recognize some authentic changes. You recently discovered RP and decided it was time to take ownership of your household, build a body you can be proud of, and flaunt the sexy confidence you're finally learning to toy around with. She FINALLY gets a better husband, so ...

- ****A woman will use sex as a reward to good little boys who start showing real initiative to finally become the man she has been trying to get them to be all along.**

In psychological terms, we call this "positive reinforcement." Notice the frame issue here, though? A guy will think at this phase, "This RP stuff is working. She's totally in my frame because I'm finally getting the sex from her that I want." The thing is: she knew all along that you wanted to have sex with her. She just didn't want to have sex with you. And she still doesn't, much. But she does want to encourage you in your good behavior - as long as it continues in a direction that she approves. At this point, she wants to define what she believes will make you attractive; you don't get to be your own man. My wife used to try this positive reinforcement overtly back in my slobbish days: "How about for every 5lbs you lose, we'll try a new position?" In reality, even with significant weight loss, we not only tried a grand total of 0 new positions during that time - we also went months without any sex at all. She didn't live up to her end of the bargain, and I don't think she ever actually intended to (she only told herself she did).

Now, there's absolutely nothing wrong with enjoying the reward she throws your way, if and when it actually comes. I once won a prize for a contest I didn't even know I was entered into. "I'm not playing your game, but I'll take your prize" is a perfectly appropriate attitude. But the fact that I get the prize doesn't mean they're playing my game. I just happened to be winning their game, whether I intended to or not. With your wife, this is not actual progress.

DON'T WIN HER GAME

If you let her behaviors (attitude, sexuality) define your progress toward your own goals, how can you know if

you're ever making progress? Seeing less attitude and getting more sex are, after all, among your goals. But you're still dependent on her for validation of your progress.

Now, it seems like it might be possible to accomplish your goals by being REALLY good at playing by *her* rules, right? Wrong. Because as soon as you accomplish one goal - you lose all that weight, for example - she's off to the "next thing." The rewards stop, even though the weight is gone, because you still dress poorly, for which she starts giving you attitude again. Then you dress better, the rewards come back, but after a short while they stop because you don't do enough to help around the house. And so on. Besides, you're no longer the "fat guy who got in shape" ... you're just the "in shape" guy. The effect of the change is gone.

This is why the black pill doesn't pan out. You could be the most physically attractive guy in the world, but at some point (usually earlier than you'd think) her "next thing" is going to be something other than your physical appearance, and eventually you'll be right back on the track of trying to appease her and her never being satisfied. I know countless men - especially through my divorce law practice - who are extremely fit and attractive, yet who complain about their wives not being sexually interested. It's frustrating, no doubt, but true.

YOUR GAME GENERATES FEELS

What I see, once actual progress is made with getting her on board with your mission and seeing the world the way you see it, is that she's no longer interested in the "next thing." Sure, that underlying desire is still there, but she's not as ravenously blood-thirsty over it as she used to be. Before, you told her "no" and she threatened divorce. Now she accepts it and moves on. More recently, (honey, you still reading these? eh, who cares) my wife was trying to pressure me to do all kinds of projects in our yard, wanting to buy a piano, etc., and I had no concern telling her no. Result? Instead of a bad attitude for not meeting her expectations (as used to be the case), she surprises me in bed by wearing lingerie and wanting to experiment with multiples. That never would have happened in what I would have called the "early gains" days. Those "early gains" were really just winning by her rules. But now I'm playing my own game and she finds my game more fun than her own.

- **Your frame generates feels; feels generate sex.**

What is your game? (1) Your mission is the thing that will make you say "I won the game" when you've accomplished it. (2) Your frame includes the rules of your game, how many players are involved, the size and shape of the arena, whether you play with a ball, puck, broom, picture frame, clock, or whatever else. (3) Your vision is the strategy you utilize to win the game. You get the idea. Does she see the same "win" you do when the mission is accomplished? Does she understand the rules of the game? Does she play by your strategy or develop her own? Does she run the plays autonomously (as intelligent players do), or expect you to have to announce every single footstep you want her to take as she goes down the field?

FEELS GENERATE SEX

All girls are mildly histrionic. They thrive on feelings, which are generated by the attention (or lack thereof) that they get. When their feels aren't being satisfied, they act out to get attention to generate new feelings. Even negative feelings are better than no feelings at all. They know their own game inside and out to such a degree that it doesn't generate feelings anymore. That's why they have "Next-Thing-itis" - because the feelings they THINK the next thing will give them doesn't actually give it to them. It can, but it doesn't, because they've been getting one thing after another that it's just a dry loop anymore.

Cue your mission. Your game. You presumably don't have "Next-Thing-itis" like her. You have a singular target so far out of reach that it's going to take a lifetime to accomplish what you're building. It's risky. There will be ups and downs. At first, she just wants to watch from the sideline. The ways to accomplish your goals are totally different

from the ways she would accomplish hers and she doesn't know what to do with that. But even as a spectator, she starts to get as invested in watching you as you are in watching your favorite sports team in a championship game. Then, eventually, she actually hops onto the court and starts playing your game with you. You get to play coach and quarterback, and you tell her which position to play and at what times you need her to play them, and she's just excited to be on the field at all - something she never would have done if you hadn't invited her out to play in the first place.

There are a lot of negative feelings associated with this - fear, anxiety, uncertainty, etc. And all of those feelings fuel her. But there are also lots of positive feelings: curiosity, excitement, passion, rejoicing at new milestones, etc. These exist in a way she doesn't know how to generate herself. When she starts feeling things she hasn't felt in a while, she doesn't know what to do with it. Sometimes she'll do a happy dance around the house. Other times, she'll just start smiling more. Still other times, she'll express it through additional productivity. But another way women express deep emotion is through their sexuality. You can take it from there.

How many of you like it when you work your butt off and your wife responds by initiating sex that night? Now, let's be honest: how many of you had that experience early in your path of improvement, but sooner than you were expecting to see such results? "This RP stuff really works!" you're probably quick to conclude. After all, you've been married for over a decade and it's only been a month or two and you're already seeing her respond. "She must be in my frame because I'm getting what I want."

In reality, there's a good chance you haven't made any actual progress *with her* at all. Sure, you've made progress on your lifts. You've improved your attitude. You're being more productive. But at this point, it's far more likely that you're just finally reaping the benefits of her frame.

HER FRAME

Women aren't nearly as complicated as the world would have you believe. For one example, they all suffer from a disease I call "Next-Thing-itis." They won't be happy until they get that "thing" they really want. And once they have it, they're not happy and can't possibly be until the "next thing" gets done - and then the next, and the next, and the next. I have never met a woman who didn't have this innate compulsion.

- **A woman's frame is ultimately defined by whatever that thing is and what it takes to get it. If you are not that thing, she's not in your frame.**

Is she begging for more of you ... or for you to fix the leaky pipe, or buy her that outfit she really wants, or to go on the vacation she's been dreaming about? Now, let me be clear about one more thing. That "next thing" she wants might be you-oriented. She might want you thinner, better groomed, nicer dressed, handier around the house, more responsible with chores, etc. In this situation, **YOU** are not her "thing." *What you can do for her* is her "thing." This is what we mean when we say that women love *opportunistically*.

A note on this: often-times, the reason she wants you to be more attractive is not so that she will desire you more, but so she doesn't feel so embarrassed showing you off to her friends. After all, you're not just "unattractive right now" - you **ARE** unattractive to her. Period. She doesn't expect her attraction to you to change because her hamster refuses to admit she's currently that shallow. If you getting more fit, nicer dressed, better groomed, etc. actually made her more attracted to you, then that means she's shallow for not being attracted to you without those things. We can't have that. So, instead she tells you she might be more attracted to you if you make those changes, hoping to use that as a sexual lure for you (that she likely won't actually fulfill), yet she's really only concerned with her own public appearances and not being embarrassed to show you in public, branding her as the girl who married the slob who calls himself a man.

YOU IN HER FRAME

Many men spend many years of marriage living to satisfy that "next thing" for her. This is the epitome of being in her frame. She may call you the "head of the household" as verbal homage to an ideological concept, but the reality is that she's the one setting the course one "thing" at a time, and you're her work-mule helping her get it done.

Now, maybe you're not all that interested in getting it done. Some guys get that far on their own. But they also find her responsive attitude enough of an annoyance that they try not to trigger her, so they'll do the minimum to appease her so they can get back to video games and football. She's still controlling your decisions/actions, so you're still in her frame.

HER ATTITUDE

Now, if you've ever been that second guy, you know how it always turns out: she wants you to help her get that next "thing," and she's not getting it, so she uses her nagging attitude as her primary method of getting you off your butt and onto her goals. Or maybe it comes in the form of whining and complaining. Or perhaps she acts depressed and sad, crying all the time. One way or another ...

- **A woman's primary tool for getting you to do what she wants is her attitude - an external display of emotion meant to show disapproval of your present state.**

In psychological terms, this is what's called "negative reinforcement." This is the primary mode women operate on. After she gives you enough attitude, maybe you do start making some changes. You finally hit the gym - not because you want to take care of yourself, but because she keeps making you feel ashamed for what you look like. You start doing things around the house not because you want a working toilet, but because you want her to shut up about it. Her attitude has worked. She gets what she wants from you, and she didn't have to whore herself out with sex to do it. After all, she's a woman and women are too pure to use sex to get what they want ... if they don't have to ;)

YOUR REWARD

Now, in the above case, virtually every woman knows when her man is just placating her. It's usually a longstanding enough pattern that it's obvious things will return to normal. Sometimes it's just assumed. Even if he does make certain permanent improvements to his life, she doesn't believe it will last. But at some point she might recognize some authentic changes. You recently discovered RP and decided it was time to take ownership of your household, build a body you can be proud of, and flaunt the sexy confidence you're finally learning to toy around with. She FINALLY gets a better husband, so ...

- ****A woman will use sex as a reward to good little boys who start showing real initiative to finally become the man she has been trying to get them to be all along.**

In psychological terms, we call this "positive reinforcement." Notice the frame issue here, though? A guy will think at this phase, "This RP stuff is working. She's totally in my frame because I'm finally getting the sex from her that I want." The thing is: she knew all along that you wanted to have sex with her. She just didn't want to have sex with you. And she still doesn't, much. But she does want to encourage you in your good behavior - as long as it continues in a direction that she approves. At this point, she wants to define what she believes will make you attractive; you don't get to be your own man. My wife used to try this positive reinforcement overtly back in my slobbish days: "How about for every 5lbs you lose, we'll try a new position?" In reality, even with significant weight loss, we not only tried a grand total of 0 new positions during that time - we also went months without any sex at all. She didn't live up to her end of the bargain, and I don't think she ever actually intended to (she only told herself she did).

Now, there's absolutely nothing wrong with enjoying the reward she throws your way, if and when it actually comes. I once won a prize for a contest I didn't even know I was entered into. "I'm not playing your game, but I'll take your prize" is a perfectly appropriate attitude. But the fact that I get the prize doesn't mean they're playing my game. I just happened to be winning their game, whether I intended to or not. With your wife, this is not actual progress.

DON'T WIN HER GAME

If you let her behaviors (attitude, sexuality) define your progress toward your own goals, how can you know if

you're ever making progress? Seeing less attitude and getting more sex are, after all, among your goals. But you're still dependent on her for validation of your progress.

Now, it seems like it might be possible to accomplish your goals by being REALLY good at playing by *her* rules, right? Wrong. Because as soon as you accomplish one goal - you lose all that weight, for example - she's off to the "next thing." The rewards stop, even though the weight is gone, because you still dress poorly, for which she starts giving you attitude again. Then you dress better, the rewards come back, but after a short while they stop because you don't do enough to help around the house. And so on. Besides, you're no longer the "fat guy who got in shape" ... you're just the "in shape" guy. The effect of the change is gone.

This is why the black pill doesn't pan out. You could be the most physically attractive guy in the world, but at some point (usually earlier than you'd think) her "next thing" is going to be something other than your physical appearance, and eventually you'll be right back on the track of trying to appease her and her never being satisfied. I know countless men - especially through my divorce law practice - who are extremely fit and attractive, yet who complain about their wives not being sexually interested. It's frustrating, no doubt, but true.

YOUR GAME GENERATES FEELS

What I see, once actual progress is made with getting her on board with your mission and seeing the world the way you see it, is that she's no longer interested in the "next thing." Sure, that underlying desire is still there, but she's not as ravenously blood-thirsty over it as she used to be. Before, you told her "no" and she threatened divorce. Now she accepts it and moves on. More recently, (honey, you still reading these? eh, who cares) my wife was trying to pressure me to do all kinds of projects in our yard, wanting to buy a piano, etc., and I had no concern telling her no. Result? Instead of a bad attitude for not meeting her expectations (as used to be the case), she surprises me in bed by wearing lingerie and wanting to experiment with multiples. That never would have happened in what I would have called the "early gains" days. Those "early gains" were really just winning by her rules. But now I'm playing my own game and she finds my game more fun than her own.

- **Your frame generates feels; feels generate sex.**

What is your game? (1) Your mission is the thing that will make you say "I won the game" when you've accomplished it. (2) Your frame includes the rules of your game, how many players are involved, the size and shape of the arena, whether you play with a ball, puck, broom, picture frame, clock, or whatever else. (3) Your vision is the strategy you utilize to win the game. You get the idea. Does she see the same "win" you do when the mission is accomplished? Does she understand the rules of the game? Does she play by your strategy or develop her own? Does she run the plays autonomously (as intelligent players do), or expect you to have to announce every single footstep you want her to take as she goes down the field?

FEELS GENERATE SEX

All girls are mildly histrionic. They thrive on feelings, which are generated by the attention (or lack thereof) that they get. When their feels aren't being satisfied, they act out to get attention to generate new feelings. Even negative feelings are better than no feelings at all. They know their own game inside and out to such a degree that it doesn't generate feelings anymore. That's why they have "Next-Thing-itis" - because the feelings they THINK the next thing will give them doesn't actually give it to them. It can, but it doesn't, because they've been getting one thing after another that it's just a dry loop anymore.

Cue your mission. Your game. You presumably don't have "Next-Thing-itis" like her. You have a singular target so far out of reach that it's going to take a lifetime to accomplish what you're building. It's risky. There will be ups and downs. At first, she just wants to watch from the sideline. The ways to accomplish your goals are totally different

from the ways she would accomplish hers and she doesn't know what to do with that. But even as a spectator, she starts to get as invested in watching you as you are in watching your favorite sports team in a championship game. Then, eventually, she actually hops onto the court and starts playing your game with you. You get to play coach and quarterback, and you tell her which position to play and at what times you need her to play them, and she's just excited to be on the field at all - something she never would have done if you hadn't invited her out to play in the first place.

There are a lot of negative feelings associated with this - fear, anxiety, uncertainty, etc. And all of those feelings fuel her. But there are also lots of positive feelings: curiosity, excitement, passion, rejoicing at new milestones, etc. These exist in a way she doesn't know how to generate herself. When she starts feeling things she hasn't felt in a while, she doesn't know what to do with it. Sometimes she'll do a happy dance around the house. Other times, she'll just start smiling more. Still other times, she'll express it through additional productivity. But another way women express deep emotion is through their sexuality. You can take it from there.

11

UPVOTES

Why is mission so important? Because ...

17 March 2020 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

Despite how much writing I've done on the significance of having a mission, this one just keeps coming up again and again, especially in DMs/chat. When people give their Rule 2 stats, it's the #1 thing that gets left off, or otherwise is some kind of cheap cop-out answer. Someone on MRP just asked, for example:

I just don't know if most people have a mission that would take a lifetime to complete.

Right. Most people are also getting divorced. Make sense now? He goes on ...

And even if they did, they might change their mind from year to year.

Then they're fickle and weak-willed. Any mission not worth committing to is one not worth having. Let them putter around until they come up with something actually worth their time.

Maybe a mission that has a year's completion date is more realistic.

A mission that can be completed in a year is a short-term goal. It reinforces a "Next-Thing-itis" mentality (per my last post, this is a BAD thing) because once that year is up, what's the next thing you're going to invest time in?

I just can't think of anything that would take a lifetime, apart from creating a family or building up an insane amount of wealth.

Missions that could take a lifetime other than pure money-making:

- Become a best selling author on the NYTimes list
- Write a show that gets produced on Broadway (one of my second-tier "missions")
- Start a non-profit that will cure world hunger
- Create a cure for cancer
- Own your own professional sports team
- Make it into the Guinness book of world records
- Another example I gave someone recently: become the best-selling yodeler of all time
- Mine: Making spiritual disciples of all nations (a long-term goal as a waypoint for this is to reach 60 countries by age 60)

You can see how some of these are legit, while others are somewhat goofy or laughable. Others are realistically unattainable. The actual destination, for women, is less significant than the journey - as long as the destination is something that will require a man to display his masculinity to accomplish it. You don't see Indiana Jones losing the girl because he didn't actually get to take the Ark home at the end of the movie.

All of these require consistent dedication, self-improvement, passion (so you don't fizzle out), leadership skills, social networking to get a team of people supporting you, etc. Most of them also require you to be generally attractive, as it's extremely hard to be successful if you're an unattractive person.

When you summarize all of this together, you realize that being mission-oriented, even toward a stupid mission, has the passive byproduct of causing you to become more attractive overall, so it's a double-hitter. 1. The mission itself

is attractive because women love supporting something bigger than themselves. 2. Pursuing the mission diligently as your top priority causes you to develop skills that are inherently attractive to women. Win-win.

For more reading, check out "[210 - Mission Matters, Nothing Else,](#)", which goes more into detail on how having a solid mission affects all of the other fundamental issues discussed on the various red pill forums.

It's the #1 topic of conversation nation-wide right now, so let's make use of the silver platter we're being given. Here are a few of my thoughts - add yours in the text below.

My Familiarity

I've done an incredible amount of research on all of this. How could I not? It's affecting virtually every aspect of my life and I want to know why.

Here's my foundation. I have a degree (college minor) in statistical methodology, as well as a major in pre-med, which helps me evaluate the validity of what I read on the internet. I have family, friends, and clients who are significantly involved in the health care industry aspect of this. For example, my mother is a medical lab technician whose job is to test people for this and other issues. I also have a client who is an owning/managing partner in 3 different hospitals. I also have a friend from church who owns his own private medical practice. I have consulted with some of these people in formulating my opinion and evaluating what I read online about this.

Is this all legit or over-blown?

My short answer: I don't know. I'm okay with not knowing. That's right, even having access to top-tier information and being educationally qualified to formulate a reliable opinion doesn't actually mean I know what the heck is going to happen any better than the next guy. Here's where I lean, but I'm ready to admit if I'm proven wrong.

- I do believe the concerns about the virus itself are overblown. I do believe the risks to most of us are very low. The death projections are great scare-tactics that boost readers/viewers/listeners and make people money, but if you look at the actual demographics of deaths relative to age or those with/without pre-existing conditions you realize that the rate of death for those under the age of 70 with no pre-existing conditions is so low that I'm not rationally worried about most of you. Of course, this doesn't mean we don't care about those who actually are high-risk. It just means we put the death risk in perspective of the many other death risks and how they fare to those of similar demographics.
- Knowing all of the statistics, my guess is that most of you should be less worried about contracting the virus itself and more worried that if you get into a car accident, or your kid falls down the stairs, or your wife goes psycho and stabs you with a knife, you're not going to have a hospital bed available because they'll be full up with people who think their mediocre symptoms are the coronavirus ... or, in worst-case scenarios, the hospital is full-up with actual patients who aren't super-likely to die, but who appropriately warrant medical quarantine and treatment.
- I don't think the concerns about the impact this will have on the economy are overblown. I have already been predicting a sharp decline in the market even before the coronavirus started tanking things. We were in the best economic boom since the roaring 20s, which was immediately followed by the great depression. The only difference now is that because of the widespread panic and lockdowns, the traditional forms of stimulating the economy are unavailable, which I expect will result in a harder crash than anyone would anticipate. My greatest hope here is that the effect of the coronavirus on the economy stabilizes before the natural economic depression would hit.
- Along with the previous point, I'm very concerned that the substantial closures nation-wide will put numerous small businesses out completely, resulting in huge drains on social welfare programs (social security, unemployment, fraudulent claims being filed for things like worker's comp, etc.). This will likely result in

artificial inflation (i.e. printing more money to meet the demand) that will reduce the value of the dollar. Given that China has already stabilized the impact of the coronavirus in their country, this will really give them an edge over America in the world economy and it will take a very long time to regain our foothold. More significantly, the dependence on social welfare programs will also increase the nation's reliance on government aid, further forcing us toward the inevitability of socialism over capitalism in America (the one hope being that the survivability of big business will give them enough of a foothold to fight against the increased dependence on governmental assistance in order to maintain some balance toward capitalism).

Rather than giving an exhaustive list, that should stimulate conversation on a number of angles.

How should a Christian respond in such times?

I've heard a number of proposed responses.

- **Fear Gospel:** One camp suggests we should use the fear as a tool to scare people into Jesus' promises of protection and provision. Of course, nobody would openly admit this is their intent, but the pragmatic reality of some of the evangelistic models I'm seeing make clear that this is what's actually going on. There's merit to this. Jesus used preaching of hell and the apocalypse as a means to call people to repentance. I'm not past this, but it's not my personal style.
- **Love and Service:** Another camp suggests we should just show acts of love and service to the community through widespread communal programs. Start a food drive for those families out of work who need to feed their kids. Donate to the homeless shelters that are likely going to get an influx of residents. Etc. This response, of course, ignores the evangelistic value in favor of building congregational rapport with the community. The effect, in my view, is more likely to lead to an increase in a congregation's brand recognition in the community more than it actually results in people being led to Christ.
- **Mystical Bubble:** A third camp offers a mystical faith, churchy-bubble approach: devote yourself even more to God and studying the Bible and prayer and he'll protect you so you have nothing to worry about. Just shun the evil world and trust the angel of death to pass by your doorframe.
- **Wisdom:** Perhaps a more balanced approach comes from those who suggest, quite simply, to trust God, whatever the results, while being wise in the way we express that trust. These people suggest that "wisdom" means taking appropriate precautions to protect yourself and your family, while making use of the few opportunities that do arise for spreading the Gospel. Many proponents of this view seem to be taking it too far to the extent that the Gospel is neglected entirely because "wisdom" would dictate that one must keep themselves safe in order to live to share the Gospel another day. But the death stats on the coronavirus don't support that conclusion, and both Jesus and the apostles, among man, many others, have modeled for us that it is better to risk your life for the sake of the Gospel than to play it safe. Remember that Epaphroditus "almost died for the work of Christ. He risked his life to make up for the help you yourselves could not give me" (Philippians 2:30).

There is some merit to each of these (and many more that I haven't listed). Personally, I think it's absurd to assume that if you have enough faith God will protect you. There are numerous examples of Christians in deadly situations that God chose not to protect. Most of the apostles were martyred. Stephen was stoned. Epaphroditus was ill and almost died - and to a degree that in Philippians 2 Paul, who had healed many people, was worried over his death. Sometimes God allows his most faithful followers to fall victim to these types of things. We have to be okay with that. But there is also some basis for recognizing the significant influence God has given to such things as prayer, fasting, corporate petition, and devotion to the mission he has given us.

Notice, of course, that most of the people who receive the strongest blessings in Scripture, amidst their troubles, are people who were 100% sold-out and committed to the mission God had given them. Are you?

So, how *SHOULD* a Christian respond to all of this? By remaining committed to the mission of making disciples, regardless the circumstances, yet being wise in the way we leverage the cultural situation for getting the Gospel into people's heads and hearts. How do we do this? Cue ...

MY RECOMMENDATIONS

As a Believer

Social distancing is pretty much the exact opposite of the relational disciple-making model Jesus presented to us. It makes it even harder to invite those into the Kingdom who really need Jesus now more than ever. So, here's my solution for using the current crisis to deepen relationships rather than losing them to social distancing, and simultaneously drawing people toward Christ.

- **Do what you want to do.** That's right. If you want to go to the grocery store, go to the grocery store. If you want to lock yourself in your house, lock yourself away. If you want to go for a walk in the park, go for that walk. If you want to participate in a community service event through your church, you go help those people!
- **When you go out, double-purpose for your neighbor.** If you're going to the grocery store, text your neighbor: "I'm headed to the store. Is there anything I can pick up for you so you don't have to risk going out yourself?" Or if you're going on that walk, "I'm heading out of the house for a bit. Anything you're curious about that you want me to keep an eye on?" Yes, participating in community-wide outreach and service events are nice, but they won't build relationships toward the Gospel the same way this approach will.
- **When you stay in, stay in touch.** If you feel confident in not being infected, now is the easiest time to have an excuse to ask your neighbor to watch that Netflix show you've been planning on binge-watching. Just make sure to stay 6 feet away while you watch. Alternatively, keep your distance but start a text chain with a few of your neighbors/co-workers/friends that you wouldn't normally text. You now have a GREAT conversation starter that everyone is interested in discussing. Make use of it.
- **Stay positive.** While many people in the world are plagued with fear, your positive frame will be incredibly attractive and reassuring to them. As you do some of the above with a positive attitude, your uplifting frame will rub off on them in a good way and possibly open doors to share the Gospel directly.
- **Don't jump the gun.** While it may be tempting, don't force spiritual conversations just because you don't want to let this pandemic come and go without sharing the Gospel. The situation is better used to develop deeper relationships that can be the vehicle for the Gospel to thrive in another; not to use the cultural context as that vehicle, which will break down as soon as the crisis goes away.
- **Don't force your views.** Some people will not agree with you. Respect the limitations of your knowledge and allow people to think for themselves. At the end of the day, I'm less concerned over whether or not someone can accurately predict what will happen with the coronavirus death numbers or the impact it will have on your nation as a whole, and far more interested in building a relational rapport with someone that can be leveraged for the Gospel later - and perhaps even sooner than you'd expect.

As a Red Pill Man

Here are a few more less (or perhaps just indirectly) spiritual things:

- **Keep having sex with your wife.** Chances are, if one of you has it, the other is going to get it whether you have sex or not, so no need to back down there.

- **Keep lifting.** Sure, you probably can't go to the gym, as many states have shut them down by now. But there are plenty of apps that let you use body weight. You can also cancel your gym membership for a time and redirect the funds toward some home equipment. Personally, I'm a big fan of my stationary bike, as it lets me double-task work, watching shows with my kids, etc. while continuing to burn calories and (to a lesser degree) work out my leg muscles. As far as apps go for body weight routines, I'm a fan of BodBot Personal Trainer.
- **Budget.** Yes, this is very hard when grocery stores are selling out of things constantly. That just makes dieting even easier, right? Save the funds, save the calories. As for your kids, they can survive on things like oatmeal, pancakes, or peanut butter, none of which seem to be the hot sellers right now, all of which are dirt cheap. Also, now is a great time to take the financial reins in your family, if you've been letting your wife manage things. She can't go to the stores like before anyway, so take the opportunity to press the reset button rather than returning to business-as-usual when this is all over.
- **Fashion.** I've failed here, but realize my need to work on this, as I write this post. It's easy to assume you can stay dressed down in lazy clothes because you're not actually likely to go in public much. But you'll be better off maintaining that higher standard. If you're working from home, dress for work anyway. If you're taking some time off, dress like you would if you have friends coming over. Maintain confidence in your appearance rather than getting lazy with it just because you have an excuse. What you do when you have excuses and cop-outs will be a good test of your character. This will show your family whether the improvements you've been making are just as show for when you're in a context to put one on, or if they're genuine internal changes that continue to apply just because YOU want to do it, not something that dies out when you have no one around to impress.
- **Pass Tests.** Chances are, your wife and/or kids are at least a little nervous about everything going on. They're going to want reassurance that you know what you're doing. It's probably good at times to act like an arrogant know-it-all when poking fun, but don't forget that at some point they're going to want a serious answer that also acknowledges you can Own Your S...elf-awareness of your flaws. In times like this, it's likely not a challenge to your authority as much as it is a cry for assurances that you're competent in managing your family through this crisis.
- **Maintain Frame.** This doesn't mean trying to convince everyone else you're right about everything, as if this would somehow get them into your frame (it doesn't; it's more akin to DEERing). It does mean maintaining that positive attitude I referenced above, paving your own way for managing your family that take into account information you learn, but also doesn't succumb to pressure just because someone else is doing it another way.

Feel free to add your own thoughts to any of these ideas and more. Think I'm wrong? Tell me about it. Have better ideas? I'd love to hear them. Any important information I've missed? Open our eyes.

23

UPVOTES

An MRP Mod makes a disciple

24 March 2020 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

For all you intellectuals who like to over-think basic concepts of relational disciple-making, [u/HornsOfApathy](#) just put up [a great post on what it looks like to informally disciple someone](#) (of course, being a secular example).

Now - I want you all to discuss principles you see in what he did that could apply to how you disciple others. A few ideas to get the conversation started: (1) organic, (2) relational, (3) being what other people want to be, (4) life modeling, (5) progress and results noticed. What do you see here? Do you see (unintentional) similarities between what he did and how Jesus disciplined people?

Have you swallowed the Red Chewable Tablet?

3 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

These are stressful times. And nobody experiences stress more than wives. I wrote 80% of this post before my computer crashed, so I'm going to skip my original introduction and hop right in.

A lot of guys right now are struggling with wives who are going crazy having the kids home all the time now. There's no school, no daycare - the daily routine and ability to keep up with housework is changed for the foreseeable future. One of our users recently commented: "The more I help the more I enable her, however the less I help the more distraught she becomes and the house becomes a place of strife instead of peace." Heck, I felt that way at one point even before all of this - and my situation is exacerbated by the fact that my wife also balances a part-time job.

The **SHORT ANSWER** is obvious: *Do what you want to do; and (1) if that means more strife, part of being a man is learning how to deal with that while maintaining frame - not just the outward appearance of frame, but the internal sense of peace about it.* This is why stoicism is so important. A man **MUST** learn to deal with difficulty in life without being emotionally phased by it. I don't always succeed, but I'm certainly always working to excel at this. (2) *Alternatively, if you want to be a more active dad to your kids, go do that too. Don't get hung up on whether or not she'll feel enabled.* The goal isn't to train her (I tried that route early in my RP days and it doesn't work). It's to be your own man and let her figure out how she's going to respond to that.

Apart from that, here are some additional insights my own experiences and observations have given me that may be of value in the conversation.

KIDS

The Nature of Women

I mentioned in a [previous post](#) that women suffer from a disease I call "Next-Thing-itis." Because the "next thing" will always require work and effort to accomplish, another way to word this is that women are always seeking out things that increase stress. That's right: **women chase stress**. Personally, I believe this to be a subconsciously desire-driven positive feedback loop for them:

- Women chase after men to help them feel better about the stressors in their lives.
- Women chase after stressors to make them feel better about the man in their lives.

This is why single women are always so boy-crazy. For them, the "Next Thing" is always related to their man: first date, first kiss, getting engaged, getting married. They believe that with increasing measure these things will add security that they'll have a man to help them get through all of life's greatest challenges - whether by physical provision, emotional support, companionship, etc.

On the flip, wives are more interested in things outside their man - buying a house, improving the yard, building a playground for the kids, building up that 401K. These things take work to accomplish and it seriously stresses a wife out when she wants them done, but they're not getting done. Often-times she'll let the stress build until she lashes out at her man just to see if he can weather the storm. And suddenly she feels good again, if he does.

And what is the easiest, most common focal point of a mother's stress? Kids. They're always on her mind, provide easy and obvious examples, and it's culturally acceptable to talk about.

The Nature of Children

An [r/RPChristians](#) user recently commented:

I can handle a tremendous amount of risk and stress while she becomes overwhelmed within a few minutes of waking when the kids argue. In the past I have tried to give her tips on how to better manage the kids but they run all over her and I believe she doesn't want the advice. When I am home their demeanor changes drastically. They are much better behaved kids because I am a stern disciplinarian while my wife is a negotiator. "Please go wash your hands and come eat lunch. Please, stop hitting your brother and go wash your hands! GO WASH YOUR HANDS! UGHH, WHY DONT YOU EVER LISTEN TO ME!" My children aren't bad kids, they are simply little sinners who manipulate, backtalk and rebel against mom who gets emotionally drained disciplining her kids. They can smell mom's weakness and exploit it.

Sound familiar? It certainly reminds me of the way things used to be in my own household years ago (and yes, it can still creep back periodically). While he puts the primary focus on the discipline issue, he only alludes to what I believe is the more significant issue: **She does not understand the true nature of children (or at least she forgets it in the moment, replacing it with her own expectations)**. Don't blame her for doing this with the kids because **you've probably done it with your wife many times through your RP journey**. This causes her to have great difficulty understanding how to interact with them. Consider:

- **Just as a man needs to understand the true nature of women to interact properly with them, so also do parents need to understand the true nature of children to interact properly with them.**

A friend of mine once commented: *Women go into relationships hoping to change their man; men go in hoping she'll always stay the same; in the end, neither gets what they want.* That's always stuck with me. It illustrates that women are always focused on what **SHOULD** be (at least to them), not what **ACTUALLY IS**. This is part of why they contract "Next-Thing-itis" in the first place. They cannot be satisfied with the present - they're always pushing for some ideal in their mind. This is true of their view of kids as well.

Now, every wife will say, "This is absurd. I don't expect my kids to be *perfect*," usually with an obviously exaggerated understanding of that word. "I really just need them to change these few small things. I don't think I'm being unreasonable here." But as soon as those few small changes are made, they'll move on to the "Next Thing" that needs changed, and so on - and they will never be satisfied until their kids actually are as close to perfect as kids ever were.

But the reality is that those kids will never be even half of what her mind would take her to if we let the "Next-Thing-itis" play out on this. **The true nature of children is that they are children, not adults. They are chaotic, mischievous, loud, manipulative, etc.** We cannot expect children to behave like adults. Sound familiar? Oh yeah: **Just as you can't expect your wife to behave like a man; don't expect your kids to behave like anything other than kids.**

You married a woman because you wanted a woman at your side. You had kids because you wanted to raise kids, not because you wanted your wife to squeeze out a 180lb athletic Harvard PhD grad from her vagina. Part of the fun of parenting is *actually parenting*.

- **Just as you had to come to your "red pill awakening" about the true nature of women, parents need to have their "red chewable tablet awakening" about the true nature of children.**

Let me be clear: embracing this true nature doesn't mean you stop expecting them to improve. After all, as a parent it's your responsibility to raise your children into responsible adults. But this doesn't happen overnight. You have to accept them *where they are right now* and not place unrealistic expectations over their behavior.

Loving Your Child

Entertain me down this rabbit trail, as I think it's relevant here. The feminist agenda strongly pushes this notion that women love their children more than men do. Consider one of my recent cases and the impact that this mind-frame had on my client's life: The parents have a baby together, they split up, Mom hates Dad (my client) and wants sole

custody. She argues:

- "Dad won't use the right nipple size on the bottle, which proves that I love my child more than him, because I pay attention to these things." The reality is: he was using the pediatrician-recommended size (which we proved) and she was using a smaller size. She explained that it was because the child had acid reflux problems and that he was being unloving to his child by not accounting for this detail in his nipple size selection. The reality is: the child only ever had one week of documented acid reflux problems 7 months before and it never showed up in any monthly checkup notes again. Mom sent literally dozens of e-mails to the Guardian (GAL) and forensic psychologist about this issue, ultimately costing my client nearly \$7,000 (not just to me) to research the medical notes, pediatrician and bottle manufacturer recommendation pages, conduct discovery on the issue, reply to numerous phone calls and e-mails, pay the GAL's and psychologist's fees to investigate the issue also, etc. ... all because Mom and the GAL wanted to condemn him for not loving his child enough to pay attention to these details (the forensic psychologist was a man and less concerned). Yes, we won the point. But how absurd is it that a guy has to pay \$7,000 just on that one issue alone in order to prove he does actually love his child!?
- "Dad doesn't buckle my child in the car tight enough, which proves that he doesn't love her enough to care about her safety in the car, but I do love her enough to pay attention to these things." I kid you not: the GAL actually conducted a surprise visit to one of the parenting exchanges, hid in the bushes to watch the child get buckled, then popped out to inspect how tight it was. It was perfectly fine. But doggone it, if mom was right and Dad didn't pay attention to pulling that strap 3.5 inches instead of 3, that could have hurt his case. How petty. He was paying 80% of the GAL's fees to investigate this complaint (because Mom was unemployed when the case started).

My original draft had more examples from the same case, but you get the point. What is it? **Women think that because they are more obsessed about details involving their children, they ultimately are better parents than men and love their kids more than men.** Personally, I think this couldn't be farther from the truth. In fact, I take the exact opposite position: **A mama bear's "protective" and obsessive attitudes toward her children unnecessarily interferes with their ability to learn, adapt, and grow from life's challenges - and this sacrifice is made only to satisfy the woman's insecurities about her kids.** Men and women alike have been raising children for millennia without nipples gradated in size for age and milk flow, without car seat straps (including after cars were invented), without foam pads to put on the corners of tables, and without hand sanitizer. I'm not saying mothers don't love their children. I'm suggesting that when they become overly detail-oriented, their love becomes tainted by their own insecurities - a trait that doesn't hinder most men from authentically appreciating their child.

Back to the True Nature of Children

Similarly, when a woman gets stressed out because her kids won't behave as she believes they *ought to* behave, she diminishes the authenticity of her relationship with them. This stress often causes her to yell at them, overly discipline them, or otherwise temporarily abandon them (the "I can't handle them anymore; you deal with them" approach).

In [u/OsmiumZulu's](#) latest post ([Most Christians Do Not Love Women](#)), he gives an appropriate example:

Imagine two men who each claim to love sports cars. One says, "I love sports cars because they can tow my boat, haul a load of wood, and fit all my dogs in the bed." The other says, "I love sports cars because of how fast they go, how quick they accelerate, and they were built to handle a windy road." Which man actually loves sports cars?

I submit that the same concept is true: that a person cannot truly love their child if their operative focus is on what they wish their child was than who their child actually is. This doesn't mean you can't want better for your kids. It does mean that you must set your expectations on their capacity to implement what you teach them at realistic

levels in light of their present maturity and the incredible amount of time it takes for a child to understand the world the way an adult does, even on singular points. **You cannot focus on one concept with a child, help them completely master that concept to an adult level, then move on to the next item.**

Yet this is what the "Next-Thing" approach with kids tries to implement. The reality is that kids will work on 90% of things in their life simultaneously and make maybe 1% improvements every month or two until after 120+ months they're finally reasonably able to apply these concepts at an adult level ... just in time for puberty and hormones to throw it all out of whack again. The "reasonable" improvements most mothers want to see in their kids immediately are really things that will likely take several months - possibly even years - for the kids to learn and implement.

This is also why I've never been a fan of the "let's work on <this> with our kids this season" approach. Having a particular emphasis on a focal point isn't a bad thing, but it's also not an effective strategy if it (even unintentionally) results in the exclusion of other things they need to be working on simultaneously.

HOUSEWORK

The other aspect of a wife's stress is often associated with housework. I don't feel like re-writing what I had on this section, so let me summarize.

Most women are stressed about housework because they overstep their bounds seeing the house as primarily theirs. Their husband just lives there. She might let him lead "the relationship," but she gets to run the house. In her mind, that's a woman's prerogative.

Contrary to popular opinion even among traditional-valued conservatives, I believe the house is still the man's domain. The fact that he may delegate to his wife certain aspects of its care and then choose not to oversee or micromanage how she does it doesn't in any way diminish the man's authority over the home. But it does give the woman the psychological excuse to usurp his authority in areas where he hasn't actually given it to her.

More to the point: this is the core of a woman's stress when it comes to managing the housework. She places more responsibility on herself than is actually on her. In reality, she fell in love with a bachelor who had his own place and managed his own home and dreamed of helping him when she got to move in to **his house/apartment**; not the guy who punts all the responsibility for its upkeep to her - with cognitive dissonance, usually because she makes every subliminal effort to usurp the responsibility she will eventually despise him for letting her take. For more reading on this, I stand by and reaffirm my first two substantive posts on MRP from nearly 3 years ago now:

- **The Biological Stepmother** - delving a bit further into the concept of women being attracted to bachelors, not a husbands
 - **Dealing with the Stressed Wife** - providing a pragmatic short-term solution to the problem
-

NOTE: In all of this, PLEASE do not walk away thinking that it's now your job to teach your wife the true nature of kids so she can have her "red chewable tablet awakening" and stop stressing so much. Don't worry so much about her. If she's interested, let her have it. But this post is more about YOU understanding what YOU're working with so YOU can make an informed decision about what YOU want to do with YOUR life in the midst of the present chaos and stresses it brings. To that end, I defer to my "short answer" at the very beginning of this post.

73

UPVOTES

Have you swallowed the Red Chewable Tablet?

3 April 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill · Archived copy · Reddit

These are stressful times. And nobody experiences stress more than wives. I wrote 80% of this post before my computer crashed, so I'm going to skip my original introduction and hop right in.

A lot of guys right now are struggling with wives who are going crazy having the kids home all the time now. There's no school, no daycare - the daily routine and ability to keep up with housework is changed for the foreseeable future. One of our users recently commented: "The more I help the more I enable her, however the less I help the more distraught she becomes and the house becomes a place of strife instead of peace." Heck, I felt that way at one point even before all of this - and my situation is exacerbated by the fact that my wife also balances a part-time job.

The **SHORT ANSWER** is obvious: *Do what you want to do; and (1) if that means more strife, part of being a man is learning how to deal with that while maintaining frame - not just the outward appearance of frame, but the internal sense of peace about it.* This is why stoicism is so important. A man **MUST** learn to deal with difficulty in life without being emotionally phased by it. I don't always succeed, but I'm certainly always working to excel at this. (2) *Alternatively, if you want to be a more active dad to your kids, go do that too. Don't get hung up on whether or not she'll feel enabled.* The goal isn't to train her (I tried that route early in my RP days and it doesn't work). It's to be your own man and let her figure out how she's going to respond to that.

Apart from that, here are some additional insights my own experiences and observations have given me that may be of value in the conversation.

KIDS

The Nature of Women

I mentioned in a [previous post](#) that women suffer from a disease I call "Next-Thing-itis." Because the "next thing" will always require work and effort to accomplish, another way to word this is that women are always seeking out things that increase stress. That's right: **women chase stress**. Personally, I believe this to be a subconsciously desire-driven positive feedback loop for them:

- Women chase after men to help them feel better about the stressors in their lives.
- Women chase after stressors to make them feel better about the man in their lives.

This is why single women are always so boy-crazy. For them, the "Next Thing" is always related to their man: first date, first kiss, getting engaged, getting married. They believe that with increasing measure these things will add security that they'll have a man to help them get through all of life's greatest challenges - whether by physical provision, emotional support, companionship, etc.

On the flip, wives are more interested in things outside their man - buying a house, improving the yard, building a playground for the kids, building up that 401K. These things take work to accomplish and it seriously stresses a wife out when she wants them done, but they're not getting done. Often-times she'll let the stress build until she lashes out at her man just to see if he can weather the storm. And suddenly she feels good again, if he does.

And what is the easiest, most common focal point of a mother's stress? Kids. They're always on her mind, provide easy and obvious examples, and it's culturally acceptable to talk about.

The Nature of Children

An [r/RPChristians](#) user recently commented:

I can handle a tremendous amount of risk and stress while she becomes overwhelmed within a few minutes of waking when the kids argue. In the past I have tried to give her tips on how to better manage the kids but they run all over her and I believe she doesn't want the advice. When I am home their demeanor changes drastically. They are much better behaved kids because I am a stern disciplinarian while my wife is a negotiator. "Please go wash your hands and come eat lunch. Please, stop hitting your brother and go wash your hands! GO WASH YOUR HANDS! UGHH, WHY DONT YOU EVER LISTEN TO ME!" My children aren't bad kids, they are simply little sinners who manipulate, backtalk and rebel against mom who gets emotionally drained disciplining her kids. They can smell mom's weakness and exploit it.

Sound familiar? It certainly reminds me of the way things used to be in my own household years ago (and yes, it can still creep back periodically). While he puts the primary focus on the discipline issue, he only alludes to what I believe is the more significant issue: **She does not understand the true nature of children (or at least she forgets it in the moment, replacing it with her own expectations).** Don't blame her for doing this with the kids because **you've probably done it with your wife many times through your RP journey.** This causes her to have great difficulty understanding how to interact with them. Consider:

- **Just as a man needs to understand the true nature of women to interact properly with them, so also do parents need to understand the true nature of children to interact properly with them.**

A friend of mine once commented: *Women go into relationships hoping to change their man; men go in hoping she'll always stay the same; in the end, neither gets what they want.* That's always stuck with me. It illustrates that women are always focused on what **SHOULD** be (at least to them), not what **ACTUALLY IS**. This is part of why they contract "Next-Thing-itis" in the first place. They cannot be satisfied with the present - they're always pushing for some ideal in their mind. This is true of their view of kids as well.

Now, every wife will say, "This is absurd. I don't expect my kids to be *perfect*," usually with an obviously exaggerated understanding of that word. "I really just need them to change these few small things. I don't think I'm being unreasonable here." But as soon as those few small changes are made, they'll move on to the "Next Thing" that needs changed, and so on - and they will never be satisfied until their kids actually are as close to perfect as kids ever were.

But the reality is that those kids will never be even half of what her mind would take her to if we let the "Next-Thing-itis" play out on this. **The true nature of children is that they are children, not adults. They are chaotic, mischievous, loud, manipulative, etc.** We cannot expect children to behave like adults. Sound familiar? Oh yeah: **Just as you can't expect your wife to behave like a man; don't expect your kids to behave like anything other than kids.**

You married a woman because you wanted a woman at your side. You had kids because you wanted to raise kids, not because you wanted your wife to squeeze out a 180lb athletic Harvard PhD grad from her vagina. Part of the fun of parenting is *actually parenting*.

- **Just as you had to come to your "red pill awakening" about the true nature of women, parents need to have their "red chewable tablet awakening" about the true nature of children.**

Let me be clear: embracing this true nature doesn't mean you stop expecting them to improve. After all, as a parent it's your responsibility to raise your children into responsible adults. But this doesn't happen overnight. You have to accept them *where they are right now* and not place unrealistic expectations over their behavior.

Loving Your Child

Entertain me down this rabbit trail, as I think it's relevant here. The feminist agenda strongly pushes this notion that women love their children more than men do. Consider one of my recent cases and the impact that this mind-frame had on my client's life: The parents have a baby together, they split up, Mom hates Dad (my client) and wants sole

custody. She argues:

- "Dad won't use the right nipple size on the bottle, which proves that I love my child more than him, because I pay attention to these things." The reality is: he was using the pediatrician-recommended size (which we proved) and she was using a smaller size. She explained that it was because the child had acid reflux problems and that he was being unloving to his child by not accounting for this detail in his nipple size selection. The reality is: the child only ever had one week of documented acid reflux problems 7 months before and it never showed up in any monthly checkup notes again. Mom sent literally dozens of e-mails to the Guardian (GAL) and forensic psychologist about this issue, ultimately costing my client nearly \$7,000 (not just to me) to research the medical notes, pediatrician and bottle manufacturer recommendation pages, conduct discovery on the issue, reply to numerous phone calls and e-mails, pay the GAL's and psychologist's fees to investigate the issue also, etc. ... all because Mom and the GAL wanted to condemn him for not loving his child enough to pay attention to these details (the forensic psychologist was a man and less concerned). Yes, we won the point. But how absurd is it that a guy has to pay \$7,000 just on that one issue alone in order to prove he does actually love his child!?
- "Dad doesn't buckle my child in the car tight enough, which proves that he doesn't love her enough to care about her safety in the car, but I do love her enough to pay attention to these things." I kid you not: the GAL actually conducted a surprise visit to one of the parenting exchanges, hid in the bushes to watch the child get buckled, then popped out to inspect how tight it was. It was perfectly fine. But doggone it, if mom was right and Dad didn't pay attention to pulling that strap 3.5 inches instead of 3, that could have hurt his case. How petty. He was paying 80% of the GAL's fees to investigate this complaint (because Mom was unemployed when the case started).

My original draft had more examples from the same case, but you get the point. What is it? **Women think that because they are more obsessed about details involving their children, they ultimately are better parents than men and love their kids more than men.** Personally, I think this couldn't be farther from the truth. In fact, I take the exact opposite position: **A mama bear's "protective" and obsessive attitudes toward her children unnecessarily interferes with their ability to learn, adapt, and grow from life's challenges - and this sacrifice is made only to satisfy the woman's insecurities about her kids.** Men and women alike have been raising children for millennia without nipples gradated in size for age and milk flow, without car seat straps (including after cars were invented), without foam pads to put on the corners of tables, and without hand sanitizer. I'm not saying mothers don't love their children. I'm suggesting that when they become overly detail-oriented, their love becomes tainted by their own insecurities - a trait that doesn't hinder most men from authentically appreciating their child.

Back to the True Nature of Children

Similarly, when a woman gets stressed out because her kids won't behave as she believes they *ought to* behave, she diminishes the authenticity of her relationship with them. This stress often causes her to yell at them, overly discipline them, or otherwise temporarily abandon them (the "I can't handle them anymore; you deal with them" approach).

In [u/OsmiumZulu's](#) latest post ([Most Christians Do Not Love Women](#)), he gives an appropriate example:

Imagine two men who each claim to love sports cars. One says, "I love sports cars because they can tow my boat, haul a load of wood, and fit all my dogs in the bed." The other says, "I love sports cars because of how fast they go, how quick they accelerate, and they were built to handle a windy road." Which man actually loves sports cars?

I submit that the same concept is true: that a person cannot truly love their child if their operative focus is on what they wish their child was than who their child actually is. This doesn't mean you can't want better for your kids. It does mean that you must set your expectations on their capacity to implement what you teach them at realistic

levels in light of their present maturity and the incredible amount of time it takes for a child to understand the world the way an adult does, even on singular points. **You cannot focus on one concept with a child, help them completely master that concept to an adult level, then move on to the next item.**

Yet this is what the "Next-Thing" approach with kids tries to implement. The reality is that kids will work on 90% of things in their life simultaneously and make maybe 1% improvements every month or two until after 120+ months they're finally reasonably able to apply these concepts at an adult level ... just in time for puberty and hormones to throw it all out of whack again. The "reasonable" improvements most mothers want to see in their kids immediately are really things that will likely take several months - possibly even years - for the kids to learn and implement.

This is also why I've never been a fan of the "let's work on <this> with our kids this season" approach. Having a particular emphasis on a focal point isn't a bad thing, but it's also not an effective strategy if it (even unintentionally) results in the exclusion of other things they need to be working on simultaneously.

HOUSEWORK

The other aspect of a wife's stress is often associated with housework. I don't feel like re-writing what I had on this section, so let me summarize.

Most women are stressed about housework because they overstep their bounds seeing the house as primarily theirs. Their husband just lives there. She might let him lead "the relationship," but she gets to run the house. In her mind, that's a woman's prerogative.

Contrary to popular opinion even among traditional-valued conservatives, I believe the house is still the man's domain. The fact that he may delegate to his wife certain aspects of its care and then choose not to oversee or micromanage how she does it doesn't in any way diminish the man's authority over the home. But it does give the woman the psychological excuse to usurp his authority in areas where he hasn't actually given it to her.

More to the point: this is the core of a woman's stress when it comes to managing the housework. She places more responsibility on herself than is actually on her. In reality, she fell in love with a bachelor who had his own place and managed his own home and dreamed of helping him when she got to move in to **his house/apartment**; not the guy who punts all the responsibility for its upkeep to her - with cognitive dissonance, usually because she makes every subliminal effort to usurp the responsibility she will eventually despise him for letting her take. For more reading on this, I stand by and reaffirm my first two substantive posts on MRP from nearly 3 years ago now:

- **The Biological Stepmother** - delving a bit further into the concept of women being attracted to bachelors, not a husbands
 - **Dealing with the Stressed Wife** - providing a pragmatic short-term solution to the problem
-

NOTE: In all of this, PLEASE do not walk away thinking that it's now your job to teach your wife the true nature of kids so she can have her "red chewable tablet awakening" and stop stressing so much. Don't worry so much about her. If she's interested, let her have it. But this post is more about YOU understanding what YOU're working with so YOU can make an informed decision about what YOU want to do with YOUR life in the midst of the present chaos and stresses it brings. To that end, I defer to my "short answer" at the very beginning of this post.

We talk a lot about living out of your own point of origin. **This guy** got confused about a couple things and it's worth a post to set things straight. Of all the things I've put out before, this is probably one that will trigger mainstream churchianity in you more than any other. I may be wrong. Test everything against Scripture. But here goes.

- **Do what you want to do, not what you think God wants you to do.**

Yikes! Sounds heretical, right? Let me explain.

Who are you?

I was once in a German Lit class in college reading the Sorrows of Young Werther. A conversation opened up on how we understand our own identity. A flood of people came in with the same viewpoint: we are what we do. "I play soccer all the time, so that's who I am: I'm a soccer player." Another said, "Well, I want to be a doctor, which is what I'm going to school for. So I'm not one yet, but after I do all this stuff, I'll become one. Right now, I'm a student."

Of course, I spoke up - and it turned out I was the **ONLY** person in the class who held this view: "No, you're not what you do. You do what you are. If you started picking up trash, would you become a garbage man as your identity or would you still long to play soccer and be a soccer player at heart?" He was confused.

A Christian girl speaks up and says, "Well, I'm a Christian. I go to church, attend Bible studies, pray, etc. And I do all of these things because I want to be a better Christian and that's what Christians are supposed to do." **WRONG!** I argued back: "Do you actually enjoy doing these things? Are they an outflow of your heart that you do because you love them, or is it a rote mechanical thing that you do to force an identity on yourself that isn't actually inside of you?" She shut up pretty fast, never answering the question. Either she didn't want to admit she was wrong about the source of her identity, or she realized that her identity wasn't actually from Christ.

Defining Your Identity

We are human beings, not human doings. We are not defined by what we do; we are defined by who we are, and what we do flows out from who we are. So, what defines who we are if we can't use our actions to change our identity?

Imagine your TV stopped broadcasting shows and instead dethroned the painting above your mantle and positioned itself as a painting instead. Is it now a painting? Would anyone walk in, see it, and think: "What a beautiful painting!"? No. It's a TV. And a broken one, at that, which would become more obvious if someone tried to turn it on to watch a show and it wouldn't. What's a broken TV good for? To be thrown in the trash. That's about it.

God created people to bear his image and glorify him. Instead of doing this, we sinned and started propping ourselves up as something other than what God created us to be. Nobody who knows human design - God, angel, or demon - would look at us and say that we **ARE** what we do in our sin. We're still fundamentally the humans God created us to be. We're just broken ... or "fallen," as the church more commonly likes to say. And what's a broken human good for/ To be thrown in the trash ... or "lake of fire," if you prefer.

Why didn't the TV become a painting? Couldn't it choose for itself what it wants to be? No. The TV manufacturer who made it gets to choose. Or perhaps we could argue the one who bought it can do with it as he pleases. If I buy a TV to use as decorative art rather than to broadcast shows to my living room, then I suppose it could be decorative art to me. But in the Christian case, the one who made us and the one who bought us are the same, so our identity comes from him. Whether we remain broken or we allow him to fix us is up to us - as long as we always remember that he's the one who has to do it, for we can't fix ourselves. This is part of the Gospel, after all.

The Direction of Sanctification

Now, this "fixing" process takes some time. Nobody decides to fix a TV and is done in a milisecond. It takes hours. Fixing a human takes much longer - and it likely won't be complete in this lifetime (unless you're one of those weirdos who believes in total sanctification ;). But no Christian denies that this "fixing" or "sanctification" process is a fundamental part of what it means to be alive.

And what is sanctification? Becoming more like Christ. Too many people think it's "stop sinning." It's not. That's repentance. Sanctification encompasses more than taking off the bad. It also involves putting on the good. The church is so hung up with defining Christians by what we don't do (i.e. "stop sinning!") that we often forget what we were actually designed TO do: make disciples. "Be fruitful and multiply" was the first operative command to humanity. If you created a TV, the first thing you're going to do is turn it on and tell it to broadcast a show to make sure it's actually working. When God said to be fruitful and multiply, that's what he was doing - telling humanity its primary function to make sure we were working properly ... and then we broke before we even got started.

Now, this whole "be fruitful and multiply" command often gets chalked up to some notion of filling the earth with physical bodies through physical generations. But doesn't the story of the flood kind of make that point moot? The conservative estimates involve the world having 10s of billions of people on the planet at the time of the flood, whereas higher-end estimates go all the way up to **10 trillion people**. Regardless, the point is: it's a lot. Certainly the command to "be fruitful and multiply" was fulfilled, right? Yet is this what God wanted? No. He wipes them all away, as if saying, "Guys, you misunderstood my point."

What was the point? Malachi 2:15 tells us clearly, "And why did the Lord God make them one with a portion of his Spirit in their union? To produce **GODLY** offspring." That's right, he was looking for spiritual life on the earth, not a reproduction of bodies of death. In the age of the Gospel, we have the ability to cause people to be "born again," multiplying spiritual life into others - and that this is the **PRIMARY** function of marriage and humanity as a whole: to fill the earth with glory-bearers. That is what it means to be human. This is the imperative of our sanctification. **If we are to be restored to what God created us for in Eden, then our primary operation will be to fill God's Kingdom with those who are spiritually alive and bear his glory and image throughout the world.** In Jesus terms, this means making disciples and teaching them how to make disciples who make disciples, etc.

Living Out of Your Internal Point of Origin

Here's where this gets somewhat weird: how do you know if that is fundamentally *who you are* from *what you do*? As we already said, we can't through our works manufacture an identity for ourselves. So, how do we know if our internal state of being (or "point of origin") is truly aligned with Christ or not?

Obviously: you do what you want to do. This will have one of two results:

1. You're going to start sinning a lot and realize real fast where you're not yet sanctified. You're also going to see that your **ACTUAL** mission is not the one you're pretending to live out through your behaviors. This will alert you that you need further sanctification and drive you back to God for the renewing of your mind into further conformity with Christ, which is possible because you are one with Christ and his Spirit is in you and will do this work. Remember, you can't fix yourself: only the Holy Spirit can do that (Galatians 3:3).
2. The alternative is, of course, that you do discover that you are actually in God's image and that your own internal passions are already oriented toward doing what he would have you do - but now you're doing it as an outflow of your heart and not out of behavior modification that you've been trained by churchianity to be your operative premise for living.

The latter became evident to me when I first went off to college. I have shared **my testimony** before about how I was the behavior-oriented "super Christian" before I actually found Christ. I would go so far as to say I wasn't even saved in those days because my impressive life "for Christ" was really a facade that I put on, believing these actions somehow proved I was more of a Christian and more Christ-like than others. I was wrong.

When I went off to college, I had a dilemma: my parents, pastor, high school friends, etc. aren't watching. I wasn't living to prove anything to them anymore. So, do I still do all the Christian things or create a new persona for myself? At first, I opted for the former and tried to put on the super-Christian act to impress a new crowd of people, but I was quickly pulled back down. When I stopped living the lie and operating to impress others with my spirituality (their frame), I was forced to come face to face with who I really was. I found my own sin, but I also found my own passion: suddenly I INTERNALLY wanted to do the same things I had been doing for external reasons for so long.

From then on, my drive to make disciples was an outflow of my internal point of origin (my frame), not something I did to impress people (their frame) with how many converts I could produce.

But at the same time, in doing this I also uncovered aspects of my character that weren't so great - like my incredible pride that I'd ignored for so long because my external behaviors didn't reveal it to me. When I started living out of my own desires it became more obvious how proud and arrogant I was about my history, and that gave me an opportunity to go to God in repentance to become something better. To let him fix (sanctify) me.

How Does Repentance Factor In?

Obviously sanctification and repentance are tied together. Repentance is something churchianity really screws up a lot. Remember [this guy I referenced above](#)? He commented:

while we're in these tainted bodies, those desires will never fully go away ... I already know the true nature of my heart, and so does most. Infact its required for repentance,a requirement for salvation

Churchianity will tell you that repentance is about behavior modification. I hope you realize now that God isn't interested in behavior modification. He is interested in spiritual transformation. Those who think like this operate on the premise (ever hear this one?): "Once an alcoholic, always an alcoholic," believing that God will never free someone from any form of addiction - that the underlying desire will always be there.

This is simply wrong. I know MANY alcoholics, cigarette smokers, (legit) porn addicts, druggies, gluttons, gamers, etc. whose desires have actually gone away to the point where the compulsion to return to their sin isn't even remotely present - even when they re-experience their past vice. I know alcoholics who can take a drink once in a while and experience ZERO temptation to drink a second one, former porn addicts who can see a popup ad click away without the thought even crossing their mind to click on it and watch, or ex-drug addicts who legit are disgusted at the thought, even when in the presence of it (tag: [/u/rocknrollchuck](#) - haven't you affirmed this in your own life?).

Proponents of this view will say things like what that same user commented: "The self- Sacrificing narrative is a biblical one, we are infact sacrifices on the altar to God." They will then define "self-sacrifice" as "setting aside our desire to do what God desires for us instead." But all of this treats God as **EXTERNAL** to ourselves. The reality is that if Christ is IN us and the Spirit is working IN us, then God is now **INTERNAL** to us.

Self-sacrifice doesn't mean sacrificing your desires in exchange for the behaviors God wants you to do. That's totally ridiculous. Jesus actually says to DIE to yourself and to "take up your cross." The goal here is not to live in a perpetual state of struggle against oneself - an impossible task. It's that your internal point of origin dies away as you become sanctified and more one with Christ so that YOU die and CHRIST lives IN YOU. Isn't that the point of Galatians 2:20? That "I have been crucified with Christ and I no longer live, but Christ lives in me"? Now Paul also clarifies that he hasn't accomplished this yet (Philippians 3, I believe), but does add: "But one thing I do: forgetting what is behind and straining toward what is ahead ... to win the prize for which God has called me heavenward," and then he goes on to talk about how he is making disciples by setting up his life as a model for others (i.e. not just about taking off the sin, but also about doing the positive things we're called to do).

This is why churchianity is so doggone bad at getting people to stop sinning and start living rightly. Because they misunderstand the internal beauty of sanctification - that our heart is actually being transformed. "I will remove

from you this heart of stone and give you a heart of flesh," right? It's not just an external behavioral change to cover over our perpetually internal evil state of being. It's that our internal state of being is in the process of becoming like Christ because we are one with him. If there are a trillion sinful inclinations in our being when we start, maybe when we die there will still be a billion. But that is sanctification - that many of those inclinations have gone, not merely that one has learned to control them.

Those who follow a behavior modification approach seem to be saying, "Repentance is when you get to keep your sinful desires, but you just choose to ignore them as much as possible." That's ridiculous. Repentance is not a mere recognition that we DO evil, but that we ARE evil, and then repenting not merely of what we DO, but of who we ARE and letting who we ARE be what gets changed.

THE BOTTOM LINE

When I say to "**Do what you want to do, not what you think God wants you to do,**" I really mean it. I want to break people free from the behavior-modification view of repentance and sanctification that churchianity puts out.

When you live purely on behavior modification, you find that the things plaguing you will never go away. It's why you still watch porn all the time - because as much as you try to modify your behaviors away from it, you can't keep up a facade forever. It's why you can't stop yelling at your kids, or drinking alcohol, or looking to get your ego stroked, etc. To overcome all of these issues you must be internally changed.

The only way you can move toward internal change is to let that which is internal to you come to light. Instead of hiding it, start expressing it. Openly. Much of the NT talks about this - especially from John. This doesn't necessarily mean inviting your Christian brothers over to watch you masturbate to porn, as if this is bringing your habit "into the light." It might mean confessing it to them ... it might not (I'm not a fan of "accountability partners" - it rarely ever works).

What it does mean is that you start openly following your own internal compulsions to figure out who you are first. Once you figure that out, you can see just how evil you are, just how much you need Jesus, and just how poorly your mission and vision for life is aligned with His.

Then, as you become sanctified and Christ's internal presence in your life, manifest through the Holy Spirit's work on your heart, your innate desires will gradually become conformed to Christ-likeness. Then, instead of hiding your evil through behavior modification, as churchianity would have you do, you will actually have the capacity to expose it (even to your own eyes), repent, be transformed and renewed in your mind about it (which will likely take some time), and BECOME better rather than merely BEHAVING better.

At the end of this process, you will not do things because God told you to. You will do them because you want to. This is why I will continue to push that a Christian should live in his own frame, not try to live in Christ's frame, as if Christ is something external. He is internal and we are becoming like Christ, even as the word "Christian" in its origin is meant to mean a "mini-Christ."

There's this view floating around that "men are visual and women are not" when it comes to sexual arousal. Some people qualify it by admitting, "Yes, women have a visual component ... but men are *moooooore* visual." However you want to slice it, the evidence I have seen seems to report otherwise. I'm going to go through a few sources and then we'll hit home on some conclusions of how to apply it all.

Yes, this is a long way to say: "Women are visual creatures too. Go lift." But there's value for some who want to know the research and theory behind the conclusion rather than just accepting conclusory statements just because someone said it.

No, the Bible doesn't weigh in on whether or not women are less, equally, or more visual in their sexual arousal patterns as compared with men. No, I'm not making any statements in here about what **should** be true about sexual arousal patterns. Perhaps that deserves another post for another day. What I am focused on here is what we observe in the sexual marketplace today - a reality that holds true for those in the church just as much as it does for those outside.

DUAL DESIRE: The Problem With Self Reporting

Before going into the research, it's important to note that many research studies on the topic of sexual responsiveness are suspect because the research relies on subjective reporting. That is, a man or woman will tell the researcher how aroused they *feel* by whatever stimuli is being presented. Some people have caught on to the unreliable nature of this method. One writer at scientificamerican.com noted:

The issue with such studies is the social and cultural baggage about sex and desire that women likely bring into a controlled laboratory environment. It's tough to get an unfiltered biological response to a sexual stimulus, especially when most studies rely on women's own reporting about their responses - which is often shaped by the burden of sociocultural influences.

Specifically, women are trained to believe that they **SHOULD** be attracted to a nice guy - someone who has a stable job, a great personality, is comfortable with himself, is warm and affectionate, has a high moral character, and will rub her feet whenever she wants, etc. But she is **ACTUALLY** aroused by guys who embody all of the things we discuss here: confident, mysterious, risky, DNGAF, lives in his own frame, etc. **The reality is that women operate on dual desires, but pretend they're the same.**

- Women are physically aroused by the bad boy.
- Women pragmatically want the benefits of being married to the nice guy.

They then conflate these two desires into a singular concept of "what I want in a man." So, when women give advice to a guy on how to attract other women, they will assume he wants marriage (players usually don't need to go to women to get advice in the first place), then usually emphasize those things that are more socially acceptable and which will highlight the benefits the women can get from marrying the guy. They won't mention wanting the "bad boy" because that would destroy plausible deniability when the hook up with one and it turns out to be a poor choice for a long-term relationship. Yet their behavior shows that their **spontaneous** (emphasis on that word to be explained later) sexual attraction is still toward him all the same.

More significantly: this conflation of types of desire (sexual v. pragmatic) explains why "scientific" studies that rely on self-reporting are ultimately *UNreliable*.

RESEARCH AND NOTES

With the above in mind, let's take a look at a few studies.

Tinder/OKCupid:

A meta study was once done on Tinder that looked at a lot of user rating data purely for looks. Yes, this study relies on self-reporting. The difference is that the self-reporting comes from real-world observation of what occurs on dating profiles rather than sterile "controlled environments," which really creates a pressure to represent one's own gender in conformity with preconceived biases. So, what did Tinder see when observing its user rating data?

The bell curve for men was exactly what you'd expect: The majority of women were rated in the middle range, and it tapered on both sides so that only a select few were rated in the lowest and highest ranges for physical attractiveness. This is normal. When rating men, however, women placed over 80% of men in the "below average" ranges of physical attractiveness. Another way to word that is: *women have irrationally high standards for physical attractiveness in a man*. This is what we call hypergamy. I believe OKCupid also repeated the same study with their dating profiles and found almost the exact same conclusions (slight number variations).

Image Test (Self-Reporting)

When I was in psychology class in college, we discussed two interesting studies. The first was from the 1980s and involved various people of various ages, genders, races, ethnicities, sexual orientations, etc. They were shown a variety of pictures and were asked to rate how the picture affected their arousal levels. Women self-reported similar levels of arousal as men. This was unique, as most previous studies (before the rise of third wave feminism) left the impression that women were less visually aroused by men. Apparently those born and raised in the wake of the 1960s sexual revolution were starting to show a different attitude toward the cultural acceptability of reporting openly on their arousal levels. That aside, this test really only sets the stage for the next one and shouldn't be given too much weight in itself, except as to confirm the more in-depth study that followed. There was also another fascinating result, but it was confirmed in the following study, so I'll defer ...

Image Test (Brain Patterns)

The above study was repeated in the 1990s, but with a unique twist. Instead of self-reporting, it measured brain patterns. The scientists showed students pornographic images and attached various nodes to them to measure brain activity to assess the location and levels of arousal centers in their brains. After that, they took the same students on a separate day and showed them in randomized order a wide variety of pictures from animals to tress, cars, landscapes, household objects, etc. Among the pictures were various images of men and women in varying degrees of sexually suggestive pics, from not at all (ex. working on a computer) to extremely suggestive (ex. naked and touching themselves). They compared the brain patterns to discern arousal rates. The order of the pictures didn't seem to show any statistically significant variances. However ...

Results? Women were **MORE** stimulated by physical imagery than the men were. However, they were also only sexually stimulated by the most physically attractive men (i.e. fat men touching themselves did nothing; a guy with a 6-pack did).

Want to know something **even more fascinating?** As confirmed by both studies: **Even the heterosexual women had larger arousal spikes looking at other women than looking at men.** That one still boggles my mind. For fairness sake, the most attractive men produced larger spikes than the most attractive women; but even the middle-ground women produced higher spikes than middle-ground men. Of course, that's not to say the heterosexual women are closet lesbians or that they would actually act on any arousal prompted by a woman; rather, it's to say (primarily) that women certainly are aroused through physical stimulation, but that their levels of stimulation by moderate or unattractive men is so low that it leaves the impression that they're not stimulated by physical appearance at all. Personally, I suspect hypergamy is at play here - that women know when a man is unattractive

because she actively compares him to other men; but because of her heterosexuality she is not comparing women to other women, and thus is able to see and appreciate the attractiveness of even the average woman rather than discarding the average woman the way she does the average man (that's just my suspicion, though).

Character Traits

Another study attached monitors to people (I believe to assess heart-rate, breathing patterns, genital responsiveness, etc.) and placed them in small-group social situations. The circumstances varied. Sometimes it was a hot girl with two ugly guys. Others it was an average girl with an ugly and a hot guy. You get the point. The same people were placed in multiple different groups to chart data from a consistent source. The real goal of the study was not to measure arousal from visual stimulation; rather it was to rule out the impact of visual attractiveness so that they could gauge the impact of arousal from other traits. One guy wore an expensive watch and would talk about his high-end job and luxury car, whereas another would be a trained improv comedian, and another was well-versed as a poet, and so on.

Know what the results of that study were? **NOTHING**. That's right: it was a big, fat, pointless "inconclusive." Now, that doesn't sound very significant. But what it does show us is that even in a study uniquely designed to measure the impact of these peripheral characteristics on physical arousal, they could not prove that women were actually aroused by them the way they said they were, when physical appearance was removed from the equation.

2019 Meta Study

In 2019 a research group looked at 61 different studies that included brain imaging and concluded that "men and women don't differ much at all in the brain pathways that respond to sexually arousing visual stimuli." This was published in the *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA*. Hamid Noori, head of the Neuronal Convergence research group in Germany commented that "the team found that being male or female contributes very little to which neural networks fire up in response to visual erotica."

Bergner and Chivers

Daniel Bergner has done a lot of research on the topic as well. One of his studies showed that women's eyes linger on erotic imagery just as much as men's do. In commenting on another researcher, he said, "Every one of Chivers' experiments shows an immediate physical response [by women] to erotic imagery, and that in itself is an indication that we've been missing something."

In another series of (self-reporting) studies, the first (and by far the oldest) involved a man and a woman asking 200 members of the opposite sex (1) for a date, and (2) for sex. Roughly the same % of men/women said yes to the date, but 75% of the men said yes to sex and 0% of the women did. *However*: another study was done where a hypothetical was presented instead of an actual person: an attractive celebrity is the one asking. Bergner notes: "What the researcher did was strip away the social stigma that's involved in casual sex and take away the reality of physical danger. And once those things were taken out of the equation, women said yes to casual sex just as often as men." Chivers did another study, changing the hypothetical to the trusted friend or stranger. The women self-reported being more turned on by the trusted friend, but their measured physiological responsiveness was significantly stronger in response to the hypothetical involving the stranger.

In short: the latest studies on the subject show no difference in the impact of visual stimuli on arousal between men and women. Moreover, women once again proved that their outward expression of what they feel they *should* be attracted to is inconsistent with their actual biological response.

Lastly: While not so much of a "study," visit [/r/WhereAreAllTheGoodMen](#). The evidence is a never-ending stream of men swapping "notes" about real women and how they represent themselves in the online sexual marketplace.

Nuances

Let's be clear: these are just various studies performed to test isolated features. They don't account for every situation. A glaring one is that **NONE** of these accounted for the impact of a man employing kino on any of the women who participated in the study. That is, they only measured **SPONTANEOUS** arousal to the images, conversations, etc. My guess is that if men were allowed to initiate actual sexual contact with these women, we'd find the women getting far more sexually stimulated by things that wouldn't stimulate her innately.

What I'm getting at here is the difference between spontaneous and responsive sexuality. It's occasionally discussed that women are primarily sexually responsive - at least insofar as the average man is concerned. This is corroborated by the studies above, which show that the average man will not cause a spontaneous sexual arousal in her. But the most attractive men **DO**. Conclusion? She's sexually spontaneous for hot guys and only reactive for ... well ... you. So, average men who are not in the top 5% of physical appearance are going to have to rely on other attributes to stimulate sexual arousal with a woman. This is where things like confidence and frame come in. Yes, they are attractive in themselves. But even more so: guys who master these concepts have no qualms initiating with a woman because they're not afraid of rejection. That initiation triggers women's sexual responsiveness, developing arousal where it otherwise wouldn't have spontaneously occurred, and therefore they get sex and the guys who are too chicken or butthurt to initiate with a woman get nothing, unable to generate spontaneous arousal and also refusing to provide initial stimulation for her to respond to.

What About the Other Stats?

There are too many other stats to address entirely, though the majority of them can be written-off as being based on self-reporting (which I've shown actually provides conflicting results, not counter-results). Some which rely on brain scans (Noori's, for example, if you research his 2004 and 2014 studies) have been explained as being extremely nuanced, giving significance to micro-variances that aren't reflected in larger scale reviews. One of Noori's own co-authors came out and acknowledged, "For the majority of the brain, the neural response was actually similar between men and women" and that the variances were only in "a few small structures."

The majority of the remaining data is statistical in nature, such as the claim that only 1/3 of porn users were female (instead of 50%), or the fact that Playgirl was ultimately a huge flop among women (primarily finding its success among homosexual men). These types of variances are easily understood when one accepts women's tendency to conform to cultural norms. That is, if women believe it's not normal or appropriate for women to watch porn or buy a Playgirl, they're going to be less likely to do this. It's not surprising, then, that the percentage of women relative to men who are engaged in these activities has been rising consistently with cultural approval of open female sexual expression. That is, culture may not approve of men using porn so much, but it accepts it as the reality; culture does approve of empowering women toward the use of pornography, but it's not yet embraced as *normal*, and therefore the majority of women haven't yet embraced it, but those who do are increasing as it becomes more normal.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Lift. If sex is important to you, your physical appearance is important to you. That's not to say this should be your primary reason for lifting, but better sex and hotter women sure does provide some nice support to your pre-existing internal motivation (you do have that, right?).
2. Don't discount the importance of physical appearance to female sexuality, so go lift some more.
3. If you want your wife to initiate with you (i.e. become spontaneously sexual), do things that highlight your top-quality physical appearance in a sexually suggestive way. This could be the clothes you pick out for the day, knowing when to take your shirt off and when to keep it on, your physical presence around the house, not being afraid to move your body (dance, swagger, etc.) while you're getting stuff done, etc.
4. If you're not a top-tier looker, stop expecting her to be spontaneously sexual toward you and start driving home your married-man game: confidence, frame, kino, teasing, etc. Give her something to respond to. Hike up those

feels.

5. If you wallow up in self-pity over how ugly you are, and therefore think you'll never have a happy sex life because you'll never be visually appealing to a woman, just remember: some of the best PUAs are slightly overweight, short, and in one case, even legitimately on the autism spectrum. This is not a post meant to enable those who take a "woe is me" reaction. It's to give you a hard dose of reality about the sexual marketplace, why your marriage may not be going the way you want, and why it's so doggone important to lift.

NOTE: No, I don't still have my college psychology textbook - though for this purpose I do wish I'd saved it, as I've referenced a few of those studies a number of times before. The Tinder/OKCupid stuff is easy to look up, as well as a few of the others. [r/WhereAreAllTheGoodMen](#) is, of course, a never-ending supply of evidence from the online dating world that shows just how looks-oriented women are.

There still seems to be some confusion about this subject, so let me break it down for you.

OVERARCHING GOAL

This is the broadest level of understanding your purpose. When a nation takes action, its overall purposes are broad: to keep its citizens safe, develop economic success, and (on occasion) improve the world. God's overarching goal is that he be glorified (1 Cor. 10:31) by building a kingdom for himself (entire Bible). This is what he asked Adam and Eve to do when he commanded them to fill the earth with godly offspring (Genesis 1:28; Malachi 2:15) - it's what he did through Abraham (Genesis 12:2), and what he did through Jesus and the Church (Philippians 2:10-11; many of Jesus' teachings on the Kingdom of God), and it will be complete in heaven (Revelation 20).

MISSION

A mission is a sub-task that drives forward the overarching goal in some way. It is the broadest way that an individual person can understand their contribution to the overarching goal, and big/valuable missions will involve teamwork. This is like a General who orders one battalion to complete one mission on the battlefield, such as demolishing a communications array. It's not the only mission in play, but it's the only one that battalion should worry about. While God has many avenues for building his Kingdom, the Church has its standing orders: make disciples (Matthew 28:19-20). If you are part of the Church, this is your mission also.

When we talk about mission, we tend to over-personalize it and blend it with your calling and vision. Why? Because if it's not personal, you won't follow-through. Plus, it's too confusing to use three separate words all the time, so we lump them all under the general word "mission." But let's break it down for now so you can understand the additional components of your mission.

CALLING

Your calling is the context in which you will fulfill the mission. Once the battalion gets its orders, the leader has to decide how best to fulfill it. Suppose the order is to destroy an enemy communication base. He may say to Adam, "You're great with demolitions. You place and prepare the bomb." He may say to Bob, "You're great with transport. It's your job to get Adam to the communications array." He may say to Carl, "You need to lead a team of ground troops to protect Adam and Bob." Then he'll say to Dave through Zeek, "You're part of Carl's team." These are all individual callings within the scope of the mission. The commander is the one who calls these people into their positions, but they also voluntarily chose based on their own skills and interests which areas they would specialize in, which makes it obvious to the commander what call to make.

God says to some, "You're really good at teaching. I want you to find people among your students to disciple." To another, "You're excellent in the art of hospitality. I want you to invite people into your home to disciple them." And to another, "You're gifted in how merciful you are. Go find those experiencing tragedy and show them mercy, then disciple them." These are where Spiritual gifts come in. Your career can play into this too, but it doesn't have to - and too many men want to pretend their career should be a bigger part of the mission than it actually should be. Don't get too hung up on any one thing, unless you're pretty certain what your gifting and calling already are. If not, keep an open mind.

VISION

This is the specific of how you see yourself accomplishing the goal. Once Adam is given the task of blowing up the communications array, he's going to be processing, "What explosive will work best? How many do I need? Where should I place them? etc." Carl will be thinking, "I've got to protect that transport, so how do I position my men? Which gear should we take with us? Where do we anticipate the enemy to be positioned? Do we focus on defense or taking out their offense? If x situation happens or y, how will we respond?"

You ever see Boondock Saints? Fantastic movie. Remember how Willem Defoe would close his eyes, turn on some music and see what must have happened at the crime scene? He could envision the past. Your vision is of what WILL happen in the future - in your own life (God-willing).

This is why a generic goal to "change the world" or "make disciples," in itself, is worthless. You'll note around here that even when a guy tells me his mission is to make disciples, I usually follow up - "Great. How are you going to do that?" Yes, your vision will fluctuate over time. Your interests will change. Circumstances will cause you to have to pivot. That's okay. Just make sure you're actually envisioning something you can follow through with and not setting out some generic goal that will get posted on your wall and 10 years go by before you think, "Oh yeah, I should probably get around to that."

MY APPLICATION

I'm not saying you have to adopt my understanding of these concepts. I'm just giving this as an example of how I've processed all of this information for my own life:

Overarching Goal: Glorify God by building a Kingdom for him.

Mission: Advancing the Gospel into the nations through spiritual generations flowing from my life, training those future generations to live and disciple among the lost as I model for them.

Calling: I have been given specific spiritual gifts in the areas of teaching and apostleship, and have become skilled in the areas of intelligence and developing/executing a broader framework for accomplishing God's purposes.

Vision: To build a network of discipler-making ministries throughout the world. Long-term mile-marker: 60 countries, 60 discipler-making ministries, by 60 years old. No, this is not a legalistic end for me. Yes, it's a high bar to keep me active - even if I miss it, I will have succeeded significantly.

Mile-Markers Within My Vision

- 2020 - Disciple 3 guys: 1 overseas, 1 from my home congregation, 1 other. Myself and my wife to build a relationship with my local congregation leader and his wife/kids. Lead a small group session.
- 2021 - Discipling 3 guys, as above. My family has a role of influence in my local congregation. My wife and I lead a small group session.
- 2022 - Discipling 3 guys: 1 overseas, 2 from my local congregation. Start a discipler-making team within my congregation. My wife and I lead a small group session. My wife begins discipling another woman.
- 2023-24 - Discipling 3 guys, as above. Establish a second discipler-making team led by someone in the first group (not me); I disciple him. Wife and I lead a small group session. My wife discipless another woman.
- 2025-34 - Discipling 3 guys: 2 overseas, 1 local. Begin developing interest in other congregations with what I'm doing in my home congregation. Wife and I lead small groups. My wife becomes seen as a valuable consultant for women's ministry.
- 2035-44 - Discipling 3 guys: 1 overseas, 1 locally, 1 ministry leader. Retire into full-time ministry. 1 home congregation; actively training other congregations. Wife and I actively training small group leaders. Wife seen as valuable consultant for women's ministry.
- 2045-54 - Same as above, except actively training full-time missionaries
- 2055-74 - Same as above, except all 3 guys I disciple should be ministry leaders

That's my "life mission" category. My spreadsheet breaks down other categories the same way: fitness, finances,

career, family, hobbies, friends. All of this is, of course, "God willing." I don't know what will happen tomorrow. These views can change - but NOT due to laziness. They change when they become physical impracticable or inferior to a superior alternative that arises.

You'll notice in all of this: reddit is not included. What I do here is a hobby that has become a convenience to finding guys I disciple. It is inferior to the things I do IRL. I never want this to become my primary ministry. I encourage you all to take a similar view. But that doesn't mean I will neglect you, if I otherwise have time.

You'll also notice that I include my wife in my mission. I'd suggest she's even a vital part of it. If she doesn't cooperate, I can pivot my vision and proceed without her. But you can see that her contribution will be a great asset to accomplishing the goals I have set - being goals I hope and expect were influenced by God's Spirit. I encourage everyone here to contemplate if you view your wife as a **HELPER TO YOUR MISSION**, or if she's just the helper around the house so you can go do your mission alone.

If the latter, why do you have a house and family in the first place? It's circular to say, "I want a wife so I can have a family," and then when you have the family you say, "That's why I needed a wife." This is a fast-track to having a disgruntled spouse. You think Indiana Jones' girl would be content to sit around the house changing diapers and doing dishes while he quests for the Ark? Of course not. Yes, she can change diapers - but she also wants to know that she has a vital role to play in what he's doing. Give her that role. Let her be your helper and not just your fan.

YOUR ACTUAL MISSION

If you find yourself setting a mission, but doing relatively little to accomplish it, then **IT'S NOT YOUR MISSION**. Your mission is based on your **CONDUCT**, not your words. Look at what you're **DOing** with your life, not what you **SAY** you'll do with your life.

With that in mind, if you say your mission is to "make disciples" (as a lot of people have finally caught on to here), but your day-to-day life is full of going to work, fixing up your house, eating dinner, doing something with your kids, then going to bed ... then your mission isn't to make disciples. It's to live the "American dream." Because that's exactly what you're striving for.

So, before you start getting hyped up about your mission *statement*, take a look back at the last 4 weeks of your life and ask: *Am I actually making disciples or am I pursuing the American dream with how I spend my time?* Yes, it's possible to do both. But more often, one comes at the exclusion of the other. You cannot serve two masters.

In this situation, it's usually your vision that's lacking. You don't see how you can work toward making disciples today, much less tomorrow, or 5 years from now. You just assume it will happen. It won't.

BUT I CAN'T BECAUSE ... REASONS

There's a reason I told you to look back at the last 4 weeks, in particular. Too many people want to give "social distancing" as their excuse for not making progress. There are no excuses. Do you think that battalion trying to destroy the communications array would suddenly postpone their mission indefinitely because the enemy doubled their guard around the entrance they intended to take? No. They'd find another way. There are no excuses.

The mission is critical. The time is now. The lost don't have eternity to figure this out. Do you really love them? Forget your excuses. There are no good excuses. If you're alive, you're to make disciples. Your vision for how that will happen might change because of whatever "reasons" you think are out there. But the mission remains.

Paul was very clear in Phippians 1 - "I desire to depart and be with Christ, which is better by far." That is, he would personally be better off dead and in heaven. "But it is more necessary for you that I remain in the body."

Translation: The only reason he's still alive is because he has people to train up. "Convinced of this, I'm certain I

will remain and will continue with all of you for your progress and joy in the faith." Are you helping anyone progress in the faith? If not, what's your "*reason*"? That's right. You don't have one. I don't want to hear it. Now go.

Is compatibility essential (or even useful!) in a marriage? No, not really.

26 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

This is a fantastic question recently raised - and one I'm surprised hasn't been brought up in any substance before. Let's look at what the Bible says and follow that up with some common sense that our modern culture has over-thunk itself out of.

BIBLICAL PRECEDENT

Everyone should have 2 Cor. 6:14 memorized by now, it's quoted so often here: "Do not be yoked together with unbelievers." But have you kept reading? *"For what do righteousness and wickedness have in common? Or what fellowship can light have with darkness? What harmony is there between Christ and Belial? Or what does a believer have in common with an unbeliever? What agreement is there between the temple of God and idols?" In short, when it comes to saved v. unsaved, the two are *so drastically incompatible that compatibility actually matters.*

Okay, beyond salvation, how important does God view the issue of compatibility? Let's start with the history of marriage throughout Scripture and see where we go.

First, there's Adam and Eve. God creates Eve to be his helper. Eve is created in Eden to be a suitable helper for Adam. The imperative here is that any "compatibility" is for the designed purpose of fulfillment of the mission for which she was to help - not that they shared common interests. There wouldn't even have been any interests on the first day of creation to know to vet for in the first place. Moving on.

After that, the next story of substance we have of biblical couples finding marriage is Isaac and Rebekah. Abraham orders his servant to find a wife for Isaac in another town so Isaac doesn't have to marry one of the local Canaanites. He asked God that she at least be someone who would give a drink to a stranger and his camels. The first girl who came along (Rebekah) did just that. Was compatibility at issue here? The only "compatibility" requirement was that she not be a Canaanite - and even Isaac didn't have a say in that aspect, as that command came from Abraham.

The next one is Jacob, who fell in love with Rachel because of her beauty. He got a bad case of ONEitis. He had to marry Leah first, then he got to marry Rachel, then eventually each of their servants. There's no mention of actual compatibility with Rachel, other than the assumption that they stopped sleeping together (and that even before he married their servants). This is evident from her demand that Jacob "Give me children, or I'll die!" As in, "Why won't you sleep with me anymore?!?" Of course, Jacob gets angry with her because he really didn't want to and didn't believe it would help, so she says, "Fine, sleep with my servant instead." Yeah, this sounds like they were real compatible. He also was obviously not all that thrilled about marrying Leah either. By the time the servants came into the picture, I imagine Jacob was really just interested in having more women under his sheets, so he went along with it. Sure enough, despite the obviously tense situation in the whole household, God blesses the situation and gives Jacob 12 children who became the 12 named forefathers of the tribes of Israel. Compatibility didn't seem to be necessary for the fulfillment of God's blessings here.

Somewhere along the way comes Ruth and Boaz. He basically sees her out in the field and finds her attractive. She sees a good man who can provide for her and sleeps with him (presumably non-sexually). There's no mention of shared interests here, other than that he liked growing things and she liked taking from what other people were growing.

Then comes David. Michal seems to think he's a great catch, even though he was poor and couldn't pay a bride price. Instead of money, Saul asks for 100 Philistine foreskins, and David was interested in Michal enough that he got Saul 200 instead, presumably to prove his desire for Michal. One could assume they thought each other a compatible match (though that's stretching it), but it ultimately doesn't matter, as their marriage ends very poorly, with the presumption that David stopped sleeping with her to focus on other women. Cue Bathsheba - the girl _____

David hooked up with before murdering her husband to hide their adultery. This was a marriage of lust. While God condemned the act, he also blessed the marriage and had Solomon be born from her.

After him is Solomon. While he does share a lot of general wisdom, he also had hundreds of wives and concubines. It's hard to say if any of his marriages were particularly successful. At best, we can suggest that the lustful attraction to his beloved in Song of Solomon is honored. Yet again, there is little reference to compatibility.

There are also laws on the books that if a guy raped a woman or (with mutual consent) took her virginity, he was legally obligated to offer to marry her, at which point her father would decide if the marriage would go through. This would seem to be the opposite of compatibility, yet it's God's law to the Israelites all the same.

Generally, there's enough information throughout the books of the law to figure out that most of Israelite culture involved arranged marriages for familial convenience, not out of love or dating to assess compatibility between the bride and groom. At best, we could say that the only actual "compatibility" requirement was that

While marriages are referenced in the New Testament, there's no information that any of them - Joseph/Mary, the wedding where Jesus turned water to wine, etc. - were based on compatibility, arranged marriage, etc.

Jesus and Paul both encourage people who can avoid marriage to do so (Matthew 19; 1 Cor. 7). Paul elaborates on this that the only time he actually encourages marriage is if the two can't keep their hands off each other and they'd "burn" if they don't get married (I've always found humorous [u/BluePillProfessor](#)'s note of the possible double-entendre here, as the "with passion" part is an editorial addition). Paul didn't say to look for someone compatible to marry; he said to avoid looking for someone to marry, but if you're so horny toward each other, that's the best time to start thinking of marriage.

Conclusion: Other than the requirement that both people be of God's Kingdom, compatibility is never referenced as a thing to look for in a potential spouse or successful marriage. In fact, it's curiously absent in a number of marriages that God seemed to bless anyway.

COMMON SENSE

Define Compatibility

You can't. You can give dictionary definitions, but what it means in a pragmatic sense is left wide open. Let's look at the dictionary definition:

- "A state in which two things are able to exist or occur together without problems or conflict."

Sure, if you want to define "compatible" this way, then compatibility would be a useful asset in a marriage - though not necessarily to perfection. A little conflict is good. It breeds emotion, which keeps passion alive. Compatibility, in itself, is often boring. But let's look to the more practical consideration: *How can you ever know if you're compatible with someone under this definition?* You can't ... at least not until years after you're married. Because you can't know if you'll co-exist "without problems or conflict" until you actually co-exist (unless you move in together before marriage, which is best left for another day).

Moving on from the dictionary definition, the common use of the word is even less useful. People say they're compatible if they have the same shared interests. Others think it means that you have personalities that, while different, blend well together. Others mean you have the same core values and aspirations in life. So, how important is compatibility? I can't even answer the question until I know which you're talking about. But even then, the answer is most likely going to be simple: *It's as important as you want to make it.* Personally, I don't think it's important at all. Why not?

Back to the Bible

For a brief interlude, let's look back at Genesis. God creates Eve out of Adam to be a helper for him. That is, God

designs Adam for a God-given purpose; and then he designs Eve for an Adam-given purpose ... which, of course, is her God-given purpose, vicariously and directly - (1) vicariously in that God gave Adam his purpose that she's to help on; and (2) God also directly gave her the purpose of helping her husband. Long story short, a successful marriage is defined not by the levels of the happiness of the couple, but by their utility toward the purposes for which God united them in marriage (which is to make disciples - Malachi 2:15, etc.). Because of this, God designed women to mold to their man's purposes. This is why we often see that many women (yes, I'm over-generalizing in modern culture) tend to struggle to have hobbies of their own, but quickly adopt the hobbies of their husbands, either as direct participants or as sidelined cheerleaders. It's why literal cheerleaders exist in the first place, for that matter ... at least until some feminist somewhere decided it needed to be about female empowerment and competition rather than supporting their men on the field, or even their community pride.

The point is: if God designed women with an innate desire to mold their life direction and interests to the men they find most attractive (which is one of their tools for keeping an attractive guy around), then it doesn't really matter whether you have:

- ... **shared interests**, because those interests will conform to the man they want to be with. That's not to say women won't maintain independent interests. They will. But, on the whole, they are excited to adopt their man's interests also, if they find the man attractive and they want to be with him. The only broad-scope reason a woman wouldn't want to engage in her man's interests with him is if her attraction level toward him is lower than her interest in the activity he wants to do. Either he's unattractive, and therefore she's not motivated to do much of anything with him; or he's attractive, but the activity is so repugnant to her that she's still not interested ... though [Deep's Brad Pitt post](#) shows that even this is still all part of sliding scale and would be flexible if he was hyper-attractive.
- ... **well-balanced personality traits**, because as someone designed to be a helper, God created her to be able to fill in the gaps where her husband needs them. No, this isn't executed naturally in every marriage. But it is played out wonderfully in every biblical marriage. I have yet to meet a godly couple where the wife would not be gleeful to share all the ways that she helps cover the things that her husband doesn't have time, attention, or awareness to address - and a man who isn't ultimately glad that she does this.
- ... **core values and aspirations in life**, because the wife's God-given purpose is to pursue the mission God gave him, therefore becoming God's mission for her. To say she wants to pursue her own values and aspirations separate from the ones he discerns from God to set for the marriage is to suggest that she knows better for her life than God knows for her. This, of course, is more difficult when you have someone whose values and aspirations are *not* coming from God - but even 1 Peter 3 says she should submit to such a man's leadership ([which I've already written on before, and won't do so again here](#)).

People Change

Of course, the real common sense reason for ignoring "compatibility" is that people change. You can't ever predict what someone will be like in 10 years in the absence of you molding them during those 10 years. And if you're the one molding them, then who they are today is a lot less significant than who you're going to help them become tomorrow. This is, after all, the essence of discipleship and why Jesus was willing to die, even while he knew we were still sinners (Romans 5:8). **Can you imagine if Jesus used "compatibility" as a standard before making us any part of his bride?** - other than that Jesus was of the faith of Abraham, and therefore of "spiritual Israel" just as the Church also is (per Romans 9), and therefore the ONE area of necessary compatibility is satisfied.

I love my brother's comment shortly after he got engaged: "I wish I knew in high school how unimportant liking the same music was in a relationship." He literally only dated girls who liked the same bands as him. Idiot. My wife also once commented that when she was a kid she thought, "How are my aunt and uncle ever going to be happy in marriage? One is a [sports team 1] fan and the other is a [team 2] fan! How did they ever get married?"

See how juvenile those thoughts are? Yet the world still thinks this is true - that if you don't like the same things it will never work. It's laughable.

Working the Change

As a brief note, make sure you're actually giving her something to change into. Women WILL change no matter what you do. Period. It's a fact of life. Some basic aspects of their character may stay the same, but at the end of the day, they all have **Next-Thing-itis**, and that "Next-Thing" is what will keep them changing and always evolving. This isn't a bad thing - it can often even be a good thing! But it's a consistent thing, nonetheless.

With that in mind, if you're already "compatible" in the sense of being perfectly aligned with each other, there are only two ways this can go:

1. She's going to change away to be less compatible with you, or
2. You're going to keep changing to give her something to keep changing toward as well.

In the first instance - the one where you're not going to change, as a man - you're better off finding someone you're **NOT** compatible with, as that will at least buy you some time with the chance that her inevitable changing will eventually mold to who you are today. But this is only postponing the inevitable, even for the most attractive men.

In the second instance - the one where you're constantly changing as a man - you're either (1) changing for the worse and she's going to want to deviate away anyway ... because who wants to mold into the likeness of a rapidly deteriorating person? or (2) you're constantly improving yourself and giving her something to try to improve toward as well.

Which option do you prefer?

Two notes:

- First, obviously this is ultimately a post about discipleship. Disciple your wife! Single guys, be prepared to disciple the girl who catches your eye! Stop looking for a "perfectly compatible unicorn" and expect to have to disciple her.
- Second, also obviously: just because you shouldn't look for/expect compatibility doesn't mean you can ignore red flags. Having standards is necessary and appropriate.

Edit to Add: My wife and I are about the most incompatible couple I'm aware of. I've shared my story before about how she admitted years into our marriage that she lied about many facets of her personality and interests in order to get me to marry her, making us far less compatible than I had thought. I also started studying M-B typology late into our marriage and discovered that an ENTP (me) married to an ISFJ (her) not only has no personality trait in common - many message boards were saying (including from licensed marriage counselors) it was the worst possible combination for marriage in existence, often suggesting people to divorce and run away before you get too far down the rabbit hole to turn back. I believed these things would be problems and challenges for us for a long time - and, in fact, they were (when I wasn't focusing on taking care of myself and working my mission). Once I got myself pointed in the right direction:

- My wife, while being a 98% I is actually the one who coordinates play dates with other moms, invites people over for dinner, connects people in the neighborhood, etc. - all very E traits.
- While being a 58% S, instead of focusing on the details all the time, she's learned to look for patterns and threads between concepts, keep an eye out for the bigger picture, and plan events and activities from a bird's eye

view rather than getting muddled down into the details too early - all very N traits.

- While being a 92% F, she now opens difficult conversations with rational arguments rather than emotional whining and complaining, and when she finds herself getting flustered throughout the day she can stop and remind herself of good things that are going on in life as well to direct her feelings through rational thought rather than the other way around - very T traits.
- As a 76% J, she still loves being organized and planning things in detail before getting started, or following the recipe exactly when cooking; yet she also recognizes that she EVEN MORE loves it when I throw all her planning out the window and spontaneously come up with better, more fun things to do or ways of doing things she had already planned to do - a bold embrace of the P.

No, M-B typology is not the focus here. My focus is that even a woman's core personality traits will ultimately mold to her man's - if not to adopt them completely herself, then at least to appreciate them and embrace them as her way of doing things too. To everyone who says an ENTP and ISFJ are incompatible and should never be married - now I just laugh because why did I ever think blue pill marriage counselors would ever have good advice in the first place?

Refreshing words and an encouragement to start conversations

28 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

Many of you know my passion for uprooting the churchianity structure we have today. I don't believe it is in any way compatible with the mission of the Church that Jesus gave us. Maybe it's better to say that it COULD be, but that we have dug ourselves in so deep a rut, that rather than shoveling the rut to move in a new direction, we're better off just getting out of it entirely. As long as the existing structure is maintained, people will expect the same activity and results that structure has always put out and will never be willing to put in the work to get a more Christ-like foundation for activity and the biblically promised results of 30, 60, or even 100 times what was sown.

Instead, my view is that discipler-making must exist independent of the congregational structure's authority, just as Jesus generally ignored the authority of the religious structures of his day, constantly rebuking the Pharisees rather than focusing all of his efforts on trying to change them. Instead, he largely ignored the religious leaders and focused his greatest efforts on commoners, like the 12. This grass-roots momentum Jesus modeled is ultimately how I believe we will bring Jesus's model back to the Church (capital C) today. That's not to say we can't utilize the work congregations have already done in pooling people together for us - and because of this I will continue to be a part of one. But my goal will always be to make disciples of the people, not to adapt the congregation itself.

Nevertheless, some moments, like this past Sunday, still give me some hope - and I believe the present time of the coronavirus lockdown gives a unique opportunity to initiate a change where one would have been impossible of the previous inertia of congregations had been permitted to continue. Specifically, I've texted off and on with my pastor about the difference between pursuing the MISSION of the Church rather than the growth of congregations. In his most recent (online) sermon, he seems to have caught on:

- "I personally empathize with the pain, the grief, the frustration, the anger that this season has brought - including myself. But I'm not convinced that 'normal' was working."
- "I think there is within this time the opportunity for us to lean into the creation of a new normal. I don't know how or what will change on the other side of this season, but I do know this: that I want to change in the midst of this season so I come out on the other side better, stronger, and more equipped."
- "I do know that right now ... that I'm a better dad than I've ever been. I'm a better husband right now than I've ever been. My wife would probably agree ... I'm a better friend ... a better pastor."
- "I'm thinking more about the mission of the church and less about the expansion of the church ... less about how we just keep on keeping on."

Fantastic. This isn't the first time he's directly referenced our conversations in his messages. I expect it won't be the last. But I'm more encouraged at the imperative toward change and improvement and ultimately the drive to place the mission over the structure. Baby steps for now. I can see the full-on sprint coming alongside the last few pastors I'd red-pilled (we've only barely touched on the feminization of the church, so there's still a long way to go).

Also on Point - Here's something else I'd written earlier in the lockdown season (addressed to a different, non-red-pilled audience), which adds to the point.

Many congregations are struggling to decide: "Do we keep meeting or not?" No, I'm not going to answer that question. Instead, I suggest it's the wrong question in the first place.

I'm disheartened to read on Facebook, Reddit, blog articles, hear on the news or from friends, etc. that as soon as Sunday services were shut down, the mainstream church's entire disposition ever since was focused on one

operative question: "How can we get our Sunday services back!?!?" as if this is somehow the most important thing the church should be figuring out right now.

Some outright disregard social distancing and continue to meet in-person anyway - either in large groups or small ones. Others are doing drive-in services. Another sect honors social distancing and has found virtual ways of recreating Sunday services either through live simulcasts, pre-recorded messages, or video conferencing. Regardless of their disposition toward social distancing, the universal imperative seems obvious: "We need our Sunday services back!"

This would be fine if Jesus had ascended and said, "All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me. Therefore, go and get all nations to attend Sunday services." If I'm missing that verse somewhere, help me find it! (No, Hebrews 10:25 isn't a reference to attending a weekly service.)

The way mainstream congregations idolize the Sunday service structure is truly saddening to me.

Don't get me wrong. It's a FANTASTIC tool/resource. I encourage everyone to make use of weekly services whenever possible (in more ways than you may realize!). But the services themselves are still just that: a tool - and one that's not even being utilized as efficiently as it could be, in many cases. These services are not the operative mission of the Church (capital C).

Plumbers have a fascinating, highly useful pipe cutting tool. You ever see one? They're really handy. I couldn't imagine how hard it would be as a plumber if they didn't have one. It's really quite necessary to *many* jobs (though not all). But can you imagine if a plumber loved this tool so much that it's all he ever talked about? Every job, he'd find a way to use it. Instead of that wrench to turn the nut, he pulls out that pipe cutter and starts toying around. He won't get very far, but he's okay with that as long as he gets to use his tool.

Of course, when the client complains about his kitchen flooding because the plumber cut a pipe that didn't need to be cut, he just say, "Oh, you're just mad because you don't understand how awesome this pipe cutting tool is. If you had one yourself and worshiped it the way I do, you'd realize that it's so great you won't care that your kitchen is flooding." Such a plumber might even get to the point of forgetting that wrenches actually exist! Or maybe he'll remember, but they're so side-lined in his mind compared to that pipe cutter that he views wrenches as archaic tools relative to what plumbers should REALLY be doing today. So, we don't need wrenches anymore.

You all know that my life's passion is making disciples. Actually, I got it from Jesus. It's really his passion. It's what he spent the bulk of his active years doing. It's what he commissioned the apostles to do. It's what the Holy Spirit has assisted the church in doing since the beginning. The Sunday service structure is a FANTASTIC resource for assisting in the disciple-making process. But it DOES NOT make disciples in itself. In fact, the current model we use for Sunday services didn't even exist for the first few hundred years after Jesus rose. I can't wait until we can resume services under more normal conditions, but the lack of services will have NO NEGATIVE IMPACT on my active daily ministry for Christ.

Let me rephrase that: I love weekly services, but I don't need them; I can serve Christ as completely without them as I can with them.

When COVID-19 caused the world to shut-down, my initial sincere hope was: "Finally! Congregations will have to rediscover the mission of making disciples rather than the mission of filling pews. Pastors will have to take a hard look at ecclesiology and rediscover God's mission for the church and figure out how to live it out in this new context now that they are forced to set aside their comfortable patterns."

I was wrong. All I have heard across the nation is a resounding: "We want our Sunday services back!" and congregation leaders are going to great lengths to find creative ways to make this happen. This is nothing short of idolizing the tool over the mission and the one who gave it to us.

Seriously: I don't see nearly as much emphasis from the service-attending community right now on spreading the Gospel as I do on Sunday services - whether in the form of complaining that they can't be in person, or in talk about

how great it is that their congregation has found an innovative way to recreate it while honoring social distancing. Even before social distancing, I was already writing articles on my observation that I am hearing Sunday service attenders cry out "I love my church!" more than "I love Jesus!" This is bizarre and is turning CHRISTianity into CHURCHianity. Be extremely cautious that you don't tread in this direction.

If I'm right, what do we do with this? I encourage everyone to the following:

1. Study up on the way Jesus disciplined his 12, which didn't revolve around weekly gatherings. Emulate with others in your life the way Jesus oriented his time with his 12. If you need resources for figuring out how to do this, let me know and I can point you to some things that have been helpful to me.
2. In furtherance of #1, use the time that you're unable to meet corporately to start building individual relationships (with both believers and non-believers; whether from your congregation or not) in ways that you wouldn't have before - and also with people you wouldn't have before. Let these relationships start the foundation of something that can turn into an evangelistic or discipleship relationship as it grows. I find that most people today are excited to receive contact from others, but are too insecure to initiate it. Be the one to initiate it!
3. Continue to practice your convictions regarding social distancing. Adjust your evangelistic and disciple-making efforts to account for these convictions. Wave to your neighbors. Text the co-workers you aren't getting to see anymore. Play online board games, escape rooms, etc. with your friends. Synchronize a movie and watch it over the phone (video chat if you can!). There are lots of cool ways to connect with people still, and the sudden, drastic change in life context CREATES context to make it easier and more natural for you to initiate with others in ways you haven't done before, without it being weird or uncomfortable.
4. Continue to take advantages of the opportunities provided by your congregation leaders, as I intend to continue doing myself. Again, the point here is not to boycott these opportunities, but to understand their proper role and value in light of the church's actual mission. Use a wrench when you need a wrench, and use a pipe cutter when you need a pipe cutter (and no: a Swiss-army pipe cutter that has a wrench attachment to it is not going to be as effective as using an actual wrench). That's really all I'm saying.
5. Ask for help when you need it.

47

UPVOTES

r/RPCWomen is now active.

21 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

Welcome post is here: https://www.reddit.com/r/RPCWomen/comments/gnpbgh/welcome_to_rpc_women/

Ladies (and men who want to engage too), enjoy the conversations you all create at [r/RPCWomen](#).

No, the mods here are not interested in taking primary responsibility for creating content there.

Yes, we're fine with having women join on as mods. It should be understood that the primary audience of this sub is women, even though men may participate from time to time. It should address many topics raised by passages like Titus 2, 1 Peter 3, Proverbs 31 - either from a theological level (if you're comfortable with that) or a more pragmatic, "Here's what's worked for me" angle.

Have fun.

Differences between red/blue for men and women (Drafted for RPCW)

21 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

This was written for the newly created [r/RPCWomen](#) sub, but if you want to take a read here instead, here you go.

Why listen to a man on a woman's sub?

TRP/MRP/RPC all note that women are generally not fluent enough with their own desires and what will make them long-term happy to provide reliable advice for men to follow. I agree. Heck, my own wife just told me 2 weeks ago, "I realize that if you became everything I want you to be, I'd be miserable and depressed. I think I know what I want, but I really don't. Somehow you've figured that out better than I have."

But the reverse doesn't necessarily apply. Women operate within relationships (not necessarily every area of life) primarily on feelings, which are fickle and not always consistent with what their biology responds to. An unattractive man can make them feel good, whereas an attractive man can make them feel like trash - yet they'll still want sex with the attractive guy more than the unattractive one anyway. When women give advice to men, it's usually in the context of what they think they **SHOULD** want in a man, not their **ACTUAL** desires (like a 6-pack) for fear of coming off shallow. Heaven forbid a woman in churchianity culture come off as shallow!

Men, however, often base advice not on fickle feelings or what we think *should* be true, but on observation and conclusions. Most competent men who haven't been completely feminized will have no problem explaining plainly to a woman: "Look around. Guys go for the hottest girls. You want a good guy? Become a hot girl." This isn't necessarily coming from our own internal experience. Even blue pill guys will recognize this - and then still think they're somehow better than "those macho guys" for it.

My point is: while I do encourage men to be skeptical of advice from women (not that we altogether discount it, but that we give it extra caution and testing), the same doesn't necessarily apply in the reverse. Now, onto the show ...

The Nature of Women: Hypergamy

If the red pill is knowledge/understanding of truth, the behaviors Anna references are the byproduct of one who operates within/without that knowledge. Most of the red pill for men revolves around understanding the female dual mating strategy (i.e. AFBB, "strategic pluralism"). When a man fails to understand this aspect of women, he is blue pill and his behaviors with women reflect this. He believes the falsity presented by culture that women truly love the BB who pedestalizes her and that if he is BB enough and gives her more and more of his power and authority, she will be sexually attracted toward him for it too. Similarly, it is his ignorance of the entire equation (AFBB) and how relationships should function that causes him to ignore other strategies toward achieving his sexual goals.

Along those lines, a woman who is ignorant of her sinful application of AFBB tendencies (i.e. who lacks "red pill awareness") will behave in a manner consistent with what culture tells her is acceptable and appropriate. It will encompass all of the entitlement dynamics Anna was referencing. When she becomes "red pill aware" in the sense that she discovers why her marriage is so unhappy (because she's not living in her God-given role as a helper to her husband), she begins to change, learning to suppress her cultural conditioning toward dominance over her husband and replaces it with conditioning from the Holy Spirit toward more godly qualities for women to express in marriage.

The Intergender Aspect

To be clear, there are two components to this: AF is the sexual nature of women, whereas BB is the relational nature of women. For men, understanding women is the operative impetus to get us to grasp where we're going wrong. For women, the same applies in reverse, so the red/blue dynamic is less about whether she understands her

own sexual/relational nature and more about whether she understands that of the men she wants to be with in order to accomplish her goals.

In this, the red pill is often described as being a study of "intergender sexual dynamics." The "intergender" part of that means both genders are involved. It's not merely a study of female strategies, but of the male position as well. For the men, this means not only understanding women, but also their own nature and to improve upon it. Similarly, a red pill woman understands her own nature and seeks to improve upon her femininity, whereas a blue pill woman does not - yet she will also seek to understand the male nature and allow that understanding to affect how she goes about achieving her goals.

The Sexual Nature of Men: Polygamy

The red pill for men often revolves around getting sex, as that is one of our primary drives in life. Because of this, men often talk about the red pill in terms of sexual strategy. If we keep that limitation in place, then the red/blue pill for women would depend on how aware they are of male sexual strategy and how that affects their behaviors.

In that regard, there's a lot less discussion on female sexual strategy because single women don't really need it. Even a relatively unattractive woman could walk into a bar, take off her panties and announce, "Who wants to get lucky tonight?" and someone would answer. The issue is, he may not be the quality of man she wants, and he may not give her the commitment she wants. In this sense, a "female blue pill mentality" would involve a woman who believes she can get a grade-A man and keep him sexually aroused indefinitely without any work on improving herself because culture has trained her to believe that men should love her for "who she is" and that there's no reason for her to want to change.

Up-front, this may actually work for the first few lays. But in time, just as women are hypergamous, the polygamous nature of man will win out and he'll be focused on other women - even less attractive ones, which is mind-blowing to many wives out there who find their husbands cheating with someone who happens to be a step down. My dad was someone who did this, blowing up his marriage to my mom in order to pursue a relationship (that didn't end up working out) with someone who was far less attractive than my mom. That confused my mom to no end - but her blue pill ignorance let her be fooled about what would keep him sexually interested over the long-haul.

To be clear on that, she assumed my dad was hypergamous, projecting her own nature onto how she believed she would act, just as men do toward women in wanting them to be spontaneously sexual. Accordingly, she assumed he would only cheat with someone better. In her mind, he was overweight and childish, so she didn't think there was much of a chance that someone *better* than her would want him, thus she had no real risk of losing him. What she didn't count on is that men are not hypergamous; they are polygamous. He didn't want better. He wanted different. That mistaken understanding of the male sexual nature cost her her marriage.

The Relational Nature of Men

With all of the above in mind, just as hypergamy is both sexual and relational in its strategy, so is polygamy for men. Again, women don't need much sexual strategy to get a man in bed because men crave sex with women anyway. For men, even the most omega guys can get a girl to be in a relationship with him because women crave relationships. She just may not be sexually interested. Because of this dynamic, many of come to acknowledge the axiom that "women are the gatekeepers of sex, men are the gatekeepers of commitment."

What most women struggle with is getting commitment out of a man. Where's the ring? Will he stay faithful? Does he give me the time of day or do things by himself while avoiding me? These are the questions many women struggle with.

As such, if we ignore the "sexual strategy" definition of the red pill and focus on a more MRP-like angle, **the blue pill for a woman is whether or not she understands the true nature of men to the extent of acquiring their commitment.** Much of the answer is still found in the polygamous nature of men. That said, I'm out of time and

it'd be more fun for you all to start discussing on your own what keeps a man around long-term.

If you're anything like pretty much everyone on the planet, your social life sucks. Why should you care? Because as much as you want to be your own man, you need other people to do pretty much anything you actually want to do in the world. In the drafting phase, I at one point split this out into a two-part post, but didn't feel like taking the time to separate it all out, and the content blends better when together, so here's the whole thing.

PART I: MENTALITY

No Man Is An Island

Most guys coming here need to learn independence. They're so heavily influenced by society that they need to pull away from everything the world and their wife tells them and develop their own kingdom that operates within their own frame. That's a beautiful thing. But it's unsustainable to go completely independent.

Let's be real: do you really want to live in the wilderness like Thoreau? Even Thoreau didn't live like "Thoreau." He made regular trips to town to visit family and friends. He didn't live in the woods, but in a cabin in a wide open field. He had visitors over and hosted an annual melon party. Nobody actually wants to live in isolation, yet many people's behaviors would indicate they do. Are your behaviors aligned with your goals? In the case of having a social life, for most people the answer is no.

The "Loneliness Epidemic"

I wrote a post about a year ago citing some stats from a survey by Cigna. The conclusion was that around half of the country admitted to sometimes or always feeling alone and having no meaningful relationships. Surprisingly, having kids doesn't decrease your susceptibility to the "loneliness epidemic." Not surprisingly, today's young adults are considered the loneliest people ever to live since we've been recording stats on the subject.

Interestingly, despite what our feminized society tells us about how women are so much better at being "social butterflies" than men, [Psychology Today](#) says otherwise:

"According to substantial research, women across all ages and lifestyles report higher levels of loneliness than men do. [Ironically:] Except, perhaps surprisingly, in one subset of people - single people. While married women inch out married men for the lonelier group, single men vastly outweigh single women as the lonelier bunch."

Sucks to be an omega. Notice the language here, though? **Substantial** research. **All** ages. **All** lifestyles. While the world will tell us that we should all build friendships like women (trust, communication, emotional connection, etc.), the reality is that it isn't working for them. At some point, you need to learn to build your social network like a man - and not the feminized betas and omegas who are ruining the gender curve. But we'll get to that later.

Why Does it Matter?

So you've worked on your stoicism and frame a bit. You don't feel lonely anymore. You're an introvert anyway, so why do you care about building social relationships? Because if you don't, you're still a loser. Let me break this

down:

- Even the most introverted person needs *some* social contact. If you don't have friends outside the home, you're going to default to your wife and kids. This makes it easy to pedestalize them and become co-dependent on them as your only source of relational fulfillment in life.
- Dread is literally impossible if you never leave your house. Just as bad is when you do leave the house, but everyone knows you're not actually going to be chatting up a random hottie.
- Online forums can only take you so far. At some point, if you want to learn how to be a man you need to actually see what other men do. The movies don't cut it because you know it's scripted.
- Chances are, your mission in life involves other people. Financial goals? Unless you are forging your own currency, you can't manufacture money on your own, which means you have to get it from ... people. Athletic goals? You need someone to train you, a rival to best, peers to give you feedback, etc. Political goals? You have to have connections to get into office. Very few goals in life wouldn't benefit from an improved social game.

I could go on, but you get the idea.

So why aren't you?

Some people are dumb and needed to read all that, but for those with common sense, able to figure out with 10 seconds of thought why it's important to build a social game, you're still left with the cognitive dissonance: "Oh yeah, I guess it IS important, but I'm still not doing it. Why not?" There are lots of answers: fear, shame, apathy, laziness, mental health issues (that you probably don't even realize you have), etc.

But there are two answers that rise to the top: (1) You're incompetent. You just don't know how to make friends. I'll address this in the "Action" section, below, so no need to re-hash it here. (2) You Make Idiotic Assumptions. When I coach guys on building their social life, I ask lots of questions about why they're not already friends with someone in particular ... you know ... like ... women. Number 1 response? "They already have a circle of friends, and it's just hard to break in." I'll address the frame issue later. For now, let's realize that this is based on a series of bad assumptions.

- **Assumption 1: The other person doesn't want more friends.** This excuse only applies if someone has actually made a clear decision not to have anymore friends. I doubt anyone has actually done this, so they're on the table.
 - **Assumption 2: The other person actually has friends.** Yeah, you see them hanging around other people, but most social contexts are recurring acquaintanceships, not genuine friendships. Your neighbors and co-workers may call you their "friend," but do you really relate with them the same way you did your roommate in college? Probably not. And that's probably also the case for the person you want to connect with.
 - **Assumption 3: The other person doesn't want YOU as their next friend.** If you're making this assumption, you need to go back to the sidebar and learn (1) that you're the prize, or if you're not, (2) how to become the prize.
 - **Assumption 4: It's hard to break in.** It's not. More on that to come.
 - **Assumption 5: That there's anything to "break in" on in the first place.** Are they putting up invisible fences? Again, this is something of a frame issue, so let's go there.
-

Your Frame/Their Frame

When my wife looks to make new friends, she asks herself what she could do to cause them to want to include her. This is how women think. They're naturally compelled to want to be in the frame of someone they desire to associate with. But you're a man (I hope). You should be inviting everyone else into your frame. This means that your method of winning friends isn't to suck up to them. It's to be someone they pander to be around.

Church folk are an easy example of this dynamic. The typical strategy for "plugging in" is simple: believe what everyone else believes, suck up to those in authority and praise whatever they say. If you do this, you become part of the crowd and make lots of acquaintances. But nobody actually wants to spend time with you or become closer friends.

On the other hand, have you ever noticed that the popular people are the most critical? They gossip about the secrets they hear and make fun of those around them. This is true even in congregations. Why does everyone gravitate to them? Because they're alpha enough to say what the betas wish they had the balls to. These people are fun. They run against the grain. Their controversial nature gets them attention, and that attention wins them friends, but also makes them enemies. They live in their own frame and it's alluring to everyone around.

Of course, you can live in your own frame and not be a slanderous gossip. This is my approach. Instead of running my mouth about how much better than everyone else I think I am, I actually strive to be the best man I think I can be. People respect that. At some point, they realize they want what I have (even if I have to invite them to have it with me, to get them there). This is what draws the crowd. Once the crowd amasses, I can pick and choose who I want to build closer relationships with.

Relationships and Networking

Now, there's a reason I've been talking most of this time about building authentic relationships. Yes, acquaintances are useful. This is the goal of **networking** - to build a vast array of people you are loosely connected to in the hope that one of those connections will one day become handy. There is a value to having a vast plethora of people who know your name in the community. I had that in my old community, and I'm working toward rebuilding that after having relocated less than a year ago. Acquaintances make you look good in public, but their utility is limited. I have set aside "networking" as a viable model for long-term success as a man, whether in my career, my neighborhood, in my spiritual pursuits, etc.

When you network, nobody has a vested interest in what you're doing unless it mutually benefits them. Most relationships aren't immediately mutually beneficial. I may meet a businessman who could refer me a case someday, but chances are that he'll recognize me in the grocery store, but won't remember me when his neighbor needs an attorney. Why not? Because he doesn't have a relationship with me. He's only thinking about me when I reach out to him or when he's personally in need.

Instead, 99% of my clients by referral come from people I've spent substantial time with. We've gotten to know each other personally. We've sat down for a meal or talked a dozen or two times, even if only briefly. I know the names of their kids. We make it a point to meet up regularly. These people have you on their mind. My closest friends refer me 2-5 new cases each year, and my more casual friends give me 1-2 cases a year. Even when I'm not around, they're thinking of me when the context comes up. [Funny story: the 1% was a client who was referred to me by an opposing party who was so impressed with my cross-examination of her that she told her friend to go to me instead of her own attorney.]

Lee Rosen used to run the #1 blog on the internet for law practice management. He coached a number of businesses beyond just law firms. I spoke with him by phone once and he told me his singular secret to building a successful career. Can you guess what it was? "Build your relationships, not your networks. Nurture people to think about you when you're gone, not merely to notice you when you're there."

Now, realistically you can't have deep relationships with everyone. You have to balance networking and building relationships to get the best of both worlds. In reality, networking is the first phase of building relationships. So let's go there.

PART 2: ACTION

Building Your Network

I wrote a post a couple years ago titled [Social Influence and Defying Context](#). Much of what I'd say here I've already said there, so no need to make this post longer than it already is. But let me clarify an easy way to build your social network.

- **Say hi to new people.** It's that simple. This is where it all starts. My favorites: on a jog, at the gym, in an elevator, grocery shopping, waiting in line. Just say hi. Even if you don't say anything after that, learn to get the conversation started. If possible, focus on people you know it's reasonably possible you'll see again.
- **Say hi again.** Again, basic stuff here.
- **Have a brief conversation.** This can be done simultaneously with one of the above, if the situation calls for it. What do you talk about? It doesn't matter. Talk about how awkward you are at starting random conversations, for all it matters. Preferably, talk about the aspect of your life for which you're trying to build a network. Just make sure you're smiling most of the time (unless they tell you their dad just died ... use some common sense, foo). You can have this conversation over coffee, or on the street where you met. It doesn't really matter, though more personal and focused environments are generally going to be more fruitful.
- **Exchange contact information, or learn how to locate them.** When I go running, I tend to learn where the people live who I say hi to. They remember me as that dad who pushes 3 kids in a jogging stroller for 5-8 miles at a time. "Hello" becomes "Hello again," which turns into, "Good to see you're still at it." Other times, I cut the conversation short and say, "I've enjoyed talking about this, but I've got to get going somewhere. Here's my number/e-mail. Let's finish our chat soon." If possible, get their info too, then leave. Once you have their info, by this point you've established enough of a foundation that it shouldn't be too awkward to contact them if you're in need.

That's about it for basic networking. Whenever you see these people again, they'll remember you and be primed for acquaintance-like conversations.

Building Your Friendships

After your network grows large enough, you'll start to get an idea of who you'd like to get to know better. It might be someone whose career aligns well with your career needs. It could be someone whose interests are similar to your own and you just want to have fun together. It could be someone you'd like to mentor so you can gain a sense of fulfillment in passing on what you've learned to someone else and sending them out into the world. Whatever your motive is, friendships are where the real value is at. Let's continue our path.

- **Follow up.** Remember that contact information you got? Start using it. While I encourage people to master the art of no-context conversations, this is a weird lull where it's better to create context so the other person feels comfortable with the foundation for follow up. "I remembered you said blank, and I'm doing blank, so I figured

I'd call and get your thoughts on this."

- **Invite, Mild.** Keep it light at first. Grab a meal or coffee together. The idea is to become comfortable hanging out in person. Once that comfort is established, the friendship itself IS the context for future conversations, so you don't need to manufacture context to keep things from becoming awkward for long.
- **Invite, Serious - "Going all the way."** Don't do this too soon. Rather than explain this one, **I'll just leave this clip.**
- **Shift the Dynamic.** Make yourself available and let them invite you. This only works once they're already convinced you're someone they want to be around.

Male v. Female Social Matrix

It's important to note that there are some key differences about how men and women engage with friends when they're in the "follow up" and "invite" phases. Hopefully by now you've become fluent with **The Female Social Matrix**. From this and what I've observed elsewhere, here are a few discrepancies I've seen in how men and women interact, which should help you learn how to build friendships with other men that actually help rather than drain you.

Women	Men
Crabs in a bucket	Encourage social ascent
Equality	Competition
Diss progress beyond the group dynamic	Spur on progress
Social niceties; pleasant demeanor	Ribbing, critiquing
Focused on the group	Focus on role within the group
Supporting conversation	Dominating conversation
Plausible deniability	Overt expression
Appearance of being wholesome	Raw, crude, and blunt
Being fair	Being efficient
Consensus/Democracy	Hierarchical Structure
Involvement	Achievement

Obviously there are going to be exceptions, and most of these will operate on a scale. This doesn't mean that men can't engage in social niceties or encourage equality; rather, it's to say that if there is a conflict between the two, or the opportunity for the male side is present, the man will engage in ribbing and competition instead. For example, a guy might prefer to look for a consensus/democratic solution before acting. But when it becomes apparent that no consensus will be reached, the women will keep trying to find one, but the man will say, "Enough is enough. We're doing this," and then do it.

You'll notice quickly that this dynamic isn't merely describing the difference between men and women, but also between feminized men and the masculine. I have found that even the most feminized men will respect the male social matrix when in the presence of the masculine. Accordingly, **my point here is not merely to explain the different social matrices to you, but to encourage you to socialize like a man. In doing so, you will teach other men how to be men, while simultaneously earning the social status afforded to the masculine in your social interactions.**

Ten Extra Tips

1. **Take Control of Your Social Life.** Even before social distancing, the world at large conditions people toward isolation and arm's-length interactions with others. Even the most extroverted people are unlikely to make much of an effort to build genuine friendships with you. If you want it, you make it happen. That's how it is with pretty much anything worth having. Yes, other people want friends too, but they're either too dumb or too socially conditioned to act on it.
2. **Ignore Context.** "Context" is the meta framework most people operate in, made up of the social norms they think they must follow in order to take certain actions. Those social norms are the very ones that ruin so many marriages and condition guys to be beta pussies, leading to higher divorce rates, children out of wedlock, etc. Do you really want to submit to the cultural forces that have created the societal chaos we have today? Plus, learning to defy context makes you more interesting to others and also fast-tracks your progress. See my previously linked post on defying social context.
3. **Embrace rejection.** About 7 months ago I wrote a post titled [Initiate Often, Confident Always](#). The premise is that rejection should not rattle your confidence - it should immunize you against further rejection and failure, making it easier the next time. I remember having to raise funds for a ministry job I once took. The first few rejections were tough to take. After several dozen more, I didn't care. It was much easier to raise funds after that - not merely because I could get to the "yes" people faster, but because my fearless charisma started giving some of the "no" people enough confidence in what I was doing that they came around.
4. **Master Asking Questions.** This is the most valuable skill you can ever learn. A decent conversationalist uses questions to keep a conversation going. A skilled conversationalist can use questions to engage in deep conversations on matters he's entirely ignorant. A master can use questions to persuade others to believe virtually anything, while thinking it was their own idea to believe it. I could do an entire post just on the art of asking questions.
5. **Be a Social Sculptor.** Many guys, especially those who run against the grain of culture, tell me, "I just don't want to be friends with the people I'm around. They're so liberal and weak and it's annoying." Right, unicorns don't exist. You think you're going to randomly bump into a red pill endorsed contributor out on the streets? It's not going to happen. Rather than looking for the perfect friend, create one. This is the same advice I give for relationships. In my experience, it's harder finding someone worth being friends with than it is to take someone I'm iffy about and influence them into becoming the kind of person I want as a friend.
6. **Negative to Positive.** Generally speaking, it's easiest to bond over shared disinterests. Many people have stronger negative reactions to what they don't like than they do positive reactions to what they do like. This creates an easy camaraderie up-front early in a relationship. Of course, focusing on the negative is unsustainable, as people don't like feeling negative all the time. Most people recognize their best friends as those with whom they shared overall positive experiences with. Even if the "positive experience" was something that landed them in trouble, they remember it fondly because of the fun they had in the process.
7. **Learn Cultural Distinctions.** Trying to engage with a hipster? Frat boy? Businessman? African American? There are so many cultural subsets that are misunderstood (or perhaps understood better than they want to admit). Knowing some of the unique ins and outs can go a long way.
8. **Tell It Straight, Unapologetic, Yet Tactfully.** Most people know I'm a Christian, so I'll use that as an example. Some people think it's impossible for biblical Christians to relate with certain communities, like homosexuals. This is dumb. I've had a number of homosexual friends. For a time, I danced around the issue, not wanting to upset them. That actually upset them even more because they knew I was treating them differently because of

their sexual orientation. They wanted me to talk to them the same way I would anyone else. So, we took it a step further. He'd start talking about making out with his boyfriend and I'd tease back, "Yeah, you'll have a lot of time to do that while you're burning in hell for eternity ;)" and they'd laugh. Once the rapport is there, and it's clear that the friendship exists through your disagreements, let the disagreements be a point of humorous distinction, not a point of division.

9. **Have Male Friends.** You can't learn how to be a man without being around other men. Even if the guys you know aren't the types of guys you want to emulate, you can influence them to become someone you're proud to be around - and then you can fuel each other on. I've done this many, many times. It's fun and rewarding.
10. **Have Female Friends.** Society will tell you that a married man should not be good friends with a woman other than his wife. This is somewhat absurd. Can guys and girls actually be "just friends"? Probably not. So what? Does that mean you're going to start unzipping your pants every time you're around one of your female "friends"? Is your self-discipline really so low? The social convention on this makes sense if you're a weak man who can't control his own dick - and if that's you, and you don't want to blow up your marriage, then follow it. But if you know how to keep your pants on, you'd be a fool not to take advantage of the power that women have usurped in society by building relationships with them. It's seriously idiotic to cut off half of the population from your life just because your wife might not like it. Besides, chances are she actually does like it more than she's willing to admit to herself. Dread. Preselection. Mystery. Got it now?

If you're anything like pretty much everyone on the planet, your social life sucks. Why should you care? Because as much as you want to be your own man, you need other people to do pretty much anything you actually want to do in the world. In the drafting phase, I at one point split this out into a two-part post, but didn't feel like taking the time to separate it all out, and the content blends better when together, so here's the whole thing.

PART I: MENTALITY

No Man Is An Island

Most guys coming here need to learn independence. They're so heavily influenced by society that they need to pull away from everything the world and their wife tells them and develop their own kingdom that operates within their own frame. That's a beautiful thing. But it's unsustainable to go completely independent.

Let's be real: do you really want to live in the wilderness like Thoreau? Even Thoreau didn't live like "Thoreau." He made regular trips to town to visit family and friends. He didn't live in the woods, but in a cabin in a wide open field. He had visitors over and hosted an annual melon party. Nobody actually wants to live in isolation, yet many people's behaviors would indicate they do. Are your behaviors aligned with your goals? In the case of having a social life, for most people the answer is no.

The "Loneliness Epidemic"

I wrote a post about a year ago citing some stats from a survey by Cigna. The conclusion was that around half of the country admitted to sometimes or always feeling alone and having no meaningful relationships. Surprisingly, having kids doesn't decrease your susceptibility to the "loneliness epidemic." Not surprisingly, today's young adults are considered the loneliest people ever to live since we've been recording stats on the subject.

Interestingly, despite what our feminized society tells us about how women are so much better at being "social butterflies" than men, [Psychology Today](#) says otherwise:

"According to substantial research, women across all ages and lifestyles report higher levels of loneliness than men do. [Ironically:] Except, perhaps surprisingly, in one subset of people - single people. While married women inch out married men for the lonelier group, single men vastly outweigh single women as the lonelier bunch."

Sucks to be an omega. Notice the language here, though? **Substantial** research. **All** ages. **All** lifestyles. While the world will tell us that we should all build friendships like women (trust, communication, emotional connection, etc.), the reality is that it isn't working for them. At some point, you need to learn to build your social network like a man - and not the feminized betas and omegas who are ruining the gender curve. But we'll get to that later.

Why Does it Matter?

So you've worked on your stoicism and frame a bit. You don't feel lonely anymore. You're an introvert anyway, so why do you care about building social relationships? Because if you don't, you're still a loser. Let me break this

down:

- Even the most introverted person needs *some* social contact. If you don't have friends outside the home, you're going to default to your wife and kids. This makes it easy to pedestalize them and become co-dependent on them as your only source of relational fulfillment in life.
- Dread is literally impossible if you never leave your house. Just as bad is when you do leave the house, but everyone knows you're not actually going to be chatting up a random hottie.
- Online forums can only take you so far. At some point, if you want to learn how to be a man you need to actually see what other men do. The movies don't cut it because you know it's scripted.
- Chances are, your mission in life involves other people. Financial goals? Unless you are forging your own currency, you can't manufacture money on your own, which means you have to get it from ... people. Athletic goals? You need someone to train you, a rival to best, peers to give you feedback, etc. Political goals? You have to have connections to get into office. Very few goals in life wouldn't benefit from an improved social game.

I could go on, but you get the idea.

So why aren't you?

Some people are dumb and needed to read all that, but for those with common sense, able to figure out with 10 seconds of thought why it's important to build a social game, you're still left with the cognitive dissonance: "Oh yeah, I guess it IS important, but I'm still not doing it. Why not?" There are lots of answers: fear, shame, apathy, laziness, mental health issues (that you probably don't even realize you have), etc.

But there are two answers that rise to the top: (1) You're incompetent. You just don't know how to make friends. I'll address this in the "Action" section, below, so no need to re-hash it here. (2) You Make Idiotic Assumptions. When I coach guys on building their social life, I ask lots of questions about why they're not already friends with someone in particular ... you know ... like ... women. Number 1 response? "They already have a circle of friends, and it's just hard to break in." I'll address the frame issue later. For now, let's realize that this is based on a series of bad assumptions.

- **Assumption 1: The other person doesn't want more friends.** This excuse only applies if someone has actually made a clear decision not to have anymore friends. I doubt anyone has actually done this, so they're on the table.
 - **Assumption 2: The other person actually has friends.** Yeah, you see them hanging around other people, but most social contexts are recurring acquaintanceships, not genuine friendships. Your neighbors and co-workers may call you their "friend," but do you really relate with them the same way you did your roommate in college? Probably not. And that's probably also the case for the person you want to connect with.
 - **Assumption 3: The other person doesn't want YOU as their next friend.** If you're making this assumption, you need to go back to the sidebar and learn (1) that you're the prize, or if you're not, (2) how to become the prize.
 - **Assumption 4: It's hard to break in.** It's not. More on that to come.
 - **Assumption 5: That there's anything to "break in" on in the first place.** Are they putting up invisible fences? Again, this is something of a frame issue, so let's go there.
-

Your Frame/Their Frame

When my wife looks to make new friends, she asks herself what she could do to cause them to want to include her. This is how women think. They're naturally compelled to want to be in the frame of someone they desire to associate with. But you're a man (I hope). You should be inviting everyone else into your frame. This means that your method of winning friends isn't to suck up to them. It's to be someone they pander to be around.

Church folk are an easy example of this dynamic. The typical strategy for "plugging in" is simple: believe what everyone else believes, suck up to those in authority and praise whatever they say. If you do this, you become part of the crowd and make lots of acquaintances. But nobody actually wants to spend time with you or become closer friends.

On the other hand, have you ever noticed that the popular people are the most critical? They gossip about the secrets they hear and make fun of those around them. This is true even in congregations. Why does everyone gravitate to them? Because they're alpha enough to say what the betas wish they had the balls to. These people are fun. They run against the grain. Their controversial nature gets them attention, and that attention wins them friends, but also makes them enemies. They live in their own frame and it's alluring to everyone around.

Of course, you can live in your own frame and not be a slanderous gossip. This is my approach. Instead of running my mouth about how much better than everyone else I think I am, I actually strive to be the best man I think I can be. People respect that. At some point, they realize they want what I have (even if I have to invite them to have it with me, to get them there). This is what draws the crowd. Once the crowd amasses, I can pick and choose who I want to build closer relationships with.

Relationships and Networking

Now, there's a reason I've been talking most of this time about building authentic relationships. Yes, acquaintances are useful. This is the goal of **networking** - to build a vast array of people you are loosely connected to in the hope that one of those connections will one day become handy. There is a value to having a vast plethora of people who know your name in the community. I had that in my old community, and I'm working toward rebuilding that after having relocated less than a year ago. Acquaintances make you look good in public, but their utility is limited. I have set aside "networking" as a viable model for long-term success as a man, whether in my career, my neighborhood, in my spiritual pursuits, etc.

When you network, nobody has a vested interest in what you're doing unless it mutually benefits them. Most relationships aren't immediately mutually beneficial. I may meet a businessman who could refer me a case someday, but chances are that he'll recognize me in the grocery store, but won't remember me when his neighbor needs an attorney. Why not? Because he doesn't have a relationship with me. He's only thinking about me when I reach out to him or when he's personally in need.

Instead, 99% of my clients by referral come from people I've spent substantial time with. We've gotten to know each other personally. We've sat down for a meal or talked a dozen or two times, even if only briefly. I know the names of their kids. We make it a point to meet up regularly. These people have you on their mind. My closest friends refer me 2-5 new cases each year, and my more casual friends give me 1-2 cases a year. Even when I'm not around, they're thinking of me when the context comes up. [Funny story: the 1% was a client who was referred to me by an opposing party who was so impressed with my cross-examination of her that she told her friend to go to me instead of her own attorney.]

Lee Rosen used to run the #1 blog on the internet for law practice management. He coached a number of businesses beyond just law firms. I spoke with him by phone once and he told me his singular secret to building a successful career. Can you guess what it was? "Build your relationships, not your networks. Nurture people to think about you when you're gone, not merely to notice you when you're there."

Now, realistically you can't have deep relationships with everyone. You have to balance networking and building relationships to get the best of both worlds. In reality, networking is the first phase of building relationships. So let's go there.

PART 2: ACTION

Building Your Network

I wrote a post a couple years ago titled [Social Influence and Defying Context](#). Much of what I'd say here I've already said there, so no need to make this post longer than it already is. But let me clarify an easy way to build your social network.

- **Say hi to new people.** It's that simple. This is where it all starts. My favorites: on a jog, at the gym, in an elevator, grocery shopping, waiting in line. Just say hi. Even if you don't say anything after that, learn to get the conversation started. If possible, focus on people you know it's reasonably possible you'll see again.
- **Say hi again.** Again, basic stuff here.
- **Have a brief conversation.** This can be done simultaneously with one of the above, if the situation calls for it. What do you talk about? It doesn't matter. Talk about how awkward you are at starting random conversations, for all it matters. Preferably, talk about the aspect of your life for which you're trying to build a network. Just make sure you're smiling most of the time (unless they tell you their dad just died ... use some common sense, foo). You can have this conversation over coffee, or on the street where you met. It doesn't really matter, though more personal and focused environments are generally going to be more fruitful.
- **Exchange contact information, or learn how to locate them.** When I go running, I tend to learn where the people live who I say hi to. They remember me as that dad who pushes 3 kids in a jogging stroller for 5-8 miles at a time. "Hello" becomes "Hello again," which turns into, "Good to see you're still at it." Other times, I cut the conversation short and say, "I've enjoyed talking about this, but I've got to get going somewhere. Here's my number/e-mail. Let's finish our chat soon." If possible, get their info too, then leave. Once you have their info, by this point you've established enough of a foundation that it shouldn't be too awkward to contact them if you're in need.

That's about it for basic networking. Whenever you see these people again, they'll remember you and be primed for acquaintance-like conversations.

Building Your Friendships

After your network grows large enough, you'll start to get an idea of who you'd like to get to know better. It might be someone whose career aligns well with your career needs. It could be someone whose interests are similar to your own and you just want to have fun together. It could be someone you'd like to mentor so you can gain a sense of fulfillment in passing on what you've learned to someone else and sending them out into the world. Whatever your motive is, friendships are where the real value is at. Let's continue our path.

- **Follow up.** Remember that contact information you got? Start using it. While I encourage people to master the art of no-context conversations, this is a weird lull where it's better to create context so the other person feels comfortable with the foundation for follow up. "I remembered you said blank, and I'm doing blank, so I figured

I'd call and get your thoughts on this."

- **Invite, Mild.** Keep it light at first. Grab a meal or coffee together. The idea is to become comfortable hanging out in person. Once that comfort is established, the friendship itself IS the context for future conversations, so you don't need to manufacture context to keep things from becoming awkward for long.
- **Invite, Serious - "Going all the way."** Don't do this too soon. Rather than explain this one, **I'll just leave this clip.**
- **Shift the Dynamic.** Make yourself available and let them invite you. This only works once they're already convinced you're someone they want to be around.

Male v. Female Social Matrix

It's important to note that there are some key differences about how men and women engage with friends when they're in the "follow up" and "invite" phases. Hopefully by now you've become fluent with **The Female Social Matrix**. From this and what I've observed elsewhere, here are a few discrepancies I've seen in how men and women interact, which should help you learn how to build friendships with other men that actually help rather than drain you.

Women	Men
Crabs in a bucket	Encourage social ascent
Equality	Competition
Diss progress beyond the group dynamic	Spur on progress
Social niceties; pleasant demeanor	Ribbing, critiquing
Focused on the group	Focus on role within the group
Supporting conversation	Dominating conversation
Plausible deniability	Overt expression
Appearance of being wholesome	Raw, crude, and blunt
Being fair	Being efficient
Consensus/Democracy	Hierarchical Structure
Involvement	Achievement

Obviously there are going to be exceptions, and most of these will operate on a scale. This doesn't mean that men can't engage in social niceties or encourage equality; rather, it's to say that if there is a conflict between the two, or the opportunity for the male side is present, the man will engage in ribbing and competition instead. For example, a guy might prefer to look for a consensus/democratic solution before acting. But when it becomes apparent that no consensus will be reached, the women will keep trying to find one, but the man will say, "Enough is enough. We're doing this," and then do it.

You'll notice quickly that this dynamic isn't merely describing the difference between men and women, but also between feminized men and the masculine. I have found that even the most feminized men will respect the male social matrix when in the presence of the masculine. Accordingly, **my point here is not merely to explain the different social matrices to you, but to encourage you to socialize like a man. In doing so, you will teach other men how to be men, while simultaneously earning the social status afforded to the masculine in your social interactions.**

Ten Extra Tips

1. **Take Control of Your Social Life.** Even before social distancing, the world at large conditions people toward isolation and arm's-length interactions with others. Even the most extroverted people are unlikely to make much of an effort to build genuine friendships with you. If you want it, you make it happen. That's how it is with pretty much anything worth having. Yes, other people want friends too, but they're either too dumb or too socially conditioned to act on it.
2. **Ignore Context.** "Context" is the meta framework most people operate in, made up of the social norms they think they must follow in order to take certain actions. Those social norms are the very ones that ruin so many marriages and condition guys to be beta pussies, leading to higher divorce rates, children out of wedlock, etc. Do you really want to submit to the cultural forces that have created the societal chaos we have today? Plus, learning to defy context makes you more interesting to others and also fast-tracks your progress. See my previously linked post on defying social context.
3. **Embrace rejection.** About 7 months ago I wrote a post titled [Initiate Often, Confident Always](#). The premise is that rejection should not rattle your confidence - it should immunize you against further rejection and failure, making it easier the next time. I remember having to raise funds for a ministry job I once took. The first few rejections were tough to take. After several dozen more, I didn't care. It was much easier to raise funds after that - not merely because I could get to the "yes" people faster, but because my fearless charisma started giving some of the "no" people enough confidence in what I was doing that they came around.
4. **Master Asking Questions.** This is the most valuable skill you can ever learn. A decent conversationalist uses questions to keep a conversation going. A skilled conversationalist can use questions to engage in deep conversations on matters he's entirely ignorant. A master can use questions to persuade others to believe virtually anything, while thinking it was their own idea to believe it. I could do an entire post just on the art of asking questions.
5. **Be a Social Sculptor.** Many guys, especially those who run against the grain of culture, tell me, "I just don't want to be friends with the people I'm around. They're so liberal and weak and it's annoying." Right, unicorns don't exist. You think you're going to randomly bump into a red pill endorsed contributor out on the streets? It's not going to happen. Rather than looking for the perfect friend, create one. This is the same advice I give for relationships. In my experience, it's harder finding someone worth being friends with than it is to take someone I'm iffy about and influence them into becoming the kind of person I want as a friend.
6. **Negative to Positive.** Generally speaking, it's easiest to bond over shared disinterests. Many people have stronger negative reactions to what they don't like than they do positive reactions to what they do like. This creates an easy camaraderie up-front early in a relationship. Of course, focusing on the negative is unsustainable, as people don't like feeling negative all the time. Most people recognize their best friends as those with whom they shared overall positive experiences with. Even if the "positive experience" was something that landed them in trouble, they remember it fondly because of the fun they had in the process.
7. **Learn Cultural Distinctions.** Trying to engage with a hipster? Frat boy? Businessman? African American? There are so many cultural subsets that are misunderstood (or perhaps understood better than they want to admit). Knowing some of the unique ins and outs can go a long way.
8. **Tell It Straight, Unapologetic, Yet Tactfully.** Most people know I'm a Christian, so I'll use that as an example. Some people think it's impossible for biblical Christians to relate with certain communities, like homosexuals. This is dumb. I've had a number of homosexual friends. For a time, I danced around the issue, not wanting to upset them. That actually upset them even more because they knew I was treating them differently because of

their sexual orientation. They wanted me to talk to them the same way I would anyone else. So, we took it a step further. He'd start talking about making out with his boyfriend and I'd tease back, "Yeah, you'll have a lot of time to do that while you're burning in hell for eternity ;)" and they'd laugh. Once the rapport is there, and it's clear that the friendship exists through your disagreements, let the disagreements be a point of humorous distinction, not a point of division.

9. **Have Male Friends.** You can't learn how to be a man without being around other men. Even if the guys you know aren't the types of guys you want to emulate, you can influence them to become someone you're proud to be around - and then you can fuel each other on. I've done this many, many times. It's fun and rewarding.
10. **Have Female Friends.** Society will tell you that a married man should not be good friends with a woman other than his wife. This is somewhat absurd. Can guys and girls actually be "just friends"? Probably not. So what? Does that mean you're going to start unzipping your pants every time you're around one of your female "friends"? Is your self-discipline really so low? The social convention on this makes sense if you're a weak man who can't control his own dick - and if that's you, and you don't want to blow up your marriage, then follow it. But if know how to keep your pants on, you'd be a fool not to take advantage of the power that women have usurped in society by building relationships with them. It's seriously idiotic to cut off half of the population from your life just because your wife might not like it. Besides, chances are she actually does like it more than she's willing to admit to herself. Dread. Preselection. Mystery. Got it now?

46

UPVOTES

RPC Video Chat

3 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

For those not fans of long blocks of text, a few of us have started up an RPC video chat series for you all to listen in on. So as not to defeat the purpose, I'll just share the links and say no more.

- [Episode 1 - Introductions](#)
- [Episode 2 - Archetypes](#)

121

UPVOTES

Actual conversations with "abuse" victims.

4 June 2020 · r/MarriedRedPill · Archived copy · Reddit

It occurred to me recently that many guys may not know what their wives are telling the attorney in preparation for that looming divorce filing she didn't tell you she was already planning. So, let me give you some insight on what that conversation looks like behind the scenes.

All of these are approximations of actual quotes I've heard throughout my career. They usually start with an allegation that the other side is abusive, followed by my asking: "How is he abusive?"

The Typical Conversation

This is based off of an actual conversation I had with one client in particular, but is fairly common of most:

"Did he ever hit you?"

"No," she says.

"Okay, so how was he abusive then?"

"He's verbally abusive."

"How so?" I always ask.

"He swears at me."

"Out of the blue or during arguments?"

"During arguments."

"Did you swear back at him?"

"Yes, but nowhere near as bad as he did it to me. He gets REALLY angry during arguments. Did I mention he's emotionally abusive too?"

"How's he emotionally abusive?"

"Because he gets soooo mad at me for little things or when I didn't do anything wrong at all!"

"Does he think you did something wrong?"

"Well yeah, that's why he's mad. But I swear I didn't. I just didn't do it his way - and he wants to make me feel horrible for that. That's emotional abuse. I looked it up on the internet."

"I'm sorry to hear that. Have you ever gotten mad at him over something that he felt was unjustified?"

"Oh sure. He accuses me of nagging him all the time."

"And have you ever yelled or gotten angry in those situations?"

"Well, yeah - because he's so abusive that it makes me mad and I can't help but yell and get angry! But what do you think? Can we show the court how abusive this man is?"

Other Memorable Quotes

I have added the first sentence for context, but I assure you that ALL of these quotes have included an allegation of the exact type of abuse referenced at some point in the conversation/testimony, and the second sentence on is part of the explanation given. Some are my client, others are the opposing party during my examination.

- "He's manipulative. He doesn't actually do anything that I could call abusive, but he does things to make me feel

abused anyway. That's how he tries to get away with his abuse."

- "He's manipulative." I ask, "How does he manipulate you?" She answers, "By asking me to do things, and then I feel like I have to do what he wants all the time." I ask, "Does he ever threaten you if you don't do it, either direct or implied?" "No, I just know that he'll be angry. He uses his anger to manipulate me into getting his way."
- "He's manipulative. He uses the kids as pawns to get at me." I ask, "How so?" She answers, "When we're fighting, sometimes he takes the kids and leaves the house. He says he's 'giving me time to cool off.'" "What does he do with them?" "Usually they go to a park or out for ice cream or something fun, knowing that I'm at home in tears - and he doesn't care. Then he looks like the fun dad and I'm the crazy mom who they have to be saved from. And everyone thinks HE is the hero in the situation!"
- "He's emotionally abusive. Every time we argue, he just sits there silently and doesn't talk or get mad or do anything. He knows it infuriates me, but he keeps doing it!"
- "He's emotionally abusive. He loves to look at me with this smug grin on his face, even when I'm obviously mad at him." I ask, "You mean he does it when you're not mad too?" She answers, "Yeah, he's just smug all the time."
- "He's emotionally abusive. He told me if I tried to leave him, he'd fight for custody of the kids."
- "He's emotionally abusive. He told me that if I didn't handle this situation his way, he'd take the kids and live with his mom for a while." I asked, "Isn't that what you did when you filed for divorce two years ago before dismissing it?" She answers, "Yeah, but I'm the mother. That's different."
- "He's sexually abusive. He thinks I should have sex with him whenever he feels like it, and he'll try to pressure me to say yes." I ask, "Do you say yes or do you stand your ground?" She answers, "I always say yes. It wouldn't be abuse if I felt like I was allowed to say no."
- "He's sexually abusive. He made me give him blow jobs even though he knows I don't like it."
- "He's sexually abusive. He looks at me all the time, even when I don't want him to. It creeps me out."
- "He's sexually abusive. When we have sex, after he's finished he ends things and never tries to help me along, then makes me feel guilty for not finishing as fast as him. It makes me not want to have sex with him anymore." I ask, "So did you stop having sex with him or tell him you didn't want to?" She answered, "No. I just started finishing myself off afterward."
- "He's sexually abusive. He raped me many times during our marriage, forcing me to do all kinds of outrageous things, like blow jobs, hand jobs, and other stuff." I find peers in her congregation to confront her about these accusations. She tells them, "Oh, I made all that up. My attorney said I had to say those things to win custody."
- "He's financially abusive. He controls the check book and I have to ask for permission whenever I want to buy anything." I ask, "Has he ever said no to anything that you needed for daily living purposes?" She answered, "No."
- "He's financially abusive" as above (a common one). I ask the same question. She answers, "No." I ask, "Has he ever said no to anything you wanted to buy at all?" She answers, "No. But he still has all the power over the finances and I have none."
- "He's financially abusive. He keeps all the accounts in his name and refuses to let me know what's in the accounts." I ask, "Have you ever asked and he told you no?" She answers, "No. I don't feel like I'm allowed to ask. But he never gave me access."

- "He's financially abusive. He buys whatever he wants, like eating out for lunch while he's at work pretty much every day. But when I want to buy something, he always says no." I say, "Give me examples of things he's said no to." She answers, "Usually new decorations for the house." I ask, "Is he buying decorations for his man cave or his office?" She answers, "No, he doesn't value decor, and because he controls all the money, it means I can never have what I want, while he still gets to have whatever he wants." I ask, "And what is it, exactly, that he wants?" She answers, "Usually he just spends money on food." [Note: the guy wasn't even obese.]
- "He's financially abusive. He spends all our money, and then there's nothing left for basic needs. We're in so much debt." I ask, "What types of things does he buy?" She answers, "TVs, sound systems, video game systems, computer stuff." I ask, "Have you ever bought things like that for fun yourself?" She answers, "Yeah, he buys me a new smart phone every year. I also have a few ipads and a laptop. He likes to buy me jewelry too. He thinks I have to forgive him when he does that. But then when there's no money left for groceries, we end up having to put it on the credit card, and now I'm constantly in a panic over all the debt we've racked up. Can the courts make him stop? I can't handle the financial abuse."
- "He's financially abusive. He knows I can't afford this divorce, yet he keeps doing everything possible to ring up my attorney fees and make this case cost a small fortune." I think to myself, "No, you calling me for 3 hour chats 2-3 times a week to talk about your insecurities and not letting me hang up the phone is what's costing you a small fortune. Learn to shut up and this whole thing would have been 80% cheaper."
- "He's verbally abusive. He yells and screams and swears at me all the time." I ask, "Do you ever do it back?" She answers, "Yes."
- "He's verbally abusive. He lies all the time." I ask, "Do you have any proof of any of the lies you just told me about?" She answers, "No, he's really good at hiding things. And a lot of the stuff he lies about are smaller things just to get under my skin, not big things that would be provable."
- "He's verbally abusive. He calls me names and tries to make me feel bad about myself, telling me I'm worthless and that nobody could love me." I respond, "I'm really sorry to hear that. That sounds cruel. How did you handle it?" I thought she'd say she went to her room and cried. Her actual answer: "I know I shouldn't have done it, but I started breaking his things. I figured that if I wasn't worth anything, he couldn't have anything worth anything either. I get that I reacted poorly, but that doesn't change the fact that the way he talked to me was abuse, and I want the court to see that."
- "He's physically abusive. Just look at these pictures!" She pulls them out, I say, "Oh, that red mark on your neck?" She says, "No, that was a bug bite. It's the spot on my arm, where he hit me." I ask, "Oh, the dot right there?" She says, "No, the other arm." She points to a slight discoloration that I'm pretty sure was really just a shadow. I say, "Oh, the picture must just be faded too much to notice. Can you get me one with better resolution so the judge can see what you're pointing out?" After she gets me the better resolution copy the next day, I still couldn't see it. She didn't have any other angles of the shot (presumably because she couldn't get the shading just right from any other angle).
- "He's physically abusive. Look at the pictures of the bruises on my arm!" The pictures were entered as exhibits and showed very serious bruises. She added, "I took this video of him slamming a door on my arm repeatedly." It gets marked as an exhibit and played for the judge. The video shows the two arguing, then she drops her phone, so the video goes black, but audio can be heard of her screaming and a door slamming on her arm multiple times. Later at trial, I have my client on the stand presenting a video that he was taking simultaneously, showing her slamming the door on her own arm with an identical audio track.
- "He stalks me. He walks his dog in front of my house all the time." I ask, "How far away does he live?" She answers, "4 houses down."

- "He stalks me. He constantly posts things on Facebook directed to me and he won't stop." I ask, "Have you ever told him to stop?" She answers, "No." I ask, "How difficult has it been managing your social media account with him doing this?" She answers, "Oh, he doesn't actually tag me in any of them. I only find out about it because my friends tell me about it."
- "He stalks me. He used to take videos of us having sex together." I asked, "When did you find out about this?" She answers, "I mean, I agreed to it at first, but I didn't know he was still doing it after the first few times. Plus, I didn't know he had videos of other women too - and he didn't delete them after he broke up with them! He probably still has my video too. Don't you think that's creepy like a stalker? He's out there watching videos of me naked after we're divorced. The court has to realize that's stalking, right?" I ask, "Do you have any evidence that he's actually watching those videos?" She answers, "No." I ask where she found the videos, she answers, "In a box in our shed." I ask, "Does he know you found the videos?" She answers, "No." I ask, "So, in all probability, he thinks they're still packed away in a box in the shed and hasn't actually seen them in years, right?" She answers, "Yeah, I guess that makes sense."

In all of these situations, the women genuinely believed they were the victims of abuse. I 100% believe that they were being sincere in their allegations, despite that in most situations they did not come anywhere close to the actual legal standard of abuse. To that end, **I have only used examples from cases where the allegation of abuse didn't actually get substantiated in court** (except a few of them, where the cases are still pending, but it's not been an issue yet). I'm not here to increase panic about the divorce-rape boogey-man.

BONUS 1. Gender Reversal: "She filed a CPO against me saying I'm abusive, but she's the abusive one!" I ask, "How so?" He answers, "For example, when we would have sex, she'd make me choke her. I was really uncomfortable with it, but she'd pressure me saying she couldn't orgasm unless I was choking her hard enough that she was actually having trouble breathing."

BONUS 2. Parental Alienation [an EXTREMELY common conversation]: "He/she is alienating my kids from me! He/she lies about me, blames me for everything in front of the kids, keeps telling the kids I cheated on him/her, tells the kids it's my fault we're getting divorced, etc. This HAS to stop. Don't the courts care about parental alienation? I read online that this is a big deal and that the Courts will put a stop to it." I ask, "How's your relationship with your children?" They answer, "Oh, they love and adore me. Our relationship is very strong." I ask, "How's the other party's relationship with the kids." They answer, "Not very good. The kids really struggle being over there because of how bad of a person he/she is." I ask, "Given what you just said, who do you think the court will believe is the actual alienated parent?" They answer, "But they're doing it to themselves! I'm the one being alienated by all the things they say about me." I answer, "Give me 3 examples of how your relationship with the children has been irreparably harmed by those things." They never get past the first.

BONUS 3. Danger to the Child: "He doesn't love our daughter. It's so obvious. He's using a size 3 nipple, which I know is the manufacturer recommended, but she had acid reflux 6 months ago, so she should only be using a size 1 nipple on her bottles to limit the flow. How does the court not see that he just doesn't care about his daughter at all?" [Yes, this one's more exaggerated because of the way I summarized the conversation, but every claim I referenced is true, nonetheless.]

Caveats

In maybe 2-3 of these cases there were more significant things that came up and these were secondary rationales. But in the majority, these were the primary reasons given.

I also have a number of cases where the abuse was very, very real. This isn't to say that abuse doesn't actually

happen. Rather, it's to show that women have a grossly inaccurate concept of what actual abuse looks like.

NOT The Point

My point here is not to make you afraid that all women will cry abuse just because they can. It's also not to make you afraid of abuse charges that she will inevitably contemplate at some point throughout your marriage. I'm also not trying to make you extra cautious of doing anything that could possibly be interpreted as abuse in court.

The Point

My point ACTUALLY IS that if a woman isn't attracted to you or (even if she is) she's decided to leave, she's going to be prone to interpret any negativity in the relationship as a form of abuse no matter what you do. Sometime her feelings will be legitimate in light of the circumstances. Don't be that guy, unless it's self-defense. But none of the things I referenced above went anywhere in court, no matter how fervently she pushed the issue (some cases pending). So, my conclusion for you guys is to look at a list like this and think to yourself:

- There's no point worrying about whether or not she's going to cry "Abuse!" someday. Just assume she will.

From there, **the guys who fare best are the ones who make her second-guess why she's divorcing him in the first place.** And yes, that second-guessing is EXTREMELY common as well, despite how few women are willing to admit it. But they tell their attorney everything along those lines too. This is one of the reasons it's so vital to maintain a firm "stay plan is the go plan" mentality if your marriage is falling apart - not in the hope that you might win her back, but because the things that would give you that chance are the same things that are going to tweak whether she cries "Abuse!" or "Aw, I'm going to miss how bold of a person he was."

It occurred to me recently that many guys may not know what their wives are telling the attorney in preparation for that looming divorce filing she didn't tell you she was already planning. So, let me give you some insight on what that conversation looks like behind the scenes.

All of these are approximations of actual quotes I've heard throughout my career. They usually start with an allegation that the other side is abusive, followed by my asking: "How is he abusive?"

The Typical Conversation

This is based off of an actual conversation I had with one client in particular, but is fairly common of most:

"Did he ever hit you?"

"No," she says.

"Okay, so how was he abusive then?"

"He's verbally abusive."

"How so?" I always ask.

"He swears at me."

"Out of the blue or during arguments?"

"During arguments."

"Did you swear back at him?"

"Yes, but nowhere near as bad as he did it to me. He gets REALLY angry during arguments. Did I mention he's emotionally abusive too?"

"How's he emotionally abusive?"

"Because he gets soooo mad at me for little things or when I didn't do anything wrong at all!"

"Does he think you did something wrong?"

"Well yeah, that's why he's mad. But I swear I didn't. I just didn't do it his way - and he wants to make me feel horrible for that. That's emotional abuse. I looked it up on the internet."

"I'm sorry to hear that. Have you ever gotten mad at him over something that he felt was unjustified?"

"Oh sure. He accuses me of nagging him all the time."

"And have you ever yelled or gotten angry in those situations?"

"Well, yeah - because he's so abusive that it makes me mad and I can't help but yell and get angry! But what do you think? Can we show the court how abusive this man is?"

Other Memorable Quotes

I have added the first sentence for context, but I assure you that ALL of these quotes have included an allegation of the exact type of abuse referenced at some point in the conversation/testimony, and the second sentence on is part of the explanation given. Some are my client, others are the opposing party during my examination.

- "He's manipulative. He doesn't actually do anything that I could call abusive, but he does things to make me feel

abused anyway. That's how he tries to get away with his abuse."

- "He's manipulative." I ask, "How does he manipulate you?" She answers, "By asking me to do things, and then I feel like I have to do what he wants all the time." I ask, "Does he ever threaten you if you don't do it, either direct or implied?" "No, I just know that he'll be angry. He uses his anger to manipulate me into getting his way."
- "He's manipulative. He uses the kids as pawns to get at me." I ask, "How so?" She answers, "When we're fighting, sometimes he takes the kids and leaves the house. He says he's 'giving me time to cool off.'" "What does he do with them?" "Usually they go to a park or out for ice cream or something fun, knowing that I'm at home in tears - and he doesn't care. Then he looks like the fun dad and I'm the crazy mom who they have to be saved from. And everyone thinks HE is the hero in the situation!"
- "He's emotionally abusive. Every time we argue, he just sits there silently and doesn't talk or get mad or do anything. He knows it infuriates me, but he keeps doing it!"
- "He's emotionally abusive. He loves to look at me with this smug grin on his face, even when I'm obviously mad at him." I ask, "You mean he does it when you're not mad too?" She answers, "Yeah, he's just smug all the time."
- "He's emotionally abusive. He told me if I tried to leave him, he'd fight for custody of the kids."
- "He's emotionally abusive. He told me that if I didn't handle this situation his way, he'd take the kids and live with his mom for a while." I asked, "Isn't that what you did when you filed for divorce two years ago before dismissing it?" She answers, "Yeah, but I'm the mother. That's different."
- "He's sexually abusive. He thinks I should have sex with him whenever he feels like it, and he'll try to pressure me to say yes." I ask, "Do you say yes or do you stand your ground?" She answers, "I always say yes. It wouldn't be abuse if I felt like I was allowed to say no."
- "He's sexually abusive. He made me give him blow jobs even though he knows I don't like it."
- "He's sexually abusive. He looks at me all the time, even when I don't want him to. It creeps me out."
- "He's sexually abusive. When we have sex, after he's finished he ends things and never tries to help me along, then makes me feel guilty for not finishing as fast as him. It makes me not want to have sex with him anymore." I ask, "So did you stop having sex with him or tell him you didn't want to?" She answered, "No. I just started finishing myself off afterward."
- "He's sexually abusive. He raped me many times during our marriage, forcing me to do all kinds of outrageous things, like blow jobs, hand jobs, and other stuff." I find peers in her congregation to confront her about these accusations. She tells them, "Oh, I made all that up. My attorney said I had to say those things to win custody."
- "He's financially abusive. He controls the check book and I have to ask for permission whenever I want to buy anything." I ask, "Has he ever said no to anything that you needed for daily living purposes?" She answered, "No."
- "He's financially abusive" as above (a common one). I ask the same question. She answers, "No." I ask, "Has he ever said no to anything you wanted to buy at all?" She answers, "No. But he still has all the power over the finances and I have none."
- "He's financially abusive. He keeps all the accounts in his name and refuses to let me know what's in the accounts." I ask, "Have you ever asked and he told you no?" She answers, "No. I don't feel like I'm allowed to ask. But he never gave me access."

- "He's financially abusive. He buys whatever he wants, like eating out for lunch while he's at work pretty much every day. But when I want to buy something, he always says no." I say, "Give me examples of things he's said no to." She answers, "Usually new decorations for the house." I ask, "Is he buying decorations for his man cave or his office?" She answers, "No, he doesn't value decor, and because he controls all the money, it means I can never have what I want, while he still gets to have whatever he wants." I ask, "And what is it, exactly, that he wants?" She answers, "Usually he just spends money on food." [Note: the guy wasn't even obese.]
- "He's financially abusive. He spends all our money, and then there's nothing left for basic needs. We're in so much debt." I ask, "What types of things does he buy?" She answers, "TVs, sound systems, video game systems, computer stuff." I ask, "Have you ever bought things like that for fun yourself?" She answers, "Yeah, he buys me a new smart phone every year. I also have a few ipads and a laptop. He likes to buy me jewelry too. He thinks I have to forgive him when he does that. But then when there's no money left for groceries, we end up having to put it on the credit card, and now I'm constantly in a panic over all the debt we've racked up. Can the courts make him stop? I can't handle the financial abuse."
- "He's financially abusive. He knows I can't afford this divorce, yet he keeps doing everything possible to ring up my attorney fees and make this case cost a small fortune." I think to myself, "No, you calling me for 3 hour chats 2-3 times a week to talk about your insecurities and not letting me hang up the phone is what's costing you a small fortune. Learn to shut up and this whole thing would have been 80% cheaper."
- "He's verbally abusive. He yells and screams and swears at me all the time." I ask, "Do you ever do it back?" She answers, "Yes."
- "He's verbally abusive. He lies all the time." I ask, "Do you have any proof of any of the lies you just told me about?" She answers, "No, he's really good at hiding things. And a lot of the stuff he lies about are smaller things just to get under my skin, not big things that would be provable."
- "He's verbally abusive. He calls me names and tries to make me feel bad about myself, telling me I'm worthless and that nobody could love me." I respond, "I'm really sorry to hear that. That sounds cruel. How did you handle it?" I thought she'd say she went to her room and cried. Her actual answer: "I know I shouldn't have done it, but I started breaking his things. I figured that if I wasn't worth anything, he couldn't have anything worth anything either. I get that I reacted poorly, but that doesn't change the fact that the way he talked to me was abuse, and I want the court to see that."
- "He's physically abusive. Just look at these pictures!" She pulls them out, I say, "Oh, that red mark on your neck?" She says, "No, that was a bug bite. It's the spot on my arm, where he hit me." I ask, "Oh, the dot right there?" She says, "No, the other arm." She points to a slight discoloration that I'm pretty sure was really just a shadow. I say, "Oh, the picture must just be faded too much to notice. Can you get me one with better resolution so the judge can see what you're pointing out?" After she gets me the better resolution copy the next day, I still couldn't see it. She didn't have any other angles of the shot (presumably because she couldn't get the shading just right from any other angle).
- "He's physically abusive. Look at the pictures of the bruises on my arm!" The pictures were entered as exhibits and showed very serious bruises. She added, "I took this video of him slamming a door on my arm repeatedly." It gets marked as an exhibit and played for the judge. The video shows the two arguing, then she drops her phone, so the video goes black, but audio can be heard of her screaming and a door slamming on her arm multiple times. Later at trial, I have my client on the stand presenting a video that he was taking simultaneously, showing her slamming the door on her own arm with an identical audio track.
- "He stalks me. He walks his dog in front of my house all the time." I ask, "How far away does he live?" She answers, "4 houses down."

- "He stalks me. He constantly posts things on Facebook directed to me and he won't stop." I ask, "Have you ever told him to stop?" She answers, "No." I ask, "How difficult has it been managing your social media account with him doing this?" She answers, "Oh, he doesn't actually tag me in any of them. I only find out about it because my friends tell me about it."
- "He stalks me. He used to take videos of us having sex together." I asked, "When did you find out about this?" She answers, "I mean, I agreed to it at first, but I didn't know he was still doing it after the first few times. Plus, I didn't know he had videos of other women too - and he didn't delete them after he broke up with them! He probably still has my video too. Don't you think that's creepy like a stalker? He's out there watching videos of me naked after we're divorced. The court has to realize that's stalking, right?" I ask, "Do you have any evidence that he's actually watching those videos?" She answers, "No." I ask where she found the videos, she answers, "In a box in our shed." I ask, "Does he know you found the videos?" She answers, "No." I ask, "So, in all probability, he thinks they're still packed away in a box in the shed and hasn't actually seen them in years, right?" She answers, "Yeah, I guess that makes sense."

In all of these situations, the women genuinely believed they were the victims of abuse. I 100% believe that they were being sincere in their allegations, despite that in most situations they did not come anywhere close to the actual legal standard of abuse. To that end, **I have only used examples from cases where the allegation of abuse didn't actually get substantiated in court** (except a few of them, where the cases are still pending, but it's not been an issue yet). I'm not here to increase panic about the divorce-rape boogey-man.

BONUS 1. Gender Reversal: "She filed a CPO against me saying I'm abusive, but she's the abusive one!" I ask, "How so?" He answers, "For example, when we would have sex, she'd make me choke her. I was really uncomfortable with it, but she'd pressure me saying she couldn't orgasm unless I was choking her hard enough that she was actually having trouble breathing."

BONUS 2. Parental Alienation [an EXTREMELY common conversation]: "He/she is alienating my kids from me! He/she lies about me, blames me for everything in front of the kids, keeps telling the kids I cheated on him/her, tells the kids it's my fault we're getting divorced, etc. This HAS to stop. Don't the courts care about parental alienation? I read online that this is a big deal and that the Courts will put a stop to it." I ask, "How's your relationship with your children?" They answer, "Oh, they love and adore me. Our relationship is very strong." I ask, "How's the other party's relationship with the kids." They answer, "Not very good. The kids really struggle being over there because of how bad of a person he/she is." I ask, "Given what you just said, who do you think the court will believe is the actual alienated parent?" They answer, "But they're doing it to themselves! I'm the one being alienated by all the things they say about me." I answer, "Give me 3 examples of how your relationship with the children has been irreparably harmed by those things." They never get past the first.

BONUS 3. Danger to the Child: "He doesn't love our daughter. It's so obvious. He's using a size 3 nipple, which I know is the manufacturer recommended, but she had acid reflux 6 months ago, so she should only be using a size 1 nipple on her bottles to limit the flow. How does the court not see that he just doesn't care about his daughter at all?" [Yes, this one's more exaggerated because of the way I summarized the conversation, but every claim I referenced is true, nonetheless.]

Caveats

In maybe 2-3 of these cases there were more significant things that came up and these were secondary rationales. But in the majority, these were the primary reasons given.

I also have a number of cases where the abuse was very, very real. This isn't to say that abuse doesn't actually

happen. Rather, it's to show that women have a grossly inaccurate concept of what actual abuse looks like.

NOT The Point

My point here is not to make you afraid that all women will cry abuse just because they can. It's also not to make you afraid of abuse charges that she will inevitably contemplate at some point throughout your marriage. I'm also not trying to make you extra cautious of doing anything that could possibly be interpreted as abuse in court.

The Point

My point ACTUALLY IS that if a woman isn't attracted to you or (even if she is) she's decided to leave, she's going to be prone to interpret any negativity in the relationship as a form of abuse no matter what you do. Sometime her feelings will be legitimate in light of the circumstances. Don't be that guy, unless it's self-defense. But none of the things I referenced above went anywhere in court, no matter how fervently she pushed the issue (some cases pending). So, my conclusion for you guys is to look at a list like this and think to yourself:

- There's no point worrying about whether or not she's going to cry "Abuse!" someday. Just assume she will.

From there, **the guys who fare best are the ones who make her second-guess why she's divorcing him in the first place.** And yes, that second-guessing is EXTREMELY common as well, despite how few women are willing to admit it. But they tell their attorney everything along those lines too. This is one of the reasons it's so vital to maintain a firm "stay plan is the go plan" mentality if your marriage is falling apart - not in the hope that you might win her back, but because the things that would give you that chance are the same things that are going to tweak whether she cries "Abuse!" or "Aw, I'm going to miss how bold of a person he was."

Originally drafted for MRP. Still relevant for Christian guys whose marriage is headed toward divorce.

14
UPVOTES

RPCC Episode 3: The State of Marriage

9 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

Here's another round of our video chat series for you all to enjoy. The topic today: The State of Marriage.

Also, some bonus content: a short on whether or not creatine is worth using. Enjoy!

- **Episode 3: The State of Marriage**
- **Short Chat: Creatine**

33

UPVOTES

RPC Chat - Episode 4: Christian Dead Bedrooms

16 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

Here you go: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JQEfHzAv8jA&t=2156s>

TRADITIONAL EXPLANATIONS

I have yet to see an even remotely persuasive view of this verse in any commentary I've read. Yes, I've gone through all of them on biblehub.org. Here are the answers given on that site and others:

1- It's a reference to the fact that a woman would give birth to the Messiah (Elliott, Benson, Matthew Henry, and virtually everyone else)

- Benson suggests Eve is the one saved through child-bearing, fulfilling Genesis 3's curse on the serpent

2- Paul just put the women in their place, so he felt obligated to make them feel better by highlighting that they can have kids and men can't; that is: women still have an honorable function in the earth, if not through teaching then through bearing children (Elliott's)

3- If women are faithful and holy, God will remove the curse of the pain of child-bearing, or perhaps even the possibility of death (Benson)

4- Child-bearing references all maternal duties, being what will save women (Barnes, Geneva)

5- Child-bearing is "synonymous with education ... woman, by the proper training of her children, can obtain salvation as well as her husband, and that her appropriate duty is not public teaching, but the training of her family" (Rosenmuller)

6- The real emphasis is that women must continue in faithfulness and holiness to be saved, as is apparent from the entire rest of the new testament, and the mention of child-bearing is merely because it was the curse on the woman, suggesting that she will be saved even despite the fact that she still experiences pain while bearing children (Barnes, Poole)

7- Child-bearing, and the work associated with it, would be the context in which women are most likely to be saved, whereas a lifestyle of public teaching would actually decrease their likelihood toward salvation (Jamieson-Fausset-Brown)

WHY THEY DON'T WORK

1) There is NOTHING in the context to support the reference to the Messiah. Further, the future-tense of the child-bearing being a salvific event precludes the option of the past child-bearing event of Jesus' birth, not to mention the "if they continue" language. This point is also made moot by the fact that men are also saved by the fact of Mary (a woman) having given birth to Jesus, so why would women be singled out in this way? For this to make sense, Paul would have had to re-word himself: "Women will be honored by being the gender through which the Messiah was born," yet that's not what he said. Barnes does a decent job shredding this view apart.

2) The passage doesn't say women will be "honored" or "esteemed." It says they will be "saved." The word for "will be saved" is used a dozen or so other times, none of those times being translated anything remotely close to honored/esteemed. The only two times it's not used salvifically are, ironically, references to Jesus bringing someone back from the dead. It seems apparent that these are interpretive translations whereby "will be resurrected" or "will be made well" could have just as easily been translated: "will be saved [from death]."

3) One could argue that the invention of epidurals has fulfilled this verse, defeating the curse. The problem is that this is available even to the most vile of women, having nothing to do with faith and holiness. There seems to be no distinction between those who are faithful/holy and those who aren't when it comes to pain in child bearing.

4) Again, if we take "saved" in a soteriological sense, as seems to be the case from the other uses of the word, this interpretation would make the passage read: "Men are saved by grace through faith, but women are saved if they

have kids, but only if they're faithful and holy also." This is against most of the rest of the new testament on soteriology.

5) This interpretation seems to create an unnatural separation of the words as if it's suggesting, "Women will be saved, just like men, and they will also have a role of teaching among their children." It ignores the "saved THROUGH child-bearing" part.

6) This is perhaps the most plausible of the unlikely options. My only objection is that the word "through" in the phrase doesn't lend itself to be reinterpreted this way. Every other use of the word "through" here is a direct causal relationship. Many translations of the Greek word for "through" also say "because of." The majority use it in the context of something being said "through the prophets," emphasizing that they were the vehicle by which something would happen. It's also frequently translated as "by." None of the alternative translations lend themselves to this interpretation.

7) I'm fascinated by this interpretation, affirming my appreciation for the JFS commentary whenever I have come across it. But there is still too little context for this interpretation to make sense, and it ignores the causal nature of the word "through" in the actual text.

WHAT IT DOES MEAN

Virtually every commentary on the subject tries to "explain away" the phrase as if it means something other than it says. I propose that the Bible means what it says in this situation. The context is obviously soteriological, as it blatantly references the fall of humanity by its reference to Eve's first sin, and then immediately explains how women are to be saved going forward.

To give my TL;DR: We often discuss here that physical reproduction is a shadow of the reality of spiritual reproduction. I have also referenced on many occasions the soteriological connection to spiritual reproduction (which I will reiterate below). In this, child-bearing for women does have both spiritual soteriological significance (in the sense of producing spiritual children for them to mother, being the women they convert and disciple) as well as physical significance (by producing children to be the primary objects of their evangelistic efforts).

THE FULL EXPLANATION

Understanding the Fruit

Jesus talks a lot about plants, fruit, seeds, farming, growing, etc. He is consistent in his use of them. The parable of the sower is the most obvious one to interpret because he actually takes his disciples aside and explains exactly what it means:

- The seed is God's Word.
- We are the soil.
- The plant is when God's word grows in a person.
- When the plant grows large enough, it bears fruit.
- Fruit is the seed-bearing part of the tree that drops into the nearby soil.
- That seed then can grow, if the nearby soil is good soil.
- The result is that the tree yields a crop "30, 60, or 100 times what was sown."
- Only the good soil does this, and there's no room for the expectation that the good soil WON'T do this. It WILL.

In this, we see some imperative that those who are genuinely saved will produce fruit and a crop. The fruit contains the seed that we spread to those around us. The crop are those who grow from that seed, being those who we convert and ultimately disciple. Paul talks about evangelism as the planting process and discipleship as the one who tends the plant with water, fertilizer, etc. God is the one who makes it grow.

Caveat

Before I go much further, let me make clear up-front: **I am not suggesting that spiritual reproduction is a prerequisite to salvation.** That would be an absurd conclusion, as that would mean that one must have sex (physical reproduction) before they can be married. Instead, the marriage precedes reproduction, yet is also what consecrates it. Just as sex affirms the authenticity of the marriage and precludes the possibility of annulment, so also does spiritual reproduction - bearing fruit for Christ - affirm the authenticity of our salvation and preclude the possibility of a spiritual annulment, as will be addressed more with regard to the soteriological significance of the fruit, below.

Let me also make clear up-front that the fruit is not the actual disciple who is produced from our effort. That would be the plant that grows from the fruit falling in the nearby soil. Instead, the fruit is the part of us that goes out to spread seed into the nearby soil. The soil it falls in is still separate from the fact of the fruit that spread the seed there.

Soteriological Significance of Fruit

With that foundation, look at many other passages and the soteriological significance of bearing fruit and helping the crops grow:

First, the parable of the sower itself shows that this is directly associated with being good soil. I won't rehash that.

Second, in Matthew 7, Jesus says that we will recognize true believers from false ones by their fruit, showing the soteriological significance of bearing fruit (i.e. spreading seed, being God's Word out of us).

Third, in that same passage, Jesus doesn't say that the tree that produces bad fruit will be cut down and thrown into the fire (though this is also implicit), but that the tree that "fails to produce good fruit" is the one that is burned up.

Fourth, if we look at the parable of the talents/minas, it's all about reproducing what God gave you. The one who had 10 reproduced 10, the one with 5 reproduced 5. The one with 1 talent/mina held onto it and did not reproduce. He didn't lose it! That's important. He kept it safe. But he didn't reproduce it. What happened? It was taken away from him and he was cast into a place with the exact same description Jesus uses for hell ("weeping and gnashing of teeth").

Fifth, the parable of the fig tree (Luke 13:6-9) tells of a fruitless tree that the master wanted to cut down. It wasn't producing bad fruit. It wasn't a dead tree. It was a barren one. The gardener asks for one more year to fertilize it, tend it, and help it grow. He says, "If it produces fruit, I've saved the tree. But if it doesn't, then after giving it that one last chance, you're welcome to chop it down and throw it in the fire."

There are many, many more examples, but it's quite obvious throughout Scripture that spiritual reproduction is tied to soteriology. And consider how a woman's barrenness in the old testament was such a great shame over her! It was considered a sign of God having cursed her. She could have otherwise been a fantastic wife and woman, yet by being barren she was considered disgraced all the same. So it is with the barren believer.

The Unforgivable Sin

I'll actually add one more example: the unforgivable sin. Lots of people ask what it is. Jesus says it's "blasphemy of the Holy Spirit." Most people don't like the actual context of the passage and will say, "No, saying something with your words can't make you commit it. It's a heart thing." Then they'll break it down into one of the two most popular answers: (1) It's callousing your heart so hard that you will never choose repentance again, or (2) It's ignoring the Holy Spirit's work in your life all the way to the point of death without ever repenting.

These answers are completely absurd because there is NOTHING in the context of the passage at all that would even remotely imply this. It requires eisegesis to impute those concepts into the passage to get there. Let's look at the actual context:

- The pharisees **verbally** accused Jesus of working through demonic powers.
- Jesus rebukes them.
- He tells everyone that "every kind of sin **and slander/blasphemy** can be forgiven" - specifically highlighting verbal sins (slander).
- He adds, "Anyone who **speaks** a word against the Son of Man will be forgiven" - again, a verbal sin.
- "But anyone who **speaks** against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven, either in this age or in the age to come" - obviously talking about verbal communication.

So what does it mean to "speak against" or "blaspheme" the Holy Spirit?

The obvious contextual answer is to do exactly what the Pharisees just did to Jesus, which created the context for why Jesus said all this in the first place. The pharisees verbally attempted to thwart Jesus' efforts by preaching against him to convince others not to follow him. I have to imagine that if we do the same against the efforts of the Holy Spirit - that is, verbally attempt to persuade others away from the faith that the Spirit is drawing them toward - this would be blasphemy of the Holy Spirit instead of "blasphemy of the Son of Man."

Let's expand on this. Acts 1:8 tells us that the function of the Holy Spirit when he comes on us is to cause us to become God's witnesses to the world. That is: spiritual reproduction. God's Word grows in us because of the Spirit's work, which then produces the fruit that is spread into the nearby soil ("Jerusalem, Judea and Samaria, and to the ends of the earth"). So, the work of the Spirit is ultimately to cause us to produce good fruit (i.e. converts and disciples).

While the Spirit produces good fruit, one who produces bad fruit is one who does the opposite. Instead of generating life, they compel others toward death. Bad fruit is still fruit - it is still reproduction and not the same as barrenness. But it's producing something vile rather than nothing at all. The fruit is dead. So, one who produces "bad fruit" produces death in others, leading them away from life.

In short: those who "speak against/blaspheme the Holy Spirit" are those who attempt to lead others away from the life that the Spirit offers to everyone. It is those who fight against the Gospel and attempt to lure believers away from salvation and into death.

To recap up to this point:

- Trees with good fruit are those who are alive in Christ and actively sharing their faith among the soil (people) around them.
- Barren trees are those who are neutral and apathetic, having no interest to share their faith or fight against the faith, except to the degree that they find the conversations stimulating/amusing.
- Bad fruit comes from the active efforts made by those who seek to thwart the efforts of the Holy Spirit, leading others away from life and reproducing death in them instead.

The connectivity between the fruit and the unforgivable sin is obvious in that the very next verse after the unforgivable sin is: "Make a tree good and its fruit will be good, or make a tree bad and its fruit will be bad, for a tree is recognized by its fruit."

Oh, and after that Jesus goes into the verbal nature of the unforgivable sin: "how can you who are evil say anything

good? For the mouth speaks what the heart is full of ... everyone will have to give account on the day of judgment for every empty WORD they have spoken. For by your WORDS you will be acquitted, and by your WORDS you will be condemned." I'm not sure how we ignore the verbal nature of this entire passage, or the context of the fruit.

... not to mention that the only reason Jesus is preaching on this at all is to rebuke the pharisees for trying to lead people away from following him, making it even more obvious that the unforgivable sin is to verbally entice others away from the life that the Holy Spirit is enticing them toward, specifically "blaspheming" the Holy Spirit in the process.

Oh yeah, and beyond the fruit being mentioned in the passage itself, you'll note that I bring up the parable of the sower a lot here because that parable is shared in the very next chapter and begins with, "That same day." That is, the parable of the sower was preached almost immediately after Jesus taught on the unforgivable sin (technically, he got interrupted before he could finish his explanation, the parable of the sower being Jesus's way to get back on track).

What about vocal atheists?

This always comes up, so let me clarify: it's one thing to present a defense of your own world view. Most vocal atheists are doing just that. They're pushy about it - not because they're trying to force Christians to give up their faith (much less with any success), but because they're intellectually ambitious and arrogant of their own views. They debate just because they enjoy the debate, not because they want to stifle the Holy Spirit (even though their actions may at least appear to have that impact). **In this sense, most vocal atheists are forgivable, if they repent.**

Under the view I'm presenting, the point where they cross the line is when they actually shift their focus off of mere verbal jousting as a game they enjoy, and instead adopt the focus of the pharisees: to allow their hate for the Holy Spirit's work cause them to argue that what the Holy Spirit does is evil in an effort to entice those who would live by the Spirit away (I may even add: "and actually succeeding").

Arguably, this wouldn't even apply to the degree they may persuade a fellow non-believer not to be saved, as there's no death being produced - there was already death in the non-believer in the first case. In that situation, they're merely nurturing the conditions for death to remain. Rather, if they actually persuade a genuine believer to give up their faith with the goal of stifling the Spirit's efforts, that's actually reproducing their own death into someone else who wasn't previously dead. That is when they have produced bad fruit.

Fun Fact

As something of an aside, the soteriological significance of spiritual reproduction also explains Deuteronomy 23:1 - "No one whose testicles are crushed or whose male organ is cut off shall enter the assembly of the Lord." What a fascinating verse. Why not? Because if you have no capacity to reproduce, you have no business pretending to be among God's people. In the old testament, it references the testicles as the means of physical reproduction. We now understand this as spiritual reproduction, and therefore anyone who is spiritually incapable of reproduction cannot be among God's people. Fortunately, all people are "capable" - yet some of us refuse, becoming like the eunuchs who emasculate themselves by choice, which Jesus references in Matthew 19.

THE CHILD-BEARING ASPECT OF MARRIAGE

What does any of this have to do with women being saved through child-bearing? I know I've gone on what must seem to be a confusing side-track for a bit. But here's where it connects.

If failing to produce good fruit is what causes someone to be chopped down and thrown into the fire (i.e. go to hell), then it follows that the only way to know you won't go to hell is to produce good fruit.

In Malachi 2:15, we read, "And why did the Lord make them [husbands/wives] one [flesh], with a portion of his [Holy] Spirit in their union? To produce godly offspring." That is: the point of marriage is to produce godly offspring.

God didn't want just any offspring. Adam and Eve fully populated the world by the time of Noah, but God wiped them all away with the flood, saying through his actions, "That's not what I meant when I asked you to fill the earth." Instead, Malachi 2:15 clarifies that God wanted GODLY offspring - people who are spiritually alive.

In the New Testament we readily understand that godly offspring is not produced merely from our physical descendants (even the Old Testament, such as in Zechariah, we see that the physical offspring of the spiritually alive can still be spiritually dead), but through our spiritual descendants. While Paul was not Timothy's physical father, he calls him his son in a spiritual sense. Romans 9 talks about how it is not those who are the physical descendants of Abraham who are his true children, but those who are the descendants of the faith of Abraham. Peter and John, in their epistles, also reference having spiritual children.

So, just as Malachi 2:15 alludes to the godly physical offspring of husbands and wives, the way married couples bear physical children is a model for how the church (and us, individually, as part of it) ought to bear spiritual children. Per the above, this child-bearing concept is directly associated with salvation - not that it makes us saved, but that saving faith will always lead to a compulsion to spread seed (which is found in our fruit). Put another way, our spiritual marriage to Christ should create a desire to spiritually reproduce with him in the same way that our physical marriages should include a healthy desire to engage in physically reproductive acts with our spouse.

CONCLUSION

So, "women are saved through child-bearing" seems to be this: Just as a wife is to bear children for her husband, which was (biblically) her most significant role in the household for most of history, so also is Christ's bride - the Church - meant to bear spiritual children for our groom. This process of child-bearing is substantially and undeniably tied throughout Scripture to our ultimate judgment. Reproducing spiritual offspring for Christ, our spiritual groom, contributes to and affirms our salvation in the same way sex (physical reproduction) contributes to and affirms a physical marriage - not as a necessary prerequisite (lest we be accused of reproducing with Christ before we are married to him), but as the seal that binds a marriage in the same way physical reproduction consecrates a physical marriage, eliminating the possibility of annulment.

In this sense, women are quite literally and soteriologically saved through child-bearing - not merely in the physical sense, but in the sense of raising spiritual children for which their ability to birth and raise physical children is a template.

Interestingly, "women are saved through child-bearing" can't possibly mean that they have a different means of salvation than men, as if men are saved by grace through faith, but women through child-bearing. That would be an absurd and inconsistent result with the rest of Scripture. Instead, it's best to understand that the soteriological significance of spiritual child-bearing is imputed to men in the way that we also adopt the role of the bride in regard to our union with Christ. That is, the soteriological rubric is same between both men and women in our relationship with Christ, yet women as a physical gender are uniquely given the template for how spiritual reproduction ought to occur by virtue of the physical representation they express in human marriages.

I just wrote this as a comment to someone else, but spent too much time on it not to make a post of it. So, here goes. The question was, essentially, how to arouse a husband who doesn't show much sexual interest in you. These are, for the most part, meant to be long-term solutions rather than short "put on lingerie, light some candles, cast Marvin Gaye to the speaker, and draw him in" types of advice that really only create one-off moments.

This is a good question - and it's not the first time I've heard it. This sub probably needs a guide on the sidebar for women on how they can enhance sexuality within a marriage, especially when the husband seems disinterested. Maybe [/u/RedPillWonder](#) has already written something like this. Either way, here are a few things that come to mind:

Physical Appearance

I know most people don't want to hear it, but guys are primarily turned on by physical appearance. Is he sexually attracted to certain celebrities? If the answer is yes, then it's not that he's sexually disinterested; it's that he's sexually disinterested *in you*. Ouch. I'm sure that hurts to hear. But the good news is that there are LOTS of things women can do to become more physically attractive. Lose weight. Develop an appealing fashion sense. Become more skilled at wearing makeup. Adjust posture. Use body language.

I used to be very unattractive to my wife. She'd suggest I change as a way of improving her sexual interest in me. I'd say, "But some of these things are just part of who I am." Her reply: "So you're saying that your self-identity is tied to wearing ugly clothes? That somehow if you stopped wearing ugly clothes, you as a person would change?" The reality is that it wasn't an identity issue for me. It was a preference issue. I wanted a better sex life, but at the time I preferred wearing my comfy-pants (even in public) more than I desired to have sex with my wife. That, in turn, made her have no sexual desire for me, creating a nasty sexual stale-mate. I had to lose 50+ lbs, gain a ton of muscle, up my wardrobe, start wearing cologne, etc. to be more attractive. Now, just yesterday, she's commenting on watching my butt while on a hike. All those things that made me unattractive that I didn't want to give up, or the hard work I didn't want to start - it's all just part of life now and I don't find my new lifestyle any less "me" or even less enjoyable than my prior lifestyle. Actually, I'm MUCH happier now, even though I couldn't have foreseen myself becoming happier before I'd started moving forward in these areas.

Kino

Beyond mere appearance, men are also turned on by direct physical contact. Kino is the art of utilizing physical contact to stimulate arousal. Learn to apply it and your husband will get hard fast. Just be tactful. Grabbing his crotch right off the bat isn't likely to work and the, "There, I tried and failed" attitude is unhelpful (I've been there and seen other women go there). Use physical touch in different ways. A hug might not get him thinking about sex. He might think you're looking for emotional connectivity through the hug. The same thing could apply to a kiss when he gets home from work or before bed. Most people take general gestures as just that: general and not a communication of desire.

Instead, try sitting next to him on the couch when you're watching a movie, rather than sitting on a chair across the room. Put your hand on his thigh and rub your fingers back and forth for a while. When you snuggle up to him, instead of just enjoying the *comfort*, put your hand on his chest. Maybe even slide your hand up his shirt just to feel the warmth of his skin. Give him a massage without expecting one in return. As part of the massage, slide your hands down his back and around his waist toward his front side, then go down his legs rather than pushing for his crotch. The point here is to tease his arousal, not to force it through direct contact. Get him thinking about sex without him realizing that's what you're pushing for. If he notices right away that you're trying to get him aroused, his anti-sex defenses will go up. Once he is aroused, they stay down.

Clothes

I don't think women realize how drastically important their clothing is toward getting a man to desire her. For some, this is a "down the road" kind of thing. You really have to have the right body to make your clothes work for you. But even then, there's a lot of wiggle room if you're clever with your fashion sense. There are even some obese models I've been shocked to find myself look twice at - all because they knew how to make their attire work for them. The goal here isn't to look respectable or cute or even fashionable. It's to look attractive and feminine. There is a huge difference. The clothes women like for themselves do not often overlap with the clothes men would want to see on their wives to instigate sexual desire. My wife can still use a lot of work on this one. Her go-to outfit is jeans and a t-shirt. She thinks it works because they're girly t-shirts. But they're not attractive. Even skin-tight jeans do nothing for me. I don't even get interested in yoga pants or leggings. Know what does it for me? Skirts and dresses. Capris can even work. Gaucho pants are also fine. My rule of thumb: if men commonly wear it, it's not going to attract a man. I don't want my wife to dress like a man. I married a woman for a reason.

Now, most women assume lingerie is the answer. Yes, lingerie is great. I LOVE it. But it's only great when you're already headed toward sex. It doesn't actually get him headed there, though. It assumes he's already ready to go, or that it will be enough of a tipping point to get him ready. In reality, if you want him thinking of sex before you get in the bedroom (which is the best way to assure it happens when you do get in the bedroom), you should be wearing clothes that imply sexuality ahead of time and save the lingerie for an added boost to his already-aroused state.

Attitude

There are really 3 qualities that affect a woman's SMV (sexual market value) to a man. The first is her physical appearance (often numerically reduced to an HB ranking - ex. "She's a 7"). The second is her fluency with physical contact. A guy will be more attracted to a woman who touches him than who stays seated on the other side of the table. This is where kino comes in. In my experience, it actually boosts attractiveness and not just arousal. But the third is your attitude. Some women are total nagging harpies or plain-janes who think their husband should get hard just because she says the word "sex." This is counter-productive and only actually works for incel men who would hump anything that gave them the time of day.

I've known a lot of women who thought they had a "good attitude" because they were generally positive, optimistic, upbeat, and happy people. That's fine. But having a "good attitude" is not the same thing as having an "arousing attitude" or a "sexually alluring attitude." You ever watch a James Bond movie? Notice how the girl who wants to get him in bed doesn't act like a wife. She acts like a woman who wants to get him in bed. Right? There are some women who are not physically appealing, yet I find myself attracted to them anyway because they speak seductively, use body language, have a presence that leaves me thinking: "If I wanted to, I could have sex with her right now." This attitude can be conveyed 100% with completely non-sexual dialogue, without any form of physical contact, and without overtly being sexual.

Now, part of this is tied to Madonna-Whore Complex (which it sounds like your husband may suffer from), and I'm persuaded that adjusting one's attitude is the best solution, even over wearing better clothes or applying kino, which are things even the sweet, innocent types will do. Instead, a seductive attitude stems from you FEELING like a sexual person first. Most Christian women who struggle with sexual allure have the framework, "I'm a good girl, but sometimes I behave sexually 'naughty' with my husband," then are proud of themselves with these isolated moments of sexual expression. This perpetuates the M-WC to be even worse. Instead, flip it to tell yourself, "I'm a naughty nymph, but I behave innocently so some people don't see it." Then let your husband be one of the people who DOES get to see it.

I will also note that just as a "good attitude" is sexually neutral and an "alluring attitude" is sexually seductive ... a "BAD attitude" is a HUGE turn-off. Don't be a harpy. Don't nag. don't complain. Don't boss him around. If you need help, ask him when he's available to help you rather than telling him, "Come here, I need your help."

Dialogue

I put this one really low on the list because it should be an afterthought. Behaviors will always be more alluring than words. If you're relying on words as your primary tool, you will fail. But if you've got the other things in line, learning to incorporate sexual suggestion into your dialogue can go a long way toward getting your man to be thinking about sex with you. This can be done through innuendo, conversations on the topic of sex, commenting when a movie, person on the street, or other person you come across makes you feel sexual, etc. Most women are taught to hide their sexuality. With most of the world, I don't necessarily disagree. But certainly with your husband you should be expressing it regularly, not hiding it. Sadly, for most women they've been hiding it for so long that they don't even know how to begin expressing it - especially through dialogue - and it feels very awkward and forced. Do it anyway. Even if it's out of character and out of context.

I will note here that general encouragement and support toward your husband is not sexually alluring. It's a fantastic expression of your loving commitment toward him and can help strengthen the *relational* bond you have with him, but this type of dialogue does nothing to entice a *sexual bond*. So, recognize that even good behaviors only work within their own context.

Ambiance: The above advice should produce long-lasting results with a continual boost to your husband's sexual interest in you. If you are doing well in those areas and you just need something that tips him over the edge, try working on creating a sexual ambiance in your home. Most women like very sterile, neutral colors for their walls, generic paintings of landscapes or flowers for the walls, etc. Try putting up decore that evokes sexual thought and imagery. It doesn't have to be sexual. My grandparents, for example, had a painting on their wall for as long as I knew them that was of a woman carrying a vase of water with a man holding his arms around her. It was not at all inappropriate for company to see - it would have been viewed as a normal painting. But it also expresses a moment of intimacy between two people. [I actually think my grandmother is the one who painted it.]

I also liked buying LED lights that changed colors. So, if I had company over, I could make them ordinary white. But if I wanted, I could change them to red or blue or something else that set a different atmosphere than the typical stale white colors we often see. Or lighting candles around a room to light it, rather than just the one on your kitchen counter for the scent, can go a long way. Or you can use cheap tactics and "accidentally" start leaving some of your sexier bras and panties on the floor by your bed where he'll take notice, whereas most women generally try to hide their "unmentionables" (oh, and stop calling them that). The point here is that there are lots of things you can do with the aesthetics of your house that convey intimacy and sexuality without being totally awkward when outsiders come in.

Sexual Association

Another thing that can help is to start creating sexual association with non-sexual things. For example, I was at a Bible study once where we were talking about the word "consecrate." One lady asked, "Is that like when you move into a new house and you consecrate it by having sex in every room?" Her husband says, "No, that's *christening*." Well, now a perfectly normal word that gets used even in Christian conversation ("consecrate") reminds me and my wife of that story and gets us thinking about sex. These types of associations can help create natural triggers toward sexual thought, which raise sexual activity overall.

How do you pull this off intentionally? Create a running joke about it. For example, you can be sarcastic about how some lame chore, like folding laundry, is so exciting for you. He comes home from work and asks how your day was. You say, "I folded laundry for an hour. It was so exciting! [with dry sarcasm]. Just thinking about the excitement of folding laundry anymore makes me horny." You both laugh. Next week, you're watching a show, pull some laundry out of the dryer and plot it on the floor to start folding it and say, "Laundry day. Time to get horny," as you hold up a pair of underwear. He remembers the previous joke and you both laugh. You've just created an inside joke and now every time you fold laundry he remembers that it "makes you horny" (sarcastically). You can push even harder by actually initiating sex while folding laundry or having sex on top of a clean laundry pile (yes, even if it means having to re-wash some of it). Suddenly, you have this weird "laundry" thing, and the fact that you fold laundry frequently means he's thinking about sex frequently. Just don't force it every time.

Other than a running joke, you can also create associations in other ways. For example: buy him a generic gift, but find a way to use it while having sex. I bought my wife a back massager once. It vibrated. At first, it was used while watching TV. Then I used it to give her an intimate massage before initiating sex. Eventually it got used while having sex. Now there's a household item that invokes sexual imagery/memory. Repeat the process with other things, like ice cubes or certain types of food or a pencil or some other random object that you SOMEHOW incorporate into sex. I once bought my wife a bouquet of flowers and used the petals to rub her intimately during sex. It wasn't particularly mind-blowing and was probably less interesting than normal stimulation ... but it made her laugh now that type of flower reminds her of that one time she was pleased by one.

That's all I've got time for. Best wishes.

24

UPVOTES

RPC Podcast Episode 6: Fitness Tests (and a crucial announcement)

30 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

Hi all, here's another episode of our RPC video chat series:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4eSrwjvPMn4&feature=youtu.be>

With that link in mind, there are rumors on the secular RP subs that another wave of SJW sub-banning is about to start and they're calling for all RP-related subs to be removed. Are we at risk? It would be unjustified, given our content compared to the other RP subs, but it's certainly possible. So, our solution for now is:

- **SUBSCRIBE TO THE YOUTUBE CHANNEL. If this sub is ever shut down, we will announce our new location from this channel.**

Yes, YouTube might shut down RP-related content too, but the odds of them doing it at the same time reddit does is pretty low.

Also, you'll be glad to see that more of our guys are turning their videos on at this point in the series - or at least using a pic ;)

LIVE CHAT

Also - is anyone interested in doing a Q&A session with me on Reddit Public Access Network? I've thought about doing something like this soon. You can't get the whole team on it, as it seems to be one camera at a time, but it could be fun.

ONE-ON-ONE CHAT

Also - I'm planning on doing what I call "walk and talks." I've done this with a number of guys from this sub, where I, essentially, walk around my neighborhood while chatting with them about various topics. It could be a relationship struggle they're going through, divorce advice, developing their mission, coaching on how to transform their congregation into having a culture of discipler-making, practicing studying the Bible together - or any other number of things. I have come to love these conversations. Well, after having enough of them it occurred to me that I could record some of these conversations and post them for others to benefit from as well. Anyone interested?

18

UPVOTES

RPC Podcast Episode 7: The Importance of OYS

8 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

Yeah, nobody wants to hear this topic. It's easier to get intellectual about self-improvement than actually doing it. Is that your struggle? Listen in.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=u54FjCpt2ds>

Here's the latest in the RPC Chat series: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2zcO9cDxcfQ&feature=youtu.be>

Some of my "walk-and-talk" conversations will start going up between these videos. They can either be on-point with red pill topics, or completely side conversations.

- The first, which will be posted soon, is a conversation with [/u/praexology](#). It will address the spiritual realm - demonic forces, angelic armies, healing ministries, and other forms of spiritualism. While not necessarily authoritative, it's a fun conversation that addresses many questions people ask from time to time. I love to see prax's passion for this subject and I'm glad he's getting an opportunity to share it with you all!
- The next one to be posted after that is a chat I had today with Levi ([/u/thechristianalpha](#)) about the coronavirus and whether Christians should engage in political revolution.

I do have other calls scheduled, but want to refrain the opportunity for anyone else who would like to chat about anything - this is your moment to be in the spotlight ;) That can include things like ...

- Requests for advice
- Off-topic stuff that's been on your mind
- A subject you'd like to teach on or just flesh out more fully with another person (i.e. me)
- Studying a passage of Scripture together to hone our skills
- Challenges to the things we teach/believe here

Really, the goal of the walk-and-talk conversations is to start empowering our users to take ownership in what we're building here. Send me a message if you'd like to host or be a guest to one of these calls.

Here's the first walk-and-talk, everybody: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4lvigXaSp68&t=227s>.

In this walk and talk, [u/Praexology](#) and I talk demonic forces, angelic armies, healing ministries, and other forms of spiritualism.

Warning: It's a long one, so here's a table of contents if you want to skip to the parts you find most relevant.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 0:00 - Intro & Background on [u/Praexology](#)
- 7:30 - Praex's Background with Spiritual Warfare
- 9:10 - Personal Experiences with Healing & Over Demonic Oppression
- 13:55 - "Can a Christian be possessed or demonically oppressed, or is that reserved for non-believers?"
- 17:30 - "Why are Spiritual Attacks not publicized in Church?"
- 21:59 - "Why does the Enemy pick one person over another to oppress."
- 24:30 - "Why do people who have experienced spiritual events not immediately come to Christ/faith?"
- 27:20 - "What is the enemies scheme? What is his overarching goal."
- 29:15 - "Why do we see more often demonic influence as opposed to angelic interaction?"
- 30:15 - "Could the focus on negative spiritual interjection be explain away by saying 'people don't want to take personal responsibility for their problems?'"
- 33:50 - "What is the enemies scheme? What is his overarching goal. pt.2"
- 36:25 - Red tries to trip up Praex. :)
- 39:11 - RC's "Screw tapes lost letter" aka. make them stumble by focusing on the general rather than the specific.
- 44:00 - How the enemy misleads or smokescreens your faith walk.
- 49:50 - Healing and Deliverance
- 52:55 - First person story "Healing of an unborn child."
- 56:25 - Healing and Deliverance pt.2 and "The purpose of healing."
- 59:05 - "Why doesn't someone with the gift of healing just go through a hospital and heal everyone in it?"
- 67:50 - RC's background with intercessory work.
- 70:30 - Praex's outline for intercessory work.
- 74:30 - Defining "Theophostic Prayer Ministry" and what can go wrong if underprepared people practice it.
- 83:00 - Outro

23
UPVOTES

Episode 9 - No Frame, No Game

21 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

Frame is a huge topic, so we're breaking this up into a few different episodes. Enjoy, brothers.

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

15
UPVOTES

Episode 10 - No Frame, No Game Part 2
29 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

Here's the latest edition of the RPC podcast. Enjoy!

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=J_-_6ymGP1M

I've heard the claim a number of times that "the origins of the word 'church' point to a place of worship." On [r/askRPC](#) a user asked if it's a biblical command to attend a weekly service. Other similar issues arise frequently, so let's talk about this.

"Church" is NOT Derived from Ekklesia

You heard me right. "Church" is one of the translations we have given to the word Ekklesia, but that's not the etymological root. The word we derived "church" from is actually German: Kirche. Some suggest that this may have come from the ancient Greek Kuriakon (or sometimes conjugated Kuriakos).

- Kirche in the German referenced a building or location.
- Kuriakon in the Greek generally means "belonging to a lord."

It's not hard to see how some people would confuse the location of the church with something belonging to God. After all, even the Jews before the cross understood the notion of devoting land and property to God (Mark 7:9-13, for example). That said, anyone looking at the two can obviously see that the two words split significantly in their definitions and historical use.

The latter is only used twice in the Bible, and never as a reference to the church. The first is in 1 Cor. 11:20 regarding eating "the Lord's supper." The other is in Revelation 1:10, referencing "the Lord's day." Note, of course, the comparison with Kyrios (sometimes Kurios), which is the Greek for "lord" and often used to reference Jesus throughout most of the epistles.

The Original Ekklesia

When talking about the Church, there are two Greek words that are translated as such: Ekklesia and Koinonia.

Koinonia is the word used to describe the spiritual connectivity of the Church. It is generally used to reference a oneness bond existing throughout a group. It's where we get the word "communion" from, as the KJV translated it that way and the word stuck. During "communion" we share a oneness with Christ. In the same way, Koinonia references, on occasion, the oneness that exists among a body of believers - that we are united in Christ, despite being different members of a singular body.

Ekklesia (or Ecclesia) is the word used to describe the structure of the church. It had an established meaning in the Greek language. While "church" to us seems like a uniquely religious word that predominantly applies to Christians, that wasn't the case for Ekklesia in the Greek language that most of the new testament was written in. It was a commonly understood term for a political (arguably military) structure. There are councils, senates, committees, ekklesias, and so on.

- **Thought Experiment 1:** Imagine this: in general life among your Christian friends, instead of the church the translation was "senate" and that's the word we used regularly. How would that change your perception of things? "Sorry, I can't hang out on Sunday because I have a Senate meeting." "I love my Senate." "You should go to Senate more often." "The Senate is Christ's bride." This has a massively different connotation to what we understand about the Church today, right? This is how the Greek-speaking population would have read the word - understanding, of course, that the reference was to the spiritual Kingdom, not the physical body that met in Athens.

The original ekklesia was a fascinating event, arising even before Daniel's time, meeting as early as 621BC. The Greek Empire in those days had a form of democracy that involved a popular assembly called an Ekklesia. A few relevant details:

- There were not many Ekklesias. There was only one. It referred to a unified assembly of the **entire** Kingdom, and not merely individual local assemblies throughout the Kingdom (which also existed by different names).
- It was not only comprised of willing participants of the entirety of the Kingdom; all people in the Kingdom were bound by it! ... even if they were not present or did not agree (i.e. were in the voting minority).
 - It was not a mandatory meeting. While attendance was encouraged, there was no *expectation* of attendance.
 - A quorum of no less than 6,000 people had to participate in any votes or else it was rendered moot or the meeting would be cancelled.
 - To encourage attendance, a per diem was given to all who participated: 1.5 drachma for special ekklesias and 1 for the ordinary. A drachma was roughly a day's wages.
- It focused not on teaching the attendees how to be "good little boys and girls." Rather, it was viewed as a business meeting. The people voted on issues related to Kingdom expansion - do we go to war? Send a diplomatic envoy to a neighboring Kingdom? Shall we ratify a treaty? Who do we appoint to keep rebels and criminals from destroying the country from within?
- This one's the must humorous to me: it met outside on a plain and not in a building.

I do not believe that in borrowing the word, Jesus or the apostles necessarily intended us to model the Greek structure of the Ekklesia exactly. Rather, I believe they were intending to convey, "Hi all you Greek-speakers. You remember those Ekklesia meetings you've been having all these years? Well, what I'm referring to is kind of like that, but based on the way Christ set it up rather than the way the Greeks set it up." This is pretty much the same thing Paul did in Acts 17 when preaching the Gospel with reference to the "unknown god" statute in Athens - find something not necessarily identical, but close enough that it conveys the point, while giving room for preaching God's intentions through that vehicle.

That said, I do believe the functional nature of the Ekklesia was part of the connection Jesus and the apostles were trying to make.

- **Thought Experiment 2:** Imagine if instead of the Ekklesia Jesus referred to our modern Congress, which is probably the closest thing we have to the Greek Ekklesia in America (with some significant differences). Now, consider the function and structure that this word-association would generate today. Can you imagine being told to build a Congress for the Church and instead coming up with the local congregational structure we now have and calling that our "congress"? Of course not. Virtually everyone alive today would know that what we do is neither structurally nor functionally anything like the American Congress from which the word would have been borrowed. In the same way, I'm confident that anyone alive in Jesus's day would look at our modern structure and say, "That's not an Ekklesia. You all are crazy."

Now, I've already noted that it's not meant to be a perfect comparison. Christ's Ekklesia is certainly distinct in many ways from the Greek ekklesia. But if we strip away our modern notions of the word "church" and, instead, place ourselves in the shoes of a brand new believer in the apostles' day who knew nothing about what Jesus taught and hadn't read the epistles and only heard that there was an ecclesia of Christ, here's what one might assume about it:

- The Church should meet corporately and universally, not only locally and divided (if it would meet locally/divided at all).
- There should be a singular, united structure for the Church, not numerous branches/denominations.
- The Church should not be tied to or associated with a building or location, but understood as the assembly of the people, meeting wherever is convenient.
- The purpose of the meeting is to decide matters of policy and vote on military matters, primarily affecting Kingdom expansion.

- There would be no expectation of teaching on how to be "good little boys and girls" (which would have been taught by discipler-makers within the Church).
- It would include appointing magistrates to judge and condemn those who would internally present a threat to the Kingdom, such as through promoting heresies.
- It would discuss policies on what types of bridges/treaties to build with those outside the Kingdom (i.e. the intermingling of "church and state").
- It would financially provide to the attendees rather than be a financial drain on them.

Now, I'm not suggesting the Church should incorporate all of these things. Again, this is just a picture of what someone in that day may have imagined based on that word alone. But it does get our brains realizing that we are WAAAY more unlike the Greek ekklesia than we are like to it.

Ekklesia Participation

Here's another fascinating point: the Ekklesia had restrictions on who could attend, speak, participate in votes, etc. It was limited to every (a) free, (b) native, (c) adult, (d) male (e) citizen in the entire empire was invited to attend and vote on certain issues. Consider these requirements in light of what we see in Scripture about participation within the Church. It would be limited to those who were

- (a) free - not enslaved by sin
- (b) native - born ("again" in the John 3 sense) into the Kingdom
- (c) adult - spiritually mature
- (d) male - i.e. not women
- (e) citizen - i.e. primary allegiance is to the Kingdom, not another country.

Interestingly, I could point to a number of Scriptural passages that would imply that this is the framework the apostles had for how the Church should be run, at least from a leadership, decision-making standpoint.

CONCLUSION

While the Greek ekklesia is not a perfect parallel to what Jesus and the apostles were building, that word was chosen over other structures at the time that would have been more alike to what we see in churchianity today. This tells me that Jesus and the apostles had a more Kingdom-building understanding of what the Ekklesia of Christ. While I won't conclude the parallels should all apply, what I **AM** willing to conclude from this is that the Church is not meant to be a place for people to come, hear a nice little lesson, ponder a quotable phrase for a few hours, and get on with their week. It's meant to be a strategy and planning session for how we get the Gospel out to the world - which is how the war will be won.

When you have "feeeelz" for someone else

2 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

About a year into our marriage, my wife confessed she had romantic feelings for her boss at the time. He was obviously hitting on her - and who could blame him? She's attractive, intelligent, in a great career, and she was extremely helpful to him in his mission to make a butt ton of money in life. This confession was nerve-wracking for her, thinking I would be infuriated. Of course, that response would have been almost as blue pill as my responsive effort to support her in her feelings and empathize with the situation. I, of course, confessed that I had felt things for other women since we'd been married too - and that this is a natural expectation, not something shameful that needed to be swept under the rug.

The Last Five Years

... is the name of one of my favorite musicals about a massively successful writer named Jamie (Jeremy Jordan) and a failing actress named Cathy (Anna Kendrick) who fall in love for all the wrong reasons and end up divorced in under 5 years (not spoiling the end: that's literally the first song). It can be found [for free on YouTube](#). Note: if you watch, Jeremy Jordan's songs are in forward chronology, but Anna Kendrick's are in reverse (meeting in the middle for their wedding duet) - no doubt a metaphor for the way she, after their divorce, wishes she could go backwards to where they started. I know - movies/TV/books are generally taboo on red pill forums, but the author of this musical actually got sued by his ex-wife because it was so obviously about their relationship that I treat this as a predominantly true story, just expressed through music rather than a blog post.

There are tons of red pills in this movie. The author is so alpha by the end that he literally opens the film with his ex, having been alpha widowed, lamenting the fact that he's off enjoying life and sex with other women while she's regretting the fact that she was a cold, bitter harpy that pushed him away. I love her line: "Give me a day, Jamie. Bring back the lies. Hang them back on the wall." If you hadn't guessed, the moral of the movie (or at least one of them) is that (a) when a man is committed to his mission, and (b) he invites his wife to join him, but (c) she is bitter and won't follow because she insists on her own mission, and (d) she ends up leaving him, then (e) the alpha man ends up fine and she ends up sad and depressed.

A Part of That (25:55) is a fantastic exploration of a wife trying to conform herself to her man's frame and mission (don't worry: at 1:01:00 she change her mind and goes rebellious, like you knew she would). The Schmueel Song (30:13) is also perhaps the best example I've seen in film of a man pulling his cussing/screaming, scowling, harpy wife into his frame by addressing her feels, expressing amused mastery, negging, and applying [/u/RedPillWonder's](#) posts/comments about the power of story-telling (a tactic I use often). But I won't elaborate on those (or others - I'm sure I'll do a post on the movie someday), so let's skip to the song most relevant to this post: A Miracle Would Happen. Jamie and Cathy are newlywed, attending one of his work parties. He realizes that having a wedding ring doesn't magically take away his attraction for other women - yet it vastly enhances their attraction toward him. Some theorize that this is because the ring shows he's willing to commit, but I don't buy this explanation because being a mistress undermines his commitment (though I'm sure women can hamster this away). Instead, I believe it's because a guy stops GAF about other girls, when he's newly married, making it easier to maintain confidence around them because he doesn't *need* them. Until she turns on him, he at least has the abundance of his wife. In experiencing this phenomenon, Jamie sings:

Everyone tells you that the minute you get married every other woman in the world suddenly finds you attractive. Well, that's not true: *It only affects the kind of women you always wanted to sleep with*, but they wouldn't give you the time of day before, and now they're banging down your door and falling on their knees. At least that's what it feels like because you CAN. NOT. TOUCH THEM. In fact, you can't even look at them. Close your eyes, close your eyes, close your eyes.

Anyone else able to empathize?

Except you're sitting there eating your corned beef sandwich and all of a sudden this pair of breasts walks by and smiles at you. And you're like, "That's not fair!"

And in a perfect world a miracle would happen and every other girl would fly away. And it'd be me and Cathy and nothing else would matter. But it's fine, it's fine, it's fine. I mean, I'm happy. And I'm fine, I'm fine, I'm fine. It's not a problem - just a challenge. It's a challenge to resist temptation.

Every try to convince yourself when you start having those lustful thoughts or pesky feelings toward other people that "I'm happy" and "I'm fine" and that you wish you only ever had eyes for your wife? It's, of course, a pretty typical blue pill ideology that most newlywed men hold.

And I have to say that what exacerbates the problem is I'm at these parties. I'm the center of attention. I'm the grand fromage. And here she [that pair of breasts] comes: "Let's get a cup of coffee. Will you look at my manuscript?" And I'm showing her my left hand. I'm gesticulating with my left hand. And then OH! There's Cathy! **Cause she knows. They always know.** And there's that really awkward moment where **I try to show I wasn't encourage this ... which of course I was.** And I don't want to look whipped in front of this woman, which is dumb - I shouldn't care what she thinks since I can't *touch* her anyway.

That's right: women always know. Don't think you're clever enough to hide the way you find other women attractive. Own it. Make it work for you rather than being a secret you think works against you.

And in a perfect world a miracle would happen and every girl would look like Mr. Ed. And it'd be me and Cathy and nothing else would matter, but it's fine, it's fine, it's fine. You know I love her. And it's fine, it's fine, it's fine. **It's what I wanted!** And I'm fine, I'm fine, I'm fine. it's not a problem. It's just a challenge. It's a challenge to resist temptation.

Yes. The blue pill fantasy is what you want **ED**. Is it still what you want? The reality is that chasing it down with another woman is just shifting the object of your blue pill fantasy. Never forget the third commandment of poon here: **You shall make your mission, not your woman, your priority.** In the movie, as a writer, Jamie (Jeremy Jordan) ends up believing he needs a woman in his life to be the inspiration for his writing. This is his flat that contributes to the downfall of the marriage. But the point I want to summarize is a simple one:

- **The fact that you get married doesn't change your proclivity to be attracted to other people.**

My guess is that if you're lifting, developing a stronger and more fun frame, becoming more charming, socially acknowledged, etc. that along your red pill journey you're going to deal with this exact same kind of attention. Fantastic! Find proof in the abundance mentality you've been building. But as enjoyable as it may be, many men and women simply don't know what to do when these feelings come up - and I'm not just talking about casual lusts, but actual entanglements that haunt your mind and are difficult to pull yourself out of.

UNDERSTANDING THE LACK

I'm reminded of the three Hebrew loves (I hate talking about the Greek loves because Jesus didn't speak Greek, nor was it native to the apostles):

- Dod: Physical passion
- Raya: Friendship and fun
- Ahava: Commitment

These all hit different peaks at different points in a relationship. The dod is highest when you're young and hormones are high. The Raya grows over time and peaks in mid-life, if you are wise with your finances and have the ability to enjoy life when your kids are teenagers or off to college. The ahava peaks in late-life, experiencing the fullness of a committed life to one another. When one is at its peak, the others are generally weaker - and the further from the peak, the weaker you are. That said, it's possible (at least for short bursts) to have all three in perfect, excellent harmony - and those are your best emotional-feelzy moments with your spouse.

When you find yourself emotionally entangled with someone else, it's often because you haven't developed ahava in your marriage yet. This love is lacking. You'll get there. But that level of commitment is still shallow. That's why it's easy to have eyes for other people - and you'd be a fool to believe your spouse doesn't look outside the marriage in similar ways.

At some point, the dimmer switch on other prospects will fade away, and it happens very gradually over time. On a new marriage, you're still too used to being in the single arena. It's going to take over a decade to shift away from that and settle in your mind to a point where ahava can even start to take hold. For the newlyweds, it's only a fanciful notion of what you want to be true, but not yet being experientially true.

WHAT TO DO?

Well, if you feel like blowing up your marriage, you can act on these feelings. That option's certainly out there. Obviously I'm not going to recommend that for Christians, who wouldn't want that route anyway. Otherwise, the simple unhelpful answer is: *Don't act on these feelings.*

It's unhelpful because it's "easier said than done." There are a number of reasons it's hard to do:

- You lack discipline
- You intentionally enter tempting situations or permit them to continue
- You've trained your mind and body to act on impulses
- The alternative isn't particularly appealing
- It would be easy to "get away with it"
- There's nothing *technically* wrong with what you're doing

Notice something sorely lacking from all of these? Yeah, it's your mission. Do these feelings advance your mission? Let me recite the third commandment of poon yet again: **You shall make your mission, not your woman, your priority.** Most people wrestling with will-power issues only have those issues because they aren't committed to a mission that matters. Or, if they are, they either (1) haven't found much success at it to become passionate, or (2) have higher priorities, meaning their "committed mission" is really their "committed hobby."

Along the latter lines ...

APPRECIATION AND PRIORITIES

I said above that you'd be foolish to think your spouse isn't noticing, and possibly feeling things for, other people the way you do. It's human nature. Expect it. That said, here's one of the biggest blind-spots for men: **when your wife feels unappreciated.**

I've been there. I mentioned above that my wife developed feelings for her boss at one point. It happens. No biggie. But why? Well, she was doing a stellar job at the office and he appreciated that. He gave her attention *for the things*

she contributed rather than just expecting them because it's her job. I, on the other hand, didn't give my wife a job in the first place. I let her make up her own set of responsibilities around the house, hoping she'd figure out what needed to be done and not. While she did a pretty good job, her priorities weren't identical to mine.

The things she was doing were things I didn't ask her to do and that I didn't find any value in - and yet she wanted me to dote on her for how well she did them. For example: she would dust the living room. I never saw any dust in the first place. She'd tell me she did it and I wouldn't bend over backwards with appreciation because I didn't even know it had been done. Why would I show appreciation for something that doesn't matter to me?

- *Thought Experiment:* Imagine that you're gone on vacation. A stranger comes by and spends 8 hours a day every day that you're gone picking up ants off your porch and putting them back in the grass. You get home and he tells you about all the hard work he did for you picking up all the ants and putting them back in the grass to keep your porch ant-free during your vacation. You're likely to say to him, "Thank you for your effort" as a general courtesy, but inside you will be thinking: "That was a waste of his time. The ants are going to come back anyway. And I wasn't here to enjoy the ant-free porch in the first place. And even if I was, I don't care if my porch is ant-free because I expect an ant every now and then. That's just normal for a porch. That guy was crazy and just wasted all that time and hard work for literally nothing."

Between your verbal expression of gratitude and your internal thoughts toward the situation, one is a lie and the other is true. I assumed it was better to live as I truly felt rather than lying in order to make someone else feel good. When my wife dusted the living room or vacuumed the floors, or wiped down the counters, etc. when I never saw them dirty in the first place, it felt like the guy picking ants off a porch. What a crazy, insane waste of time, expending all that effort for nothing! Rather than lying to my wife by pretending appreciation, I simply ignored it the same way I would have ignored the ant man in that scenario, brushing him aside to get his craziness out of my way.

Then at some point, especially after becoming red pill'd, I realized that women (with due respect) often have the emotional maturity of children - or perhaps most men have such a lack of emotional expressivity that a woman's emotional needs feels like the needs of a child. I don't extend the metaphor much further, as many men do. I do believe women can be highly intelligent, have well-developed thoughts and impressions and fascinating perspectives. And many are able to balance their emotions with rational thought. But the underlying craving for someone to treat them with the same expressivity they experienced as children is always there.

My kids waste time on lots of stupid things. It's fun to watch them sometimes. Sometimes they'll spend an hour trying to "help" me with something, while really making it worse. How do I respond? Do I chew them out for having caused me trouble? Of course not. I dote on them. "Oh, it's so wonderful. Thank you! Let me give you hugs and kisses. You really did this for me?!? I love it!" ... as I teach them a better way to do it next time that might actually be helpful in the future, or at least cause less harm.

At some point I realized my wife wanted me to treat her the same way. **She wanted that affection and it was wise for me to give it to her because that would create the emotional context for her to desire to improve to a point where she actually was more helpful.**

Simultaneously, my wife became wiser and started to realize she was plucking ants from a porch. She stopped wasting time on things that didn't need to be done because the list of things that actually did need to be done grew ever more massive. Prioritization occurred and helpfulness abounded, and now I am authentically appreciative for her contributions.

If your wife is looking elsewhere, there's a good chance it's because you're not giving her feels. You don't understand her child-like need for emotional fulfillment - possibly something that was lacking in her upbringing that she's validation-seeking from you. While there may be other reasons, that's often the case. Regardless, I don't say that as a negative. Wives **SHOULD** look for validation from their husbands - it's the husband who shouldn't look for it from his wife, but from God. So, she's right to want his validation. You'd be wise to give it - and not in

the cold, dead way you probably often communicate. Try ...

- Giving her a high-five. It's corny, but makes people feel good. Even your wife.
- Doing a happy dance.
- Spinning her around and finishing with a dip.
- Wrapping your arms around her and whispering your appreciation seriously and mysteriously in her ear.
- Agree and Amplify the value of what she's done, but actually end on a more serious note of, "For real, though: thank you."

You get the idea. These are ways to trigger her feels. While the actual words you say may not be precisely accurate, your words aren't all you're communicating. You're communicating your emotions too. Just as true words with false emotions *can* be either a lie or accurate expression of truth, so also can false words used to communicate real emotions.

Now, if your struggle is that you just don't have any real emotions to communicate toward your wife in the first place ... well, you've got bigger frame issues to work out before trying to address stuff like this.

For the Women

For the women: my suggestion in all of this is to focus your efforts on things that your man does find valuable rather than things that you find valuable that you wish he valued as much as you do. But even if he doesn't, remember Luke 17:7-10.

- Suppose one of you has a servant plowing or looking after the sheep. Will he say to the servant when he comes in from the field, 'Come along now and sit down to eat'? Won't he rather say, 'Prepare my supper, get yourself ready and wait on me while I eat and drink; after that you may eat and drink'? Will he thank the servant because he did what he was told to do? So you also, when you have done everything you were told to do, should say, 'We are unworthy servants; we have only done our duty.'

Have this attitude with your husband, as we are to have with Christ. It's not fun, but if you can recognize this as your role, you won't be demanding the validation, thus will be less likely to fawn over the next guy who gives it to you. In this, while it's appropriate for a wife to seek validation from her husband, that should not be the purpose of her being with her husband.

The purpose of marriage is to produce godly offspring (Malachi 2:15), which means to make disciples - first of your birth children, if you have them, and simultaneously outside of your home.

If you view your own thirst for validation as the purpose of your marriage, then when you don't get it (despite appropriately seeking it), you'll begin to wish you were married to another man and forsake the things you'd otherwise do that would fulfill that purpose. If the point of marriage was to get validation from your husband, then you'd be right to develop feelings for another man when your husband isn't validating you. But because that's not the point of marriage, having your eyes fixated on the actual goal - to make disciples - should go a long way in reorienting your heart to where its passions should be aroused. 3 John 1:4 - "I have no greater joy than this: to get validation from others" ... ooops, I mean "to see that my [spiritual] children are walking in the truth." See how that works?

What makes a man "red pill"?

- A. Suppose a man reads red pill forums for several years. He reads every sidebar book, all the top posts, and familiarizes himself with all the major blogging content in the manosphere. He doesn't believe a word of it, but it fascinates him.
- B. Or suppose he does believe it. He gets fired up and goes through his rage stage before moving on into embracing the reality of how the world operates as a fact of life that he can make for him. But the red pill life requires him to change too many things about himself that he doesn't care to do. After all, it's hard work and he doesn't have the chops for that, so he ignores it. He spends the rest of his days as a fat slob, playing video games with most of his free time, ending up a true incel, forever alone, yet continually fascinated at how perfectly the red pill explains his life experiences and why he has been rejected by women.
- C. Or suppose a man knows the red pill, but completely rejects it as a source of truth regarding intergender relational dynamics. He, for independent reasons, lifts weights, develops a charming personality, is in high social demand, at the top of his career, and ultimately marries a major hottie. He idolizes her and continues to do all of these things in the hope of keeping her sexually interested in him.
- D. Or suppose he doesn't give two franks about her because he knows he could have sex with any woman he wants, but he stays loyal because she pleases him and continues to provide value to his household. He's still clueless about the red pill, but has observed enough about human nature to know that what he's doing works. He does live out of his own point of origin and accomplishes everything he sets his mind to, which happens to perfectly align with everything the red pill expresses to be true, despite his ignorance of it. His life is exactly as he wants it to be, not what anyone else tries to make of it.
- E. Or what of the man who reads the red pill forums, applies what he learns, and finds his goals becoming realities?

We'd all agree that behavior alone does not make a man "red pill," right? You can't lift enough, be charming enough, or have a good enough social game to be *red pill* if you're still pining over women.

We'd all agree that knowledge alone does not make a man "red pill," right? You can't read enough books, write enough posts, or have a thorough enough understanding of the content to be *red pill* if you reject the notion that these things have any application in your personal life - you are not transformed by them.

But at some point something clicks in the content. You realize: *This isn't just some interesting theory. If it's true, then to accomplish my relational and sexual goals, I have to adjust my strategy.* That is when you're red pill, right?

And perhaps even the man who doesn't know the content for what it is, yet by nature lives by what is true and trusts that it will work for him - as it does ... perhaps he is also red pill.

What makes a man "Christian"?

- A. Suppose a man reads the Bible consistently for several years. He reads it completely, studies commentaries, familiarizes himself with historical contexts and memorizes passages. He doesn't believe a word of it, but it fascinates him.
- B. Or suppose he does believe it. He gets fired up about this fascinating new discovery he's made about how God created the world and the spiritual realms beyond it that influence everything that's been going on for

millennia. But the Christian life requires him to change too many things about himself that he doesn't care to do. After all, it's hard work and he doesn't have the chops for that, so he ignores it. He spends the rest of his days as a gluttonous drunkard, giving in to sloth, sexual sins, and ending up a truly depraved individual, yet continually fascinated at how perfectly the Bible explains his life experiences and why he never feels fulfilled in life.

- C. Or suppose a man knows the Bible, but rejects it as a source of truth. He, for independent reasons, decides to love his neighbors, serve those in need, develops a character of bold humility, is well-respected, and ultimately loved by all, accomplishing great things from his own internal sense of altruism toward the world. He thrives on the way the world recognizes him for these accomplishments, even if he doesn't show it, and he continues to do them in the hope that history will recognize him for it.
- D. Or suppose he doesn't give two franks about recognition from the world because he knows he could get recognition if he wants, but that's not what it's about for him. He continues to do these things because he genuinely loves the world God created. He's still clueless about anything the bible says, but can see through creation that there is some god out there who wants better for humanity - to redeem it - and that what he's doing is consistent with what this unknown god might expect of him. He lives to serve this unknown god and accomplishes everything creation can reveal to him about that god's expectations of him - which happens to be perfectly aligned with everything the Bible says is true, despite his ignorance of it. His life is, for all practical purposes, the closest representation of Christ on the earth since Christ himself, not what the world or any other religion would have him be.
- E. Or what of the man who reads the Scriptures, applies what he learns, and is transformed such that God's goals through him become reality?

We'd all agree that behavior alone does not make a man "Christian," right? You can't be good enough, humble enough, meek enough, serving enough, make enough disciples, or anything else to be *Christian* if you're still rejecting the truth of Scripture as the underlying foundation for your behaviors.

We'd also all agree that knowledge alone does not make a man "Christian," right? You can't read the Bible enough, memorize enough verses, study enough commentaries, or have a thorough enough understanding of theology to be *Christian* if you reject the notion that these things have any application in your personal life - you are not transformed by them.

But at some point something clicks in the Scriptures. You realize: *This isn't just some interesting religious text. If it's true, then to accomplish my innermost goals and for my life to have any meaning at all, I have to adjust my lifestyle.* That's when you're Christian, right?

And perhaps even the man who's never heard the name of Jesus or seen a Bible for what it is, yet by nature lives by what is true and trusts that the God who is discernible through nature will value his dedication ... perhaps he is also Christian.

Let's set this up clearly:

1. Christ is the groom.
2. The Church is his bride.
3. Producing spiritual children is evangelism - tantamount to spiritual sex through the oneness bond we have with Christ/the Spirit/God's Word.
4. Raising spiritual children is discipleship, which requires both a mother and a father.
5. A child who is birthed, but abandoned by the parent is an orphan.
6. Congregational structures collect spiritual orphans, becoming spiritual orphanages.

With this in mind, what do we make of our role within congregational structures - if any at all? Should we abandon them? Work within them? Worship them as many do? Did Jesus intend for the Church to become a spiritual orphanage? Or did he intend for his Kingdom to be made up of patriarchal lineages of grandparent to parent to child to grandchild to great-grandchild, and so on, and that the Church would be the name of the Kingdom under which these family units would live?

Let's go back through the list and contemplate these:

Christ is the Groom - Do we actually recognize our (instead of one-flesh) one-Spirit relationship with Christ? Is it an abiding relationship where he and his Spirit dwell within us, together with God's Word? If not, then the Church would be a single woman or a wife who has divorced her husband. Is that really what we want for ourselves? And if not, then what does it mean to live as if we are one-Spirit with Christ and he is head over us?

The Church is his bride - Do we really embrace the role of a bride in the relationship? Are you willing to live toward Christ the same way we talk about a woman should love toward us? After all, how can you lead your wife to follow you if you're not willing to model it in how you follow Christ? Contemplate 1 Cor. 11:3 on that. And this is where the MGTOWs get it wrong. A MGTOW mentality that communicates a man's refusal to engage in the sexual marketplace is akin not to our abandonment of the Church, but Christ's abandonment of the Church. Christ does not forsake the Church or his people. Nothing can separate us from his love. Neither should we model with our lives something distinct and separate from what would reflect the accuracy of Christ's relationship with his people - **UNLESS** we are already living out the spiritual reality to which the physical representation was meant to point. In that case, and that one alone - if a man is already united with Christ and reflecting to the World Christ's oneness bond with him through the way he spiritually reproduces and spiritually raises his children - then such a man is free from the model of the physical representation because the spiritual reality is already evident in his life and he doesn't need the road-map to get him where he already is or to show the world how to get to where he has already arrived. He merely says, "Here I am. Come with me." That is the only viable MGTOW man, who is in his physical singleness fully living in light of his spiritual marriage to Christ as an evangelist and disciple-maker.

Producing spiritual children is evangelism - One of my family members - gorgeous as she may be - cannot physically have children. She recently posted on Facebook that she's frustrated at the number of Christian men who insist on a bride who will give them children of their own, even saying that some were arguing that adoption is unbiblical. It's not, but that's beside the point. What man wouldn't want his seed to produce an heir for him? Of course you do. God gave you that innate desire. Yet when Christ wants a bride who will produce children for him, rather than raising someone else's kids, why do we suddenly shy away and think it's okay to ignore evangelism in favor of just teaching a class within our congregational unit? Just as sex is the most physically pleasurable and

fulfilling (and if it's been a while, full-filling) thing we can do in life, so also is evangelism the most spiritually pleasurable and fulfilling aspect of the Christian life.

Raising spiritual children is discipleship - How many husbands and wives take a purely evangelistic approach, thinking, "I want to have as many kids as humanly possible so that I can fill the orphanages of the world and make them glorious with how many kids they raise!"? That's absurdity. The expectation - and even LEGAL OBLIGATION by default - is that parents must raise their own children. Virtually everyone recognizes that raising children into mature, upstanding citizens who can birth the next generation, giving you grandchildren and great-grandchildren, and so on is the most rewarding aspect of life, even as sex is the most pleasurable.

Which requires both a mother and a father - Here's where too many people misunderstand the balance of authority in discipleship. Many red pill men are quick to jump to the conclusion that "women are to raise the children at home" while the "men are carrying on a mission." I don't disagree, except to the extent that men are to be active fathers and the ultimate authority in deciding how the children are to be raised, even if the wife spends more of the day-to-day time implementing it. The congregational structure is quick to cut out Christ's model of spiritual parenting in how he disciplined his 12, and which they modeled with others, such as Paul with Timothy or Peter with Mark - instead, acting as if the mother (the Church) has the final say and authority in how children are to be raised. As such, we get congregations all over the world who come up with their own philosophies that they believe are based on various *teachings* of Jesus, while ignoring the *example* of Jesus. Others take the reverse approach: they cut out their own role in mothering/nurturing children, commissioning them to Christ on the expectation that God will carry the person on to maturity if the person is truly saved. In reality, Christ works through the Church as the vehicle through which his parental authority is carried out, and we must embrace his role in being a spiritual father just as much as we cannot abandon our role in spiritually nurturing the young and immature.

A child who is birthed, but abandoned by the parent is an orphan - This is when we evangelize someone, but refuse to be a parent to them. I love this quote in Dawson Trotman's message, *Born to Reproduce* ([here, for those who want to listen](#)):

A boy came into my office one day and told me about all the souls he had won. He said they were all Armenians. He was an Armenian. He had the list. I said, "Well, what's this one doing?" He said, "That one isn't doing so good. He sort of backslid." "What about this one?" We went all down the list and there was not one living a victorious life.

I said, "Give me your Bible." I turned to Philippians and I put a coardboard right under the 6th verse, and I took a razor blade out of my pocket and started to come down on it. He grabbed my hand and asked, "What are you going to do?"

"I'm going to cut this verse out. It isn't working." Do you know what was wrong, friends? I had been taking the 6th verse away from the 3rd, 4th, 5th and 7th verses. Paul didn't just plot that down and say, "All right, the Lord has started something, He'll finish it." You know, that's what people tell me when they win a soul. They say, "Well, I just committed him to God."

I see Norm Lewis here. He's the father of 7. If I went up to Norm and said, "Who's taking care of your children, Norm?" "Huh, oh, I left them with the Lord." I've got a verse for you, Norm, if you say that. *If any man provide not for his own household, he is worse than an infidel.* Paul said to the elders of the Presbyterian ... er, the church at Ephesus, "Take heed to the flock over which the Holy Ghost has made YOU the overseer." You don't make God the overseer. He makes you the overseer.

Congregational structures collect spiritual orphans, becoming spiritual orphanages - The reality is that most people aren't willing to parent their own spiritual children. They pretend they don't know how. They're good at

having sex, but the concept of actually raising a child is too terrifying, so they either abort (i.e. engage in self-defeating evangelism strategies) so they don't have to worry about raising the child, or they leave the child up for adoption for the church to raise, hoping that they can find someone who can raise the child. The reality is that there aren't enough parents willing and able to adopt children - and even if you're not ready to parent a child, it's better if you try. It's better than letting the child die in the womb or sending them to the overcrowded mass-structure for them to be a number in the crowd.

God bless those who run orphanages. They are a necessary and praise-worthy part of society. Never stop supporting those who care for these little ones! But even better if we didn't need them. Even better if parents learned to raise their own children without killing them or giving them away. In an ideal world, there would be no congregations because every family unit would stay a family unit - and the Church would be meeting together not to teach all those orphans how to be good little boys and girls, knowing very few will actually listen - rather, it would be meeting **to discuss how we can produce more children and raise them and make our family lineages even more fruitful in comparison to the opposing kingdoms around us - even dominating those kingdoms and making their children our own.**

Support your spiritual orphanage, but always make it your primary goal to transform the world around you until they become totally and completely unnecessary because the Church becomes a united Kingdom of families rather than a structure to contain orphans.

7

UPVOTES

Walk & Talk 2: Kings, Kingdoms, and Corona

6 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

I almost forgot to post this. Enjoy! https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7LtJMzHyI_s&t=60s

"Headship" as a concept is given a lot of lip service, but few people actually practice it the way Christ does with the Church. I can't count the number of people who tell me how "red pill" their ~~church~~ congregation is, or how "biblically grounded" the teachings are on marriage and relationships, while being exactly the opposite.

KNOWING THE STRUCTURES

I believe a large reason for this stems from inappropriately understanding the views on marriage expressed by different congregational structures. Here they are:

1. **Headship:** The view that the man is the head of his household. What he says goes.
2. **Complementarianism:** The view that God has given men and women different roles to fill. Among the man's roles are the right to have the final say on disputed matters in the home.
3. **Egalitarianism:** The view that husband and wives are on equal footing with regard to all roles, including decision-making authority.
4. **Feminism:** The view that women should be empowered in the home to do as they please and that men should support them in the direction the woman chooses to go, unless it would otherwise amount to direct sin.

Very few congregations actually claim the title of "feminist" when it comes to discussing marriage roles, as they realize this cultural ideology is in direct opposition to Scripture, so most of them will take the feminist agenda and mask it in the form of egalitarianism or complementarianism. Egalitarian-feminists will push the notion that a wife's *equality* with her husband prohibits him from exercising authority over her, empowering her to have an *equal* say, which is virtually always interpreted that her "equal" say should win because if he wins then he's just a patriarchal monster. Complementarian-feminists will pay lip-service to male authority in the home, but instead redirect that authority in ways that serve the wife. If there's a dispute, the husband would be "ungodly" if he were to exercise his authority in a way that displeases his wife or fails to give her what she wants. As such, the man's authority in the home is merely that of a puppet figurehead, while the wife truly runs the show. Feminist structures incorrectly reflect to the world that the bride (Church) has authority over her husband (Christ) either by direct authority or obligational exercise of authority.

True egalitarianism (of the non-feminist variety) is still unbiblical and dangerous. Jesus directly preaches that no kingdom can have two leaders, or else it will be divided. Married people are meant to be ONE, not divided. The only ways *true* egalitarians can resolve conflicts are: (1) by compromising, which inherently means that even if one party is right, the right answer must be set aside for the compromised conclusion, or (2) taking turns (usually couched in "loving the other enough to let him/her have this one"). Egalitarianism incorrectly reflects that Christ and the Church are equal in authority in the relationship.

True complementarianism (of the non-feminist variety) is another beast entirely. Even up to 3-6 months ago I would have identified as a complementarian purist (meaning: the feminist expressions of it are eradicated). But I have since come to realize that it is flawed even in its fundamental ideology, which is that God has assigned certain roles for men and women to follow. While many complementarians will focus on the authority dynamic as the "hot topic" to discuss, and thus use the word "headship" to describe aspects of their theology, the reality is that the full doctrine of complementarianism insists on many other role distinctions that men and women must align with. These roles are often not found directly in Scripture as obligations; rather, they are cultural norms that have an imputed theology about them, such as the man going off to work his 9-5 job while the wife stays at home to cook and clean. The complementarian view looks at the way men and women are created and attempts to deduce what God must have intended for men and women to do with regard to the family unit and within the body of Christ, while ultimately having little Scriptural support for the conclusions reached.

HEADSHIP

HEADSHIP, on the other hand, is completely distinct from feminism and does not have a feminist expression (at least that I've seen). It ordinarily isn't listed as a distinct structural component of marriages, often being taken as a singular component within true complementarianism. Yet to suggest that headship must also always be accompanied by other complementarian views is irrational. Headship, by itself, simply states that God gave men the authority over their own households to decide how they ought to be run. Instead of assuming that women are designed by God to fold laundry and men are designed by God to mow the yard, if a man so chooses, he may exercise his headship authority to delegate the responsibility of mowing the yard to his wife while he folds the laundry - or, if he so chooses, that she does both and he watches the football game.

Many women object: "That's not fair!" And it certainly doesn't seem so, if the man is ungodly. But I'll echo [/u/RedPillWonder](#), who wrote a fantastic post which I'll paraphrase (you can go to his history for the full thing): *The wife's obligation to submit to and respect her husband is not contingent on his fulfillment to love her as Christ loves the Church, and vice versa.* I've written before on 1 Peter 3, showing that even for non-believers who were guaranteed to be ungodly, the wife was still expected to live in submission to him with a gentle and kind spirit toward him, and that this is set up in the passage as paralleled with the way a slave should submit to an oppressive master or the way Jesus submitted to the authorities who crucified him. No, it's not fair. But it's godly. Yes, you will fail, just as he will. But always remember that these obligations are independent, not interdependent.

The key aspect of headship is that the husband decides how his own household is to be run. There is no eisegetical attempt to stretch Scripture to endorse why women should cook and clean while the husband fixes the toilet. He plots the course and decides how the ship will get there. The wife helps him along the way, not defying him on the basis that "God created women to be better at cooking, so I'd rather cook the meals than do that other stuff you want me doing." Of course, this doesn't mean a man can't delegate domains to his wife. He doesn't need to micromanage her. But he does need to accept responsibility for those areas which are delegated to her because they are ultimately still part of his domain, not hers.

In this, I disagree with those who stretch passages like Titus 2:3-5 to suggest that the house is the woman's domain and not subject to her husband's leadership. I laugh at the concept of the "man cave," where men have defaulted so much authority over the home to their wives that they only have the frame to insist on a small corner in the basement to decorate as they choose. The entire house is his - and while he may trust her with much of the decor and maintenance, it is still ultimately his domain and he is the one responsible for its upkeep, which she *helps* him with, as that is her function within a headship structure: *to be his helper*.

Yes, this places an immense amount of responsibility for the well-being of the kingdom on the man - not only his personal kingdom, but God's heavenly Kingdom on earth too! He'd better be a man worth living up to that responsibility. This is what headship demands of him. And what the red pill teaches us is that a woman, even if she agrees with headship and knows it's wrong to divorce, will likely leave a man if she believes he is ultimately a dead-end for her. So, no ... you don't get to insist that she follow your crappy leadership "because the Bible says so" - you can expect she'd rather sin by divorcing you than sin by resenting you.

"Headship" Gone Wrong

The word "headship" is often misused in modern churchianity. Instead of referring to a man's God-given authority over the home, it gets misapplied to reference God's authority over man in how he treats his wife, undermining the whole concept in the first place. To be clearer: the word often gets used to imply that God micro-manages men to a point that the actual exchange of authority is little more than a phantom transfer for the woman's benefit. Take, for example, [this article](#) from the self-professed "Council on Biblical Manhood and Womanhood." Sounds like an authoritative body to decide these things, right? Let's walk through it.

- *The Wife is Primary*

I kid you not: the article's very first point is that "Christlike male headship means that you see the spiritual nourishment of your wife as your primary duty." Apparently our primary duty is not to God, but our wives. It has nothing to do with advancing God's Kingdom into the nations, but to "nurture" God's Kingdom within your own little household. What a joke. I also love the exaggeration of calling this a "primary" duty and using Ephesians 5:28-30 as the reference. Show me where it says anywhere that this is a "primary" duty.

Yes, the husband is responsible for the sanctification of his wife - but this is not his "primary" duty. God says the purpose of marriage is "to produce godly offspring" (Malachi 2:15). If the husband is to lead the marriage toward the fulfillment of the purpose God gave for the marriage, then THIS is his primary duty: to make disciples (i.e. godly offspring). Yes, he should begin with his wife and children, but he cannot teach them how to be discipler-makers if he is not showing them by how he makes disciples outside the home as well.

More to the point: what does this have to do with headship/authority? If I were to re-word his point, it would be more accurate to write: "*Part of being a Christlike male headship husband means that you see the spiritual nourishment of your wife as your primary one of your duties.*" That's a statement I can agree with.

- *One Wife*

When he writes "headship means that you love just one wife" - does he mean you can have more, but you're only allowed to love one? Obviously not. So, the word "love" there is superfluous. He really means that a man should only have one wife (at least if he's to be in a position of authority within the Church). But note that he feels compelled to add the word "love" there to show extra emphasis on how good a man should treat his wife, because that's really the point of his article rather addressing biblical standards. By the way, note that he didn't cite a reference for this one.

Headship is an authority structure. Was David not head over his many wives? Was Solomon, with his hundreds of wives, not head of them? The authority structure is distinct from the issue of how many people you have authority over. If I were to rewrite this statement it would read either: (1) "Christlike male headship means that you ~~love just one~~ have authority over each and every wife in your household," or (2) "~~Christlike male headship means~~ Being a leader in the Church requires that you ~~love~~ have just one wife." Those are statements I can get behind.

- *Know the Lord*

He writes that "headship means that you train yourself to know the Lord in a vibrant way." This has nothing to do with authority structures within marriage. A better re-write would be: "Christlike male headship ~~means that is best expressed when~~ you train yourself to know the Lord in a vibrant way." I can agree to that.

- *Her Interests First*

No joke, actual quote: "Christlike male headship means on date night/vacations, you think first, 'What would she like to do?' not, 'What would I like to do?'" He concludes: "She will love you for it." Haha! Look, I'm all for rewarding a respectful, satisfying wife with things you know she enjoys and values. But the idea that a man must exercise headship in a way that defers to his wife and that he's not allowed to have his own wants and desires is unbiblical and inconsistent with what we see in Jesus throughout Scripture. By the way - where's his verse to back this one up? Oh yeah, that's another one without it. This would be better written: "Christlike male headship ~~means~~ can involve, at times, on date night/vacations, you think first, ~~What would she like to do~~ Do I want to reward this woman I care about?' not, ~~What would I like to do~~ What would she like to do?"

- *Hold the Baby*

He says, "Christlike male headship means that at dinner, after a long day at work, you hold the baby so your wife, frazzled from kids and home, can eat first." He gives no verse to back himself up, so let me give one instead: Luke 17:7-10 has something to say about this: "Suppose one of you has a servant plowing or looking after the sheep. Will he say to the servant when he comes in from the field, 'Come along now and sit down to eat'? Won't he rather say,

'Prepare my supper, get yourself ready and wait on me while I eat and drink; after that you may eat and drink'? Will he thank the servant because he did what he was told to do? So you also when you have done everything you were told to do should say, 'We are unworthy servants; we have only done our duty.'" Notice that the master isn't working hard in the field and coming home to ask for his food to be prepared. The SERVANT is the one who is working in the field and then comes home and is asked to do more work rather than getting to take a break. While I recognize that there is some distinction between wives and servants, the principles within the headship authority structure still apply, which is why 1 Peter 3 is written as it is.

I'll reword this one: "Christlike male headship means that at dinner, after a long day at work, you ~~hold the baby so your wife, frazzled from kids and home,~~ have the right, if you so choose, to ask your wife to cook you dinner so you can eat first." Would this be the best idea in modern culture? Probably not, given the feminist tendencies most women have today. But as a descriptor of biblical headship, this statement is MUCH more accurate.

- *Apologize*

"Christlike male headship means, when conflict happens (as it will), you lead in apologizing." Again, no verse for this one. Now, I'll note, in all these re-wordings I'm going to interpret "means" as "involves" going forward. Headship is literally just an authority structure. The "Christlike" part is what he's trying to get at, but by saying "means," it's as if he's trying to re-define the term/phrase. That said, ignoring the difference between "means" as a definition matter and "involves" as a matter of inclusiveness, let's re-word it: "Christlike male headship means, ~~when~~ if conflict happens (as it will if you're a blue pill idiot), you lead in ~~apologizing~~ resolving it."

- *Show Strength*

Woohoo! One I actually pseudo-agree with. Maybe his explanation could use some tweaking, but let's celebrate the commonality while we can and move on.

- *Take a Hit*

"Christlike male headship means that you put yourself in harm's way, gladly taking a hit to protect your family (and the weak)." Where did the "and the weak" section come from? How does my authority over my wife suddenly equate to me jumping in front of a bullet for a guy down the street from me? That aside, I'm not at all opposed to protecting my family. I'm just confused about how often this situation actually comes up? Regarding physical danger, I'm not sure how often you and your wife are held at gun-point or threatened by a man trying to punch your wife in the face and not you so that you'd have to jump in the way ... but it's never happened for me.

- *Solicit Wisdom*

He was doing so well with this one until the end: "Christlike male headship means that like the best leaders - generals, presidents, coaches, and so on - you solicit gobs of wisdom from wise counselors (namely, your wife)." I love his follow-up here: "If your relationship is like mine, she will put you to shame in this category." If she's so wise and you're so unwise, dude, why are we reading an article by you in the first place? His answer would, of course, have to be: "Because my wife told me to write it and I learned all this from her."

Yes, your wife is wise in many areas. Yes, you should absolutely hear what she has to say and weigh it carefully. No, you should not will-nilly *assume* your wife is wise on any particular issue just because she's your wife. If I'm fixing my lawn mower, I'm not going to solicit her "wisdom." When I'm arguing a case in court against a wife and I need to conceptualize how she and her attorney will present their case ... yeah, I'm going to ask my wife how a woman might perceive the issue, and her input is often helpful.

If I were to re-word this one, I'd probably add after "wife" - "in contexts that she is likely to have more experience and/or insight than I am."

- *Die to Yourself*

"Christlike male headship means you die to yourself daily." I would make no changes to this statement. But look at his explanation: "... for the good of my wife and my family." Yes, we want their good. But this is not the reason Jesus died. It was A reason GOD had Jesus die - because of his love for his children. But JESUS died to bring glory to his father and out of obedience to him. In the same way, your obligation to "die to yourself daily" is not "for the good of your wife and family," as the author suggests, though they certainly benefit from it the same way we benefit from Christ's death. Rather, it is for God's glory and out of obedience to him that we do it. Always keep your priorities straight here.

CONCLUSION

Biblical headship is an authority structure. It is not a collection of ideas about how a man ought to treat his wife. Those are peripheral aspects - and they may be quite biblical - but they are not headship itself. The authority to lead in the home is not synonymous with a man's obligation to love his wife - though both are equally and separately true. Failing to recognize the separation between these two leads to inappropriate results, such as a wife believing the husband's authority is contingent on him doing for her all the things that ridiculous article spells out.

Biblical headship simply states that a man has the authority from God to lead his home as he sees fit. The wife does not have dominion over the home or raise the children. Those are his responsibility. Her role is to help him with those responsibilities. If he trusts her, he will delegate some of these responsibilities to her with minimal oversight. If she is untrustworthy, giving her carte blanche would be a poor use of a man's headship and he should take a more involved role.

Just as you have headship of your wife, Christ has headship of you. Just as your wife tries to usurp as much control and dominion over your household, so do you to God's - which you shouldn't get if you are untrustworthy. Just as a husband does well to delegate (rather than micromanage) categorical responsibilities to his wife (rather than individual tasks) if she is trustworthy, so also, if you are trustworthy, will God delegate categorical responsibilities to you within his Kingdom (see the parables of the minas/talents, for example).

Meditate on this: that my point in this post is not to preach to the wives (who have their own sub), but to the men (who have their own spiritual head). 1 Cor. 11:3.

This is a tweaked version of an old post from MRP that I never shared here, but it came up recently, so enjoy.

My job right now is to argue (attorney). It's rare to have a case where I'm not arguing against someone. There's almost always an attorney or party on the other end. But if I were to run for judge and win, my new job would be to hear someone else's arguments and make a decision. Which role are you playing in your marriage?

Playing Attorney

When you DEER and argue with your wife, you are putting yourself on an equal playing field with her. You're saying that you're one attorney and she's the other and you're both pushing for differing agendas. The problem is that there's no invisible judge presiding over the situation. This means that you're both implicitly assuming that there's some objective "right answer" and you're more closely aligned with that objective reality than the other. But because that objective reality is an inanimate ideology that never acts or reveals itself, the argument itself becomes the centerpiece of the show. The argument is emotionally devastating in many such cases because there is no absolute resolution - only a concession toward trial and error based on whoever has more steel plates in their head to keep banging.

- **EXAMPLE:** Suppose she starts arguing that you should never spank your kids. You argue back that spanking is perfectly appropriate and beneficial. There's so much evidence on both ends of the spectrum that nobody can definitively say whose way is better. There is no *magical parenting fairy* who will appear to screaming parents and tell them who's right.

Whenever you engage in an argument in a back-and-forth manner, even though you're arguing against her, you're actually validating her view. By playing the role of "opposing counsel" you're communicating that objective truth has not been discovered on that issue yet, so it needs to be discussed and argued. Once you do that, you cannot then play the "headship card" because now it comes from a place of weakness (and playing that card so directly and verbally is generally from a place of weakness anyway). In the end, you have not persuaded her that your way is better. At worst one of you caves and the other feels like a loser; at best, you reach a compromise, which *compromises* the truth of the situation just to keep both parties somewhat appeased. Either way, you have just proven that no objective reality is going to decide the case ... so, in her mind she's following a guy who keeps getting it wrong, and she's the wife who just has to put up with a husband who makes wrong decisions all the time, or with whom she has to compromise to half-measures.

- **NOTE:** Winning arguments and getting your way aren't methods of strengthening your frame or "holding frame." Being an argumentative jerk who never backs down might be a persona you want to craft into your frame, but it is not your frame itself. Your frame is who you are and how you project that to those around you. If you deviate from who you want to be just to win an argument or get your way, you may prove a point, but you've broken frame to do it. You've shown her that she has the power (through sacrifice of her ideologies) to change you, for better or worse. This is not a display of strength, but of weakness.

Playing Judge

Instead, you just need to take the position of judge from the get-go. At that point, you're not arguing *with her* - you're *listening to her argument*. That's a huge difference.

Interestingly, go watch a real trial (not Judge Judy crap) and you'll notice something right away: **Judges STFU**. They sit there and listen. They don't argue. They really only speak when someone objects. When a witness is finished or the case concludes, the judge might ask some questions to get more clarity on the situation, but they never engage in the argument itself. They never argue back. They are only seeking more information with which to

make a wise decision. The judge's opinion, then, becomes objective reality to the parties under its authority. Yes, it may be subjective as to the decision itself (one or the other always thinks the judge got it wrong), but the authority from which the decision is made is objective - something that everyone knows not to defy. As attorneys often tell clients, "I don't care if it's a bad decision; you better do what the judge says anyway."

Now, in his opinion the judge does account for the arguments. He doesn't "pre-judge" the case before even hearing the facts (which would be unethical in every jurisdiction). He shows empathy to the attorneys and parties: "I heard what you had to say and here's my conclusions based on all the information you've given me." He does this to let the parties know that their arguments have actually been heard and understood, not ignored - and that *feeling* of being understood is often more important to a wife than actually getting her way. It also bolsters his decision, making it harder to appeal, as often happens when a judge's decision fails to reference substantial aspects of one side's case. By acknowledging the arguments, he's not merely communicating empathy, but also establishing a precedent: "If something similar happens again in the future, this is how I'm going to process that situation and rule on it."

Whether you're an attorney or judge, the arguments will be never-ending - and often-times you will want them. My wife is great at researching issues and presenting information to me. When she does this, she has a conclusion in mind that she wants me to reach, so she presents the information in the form of an argument to persuade me to her side. Sometimes I agree with her position, other times I'm outright opposed to it, and other times what she says inspires me to investigate the issue personally because I may not agree with her argument immediately, but I'm persuaded enough that it's worth further insight.

The difference is that as an attorney the arguments are against you; but when you're a judge, the arguments are to you. Position yourself as judge, not attorney. Don't argue back. STFU until she's said all she has to say, then issue your ruling, acknowledging that you heard and understood her. In this, I'm not giving you a license to ignore your wife by giving a boilerplate speech of how you comprehended her words. Actually weigh them, as good judges do. But once you've made your decision, if she tries to argue back, let her know that you're not arguing - you're deciding. I've had good luck in the past reminding my wife, "We could argue about this, but then there would never be finality. Do you want to have a decision and move forward or do you want to debate for the next three hours?" The question is, of course, rhetorical - she knows I'm not going to entertain the debate even if she says that's what she wants.

Since I first wrote that post, the dynamic in my household has changed a lot. First, my views and understanding have updated enough that I had to edit significant chunks (and probably would have done more, if I had the time). But more to the point: my wife has wonderfully fallen in line with this forum. Instead of a civil court judge who is resolving conflicts, I'm now more of a probate judge who receives petitions and decides whether or not they have merit and should be granted or denied.

Or perhaps a better analogy would be the scenes we see in movies where the king sits on his throne as people file in, waiting for their turn to ask things of him. Their request always involves an argument. But it's not an argument *against* anyone. It's an argument *to* the king. This is how it should be. And yet when another subject within the kingdom has a petition - like one of your kids - your wife shifts to the role of the queen next to you or the advisor whose input you value and esteem, but have no obligation to. Do you think the king is worried about whether or not his advisor will be upset with him for making a different decision? Of course not. Yet the wise king makes the wisest decision, whether it came from his advisor or himself, or elsewhere entirely.

It's interesting to see how 2+ years of applying a concept has changed the dynamic. Sometimes I think my wife still has 998 feet to go on that 1,000 foot rope, but other times I look back at these old posts and realize we've come so much further than I ever imagined. But when the changes are ever so gradual, we hardly realize just how far we've come.

"Spiritual Growth" - such an awkward phrase.

14 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

The "spiritual growth" concept is another pop phrase I've started reconsidering lately. It's obviously not a phrase actually found in Scripture, though the concept is tangentially there.

The Bible talks a great deal of growth in individual virtues - "grow in stature" or "grow in grace" or "grow in knowledge" or other such traits. Everyone can understand that "grow in stature means developing a more mature frame. Growing in grace means becoming more gracious. Growing in knowledge means learning (and presumably understanding).

But "spiritual" isn't a biblical virtue or measurable attribute. I can tell when someone is very gracious and not gracious at all. But "spiritual"? It's so open for interpretation because the Bible doesn't define it. We see examples of Jesus showing grace and other people not showing grace in Scripture. We don't see examples that say: "This person is spiritual, and this person was not." It's a pop culture word created for convenience. When someone in the world today says "I'm a spiritual person," they mean something very different from when a Christian talks about "spiritual growth."

For the most part, people mean it to be a metric of the maturity of the believer - and that's probably the best and most biblically appropriate use of the phrase. But "maturity" of what? Their "spirit"? Their "spirituality"? They way they "walk by the Spirit"? What does that even mean? Yes, the concept of "walking by the Spirit" is certainly a biblical one (Galatians 5:16-18). But is that, itself, the standard of maturity, or is it merely one aspect of the mature person? Or does it all blend together.

- Let me sidetrack on that point real fast. Galatians 5:16-18 is an explanation of how we follow the command to "love your neighbor as yourself," as is made clear in 14-15. I show love for myself not merely in gratifying my desires, as is often misinterpreted in the phrase, but also by exercising, developing my career, taking care of my home, studying/memorizing Scripture, making disciples, etc. - as these all benefit me in a variety of ways. In the same way, if I am to love my neighbor as myself, just as I follow Christ as my primary means of loving myself, even as Christ loves me, so also must I disciple my neighbor to help him follow Christ if I am to love him the same way I love myself.

Back on point, many people use Christ-likeness as the standard of "spiritual maturity," which is probably best. But if the target is so clear, why use such an ambiguous phrase as "spiritual growth" when what we really mean is "growing in Christ-likeness"? The answer is, of course, because nobody really wants to sit down and examine what Christ would be doing in their personal situations. Would Christ really be sitting in front of a computer screen typing this post? Maybe. Maybe not. Would he really be playing that video game? Would he really be memorizing verses when his neighbors are out with their kids and he could be talking with them?

- Another sidenote: this is why I hate the "WWJD" phrase - because some of these things may seem like blind speculation. We don't know what Jesus *would* do in these situations, but we do know what he *did* do - and if 1 John 2:6 says that anyone who abides in him "must walk as Jesus walked," that means we don't ask the question of *what WOULD Jesus do?* but instead ask: *What DID Jesus do - and that's what I must now be doing.* Yet "spiritual" growth rather than being Christ-like can be attributed to a number of other things that are much less life-changing. And we all know how little Christians actually want to change their lives, despite how much they may talk about it. Really, though: I could walk into most grocery stores, shopping malls, movie theaters, etc. and find it impossible to distinguish the believer from the non-believer because the lifestyle churchianity produces today is in no way distinct from the lifestyle of everyone else in the world. The same "be good people" message churchianity puts out is, on the whole, no different than the moral life lessons even the non-believers convey in TV shows, public broadcasts, books, through counselors, etc. The notion that "by this all men will know that you are my disciples, if you love one another" ... it's just not working under the message of what churchianity puts out regarding what it looks like to "love your neighbor as yourself," as Paul is discussing in Galatians 5, per the

last aside. That's why there has to be more to it.

Back on track again: all of this begs the question: "what's the metric?" Because the metric for maturity given by most of churchianity is not the one we see in Scripture.

Churchianity's metric of "maturity" is usually based on one or a combination of (1) emotionalism, (2) knowledge, (3) good deeds, or (4) avoidance of bad deeds. But this is an awful metric. A person could despise Christ in their heart, but wanting to fit in churchianity culture still train themselves to become emotional during worship, learn the Scriptures, serve his neighbors, and give up cussing, drinking, porn, etc. Yet he is no more "mature in Christ-likeness" than a pagan. It is a facade. This is why the generic term "spiritual growth" is often unhelpful - because it gives people carte blanche to decide for themselves what it looks like to "grow spiritually" or to look back to ANY life change over the last several years and conclude that it is "spiritual growth," and then people can persuade themselves that they are mature when they are still babes. And this is EXACTLY what we see in churchianity culture today: infants who want to play dress-up as adults.

Thank goodness Jesus gave us an actual metric for maturity: "By their fruit you will recognize them." If we look at the life of Christ, he was constantly producing fruit for the Kingdom. He was sowing seed everywhere he went. You can't fake that because at some point what you're proclaiming to those around you is going to result in fruit. Sow enough seed, something will grow. And you'll see really fast if it's good fruit or bad. And that process of sowing seed and nurturing it to life is evangelism (sowing) and discipleship (nurturing growth).

Paul confirms this in Philippians 3, saying, "Let all of us who are MATURE take such a view of things," meaning he's about to give his test for what distinguishes a "mature" person from an "immature" one. He emphasizes how ABSOLUTELY certain he is about this by adding immediately after: "and if on some point you think differently, that too God will make clear to you," meaning: "There's no way I'm wrong. Argue with me if you want, but God will prove to you I'm right."

He then gives two criteria for maturity: (1) "Only let us live up to what we have already obtained" - that is, mature people know their roles, capabilities, skills, limits, etc. and live in those, not pretending (a) to be more capable than they are, unlike a child who, in his immaturity, tries to act like an adult; rather, a child who is actually mature recognizes he is a child and embraces this as he continues to progress in life ... or (b) to be less capable than we are, failing to live up to the capacities we have attained in life due to sloth, apathy, etc. That is, we know our roles and capacities and we live within them.

(2) "Join with others in following my example, brothers, and take note of those who live according to the pattern we gave you." That is, Paul disciplined people at Philippi, showing them his way of life - his "pattern" of living, preaching, bearing fruit - all of it. 1 Thess. 2:8 - "so we cared for you. Because we loved you so much, we were delighted to share with you not only the gospel of God but our lives as well." And just as Paul did this with a wave of Philippians, he writes this letter, saying, "And just as we modeled our lives for them, now let their lives be the model for you," passing down that example through successive generations. And we know that Paul's "model" of life is based on Christ because he spells it out in the way he did this exact same process with the Corinthians in 1 Cor. 11:1 - "Follow me as I follow Christ."

To summarize this passage, Paul says that "maturity" is when someone (1) knows their roles and capacities and lives within them to the fullest, not over-reaching or under-performing, and (2) actively participates in a generational pattern of life-modeling in the art of Christ-likeness.

So, when someone talks about helping others with their "spiritual growth," and yet defaults to churchianity's rubric of (1) feeling more emotionally connected to God, (2) teaching them more knowledge, (3) helping them become better people, or (4) showing them how to avoid sin - I am immediately skeptical because it leaves out the fruitfulness aspect. "By their fruit you will recognize them," we see Jesus quoting in a number of places. A sapling struggles to bear fruit, but a full grown tree produces a lot of it - "30, 60, or even 100 times what was sown," as Jesus says. A tree that trickles out 1 or 2 apples a season would hardly be considered a mature apple tree; but one

that produces hundreds ... now that's a fully grown tree. Right?

So, if you're going to help others with "spiritual growth" - what are you doing to prompt them to produce fruit? Because if the person you're "spiritually growing" isn't producing fruit and the things you're teaching aren't being communicated in a way that shows how they are helpful toward the goal of producing fruit, then what are you actually accomplishing? Certainly not maturation or "spiritual growth" at that point. Instead, (a) at worst, we are training them to put on a facade - "having a form of godliness but denying its power" in that God's power is designed for the expansion of his Kingdom, or (b) at best, we are giving them peripheral lessons/skills that *could* become helpful at bearing fruit if they ever connect the dots, but still failing to connect those dots, making it ultimately a wasted effort, just like giving a tree lots of water while denying it sunlight will still result in a dead, fruitless tree.

"Spiritual growth" - better termed "becoming more Christ-like" - must, then, be focused less on these things and more on what will result in production of fruit for God's Kingdom.

I was chatting with some guys from [the RPC Discord](#) recently about a few terms that could easily get confused:

- **Formal Discipleship:** When you invite someone to learn from you, and he commits to letting you lead him for a time.
- **Informal Discipleship:** When you disciple someone without a structured arrangement and, usually, he won't realize you're discipling him until weeks/months down the road where you give the big "ah ha!" reveal so that he can pick up on how to do the same for others.
 - These processes are identical. The only difference is that one involves the other's knowledge up-front and the other keeps it on the back-burner until the guy's ready to receive it.
- **Reverse Discipleship:** When you maintain the submissive position beneath someone in authority over you, but express your submissiveness in a way that is uniquely designed to train them to be a better leader over you ... and (more relevantly) others.
 - This process is distinctly different from traditional formal/informal discipleship.
- **Direct Leadership:** When you have a recognized position of authority within a group as the platform from which you speak.
- **Invisible Leadership:** When you take control of a group without anyone realizing you've done it, including the person who is the actual positional leader of the group.

It's this last point that prompted the relevant aspect of the discussion - something that you may find useful, whether in your personal life, your career, your congregation, or (ideally) your effort to make disciples.

LEADERSHIP

What is it? I often hear answers that more eloquently boil down to:

- A title or position
- Telling others what to do
- Serving others

Sure, these may be *aspects* or *methods* of leadership, but they are not leadership themselves. Lots of people hold positions/titles without actually leading anything. Tons of people boss others around and accomplish nothing. A butler serves people, but he's hardly leading them.

Leadership is influence. That's it. Any form of influence you exert over another person leads them down a path you created - whether intentional or unintentional; small steps or large ones; good or bad.

How do you gain influence? I'm only aware of three universal consistently reliable answers (though there may be more): force, fear and desire.

- **Force:** When you coerce someone to act differently by literally manipulating the world around them beyond their control. For example, when a mobster wants to buy out a business for cheap, they may vandalize the business. The owners are forced to sell it for cheap, knowing they don't have the funds to fix it up and make it operational again.
- **Fear:** Causing others to follow your influence by use or threats of negative consequences. A mortgage company leads you to make timely monthly payments by threatening foreclosure, payment of late charges, etc.

- **Desire:** Inciting others to *want* to be under your influence. A child will clean his room because he is promised a cookie if he does a good job.

There are other examples that fit in each category, but you get the point. Interestingly, we see Jesus leading primarily through desire, God (in the OT) often uses fear, and the Holy Spirit, in isolated examples, seems to consume people and cause them to start behaving as he sees fit, and also bends circumstantial reality to his whims, causing the world to follow in the broad direction he wants it to go, even in our ignorance.

INVISIBLE LEADERSHIP

Anyone ever visit a small group where "that one person" always makes the group about *their problems* and nobody else really gets to chime in about their own life issues? And don't even bother asking about the actual content prepared for the day! *That* person is practicing (unintentionally) invisible leadership ... often to the detriment of the group. They take the reigns on the direction the group should go. The positional leader believes he still has control because, as he tells himself, "I could put a stop to this if I wanted, but I'm going to entertain it" - and perhaps in so doing the leadership dynamic is in harmony between the two forces. But the reality is that most just don't know how to deal with someone like that. Nobody accuses the other person of taking over "leadership" of the group, but it's obvious that *that person* is the one setting the path the rest walk on for their time together.

But this strategy can be used as a force for good, especially if the positional leader is a useless one - and there are a lot of them out there in churchianity! Take small groups, for example. If you follow the Rick Warren model, as my previous congregation did, small group leaders don't even need to be Christian! They just need to have a TV and know how to press the play button. Yikes!

The Basic Plan

When talking with [/u/brotherchad](#) recently, I gave him this model to start with. It needs to be adjusted for each circumstance, and it's certainly not the only viable model, but it's a reliable one:

- Week 1: STFU. Observe the group, gauge where they're at, and learn their personality styles. Through observation and charm as a participant, focus purely on developing trust and rapport with no effort to dominate the group. Don't try to impress, unless the opportunity is handed to you on a silver platter. Literally, this week is all purely about making yourself likable.
- Week 2: Take on two roles:
 - Be the silent sage. [/u/SkimTheDross](#) is fantastic at this. When I was hosting a weekly small group for RPC guys, he rarely talked, but when he did it was solid gold. Instead of answering every question, you let others speak first. When they don't come up with a good answer, you give the best answer - and only when you actually have something better to say. Don't answer every question or it'll come off as if you think you have the best answer to every question - which you might, but building rapport right now is more important than preaching truth that won't be received well. When you speak, you affirm what others say, gaining rapport and trust, but take the conversation to the next level. The goal here is to earn respect through meaningful contribution rather than domineering contribution. Domination is a fast-track to butt heads with the positional leader. You want to stay off his radar.
 - Be curious. Ask lots of really good questions that get people thinking. Thinking about things you want them thinking about, that is. Do it in the context of the content of the week. Your goal here is not to wow anyone with how deep your questions are (that's what the silent sage comments are for), but to show them (1) that you're not an arrogant jerk who only ever impresses people with the final word because you're here to "learn" too, and (2) most importantly: to gauge in deeper measure what the needs of each person in the group are - at least insofar as what will get them where you want them. In the case of making disciples, this means figuring out how to help them move just one step further toward being like Christ.

- Weeks 3-5: Play the fool. By this point, if you're effective, you're pretty popular in the group (hitting the gym helps here - you are doing that, right?). People are picking up on the fact that you're probably the smartest person in the room (at least insofar as biblical wisdom is concerned), but instead of flaunting it you humbly ask questions to the group with a(n at least apparently) genuine desire to know the answers. These questions are designed uniquely to help each individual take one step further in the direction you want them to go. And you use the content as context to do it.
 - It doesn't matter what the content is, by the way. I did this with my last small group and the content was a Lord of the Rings book. No joke. Bob needs to start having quiet times? Me: "I'm fascinated at the way the hobbits seem to talk to themselves. It's obvious they're meditating on something. Has anyone in the group ever tried meditating on something like that? Do you ever talk to yourself - or even God - like they do? Is it a helpful thing to do, or a waste of time? Most people will realize the common-sense reply: that quiet times are a moment of personal, prayerful reflection on God's Word, much like this. So, someone brings it up and you respond: "Yeah, I do that sometimes too, I guess. Anyone want to do it with me this week?"
 - Let's give another example. You're going through [/u/Deep_Strength's](#) book with a group of guys. The first chapter is on the history of the feminization of the church. Carl really needs to learn how to memorize Scripture and Dave doesn't ever pray. Your agenda is to get these guys practicing these basic disciplines with Scripture. Yes, you want them to read the content of the book also, engaging with it - but discipleship is more than just good content here and there. It's developing a lifestyle. So, with Carl you ask the group if they know any verses that prove the feminized views of modern churchianity wrong (Deep gives plenty), and then say you're going to memorize one such verse a day - and then you look to Carl and ask if he'll check you on them next week. And then ask if he'll memorize some too so it's a mutual thing. For Dave, you ask about how the feminized churchianity culture can be fixed. He doesn't know if it can be. You ask, "Do you think we can get the job done, or is it going to require an act of God?" He says the latter. You ask, "So what can we do to get God to act?" *We can pray!* he says. "Great idea, Dave! How about we both pray every day this week, even if only for 3 minutes, that God would use us as instruments in helping to restore the Church to biblical teaching." Again, the content itself doesn't matter - you can use a bologna sandwich as content to get someone to evangelize, if you want. You just have to know how to ask the right questions.

THE INVESTIGATOR

In our [204 post on leadership styles](#), [/u/ruizbuja](#) sets up a handful of strategies that can work in different situations. Having learned from him, I've become proficient in being "the investigator" - the art of asking questions to lead people to a pre-drawn conclusion. This is, of course, something I'm trained at doing in my career: cross-examination. I know what I want an opposing witness to say and he's going to avoid saying it with everything in his power. Yet by wording my questions cleverly enough, I can get him there in a way he can't deny without committing perjury.

There are two great ways to do this:

*Direct

- If you're the positional leader, do it **DIRECTLY**. In this situation, people know in advance that you're going to teach them something. Rather than lecturing at them, you turn it into a fun game, where they get to figure out your conclusion for themselves by following the trail of questions you have set out for them. It's also a fantastic strategy for dealing with someone who has an opposing view. People who fail at this direct method, where others find it coming off as condescending, simply have a crappy frame. The goal is to make them *WANT* to answer your questions, not for you to force them to do it.

EXAMPLE 1: I'm leading a Bible study on why street preaching is not enough.

- Did Jesus teach in the streets? *Yes, obviously.*
- And did people follow him or reject him when he did this? *Both.*
- Was that the most effective strategy he utilized? *Well, he did it, so we have to assume it was effective and biblical and that we should do it too.*
- Good, but was it the only strategy he utilized? *No.*
- What other strategies did he use for spreading the Gospel? *He discipled his 12.*
- And which strategy proved more effective at spreading the Gospel to the nations - Jesus' street-preaching, or his discipleship of the 12? *The 12.*
- So, should we neglect preaching to crowds? *No, Jesus did it.*
- But between preaching and discipleship, which was Jesus' priority? *Discipleship.*
- Which should be our priority? *Discipleship.*

Fin.

I've had that conversation at least a couple dozen times. It goes exactly like that about 95% of the time. People enter the conversation knowing I'm going to unfold why discipleship is essential. But this method of "biblical cross-examination" is generally more effective than just teaching someone because **they are forced to acknowledge their agreement every step of the way**, making it particularly effective with someone who disagrees with you, whereas a lecture gives room for them to debate back with a big old "BUT ... I think this or that" afterward because you haven't compelled them to agree.

If you make them agree with your smaller points, the bigger point tends to stick much better.

Invisible

The second way is what I mean when I talk about "invisible leadership." Watch how this plays out.

EXAMPLE 2: I'm participating in a Bible study on why street preaching is the epitome of the Christian life.

- Guy starts off: *"Street preaching is the best. Gotta get the word out. Let's talk about how we can do it better."*
- Fun stuff. I always like to ask: *Hod did Jesus do it? Great question. What does the group think?* They give basic answers.
- One thing that's **always puzzled me** about street preaching is why Jesus seems to run away from the crowds. *Why do you think that is? Because he did so much of it he needed a break to recharge with God.*
- Was it always just to have quiet times by himself, though? *No, he spent time with his 12 too.*
- **Is it possible** that that's something God expects to accompany a good street-preacher? That he has his team of 12 also? It's an interesting thought, but maybe if we want to be better street preachers, the quality starts off the streets. What are some ways we can enhance our ministry and influence on the streets by what we do off the streets? *Great question. What does the group think?* They give basic answers of reading the Word, praying, studying, memorizing Scripture, etc. - the 7 basics, essentially.
- **I'm still confused.** Do we see Jesus spending more time doing this with his 12 or more time doing public preaching? *Public preaching.*
- **Maybe I'm missing it.** Can you give me examples of when Jesus did this without his 12 around? *No, he always*

had them around (which isn't quite true, but that's what people say).

- **I guess I just want to know** what the goal of street preaching actually is. I know it's important, but what's the end-game? *To get the Gospel to the world. To save the lost.*
- So between street preaching and spending time with "our 12," what's the higher priority? Which one will be more effective? **Help me wrap my head around this.** *Well, the priority is the 12, like Jesus had as his priority. But the preaching is what he trained them for. So we need to have people we're raising up to help us preach and who can go out preaching elsewhere.*
- **Ah, that clarifies things for me. Thanks!** *You're welcome.*

They're not as far along in this example as in the first example. It's inferior, overall. But they still reach the same conclusion. Yes, they are still too focused on street-preaching, but now I've steered their approach to prioritize discipleship and raising up new leaders. And if the context they create is toward getting people to preach the Gospel on the streets, that's still a win.

But notice the bolded language I gave - see how those create an appearance of genuine question-asking and sincere exploration as compared with the more dominant approach? **You're asking the group to teach you their wrong ways so thoroughly that they realize it's wrong.** They won't admit they're wrong, but as they process the information to teach it, they have to refine it, and you use your feigned confusion as the vehicle to drive them toward realizing it.

In this approach, the leader believes he retains his position because he gets to be the know-it-all who has the answers to all of your questions, when in reality **he's in your frame, and you're just leading/influencing him through clever questions to get him to give the answers you wanted all along.**

[/u/TheChristianAlpha](#) - You want to share your experience when I made you (on the spot) teach us all something that only you knew, and with only using questions? Fun exercise for anyone who wants to try it.

Some people just can't figure out common sense. There's literally a group of people who lack this cognitive capacity ... then there are guys new to the red pill who forget they have this ability for a time. I'm skeptical that anyone will want to admit to identifying with this post, but there's a good chance others are seeing it in you - and in hind-sight, I wish I'd been self-aware enough a few years ago to know when I needed something like this, so let's see where it goes.

Google describes autism symptoms as "difficulty with communication, difficulty with social interactions, obsessive interests, and repetitive behaviors." Psychologists I have spoken with and examined as part of my career have noted that one expression of autism is when someone compartmentalizes a particular thought process away from all the others, or fails to recognize appropriate contexts or limits/boundaries for expressing that thought process through behavior. Another noted that what we perceive as common sense, they don't comprehend intuitively - they have to learn many such concepts the same way you would have to learn carpentry: study, observation, and practice.

Let's clean that up: *autists have difficulty figuring out when to apply good advice and when not to.*

EXAMPLES

Consider Sepean's [10 ways to fail at MRP post](#).

- **You don't lift hard enough.** Some guy reads this, doesn't actually research lifting or follow a program, but just puts more weights on the bar, then gets himself injured.
- **You mistake your idea of a real man for being alpha.** Guy has his own idea of "alpha" having a dominant frame, forgetting the importance of the *quality* of his frame, so he tries to dominate his wife in every conversation and it blows up in his face.
- **You listen to your wife.** Sepean already foresaw this one and addressed the guy who idiotically ignores everything his wife says, even in casual conversation.
- **You're upset your wife is angry.** Someone reads this and idiotically stops paying attention to legitimate emotional cues of other problems that don't involve you.
- **You think your wife is a puzzle you have to solve.** After reading this, you trivialize every differing thought and emotional issue she expresses, making you incapable of distinguishing fitness tests from comfort tests.
- **You're angry at how women are.** Guy reads this and decides that instead of being *angry* he'd *embrace* the nature of women, which idiotically came with an absence of caution when interacting with them, so he gets slapped with a DV charge, divorce, unexpected child support, etc.
- **You go Rambo.** Guy decides not to go Rambo, taking things slow, and 5 years later is wondering why he's still not seeing results.
- **You won't play dread.** Guy decides to "dread" his wife by making her jealous as often as possible.
- **You half-a it.** Someone decides he's going to be "all-in" and starts going Rambo instead, or so drastically changes his routine all at once that nobody else in his house has the ability to adjust or follow his lead.
- **You don't switch into dominance and boundary enforcement.** The guy reads this, ignores the "eventually" context and starts the process too early, resulting in massive Rambo-like explosions.

Let's add a few more common ones:

- Guy is told to STFU. He literally stops talking to his wife and won't speak during conflict.
- Guy is told to develop a strong frame. He becomes emotionally dead, extremely cold, and completely unlovable.
- Guy is told to AA through fitness tests. Starts cracking AA jokes during comfort tests.

You get the idea.

OBJECTION 1

But Red, most of these posts explain what they mean so people wouldn't make stupid mistakes like this.

You'd think, right? Turns out: lots of guys ...

1. Skim rather than read
2. Read, but read so much at once that they can't remember half of what they read
3. Remember what they read, but don't process it
4. Process, but don't apply
5. Apply, but only the things they *think* are relevant

This entire sub is filled with gold. Yeah, there's some crap too. I've written some of the crap myself - stuff I'd go back and change, if I cared enough. I get it. But that's kind of the point. Don't be autistic and do something just because some rando on the internet wrote a post. Look for the guys who have a track record for reliable content. Read through the comments and figure out which suggestions work and which don't. It's often said reddit-wide that the best of reddit isn't the posts, but the comments. That principle certainly holds true here too.

Actually read and process what you read, then test it against your own common sense and instincts.

OBJECTION 2

But, Red - if I've been blue pill for so long, should I really trust my own 'common sense' and instincts?

No, but I'm telling you to anyway. Know why? Because that's what's going to pace you. Yes, your "common sense" is going to push against all of this stuff. But if you didn't have that, you'd apply it all way too fast in all the wrong ways, as many do, and end up blowing up your life rather than fixing it.

Instead, you read a red pill nugget and your common sense says not to do it. Rather than picking one or the other, this tension causes you to test/practice applying the concepts at safe contexts at a gradual pace. As you see it working and you become competent, your common sense adjusts to recognize that you can keep applying the concept in other contexts as well. In time, your blue pill instincts that were buffering you from going Rambo are now encouraging you to expand.

In this, you'll figure out quickly what works for you and what doesn't. And when you see that you're improving, but plateauing in the results you wanted, *common sense* would send you back to some of those principles you previously discarded. Maybe you weren't ready for them then, but you are now. Pick them up again and get back at it.

OBJECTION 3

But if she's disgusted by me right now, wouldn't a sudden, drastic change be better to show her I'm not the

same?

No. I've heard guys say this. You don't change overnight just because you read an internet post. YOU have not changed. At best, *your perspective* has changed. Besides, questions like this still focus too much on her. Stop worrying about how she perceives things and you be better because YOU want to be better. All I'm saying is that if you want to do that in a way that *doesn't* blow up your life/marriage, apply some common sense.

The levels of dread are a great reference point here. Notice how you don't even *start studying* PUA until level 6, and you don't actually practice it until level 7? So what are you doing hitting on your waitress in front of your wife when you haven't even passed your first fitness test yet? It's **right there in bold letter**: **"Move up these levels one at a time, slowly, and carefully, taking approximately 1 month for each level."** Slow down. Master the basics before going on.

I still find that revisiting the basics has more value to me than trying to practice "advanced" concepts. Do I learn anything new when I do? Nope. But I certainly remember some things I forgot. And it reminds me that being a high value man, while requiring lots of effort, is ultimately nowhere near as complicated as some men try to make it. Common sense. Don't be autistic.

Lots of guys have caught on to the mission of making disciple(r)s. This is great. I have three qualms with how this is manifesting here, though:

1. Some men are adopting this mission externally rather than internally. "The Bible says I need to do it, so I'm going to do it" is an acceptable *starting point*, but it's also a very blue pill approach. I've said here before: **The red pill Christian doesn't "enter Christ's frame," as many suggest. He is internally transformed/sanctified so that HIS OWN frame becomes synonymous with Christ's frame.** The mission to make disciples is something you do for you, not something you do to appease God or earn his favor (which would be legalism), and having a proper perspective on this world in light of eternity necessitates this conclusion for anyone paying attention.
2. I don't get the picture that many guys actually know what discipler-making looks like, often confusing the process with more common concepts like evangelism or mentoring. Join the RPC discord if you want to flesh this out more, as it's a much better place for getting insight. Otherwise, I do intend to proceed with the 300 series soon.
3. Other guys have compartmentalized their mission from their mate.

We've talked about the first before, and the second will be upcoming, but let's focus on the third for now.

COMPARTMENTALIZATION

I'm as guilty of doing this as anyone else here. I don't mean just in the past - I'm talking the present too. It's an easy trap to fall into, especially within the red pill scene where there's so much emphasis on the man doing his own thing separate from the inappropriate influence of his wife. Yet there's a significant difference between being influenced *by her* and *influencing* her.

To be clear, there are areas where you **SHOULD** be influenced by your wife. Maybe she has skills you don't, or insight you lack, or experiences you could benefit from. Don't shoot all that down just because you have some ridiculous notion of what it means to be a "red pill man." The red pill is about understanding the truth - and I'll add: in its proper context. Yes, it may be a red pill truth that sometimes women need to be told no. But **don't be autistic about it.**

When it comes to being the one *doing* the influencing, lots of guys take a pass. Or, more accurately: they become *passive*. They take the "autist" route of misunderstanding the red pill advice of "do your own thing and let her follow" as "I'm just going to ignore her and expect her to get with the program all on her own." That's foolish.

But the natural conclusion of this foolishness is segregating your mission from your mate. Why?

- Maybe she told us she didn't want to be involved, so we obeyed her like good little children
- Maybe she's not naturally good at helping in our mission, so we didn't even bother trying to train her
- Maybe we're just idiots and completely forgot to include her in the first place

Whatever your reason, the reality is that this needs to be fixed. Your wife is your helper. Let her help. If she doesn't try on her own, invite her. If she's not good at it, train her. If she resists, correct her. If she fails, encourage her.

RED PILL EXCUSES

What I DON'T want you doing is using the red pill as an excuse to avoid connecting her with your mission. I noticed myself doing this at one point, and I've seen it in other men. Their wife isn't following, so you say things like "1,000 foot rope" and "you do you" as cop-outs for never actually trying to connect with her on your mission in the first place.

Yes, the 1,000 foot rope may take time to reel in. Yes, "you do you" certainly applies. But these only make sense IN THE CONTEXT of her refusing to join in with the program. What if she doesn't refuse? Then there's no point going off on your own! How do you know if she will or won't?

Some guys fail to involve their wives for the same reason other guys fail to ask out a girl in the first place: "What if she says no!?" Oooh, the horror. So, you guarantee the bad conclusion (rejection) in order to maintain your feeling of control and dominance over the situation, giving a false sense of safety and emotional stability.

But if you can get on board with the idea of a single guy asking a girl out in order to build confidence (either through success or gradual immunization from rejection), the same should apply to you with your wife, just in a different context.

The principles are still the same. When a single Christian man asks out a girl, that's his way of saying, "I want you to be my helper in what God has in store for my life." In case you haven't caught on, what "God has in store" is for you to make disciplers. When a married Christian man is compartmentalizing his mission and his mate, he's in the same scenario, needing to ask her: "Will you start helping me in what God has in store for our lives?"

MARRIAGE AND MINISTRY

For discipler-makers, here's a principle to live by: **Your marriage affects your ministry.** You may not realize how, and even after hearing the explanation you still may not see it ... but it does.

Discipleship is about life-modeling. If your marriage sucks, how can you model for other men what marriage should look like? The Church has been warned that if a man can't manage his own household, he shouldn't manage God's household either. 1 Timothy 3:5. "One who is faithful in a very little is also faithful in much." Luke 16:10. And that applies to leading your family, if you want to have greater influence in God's Kingdom. Get the point?

But the connection goes to another level: your wife should be the first among those you disciple, and your children after her. How can a man pretend to disciple other men if he does not disciple his own family? It's a lunacy trap I'd been caught in for years, and having escaped it I see how many other men are there too. It ultimately stems from a weak frame - a man who likely believes, "My wife would never let me disciple her." This, as described above, is partly due to misconceptions about what biblical discipleship actually looks like and how to implement it in the context of a marriage (a process I'd enjoy much more discussion on). But it's more commonly because most guys haven't developed a frame that's strong and attractive enough to handle it.

FIRST AMONG

We've already said that your wife should be the first among your disciples. Great. But it's more than just that. She's also the first among those who should *WANT* to follow your lead. Does she?

Your wife has vowed to follow you, right? If anyone would want to follow you, she has more motive and obligation than anyone else. Now, remove the obligation component. Suppose the Bible never said wives should submit to their husbands, but still impressed on the man the obligation to lead their wives. The dynamic suddenly shifts to parallel the rest of the world in your discipler-making efforts, where you have an obligation to lead them toward

Christ-likeness, yet they have no obligation to submit to your leadership.

With that in mind, the principles that will cause your wife to want to follow you are identical to what will cause others to want to follow you. Physical attractiveness, strength, confidence, charisma, charm, wit, emotional stability, financial acuity, a clear vision, etc. - these are all things that make you more attractive to your wife, and will also make you more attractive to the rest of the world. She's just the first among your followers.

Yes, you can probably get a guy or two to follow you even if your wife won't. But I've found that such relationships rarely produce fruit in the long-haul. They're guys who often see themselves as more your peer, and generally tend to be low-value men who share similar struggles as you. Maybe they respect one aspect of you that they want to learn from, but will they truly want to be discipled by you the way Jesus discipled his 12? Probably not.

My point: If you want to be effective at your mission, be effective in it at home first. I don't mean "first" in a successive sense - "this first, then that" - but in a priority sense. Have other guys you're working with too. Be simultaneous inside and outside the home. But make sure your home life is the priority. That's where it starts. Because that's where you're going to model for other men what they should look like in their own life and relationships.

CONCLUSION

If you don't know who to disciple, start with your wife/girlfriend. If you can't figure out why you're not effective at making disciples outside the home, perhaps it's because you haven't prioritized making disciples inside the home. The same things that make your wife want to follow you will also make other people want to follow you.

In another context, this is much of why we talk so much about improving men's marriage and sex lives - not because we're obsessed with marriage and sex. It's because the processes are often parallel, and a healthier marriage/sex-life is a waypoint on the larger journey toward advancing God's Kingdom during your time on this earth.

Some people just can't figure out common sense. There's literally a group of people who lack this cognitive capacity ... then there are guys new to the red pill who forget they have this ability for a time. I'm skeptical that anyone will want to admit to identifying with this post, but there's a good chance others are seeing it in you - and in hind-sight, I wish I'd been self-aware enough a few years ago to know when I needed something like this, so let's see where it goes.

Google describes autism symptoms as "difficulty with communication, difficulty with social interactions, obsessive interests, and repetitive behaviors." Psychologists I have spoken with and examined as part of my career have noted that one expression of autism is when someone compartmentalizes a particular thought process away from all the others, or fails to recognize appropriate contexts or limits/boundaries for expressing that thought process through behavior. Another noted that what we perceive as common sense, they don't comprehend intuitively - they have to learn many such concepts the same way you would have to learn carpentry: study, observation, and practice.

Let's clean that up: *autists have difficulty figuring out when to apply good advice and when not to.*

EXAMPLES

Consider Sepean's [10 ways to fail at MRP post](#).

- **You don't lift hard enough.** Some guy reads this, doesn't actually research lifting or follow a program, but just puts more weights on the bar, then gets himself injured.
- **You mistake your idea of a real man for being alpha.** Guy has his own idea of "alpha" having a dominant frame, forgetting the importance of the *quality* of his frame, so he tries to dominate his wife in every conversation and it blows up in his face.
- **You listen to your wife.** Sepean already foresaw this one and addressed the guy who idiotically ignores everything his wife says, even in casual conversation.
- **You're upset your wife is angry.** Someone reads this and idiotically stops paying attention to legitimate emotional cues of other problems that don't involve you.
- **You think your wife is a puzzle you have to solve.** After reading this, you trivialize every differing thought and emotional issue she expresses, making you incapable of distinguishing fitness tests from comfort tests.
- **You're angry at how women are.** Guy reads this and decides that instead of being *angry* he'd *embrace* the nature of women, which idiotically came with an absence of caution when interacting with them, so he gets slapped with a DV charge, divorce, unexpected child support, etc.
- **You go Rambo.** Guy decides not to go Rambo, taking things slow, and 5 years later is wondering why he's still not seeing results.
- **You won't play dread.** Guy decides to "dread" his wife by making her jealous as often as possible.
- **You half-a it.** Someone decides he's going to be "all-in" and starts going Rambo instead, or so drastically changes his routine all at once that nobody else in his house has the ability to adjust or follow his lead.
- **You don't switch into dominance and boundary enforcement.** The guy reads this, ignores the "eventually" context and starts the process too early, resulting in massive Rambo-like explosions.

Let's add a few more common ones:

- Guy is told to STFU. He literally stops talking to his wife and won't speak during conflict.
- Guy is told to develop a strong frame. He becomes emotionally dead, extremely cold, and completely unlovable.
- Guy is told to AA through fitness tests. Starts cracking AA jokes during comfort tests.

You get the idea.

OBJECTION 1

But Red, most of these posts explain what they mean so people wouldn't make stupid mistakes like this.

You'd think, right? Turns out: lots of guys ...

1. Skim rather than read
2. Read, but read so much at once that they can't remember half of what they read
3. Remember what they read, but don't process it
4. Process, but don't apply
5. Apply, but only the things they *think* are relevant

This entire sub is filled with gold. Yeah, there's some crap too. I've written some of the crap myself - stuff I'd go back and change, if I cared enough. I get it. But that's kind of the point. Don't be autistic and do something just because some rando on the internet wrote a post. Look for the guys who have a track record for reliable content. Read through the comments and figure out which suggestions work and which don't. It's often said reddit-wide that the best of reddit isn't the posts, but the comments. That principle certainly holds true here too.

Actually read and process what you read, then test it against your own common sense and instincts.

OBJECTION 2

But, Red - if I've been blue pill for so long, should I really trust my own 'common sense' and instincts?

No, but I'm telling you to anyway. Know why? Because that's what's going to pace you. Yes, your "common sense" is going to push against all of this stuff. But if you didn't have that, you'd apply it all way too fast in all the wrong ways, as many do, and end up blowing up your life rather than fixing it.

Instead, you read a red pill nugget and your common sense says not to do it. Rather than picking one or the other, this tension causes you to test/practice applying the concepts at safe contexts at a gradual pace. As you see it working and you become competent, your common sense adjusts to recognize that you can keep applying the concept in other contexts as well. In time, your blue pill instincts that were buffering you from going Rambo are now encouraging you to expand.

In this, you'll figure out quickly what works for you and what doesn't. And when you see that you're improving, but plateauing in the results you wanted, *common sense* would send you back to some of those principles you previously discarded. Maybe you weren't ready for them then, but you are now. Pick them up again and get back at it.

OBJECTION 3

But if she's disgusted by me right now, wouldn't a sudden, drastic change be better to show her I'm not the

same?

No. I've heard guys say this. You don't change overnight just because you read an internet post. YOU have not changed. At best, *your perspective* has changed. Besides, questions like this still focus too much on her. Stop worrying about how she perceives things and you be better because YOU want to be better. All I'm saying is that if you want to do that in a way that *doesn't* blow up your life/marriage, apply some common sense.

The levels of dread are a great reference point here. Notice how you don't even *start studying* PUA until level 6, and you don't actually practice it until level 7? So what are you doing hitting on your waitress in front of your wife when you haven't even passed your first fitness test yet? It's **right there in bold letter**: **"Move up these levels one at a time, slowly, and carefully, taking approximately 1 month for each level."** Slow down. Master the basics before going on.

I still find that revisiting the basics has more value to me than trying to practice "advanced" concepts. Do I learn anything new when I do? Nope. But I certainly remember some things I forgot. And it reminds me that being a high value man, while requiring lots of effort, is ultimately nowhere near as complicated as some men try to make it. Common sense. Don't be autistic.

There's lots of material out there for understanding frame from a man's perspective. But I have seen scant little on how women reciprocate the frame game. In fact, even in places like [/r/RedPillWomen](#), they're given incredibly anti-red-pill, anti-biblical advice ... and [r/RPCWomen](#) is still relatively new. So, let's explore. Here are my founding axioms:

- **ONE:** Submission and frame are not the same.
- **TWO:** Women have their own frame no matter what.
- **THREE:** Married women should live inside their husband's frame.
- **FOUR:** All women should, subject to nuance, submit to (rather than live within the frame of) male Church leadership
- **FIVE:** Women are not subject to submit or live within the frame of men in other contexts.

ONE: Submission and frame are not the same.

Lots of women are fine with both of these concepts in theory, but because they assume they're the same they miss the broader implications of frame. Some simplified definitions:

- Submission is a combination of the attitudes and behaviors expressed by a woman in graceful response to someone's exercise of authority.
- Frame is your "internal point of origin" or worldview that you project to the world around you.

1 Peter 3 is a great example of submissiveness. The **compliance** aspect is made clear by the fact that "submit yourselves to your own husband" is sandwiched between slaves submitting to their masters and Christ submitting to the authorities that crucified him. The **attitude** is more directly stated in the immediate context. The call to submission is followed by "when they see your respectful and pure conduct" and that a woman's beauty should be "of a gentle and quiet spirit, which in God's sight is very precious." These are how you respond to God-given authority.

Frame comes in all shapes and sizes. A woman can be non-submissive and yet have a strong, bold frame. 2 Samuel 6's story of David and Michal shows a clear example of this. David had his own worldview that God was to be glorified above all - and he expressed this through dancing in his underwear. Michal was embarrassed with the world view that her husband's dignity as king was more important than worshipping God. Here, her frame is evident in her rebuke of him, expressing the gap between David's frame and her own. This is why we can't confuse the two. Submissiveness is *one aspect* of a healthy frame for a woman. But a woman cannot claim to have a godly frame merely because she is submissive, or otherwise say that she is submissive merely because she lives in her husband's frame. Indeed, even people who share a common worldview can have a dysfunctional authority relationship.

TWO: Women have their own frame no matter what.

It's a common misconception in some conversations on the manosphere to assume that a woman must set aside her frame to cede to her husband's. That the perfect woman doesn't have a frame of her own. This simply isn't true - or even possible. Eve's conduct in the garden shows that even before the fall, women had the capacity for thought independent of her husband's leadership. Yes, that thought led to the first sin, but still predated that sin itself. When

married, women do not abandon their worldview or point of origin. They are meant to adapt it. This is why many in the manosphere suggest that women are designed like clay, which adjusts to the mold it is placed in. The mold is a shape. But the clay, once placed inside, also has an external shape of its own that is maintained even when it is removed from the mold afterward, if it has set.

This is important for men to realize because it helps them overcome the anger-stage and realize that even if women are malleable to a strong leader, they are still independent, functional people with thoughts, feelings, and opinions that produce fruitful discussion and perspectives toward running the ship of which she is first officer. It is also important for women to recognize this - not to embolden them toward independence, but to have the self-confidence to function autonomously without the micro-management of a husband, and to know that women have great value to contribute to the relationship/marriage, even if it may not always be the exact kind of value she wants to contribute.

THREE: Married women should live inside their husband's frame.

Rather than proving the statement, I'll assume it's a given and instead discuss what this means in three significant contexts.

How can I live in my husband's frame and have my own frame at the same time?

The wife's frame is circumscribed within her husband's frame. Consider the fact that we have "freedom in Christ." Within God's framework for his missional, obedient, godly, and even hypothetically perfect followers there is room for doctors, plumbers, and financial advisors. There's room for introverts and extroverts. Animal-lovers and animal-eaters. Each different type of person has their own framework for understanding the world and operating within it - and each also, despite having disparate frames, also has the capacity to co-exist within God's framework for his followers. Each individual's frame is circumscribed by God's because it's big enough to encompass different attributes. Yet at the same time, if the person who is an introverted, animal-eating doctor decides that disciple-making isn't for him, he has suddenly left God's frame by resisting the adaptation of God's primary imperative for this earth into his own worldview.

In this, we can see that living within someone's frame isn't about adapting every single aspect of your personality and character to a rigid set of expectations. Rather, it is an adoption of the frame-holder's point of origin as one's own, and allowing your individual and unique attributes to be expressed in a manner consistent with that worldview. In this way, a man whose frame involves starting a charitable organization can be well-supported by an extroverted wife who interacts in the community to raise support for his cause, or by an introverted wife who helps manage his books, or other behind-the-scenes methods of assisting his mission. Yet a wife who says, "I don't care about your charitable purpose, so I'll just take care of the home," may be submissive without being in his frame at all.

What if my husband's frame sucks?

I've heard this question a number of times. The answer rests on why I distinguished between *submissiveness* and *frame* in the first place. A wife has a biblical obligation to submit to her husband, but not to live in his frame. Suppose Paul had a wife while he was killing Christians and she was saved before him. Should she have adopted his worldview that Christians are evil threats to the Jewish religion? Of course not. Should she have submitted to his leadership over her home? Yes - that he may be won over, as 1 Peter 3 says, by her submissiveness, purity, respect, gentleness, and quiet spirit.

But let me emphasize one thing: **This will not produce a healthy interpersonal dynamic within the marriage; but some things are more important than having a healthy interpersonal dynamic.** If a wife lives outside of her husband's frame, the relationship will suffer. But the point of marriage, as I've often said, is not to be happy or interact well with the other person - it's (per Malachi 2:15) to produce godly offspring. That is: make disciples. In

this, a woman can be tactful in balancing between submission to her husband and living within Christ's frame if her husband's frame is not within Christ's frame.

What if "submitting to my husband" involves him asking me to sin?

Let's jump to extremes to illustrate a point. Husband asks wife to murder someone. Should she do it? No. The same Paul who wrote Ephesians 5 ("Wives submit to your husbands") also wrote Romans 13 ("submit to your governing authorities"). Does that mean he obeyed every rule, command, law, edict, etc. of Nero Caesar who was ordering Christians to be murdered when Paul wrote this? Obviously not! He wasn't telling all Christians to obey the command to put each other to death. Rather, when Paul was caught (Acts 16, for example), his response was not to escape and defy the judgment of his human authorities over him; it was to accept the legal consequences of his actions.

In the same way, if a husband asks a wife to sin, while she may have some argument to obey him (especially if it is a disputable issue, at which point she may - and perhaps should - defer to his leadership), if obedience would be clearly sinful, her act of submission is not in obedience to the order, but in accepting the consequences he lays out for her defiance - and embracing this with the same submission Christ gave to those who crucified him, or the same purity, reverence, gentleness, and quiet spirit that Peter references in 1 Peter 3.

If it helps, in my attorney-mind, think of it like parking illegally. The government doesn't say, "Thou shalt not park illegally." It says, "If you park illegally, you get a ticket." So, you can submit to your authority by not parking illegally and avoiding the ticket - or also by parking illegally and agreeing to pay the ticket. Extend that concept to submission within marriage and maybe it'll all make more sense.

What does it practically look like to live in my husband's frame?

On a behavioral level, it means adopting his worldview and supporting his purposes in all you do. If he's for the death penalty and you're against it, submission says you vote consistently with his expectations of you, but living within his frame means (on a behavioral level) trying to understand why he's for the death penalty, and giving him all benefit of the doubt in attempting to embrace his way of thinking.

But it runs deeper than behavior. Christ transforms his bride, purifying her and making him more like to himself. Consider the parallel with another concept I often teach:

- **True Christians do not live by God's expectations of them. They are transformed by God so that their own internal desires are naturally God's desires flowing out of them.**
- A true godly wife does not live by her husband's external expectations of her. She is transformed by her love, trust, and respect for his leadership so that her own internal desires are naturally identical to his desires flowing out of her.

This is what it means for a wife to live in her husband's frame.

FOR EMPHASIS:

Of course, as above, if a husband's frame sucks it's not practically going to happen. A woman's ability to live in her husband's frame is directly correlated to her attraction toward him. Like the mold and the clay, what happens if they're both magnetic and the clay is repelled by the mold instead of being drawn to it? You can try to force it in, but it will fall right back out long before it actually sets. You can't negotiate attraction. A man must take responsibility for being someone whose frame is strong and desirable enough to be a force of attraction rather than repulsion. Be attractive, don't be unattractive. Both matter (and yes, it's possible to be attractive and unattractive in varying ways simultaneously).

Equally significant: even though the man has the burden of developing attractive-leadership to draw his wife into

his frame, **this does not excuse her imperative to seek to live within his frame.** Yes, it may be difficult. But this is also why I distinguish between "on a behavioral level" and when "it runs deeper."

FOUR: All women should, subject to nuance, submit to (rather than live within the frame of) male Church leadership

I'm not going to re-hash the passages on women trying to take roles of headship within the Church. I do what to emphasize a couple nuances in my wording here.

First, I reference "submission" here and not frame. Why? Because Acts 17 encourages us to challenge what is taught even from reliable sources. We are not meant to blindly follow those who preach just because they say so. In the end, if we find we agree, we adopt their frame through Scripture rather than through titular authority - and this produces an even better result. Yet submission to an authority within their own house is still a default, even if we maintain our own frame. Law 38 of the 48 Laws of Power is relevant here: "Think as you like but behave like others."

Of course, in the above I'm implying reference to involvement in a lower-case "church." Yet my original statement referenced Church with the capital C. When addressing submission to Church leadership, this is more absolute than the hollow, self-declared authority of so-called "pastors" who call their bodes local "churches." This is significant because some congregations demand submission on absurd things. In this, your "submission" to the local congregation in which you participate is a courtesy to the fact that you are a guest in their house and if you find value in participating in their house (as you should), you should play by their rules. It is virtually always possible to play by their rules and simultaneously pursue the purposes God gave The Church within their body.

From there, the question may be asked: "What does it mean to submit to The Church, proper, if not a local human authority?" The Church is the aggregate Kingdom of God as it exists on earth. There is no singular leader but Christ, who communicates his leadership to the Church through the Spirit, which is most prominently known through the canon of Scripture. So, that's where it starts. Submission to Scripture is primary, as Christ is the *logos*/Word of God made flesh and embodied through our living and active Scriptures, breathed by God, called the "sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God." But if we really want to get technical, your local Church (as opposed to local church) is those who God has placed in your life who you know to be trustworthy and reliable as members and leaders within God's Kingdom. *That may be someone from your congregation - but it MAY also be your best friend or trusted advisor or co-worker, etc. who don't attend the same congregation as you.* But this topic is too big to address here, so I'll leave it at that.

FIVE: Women are not subject to submit or live within the frame of men in other contexts.

My son used to hold the mistaken view: "Men are leaders and women are followers. So, my sisters have to do what I say." Not so, boy. This attitude is taken by many men in TRP, and is something I've even seen among some women - that men, generally, are the head of women, therefore women must submit to men on a societal level the same way as to a husband. This is, in my view, over-reaching.

Let me emphasize this: **If you are an unmarried woman in a relationship, you do not owe a duty to submit to your boyfriend.** For relational health, it may be wise to spend some time living within his frame in order to understand whether that's a healthy long-term residence for you. But be cautious against rote submission - especially if there is some form of pressure toward sinful conduct, such as premarital sex. Even if it is not sinful, if it crosses one of your boundaries, contemplate the pros and cons earnestly before resigning yourself to "he wanted me to, and I want to be submissive [in a wrong context], therefore I did it."

That said, even though you are not obligated to this, it doesn't mean it's a bad idea. It just means you exercise wisdom and discretion.

13

UPVOTES

Female Frame Part 2: The Value of Women

9 December 2020 · r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

Female Frame Part 2: The Value of Women

26 points • 6 comments • submitted 3 months ago by Red-Curious to r/RPCWomen

In red pill communities, it's easy to glorify men and make women feel like trash. Yes, there's good reason to speak blunt realities about women, just as we are even more harsh with the men who are idiots in how they interact with women. But in doing so, the red pill doesn't speak of women's value or worth. It only speaks to their nature. Yet a crucial aspect of a woman having a healthy frame is in understanding her own sense of value - where it comes from, how it's defined, and how to live within it.

TO WHOM?

Value is a subjective quantity. My wife values a cup of coffee in the morning. I don't. I'd spill it down the drain (sacrilege, I know!). So, when addressing the question of value, we must first ask: **WHO** is the frame of reference for this valuation?

If we ask feminists, women have great and massive value far and above that of men, right? If we ask a keyboard warrior who Facebooks by day and raids orc dungeons by night, he's still going to value women more than his kind, but for very different reasons. Or what if we ask OBGYNs? Or NFL athletes? Trannies? You'll get very different answers from different people.

I propose there are only two answers that should actually matter from a woman's perspective, though: (a) her spiritual groom and (b) her physical groom. As to the first, we have Galatians 1:10 - "For am I now seeking the approval of man, or of God? Or am I trying to please man? If I were still trying to please man, I would not be a servant of Christ." God is the primary person whose valuation you should care about. As for the second, Genesis 2:18 makes clear that God created women to be a helper to her husband. That is: she is to be valuable to him in the fulfillment of his mission. While women have direct access to God through Christ, and therefore don't technically *need* a husband, the fact that this imperative was placed in women even before the fall makes clear that God has no intention of removing that compulsion anyway. It's part of you and you **SHOULD** look to your husband for his valuation of you, and weigh heavily in your heart the validation (or lack thereof) that comes with it - **especially** if he is a godly man.

Now, I suppose there are other sources of value that should matter too. For example, a daughter should look to her father to find her value as his daughter while she lives in her home. But I assume we're mostly adults here. A woman can also be asking from her own frame of reference - and this is a good and valuable thing as well, in some circumstances (not all). Yes, it's good for you to ascertain your own internal sense of valuation. But women who already have this internal self-validation aren't often the ones struggling to comprehend their value, so that's a moot point in this post.

HOW DO WE COMPARE?

So, what **IS** the actual value of women? Are women valuable, but not quite as valuable as men? I suppose in the husband's eyes, that question is subjective. But God gives us a clear answer in Galatians 3:27-28: "For as many of you as were baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Gentile, neither slave nor free, **nor is there male and female**, for you are all one in Christ Jesus." That is: from God's perspective, he doesn't differentiate between men and women when it comes to our ability to unite with Christ, have salvation, and participate in the work he has laid out for us to do. Yes, the actual work we are assigned may differ by gender, but we have equal access to his love and ability to be in a oneness, abiding relationship with our spiritual groom.

This is especially true in the sense that the Church is collectively the bride of Christ - men included. It's one of the

reasons a man is uniquely qualified by God (and not himself), if he is mature, to lead a wife. God gives him the position of follower-helper in the Christ-Church union so that the man can understand and life-model for his wife how to live that role in their own husband-wife union.

WHAT IS THE VALUE?

And now to the meat of the question. Asking, "*What is the value of women?*" is no different than asking, "*What is the value of the Church?*" Yeah, it's obvious what Christ contributes to the picture - and his headship, strength/power, authority, vision, etc. may all make it seem like the Church is pointless by comparison. After all - Jesus says that if we won't do our job by proclaiming him, the rocks would cry out (Luke 19:37-40). Jesus doesn't need the Church - or ANY of us. But does that mean we're not valuable? In this, I find the following:

- Jesus finds the Church valuable, and therefore it is valuable. Period. We don't need to ask more questions or try to understand because He doesn't owe us an explanation on why he values us. It should be enough for us to know that he does.
- Jesus has chosen the Church to be the primary vehicle through which his mission is carried out. God created the Church to be Christ's "helper" in spiritually reproducing into the nations. The Holy Spirit works through us to make this happen. All members of the trinity participate in this value-assignment.
- The Church holds its primary pragmatic value in its ability to make disciples.

Yeah, I could list a lot more ways the Church has value. Feel free to do so for me in the comments. But having hit the big ones, consider:

- Women are valuable if, when, and *because* their husbands find value in them - Christ being the first among these.
- Women have been created to be helpers to their husbands - especially in regard to his mission (which if he is faithful in submitting to Christ, is also Christ's mission: make disciples of all nations). In this, if the man **and wife** are mature, he invites her into his discipler-making mission to help him, and she actively participates - and this adds value to the man, who is now more effective in proving his value to Christ, and also to Christ directly. As such, the woman has great value to both sources that matter when this plays out. But even if the man's mission is distracted from Christ's (i.e. anything else), she can still independently be valuable in both/simultaneously (a) helping her husband with his unique mission, and (b) helping Christ with his mission of making disciples of all nations. These do not need to be mutually exclusive.
- Women also have value in their ability to produce offspring. The Bible directly says: "Women will be saved through child-bearing," and I believe this is because they hold the template for how disciples are to be born and raised. **More on that [here](#).** Remember that in Romans Paul had a similar value-conversation with the Jews after the Gentiles were given equality in God's Kingdom (per the same Galatians 3:27-28 passage, above). In Romans 3:1-2 he both asks and answers the question: the value is that they held God's Word and the prophets, which were the physical template for understanding the spiritual realities made known through the cross (Hebrews 8-9). That is: **if Paul says the Jews were still of value for being entrusted with the template for understanding the subsequent spiritual realities of the cross, so also do women have value for being entrusted with the template for understanding the spiritual mission of Christ, which is also the very purpose of marriage itself.**

If women ever doubt their value, contemplate whether or not the Church has value and let that guide your exploration of the matter.

DOWN TO EARTH

Men Don't Need Women - and that actually contributes to your value

What does this look like in a real sense? My wife used to be infuriated when I would tell her that I didn't need her. Yeah, it was a blunt reality that I could have communicated better at the time. The reality is: I don't need her. I would find a way to get by without her. But what I wanted her to understand is simply this:

- If I NEEDED her, then our interactions would be driven by compulsion.
- Because I DON'T NEED her, my interactions are driven by desire.

I want her help. I want her in my life. She adds something of value that I desire and find useful, and this is valuable. That value would not exist if it was from compulsion by necessity. I can despise something I need, and yet still make good use of it - because I have no choice. But to engage with someone I don't need should be a clear demonstration of the value we place on the help that is given.

Value-evasion through hollow contributions

Some women like to create fake value for themselves. They avoid being helpers to the man's mission by saying they'll do other things that **they think** he should find valuable because **the woman values it**. In reality, this is not a value-add at all. As discussed above, there are *times* when a woman's internal sense of value is sufficient. When she's married and her self-valuation is in conflict with her husband's ... that's not one of those times.

If he's asking for help making disciples, or building a company, or saving the rain forest, or whatever else - she cannot say, "I won't help with that; I'll take care of the house and kids so you have the freedom to go do that." Yes, this may be a healthy domain for her focus. But when God created women, he did not look at Adam and say, "I will create someone to take care of the habitat and children so you can name the animals without interruption." He created a helper suitable to him.

IF the husband does find distraction-removal to be the most helpful way she can contribute to his mission (which would make him a crappy husband with a weak *vision* for how his mission will be fulfilled, if he can't think bigger than this) - then and only then is it appropriate for her to ignore his mission and focus on the home and kids. But if he is appropriately inviting her to partake in the bigger plans he has for advancing God's purposes through his life, it is not her prerogative to step aside to focus on the things she'd prefer to do. Instead, she is being given an opportunity not only to be valuable, but to express that value, and a failure to do so deflates her worth to God and her husband. Contemplate this carefully before insisting within your own frame to reject the frame your husband invites you to live within.

130
UPVOTES

Merry Christmas - I've put together my "Tricks of the Trade for a Fun Frame" list as your present - good ideas for fun during the holidays

25 December 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill · Archived copy · Reddit

PREFACE

First off: This isn't a playbook I draw from. It's a slideshow of organic occurrences. These are mostly things I just naturally do that bring some fun and life into our relationship - ESPECIALLY in moments when she's acting sad, bored, depressed, furious, etc. That is, I created this list by reminiscing on times when she was caught in her own head, but I managed to pull her into my mood/frame/way of thinking in the moment - and what I remember doing that triggered it. That is, they are expressions of my frame. Some are heartfelt moments (which are often repeated more often than others, thus may look like they're not a significant part of my frame - don't be fooled). Others are cheap gags to introduce fun at random times (which, while high in quantity on the list, are used with far less frequency). Still others are just random things that generate feels. Play around to figure out what works for you and not.

I don't encourage you to copy my examples exactly or even try to write your own playbook. Rather, this is more to give you inspiration as you learn to develop a fun, safe, comfortable, and enjoyable frame for her to live in. Try a few things. Use what works, leave the rest. Tweak them. But if your frame sucks, by all means DO SOMETHING to build it.

Second, with the above in mind: this is meant for men who already have the foundation necessary before developing a good frame. You can't be a fat blob who gets butthurt all the time and expect these things to BE your frame. They are things occurring from my ALREADY EXISTING frame that have the effect of pulling her in when she's otherwise letting her own feels outside my frame be a bother to her.

Third: Don't be an idiot. Exercise discernment if you try these at home. For example, when she's sad, there's a difference between how I'd respond to "I'm sad just because I am" and "I'm sad because my mother just died." Don't be an idiot. Thad said, toy around with these, even if the context doesn't feel right. You may be surprised what works when you don't expect it.

Fourth: Also note that these are either supplements to existing strategies (AA, AM, etc.) or even, at times, expressions of them. Don't ignore everything you've learned and assume that you can skip the actual advice to try a few things that consistently work for me.

THE SLIDESHOW

Without further ado, in no particular order ... things I've done to pull my wife out of her own head and into my frame in the moment:

- **The Elevated Hug:** Hug her nice and sweet. Gradually tighten and lean back so her feet come off the ground, then bounce her a bit. She always complains: "Ouch, don't hurt me!" but it never fails to make her laugh and smile.
- **The Height Shift:** My wife is pseudo-tall (5'10") and self-conscious about it. I'm 6'0", but sometimes it's fun to hug when I'm on a step and she can feel petite, resting her head in my pecs instead of my shoulder. One time recently I did it in the reverse and dug my head into her breasts. That was fun(ny). For some reason, this one makes a difference to her when she's in need of a mood-booster.
- **The Frown Upside-down:** I have a few times picked her up and turned her upside-down and said, "See? That frown is now a smile. Mission accomplished." Extremely powerful - always gets the job done, especially when

kids are around and say, "Do it to me too, Daddy!"

- **The Feels:** Hand on cheek, foreheads touching. "That sucks."
- **The Tickler:** Actually tickle your wife. I can't believe I went several years forgetting that this has magical smile-giving powers.
- **The Tickle Transfer:** Tease the kids about mommy being a grouch. "But Mommy doesn't like getting tickled too much because Daddy's tickles are too strong. So I'll tickle you and you can give her my tickles for me."
- **The Confession:** Hand on shoulder, "Can we just say it like it is?" with a laugh. She looks back confused. "Life sucks right now! Repeat after me (if you want extra emphasis, one hand on each cheek): Life. Sucks. Right. Now."
- **The Sinatra:** Start singing a song. Bonus points if you serenade her in front of someone (kids count, but not as many points as strangers/in public). Even more bonus points if you're embarrassingly bad at it. Brownie points if it's a song she knows and you invite her to sing the chorus with you.
- **The Ballerina:** At random times throughout the day/week, grab her hand and give her a twirl like you're on the dance floor. Dip her afterward.
- **The Punching Bag:** When she's frustrated, suggest that she needs to let it out and exaggerate telling her that "violence is the best answer for relieving frustration." Flex and let her punch you in the abs or tricep as hard as she can. The first few times she'll be sheepish, but egg her on to do it harder and harder. This one always works well for brightening her mood ... need to remember to bring it back. Been too long, old friend.
- **The Imitation Game:** Play the imitation game with her mannerisms, but grossly exaggerated (a form of agree and amplify, charades-style).
- **The Impressionist:** Pick a character to impersonate who you know she's familiar with. Randomly start impersonating that person during conversations when she's not expecting it. Bonus points if you're really bad at it.
- **The Foreigner:** Randomly start talking in other accents and see how she responds.
- **The Nuisance:** While she's working on something - typing on the laptop, cooking, vacuuming, reading the kids a story - keep "accidentally" bumping into her or interrupting her while she's talking or tapping her on the shoulder to get her attention, then saying, "Nevermind, I figured it out." Not enough to be actually annoying, but enough that she can tell you're toying with her. This is my natural twist on Athol Kay's "shower move" from MMSLP ... just doesn't require the shower, but same idea.
- **The Fakeout:** Make up some story that's believable, but also just barely pushes the boundaries of reality. Ex. We're watching a movie and she asks who an actor is. "Oh, that's the girl from <random movie she's not actually in>. Did you know she went to high school with my brother's ex girlfriend?" Every time: "Really? That's crazy." "No, not really, babe. You're so gullible."
- **The Back Hug:** Walk up behind her while she's doing something and wrap your arms around her. Lean your head into her neck and sway.
- **The Sniffer:** Start with the back hug, but sometimes start making sniffing sounds (noticeable, but not exaggerated). Pull away from her quickly. She gets awkward and asks, "What?!?" STFU and don't answer. "Do I smell?" If you feel like it, start laughing to confirm her suspicion that it's a joke.
- **The Jalepeno:** I've done this one several times - when you order a sub (or cook a meal where it's feasible), ask to have a single jalepeno hidden inside. Sadly, she only notices about 1/4 the time I do this one. Maybe you'll

have better luck, or use a hotter pepper (not too hot though).

- **The Pillow Thief:** My wife knows I love sleeping with lots of pillows. It's been a long while since I've done this one, but when you make the bed, put every pillow on your own side - none on hers. Haven't tried it yet, but might be funny even to bring up random pillows from the couch to exaggerate how many end up on my side of the bed.
- **The Dreamer:** If you wake up in the middle of the night and she's also up, but doesn't know you're awake, start moaning like you're having a wet dream. Whisper some other girl's name. Have fun with the story (short mumbles). "I'm married" then 10-15 seconds later, "Okay, fast" then take a deep breath.
- **The Provoker:** Storm into a room she's in with an elevated voice and start accusing her without being exactly clear of what you're accusing her of (or be clear, but something that's not a legit issue). She gets worked up and defensive, you bust out laughing, "Just teasing you babe. Want to do X with me?"
- **The Hunk:** She's upset. "Babe, I know life sucks sometimes, but no matter how bad things get know that you always have one thing in your life that will never change that will always cheer you up." Stop there. She eventually asks, "What?" STFU. "God?" *Well, sure. But that's not what I had in mind.* "You?" *Kind of.* "Then what?" *These!* Grab her hand and put it on your bicep as you flex. *Any time you're upset, just grab these and squeeze and I'm confident it will make you feel all better again.*
- **The Mad Hatter:** Put random things on her head and say, "Hey, I found your hat. Stop losing it."
- **The Comb:** Rub her head. "I love rubbing my hands through your soft, smooth hair," then rub fast enough that your hands inevitably get caught in knots (but not so fast it hurts). "So silky smooth."
- **The Empath:** She's upset. You just hold her (standing or laying) and rub her back occasionally. Don't stay too stiff - motion = being present in the moment; stiff = awkward.
- **The Protector:** Someone upset her that day. Go to the door and start putting on your shoes. She asks what you're doing. "I'm going to kill him/her for you."
- **The Listener:** Actually listen to her. <I know, right?>
- **The Nazi:** Find a random framed picture in your house - particularly one she's not likely to pay much attention to. Open the frame. Slide the picture out. Replace it with a picture you printed of Hitler (or whatever else you think would be apt). Put it back on the shelf. STFU and wait for the fun to happen - preferably days or even weeks later.
- **The Wrong Turn:** You're driving and pretend you don't know where to go. Panic and ask her for directions because you can't remember. Whether she tells you a way in time or not you say, "Okay, I'm going left/right <pick the wrong one>" while you are simultaneously turning the right way. In the moment, she's paying more attention to what you're saying than what you're doing and doesn't pick up on the fact that you actually went the right way. "Too late, babe. I already turned. Can I make a U turn here?" She looks out the window and gets her bearings and punches you in the shoulder.
- **The Story Teller:** She asks you a question about something she's struggling with, wanting to know how to cope. Instead of telling her the answer or giving her advice, you tell her a story from your own life about a time you experienced something similar and came out with the result that she's looking for. Let her connect the dots for herself.

DURING SEX (leaving off most things that I assume you've already picked up from books like MMSLP, SGM, etc.)

- **The Talker:** Make her say what you tell her to say: "Say please" "If you want more, ask for it" "Beg" "Announce when you're cumming." Then add a phrase that's totally unexpected: "Tell me you like to do puzzles. Say it! Say it now! I like to do puzzles." When she says it, act like that's the thing about to push you over the edge. Yes, this breaks immersion, therefore defying SGM. But I've found that sometimes a sudden jarring out of immersion creates a jolt as a physical reaction and if it doesn't prompt an immediate orgasm (usually/I assume by breaking the concentration that was holding back), it's a nice transition point to shift to a new position. It can also be effective if she's just not immersed at all or her head seems to be somewhere else, pulling her back into the moment.
- **The Disappointment:** Edge her just before climax, then pretend you thought she already finished and lay down next to her like you're done.
- **The Pretzel:** Start moving her around like you're trying to change positions, but keep shifting things around in ways it that it would be ridiculously impractical to actually have sex like that.
- **The Favorite:** Give 98% of your attention to one part of her body - enough to others that you acknowledge that it's there, but voraciously go after that one part. For example: do everything and the book to the left boob for a while, then shift to the right boob and kiss it twice, then hammer right back into that left boob. So confusing to her, but seems to get a positive reaction the few times I've done it.

Okay ... I'm out of time, so I'm going to cut myself off there. I really wish I could keep going, though. This was fun to write!

No, I don't actually have names for these things in my head - I just put them there while writing this for the fun of it. That said, while writing this list, it's interesting to me that while she denies "physical touch" as one of her "love languages" (if you buy into that stuff), many of these involve physical touch and only work *because* of it. The ones that don't are often (but not always) less effective. Kino matters. Learn to take these starting points and build from them.

WHY I WROTE THIS POST

Because I love to have fun with my wife - and I'm sure you all have even better stories of things you've done that work and not. I'd love to hear those stories and be inspired by them. Maybe I'll add them to the list with credits.

Merry Christmas - I've put together my "Tricks of the Trade for a Fun Frame" list as your present - good ideas for fun during the holidays

25 December 2020 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

PREFACE

First off: This isn't a playbook I draw from. It's a slideshow of organic occurrences. These are mostly things I just naturally do that bring some fun and life into our relationship - ESPECIALLY in moments when she's acting sad, bored, depressed, furious, etc. That is, I created this list by reminiscing on times when she was caught in her own head, but I managed to pull her into my mood/frame/way of thinking in the moment - and what I remember doing that triggered it. That is, they are expressions of my frame. Some are heartfelt moments (which are often repeated more often than others, thus may look like they're not a significant part of my frame - don't be fooled). Others are cheap gags to introduce fun at random times (which, while high in quantity on the list, are used with far less frequency). Still others are just random things that generate feels. Play around to figure out what works for you and not.

I don't encourage you to copy my examples exactly or even try to write your own playbook. Rather, this is more to give you inspiration as you learn to develop a fun, safe, comfortable, and enjoyable frame for her to live in. Try a few things. Use what works, leave the rest. Tweak them. But if your frame sucks, by all means DO SOMETHING to build it.

Second, with the above in mind: this is meant for men who already have the foundation necessary before developing a good frame. You can't be a fat blob who gets butthurt all the time and expect these things to BE your frame. They are things occurring from my ALREADY EXISTING frame that have the effect of pulling her in when she's otherwise letting her own feels outside my frame be a bother to her.

Third: Don't be an idiot. Exercise discernment if you try these at home. For example, when she's sad, there's a difference between how I'd respond to "I'm sad just because I am" and "I'm sad because my mother just died." Don't be an idiot. Thad said, toy around with these, even if the context doesn't feel right. You may be surprised what works when you don't expect it.

Fourth: Also note that these are either supplements to existing strategies (AA, AM, etc.) or even, at times, expressions of them. Don't ignore everything you've learned and assume that you can skip the actual advice to try a few things that consistently work for me.

THE SLIDESHOW

Without further ado, in no particular order ... things I've done to pull my wife out of her own head and into my frame in the moment:

- **The Elevated Hug:** Hug her nice and sweet. Gradually tighten and lean back so her feet come off the ground, then bounce her a bit. She always complains: "Ouch, don't hurt me!" but it never fails to make her laugh and smile.
- **The Height Shift:** My wife is pseudo-tall (5'10") and self-conscious about it. I'm 6'0", but sometimes it's fun to hug when I'm on a step and she can feel petite, resting her head in my pecs instead of my shoulder. One time recently I did it in the reverse and dug my head into her breasts. That was fun(ny). For some reason, this one makes a difference to her when she's in need of a mood-booster.
- **The Frown Upside-down:** I have a few times picked her up and turned her upside-down and said, "See? That frown is now a smile. Mission accomplished." Extremely powerful - always gets the job done, especially when

kids are around and say, "Do it to me too, Daddy!"

- **The Feels:** Hand on cheek, foreheads touching. "That sucks."
- **The Tickler:** Actually tickle your wife. I can't believe I went several years forgetting that this has magical smile-giving powers.
- **The Tickle Transfer:** Tease the kids about mommy being a grouch. "But Mommy doesn't like getting tickled too much because Daddy's tickles are too strong. So I'll tickle you and you can give her my tickles for me."
- **The Confession:** Hand on shoulder, "Can we just say it like it is?" with a laugh. She looks back confused. "Life sucks right now! Repeat after me (if you want extra emphasis, one hand on each cheek): Life. Sucks. Right. Now."
- **The Sinatra:** Start singing a song. Bonus points if you serenade her in front of someone (kids count, but not as many points as strangers/in public). Even more bonus points if you're embarrassingly bad at it. Brownie points if it's a song she knows and you invite her to sing the chorus with you.
- **The Ballerina:** At random times throughout the day/week, grab her hand and give her a twirl like you're on the dance floor. Dip her afterward.
- **The Punching Bag:** When she's frustrated, suggest that she needs to let it out and exaggerate telling her that "violence is the best answer for relieving frustration." Flex and let her punch you in the abs or tricep as hard as she can. The first few times she'll be sheepish, but egg her on to do it harder and harder. This one always works well for brightening her mood ... need to remember to bring it back. Been too long, old friend.
- **The Imitation Game:** Play the imitation game with her mannerisms, but grossly exaggerated (a form of agree and amplify, charades-style).
- **The Impressionist:** Pick a character to impersonate who you know she's familiar with. Randomly start impersonating that person during conversations when she's not expecting it. Bonus points if you're really bad at it.
- **The Foreigner:** Randomly start talking in other accents and see how she responds.
- **The Nuisance:** While she's working on something - typing on the laptop, cooking, vacuuming, reading the kids a story - keep "accidentally" bumping into her or interrupting her while she's talking or tapping her on the shoulder to get her attention, then saying, "Nevermind, I figured it out." Not enough to be actually annoying, but enough that she can tell you're toying with her. This is my natural twist on Athol Kay's "shower move" from MMSLP ... just doesn't require the shower, but same idea.
- **The Fakeout:** Make up some story that's believable, but also just barely pushes the boundaries of reality. Ex. We're watching a movie and she asks who an actor is. "Oh, that's the girl from <random movie she's not actually in>. Did you know she went to high school with my brother's ex girlfriend?" Every time: "Really? That's crazy." "No, not really, babe. You're so gullible."
- **The Back Hug:** Walk up behind her while she's doing something and wrap your arms around her. Lean your head into her neck and sway.
- **The Sniffer:** Start with the back hug, but sometimes start making sniffing sounds (noticeable, but not exaggerated). Pull away from her quickly. She gets awkward and asks, "What?!?" STFU and don't answer. "Do I smell?" If you feel like it, start laughing to confirm her suspicion that it's a joke.
- **The Jalepeno:** I've done this one several times - when you order a sub (or cook a meal where it's feasible), ask to have a single jalepeno hidden inside. Sadly, she only notices about 1/4 the time I do this one. Maybe you'll

have better luck, or use a hotter pepper (not too hot though).

- **The Pillow Thief:** My wife knows I love sleeping with lots of pillows. It's been a long while since I've done this one, but when you make the bed, put every pillow on your own side - none on hers. Haven't tried it yet, but might be funny even to bring up random pillows from the couch to exaggerate how many end up on my side of the bed.
- **The Dreamer:** If you wake up in the middle of the night and she's also up, but doesn't know you're awake, start moaning like you're having a wet dream. Whisper some other girl's name. Have fun with the story (short mumbles). "I'm married" then 10-15 seconds later, "Okay, fast" then take a deep breath.
- **The Provoker:** Storm into a room she's in with an elevated voice and start accusing her without being exactly clear of what you're accusing her of (or be clear, but something that's not a legit issue). She gets worked up and defensive, you bust out laughing, "Just teasing you babe. Want to do X with me?"
- **The Hunk:** She's upset. "Babe, I know life sucks sometimes, but no matter how bad things get know that you always have one thing in your life that will never change that will always cheer you up." Stop there. She eventually asks, "What?" STFU. "God?" *Well, sure. But that's not what I had in mind.* "You?" *Kind of.* "Then what?" *These!* Grab her hand and put it on your bicep as you flex. *Any time you're upset, just grab these and squeeze and I'm confident it will make you feel all better again.*
- **The Mad Hatter:** Put random things on her head and say, "Hey, I found your hat. Stop losing it."
- **The Comb:** Rub her head. "I love rubbing my hands through your soft, smooth hair," then rub fast enough that your hands inevitably get caught in knots (but not so fast it hurts). "So silky smooth."
- **The Empath:** She's upset. You just hold her (standing or laying) and rub her back occasionally. Don't stay too stiff - motion = being present in the moment; stiff = awkward.
- **The Protector:** Someone upset her that day. Go to the door and start putting on your shoes. She asks what you're doing. "I'm going to kill him/her for you."
- **The Listener:** Actually listen to her. <I know, right?>
- **The Nazi:** Find a random framed picture in your house - particularly one she's not likely to pay much attention to. Open the frame. Slide the picture out. Replace it with a picture you printed of Hitler (or whatever else you think would be apt). Put it back on the shelf. STFU and wait for the fun to happen - preferably days or even weeks later.
- **The Wrong Turn:** You're driving and pretend you don't know where to go. Panic and ask her for directions because you can't remember. Whether she tells you a way in time or not you say, "Okay, I'm going left/right <pick the wrong one>" while you are simultaneously turning the right way. In the moment, she's paying more attention to what you're saying than what you're doing and doesn't pick up on the fact that you actually went the right way. "Too late, babe. I already turned. Can I make a U turn here?" She looks out the window and gets her bearings and punches you in the shoulder.
- **The Story Teller:** She asks you a question about something she's struggling with, wanting to know how to cope. Instead of telling her the answer or giving her advice, you tell her a story from your own life about a time you experienced something similar and came out with the result that she's looking for. Let her connect the dots for herself.

DURING SEX (leaving off most things that I assume you've already picked up from books like MMSLP, SGM, etc.)

- **The Talker:** Make her say what you tell her to say: "Say please" "If you want more, ask for it" "Beg" "Announce when you're cumming." Then add a phrase that's totally unexpected: "Tell me you like to do puzzles. Say it! Say it now! I like to do puzzles." When she says it, act like that's the thing about to push you over the edge. Yes, this breaks immersion, therefore defying SGM. But I've found that sometimes a sudden jarring out of immersion creates a jolt as a physical reaction and if it doesn't prompt an immediate orgasm (usually/I assume by breaking the concentration that was holding back), it's a nice transition point to shift to a new position. It can also be effective if she's just not immersed at all or her head seems to be somewhere else, pulling her back into the moment.
- **The Disappointment:** Edge her just before climax, then pretend you thought she already finished and lay down next to her like you're done.
- **The Pretzel:** Start moving her around like you're trying to change positions, but keep shifting things around in ways it that it would be ridiculously impractical to actually have sex like that.
- **The Favorite:** Give 98% of your attention to one part of her body - enough to others that you acknowledge that it's there, but voraciously go after that one part. For example: do everything and the book to the left boob for a while, then shift to the right boob and kiss it twice, then hammer right back into that left boob. So confusing to her, but seems to get a positive reaction the few times I've done it.

Okay ... I'm out of time, so I'm going to cut myself off there. I really wish I could keep going, though. This was fun to write!

No, I don't actually have names for these things in my head - I just put them there while writing this for the fun of it. That said, while writing this list, it's interesting to me that while she denies "physical touch" as one of her "love languages" (if you buy into that stuff), many of these involve physical touch and only work *because* of it. The ones that don't are often (but not always) less effective. Kino matters. Learn to take these starting points and build from them.

WHY I WROTE THIS POST

Because I love to have fun with my wife - and I'm sure you all have even better stories of things you've done that work and not. I'd love to hear those stories and be inspired by them. Maybe I'll add them to the list with credits.

Anything You Can Do I Can Do Better.

22 January 2021 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

There are a lot of blue pill incel types coming on here lately, who for some reason think they're other than they are. We've had massive growth over the last year, so this isn't shocking. I think last February we were at maybe 1,000 - in under a year we're almost at 9,000. A lot of people aren't reading the sidebar and are asking dumb questions or trying to put out false teaching.

I haven't helped the situation much because I focus my time on the discord. In the pareto principle, the discord and the people I work with IRL are the top 20%. I'll always invest in the committed few over the masses, so reddit takes a sideline. Point being: if you want to get serious, prove it through OYS and investing the time to get to know people through the discord. In the meantime, here's something to remember:

YOU SUCK

This is the actual problem: **You suck.**

Sure, argue with me: "Not every guy on here sucks." If you don't suck, you're a guy who doesn't care that I said it anyway. But the ones who have that knee-jerk reaction are the ones who need to take a lesson. I was one of them. When I joined the manosphere, I sucked just as bad as you all - maybe even worse. I had so much pride in my blue pill nature that you could fry a turkey in it.

- **Physical:** If you're without a physical deformity and you're not benching 2 plates yet (i.e. 225+ if you can't do math or have never been to a gym to know what a plate is) and deadlifting 3 (i.e. 315), stop and ask yourself real hard: *"Have I earned the right to post in this forum yet?"* No, spraining a muscle two years ago "and it never fully felt back to normal ever since" isn't a good excuse.
- **Mental:** Have you actually read the sidebar? Have you internalized, practiced, applied, and become it yet? How many fitness tests have you failed in the last month? If you're single, how many approaches have you been making to even engage with fitness tests at all? When's the last time you read a book? What's the last behavior you've done in the last 7 days that was caused directly by a book you read in the last 3 months? If you can't give good answers to these questions, stop and ask yourself: *"Have I earned the right to post in this forum yet?"*
- **Spiritual:** How are you doing on the basics? If you're not engaging in the Word directly, in constant communication with God, sharing your faith constantly, and living out the mission to make disciples with people you can reference by name and not the general "I make disciples by just hoping people see my life" garbage, ask yourself hard: *"Have I earned the right to post in this forum yet?"*

This is not an open free-for-all. This is a place for people who are serious and want to grow. If you're asking questions, you'd better be willing to take the advice and apply it. If you come back a few months later asking the same questions or still speaking as if you plainly haven't read or internalized the sidebar, don't be surprised if we boot you. Yeah, banning you might mean you can't comment - but it doesn't mean you can't read. Prove you've made progress and we'll let you back. In the meantime, **stop sucking so much.** Also, get in the OYS either here or on the discord. Make some of these things mile-markers you're shooting for and get off your butt to achieve those goals.

THOSE WHO HAVE, MORE WILL BE GIVEN

With that out of the way, do I really need to explain why people who don't suck get better results than those who do? A couple days ago **this post popped up** about a guy who couldn't understand why women were repulsed when a

pot-belly, toothpick-armed man asked some randos if they were virgins and it didn't go well. The reaction: that he's "a judgmental repulsive woman hating jerk for even asking that."

Years ago, when I was first starting out, I remember whining on MRP about why my wife wouldn't do this or that in bed (yeah, I was that guy too). One of the vets said: "I don't care how goodie-two-shoes she is of a Christian stereotype. Give me one day with her and she'd be begging to do those things with me." In another conversation [/u/weakandsensitive](#) commented: "An ugly guy gives a girl a teddy bear he won at the fair and he's creepy. An attractive man gives a girl a teddy bear he won at the fair and he's so dreamy. See how that works?" It took me longer than I'd like to admit to fully embrace the reality in the concepts these men were sharing - and we've incorporated into our own side bar as [/u/Deep_Strength's Christian Brad Pitt Thought Experiment post](#).

The reality is: just as that OP was asking women, "Are you a virgin?" like a social incompetent, instead of being treated like a creeper I'm confident I could get away with asking the exact same question and get a positive reaction instead. It's the same as the teddy bear. A guy who lives in his own frame and oozes confidence, purpose, and social dominance (among other things) can not only get away with things - but it even **ENHANCES** his attraction for having the audacity to be so bold.

- Unattractive Guy: "Are you a virgin?"
 - Woman: "Ew, get away from me, creep!"
- Attractive Guy: "Are you a virgin?"
 - Woman: "Does it matter? Because I'm getting the vibe that even if I was, I won't be for long."

THOSE WHO DON'T, EVEN WHAT THEY DO WILL BE TAKEN AWAY

Yeah, this is definitely not Jesus' intended context for the verse, but so many things he says turn out to be true in contexts beyond what he meant. Remember the guy in the parable? He was weak. He squandered the time he had to achieve goals while the master was away. When he had to answer for his fruitlessness, rather than owning up to it he DEERed. To his credit, I don't think a big fat: "Yeah, I screwed up. Sorry," would have changed the outcome anyway. But you see that his 1 was taken away. He wasn't put in charge of any cities. Instead, he not only lost what was given - he was even sent out of the master's vineyard altogether, where there would be weeping and gnashing of teeth - the same description Jesus gives for hell.

That's right: if you continue sucking, you will be subject to a living hell. This is exactly how many guys describe their dead bedroom marriages. It's how they talk about the nagging and disrespect they get from their wives. It's the words they use to talk about their hopeless incel singlehood. All because they're not improving. They're not setting goals and accomplishing them.

1 Timothy 3:5 says that "if someone does not know how to manage his own household, how will he care for God's church?" Yeah, single guys seem to get a pass at this, right? They don't have "members of their own household." But here's the broader principle: if you can't be faithful with the tangible things you can see and feel and touch, how can you ever expect to be faithful with the things you can't see, feel, and touch? 1 John 4:20 shows the expanding use of this concept: "he who does not love his brother whom he has seen cannot love God whom he has not seen."

The physical world is easy. And Hebrews 8-9 says that the physical things are "copies" and "shadows" of the truer heavenly things - the parallel God has always intended and which is self-evident by even a very cursory comparison of the Old and New Testaments. No, it's not the focus. But if you suck even at the easy stuff, how can you expect to master the things that actually matter in life?

CONCLUSION

Getting a girl to go gaga for you is easy. Even virgins. Even ... No: **especially** if you have the gall to ask ridiculous questions like, "Are you a virgin?" to their face. Getting a lost soul to go gaga for Christ ... well, that's a lot harder. But it's a LOT easier if you don't suck at life.

So, if your arms are toothpicks, start benching. If your social game is lame, start cold approaching randos until you master it - guys and girls; this isn't about dating, but about learning to talk to people. If your spiritual disciplines are weak and you still can't pull 20+ observations from a single verse, open your Bible and stop making excuses.

.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.

GOTCHA: That wasn't the conclusion. DISCIPLESHIP actually is - BE FAST

Here's the real advice I want you to walk away with: if you suck, but you know people who don't, **ASK THEM FOR HELP!!!** If you know someone who can do something better than you - even if it's just *one* thing in life and they suck at everything else more than you, at least ask them to teach and train you (i.e. disciple you) in that one area.

But **BEFORE** you do this, make sure you're someone worth their time investment. I won't disciple people who aren't worth it. I only have limited time to help people and I usually live within my maximum capacity - to the point that it puts a strain on other areas of my life. Other people who I'd call the "top notch" disciplers would do well to be equally selective, as long as they're living at their capacity too. If you aren't proving that you're **FAST** - Faithful, Available, Saved, and Teachable - then why would we spin our wheels on you when someone else who **IS FAST** is right around the corner?

No, you don't have to be benching two plates for me to teach you how to lift. You just need to be **FAST**. No, you don't need to have fully mastered everything in the sidebar for me to show you how I live it out. You just need to be **FAST**. No, you don't need to having daily quiet times and memorizing Scripture before I teach you how to have quiet times and memorize Scripture. You just need to be **FAST**.

In the parable of the sower, only one seed is given to the soil, yet after it's watered and tended and pruned (see also John 15), it yields a crop 30, 60 or even 100 times what was sown. You get that harvest from the process - not before the process. But being **FAST** does actually mean something more than "I'm willing."

- **FAITHFUL:** When something is given to you, you've got to apply it. You make a stupid post on here and get replies telling you what to do: you'd better come back a couple months later with a field report telling us how you've implemented the advice and what the fruit of it was - or even if you're still struggling, to give it another go.
- **AVAILABLE:** You can't pop your head around one or two times and expect people to invest in you and help your situation. I'm guilty of feeding into this attitude because I find personal enjoyment in talking to randos about their problems because it helps me stay on my game too. But don't expect this to get personal unless you —

show a commitment to being present and active often enough for your name to be known and recognized.

- **SAVED:** I have no problem evangelizing you if you're lost (even if you don't realize it); but the "fast"est growth and the real function of discipleship begins after salvation.
- **TEACHABLE:** If you come in with an attitude that you think everyone should learn from you and you just want to DEER your way through a conversation when mods and ECs are telling you you're wrong, bugger off. We're not wasting our time investing in that attitude (at least not on your terms or for your benefit).

In the end, however much you may NEED someone to disciple you to stop sucking, the reality is that **discipleship is a luxury**, not a need. You're responsible for your own growth. So **this is where it gets meta:**

- You have to stop sucking at life, which would be much easier if you had someone to disciple you.
- You have to stop sucking at being FAST if you want someone competent to disciple you.

Got it? Now go do it.

Book Notes: When To Walk Away, by Gary Thomas

23 January 2021 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

I'd be interested in seeing book reviews coming through from people who find value in them. No book will be perfect. We've even got non-Christian books on the sidebar, such as MMSLP, which talks about the proper way to watch porn with your wife. As always, understand that you've got to sift the good from the bad. But every now and then a book has enough good that it's worth overcoming its weaknesses - whether those are in the form of non-Christian world-views or blue pill ideologies mixed into otherwise highly useful content.

Gary Thomas's book *When to Walk Away* is one such book. I don't endorse the author as a whole. While I've known his name for some time (famous for *Sacred Marriage*, which I assume is blue pill), this is the only book of his I've actually read. So, let's dive in.

Read: January, 2021 **Rating:** 7.5/10

Summary: The driving theme of the book is that you shouldn't let your mission be distracted by toxic people - whether those are friends, family members, co-workers, or even your spouse. He makes a few blue pill statements about marriage as a whole, and also has a generally unbiblical view about how freely he encourages divorce from a "toxic" spouse, and some of his examples call into question whether he was accurately understanding both sides of the story (or that could just be skepticism due to my profession and what I really know goes on behind the scenes). But the drive to make disciples above all else is admirable.

Conclusion: This book is a must-read for anyone interested in engaging in online ministry in any capacity or taking on a ministry leadership position - whether by starting your own ministry or doing so within the context of an existing congregation or other entity. I hope and pray you all do have that ambition, though. It's also useful if you have *legitimately* toxic people in your life. Also useful for anyone involved in family law at all. For anyone else, skip it.

All italics in the original. Bolding is mine for significant quotes.

CHAPTER 1: A Most Clever Attack - If someone is getting in the way of you becoming the person God created you to be or frustrating the work God has called you to do, for you that person is toxic.

- One of the cleverest attacks against God's church today centers around our guilt in dealing with toxic people. Satan knows he can't stop God's people from loving and caring, because God's Spirit makes us love and care. What he can do, however, is urge us to pour most of our God-breathed love, intention, and goodwill on people who actually resent it and who will never respond to grace.
- One caveat before we begin. Some use the label *toxic* much too broadly as an excuse to avoid difficult, different, or hurting people. Let's not do that.

CHAPTER 2: Walkaway Jesus - Jesus walked away or let others walk away ... *a lot*.

- I reread the gospels and counted every occurrence where Jesus deliberately parted ways with others ... I counted forty-one such instances in all four gospels. Forty-one!
- One thing we don't see when others walk away is Jesus giving chase. As powerful as Jesus was, as brilliant as Jesus was, as pure as Jesus was, and as surrendered to God as Jesus was, not everyone he interacted with 'changed,' repented, or agreed with him.
- **Not just one, but *many* walked away. And not just casual onlookers; they're called his 'disciples.'** Instead

of chasing them down and begging them not to misunderstand him and to please come back, Jesus turns to the reliable people, the Twelve, and says, 'So, what about you?' Notice the confidence that gives authority to his message. Jesus never appears desperate, manipulative, or controlling, as if when people didn't agree with him his feelings would be hurt. He is mission focused and others-centered to his deepest core.

- Many plastic bracelets have been sold with the words 'What Would Jesus Do?' If you're dealing with toxic people, you may want to get a bracelet that reads, 'What Would Jesus *Not* Do?' The answer is, 'He wouldn't chase after them.'
- [Jesus] never allowed the desire of others to dictate who he spent his time with.
- Don't think that letting yourself be abused is always the holy choice.

CHAPTER 3: A Murderous Spirit - Three common elements of toxic opposition ... a murderous spirit, a controlling nature, and a heart that loves hate.

- They murder relationships, turning people against each other. They murder churches, turning meeting times into gigantic fights instead of worship and service. They murder workplaces, destroying productivity. They murder reputations.
- **I've seen many people claim to do God's work while seeming to use Satan's methods.**

CHAPTER 4: Control Mongers - As powerful as God is and as sovereign as God is, he is never controlling.

CHAPTER 5: Loving Hate - Some people just seem to love hating others.

- If you tell a toxic boss, "What you just said hurt me deeply," that's like telling a rhinoceros he has bad breath. He doesn't care. It doesn't even register. If you say, "What you're doing is shameful," you're confusing them with a person who is capable of feeling shame.
- **"Proactive people show you what they love, what they want, what they purpose, and what they stand for. Those people are very different from those who are known by what they hate, what they don't like, what they stand against, and what they will not do."**
- The challenge is that those who have most fallen into pride, envy, ambition, and hatred are the least likely people to see it in themselves. We recognize adultery, drunkenness, and murder, but there's something about these attitudinal sins that blind us spiritually."
- Toxic people enjoy the stink. They stop recognizing it as stink. To them, their smell is delicious. They like it. They love it. They want some more of it.

CHAPTER 6: No Time To Waste - If you are in Christ, you aren't just saved; you are *enlisted*. You have been called into a tremendously important work - an urgent work - and there's no time to lose.

- **Too many people think our salvation is about us - personal peace, assurance, happiness, and security. One of the greatest needs in the church today is more workers. Not just believers. Not just church attenders. Not even tithers. It is *workers*, those who believe that to be saved isn't to wait for heaven but to get busy bringing heaven's presence and authority to this present earth as ambassadors for Christ.**
- **It's not about protecting yourself from toxic people (though that's a valid aim); it's more about protecting your mission from toxic attacks.**
- This world may not *reward* your mission before God; it will more likely *oppose* it ... The more important the

work, the more you can expect attacks. Thus, to complete your work, you have to learn how to recognize, disarm, or step aside from such attacks.

- I have had to come to grips with the fact that people have lied and will lie about me; they will rip a few sentences out of context, twist a few passages, and make me sound like I believe something I don't because they need something to be angry about and oppose. And they'll post it all on an Amazon review or in a blog. It has taken me too long to learn that it's often best to simply not respond ... I don't want to be distracted even to defend myself. Why? God's Kingdom is more important than mine. [RC Note: If we are within God's Kingdom for eternity, it IS our Kingdom too.]
- Our mission is *not* to seek out and defeat toxic people ... our job is to ignore them so we don't get distracted from our mission.

CHAPTER 7: Reliable People - *We should be looking for people to invest in.* If I'm already living a full schedule because there are reliable people and kingdom-minded work filling up my calendar, it is much easier to say no to someone who just wants to take up time and be noticed in a toxic sort of way.

- *This priority to put our first and best effort into reliable people is a biblical call, not a personal preference ... We want to be generous to all, but focused on a few, as Jesus was.*
- Notice that Jesus didn't always walk away at the first sign of resistance. He figured out *why* a person was resisting and responded accordingly. If the reason wasn't toxic, Jesus often walked *toward* someone rather than away.

CHAPTER 8: Pigs and Pearls - The clearing of the temple is actually the scene that all but *confirms* Jesus' gentleness in this sense: the reason this incident struck a nerve is that it seemed so unlike Jesus' normal mode of operating ... this is one of the few acts of Jesus recorded in *all four gospels* ... Virtues like gentleness aren't always absolutes.

- If you're like me, preferring to be gentle most of the time, this may be a painful chapter for you. I'd much prefer to write a book about how we should love everyone extravagantly, sacrificially, and enthusiastically ... But this kind of book isn't written very often.
- Jesus is essentially saying that a spiritually dead person is as insensitive to the glory of God's truth as a big is to the value of a pearl ... When this is the condition of a person's heart, only a direct act of God can melt such a soul - not you.
- It's not the fruit's fault. You can take the most fertile seed known to humankind, pour it out on I-10 all the way from Florida to California, and nothing is going to happen. It's not that there's something wrong with the seed; there's something wrong with the surface that won't receive it.

CHAPTER 9: Love Tells the Truth - Jesus and Paul obviously didn't believe that dismissing someone's evil and sin as "well-intentioned but misguided" is always the right path. They called people out on their toxicity ... there's a difference between labeling and name-calling.

- Name-calling is about hurting, demeaning, and using words as a weapon. Labeling is about understanding. It's helpful for Tim to know his wife is selfish and manipulative because what works for a "healthy" wife may not work for his wife.
- I can't control a toxic person. I can't change a toxic person. I can't understand a toxic person. *But I can guard my mission and maintain my character.*
- A caveat here: we should be wary of labeling someone too quickly.

CHAPTER 10: A Man With A Mission - If only Satan were lazy ... Keep in mind, merely distracting you is a win for them. If they can't ultimately *defeat* your work, they at least want to *delay* your work. Our job, based on Matthew 6:33 and 2 Timothy 2:2, requires us to maintain a laser-sharp focus with wisdom, discernment, and determination.

- Mission-minded people don't have time for sentimental foolishness. Nehemiah saw through the facade to these men's real intentions and refused the meeting. Here's why: "But they were scheming to harm me; so I sent messengers to them with this reply: 'I am carrying on a great project and cannot go down. Why should the work stop while I leave it and go down to you?' Four times they sent me the same message, and each time I gave them the same answer."
- When a toxic person doesn't get his or her way, their next gambit is often to make your motives sound sinister.
- Here's the blatant trap you need to be wary of. Some people will want to waste your time and drain you by using a false sense of neediness. When that stops working, they don't give up. If they can't make you sympathize, they'll seek to make you defensive. They'll attack so you'll want to defend yourself. **What's really going on is that they just want your attention. They want to keep controlling a slice of your time, effort, and energy. Whether you sympathize with them or are angry with them doesn't matter as much as the fact that you notice them and spend time interacting with them.**
- One of the best defenses against toxic attacks, then, is seeking what John Climacus called true meekness, "a permanent condition of that soul which remains unaffected by whether or not it is spoken well of, whether or not it is honored or praised."
- **The best way to confound toxic people is to ignore them while you complete the work they want to stop.**
- The best thing you can do to witness to a toxic person is stay focused on your task, refuse to be distracted or play their games, pray instead of gossip, and then *get the work done*. Find the reliable people God has called you to invest in ... *Then they will see that God is God, and they are not.*

CHAPTER 11: Looking Like Jesus When Working With Judas - Three key strategies, based on Jesus' interaction with Judas, for how we can live with or work alongside toxic people without going crazy for ourselves:

- **Jesus Didn't View His Mission as Stopping Toxic People from Sinning** - Maybe it seems more obvious to you, but it was startling to me when I realized Jesus knew Judas was a thief and never chose to stop him.
- **Jesus Didn't Let Judas's Toxicity Become His ...** Just as astonishing to me is what happened during the act of betrayal. When Judas walks up to Jesus to hand him over to the soldiers, Jesus looks at Judas and says, "Do what you came for, friend" (Matthew 26:50). *Friend?* How about *skunk*? How about *snake*? Jesus said "friend" because Jesus didn't have a toxic molecule in his body.
- **Jesus Spoke Truth to Crazy ...** In fact, he warned Judas at the Last Supper that if he were to go through with his plans, things wouldn't end well for him: "Woe to the man who betrays the Son of Man! It would be better for him if he had not been born" (Mark 14:21).

CHAPTER 12: Learning How to be Hated - Jesus was reviled, executed as a criminal, seen as a threat, and held in utter contempt - and we demand to be praised? Paul said the early apostles were cursed and called "the scum of the earth" (1 Cor. 4:13), and yet we are sent into a tailspin if a lonely person with thirty Twitter followers attacks us?

- **The seventh-century writer John Climacus writes of three stages through which we must pass as we learn to handle toxic behavior: "The first stage of blessed patience is to accept dishonor with bitterness and anguish of soul ... The intermediate stage is to be free from pain amid all such things" ... Climacus**

goes on to describe stage three, which he calls "the perfect stage, if that is attainable," which he characterizes as being able "to think of dishonor as praise."

- Climacus summarizes all this with, "Let the first ... rejoice and the second be strong, but blessed be the third, for he exults in the Lord."

CHAPTER 13: Scripture's Skeleton - Educating an evil person without regard to evil doesn't remove the evil; it simply makes him or her more equipped to spread their evil.

- Scripture has a helpful skeleton ...: creation, fall, and redemption.
- Every war is caused by evil, but not every war is evil. Every divorce is caused by sin, but not every divorce is sinful. Sin is behind every act of a child being removed from its parents, but it is not always sinful to remove a child from abusive parents ... *We hurt the people being hurt if we can't call evil evil or toxicity toxic.*
- **Looking back, while I'm grateful we talked so much to our children about Jesus, I wish we had talked a little more about the reality of evil. Evil is an uncomfortable subject, but if we don't talk about it, evil is free to wage war against us under the cover of darkness.**

CHAPTER 14: A New Allegiance - When Jesus was out ministering, he didn't allow family drama to distract him. On one occasion, he is interrupted by a family visit and seems almost harsh in his indifference. It's not that Jesus is apathetic toward his family; it's that he is passionate about his mission.

CHAPTER 15: The Most Vicious Attack - Toxic people are masters at lecturing Christians over how they are "supposed" to behave. Even though they may have never acted like a Christian themselves, they love to hold Christians to the way *they* assume Christians are supposed to act.

- Toxic people are usually much better at being toxic than we are at dealing with them. They've been toxic most of their lives, are familiar with manipulating others, and enjoy conflict like a dog enjoys rolling on top of a dead squirrel.
- Think about it this way. Would you as a healthy believer ever tell someone they're not a Christian or acting like a Christian in a cavalier manner? You know that's a serious charge. Learn to see through the ruse: *they don't want you to act like a Christian as much as they want you to do what they want you to do* - and they're using Jesus as a weapon to wound you. He is not a Lord they follow and revere. **Anyone who tries to use Jesus as a weapon instead of as Savior proves they don't know the first thing about following Jesus.**

CHAPTER 16: Toxic Parents - Evil doesn't always come sporting a goatee and carrying a pitchfork. It doesn't always present itself with malice. It can use words of love, faith, proper authority, and even Scripture. *But evil always destroys.* Sometimes quickly, sometimes slowly, but eventually it takes its toll.

- **I've seen several young women from dysfunctional homes fall into a common spiritual trap. In spite of the negative imprinting of their childhood homes, they end up making a very wise choice for marriage ... Then the common temptation follows. It's a clever spiritual distraction. The woman has escaped a dysfunctional family and is now settled in a functional one. It won't be too long (mere months) until she thinks she is supposed to return to the dysfunctional family and try to fix it.**
- Trying to fix an unfixable relationship is doomed to failure and simply robs them of the time they need to grow their functional family.

CHAPTER 17: Toxic Marriages - There is a crucial difference between a *difficult* marriage and a *toxic* marriage. A difficult marriage consists of two sinners growing out of their selfishness, spiritual immaturity, and pride to learn how to become more like Christ.

- A difficult but not toxic marriage can also exist with a non-believer. I've talked to women who have grown in their faith and love for God, even though their spouses have never been followers of Jesus. Such relationships always have a measure of disappointment, but that disappointment falls well short of toxicity.
- A number of men are married to women who are selfish. Some of these guys have to double down on worshiping God because they receive so little from their wives. This is very discouraging, but it's not toxic.
- A *toxic* marriage isn't just frustrating; it's also *destructive*. It's marked by unrepentant, controlling behavior from which the spouse refuses to repent.
- When divorce is used as a self-indulgent weapon ... you learn to hate such selfish foolishness. By contrast, in the face of unrepentant and unrelenting evil, divorce can be an effective *tool* rather than a *weapon*.
- Jesus once said, "No one who has left home or wife or brothers or sisters or parents or children for the sake of the kingdom of God will fail to receive many times as much in this age, and in the age to come eternal life" (Luke 18:29-30). Did you get the part where Jesus explicitly says some will be forced to forsake *even their spouse* in service to him?
- [Toxic spouses] love the word *reconcile* because they know it's a loaded theological term and it tugs at the heartstrings of any sincere believer, but when you press below the surface, you soon find out they hate the *practice* of being reconciled to God and his ways. If you don't understand spiritual depravity, you'll of course want to "rescue" the marriage.
- "God doesn't care about shells; he cares about the people in the shells." Mike was referring to churches [RC Note: The author goes on to inappropriately apply this concept to marriages, but I thought the statement in its proper context was valuable all the same.]
- With sincere and mission-minded hearts, some spouses married to toxic people have fallen into responding in self-toxic ways. They have sacrificed themselves, blamed themselves, and exhausted themselves as they tried to cure a loved one's toxicity. The only thing this has accomplished (unwittingly) is to keep the toxic person from recognizing his or her toxicity. Sometimes the most loving thing a spouse can do is to walk away, as Jesus did, and let the toxic person face, perhaps for the very first time, the consequences of their toxic actions. Walking away doesn't mean you'll never walk back. It just means you won't participate in toxic activity going forward. Don't tie yourself in knots trying to figure out whether this should be a permanent walking away or a strategic walking away. That can be decided later.

CHAPTER 18: Leaving the Toxicity Instead of the Marriage - [This entire chapter is a long field report on a couple who were mutually toxic and how the man improving himself caused his wife to follow shortly behind.]

- [Darin:] **"I stopped looking to her for things that I needed to look to God for."**
- [Lesli:] **"I bought into the lie ... that because Darin has a strong, masculine personality he must be the manipulator and I must be the victim. God showed me that it was really more the other way around. By withholding affection, respect, and communication, I often played the role of the manipulator."**

CHAPTER 19: Toxic Children - When you stop fighting your adult kids' battles, you start enjoying your kids a whole lot more ... Instead of constantly strategizing about how to change them, you listen to them and relate to them. Do you ever stop praying and hoping? Of course not. How could you? But you also remember that this is *their* battle.

- Whenever you have a difficult child, the natural temptation is to pour most of your energy into saving that child as you (perhaps unwittingly) spend less time and thought on the reliable ones. This is the *exact opposite* of the biblical model we've been discussing in this book: *Don't throw away your time on toxic people; invest that time in*

reliable people. [RC Note: he earlier states that he's giving advice for managing adult children, not young ones. The context is a story of a man dealing with his three *grown* children.]

- If you have a reliable child who is qualified to teach others, one of the greatest gifts you can give to the church is to invest deeply in that child's mind and soul and imbue them with earnest passion to seek first the kingdom of God. *Don't make the reliable children pay for the unreliability of their sibling(s).*
- It's difficult for a pastor to break the sad news that loving Jesus with all your heart, raising your children in a solid church, and taking time at home to instill the basics of the faith *don't guarantee* any particular outcome. We're not programming computers; we're raising young women and men made in the image of God, and that image includes the ability to make choices.
- Thinking that we can be such good parents that our children will never stray is to think we can outdo the Trinity. You cannot as a parent create a perfect Eden experience for your kids, but even if you did, they'd mess it up.
- Jesus, by the way, is also *our hope* ... Our children's salvation never depended on us - most of us know that. Here's the refuge for brokenhearted parents: their return doesn't depend on us either.

CHAPTER 20: Trading Toxic for Tender - Franciscan priest Richard Rohr writes, "I am most quoted for this line: *'If you do not transform your pain, you will always transmit it.'* Always someone else has to suffer because I don't know how to suffer; that is what it comes down to."

- The only person we are called to control is ourselves. Self-control is a biblical command and a fruit of the Spirit. Trying to control others, as we've seen, is a murderous strategy from Satan.
- God's love and affirmation lift us to a dimension of living where fighting each other doesn't make sense. When I feel spoiled by God, what you do to me or think about me doesn't matter all that much, because God's opinion is superior to yours." [RC Note: A little AM there.]
- What should scare all of us believers a little bit is that when we listen to Jesus, he seemed to show the most compassion toward sexual sinners and more judgment toward mean people.

CHAPTER 21: Don't Be Toxic To Yourself - *Anything you wouldn't say to someone else, stop saying to yourself.*

- *What would God want you to say to you?*

[Note: Originally written for /r/NoFapChristians - this draft is unedited. Yeah, it's re-hashing old material for this crowd, but still a useful reminder.]

I've been clean from a history of what many would call porn addiction for years now. I've since discipled a number of men through the issue and found immense success with helping these men find the same victory I did. Over the years, some have suggested I post here and I was just recently reminded, so here goes. My posts tend to be long-winded, so I'll give the abbreviated version, given how late it is.

FIRST: Embrace the Limitations of Human Methods

- "Are you so foolish? After beginning by the Spirit, are you now trying to be made perfect by human effort?" Galatians 3:3

When I first got started, I tried it all - accountability partners, post-it notes, verses left around my computer desk, leaving a Bible next to the monitor. I tried the "when you're tempted" strategies of "stop and read the Bible first," "pray in the moment," or "quote verses you've memorized. I even contemplated tattooing a cross on my "special hand," as if the guilt it would create could somehow save me from ... well, becoming guilty.

These things helped on occasion. But I found the results to be very inconsistent. I was left longing for a reliable method. I found that anything that required "human effort" ultimately failed me at some point or other, never producing divine permanence.

SECOND: Understand Reproductive Compulsion

- "Did he not make them [husband and wife] one, with a portion of the Spirit in their union? And what was the one God seeking? Godly offspring." Malachi 2:15

One of the most illuminating things for me was when I saw in Scripture the parallels God was drawing between physical relationships and spiritual ones. Most notably: the Church is often referenced as Christ's bride (or even the Father's bride, in Isaiah). I discovered in my marriage that the sexual frustrations I experienced with my wife were highly correlated with the ways I was interacting with God. In the days when my wife had no spontaneous desire for physically reproductive acts as a one-flesh relationship, I also was expressing no spontaneous desire for spiritual reproduction through the oneness bond I have with the Spirit who lives in me.

The Bible constantly talks about how the physical things of this earth are (in Hebrews 8-9 terminology) "copies" and "shadows" of the truer heavenly things. In this sense, I found that my desire for physically reproductive acts (birth control notwithstanding) were little more than a roadmap to help me get to the end-destination of spiritual reproductivity. That is: evangelism/discipleship was the spiritual fulfillment of the physical drive I had for sex.

THIRD: Understand Biblical Indwelling

- "They shall become one flesh" Genesis 2:24

The Bible was (presumably with *some* exception) written in a time when there was virtually no real form of birth control. Sex produced babies. When a man physically indwells a woman, that's the expected result. So, I started looking at what the Bible says about a spiritual indwelling. I found that there are only three good things (i.e. not demons, sin, etc.) that can indwell us: (1) God's Word, (2) Jesus, and (3) the Holy Spirit - not unsurprisingly, these are all representative of the three aspects of the trinity (God's Word, as referenced by Jesus, being OT Scripture, thus the Father - not the "Word" in the John 1:1 sense). Fascinating to me was that all these references to God indwelling us shared a common trait:

- **God's Word:** "The sower sows the word ... those that were sown on the good soil are the ones who hear the

word and accept it and **bear fruit, thirtyfold and sixtyfold and a hundredfold.**"

- **Jesus:** "I in them and you in me, that they may become perfectly one, **so that the world may know that you sent me and loved them even as you loved me.**" John 17:23 (see also John 15, where this is spelled out in much greater detail)
- **Holy Spirit:** "You will receive power when the Holy Spirit has come upon you, **and you will be my witnesses** in Jerusalem and in all Judea and Samaria, and to the end of the earth." Acts 1:8

When God - any person of the trinity - enters into and indwells us, the result is spiritual reproduction. Someone else just posted a CS Lewis quote about our desire for physical sexuality not being too much, but too little - that God has so much greater in store. I have found this to be quite true in the form of evangelism and discipleship - that, to be crude, it "scratches that itch" in a way that I never would have expected.

FOURTH: Pruning

- "Every branch that does bear fruit he prunes, that it may bear more fruit" John 15:2

Jesus as much as gives the answer to all sin problems, and it's not "try really hard to stop!" He says first that any branch that fails to produce good fruit "withers; and the branches are gathered, thrown into the fire, and burned" (John 15:6). Yikes! If you are fruitless, God won't prune away your sin. He lops you off from the vine entirely. See also the parable of the talents/minas - the one who kept his coin didn't lose it. He still had it. But he didn't *produce* with it, but that was enough for the master to cast him out "where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth" (Matthew 25:30) - the same description Jesus gives for hell in Luke 13:28 (not at all surprisingly: the same chapter where Jesus preaches the parable of the fig tree, once again affirming that fruitlessness = cut down, per v7, 9).

But if we want to know how to get rid of our sin, Jesus talks about "pruning." Who gets to be pruned? "[E]very branch that does bear fruit he prunes" (John 15:2). That's right: if you want your sin pruned away, you must bear fruit. And *what is the goal of the pruning?* "... that it may bear more fruit."

Our goal in avoiding sin is usually because we want to feel less guilty. Or sometimes it's this vague concept of "being more like Christ" by being sinless. How many people do you know who struggle with porn who, when asked why they want to quit, the answer is: "So I can be better at making disciples?" Some people might get that somewhere on their list if you asked them to give a top-10 for why they want to quit, but it's rare to find anyone who has that as their instinctive response. Yet that's God's #1 reason for pruning away your sin. If he's not going to get that result - as evidence by the fact that you're not producing disciples yet already - then why would he bother pruning you? Better to lop off the unfruitful branch. But if you are producing disciples - if you are *fruitful* - then he has every reason to prune you to make you even more fruitful.

No, I don't mean to degrade this into a conversation on whether or not "bearing fruit" is what saves us (it's not). But I do want to take Jesus as seriously on this subject as his words portray, not undermining the significance of the weight he places on the concept simply because I prefer to cling to a "not by works" mantra that makes me feel good about ignoring any actual spiritual obligation that comes with my salvation.

FIVE: Make Disciples

- "Go, therefore, and make disciples of all nations ... teaching them to obey everything I have commanded you." Matthew 28:19-20

Jesus opened his earthly ministry: "Come, follow me and I will make you fishers of men." He was clear up-front that the end-product he would be creating in his disciples would be that they become discipler-makers too (no that's not a typo). When he prays during his final meal with them, after teaching them everything he could and showing them through the model of his own life how he disciplined them, he says to God: "I do not ask for these only, but also for those who will believe in me through their word" (John 15:20). He was thinking toward future generations that

would flow from them - that crop "30, 60 or 100 times what was sown." In his ascent, his final words are for them to "Go and make disciples." This singular mission is literally the focus of everything Jesus passed on to the 12 - and it's the reason God saves us. This is among the "good works prepared in advance for us to do," as Paul references as being the reason God saved us by grace through faith (Ephesians 2:8-10).

When Jesus said to "make disciples," he didn't say those words in a vacuum. He didn't mean to make "converts" or to "get people to attend a Sunday service" or "have them say a prayer." He's saying, "What I just did for you all for the last few years - now go do that for everyone else on the planet." Both Jesus and Paul understood and preached that this would happen through spiritual generations - the *fruit* of our oneness bond with Christ, just as physical children are the fruit of a one-flesh bond between spouses. Disciples are ones who follow to become like their master. And if people don't know what Jesus looks like, we reflect Christ to them living in such a way that we can profess boldly as Paul did: "Follow me as I follow Christ" (1 Cor. 11:1).

Pink Elephants

While this is a poor reflection of the spiritual dynamic at work in the oneness bond we have with God and the spiritual reproduction that can ensue from that, it at least conveys one aspect of mental remapping that has helped some.

Have you ever tried to stop thinking of a pink elephant? The more you or someone else chants: "Stop thinking of pink elephants!" the more you keep thinking of them. What's the answer to the riddle? How can you possibly stop thinking about them when the harder you meditate on that command the harder it becomes? The answer, as every child knows, is to go do something else.

The more you try and try and try to stop thinking about porn, the more you keep making it the center of your thoughts and attention. Jesus says, "I have better things in store for you. Will you join me? If you will, I will make you a fisher of men. Will you actually start fishing for men?" On that journey is when sanctification happens - not by you turning away from sin, but by turning *toward* Christ and becoming what he is molding you into: a fisher of men.

CONCLUSION: Sanctified Framework

In my journey, I've found that when I am spiritually satisfied by my oneness with Christ (which has the result of producing disciples/fruit), my compulsion toward physical gratification is equally satisfied.

I also find that the more I become like Christ - not in what I avoid, but in what I *DO*: make disciples - the more my way of thinking conforms to his. How could it not? If I want to make disciples like he did, I need to study his life and the example he gave. I need to live like he did. I need to pass on my lifestyle like he did. I need to embrace Philippians 3:17 - that Jesus was the model for the apostles, who set a model for others, and that others were instructed to follow *that* model, and so on down the spiritual-generational line. And in doing this, just as a physical child receives my physical DNA and becomes like me when it observes me and how I model life for him - so also do our spiritual children inherit our spiritual DNA, and we are raised to be like our spiritual parents. And in this process, with Jesus being the patriarch over all spiritual generational lineages - the more we become like Christ, the more we have the mind like Christ (Romans 12:1-2).

Was Jesus tempted as we are? Absolutely. And those temptations will still come, no doubt. I am still tempted. But it is never anything more than that: a temptation. Just as Jesus had a mental framework of understanding and saying no to temptation because he had more important things to focus on (like bearing fruit - making disciples), so also do I develop a mental framework of understanding and saying no to porn (and this applies to all other sins as well) because I have more important things to focus on: making disciples.

Yeah, God loves you, but that doesn't mean you'll always experience the benefits of a loving relationship with him. Lots of people see these constant, recurring struggles in their lives and think, "God must not love me." Some people are less dramatic and just want answers to their problems.

But answers aren't always easy to come by. Yeah, "no temptation has overcome you except which is common to man," but man's most common response to those temptations is also to cave. So, the commonality of our temptations, frustrations, struggles, etc. only speaks to the fact that we're "not alone" - it doesn't at all indicate that there are answers.

WHY You Struggle

There's a difference between what you **NEED** and what you **WANT**. Goodness, I feel like I'm talking to 3-yr-olds about "needs and wants," but seriously: this phenomenon persists even into adulthood with our faith.

Want

When people ask about "how to stop watching porn" or "how to get my wife sexually interested in me" (or even the reverse) or "how to find a girlfriend" or "what to do about my spouse's sin issue" or "how to cope with the feminine imperative" or any other life issues, they're focusing on *WANTS*.

These people are saying: "I have an idea in my head of what my life ought to look like. This thing is holding me back from experiencing that ideal. As such, I *think I need* the answer to this problem in order to get back on track to my ideal life." In reality, they can be fine with or without that resolution. They just don't comprehend that reality yet because they're so fixated on that one issue.

Look at all the chumps on askMRP who think they need their wife to change. The barrage inevitably comes in: "No, what you really need is to STFU, sidebar, and lift." The seculars over at MRP understand that what a person *wants* isn't the same as what they actually need in the moment. In fact, even getting what they want probably wouldn't make the person's life nearly as good as they expect because the resolution of one problem without solving the underlying cause is inevitably going to expose even more problems.

Need

What you *NEED* in life is spelled out in Scripture. You *NEED* to be following Jesus; you *NEED* to be bearing fruit - spiritually reproducing; you *NEED* to know the Scriptures inside-out to be established and equipped to do these things. I have summarized it consistently in the three greats:

- **Love God** - This is the greatest commandment. Go read Deuteronomy 6:4-9 again, if you haven't lately. Get to know him, prioritize his interests for you rather than your interests for him. Study the Bible, pray, meditate, memorize, etc. Remember that time Jesus said in John 14:21, "The one who has gushy feelings for me is the one who loves me?" Oh, that's right, neither do I. It says, "Whoever has my commands and keeps them is the one who loves me."
- **Love Others** - This is the second greatest command (per Matthew 22:39). Same as above. It doesn't mean just having positive vibes or good-will toward your neighbors. It's active. But even more so: 1 John 4:8 says that "God is love." God has to be part of the exchange. If you're not reflecting God's character toward them in the interaction, it's not loving.
- **Make Disciples** - The Great Commission. Matthew 28:19-20. This isn't just for that one person you've thought about sharing the Gospel with, but you never get around to doing it. It's a call that we, collectively, are

responsible for the whole world - yes, literally ALL NATIONS - being not only "converted" to faith, but disciplined toward competency at obeying everything Jesus commanded us. Who are you discipling right now? If no one, you'd better figure out what's holding you back and overcome it. If you don't know how to disciple someone, that's what the discord (called "disciplecord") is for.

These are your NEEDs. These are the things you should be focusing on in your life. These are as important to you as the food you eat and the water you drink and the sleep you get every night. Without these things, you will die and burn in hell for eternity. Yes, I can point to very clear soteriological passages on each of these points if this were open to debate, but let's skip that from this conversation and simply note that if this is what God wants for your life, it's what you *NEED*.

ARE YOU PRAYING TO US?

A "prayer" is, in its most historic context, an earnest expression to another, usually with a hope or expectation of a helpful reply. It's not always "fix my problem." Sometimes it's just communication of a situation with the hope that the recipient would receive and experience the good-intent. For example, "I prithee well" was an old-English way of saying, "I earnestly hope/pray things go well with you." Biblically, prayer has a somewhat expanded definition with a more conversational aspect of our relationship with God, but the "earnest expression" is always a part of the definition, as seen clearly through many of David's Psalms - even the ones where he's just talking to God and not asking for anything back.

Lots of the posts we get around here are honest requests - even earnest ones. People see a problem in their lives. It's killing them. They desperately want a solution. I'm guessing that most people haven't prayed with the Luke 11:8 earnestness or, as the NIV puts it: "shameless audacity," before coming here. But even if they have, it's because God hasn't given them the solution they're looking for. So, they come to us instead.

We are NOT here to give you the answer to your perceived need (i.e. your "wants"). What we CAN do is point you toward what your *actual needs* are (i.e. your "needs"). This will include sub-goals with a broader agenda than what you intend for yourself.

- You aren't getting sex with your wife. We find out you're fat. We tell you to lift and diet. You think it's because we know that'll help your sex life. Our real agenda: men who are fit and disciplined are more useful to God's Kingdom than those who aren't.
- Your wife keeps nagging you. You have no frame. We teach you how to build a both strong and desirable frame. You think it's so you can pass fitness tests and curb the nagging. Our real agenda: men with desirable frames are able to be more influential in Kingdom-building.
- You struggle with porn. We give you advice on how to overcome it. You think it's because porn is sinful and you need to stop. Our real agenda: get you focused on making disciples like Jesus told you, which is more important than stopping porn.

[u/RStonePT](#) once commented that MRP was one of the greatest bait and switches of our time because "men come here for better sex, but we send them away as better men." When you pray your problems to us, that's what our agenda *should* be to you. It's what my agenda always is - ask [/u/paexology](#) for his memes on-point. And if you're responding to people's posts by focusing on the weeds and forgetting the forest, think twice about what you're actually trying to accomplish.

But there's also a reason *WHY* you CANNOT find actual solutions to your broader problems without this bait-and-switch in the answers we're giving: because to do otherwise would simply be *enabling*.

FRUITFUL PRAYER-DYNAMIC

I'm going to keep this short and sweet: **If you aren't living the victorious life that God designed for you - a life of fruit-bearing discipler-making - why do you think God would be so foolish as to become your enabler by solving your problems, making you more comfortable in your unfruitfulness?**

The reality is that Jesus says in John 15 that the fruit-bearing branch is the one that gets pruned - whose problems are shorn away; but the fruitless branch is lopped off and thrown into the fire. So, if you're not bearing fruit for the Kingdom yet, NO DUH! why you aren't seeing clean, easy, and consistent answers to your prayers.

Ironically, when you ARE bearing fruit for the Kingdom and your whole life is bent around those things which God designed you for - not because "God said so, so I'd better get off my butt and do it" but because you are transformed inside and out and can't stop seeing the world the way God sees it in its vast need for the Gospel and training in righteousness ... when you're there you find two changes in your prayer dynamic:

- You stop praying about things like "fix my spouse" or "help me stop sinning" or "what job should I choose?" because you realize that when you're living victoriously, these things seem to work themselves out naturally (Matthew 6:33) to the point where they're non-issues; or your priorities are so rightly re-aligned that you realize the insignificance of such trite and silly little requests in the face of the larger missional objectives ahead of you, thus ...
- You ask for BIG things in your prayer life. Instead of asking for trinkets, you begin asking God for continents. Anyone remember **my vision for how I'm pursuing the fulfillment of my mission?** Yeah, think big! To quote Dawson Trotman:

"Do you know why I often ask Christians, 'What's the biggest thing you've asked God for this week?' I remind them that they are going to God, the Father, the Maker of the Universe. The One who holds the world in His hands. What did you ask for? **Did you ask for peanuts, toys, trinkets, or did you ask for continents?**

"I want to tell you, young people, it's tragic! The little itty-bitsy things we ask of our Almighty God. Sure, nothing is too small – but also nothing is too big. Let's learn to ask for our big God some of those big things He talks about in Jeremiah 33:3: 'Call unto Me and I will answer you and show you great and mighty things that you do not know.'"

THE IMPERATIVE OF BIBLE FLUENCY

The reason it's easy for people to forget the difference between *wants* and *needs* in our lives is that most people don't have a competent grasp of Scripture. A physical bride has a physical husband who presumably speaks to her regularly, even when she isn't chasing him down for a conversation. Our spiritual groom, however, speaks primarily through his Word. And where he has spoken, he won't repeat himself. If we don't pick up his Word, we'll never figure out what he's trying to say to us. With that ignorance, it's easy to come up with our own ideas of what God expects.

But even among those who do pick up the Word regularly, if they're doing it just for the purpose of hearing God's voice, but without the intent of understanding it (i.e. frequent quiet times, but never moving on to actual *Bible study*), they'll be no better than a wife listening to her husband say, "I have a present for you, so go finish your household responsibilities and I'll give it to you" and all she hears is, "I have a present for you ... and I'll give it to you," then holds out her hand waiting, ignoring the rest of what he says.

Just as our daily time in the Word (i.e. quiet times/devotionals) help us develop a breadth of knowledge of what the Scriptures say, Bible study is necessary to develop a *depth* of understanding of it - and the two MUST work hand-in-hand. And Scripture Memory is the key to persistence in application of the Word, having an almost mysterious quality of evoking internal transformation as we let God's Word indwell our hearts.

THE OTHER BASICS

And if you haven't guessed it by now, just as I've covered prayer, quiet times, and Bible study, **I could write sections in this post for the other 7 basics in the 300-series**, if I had the time. Content like this post comes in the equipping phase after the basics are instilled, but hopefully you see how developing a lifestyle that exudes these disciplines with great frequency will both make you fruitful as a Christian and also optimize the conditions in which God will want to prune away the struggles you're dealing with, just as Jesus said in John 15 that the fruitless branch is chopped off, but the fruitful one will be pruned.

CONCLUSION

The lives we want for ourselves are incompatible with Christian living. Pursuing our own vision for life, no matter how well-intentioned and God-honoring we try to make it, will always be rife with problems. Some people want to tell God how they will serve him. It doesn't work. We must start focusing on God's vision for our lives as expressed through Scripture, most notably through the example laid out by Jesus and the apostles, who devoted their whole lives toward a singular purpose - everything else being mere stepping stones along the way. Only then will God give solutions.

If God gave answers to our problems any sooner, he would become an enabler. Why would God enable us in our sinful rebellion toward our own life-visions by taking away the problems that inherently arise when we pursue those other visions? That would be foolish of him, and God is no fool. This is why even Paul, when addressing the "thorn in his side" (2 Cor. 12) finds peace in the conclusion that God's grace is sufficient for him, embracing the weaknesses without allowing them to hinder his relentless pursuit of making disciples for Christ.

So when someone complains, "How do I deal with my spouse?!?" and insists, "She simply refuses to change/follow me," don't get so hung up on her reaction. You do what you need to do and if the thorn persists, it persists and you accept the sufficiency of the grace God does give. But most often, I find that this attitude achieves the result promised in Matthew 6:33 - "Seek first His Kingdom and His Righteousness and all these things will be added to you as well." Are you Loving **G**od, Loving **O**thers, and Making **D**isciples? If not, get to it - and work toward internalization of these things as part of your frame (i.e. your *own* internal point of origin) rather than rote behavioral modification.

Why Lifting is Not a Suggestion

18 March 2021 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

__ Mental Masturbators __

Mental Masturbation: "The act of engaging in useless yet intellectually stimulating conversation, usually as an excuse to avoid taking constructive action in your life" (urban dictionary).

I'll throw out the way I tend to use the word most: *People who "get off" on talking of subjects they fantasize about, but only toy around with in practice.*

A post recently showed up titled "The (True) Biblical Argument for 'Lifting Is Not A Suggest.'" It was written by a man who self-described: "For full accountability: I'm fat. 6'4" 300lbs." I wrote a post not too long ago, titled: **Anything You Can Do I Can Do Better**. One of the thrusts of the post was that people here should be asking themselves before posting: *Have I earned the right to post on this subject?* I concluded: "This is not an open free-for-all. This is a place for people who are serious and want to grow."

To that poster's credit, he seemed to be growing. But I stand by the fact that this place is not for keyboard jockeys to steal a platform they haven't earned. I have met many men here in-person or spoken face-to-face over Zoom - [/u/praxology](#), [u/redirectedfs](#), [/u/TheChristianAlpha](#), among many others - and even, most notably in this context: [/u/OsmiumZulu](#). I can attest that these men are the real deal. This sub has become increasingly relaxed about permitting content from those who aren't.

No, your ability or failure to bench 300+lbs does not directly affect your intellectual capacity to exegete Scripture. But it does affect the lenses through which you interpret it. I've scarcely ever seen an obese pastor preach a sermon on gluttony. I've yet to see a woman pastor preach a sermon on the biblical premise for why women should *not* be leaders in the church. I've never found a pastor who isn't solid on Scripture memory preach a sermon about the importance of memorizing Scripture.

In the same vein - and not intending to be cruel, rather to point out the blunt reality: are we at all surprised when a 300lb man wants to argue the nuances of Scriptural interpretation regarding the degree to which men should be taking care of their bodies? And to use the exact same eisegetical and logical-leaping strategies that he accused OZ of using is humorous, at best - misleading this body of believers, at worst. This is the definition of mental masturbation. No.

Also significant: **Any time someone claims to have the "true" anything, treat the claim with great skepticism - even if it's coming from me.** In this case, the "True Biblical Argument" was just another hollow stab at pretending one avenue of beating around the bush was better than another.

__ The Bible __

You'll notice that OZ's original "Lifting Is Not A Suggestion" post is the only one on the entire sidebar that's bolded. Does that mean it's more important than all the other content? Nope. But it does mean it's the one that most guys need to start with when they first come here complaining about how awful their marriage/dating life is.

The "Biblical" Foundation ... is Lacking

You'll notice from the post immediately that OZ did not intend it to be an exegetical-heavy post. It isn't there to create a Scriptural foundation for the practice of hitting the gym. The reality is that **there's no exegetical basis in Scripture for how many plates you should bench or squat, or what your body fat should be.** We all get that.

Any verse that *could* be interpreted to imply the level of body-building/strength-training that we encourage here could also just as easily (sometimes even more easily) be interpreted in another way that wouldn't support our model at all. I'm okay with that.

And why would we expect the Bible to address lifting in the first place? The cultural dynamic is also different today than it was back then. Instead of walking from town to town, we ride cars, bikes, or even things like my son's Christmas present that don't require any more muscular action than tilting your foot a degree or two. Instead of eating predominantly what grows from the ground, meat, and bread, we're inundated with greasy fried foods plastered on billboards, tv commercials, and signs creating pavlovian responses toward obesity.

Suffice it to say: I'm not persuaded that obesity or muscular atrophy were such great problems in the biblical days that would have warranted a clear biblical statement. I'm also not persuaded that Jesus made sure all his apostles could bench 300+ lbs with a six pack either.

Don't Be An Idiot

Is there a subreddit for Christian physicists? I love physics. It's fun to study it. Wouldn't it be so much fun to go on a subreddit for Christian physicists and start attacking them: "Your biblical basis for comprehending mass and acceleration is totally weak!" That's called being an idiot, for lack of other words that the reddit admins are now banning us for using ([though I have a post for that too](#)).

- Obviously subreddits for Christian physicists are going to include discussions of equations, scientific theories, etc. that involve things they learned outside the Bible.
- Obviously subreddits for Christian lawyers are going to include discussions of statutes, arguments, etc. that involve things they learned outside the Bible.
- Obviously subreddits for Christians who want to talk about building attraction are going to involve discussions of physical, mental, emotional, and ... yes, even spiritual "game" (or for [/u/Deep_Strength](#)'s benefit, let's call it "passively internalized attraction factors") that we've learned outside the Bible.

I frequently talk about the knowledge hierarchy: theology >>> science >>> philosophy. I note that philosophy is "logical reality," if the world were a logical place all the time; but science one-ups it by addressing "observable reality," if the world always functioned in scientifically predictable ways (i.e. in the absence of miracles); while theology addresses "actual reality." Yeah, this is one of those "the TRUE thing" statements I'm making. Feel free to test that claim yourself.

The hierarchy exists because we recognize that one method of answering questions and solving problems won't have all the answers. It isn't to shame lesser degrees of thought. It's to make sure they are used in their proper place and to empower them - that as we recognize where theology is silent, we move to science; and when both are at a loss, we defer to logic and philosophy. The Bible doesn't teach us that $2+2=4$, yet I'd be hard-pressed to function in my day job if I didn't rely on that scientifically observable reality.

You'd be a fool to reject such useful information as the very foundations of mathematics on the principle that "the Bible didn't say it, so I won't acknowledge it."

You'd be a fool to reject such useful information as the very foundations of the principles of attraction on the ... principle that "the Bible didn't say it, so I won't acknowledge it."

Don't be an idiot.

__ Why Lifting Isn't A Suggestion HERE __

The Surface Level

For RPC purposes, lifting is a mandatory part of our prescriptive advice. I maintain that the red pill is descriptive, not prescriptive. But there are some realities that are so broadly true that it's hard to reach any other conclusion. In the case of developing attraction - whether for the single guys who come here complaining they can't get a date, or the married men who complain their wives won't sleep with them - we have to assess quickly: *Are you here to accomplish the goals you're asking about, or are you just mentally masturbating?*

It's been said a number of times: *Looks aren't everything, but they are the difficulty level you're playing on.*

When we tell a guy to hit the gym, are we commanding: "This is a theological imperative, and you're sinning if you're not"? Well, **I suppose someone did suggest that**, but he's not endorsed ;) No, we're not making a theological conclusion.

Instead, we're making a broader statement: **The chances of you developing an idyllic frame and tight social, mental, emotional, and spiritual game to the degree that you will achieve all of your relationship and sexual goals while still being over 25% body fat and unable to bench your own bodyweight is so low that if you're serious about your goals you must treat lifting and dieting as mandatory.**

If you're not willing to put in the effort to lift, then we are treating your goals as unachievable. In this sense, it is not a suggestion.

The Deeper Reality

I've also noted a number of times that RPC is a giant bait-and-switch. Men start here with the aim of improving their relationship/sexual prospects - and we can help you with exactly that. But my greater purpose is - and always has been - my mission: to make disciples. I want to get guys following the Jesus of the Bible. For many men in the manosphere, a healthy relationship/sex life is a milestone still ahead of them in that journey, not a waypoint they've already hit and somehow lost track of. So, if they start at A, a healthy relationship is B, a healthy sex life is C, and Jesus is moving on to D, then E, then F, etc. - well, getting them from A to B to C is part of the process of moving men to follow Jesus. No, it's not all of it. That's why I refused to stop the sidebar series with only the 100s and 200s - why I continued to add at least the basics of following Jesus as the 300 series, or dealing with complex sin/emotional/whatever struggles as the 400 series, even though at the time it felt grossly out-of-place on this sub. But for many men, these relational/sexual pursuits actually will be the starting point.

For most of these guys, their relational/sexual dysfunction is so blinding to them that they cannot see anything past it. They cannot get on board with making disciples for Christ, much less follow him themselves, until they see that "the light at the end of the tunnel" will let them drain their balls every now and then.

To put it another way: *If we want guys following Jesus, we have to get them past the immediate roadblocks holding them up.* If a guy's physical shape is so poor that he can't jump either the literal or metaphorical hurdles he comes across in life, then he's never going to be an effective Kingdom-builder.

Is it possible to help you all develop such a great frame that you don't need to be physically fit? Yes. But it'd probably take half a decade of training, life-modeling, etc. that I simply don't have to give. And why would I when I can accomplish the same level of progress with the next guy over in 1/10th the time because he's actually willing to hit the gym and I don't have to put in any more effort than tell him: "DYEL, bro?"

No, that's not a testament to the laziness of not wanting to put in the time to train men. It's a testament to the fact that we won't waste our time to train the man who isn't willing to train himself; yet for the one who does, we don't have to waste the time on intricate nuances and advanced concepts of frame projection or what-have-you because we can get down to business in being effective for the Kingdom far sooner. And the man who lifts will be playing life on easy mode, meaning he's far more likely to be effective, multiplying our efforts beyond what the other man will ever likely achieve. That's a wise choice.

Seriously: think about that for two seconds. Imagine two guys are competing against each other to see who can survive the longest in a game of Tetris. The competition rules are ambivalent toward what difficulty you play on. One man is playing on easy mode and the other is playing on "dear God just kill me now" mode. Your job is to train one of these guys to beat the other. Could you train the second guy to win? Possibly. But that would be the foolish choice. Being effective for God's Kingdom is not an area of life where we should take on the challenge just for the sake of it being challenging. Yeah, I like the challenge every now and then too. But when it comes to the Kingdom I will always prioritize being effective over testing my ego. No mental masturbating over theory. If you want to achieve a goal, put in the work. When you've proven yourself, then we can talk the finer points - if we even need to at all.

Here's a quick hint: *There's a reason MRP/RPC rarely ever talk about "advanced" topics. Because most men never need them. Why not? Because they hit the gym, after which the basics are more than enough to get them where they need to be.*

Steve and Susan

"You're just like your father!" Susan shouted at Steve. She knew how to push his buttons, and that particular one stung the most. Steve let out a flurry of cuss words, mumbling promises to himself under his breath between outbursts. He raised a hand to her and she dared him to do it. He knew better. It was 3 in the morning before he came home that night. She tried to apologize, but he was back to his cold, dead self. The excitement only lasted a little while. At least she knew how to get him back to a place where he makes her feel *something*. It's so much easier now that they have to share parental rights of their child.

Susan couldn't love a robot, but the fighting humanized Steve - and having solidified their status as cojoined opposing forces in legal documentation, she continues to enjoy the histrionics she came to remember as the only thing from her marriage that was worth talking about with her girl friends. In fact, it helped her find a new man who was only too eager to play the hero. She felt something with him ... as long as her ex continued to make her feel like the damsel in distress. Otherwise she was just as bored with *segundo macho*. Steve hasn't found another input-giver to take coding from yet.

Polarization

Polarization has value. But jumping from one off-putting characteristic to another is not being polar. It's closer to being bipolar. Valuable polarization comes when one crowd identifies with you and another despises you. It lets you know quickly where you stand, and builds a powerful bond of camaraderie with those on your end of the line. It also creates a strong emotional reaction with those on the other side that can, in many cases (though not all), result in an "opposites attract" path opening up.

Jesus was polarizing. He did it the right way. He had a drove of followers who adored him. He also had a committed band of opponents with influence and authority who wanted to kill him. He knew where he stood between each crowd and he played it to his own advantage unto his death, resurrection, and glorification.

Steve was not polarizing with his wife. He was agonizing. But there were two more things he also was not:

Equable

Equability is when a man is able to remain calm and centered in the midst of troubles that come his way. As the Bible says, he is "not easily angered" and "keeps no record of wrongs." He is a static force. He is a rock in the midst of the stormy seas - a rock that some people despise and others love, but a rock nonetheless.

Jesus was equable. He could be driven to great anger and even insults, as we all know. But he was not *easily* angered. It took a lot to get him riled up, and even when he was, it was always for a purpose. It was rational anger.

Steve was not equable. Equability is a virtue that is not expressed in any one moment, but as a broader character trait that can only be understood with observation through a multitude of scenarios of varying intensity. At times Steve was shallow and robotic, but it wasn't hard for Susan to rile him up. It wouldn't be proper to say he was "equable in his calmer moments" and then simply "stopped being equable" when he became angry any more than I could say that "Bob is an honest man, except when he tells lies."

Rational

I don't believe Rollo titled his books simply because the name sounded cool. He understood that rational thought is a shockingly rare commodity these days. People are beholden to their emotions as the foundation for their decisions. The dominance of feelings over rational thought is apparent not only in intersexual relationships, but also in politics, our educational system, the business/marketplace, and even the judiciary - the one bastion of logic and

argument that should have held out. The church is no exception.

It is not sufficient that a man has the capability to express rational thought. He must BE a rational male.

Rationality is not a factor of intelligence or mere logical clarity. A man is irrational when his behaviors don't align with what he knows to be the proper course of conduct. When a man discovers the red pill and intellectually grasps that ONEitis is destroying him, yet he continues to cede to the contrary impulses at work in him, he is irrational. Rationality is not only about how well you can comprehend your own circumstances, but also how you translate that into behaviors that dominate over your emotional predispositions.

Jesus was rational. He not only knew the face value of his circumstances, but also the motivations of the people who presented them, and had thought out insightful solutions in response. He also acted on these solutions in a manner that consistently led him to his ultimate goal to be crucified so as to save us all.

Steve was not rational. Even if he knew why Susan was pushing his buttons, he didn't behave in a manner that was grounded on any real solution. He never bothered to rationalize his circumstances or assess solutions to his problems. He is still unhappy to this day, last I knew him.

Jeff and Jane

Jeff was a character. He was funny, ~~even~~ especially when he didn't know it. Not everyone got his type of humor, so there was a degree of polarization too. You had to appreciate the macabre to get him. Jane didn't. She romanticized men like Steve because of the high paying job, well-groomed haircut, and flashy clothes. Steve knew how to attract a woman, but not how to keep her interested. Jeff was the opposite. It took a man like Steve in his life to play "wingman" before Jane gave him the time of day. After the first introduction was made, Jane was reassured by Jeff's unending fun with life, even when pessimistic. He once was genuinely worried he would be fired from his job, but teased Jane endlessly about the "poor, homeless schmuck she'd soon be dating." Whether she believed there was any real risk or not, it was obvious that even when times were bad he knew how to make her laugh and enjoy what life brought their way. He was never fired.

Jeff and Jane are engaged. I don't know if marriage will change Jeff as it does for so many. But I do know that Jeff, at least for now, is equable. His demeanor is entertainingly consistent (and I include that modifier by necessity, not merely for emphasis), despite that the things he has experienced would trouble the average Steve into a cold depression or an angry storm. He is also rational. He understands that his behaviors have consequences and affect his relationship and sexuality, and he allows that cognizance to be the primary contributor (over emotional impulsivity) toward the resolve he has in maintaining his affable nature.

Patrick and Sally

It's not quite fair to compare Steve and Susan with Jeff and Jane because Jeff and Jane are still "young and in love." It's easy to overlook a lot and stay positive when you're still in your mid-20s, broadly untainted by the burden of responsibility, and new in a relationship with lots yet to explore about each other. Patrick and Sally have been through all that. Patrick and Sally are who I imagine Jeff and Jane will become someday, if they don't lose what they have going for them right now. I've seen Steves and Susans in the dating phases of life too, and it's never pretty when solemnized.

Patrick and Sally have not only learned to enjoy each other without regard for their circumstances, but they have also learned to balance that with the weight of the responsibilities God has given them in life - responsibilities not only to their own family, but to a much bigger purpose that they could not manufacture for themselves. **It took this purpose to help them work past their low points** before Patrick could lead Sally into a healthy bond that remains today.

Patrick is the head of a local student ministry where Christians are not welcome. He and Sally are constantly struggling between a family of believers who love them and a secular institution that has engaged in legal proceedings on at least two occasions to kick them out. It makes life interesting, if not worrisome. He is a polarizing person on his campus, and not shy to engage in conversation with those he knows oppose him. You have to be that way in ministry. His theme verse for his family is both equable and rational: "I have learned to be content whatever the circumstances. I know what it is to be in need, and I know what it is to have plenty. I have learned the secret of being content in any and every situation, whether well fed or hungry, whether living in plenty or in want: ..." He humorously leaves off the far more popular concluding verse in an effort to draw on others' curiosity while simultaneously emphasizing the context that is so often forgotten.

Patrick is a man I want to be like in many ways.

Steve and Susan

"You're just like your father!" Susan shouted at Steve. She knew how to push his buttons, and that particular one stung the most. Steve let out a flurry of cuss words, mumbling promises to himself under his breath between outbursts. He raised a hand to her and she dared him to do it. He knew better. It was 3 in the morning before he came home that night. She tried to apologize, but he was back to his cold, dead self. The excitement only lasted a little while. At least she knew how to get him back to a place where he makes her feel *something*. It's so much easier now that they have to share parental rights of their child.

Susan couldn't love a robot, but the fighting humanized Steve - and having solidified their status as cojoined opposing forces in legal documentation, she continues to enjoy the histrionics she came to remember as the only thing from her marriage that was worth talking about with her girl friends. In fact, it helped her find a new man who was only too eager to play the hero. She felt something with him ... as long as her ex continued to make her feel like the damsel in distress. Otherwise she was just as bored with segundo macho. Steve hasn't found another input-giver to take coding from yet.

Polarization

Polarization has value. But jumping from one off-putting characteristic to another is not being polar. It's closer to being bipolar. Valuable polarization comes when one crowd identifies with you and another despises you. It lets you know quickly where you stand, and builds a powerful bond of camaraderie with those on your end of the line. It also creates a strong emotional reaction with those on the other side that can, in many cases (though not all), result in an "opposites attract" path opening up.

Steve was not polarizing with his wife. He was agonizing. But there were two more things he also was not:

Equable

Equability is when a man is able to remain calm and centered in the midst of troubles that come his way. As the Bible says, he is "not easily angered" and "keeps no record of wrongs." He is a static force. He is a rock in the midst of the stormy seas - a rock that some people despise and others love, but a rock nonetheless.

Steve was not equable. Equability is a virtue that is not expressed in any one moment, but as a broader character trait that can only be understood with observation through a multitude of scenarios of varying intensity. At times Steve was shallow and robotic, but it wasn't hard for Susan to rile him up. It wouldn't be proper to say he was "equable in his calmer moments" and then simply "stopped being equable" when he became angry any more than I could say that "Bob is an honest man, except when he tells lies."

Rational

I don't believe Rollo titled his books simply because the name sounded cool. He understood that rational thought is a shockingly rare commodity these days. People are beholden to their emotions as the foundation for their decisions. The dominance of feelings over rational thought is apparent not only in intersexual relationships, but also in politics, our educational system, the business/marketplace, and even the judiciary - the one bastion of logic and argument that should have held out. The church is no exception.

It is not sufficient that a man has the capability to express rational thought. He must BE a rational male.

Rationality is not a factor of intelligence or mere logical clarity. A man is irrational when his behaviors don't align with what he knows to be the proper course of conduct. When a man discovers the red pill and intellectually grasps that ONEitis is destroying him, yet he continues to cede to the contrary impulses at work in him, he is irrational.

Rationality is not only about how well you can comprehend your own circumstances, but also how you translate that into behaviors that dominate over your emotional predispositions.

Steve was not rational. Even if he knew why Susan was pushing his buttons, he didn't behave in a manner that was grounded on any real solution. He never bothered to rationalize his circumstances or assess solutions to his problems. He is still unhappy to this day, last I knew him.

Jeff and Jane

Jeff was a character. He was funny, ~~even~~ especially when he didn't know it. Not everyone got his type of humor, so there was a degree of polarization too. You had to appreciate the macabre to get him. Jane didn't. She romanticized men like Steve because of the high paying job, well-groomed haircut, and flashy clothes. Steve knew how to attract a woman, but not how to keep her interested. Jeff was the opposite. It took a man like Steve in his life to play "wingman" before Jane gave him the time of day. After the first introduction was made, Jane was reassured by Jeff's unending fun with life, even when pessimistic. He once was genuinely worried he would be fired from his job, but teased Jane endlessly about the "poor, homeless schmuck she'd soon be dating." Whether she believed there was any real risk or not, it was obvious that even when times were bad he knew how to make her laugh and enjoy what life brought their way. He was never fired.

Jeff and Jane are engaged. I don't know if marriage will change Jeff as it does for so many. But I do know that Jeff, at least for now, is equable. His demeanor is entertainingly consistent (and I include that modifier by necessity, not merely for emphasis), despite that the things he has experienced would trouble the average Steve into a cold depression or an angry storm. He is also rational. He understands that his behaviors have consequences and affect his relationship and sexuality, and he allows that cognizance to be the primary contributor (over emotional impulsivity) toward the resolve he has in maintaining his affable nature.

Patrick and Sally

It's not quite fair to compare Steve and Susan with Jeff and Jane because Jeff and Jane are still "young and in love." It's easy to overlook a lot and stay positive when you're still in your mid-20s, broadly untainted by the burden of responsibility, and new in a relationship with lots yet to explore about each other. Patrick and Sally have been through all that. Patrick and Sally are who I imagine Jeff and Jane will become someday, if they don't lose what they have going for them right now. I've seen Steves and Susans in the dating phases of life too, and it's never pretty when solemnized.

Patrick and Sally have not only learned to enjoy each other without regard for their circumstances, but they have also learned to balance that with the weight of the responsibilities God has given them in life - responsibilities not only to their own family, but to a much bigger purpose that they could not manufacture for themselves. **It took this purpose to help them work past their low points** before Patrick could lead Sally into a healthy and sexually fulfilling bond that remains today.

Patrick is the head of a local student ministry where Christians are not welcome. He and Sally are constantly struggling between a family of believers who love them and a secular institution that has engaged in legal proceedings on at least two occasions to kick them out. It makes life interesting, if not worrisome. He is a polarizing person on his campus, and not shy to engage in conversation with those he knows oppose him. You have to be that way in ministry. His theme verse for his family is both equable and rational: "I have learned to be content whatever the circumstances. I know what it is to be in need, and I know what it is to have plenty. I have learned the secret of being content in any and every situation, whether well fed or hungry, whether living in plenty or in want: ..." He humorously leaves off the far more popular concluding verse in an effort to draw on others' curiosity while simultaneously emphasizing the context that is so often forgotten.

Patrick is a man I want to be like in many ways.

A few years ago I wrote [this post](#) on spinning plates. Over the last few years I've heard a few people comment on the need for an update or more info on this topic. Let's start with a recap:

- **Definition:** "Spinning Plates doesn't necessarily mean you're f----- all of your plates. It's more of a spreading out of your efforts across a wider pool of subjects." ~ Rollo Tomassi. Spinning a plate is simply *exerting effort toward a woman* (and I'll add for precision): *who finds you more desirable than you find her*. If you're interested and she's not, she's not your plate; you're hers. She needs to be your orbiter, not you hers.
- If you're not satisfied with your current relationship status or prospects, you can do one of three things: (1) fix yourself, (2) improve the quality of your plates, or (3) improve the quantity of your plates.
- You're far more likely to (a) find a high quality woman, or (b) develop an abundance mentality if you take a shotgun approach (multiple targets spread out) rather than a sniper approach (single target and just waiting for your one chance).
- Different people will require different levels of effort to keep them spinning. However, the more effort you put in, the more you display low value because at some point she assumes she's worth all that effort ... and more. The result is that she stops putting in effort back toward satisfying you (except as may be innate to her sense of self-identity).

Why is this okay?

My son recently asked me why I said it's okay to go on dates with different people at the same(-ish) time. I simplified it for him this way:

- When you're dating, you're not married, right?
- You haven't agreed to be exclusive yet?
- Dating is just two friends spending time together to see if they might want to be exclusive later, right?
- So why does spending time with one friend mean you can't spend time with other friends at other times?

He kind of got it, but a few days later asked again, so I simplified it some more:

- Have you ever played with your friend Cordelia without Angie around?
- Have you ever played with Angie without Cordy there?
- In the same week?
- Even though they're both your friend? How dare you!
- Was it wrong to do that?
- So why would it be wrong to spend time with two different girls who are both your friend, even in the same week?

Going on a date is not a commitment to exclusivity. It's just something you do to get to know someone better. It might lead to marriage. It might not.

They're just friends at this phase of the relationship. Jesus had lots of friends - both guys and girls. He spent time with them jointly and also individually. Do likewise.

Acquiring "Friends" (i.e. orbiters and preselection bouys)

Now, depending on where fall on the "can guys/girls ever be 'just friends'?" question, dating can take two spins:

(1) **Can be friends:** If guys and girls can be "just friends" and nothing more, then shotgun dating (rather than sniper dating) doubles as an opportunity to build your social circle, making you more capable of meeting others and expanding your influence in the world. This can be beneficial not only toward finding higher quality women to spend time with, but also in broader missional/ministry efforts because I guarantee that most of the people you will ever meet in life aren't actually following Jesus. So, if you believe men and women can be "just friends," then there's no reason not to "spin plates" to the end that you're just building friendships (even if with the passive hope that one of them pans out into something viable as a romantic interest).

For married men, this "just friends" thing is significant because it affects personal boundaries for the undisciplined. If you can "just be friends," then there's no harm in seeing a colleague or whoever over lunch. If you can't just be friends, then it's a bit trickier: you then have to balance the risk of your sexual interest becoming a problem (i.e. the degree of your own self-control) against the value that the relationship adds.

(2) **Can't be "just friends":** In this view, there's no such thing as "we're just friends getting to know each other better" because all guy/girl interactions will ultimately have romantic undertones. Either you're sexually interested or you're not. While the term "friends" might be used to describe the relationship, at least on some subconscious level it will never be truly platonic for at least one of them. While the pragmatic utility doesn't change here, some guys interject an ethical conundrum that's twofold:

- *If she's the one sexually interested in me, am I inappropriately leading her on?* To this I defer to my analysis in the previously linked post. Be friends, just don't incite her to cross any boundaries that you don't intend to cross yourself.
- *If I'm the one sexually interested in her, but I'm only willing to have sex within marriage, is okay for me to pursue marriage with multiple women?* To this I say to stop over-thinking it. Until you've made a commitment of exclusivity, it doesn't matter.

In either case, if you decide the person isn't someone you want to marry, they will either become passive orbiters (i.e. orbiters you don't have to exert much/any influence to keep around) or they'll become preselection buoys. Buoys just kind of float in place. They have a purpose, but it's not readily apparent to those swimming in their vicinity. Sometimes they are there just to mark a boundary, other times it's to test the temperature of the waters, or they can record oceanographic data ... or in this context they can just be in your presence so that the type of women you want to attract will have their preselection vibes triggered and be more interested.

On a more biblical note, the question arose in my head whether or not Jesus was "just friends" with some of the women in his life? As a matter of technicality, they became part of the Church, which is his bride, but his interest wasn't sexual-reproductive; it was spiritual-reproductive. And yes, he did want to reproduce spiritually through all of his followers and not just any one of them. But we are also a collective singular body. So, take that for what you will. In the end, I do believe Jesus experienced sexual attraction (otherwise Hebrews 4:15 would be false which says that he was tempted in every way we are), but I also believe that he was perfectly able to maintain platonic relationships with women because of his devotion to his mission without room to be distracted with thoughts of marrying. So, I do believe at least in the case of Jesus that "just friends" is an option ... but he's also Jesus, so take that for what you will too.

Impact on Age

Drawing from [/u/praexology](#) and [/u/r_horizon](#)'s comments on the discord, it's significant to note that spinning plates is different at different ages. When you're a teenager, you may not actually be thinking about marriage yet, or close to being ready. I recommend guys not marry until you're in your 30s, or at least late-20s if you really want to optimize (though depending on your individual goals, earlier can still certainly be appropriate).

When you are marriage ready, it's almost impossible to go on a date without the subconscious assessment of whether or not the person in front of you is potential marriage-material. This goes back to the "can we really just be friends?" question, but suffice it to say: it's something you should be thinking about. Otherwise, why are you going on the date to begin with? And the answer is that you could still just be acting like a child.

In those younger childhood years before you're ready for marriage, the goal of going on dates is to practice your social skills. As praex words it, "Exercise my social muscles." This benefits not on your dating-game, but your broader social life as well. The more things you go out and do, as compared with sitting in your room playing video games and watching netflix, the more interesting stories you'll have to tell and life lessons you'll have to teach. In the end, you won't be "starting from nothing" when you are ready to be marriage-minded. You'll have a solid foundation under you, rather than being one of those guys in their 30s who has only just now really started going on dates. [Any of you guys in that situation want to share your horror stories in the comments?]

Invest in your social skills now, reap the reward later.

Biblically, Ecclesiastes 11 has some wisdom for us. Verse 6: "In the morning sow your seed, and at evening withhold not your hand, for you do not know which will prosper, this or that, or whether both alike will be good." Fascinating. Let's skip to 9, which gives a good set of boundaries for the young who want to start dating. "Rejoice, O young man, in your youth, and let your heart cheer you in the days of your youth. Walk in the ways of your heart and the sight of your eyes." This is reminiscent of chapter 2 where Solomon talks about how he "denied myself nothing my eyes desired," and we all know how many wives and concubines those eyes desired. But he doesn't merely give men a blanket green-light to take the same path that he ultimately found to be meaningless. He ends the verse with a caution: "But know that for all these things God will bring you into judgment." Yikes! Yes, sow your seed and don't put all your eggs in one basket; but make sure that you do it in a way that's mindful of the coming judgment. That's wisdom.

What to do?

Okay, so you've figured out what a plate is, decided who you want to start getting to know better, resolved your moral dilemmas, and are ready to start building friendships with these women in your life. What do you actually do now?

Do you take them out to the movies? Go on a romantic date to a fancy Italian restaurant? Play putt putt just the two of you? Take a stroll down the beach? Grab a cup of coffee? Head to a night club?

The simple answer is: just do whatever you want to do. But know that when you do this, if "what you want to do" is to be alone with her, you quickly open the pathway to ONEitis.

My alternative answer is: do whatever you would have done if she wasn't around, but invite her to join you.

- If you were going to spend time with friends, still do so ... just let her come along.
- If you were going to watch Netflix and chill, still do so ... just let her come along.
- If you were going to your congregation's small group, still do so ... just let her come along.
- If you were going to study for an exam, still do so ... just let her come along.

This isn't rocket science here. You live your life. You invite her to join you on your life. If she can help you live

your life, even better. If not, you'll find out fast.

In the early days of a relationship, I'd certainly emphasize this "join what I'm already doing" strategy, not bending your plans to create isolated time. After a bit, once you have a clearer decision about where you want to take the relationship, go do whatever fun "couples stuff" you've been holding off on. But always watch out for ONEitis because it will crush those who are not careful, even when you don't think you have it.

WISNIFG RECAP

Hopefully by now you've all read WISNIFG, which has some great communication strategies. Let me recap the most significant ones:

- **Fogging:** Find a way to agree with what someone else says, even if you don't agree to the substance. "I can see how from your perspective that would make a lot of sense." It's hard to argue with someone who keeps agreeing with you.
- **Broken Record:** Keep repeating the same phrase over and over without changing your position. This shows people that you won't back down and you insist on getting your way on this issue. "I want a refund ... I understand, but I still want my refund ... Yes, you may speak with your manager if he is the one who can give me a refund ... I appreciate your alternative offer, but I want a refund."
- **Self-Disclosure:** Providing relevant additional information about your situation, goals, motives, etc. that can move people toward understanding what you want from them and be more inclined to give it to you. "I need to reschedule our appointment" v. "My child is in the hospital, so I need to reschedule our appointment."
- **Negative Inquiry:** Asking questions that challenge the false assumptions people make when they accuse you. "Why is it wrong for me to spend time with my co-worker after hours?"
- **Workable Compromise:** Exchanging something that does not sacrifice your goals or self-worth in order to get what you want in return. "If you give me the parenting schedule I want, I'll agree to your right of first refusal provision."
- **Negative Assertion:** Admitting to your own shortcomings in order to build credibility or neutralize accusations. "That was a dumb thing for me to do." It's hard to accuse someone angrily who already recognizes the full weight of the accusation. Of course, this doesn't work if the "owning up" is done in a minimizing way.

RC'S ADDITIONAL STRATEGIES

In my time as an attorney, I've found that there are a number of additional conversational strategies that work not only in the courtroom, but also at home, in social contexts, high conflict scenarios, in the office, etc. Here are a few to dabble with.

It's About Me (But Really You) - Leadership strategy

Legal Context - I'll open with a simple one because it plays into some of the others really nicely. As we all know, blunt accusations aren't often received well. They make people defensive and emotionally unstable. So, I often suggest to my clients that instead of accusing the other parent of doing something wrong, take that exact issue and communicate (preferably in writing) to the other parent that you intend to work on that issue in your own parenting because you believe it would be best for your child. The idea is that the other side is then prompted to process the utility in what you're doing and they may attempt to implement it in their own home (even if my own client doesn't actually follow through or never intended to in the first place). This comes down to the power of suggestion. As a worst-case scenario, even if they don't implement the thought, if things go wrong my client now has a written record that they are trying to be proactive thinkers for their child and the other parent's failure to do likewise is what contributed to the mess.

Home Application - This works outside the legal custody context also. If your wife is fat, telling her, "You need to

lose some weight" can be powerful if you have the frame and value to pull it off, but it's still probably going to make her upset. The "It's about me (but really you)" strategy is simply to take ownership of something you want another person within your influence to do also. In this example, you could tell your wife, "I've decided I'm not satisfied with my body. I'm overweight and it's time to start dieting and exercising more." Often-times such clear statements about your own intentions causes the other person to self-reflect and contemplate that they should make a similar decision for themselves.

This conversational approach shouldn't be used to undermine the importance of "do, don't tell." There is still great value in not blabbing your mouth about your plans if your primary concern is your own life improvement. But sometimes the "lead by example" path doesn't quite get through. Remember the discipleship strategy Jesus used: (1) tell them what, (2) show them how, (3) let them try, (4) send them out/keep them going, and (5) pass it on. If your goal isn't just for your own improvement, but also to lead someone else, then it can be beneficial to tell before you show, giving them a context to see how to do what they're aspiring to and to stay motivated by seeing your progress.

There's also a split between situations where you're leading by example and leading by setting boundaries/expectations. I can tell my wife, "cook this for dinner" or "wear this tonight" without showing her how first. I'm not going to put on a skirt just to "show her how" when she already knows. So, if I'm setting a boundary or expectation for her, telling her without showing is sufficient and the "it's about me (but really you)" strategy is unnecessary. When this comes most into play is when you're dealing with more sensitive issues of a spouse's shortcomings and you want her to learn from your example how to overcome them.

Lastly, it's worth noting that you can use this strategy by replacing "me" with someone else your wife might have reason to keep up with. Here are some examples of how this conversational technique can work:

- **Example 1:** "I've noticed our bathroom sink getting cluttered. I think I'm going to clean it up and make an effort to keep it clean soon. Is there anything on there that you don't want me messing with?" Chances are, 80% of the mess is hers. You're not accusing her; you're just taking responsibility. But she will likely adopt that responsibility as her own also.
- **Example 2:** I want my wife memorizing Scripture more often. I start training my kids in Scripture memory. I tell my wife, "I've decided that Scripture memory is important and our kids need to be doing it. So, I've been having the kids memorize <this or that> verse. They're doing great! I love the idea that our family will become one that knows the Bible inside and out." She sees that the kids are starting to excel at something that she should be better than them at, so she starts memorizing Scripture with them to keep up.

DOC Examination - Conflict and Leadership Strategy

Legal Context - The goal of any good cross examination is to lead a person to your own pre-drawn conclusion by asking questions. The most famous technique is the "Pozner Cross," which involves only yes/no questions. You essentially back the witness into a corner where they ultimately have to agree to see things your way. Through a series of "yes or no" responses the person ultimately admits what you want. It's ideal if you begin the line of inquiry in a way that the other person doesn't know what you're trying to get them to admit to.

- **Pozner Example:** I may ask Bob about his favorite holiday. "Even if it's not your favorite, Bob, July 4 is always a great time, isn't it?" "Don't you just love to sit on your lawn sipping a few beers while the lights dance in the sky?" "And it's even better when you get to be with your kids, enjoying a family holiday, don't you think?" "Wasn't it great that you got to do that last week?" "And you even had your kids with you too, to make it even better, right?" "And you were drinking those beers while your kids were with you, right?" "And you knew the order prohibited drinking during your parenting time, right?" Trapped.

Home Application - To be clear, making your spouse feel "tricked" into an admission rarely goes over well, so avoid

the yes/no questions. Instead, I've started doing in specific cases what I call a "direct-on-cross" (DOC) strategy. During direct examinations you can only ask open-ended questions. Yes/no questions are prohibited (with limited flexibility). Why would you limit yourself like that on cross examination? Because it better shields your motives and removes the air of trickery, as they get to answer any way they like. But by maintaining control of the conversation and ensuring that it follows the direction I want it to, the person usually ends up saying what I want them to say anyway. Even better: in low-conflict scenarios, I can even persuade someone through this strategy to think that my idea is actually their idea.

- **DOC Example 1:** My son says something nasty to his sister. Instead of scolding him I ask, "Ten years from now, what kind of relationship do you want with your sisters?" He answers with something generally positive. "That's a great goal. If you want that goal to become a reality, how do you think that will happen?" He answers that they both have to work on being "excellent" to each other (a Bill & Ted reference I tease them about every now and then). "What are things you can do to help her be 'excellent' toward you?" He gives an idea or two and I latch on. "What are ways that will get in the way of your goal of having a good relationship with her?" He starts to connect the dots and realizes that talking mean doesn't help.
- **DOC Example 2:** Suppose I want to teach someone about the importance of prayer. I would open with the IAM(BRY) strategy: "I've been thinking about things I can do to improve my relationship with God." Response: *That's a good idea.* "Do you have any ideas on how I can do that?" He goes through a list. Prayer is on the list. "That's a good one. What would be good ways to approach prayer?" I let him brainstorm a few ideas. If he's struggling I give a few mediocre ideas while waiting for him to come up with the ones I really want him doing. "I like that. Do you want to do that with me?"

Buffering - Conflict and Persuasion Strategy

Legal Context - This is one of the most useful strategies I use in my legal profession. Parties in custody disputes can't wait for their chance to talk about how awful the other side is. When they get before a psychologist, judge, magistrate, guardian ad litem, or whoever, they just blab their mouth about "he's so evil because he did this" or "she's so crazy because she did that." Result? "You're both crazy and just acting out of spite and emotion. I can't trust either one of you." That's not how you win cases. And I like to win.

In order to combat this dynamic, I teach my clients the art of "buffering," which is a strategy I've developed for building credibility without compromising the very real and serious points you otherwise like to make. It's very simple: for every accusation you want to make, "buffer" it with a complementary statement of understanding and giving the benefit of the doubt. That's it. $Credibility = [Buffer] + [Harsh Truth]$. The two are reversible or can be multiplied in any number and order you see fit. It's a way of saying, "You can trust me. My motives aren't bad like you might assume, but I do want you to know the seriousness of this issue."

Especially when you're in a conflict scenario, other people are constantly trying to evaluate whether or not they can trust what you're saying. If you come off as your perspective being clouded by your own ego investment in the situation, you lose credibility and hinder your ability to achieve your goals in the situation. By demonstrating that you really are level-headed about the situation and thinking rationally and even with positive affect toward the other person in the conflict, you don't merely "not hurt" your credibility; you bolster it.

Home Application - This strategy works well in the home when you're giving instruction to someone else, such as your spouse or your child, on something you know they will be resistant to, but you want them to do it anyway. By creating an identification with their frustration, they are more likely to accept the reality of the undesirable task as a mandate from you because you're not asking them to do anything you haven't already done yourself. Or you can use this strategy to resolve conflict with your spouse because at the end of the day, your wife is probably more interested in being understood than she is in actually getting her way (at least if she trusts you this is more often the

case).

- **Example 1:** "[Buffer] In an ideal world, I'd love nothing more than to have shared parenting with equal time with my ex, [Harsh Truth] but that's just not feasible in this situation, and here's why."
- **Example 2:** "[Buffer] I fully believe that my spouse has good intentions and is just trying to do what s/he thinks is best, [Harsh Truth] but the reality is that she has made things worse."
- **Example 3:** "[Harsh Truth] Dalia is insane. [Buffer] I don't say that lightly. I love her and care about her. I wish we could figure this out peaceably between us. She's a beautiful, intelligent woman. [Harsh Truth] But the more I have spoken with competent professionals and researched what I've seen in her, the more I see lots of overlap with serious mental health concerns. [Buffer] I think if she could get the help that she needs, we might actually be able to communicate with each other in a way that would be fantastic for our kids. [Harsh Truth] But we're just not there right now, [Submissive Posturing] and I don't know how to get there. Could you help me figure that out?"
- **Example 4:** [Harsh Truth] Son, you're going to have to clean your room. [Buffer] I know you don't like doing it. It sucks. I hated cleaning my room when I was a kid too, so I understand your frustration with it. [Harsh Truth] But your room is trashed and it is your responsibility to get it back in order."
- **Example 5:** [Harsh Truth] Babe, this is what we're going to do going forward. [Buffer] I understand that you think this and that. I appreciate your thoughts and how well you have communicated them. But as much as I can see where you're coming from, [Harsh Truth] this is the decision I'm making right now and I would like you to be on board with me."

Submissive Posturing - Persuasion/Likeability Strategy

Legal Context - Another big mistake a lot of people make (especially in the legal arena) is failing to recognize power dynamics. For example, when meeting with a guardian, lots of people want to tell the guardian how to do their job, what they should believe, why their choices with the kids were the best ones, etc. This *can* work if you legitimately have the better position. But I've found that EXACTLY 50% of parties in custody cases overestimate the actual strength of their position relative to the other side, so it's a risky gamble. The better strategy is to set your own agenda aside, take some humble pie, and submit yourself to the "experts."

Home Application - To do this, you simply ask for help, advice, or suggestions from the person who has a power dynamic over you or with whom you want to build a better relational affinity. The goal is to demonstrate that you can be trusted because you're more interested in finding the best solution than in pushing your own proposed solution (or at least this is what you give the appearance of doing). If your solution really is the best one, it's not often hard for the person in the higher power dynamic to realize this, so you can blend in some DOC Examination strategy as a way to get them to your actual preferred solution. The real thrust here is that you're getting someone else to empathize with you and your way of doing things by letting them believe you are allowing them to be in control.

The reality is that you are in control. But you are expressing your control in a way that utilizes an appearance of submissiveness coupled with guided disclosures or questions that ultimately lets them feel like they have been instrumental in your decision-making process to the degree that they believe you are taking their advice rather than persuading them that your decision was the correct one. The end result is that people see you as an appropriately humble person who validates their need to be needed, giving them a positive affinity toward you in future interactions and makes them more inclined to side with you when you need them to ... all without actually having to change what you ever intended in the first place. Law of Power 38 comes to mind: "Think as you like, but behave like others."

Another benefit is that this gives you a win-win-win-win scenario in the aftermath no matter what the outcome.

Win 1: If things go well, they go well and you've improved your relationship with the other person by making them feel validated for having been able to participate in the process. **Win 2:** If things go poorly, you have the option to double-down on the humility aspect by accepting responsibility, even though the other person believes that they were the one who gave the advice that led to the failure. **Win 3:** If the situation truly calls for it, you also have the option available to defer responsibility because you were "just following so and so's advice, and after all, he's the one in charge." **Win 4:** By getting someone else's input before acting on your plan, you may actually discover a better plan than what you were thinking.

In all of this, don't apply this strategy on the mundane where it would seem trite or even pedantic to bring it up.

While I call it a "submissive" strategy, it is really about leveraging (hopefully authentic) humility to advance your own goals and build up others around you in the process. As such, it can be applied in situations where it may be beneficial to express humility, even if the person is not in a higher power dynamic over you, such as with your spouse at times. Women love to feel needed. Even if you have a plan, allowing her to feel involved in the process validates her desire to be helpful to you in what you do. Let her be that help, even if you don't actually need that from her. This is part of where she gets her feels.

- **Example 1:** I want to do something unique a certain way in my job. Instead of doing it myself, I go to my boss and ask, "Do you have any suggestions for how I can handle this somewhat unique situation?"
- **Example 2:** I have a tricky situation coming up with my job so I ask my wife, "What would you do if you were in my situation?" Whatever answer she gives, I say, "Those are some good thoughts." If she says the thing I was thinking, I answer: "That's a good idea. I think I'll go with that. I appreciate the help, babe." She doesn't need to know if I'd already come up with that idea on my own or not.

Key Issue Focusing

Legal Context - Virtually everyone in custody cases blurs the line between their own goals/desires and what's best for the children. They always assume that what they want is best for the children, but neglect to connect the two concepts. So, I always prepare my clients for meeting with a GAL or psychologist or before going into a deposition or trial: "Make sure to connect EVERYTHING to the well-being of the children in some way." If they can't stay laser-focused on that singular issue, then much of what they say will be deemed "not credible" and they can lose. Of course, many judges forget this line too, which isn't helpful. But as soon as one party repeatedly hammers that line and the other party isn't ready for it, you'd better believe the judge will suddenly remember the actual focal point, and guess which parent he's more likely to side with on that focal point? The one who repeatedly demonstrated the connection between their plan and the relevant goal.

Home Application - I remember days of arguing with my wife where we jumped from one issue to the next and at the end it was all just a confusing mess and the actual core issues beneath the argument became a thing of the past by the end. That doesn't mean the new things that came up weren't significant issues too; they're just independent issues that distracted from resolving the first ones first.

Keeping this in mind, "Key Issue Focusing" is a framework for applying things like "broken record" or "negative inquiry" or other WISNIFG strategies in a way that avoids the argument and minimizes your risk of DEERing significantly. The reason that arguments get out of hand and become unproductive is because people over-explain themselves in manners that remind the other person of *even more* things they want to complain about, or at least *more things* that they want to say in defense of their position or feelings.

To do "key issue focusing" effectively, you use a string of negative inquiry to figure out what the actual core of the issue is, then as the conversation evolves you keep asking questions to bring it back to that.

- **Example 1:** Your wife is bouncing between comfort and fitness tests like a game of pong. You ask questions to figure out what's really going on and find out an insecurity issue is at the core of her discontent. She starts talking about how annoyed she feels when you clip your toenails in the living room. "[Fogging] I can see how that would upset you, but [KIF] we've been talking about the insecurity you've been experiencing and I'd like to focus on that. How does that affect your feelings of insecurity?" She goes on about how annoying it is. "[Fogging] I get that and agree you find it gross, which we can talk about later. [KIF/Broken Record] But let's stay on the insecurity topic for now. [Self-disclosure/passing comfort test] You know you're my woman and I care about you. [KIF] That's what's most important here."
- **Example 2:** You're talking to a GAL and tell a story about how the mother is with a new boyfriend who you don't like. **WRONG:** "He's a dangerous person and shouldn't be around my kids. He has a criminal record for drug possession and assault. She shouldn't be taking people like that around my children." This is a lot of "he, he, he" and "she." The kids are mentioned, but not the actual FOCUS of the statement. **RIGHT:** "My children are experiencing a lot of anxiety through this legal process. Bringing new people into the home who aren't even established in the relationship could put the kids in a situation of building a bond with someone just to have it ripped away from them if it doesn't work out. This guy has a criminal history and if he gets picked up again, he'll probably go to prison, and that would be unnerving to have these relationships come and go without safeguards. That situation would also hurt their relationship with their mom too, if they started seeing her poor choice in men. What's more concerning, though, is that kids with anxiety problems are more prone to self-medicate through the use of drugs, and if this new guy in their home has a history of it, and may even still be doing it, there's a chance that he's going to endorse that type of behavior around them, or at least not discipline them against it, which could really harm them in the long term. The fact that he has an assault on his record also shows that he's easily angered to a point where he'll cross even legal boundaries - and if he did that in a public forum with others watching, how much more will he be willing to lose his anger in a private setting around my kids in a way that will increase their already existing anxiety issues? All around, it's not a good situation for them. [Submissive Posturing] So, I'd really like some feedback on the best way to approach protecting my kids in this situation. Do you have any suggestions?"

The E-Mail Formula

Legal Context - While this is generally a blend of other strategies, it's worth noting that when I find a client constantly communicating in ways that are damaging to their case, I always coach them on how they can communicate better in writing. After all, written communication will generally be used as exhibits against you if the other side can find a way to do so. So, I created a general formula for high conflict situations to create a productive and self-preserving written record in case the communication is ever shown to anyone else.

Home Application - The same communication strategy can work when you're dealing with conflict in the workplace, with your spouse, neighbors, etc. The only thing that may be different is that in some contexts you're less likely to have someone ever take a look at what you're writing - especially if it's a verbal conversation where you're applying this pattern. That said, do be mindful that even audio can be recorded, and you never know when a co-worker will want to get you fired, a spouse may want to leave you (even dredging up texts from a year or two prior), another person in the church will want to stir up trouble with you to the pastor, etc. So, tact in communication is generally warranted in most situations. With that said, here's the formula (no, I didn't bother to come up with some cool acronym; make up your own if you prefer):

- **Empathy:** Validate their feelings without validating their position on the issue and, if possible, share in them openly. "I'm sorry that you're frustrated by this situation. I am too."
- **Grace:** Communicate a way of giving them the benefit of the doubt (i.e. pre-buffering). "I believe you mean well and hope you know that I truly do understand your position."

- **Repeat:** Repeat what they're saying in your own words to confirm your understanding. This is not always necessary, but can be useful in some contexts. "From what I can tell, you're concerned about x, y, and z because of a, b, and c."
- **Assert:** Share your viewpoint in contrast in a clear, concise, and definitive way applying buffering (if you haven't already above). "[Buffering] While I can understand why you'd think that way, [Harsh Truth] I simply cannot agree. I believe h, i, and j is better because r, s, and t."
- **Offer:** Give them an olive branch - a way to look like the good guy or else pigeon-hole themselves into being the bad one. "[Buffering] I know you don't agree with me, [Harsh Truth] but a decision has to be made [Offer] and I'd like for us to work together on this. Are you willing to join me in doing things this way?"

WISNIFG RECAP

Hopefully by now you've all read WISNIFG, which has some great communication strategies. Let me recap the most significant ones:

- **Fogging:** Find a way to agree with what someone else says, even if you don't agree to the substance. "I can see how from your perspective that would make a lot of sense." It's hard to argue with someone who keeps agreeing with you.
- **Broken Record:** Keep repeating the same phrase over and over without changing your position. This shows people that you won't back down and you insist on getting your way on this issue. "I want a refund ... I understand, but I still want my refund ... Yes, you may speak with your manager if he is the one who can give me a refund ... I appreciate your alternative offer, but I want a refund."
- **Self-Disclosure:** Providing relevant additional information about your situation, goals, motives, etc. that can move people toward understanding what you want from them and be more inclined to give it to you. "I need to reschedule our appointment" v. "My child is in the hospital, so I need to reschedule our appointment."
- **Negative Inquiry:** Asking questions that challenge the false assumptions people make when they accuse you. "Why is it wrong for me to spend time with my co-worker after hours?"
- **Workable Compromise:** Exchanging something that does not sacrifice your goals or self-worth in order to get what you want in return. "If you give me the parenting schedule I want, I'll agree to your right of first refusal provision."
- **Negative Assertion:** Admitting to your own shortcomings in order to build credibility or neutralize accusations. "That was a dumb thing for me to do." It's hard to accuse someone angrily who already recognizes the full weight of the accusation. Of course, this doesn't work if the "owning up" is done in a minimizing way.

RC'S ADDITIONAL STRATEGIES

In my time as an attorney, I've found that there are a number of additional conversational strategies that work not only in the courtroom, but also at home, in social contexts, high conflict scenarios, in the office, etc. Here are a few to dabble with.

It's About Me (But Really You) - Leadership strategy

Legal Context - I'll open with a simple one because it plays into some of the others really nicely. As we all know, blunt accusations aren't often received well. They make people defensive and emotionally unstable. So, I often suggest to my clients that instead of accusing the other parent of doing something wrong, take that exact issue and communicate (preferably in writing) to the other parent that you intend to work on that issue in your own parenting because you believe it would be best for your child. The idea is that the other side is then prompted to process the utility in what you're doing and they may attempt to implement it in their own home (even if my own client doesn't actually follow through or never intended to in the first place). This comes down to the power of suggestion. As a worst-case scenario, even if they don't implement the thought, if things go wrong my client now has a written record that they are trying to be proactive thinkers for their child and the other parent's failure to do likewise is what contributed to the mess.

Home Application - This works outside the legal custody context also. If your wife is fat, telling her, "You need to

lose some weight" can be powerful if you have the frame and value to pull it off, but it's still probably going to make her upset. The "It's about me (but really you)" strategy is simply to take ownership of something you want another person within your influence to do also. In this example, you could tell your wife, "I've decided I'm not satisfied with my body. I'm overweight and it's time to start dieting and exercising more." Often-times such clear statements about your own intentions causes the other person to self-reflect and contemplate that they should make a similar decision for themselves.

This conversational approach shouldn't be used to undermine the importance of "do, don't tell." There is still great value in not blabbing your mouth about your plans if your primary concern is your own life improvement. But sometimes the "lead by example" path doesn't quite get through. Remember the discipleship strategy Jesus used: (1) tell them what, (2) show them how, (3) let them try, (4) send them out/keep them going, and (5) pass it on. If your goal isn't just for your own improvement, but also to lead someone else, then it can be beneficial to tell before you show, giving them a context to see how to do what they're aspiring to and to stay motivated by seeing your progress.

There's also a split between situations where you're leading by example and leading by setting boundaries/expectations. I can tell my wife, "cook this for dinner" or "wear this tonight" without showing her how first. I'm not going to put on a skirt just to "show her how" when she already knows. So, if I'm setting a boundary or expectation for her, telling her without showing is sufficient and the "it's about me (but really you)" strategy is unnecessary. When this comes most into play is when you're dealing with more sensitive issues of a spouse's shortcomings and you want her to learn from your example how to overcome them.

Lastly, it's worth noting that you can use this strategy by replacing "me" with someone else your wife might have reason to keep up with. Here are some examples of how this conversational technique can work:

- **Example 1:** "I've noticed our bathroom sink getting cluttered. I think I'm going to clean it up and make an effort to keep it clean soon. Is there anything on there that you don't want me messing with?" Chances are, 80% of the mess is hers. You're not accusing her; you're just taking responsibility. But she will likely adopt that responsibility as her own also.
- **Example 2:** I want my wife memorizing Scripture more often. I start training my kids in Scripture memory. I tell my wife, "I've decided that Scripture memory is important and our kids need to be doing it. So, I've been having the kids memorize <this or that> verse. They're doing great! I love the idea that our family will become one that knows the Bible inside and out." She sees that the kids are starting to excel at something that she should be better than them at, so she starts memorizing Scripture with them to keep up.

DOC Examination - Conflict and Leadership Strategy

Legal Context - The goal of any good cross examination is to lead a person to your own pre-drawn conclusion by asking questions. The most famous technique is the "Pozner Cross," which involves only yes/no questions. You essentially back the witness into a corner where they ultimately have to agree to see things your way. Through a series of "yes or no" responses the person ultimately admits what you want. It's ideal if you begin the line of inquiry in a way that the other person doesn't know what you're trying to get them to admit to.

- **Pozner Example:** I may ask Bob about his favorite holiday. "Even if it's not your favorite, Bob, July 4 is always a great time, isn't it?" "Don't you just love to sit on your lawn sipping a few beers while the lights dance in the sky?" "And it's even better when you get to be with your kids, enjoying a family holiday, don't you think?" "Wasn't it great that you got to do that last week?" "And you even had your kids with you too, to make it even better, right?" "And you were drinking those beers while your kids were with you, right?" "And you knew the order prohibited drinking during your parenting time, right?" Trapped.

Home Application - To be clear, making your spouse feel "tricked" into an admission rarely goes over well, so avoid

the yes/no questions. Instead, I've started doing in specific cases what I call a "direct-on-cross" (DOC) strategy. During direct examinations you can only ask open-ended questions. Yes/no questions are prohibited (with limited flexibility). Why would you limit yourself like that on cross examination? Because it better shields your motives and removes the air of trickery, as they get to answer any way they like. But by maintaining control of the conversation and ensuring that it follows the direction I want it to, the person usually ends up saying what I want them to say anyway. Even better: in low-conflict scenarios, I can even persuade someone through this strategy to think that my idea is actually their idea.

- **DOC Example 1:** My son says something nasty to his sister. Instead of scolding him I ask, "Ten years from now, what kind of relationship do you want with your sisters?" He answers with something generally positive. "That's a great goal. If you want that goal to become a reality, how do you think that will happen?" He answers that they both have to work on being "excellent" to each other (a Bill & Ted reference I tease them about every now and then). "What are things you can do to help her be 'excellent' toward you?" He gives an idea or two and I latch on. "What are ways that will get in the way of your goal of having a good relationship with her?" He starts to connect the dots and realizes that talking mean doesn't help.
- **DOC Example 2:** Suppose I want to teach someone about the importance of prayer. I would open with the IAM(BRY) strategy: "I've been thinking about things I can do to improve my relationship with God." Response: *That's a good idea.* "Do you have any ideas on how I can do that?" He goes through a list. Prayer is on the list. "That's a good one. What would be good ways to approach prayer?" I let him brainstorm a few ideas. If he's struggling I give a few mediocre ideas while waiting for him to come up with the ones I really want him doing. "I like that. Do you want to do that with me?"

Buffering - Conflict and Persuasion Strategy

Legal Context - This is one of the most useful strategies I use in my legal profession. Parties in custody disputes can't wait for their chance to talk about how awful the other side is. When they get before a psychologist, judge, magistrate, guardian ad litem, or whoever, they just blab their mouth about "he's so evil because he did this" or "she's so crazy because she did that." Result? "You're both crazy and just acting out of spite and emotion. I can't trust either one of you." That's not how you win cases. And I like to win.

In order to combat this dynamic, I teach my clients the art of "buffering," which is a strategy I've developed for building credibility without compromising the very real and serious points you otherwise like to make. It's very simple: for every accusation you want to make, "buffer" it with a complementary statement of understanding and giving the benefit of the doubt. That's it. $Credibility = [Buffer] + [Harsh Truth]$. The two are reversible or can be multiplied in any number and order you see fit. It's a way of saying, "You can trust me. My motives aren't bad like you might assume, but I do want you to know the seriousness of this issue."

Especially when you're in a conflict scenario, other people are constantly trying to evaluate whether or not they can trust what you're saying. If you come off as your perspective being clouded by your own ego investment in the situation, you lose credibility and hinder your ability to achieve your goals in the situation. By demonstrating that you really are level-headed about the situation and thinking rationally and even with positive affect toward the other person in the conflict, you don't merely "not hurt" your credibility; you bolster it.

Home Application - This strategy works well in the home when you're giving instruction to someone else, such as your spouse or your child, on something you know they will be resistant to, but you want them to do it anyway. By creating an identification with their frustration, they are more likely to accept the reality of the undesirable task as a mandate from you because you're not asking them to do anything you haven't already done yourself. Or you can use this strategy to resolve conflict with your spouse because at the end of the day, your wife is probably more interested in being understood than she is in actually getting her way (at least if she trusts you this is more often the

case).

- **Example 1:** "[Buffer] In an ideal world, I'd love nothing more than to have shared parenting with equal time with my ex, [Harsh Truth] but that's just not feasible in this situation, and here's why."
- **Example 2:** "[Buffer] I fully believe that my spouse has good intentions and is just trying to do what s/he thinks is best, [Harsh Truth] but the reality is that she has made things worse."
- **Example 3:** "[Harsh Truth] Dalia is insane. [Buffer] I don't say that lightly. I love her and care about her. I wish we could figure this out peaceably between us. She's a beautiful, intelligent woman. [Harsh Truth] But the more I have spoken with competent professionals and researched what I've seen in her, the more I see lots of overlap with serious mental health concerns. [Buffer] I think if she could get the help that she needs, we might actually be able to communicate with each other in a way that would be fantastic for our kids. [Harsh Truth] But we're just not there right now, [Submissive Posturing] and I don't know how to get there. Could you help me figure that out?"
- **Example 4:** [Harsh Truth] Son, you're going to have to clean your room. [Buffer] I know you don't like doing it. It sucks. I hated cleaning my room when I was a kid too, so I understand your frustration with it. [Harsh Truth] But your room is trashed and it is your responsibility to get it back in order."
- **Example 5:** [Harsh Truth] Babe, this is what we're going to do going forward. [Buffer] I understand that you think this and that. I appreciate your thoughts and how well you have communicated them. But as much as I can see where you're coming from, [Harsh Truth] this is the decision I'm making right now and I would like you to be on board with me."

Submissive Posturing - Persuasion/Likeability Strategy

Legal Context - Another big mistake a lot of people make (especially in the legal arena) is failing to recognize power dynamics. For example, when meeting with a guardian, lots of people want to tell the guardian how to do their job, what they should believe, why their choices with the kids were the best ones, etc. This *can* work if you legitimately have the better position. But I've found that EXACTLY 50% of parties in custody cases overestimate the actual strength of their position relative to the other side, so it's a risky gamble. The better strategy is to set your own agenda aside, take some humble pie, and submit yourself to the "experts."

Home Application - To do this, you simply ask for help, advice, or suggestions from the person who has a power dynamic over you or with whom you want to build a better relational affinity. The goal is to demonstrate that you can be trusted because you're more interested in finding the best solution than in pushing your own proposed solution (or at least this is what you give the appearance of doing). If your solution really is the best one, it's not often hard for the person in the higher power dynamic to realize this, so you can blend in some DOC Examination strategy as a way to get them to your actual preferred solution. The real thrust here is that you're getting someone else to empathize with you and your way of doing things by letting them believe you are allowing them to be in control.

The reality is that you are in control. But you are expressing your control in a way that utilizes an appearance of submissiveness coupled with guided disclosures or questions that ultimately lets them feel like they have been instrumental in your decision-making process to the degree that they believe you are taking their advice rather than persuading them that your decision was the correct one. The end result is that people see you as an appropriately humble person who validates their need to be needed, giving them a positive affinity toward you in future interactions and makes them more inclined to side with you when you need them to ... all without actually having to change what you ever intended in the first place. Law of Power 38 comes to mind: "Think as you like, but behave like others."

Another benefit is that this gives you a win-win-win-win scenario in the aftermath no matter what the outcome.

Win 1: If things go well, they go well and you've improved your relationship with the other person by making them feel validated for having been able to participate in the process. **Win 2:** If things go poorly, you have the option to double-down on the humility aspect by accepting responsibility, even though the other person believes that they were the one who gave the advice that led to the failure. **Win 3:** If the situation truly calls for it, you also have the option available to defer responsibility because you were "just following so and so's advice, and after all, he's the one in charge." **Win 4:** By getting someone else's input before acting on your plan, you may actually discover a better plan than what you were thinking.

In all of this, don't apply this strategy on the mundane where it would seem trite or even pedantic to bring it up.

While I call it a "submissive" strategy, it is really about leveraging (hopefully authentic) humility to advance your own goals and build up others around you in the process. As such, it can be applied in situations where it may be beneficial to express humility, even if the person is not in a higher power dynamic over you, such as with your spouse at times. Women love to feel needed. Even if you have a plan, allowing her to feel involved in the process validates her desire to be helpful to you in what you do. Let her be that help, even if you don't actually need that from her. This is part of where she gets her feels.

- **Example 1:** I want to do something unique a certain way in my job. Instead of doing it myself, I go to my boss and ask, "Do you have any suggestions for how I can handle this somewhat unique situation?"
- **Example 2:** I have a tricky situation coming up with my job so I ask my wife, "What would you do if you were in my situation?" Whatever answer she gives, I say, "Those are some good thoughts." If she says the thing I was thinking, I answer: "That's a good idea. I think I'll go with that. I appreciate the help, babe." She doesn't need to know if I'd already come up with that idea on my own or not.

Key Issue Focusing

Legal Context - Virtually everyone in custody cases blurs the line between their own goals/desires and what's best for the children. They always assume that what they want is best for the children, but neglect to connect the two concepts. So, I always prepare my clients for meeting with a GAL or psychologist or before going into a deposition or trial: "Make sure to connect EVERYTHING to the well-being of the children in some way." If they can't stay laser-focused on that singular issue, then much of what they say will be deemed "not credible" and they can lose. Of course, many judges forget this line too, which isn't helpful. But as soon as one party repeatedly hammers that line and the other party isn't ready for it, you'd better believe the judge will suddenly remember the actual focal point, and guess which parent he's more likely to side with on that focal point? The one who repeatedly demonstrated the connection between their plan and the relevant goal.

Home Application - I remember days of arguing with my wife where we jumped from one issue to the next and at the end it was all just a confusing mess and the actual core issues beneath the argument became a thing of the past by the end. That doesn't mean the new things that came up weren't significant issues too; they're just independent issues that distracted from resolving the first ones first.

Keeping this in mind, "Key Issue Focusing" is a framework for applying things like "broken record" or "negative inquiry" or other WISNIFG strategies in a way that avoids the argument and minimizes your risk of DEERING significantly. The reason that arguments get out of hand and become unproductive is because people over-explain themselves in manners that remind the other person of *even more* things they want to complain about, or at least *more things* that they want to say in defense of their position or feelings.

To do "key issue focusing" effectively, you use a string of negative inquiry to figure out what the actual core of the issue is, then as the conversation evolves you keep asking questions to bring it back to that.

- **Example 1:** Your wife is bouncing between comfort and fitness tests like a game of pong. You ask questions to figure out what's really going on and find out an insecurity issue is at the core of her discontent. She starts talking about how annoyed she feels when you clip your toenails in the living room. "[Fogging] I can see how that would upset you, but [KIF] we've been talking about the insecurity you've been experiencing and I'd like to focus on that. How does that affect your feelings of insecurity?" She goes on about how annoying it is. "[Fogging] I get that and agree you find it gross, which we can talk about later. [KIF/Broken Record] But let's stay on the insecurity topic for now. [Self-disclosure/passing comfort test] You know you're my woman and I care about you. [KIF] That's what's most important here."
- **Example 2:** You're talking to a GAL and tell a story about how the mother is with a new boyfriend who you don't like. **WRONG:** "He's a dangerous person and shouldn't be around my kids. He has a criminal record for drug possession and assault. She shouldn't be taking people like that around my children." This is a lot of "he, he, he" and "she." The kids are mentioned, but not the actual FOCUS of the statement. **RIGHT:** "My children are experiencing a lot of anxiety through this legal process. Bringing new people into the home who aren't even established in the relationship could put the kids in a situation of building a bond with someone just to have it ripped away from them if it doesn't work out. This guy has a criminal history and if he gets picked up again, he'll probably go to prison, and that would be unnerving to have these relationships come and go without safeguards. That situation would also hurt their relationship with their mom too, if they started seeing her poor choice in men. What's more concerning, though, is that kids with anxiety problems are more prone to self-medicate through the use of drugs, and if this new guy in their home has a history of it, and may even still be doing it, there's a chance that he's going to endorse that type of behavior around them, or at least not discipline them against it, which could really harm them in the long term. The fact that he has an assault on his record also shows that he's easily angered to a point where he'll cross even legal boundaries - and if he did that in a public forum with others watching, how much more will he be willing to lose his anger in a private setting around my kids in a way that will increase their already existing anxiety issues? All around, it's not a good situation for them. [Submissive Posturing] So, I'd really like some feedback on the best way to approach protecting my kids in this situation. Do you have any suggestions?"

The E-Mail Formula

Legal Context - While this is generally a blend of other strategies, it's worth noting that when I find a client constantly communicating in ways that are damaging to their case, I always coach them on how they can communicate better in writing. After all, written communication will generally be used as exhibits against you if the other side can find a way to do so. So, I created a general formula for high conflict situations to create a productive and self-preserving written record in case the communication is ever shown to anyone else.

Home Application - The same communication strategy can work when you're dealing with conflict in the workplace, with your spouse, neighbors, etc. The only thing that may be different is that in some contexts you're less likely to have someone ever take a look at what you're writing - especially if it's a verbal conversation where you're applying this pattern. That said, do be mindful that even audio can be recorded, and you never know when a co-worker will want to get you fired, a spouse may want to leave you (even dredging up texts from a year or two prior), another person in the church will want to stir up trouble with you to the pastor, etc. So, tact in communication is generally warranted in most situations. With that said, here's the formula (no, I didn't bother to come up with some cool acronym; make up your own if you prefer):

- **Empathy:** Validate their feelings without validating their position on the issue and, if possible, share in them openly. "I'm sorry that you're frustrated by this situation. I am too."
- **Grace:** Communicate a way of giving them the benefit of the doubt (i.e. pre-buffering). "I believe you mean well and hope you know that I truly do understand your position."

- **Repeat:** Repeat what they're saying in your own words to confirm your understanding. This is not always necessary, but can be useful in some contexts. "From what I can tell, you're concerned about x, y, and z because of a, b, and c."
- **Assert:** Share your viewpoint in contrast in a clear, concise, and definitive way applying buffering (if you haven't already above). "[Buffering] While I can understand why you'd think that way, [Harsh Truth] I simply cannot agree. I believe h, i, and j is better because r, s, and t."
- **Offer:** Give them an olive branch - a way to look like the good guy or else pigeon-hole themselves into being the bad one. "[Buffering] I know you don't agree with me, [Harsh Truth] but a decision has to be made [Offer] and I'd like for us to work together on this. Are you willing to join me in doing things this way?"

I loved the 2022 Toyota Prius

29 September 2021 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

I had the opportunity to visit Oregon/Washington recently. Beautiful states. I totally loved driving around and seeing all of the landscape God masterfully created - especially the volcanic Mt. St. Helens. But even more than the landscape, I enjoyed the car that drove me through it. This 2022 Prius was incredible.

Steering Assist

The best feature was the "steering assist." Now, I could just be too old-school because I've never owned a car newer than 2012. I'm generally overly-frugal for long-term financial planning purposes. So this was a brand new feature to me. I didn't even know normal cars had stuff like this, short of Tesla's or Google's fully self-driving cars that nobody actually owns *en masse*.

This steering assist was more like it was driving than me. I could literally let go of the wheel for 15 solid minutes on the freeway without any difficulty, and boy was that a beautiful and impressive thing! I respected the car's power, technology, and capabilities to do that.

The road has clear boundary lines that the car knew to stay between. I liked knowing that the pressure wasn't all on me to get to the destination safely. Yeah, I'm not going to be stupid and ignore the road ahead altogether. The car wasn't designed for me to be totally ignorant as it trudged forward at highway speeds. It wouldn't be good for the car to be alone, without a driver. It wasn't designed for that (at least not this one). But it did have a clear purpose: to get from point A to B, and it was designed skillfully and wonderfully to do just that.

Now, as the car had that goal, I had the ability to take over the wheel when I wanted. Even with the steering assist on, it didn't force me to follow its whims. I had autonomy, even though I respected the operative drive and safety controls of this vehicle. But the ideal times to exercise this autonomy against the resistance the vehicle gave me were the rare exceptions, not the rule.

That said, this was a power I sometimes abused anyway. Why? Because it was fun! I became like a child playing with a toy when testing the steering assist feature (and if the car were sentient, it would have been well within its rights to treat me like one at times!). I enjoyed grabbing the wheel and encroaching on one of those boundary lines the car knew not to cross. It was fun to see how the steering assist would react and to hear it start to beep in my ear to get back on the road. It gave me a sense of comfort to know that the car would protect me and keep me safe on the road when it saw I presenting a danger to it and myself.

It would turn the wheel against me, fighting the direction I was steering because it knew that's what needed to be done. I did this repeatedly while driving - not because I actually wanted to violate any boundaries, but because I enjoyed the dynamic of seeing the car maintain them in the face of my obstinacy. It made me smile, but also feel an extra sense of safety that the manufacturer no-doubt knew I would experience while enjoying the features in its design.

Radar Cruise Control

It also had an incredible radar cruise control. I could set the speed at whatever maximum I wanted and it would self-adjust the speed to maintain a safe distance from the car in front of me. It knew how to follow what was ahead and let those behind keep an appropriate pace with it as well. In fact, I once even set the cruise at 75mph on the highway, got off at an exit and took the car to a complete stop at the end of the exit ramp all without ever touching the breaks because my rental 2022 Prius knew the appropriate timing to slow down and speed up while on the road to our destination, keeping in appropriate pace with the lead car ahead.

Side Sensors

It wasn't just front/back sensors that helped, but it also knew when cars were keeping pace beside me. If they tried to steer into my lane, an alarm would go off so I'd have extra attention to handle the problem appropriately. It was

looking out for me in ways that I'd never expected even beyond the lead/following car by looking side-to-side too.

Windshield Wiper Automation

It also had this fascinating feature: I never needed to control my windshield wipers. It rained a lot in Oregon/Washington, and at unpredictable times. But I never had to turn the wipers on/off myself. The car knew when I needed to have clearer vision on my windshield and not. It could sense when my vision was blurred by the weather and would automatically adjust my visibility so that I could see where we were going. It would entirely turn off if it sensed the windshield was dry, knowing not to waste its time on trying to fix something that wasn't a problem. Or if it went from a slow mist to a heavy rain, it'd switch all on its own to full blast so that I could keep my visibility as best as the weather conditions allowed. Granted, even if my vision was severely hindered by the pelting rain on the windshield, I still knew the other safety features on the car were there to keep me protected.

Conclusion

Of course, the car had a host of other features too. But those were the ones that stood out to me. Although no metaphor is perfect, while I may have understood it on an outside-observational level before, my eyes were uniquely opened to how fun it can be to test the boundaries of something designed to keep me safe and protected on a singular mission, despite my wife's occasional comment about how "The car's getting mad at you!" The reality is the car had an unshakable frame. Its periodic beeping when I'd toy around with its features wasn't an emotional burst of anger from a machine. It was an appropriate warning designed to keep me from interfering with its purpose or making sure I wasn't screwing up my own agenda.

Then I remembered how I, as Christ's follower, used to marvel in the ways I used to let him do these very things for me - keeping me safe and protected, moving at an appropriate speed, in right relation with others around me, and giving me the appropriate vision to see what lies ahead. It's easy to forget to be dependent, which Galatians 3:3 warns against. Yet just as I expect this dependence and trust from my wife, I can't hypocritically refuse to give the same to Christ. Thank you, rental 2022 Prius. I will miss you, but your lessons will remain.

What is the role of "the red pill" in Scripture? We have a whole sidebar series devoted to showing how it's in there. But what do we do with it? Where does it fit in with God's master plan? I've addressed this a lot on the discord, but it occurs to me I haven't put it here yet, so let's do that now.

DISCIPLES OF WHO?

I've seen many men in this forum get hooked on the concept of discipleship. Excellent! I've said before that the entirety of the Christian life can be summed up in the three greats: (G) Love **G**od, (O) Love **O**thers, and (D) Make **D**isciples. These are the greatest command, second greatest command, and great commission. Jesus says, "The one who has my commands and obeys them is the one who loves me," so you can't say you *truly* love God if you're not fulfilling his command to make disciples. "Jesus, I love you enough to follow most of your commands, but not that one. I won't make disciples. But if I follow your other commands, is that enough love for you?" Good luck with that line.

Okay, so you're making disciples ... but disciples of who? I've known too many men who want to make disciples of masculinity instead of Christ. I'm going to pick on our mod [/u/TheChristianAlpha](#) because he's an easy target and has the frame to handle it. I remember asking him his mission at one point and he said, "To raise up more masculine men in the Church." Cool. That's useful. But it also means that the focus of his mission at that time was to generate masculinity, not Christ-followers. There's a difference. For the record, that was years ago and TCA has moved past that.

1 John 2:6 says, "Whoever says he abides in him [Jesus] ought to walk in the same way in which he walked." We are to be training people to be disciples of Christ, not disciples of "masculinity," whatever that means.

IT'S NOT A TWO-WAY STREET

The reality is that every man who follows Jesus and strives to be like him will be masculine. Jesus is the model man. The more you become like Christ, the more you will attain the epitome of masculinity. It won't be the world's definition of masculinity, nor will it be the mainstream church's. But it will be Christ's expression of it, and you can't go wrong with that. Just make sure you know who Christ actually was and what he actually did and do likewise, rather than trusting in assumptions and ingrained notions you may have been raised with on the subject. Again, we have a whole sidebar for that.

But the reverse is not true. Not everyone who pursues masculinity will be more like Christ. There are several expressions of masculinity - including those taught in secular red pill channels - which are quite unChrist-like.

This is hard for many red pill guys to wrap their heads around because the red pill has so drastically changed their lives that some people are more evangelistic about the red pill for saving them from blue pill agony than they are about Christ for saving them from sin and eternal hellfire. See the imbalance there? **If the red pill has changed your life more than Jesus has changed your life, there's a problem.** Which one are you looking to as your actual savior?

In the end, the goal should be to make people more like Jesus, which will inherently mean making them more masculine and "red pillled." But making people more red-pillled/philosophically-masculine will not necessarily make them more like Jesus.

TIMING IS KEY

The Timeline

So, why bother with the red pill at all, if Jesus is the short-term, mid-term, and long-term goal anyway?

Ecclesiastes 3 tells us, "For everything there is a season, and a time for every matter under heaven: a time to be born, and a time to die; a time to plant, and a time to pluck up what is planted; a time to kill, and a time to heal ..." a time to talk about relationships and sexual strategy, and a time to set those things aside.

In my [309 post on "the discipleship process"](#) I wrote about distinct process that help us grow. A non-Christian is "Evangelised" into becoming a Convert. A Convert is "Established" into becoming a Disciple. A Disciple is "Equipped" to become a DiscipleR. And a DiscipleR builds an "Entrusting relationship with his disciples to become a Leader over discipleR-making ministries.

- Evangelism is about building relationships with non-believers and leveraging those relationships to spread the Gospel.
- Establishing is getting a new believer grounded in the faith to the point where they are capable spiritual survival even without your leadership.
- Equipping is the process of casting a vision on one who is already following Christ so that instead of merely surviving in their faith, they are thriving and producing. The equipped man has a purpose in his following that is actually beneficial to the Kingdom and not only his own life.
- Entrusting is the process of coordinating discipleR-makers of all sorts into a common, unified effort for the sake of growth and efficiency rather than discipleship chaos.

This process is your timeline, and it could take any amount of time to help any one person move from each phase to the next. Evangelism could take weeks or years. Establishing should ideally take about 6 months, but could take as little as 3 or as long as years. I try to shoot for Jesus' timeline: roughly 3 years for the entire process with any one person.

Red Pill Timing

The **Evangelism** phase is not the place for the red pill (with one caveat): **UNLESS** the person is a non-Christian and the fact of his dying marriage is the relational "in" you have with him to build toward sharing the Gospel. In that situation, use the red pill to help him unscrew himself while pointing out that you learned all of this stuff from Jesus and that becoming like Jesus can not only help fix him in the midst of relationships woes, but every other area of life too - especially eternity. See how that works? But for the most part, evangelism is **NOT** the proper timing to be pushing red pill concepts.

The **Establishing** phase is also not the place for the red pill (with one caveat): **UNLESS** the guy is on the brink of divorce and his marriage woes so bad that they are preventing him from otherwise being established and you have no choice but to work through those issues before getting him grounded. Otherwise, the main goal of the establishing phase is just to get him following Jesus. This is the 300 series' "7 Basics" - Assurance of Salvation, Quiet Times, Bible Study, Scripture Memory, Prayer, Evangelism, and Fellowship. Those are all that matters. Keep the red pill sidelined in virtually every situation in the establishing phase (i.e. at least the first 6 months you're working with someone, unless they're already extremely well-established).

The **Equipping** phase **IS** the proper place for the red pill. To quote that section of my 309 post:

In order to aid him in this process, he must be equipped with several tools to help him. Those tools might be additional disciplines beyond the basics. It might be theological understanding. It might be a strong familiarity with the Word. It could be practical life skills, like charisma, passion, humility, etc. It could be practical things in one's life that help him connect with others, like his good looks, having a respectable family, house, and car, etc. All of these tools can usually be summarized in three categories: things that foster (1) relationship-building, (2) ministry skills and understanding, and (3) character development.

The "practical things in one's life that help him connect with others" and "relationship-building" concepts are where the red pill are finally of value in the discipleship process. Here you're not trying desperately to save a sinking ship. You're properly giving a man tools that you know he'll need in proper timing. This is the core of wisdom in the timing of the red pill in the discipleship process. **If you are introducing the red pill in your discipleship process sooner than this, then you are probably trying to red-knight a man more than you are trying to disciple him. Discipleship is about making a Christ-follower, not a red-pill-follower.**

The Entrusting phase is too late to bring up red pill concepts. In order for him to be an effective discipler he needs to know how to be an effective man. If you're training him to lead discipleship ministries and he doesn't even know how to interact with his wife or a single woman properly, you're jumping the gun.

WHY DOES THIS MATTER?

If you introduce red pill praxeology and marriage/relationship theology out of turn, you are going to create an inappropriately timed over-excitement about those concepts because they're easy to get worked up over. The person will be less interested in Jesus than they are in their newfound sexual capabilities, which will make it difficult to guide the ship where it needs to go later.

It also says a lot about your own character and the degree to which you're committed to Christ v. the red pill. What you evangelize most is likely who/what you worship most.

By introducing red pill prior to the equipping phase, you are more likely to get someone to go Rambo because he doesn't have the filter of biblical discipline tempering his understanding and expression of the red pill.

The list could go on. If you want to discuss further, do it in the comments. In the meantime, I'll simply note that there's merit to the view that we can use the red pill to build rapport with those who are hurting and struggling in their marriages, helping them with their marriage/sexuality woes as a waypoint toward becoming better men who are more like Christ. I actually love this approach to things. But we can never forget the end-goal in the process and stop at this waypoint or let the waypoint dominate our discipleship process.

THE END GOAL

In all of this, the "end goal" is to *"make disciples of all nations, baptizing in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and teaching them to obey everything [Jesus] commanded [us]."*

- Our end-goal is NOT to red knight people.
- Our end-goal is NOT to bring on a resurgence of masculinity.
- Our end-goal is NOT to enact political change in favor of men.

These may be great mini "on the way" goals that are sidelined. But the "big job" in the Bible is to make disciples. Who is your man? Who is it that you're raising up to be like Christ? Are you really raising him up to be like Christ in ALL ways that Jesus lived, or are you just hitting the "masculine" points of Jesus' life and ignoring the rest?

The "end goal" here includes not only the red pill, which is one small component of the broader Christian life for a man, but also the spiritual basics (per the 300 series) and a broader missional lifestyle. Always remember the mantra: "Whoever says he abides in him ought to walk in the say way in which he walked." That's the end-goal: to walk as Jesus walked. Yes, Jesus was masculine. But he also prayed, also studied and taught the Scriptures, also built relationships with believers and non-believers alike, and so much more.

Just as the mainstream "church" has cut off significant aspects of Jesus' character, let's not do the same on the other

end of the spectrum.

Fix Your Low-Hanging Fruit

31 January 2022 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

I've been reviewing some of the OYS on the discord and responding a bit more, now that I've had an interlude of time open up. Here are some lessons everyone should learn.

1. OVERWEIGHT

I get it. I like to eat as much as the next guy. I've struggled with weight all my life too. I just hit my post-RP high on weight this past December. January came around and I decided to do something about it. I started a #diet-reporting channel on the discord and post ever calorie that goes into my mouth, as well as every calorie of exercise I burn. Result? Over 15lbs down in 3 weeks, and counting. It's not that hard guys. Too many men want to pussyfoot around with complaints about their life while trying to hide their physical fitness problems by simply citing "5'10, 120kg," not saying anything else about their size, and hoping nobody else notices or does the conversion (it's over 260lbs, by the way).

Here's the advice I just gave two guys who had an obesity problem and both reported playing video games. I told them they must repeat this phrase back to me: **"I promise I will not play another video game until I have bought a stationary bike. I will not play video games anymore unless I am also riding that bike and maintaining a minimum 10mph pace."**

Know how I lost over 15lbs in 3 weeks? I'd literally have to 100% stop eating to maintain that same pace. My solution: I still cut my calories, but I just sit on the stationary bike for hours a day. Sometimes I'm working. Other times I'm playing video games with my son. When I'm chilling with my wife after the kids go to bed, either talking about life or watching Netflix, I'm on that bike. I refuse to allow myself certain life pleasures, like video games, unless I'm burning calories while I do it. No exceptions. I ate over 3,000 calories a few days ago but still hit my 5lbs/wk goal. Know why? I biked 51 miles and burned more than what I ate.

Two caveats:

- No, the bike (or if you prefer: treadmill) is not a substitute for your diet. You cannot maintain 2-4hrs on a stationary bike 5-7 days a week for the rest of your life. At some point you're going to reduce the cardio again. At that point you have two options: (1) make sure to keep your diet in check while you cardio-focus, or (2) eat normal, but be prepared to have this cardio-phase of life happening constantly throughout your life, even after you've hit your ideal weight; every time you creep 5-10lbs over your ideal, that's another 1-2 weeks of a sub-zero diet.
- No, you don't stop lifting. Realistically, I can only maintain this sub-zero diet for a month at a time before I have to take a week off to re-bulk. Can't lose my 275lb bench press max. So, you do the above for a month (i.e. 20+lbs lost), then take a week off to re-bulk and heavy lift (which you should also be lifting during your cardio-focus too, just not as much time-investment) in order to get your lifts back to where they were pre-cardio (you'll re-gain 5-7lbs), then hit another month sub-zero dieting. Trust me, after the first week, you don't even notice that you're dieting anymore.
 - The caveat to this second caveat is that if you're over 25% body fat, you just cardio until you're down to 25% before you try to do a "re-bulk lifting" session. You didn't have muscular bulk in the first place, so there's no "re" to do. Still work light lifting (2days/wk) into your routine, but hammer that cardio. Once you're 25% body fat, you can start hitting lifting much harder to make use of your size for quick easy lifting gains. Starting to lift when you're a twig is a lot harder than when you've got extra fat on you. Take advantage of that - and 25% is not ideal, but acceptable enough that you can scrape by in society without being a total embarrassment.

2. TIME-SINKS

So many guys in OYS are wasting their time. It's usually video games, porn, and social media. I noticed over a decade ago that my weight was directly correlated with how frequently I watched porn. Cut it out of my life entirely and I permanently lost roughly 50lbs that even in my peak-weight since then, I've never gained any of that back.

I already told you what to do about video games, so look above on that.

For social media, the same as above applies. Just promise to yourself: "I will not scroll Facebook/Instagram/Twitter/crazy blogs/etc. unless I'm burning calories while I do it." Even while I'm at work talking to clients - something that's actually a high-value, productive activity - I hop into my office conference room and pace laps. Other people recommend an under-the-desk treadmill and just go at it all work day with a standing desk. With all the time you're wasting on social media or other things, think of how much better your life would be if you either (1) burned calories while you did it, double-valuing your time, or (2) had extra non-cardio time to do more productive things in life because you've committed that you won't use social media while not burning calories.

3. PRIORITIES SUCK

One guy in his OYS talked about wanting to improve his fashion, but he was still overweight. Horrible idea. Let's break this down:

- If you buy a bunch of new clothes now, then lose a ton of weight and bulk up your chest size, you'll have wasted that money.
- By having the heavier-set clothes still in your wardrobe, you'll have more psychological lax to let yourself gain weight because you know you still have clothes to wear.
- If you wait to up your wardrobe until you have the body you want, you'll have extra motive to keep your body in that shape.
- Holding off also gives you an opportunity to save up in your budget to afford decent threads.

This type of mis-prioritization happens in other areas too, this is just an easy example. Think before you pick what you're going to start working on. Get feedback from other guys. Don't think a new slick pair of shoes is going to impress women enough to ignore your pot belly.

4. NO OTHER SINGLES

Do you know how many OYS I've read where someone complains, "Everyone I know is already paired up. The only singles I'm around are people I'm uninterested in." Seriously, if you don't have women crawling over you, it's because you suck in some way. It could be your physique, but even hot guys have trouble sometimes. Maybe his social game sucks. Maybe he has awful habits/quirks that he won't give up. Maybe he wastes his time on video games rather than socializing, even though he's good in social settings when he's there. Figure it out.

When someone complains that there are no singles in his area, here's my thought process:

- First, why do I care? Useless information. My guess is that most of these guys think it's useful because they want others to accept it as some sort of explanation or excuse to justify their frustrations with being single. That's literally half of the letters in DEER(ing). Stop doing that.
-

- Second, even if you're telling the truth and there are no singles in your social circle, your social circle sucks. Go make other friends.
- Third, most people who say this aren't being technically accurate. Literally every contact you have is married or engaged? Redefine "single" in your mind: **If she doesn't have a ring, she's single.** Options open up with this mentality. The mental box Christian guys put themselves in is pure lunacy. Trying to "honor her boyfriend's **right (!?) to her**" is something even feminists would find cringy. It's a sign of a weak frame. Guys who think this way presume that because of temporal happenstance (i.e. he got there first), somehow she shouldn't have the option of being with a better guy (i.e. you, if you keep improving; it's really NOT hard to become one of the top 10% of men). If this is making your moral insides tingle in discomfort, just stop and think about it for a second:
 - How's it fair to you to close that door on yourself because of factors out of everyone's control?
 - How's it fair to her to deny her the opportunity of being with a better guy because "he called dibs on her first"?
 - How's it fair to the other guy if he's with a girl who *COULD* do better (i.e. you, when you improve past her boyfriend and you're still interested), and you know hypergamy is going to kick in at some point and she's either going to (1) leave him, or (2) they're going to have a crap relationship?

Of course, if you do improve enough that you could pull a girl from her boyfriend, you may find you can pull better than her anyway, so you may not be as interested at that point regardless. But the mentality is useful all the same. Either way, it's a win-win-win to view relationships this way. My dad taught me that very young and I ignored him, but I see the wisdom in it now: *If you don't see a ring, she's on the market.*

Seriously, think about that: she hasn't made a commitment to her boyfriend, nor he to her. They haven't promised to be with each other for life. They haven't promised, "I will not break up with you if someone better comes along." If they did have that promise, they'd literally be engaged at that point. Rings would be exchanged. If there is no ring, that commitment isn't there. If you're better and you come along, without the ring she has the right to upgrade.

5. LOOKING TOO EARLY

I have to distinguish here:

- You should ALWAYS be approaching. For more on that, I'll defer you to the principles in [one of my older posts](#).
- HOWEVER, you shouldn't actually expect to find your wife as a result of these approaches. Don't bother "looking" until you're actually ready.

The goal of early approaching is just to have fun socializing and getting good at it. You can play around with number-closing as a goal if you want, but you don't even have to go that far. Just learning to talk to girls is valuable in itself - especially upgrading your confidence talking to attractive people. That applies to men too. Back in the day, my fear of talking to hot girls was associated with fear of sexual rejection. But I also had a fear of talking to highly attractive men, assuming they wouldn't want to hang out with "someone like me." What a useless mentality, especially for someone committed to improving (you are committed to that, right?). Learn to talk to attractive people, in general. This boosts your confidence all around.

But let's be real: if you're still 25%+ body fat, earning under \$40k/yr, with a crappy wardrobe, no social skills, etc. - do you really think you're going to pull someone you think would make your ideal wife? Think of the best woman you could pull with stats like that (and be realistic). Now imagine yourself 50lbs lighter, muscular build, better financial portfolio, having learned social skills and developed your social circle, etc. - and now think of the best

woman you could pull. You're shooting for all those things in your life, right? You're trying to improve, right? Why would you settle for the type of person you could pull now when you could make substantial gains first and then have a much, much better pool of people who would be interested in you?

Think about it this way: with your crappy stats you might be able to pull an HB6 if you compromise on some of your standards in other areas. With better stats, you might be able to pull a 9 (perhaps even a 10?) with similar compromise. *Oooooooooor* ... you could pull an HB6 or 7 without having to compromise on any of your other peripherals. Suddenly, instead of the semi-psychotic 6 who actually gave you the time of day, you've got a 6 (or even 7) who also happens to be an actual Christian (rather than the psycho girl who was LARPing in the church), takes her faith seriously, perfectly sane (for a ...), intelligent, no debt, possibly even a financial contributor, good mom-qualities, etc.

Right now you can pull the former. 6-12 months from now (longer if you dilly-dally about self-improvement) you can pull the latter.

- Yet for some reason guys keep saying with crappy stats how they're looking for a wife.

That's lunacy. Always practice game, but don't actually prioritize "looking" until you're at least as good as the girl you want to marry. Remember: women marry up, not down. Deal with it.

Caveat: Everything else I've ever written on why you shouldn't even been "looking" in the first place. Read my two sidebar posts on "how to find the girl you can't keep yourself from banging." More details there, especially the section, "How to find a wife (by not looking for one)." I stand by those posts to this day.

6. DOUBTING GOD

Lots of guys post Assurance of Salvation numbers below 10. Okay, we all have doubts every now and then. That's actually not a bad thing (longer conversation there, which I'll table for purposes of this post). But for a lot of guys, the reason is that they're on the fence about whether God is even good or has good thing sin store for them. They doubt Jeremiah 29:11 - "'For I have good plans for you,' says the Lord. 'Plans to prosper you and not to harm you.'" Yeah, that wasn't spoken to you individually, and context matters, and God created some people for humble purposes. Fine. But God still "works all things for the good of those who love him." That's a promise you can take to the bank (figuratively, not literal money; if you're into prosperity gospel garbage, go away unless you're here to learn your way out of it).

When people look at their sucky life and doubt God's goodness, I can't help but chuckle while shaking my head in disappointment.

- You screw up your physique, social life, time allocation, spiritual disciplines, etc. Your life sucks.
- But somehow God is to blame and his plans aren't good?

Get real. People like this aren't following God's plan in the first place. Our sidebar is already replete with biblical information to demonstrate that God does, in fact, want us to take care of our bodies, be good stewards of the finances he gave us, be disciplined in our pursuit of Christ and the work he gave us, managing our time appropriately, etc. Nobody actually doubts that these things are in the Bible (and much, much more that we discuss here). **How can you claim God's plan for your life isn't good if you're not actually living in God's plan for your life yet?**

Until you fix your physique, ability to love and relate with his people (i.e. social skills), become a good steward of your finances, and all those other things we try to get guys to work on, **you are not in God's will for your life**, and therefore you have no basis for saying that God isn't good or that his plan for you sucks. You are in rejection of God's plan, if you're like that, and that means **YOUR plan for your life sucks, not God's**.

7. NO MISSION

If you have no mission in life, you will never be satisfied with your life. Jesus gave you a mission. You can be satisfied with your own, but it won't get you very far in eternity. Better to adopt his so you're not only satisfied, but also building a foundation for eternity.

Guys who write OYSes ignoring mission or noting that they don't have a mission - especially if they've done several OYSes and haven't fixed this by now - are doomed to eternal failure. **Even the secular guys eventually figure out that achieving their own mission isn't enough.** I've talked to a number of TRP/MRP ECs and mods who have all adopted some form of spiritual pursuit (a lot turning to Christianity directly) because they realize there's got to be more to life than the silly things their own brains can come up with.

Mission matters. If your life sucks right now and you don't have a mission, that's why. **Mission matters, nothing else.** I'll defer to the barrage of other posts on the sidebar and in my post/comment history on this topic rather than belaboring the point here any further.

8. COVERT CONTRACTS

I've seen a number of guys complain about why other people won't treat them the way they want to be treated. In some regard, this is because you haven't earned the right to be treated that way yet. Look to the above and fix those things to deal with that.

Other times, the issue has a different cause: *You never told them how you want to be treated.* One guy recently posted an OYS complaining that his church friends didn't understand how bad he was hurting. He just assumed that it was their job to probe his mind and figure that out. That's a covert contract. If you want people to "get you" it's your responsibility to tell them who you are and what you're dealing with in life.

The problem is that most people take the "play it off" approach. They'll share their deepest fears and struggles, but they'll do so with a bold face. This is a defense mechanism, NOT the sign of a strong frame ... *IF you're upset about their response, or lack thereof.* Re-read that sentence. If you really don't care how they respond (which is part of a strong frame), then don't whine about it. If you DO care about them not reaching out and helping you the way you think they should, it's probably because you haven't communicated how deeply the issue is actually affecting you. Don't assume they'll get it. Don't have covert contracts with them. Be overt. Thinking that you're some "red pill guru" because you can talk about difficult issues with a straight face is a straight up lie you're telling yourself if you get butthurt about people's responses to you afterward.

CONCLUSION

Didn't make it to 10. Ran out of time. Suffice it to say, if you want to improve:

- First, get a mission and start pursuing it relentlessly. Consider EVERY angle that you can take in life to optimize this.
- Second, if you're not already in good shape, get there. This could be one of those extra "angles" for your mission - people will bend over backwards to help others who are fit.
- Third, stop DEERing or wasting time on stupid things, or misprioritizing your life. Re-read the first two bullets of this conclusion and let that be your focus for now.

When you've done at least that much, and your spiritual disciplines are in order (which should be part of the

pathway to achieving your mission - if they're not, then your mission sucks), then you'll start to taste what it's like being within the bounds of God's plan for your life and you'll see that it's good. It may not be what you wanted for your life. It may also not be a high and noble earth-changing plan. But it will be good. Steven was stoned to death. That was God's plan for him. That was a suck plan, God. But it was good. Know why? Because that's what scattered the early wave of new converts across the globe, when persecution began, and his death brought the Gospel to many nations. It was good. Do you think anyone would have viewed him as a martyr or that people would have scattered if it was a random ugly fat guy who did nothing for God's Kingdom and only happened to show up to a few services every now and then who was stoned? Hah. No.

40

UPVOTES

Fixing Your OYS - Your Life Will Keep Sucking Until You Read and Apply This Post

31 January 2022 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

I've been reviewing some of the OYS on the discord and responding a bit more, now that I've had an interlude of time open up. Here are some lessons everyone should learn.

1. OVERWEIGHT

I get it. I like to eat as much as the next guy. I've struggled with weight all my life too. I just hit my post-RP high on weight this past December. January came around and I decided to do something about it. I started a #diet-reporting channel on the discord and post ever calorie that goes into my mouth, as well as every calorie of exercise I burn. Result? Over 15lbs down in 3 weeks, and counting. It's not that hard guys. Too many men want to pussyfoot around with complaints about their life while trying to hide their physical fitness problems by simply citing "5'10, 120kg," not saying anything else about their size, and hoping nobody else notices or does the conversion (it's over 260lbs, by the way).

Here's the advice I just gave two guys who had an obesity problem and both reported playing video games. I told them they must repeat this phrase back to me: **"I promise I will not play another video game until I have bought a stationary bike. I will not play video games anymore unless I am also riding that bike and maintaining a minimum 10mph pace."**

Know how I lost over 15lbs in 3 weeks? I'd literally have to 100% stop eating to maintain that same pace. My solution: I still cut my calories, but I just sit on the stationary bike for hours a day. Sometimes I'm working. Other times I'm playing video games with my son. When I'm chilling with my wife after the kids go to bed, either talking about life or watching Netflix, I'm on that bike. I refuse to allow myself certain life pleasures, like video games, unless I'm burning calories while I do it. No exceptions. I ate over 3,000 calories a few days ago but still hit my 5lbs/wk goal. Know why? I biked 51 miles and burned more than what I ate.

Two caveats:

- No, the bike (or if you prefer: treadmill) is not a substitute for your diet. You cannot maintain 2-4hrs on a stationary bike 5-7 days a week for the rest of your life. At some point you're going to reduce the cardio again. At that point you have two options: (1) make sure to keep your diet in check while you cardio-focus, or (2) eat normal, but be prepared to have this cardio-phase of life happening constantly throughout your life, even after you've hit your ideal weight; every time you creep 5-10lbs over your ideal, that's another 1-2 weeks of a sub-zero diet.
- No, you don't stop lifting. Realistically, I can only maintain this sub-zero diet for a month at a time before I have to take a week off to re-bulk. Can't lose my 275lb bench press max. So, you do the above for a month (i.e. 20+lbs lost), then take a week off to re-bulk and heavy lift (which you should also be lifting during your cardio-focus too, just not as much time-investment) in order to get your lifts back to where they were pre-cardio (you'll re-gain 5-7lbs), then hit another month sub-zero dieting. Trust me, after the first week, you don't even notice that you're dieting anymore.
 - The caveat to this second caveat is that if you're over 25% body fat, you just cardio until you're down to 25% before you try to do a "re-bulk lifting" session. You didn't have muscular bulk in the first place, so there's no "re" to do. Still work light lifting (2days/wk) into your routine, but hammer that cardio. Once you're 25% body fat, you can start hitting lifting much harder to make use of your size for quick easy lifting gains. Starting to lift when you're a twig is a lot harder than when you've got extra fat on you. Take advantage of that - and 25% is not ideal, but acceptable enough that you can scrape by in society without being a total embarrassment.

2. TIME-SINKS

So many guys in OYS are wasting their time. It's usually video games, porn, and social media. I noticed over a decade ago that my weight was directly correlated with how frequently I watched porn. Cut it out of my life entirely and I permanently lost roughly 50lbs that even in my peak-weight since then, I've never gained any of that back.

I already told you what to do about video games, so look above on that.

For social media, the same as above applies. Just promise to yourself: "I will not scroll Facebook/Instagram/Twitter/crazy blogs/etc. unless I'm burning calories while I do it." Even while I'm at work talking to clients - something that's actually a high-value, productive activity - I hop into my office conference room and pace laps. Other people recommend an under-the-desk treadmill and just go at it all work day with a standing desk. With all the time you're wasting on social media or other things, think of how much better your life would be if you either (1) burned calories while you did it, double-valuing your time, or (2) had extra non-cardio time to do more productive things in life because you've committed that you won't use social media while not burning calories.

3. PRIORITIES SUCK

One guy in his OYS talked about wanting to improve his fashion, but he was still overweight. Horrible idea. Let's break this down:

- If you buy a bunch of new clothes now, then lose a ton of weight and bulk up your chest size, you'll have wasted that money.
- By having the heavier-set clothes still in your wardrobe, you'll have more psychological lax to let yourself gain weight because you know you still have clothes to wear.
- If you wait to up your wardrobe until you have the body you want, you'll have extra motive to keep your body in that shape.
- Holding off also gives you an opportunity to save up in your budget to afford decent threads.

This type of mis-prioritization happens in other areas too, this is just an easy example. Think before you pick what you're going to start working on. Get feedback from other guys. Don't think a new slick pair of shoes is going to impress women enough to ignore your pot belly.

4. NO OTHER SINGLES

Do you know how many OYS I've read where someone complains, "Everyone I know is already paired up. The only singles I'm around are people I'm uninterested in." Seriously, if you don't have women crawling over you, it's because you suck in some way. It could be your physique, but even hot guys have trouble sometimes. Maybe his social game sucks. Maybe he has awful habits/quirks that he won't give up. Maybe he wastes his time on video games rather than socializing, even though he's good in social settings when he's there. Figure it out.

When someone complains that there are no singles in his area, here's my thought process:

- First, why do I care? Useless information. My guess is that most of these guys think it's useful because they want others to accept it as some sort of explanation or excuse to justify their frustrations with being single. That's literally half of the letters in DEER(ing). Stop doing that.
-

- Second, even if you're telling the truth and there are no singles in your social circle, your social circle sucks. Go make other friends.
- Third, most people who say this aren't being technically accurate. Literally every contact you have is married or engaged? Redefine "single" in your mind: **If she doesn't have a ring, she's single.** Options open up with this mentality. The mental box Christian guys put themselves in is pure lunacy. Trying to "honor her boyfriend's **right (!?) to her**" is something even feminists would find cringy. It's a sign of a weak frame. Guys who think this way presume that because of temporal happenstance (i.e. he got there first), somehow she shouldn't have the option of being with a better guy (i.e. you, if you keep improving; it's really NOT hard to become one of the top 10% of men). If this is making your moral insides tingle in discomfort, just stop and think about it for a second:
 - How's it fair to you to close that door on yourself because of factors out of everyone's control?
 - How's it fair to her to deny her the opportunity of being with a better guy because "he called dibs on her first"?
 - How's it fair to the other guy if he's with a girl who *COULD* do better (i.e. you, when you improve past her boyfriend and you're still interested), and you know hypergamy is going to kick in at some point and she's either going to (1) leave him, or (2) they're going to have a crap relationship?

Of course, if you do improve enough that you could pull a girl from her boyfriend, you may find you can pull better than her anyway, so you may not be as interested at that point regardless. But the mentality is useful all the same. Either way, it's a win-win-win to view relationships this way. My dad taught me that very young and I ignored him, but I see the wisdom in it now: *If you don't see a ring, she's on the market.*

Seriously, think about that: she hasn't made a commitment to her boyfriend, nor he to her. They haven't promised to be with each other for life. They haven't promised, "I will not break up with you if someone better comes along." If they did have that promise, they'd literally be engaged at that point. Rings would be exchanged. If there is no ring, that commitment isn't there. If you're better and you come along, without the ring she has the right to upgrade.

5. LOOKING TOO EARLY

I have to distinguish here:

- You should ALWAYS be approaching. For more on that, I'll defer you to the principles in [one of my older posts](#).
- HOWEVER, you shouldn't actually expect to find your wife as a result of these approaches. Don't bother "looking" until you're actually ready.

The goal of early approaching is just to have fun socializing and getting good at it. You can play around with number-closing as a goal if you want, but you don't even have to go that far. Just learning to talk to girls is valuable in itself - especially upgrading your confidence talking to attractive people. That applies to men too. Back in the day, my fear of talking to hot girls was associated with fear of sexual rejection. But I also had a fear of talking to highly attractive men, assuming they wouldn't want to hang out with "someone like me." What a useless mentality, especially for someone committed to improving (you are committed to that, right?). Learn to talk to attractive people, in general. This boosts your confidence all around.

But let's be real: if you're still 25%+ body fat, earning under \$40k/yr, with a crappy wardrobe, no social skills, etc. - do you really think you're going to pull someone you think would make your ideal wife? Think of the best woman you could pull with stats like that (and be realistic). Now imagine yourself 50lbs lighter, muscular build, better financial portfolio, having learned social skills and developed your social circle, etc. - and now think of the best woman you could pull. You're shooting for all those things in your life, right? You're trying to improve, right? Why

would you settle for the type of person you could pull now when you could make substantial gains first and then have a much, much better pool of people who would be interested in you?

Think about it this way: with your crappy stats you might be able to pull an HB6 if you compromise on some of your standards in other areas. With better stats, you might be able to pull a 9 (perhaps even a 10?) with similar compromise. *Oooooooooor* ... you could pull an HB6 or 7 without having to compromise on any of your other peripherals. Suddenly, instead of the semi-psychotic 6 who actually gave you the time of day, you've got a 6 (or even 7) who also happens to be an actual Christian (rather than the psycho girl who was LARPing in the church), takes her faith seriously, perfectly sane (for a ...), intelligent, no debt, possibly even a financial contributor, good mom-qualities, etc.

Right now you can pull the former. 6-12 months from now (longer if you dilly-dally about self-improvement) you can pull the latter.

- Yet for some reason guys keep saying with crappy stats how they're looking for a wife.

That's lunacy. Always practice game, but don't actually prioritize "looking" until you're at least as good as the girl you want to marry. Remember: women marry up, not down. Deal with it.

Caveat: Everything else I've ever written on why you shouldn't even been "looking" in the first place. Read my two sidebar posts on "how to find the girl you can't keep yourself from banging." More details there, especially the section, "How to find a wife (by not looking for one)." I stand by those posts to this day.

6. DOUBTING GOD

Lots of guys post Assurance of Salvation numbers below 10. Okay, we all have doubts every now and then. That's actually not a bad thing (longer conversation there, which I'll table for purposes of this post). But for a lot of guys, the reason is that they're on the fence about whether God is even good or has good thing sin store for them. They doubt Jeremiah 29:11 - "'For I have good plans for you,' says the Lord. 'Plans to prosper you and not to harm you.'" Yeah, that wasn't spoken to you individually, and context matters, and God created some people for humble purposes. Fine. But God still "works all things for the good of those who love him." That's a promise you can take to the bank (figuratively, not literal money; if you're into prosperity gospel garbage, go away unless you're here to learn your way out of it).

When people look at their sucky life and doubt God's goodness, I can't help but chuckle while shaking my head in disappointment.

- You screw up your physique, social life, time allocation, spiritual disciplines, etc. Your life sucks.
- But somehow God is to blame and his plans aren't good?

Get real. People like this aren't following God's plan in the first place. Our sidebar is already replete with biblical information to demonstrate that God does, in fact, want us to take care of our bodies, be good stewards of the finances he gave us, be disciplined in our pursuit of Christ and the work he gave us, managing our time appropriately, etc. Nobody actually doubts that these things are in the Bible (and much, much more that we discuss here). **How can you claim God's plan for your life isn't good if you're not actually living in God's plan for your life yet?**

Until you fix your physique, ability to love and relate with his people (i.e. social skills), become a good steward of your finances, and all those other things we try to get guys to work on, **you are not in God's will for your life**, and therefore you have no basis for saying that God isn't good or that his plan for you sucks. You are in rejection of God's plan, if you're like that, and that means **YOUR plan for your life sucks, not God's**.

7. NO MISSION

If you have no mission in life, you will never be satisfied with your life. Jesus gave you a mission. You can be satisfied with your own, but it won't get you very far in eternity. Better to adopt his so you're not only satisfied, but also building a foundation for eternity.

Guys who write OYSes ignoring mission or noting that they don't have a mission - especially if they've done several OYSes and haven't fixed this by now - are doomed to eternal failure. **Even the secular guys eventually figure out that achieving their own mission isn't enough.** I've talked to a number of TRP/MRP ECs and mods who have all adopted some form of spiritual pursuit (a lot turning to Christianity directly) because they realize there's got to be more to life than the silly things their own brains can come up with.

Mission matters. If your life sucks right now and you don't have a mission, that's why. **Mission matters, nothing else.** I'll defer to the barrage of other posts on the sidebar and in my post/comment history on this topic rather than belaboring the point here any further.

8. COVERT CONTRACTS

I've seen a number of guys complain about why other people won't treat them the way they want to be treated. In some regard, this is because you haven't earned the right to be treated that way yet. Look to the above and fix those things to deal with that.

Other times, the issue has a different cause: *You never told them how you want to be treated.* One guy recently posted an OYS complaining that his church friends didn't understand how bad he was hurting. He just assumed that it was their job to probe his mind and figure that out. That's a covert contract. If you want people to "get you" it's your responsibility to tell them who you are and what you're dealing with in life.

The problem is that most people take the "play it off" approach. They'll share their deepest fears and struggles, but they'll do so with a bold face. This is a defense mechanism, NOT the sign of a strong frame ... *IF you're upset about their response, or lack thereof.* Re-read that sentence. If you really don't care how they respond (which is part of a strong frame), then don't whine about it. If you DO care about them not reaching out and helping you the way you think they should, it's probably because you haven't communicated how deeply the issue is actually affecting you. Don't assume they'll get it. Don't have covert contracts with them. Be overt. Thinking that you're some "red pill guru" because you can talk about difficult issues with a straight face is a straight up lie you're telling yourself if you get butthurt about people's responses to you afterward.

9. NO OYS AT ALL

Some guys love to complain about how their life sucks, or ask questions about these "tricky" (read: completely normal to everyone else) situations they find themselves in, but they're not even posting OYSes at all. I get it, not everyone has time to be engaged. Are you actually at least going over this type of content regularly with someone else in your personal life?

I have a number of men who I address these things with verbally - at least every other week, often-times more than that. But I still post the monthly OYS in the discord. Why? Because OYS matters.

If you're not constantly self-evaluating, you will never actually improve. If you're not doing it in a context where other men can help you, you'll be stunted by your own narrow-sightedness in how far you can improve and in which directions. Simply put, if you don't post or discuss these types of things for others to engage with (and no, the "tell us how your week went" at small group does NOT count), then you have no business coming here complaining or

asking questions about why your life sucks because I can tell you the answer in one second: "No OYS."

CONCLUSION

Didn't make it to 10. Ran out of time. Suffice it to say, if you want to improve:

- First, get a mission and start pursuing it relentlessly. Consider EVERY angle that you can take in life to optimize this. Post about it in OYS and discuss with others.
- Second, if you're not already in good shape, get there. This could be one of those extra "angles" for your mission - people will bend over backwards to help others who are fit.
- Third, stop DEERing or wasting time on stupid things, or misprioritizing your life. Re-read the first two bullets of this conclusion and let that be your focus for now.

When you've done at least that much, and your spiritual disciplines are in order (which should be part of the pathway to achieving your mission - if they're not, then your mission sucks), then you'll start to taste what it's like being within the bounds of God's plan for your life and you'll see that it's good. It may not be what you wanted for your life. It may also not be a high and noble earth-changing plan. But it will be good. Steven was stoned to death. That was God's plan for him. That was a suck plan, God. But it was good. Know why? Because that's what scattered the early wave of new converts across the globe, when persecution began, and his death brought the Gospel to many nations. It was good. Do you think anyone would have viewed him as a martyr or that people would have scattered if it was a random ugly fat guy who did nothing for God's Kingdom and only happened to show up to a few services every now and then who was stoned? Hah. No.

Abundance Fatigue and "The Meaning of Life"

23 February 2022 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

I've observed that abundance isn't always the blessing people expect, but is perhaps sometimes the one they need. Let's be clear up-front:

- **Abundance Mentality** is when you live your life in a way as if you have abundance, whether you do or not.
- **Actual Abundance** is the fact behind the mentality. You either have it or you don't.

Let's briefly look at 3 mistakes people make when improperly balancing these two in their lives.

Over-Confidence

Some people have an abundance mentality without actual abundance. This can be good and bad. On the "good" side, I like the "fake it 'til you make it" concept. This works marvelously ... as long as you *actually make it* and you're not just faking it all your life, which just cripples your frame. A guy who acts as if he already has the thing he wants will find it much easier to attain it "again" - especially when it comes to sexual dynamics.

On the "bad" side, I'm reminded of the saying: "Before you attempt to beat the odds, be sure you could survive the odds beating you." Some men play the abundance mentality or other confidence-techniques in ways they're not ready for, and when it doesn't work, they find themselves turning to the black pill, thinking the "abundance mentality" concept failed them in one set of circumstances, so it must be a failure in all, so they just give up and assume looks are all that matter.

Broken Confidence

The consequence of failed over-confidence reminds me of circus elephants. Did you know an elephant in the circus (before PITA put the kibosh on all that) could be tied to a 3ft stake in the ground and it will not escape? It could easily rip it out. In fact, if you take a wild elephant and tie it to that same 3ft stake, it'll rip it right out. Why doesn't the circus elephant? Because when it was a baby, it was tied to that same stake. It tugged and pulled and stretched at its rope with no luck. Eventually it just gave up. When it grew and developed the strength and ability to rip the stake out, it wouldn't - because its confidence was broken.

That same danger exists with sexual dynamics both inside the home and out. I remember in my own past being denied sex and thinking under similar situations even years and years later, "She said no in these circumstances last time, so she'll say no again," so I didn't even bother trying. This self-defeatist attitude wasn't helping me ... or her. Or anyone. It just made the world a sucky place to live in. Even shortly after I had just-cause for initiation-confidence and could have had an actual abundance of sex, I didn't believe it was real, so my lack of abundance mentality put the kibosh on my sexuality as hard as PITA did to the circus elephants. Goodbye, poor circus elephants. We miss you.

"Just a little bit more."

All of that leads us to the very real situation of a person with actual abundance, but no abundance mentality. Shockingly, one would think the former would produce the latter, but it often doesn't. I remember reading a quote about John D. Rockefeller, who at one point had 1% of the entire US economy as his net wealth. Insane. A reporter asked him, "How much money is enough?" His answer: "Just a little bit more."

Now, I fully expect Rockefeller had an abundance mentality to go with his unquenchable thirst. But many guys will actually let their quest for abundance control them to a point where they are never satisfied and it creates a scarcity mentality, despite being in the SMP equivalent range of a Rockefeller. I've met guys like this. Sometimes ONEitis is the culprit - because they can have any girl they want, *except that one* who he met before he became "all that."

Abundance and Hypergamy

Women have actual abundance. For the most part any girl who's a 4 or higher could probably walk into a bar and announce, "Who wants to have sex with me?" and *someone* in the bar would be willing to take her up on that offer (barring circumstances that might get in his way). Girls on dating websites have a plethora of male attention - even the ugly ones. On social media, guys will rush to a woman's defense or disproportionately respond to women's posts over men's. I don't need to prove this point, right? We have all seen it.

But let me tell you - 99% of those women, when they were barely pubescent, still got flutters in their stomach at the first guy or two who showed any actual interest in them. Why? Because they hadn't been emotionally inoculated yet.

That same young girl, no doubt, maintained a steady stream of attention from men for years. It may not have always been the attention she wanted, but it was attention nonetheless. This is where hypergamy is born. The constant stream of attention makes the drug ineffective, hence inoculation. Pharmacists are noticing this with the z-pak with bacterial infections. The z-pak has become so over-used that many strains of bacteria have become immune to it, so they have to create stronger antibiotics. When a woman has been inoculated to low-brow attention from men, she needs a stronger, more powerful hit. That means a higher value man. Instead of getting flutters when the 5 gives her attention, she then needs the 6 ... then the 7, and so on. Non-hypergamous men are willing to give them that attention because "the chance of sex is still the chance of sex." Does he intend to marry her? Probably not. She won't get the commitment she seeks. but the sexual attention she craves is coming - and from higher than her market value would account for.

Even if a woman manages to get a ring from the highest-value man in her social sphere, over time she will become inoculated to even his affection and begin to look elsewhere. At this point, lateral moves are a viable option, even in the absence of upward potential ... ergo "branch swinging." This is why there's a V in DEVI. As I assume [/u/hornsofapathy](#) would tell you, there's often value in integrating sexual dynamics outside the bedroom just as much as in it. One of my solutions to this problem is to constantly **expand my playbook of ways to keep life/sex/"the relationship" (whatever that means) interesting rather than stale**. New "tricks of the trade" create new flutters.

Abundance Fatigue

The way women become inoculated to male attention can happen to men with actual sexuality as well. The only difference is that women tend to look up (hypergamy) for a bigger dose, whereas most men I've met tend to look down. They get depressed and nihilistic. Most of these guys had made sex out to be their god, violating the third commandment of poon - "You shall make your mission, not your woman, your priority." For reasons I won't go into here, I'm persuaded that at least in monogamous relationships, making sex from her your priority de facto makes her your priority, even if because of whatever "blah blah red pill blah blah" you don't get sex from her the way she thinks she wants it.

But this applies to non-monogamous relationships too. I remember [a post from a TRP Endorsed Contributor](#) who had essentially "mastered" sexual strategy and had such great abundance - both actual and in mentality - that he, theoretically, could have sex whenever he wanted. The story initially reads like a success story on how effective the red pill is ... until you get to the end and find out that actual abundance turned him nihilistic and horrified.

I'll call this "abundance fatigue." It's when a person experiences abundance to such a degree that he no longer values the thing he now has in abundance.

A bite of chocolate cake is delicious. I have no use for having 12 chocolate cakes in my kitchen. This is why restaurants will sell you a slice of pie for \$9, or the whole pie for \$15 (although there are other aspects of business psychology in there too).

Imagine a meteor shower hit earth raining gold from the sky all over the world. What do you think that would do to the value of gold? Is it going to go up? Stay the same? Of course not. It would plummet. Because when you have more of something than you actually need or care to have, its value diminishes.

Wisdom From Solomon

King Solomon was wise enough that even atheists will quote him. He was famous for having 700 wives and 300 concubines. Crazy. That's a new woman a day for 3-ish years (though, let's face it, it was probably multiple a day, likely even at a time). Yet he writes:

I amassed silver and gold for myself, and the treasure of kings and provinces. I acquired male and female singers, **and a harem as well - the delights of a man's heart. I became greater by far than anyone in Jerusalem before me.**

Then he says, fascinatingly:

In all this my wisdom stayed with me.

What cocky arrogance. I love it. Not only did he have a harem of 1000-ish women, but he was never mentally consumed by all of it. He goes on:

I denied myself nothing my eyes desired; I refused my heart no pleasure

My heart took delight in all my labor, and this was the reward for all my toil.

Yet when I surveyed all that my hands had done and what I had toiled to achieve,

everything was meaningless, a chasing after the wind; nothing was gained under the sun. (from Ecclesiastes 2)

Solomon spends quite some time after this on his diatribe toward the meaning of life, but I won't get into that here. The point is simple: even the wisest man in the world realized the nihilistic end of such pursuits.

This Isn't So Bad

Abundance fatigue can be depressing - to realize that everything you hoped and strived for all this time isn't all it's cracked up to be when you're swimming in it.

But that's actually okay. The reality is that abundance fatigue is usually associated with men who haven't actually "killed the blue." I remember Rollo writing in one of his posts that some men like to take blue pill notions and "sprinkle a little red on it." Some guys get REALLY good at sprinkling so much red that they look pretty doggone red. But when they end up nihilistic because mass-sex didn't fulfill them the way they'd hoped, it's clear that they were still living in their blue pill fantasy world and needed something more. I once wrote a post about **Killing the Blue** - and if I were to re-write it today, I'd have a lot more to add, but one that stands out in this context is the blue pill notion that "women can fulfill us" - even if "women" is an indirect way of saying "sex."

I remember in my early days of having discovered the red pill, I was sex-starved. Constant denials. Sex was once every few months, if-that. We went as long as 18 months with squat (and not the kind you do in the gym). I had in my mind, reading MMSLP for the first time, that by the time I was done, I'd be having sex multiple times a day. And yeah, we got there. Once I realized I had achieved actual abundance - that sex was available whenever I wanted

... I no longer wanted it as much as I thought. I cared more about quality than quantity. It's the same with fasting. I remember fasting for an entire week once. When it was over, I thought about all the foods I would eat. We went to a buffet. I filled my plate and sat down. A few bites in, I was done. Why? Because my actual appetite was nowhere near as big as I thought it was when I was starving. Different people will have different thresholds, but I'd wager every guy here will have a point where he realizes, "X is enough sex."

Back to Poon - **"You shall make your mission, not your woman, your priority."**

Becoming nihilistic from life due to an over-abundance of many good things is cured simply by finding something more valuable to spend your time on than accumulating that which will ultimately disappoint.

If you bother to read the rest of the book of Ecclesiastes, by chapter 12 you'll find that Solomon figured out what he believed to be the meaning of life. You need to figure that out for yourself and then pursue it.

Abundance Fatigue and "The Meaning of Life"

23 February 2022 · r/MarriedRedPill · Archived copy · Reddit

I've observed that abundance isn't always the blessing people expect, but is perhaps sometimes the one they need. Let's be clear up-front:

- **Abundance Mentality** is when you live your life in a way as if you have abundance, whether you do or not.
- **Actual Abundance** is the fact behind the mentality. You either have it or you don't.

Let's briefly look at 3 mistakes people make when improperly balancing these two in their lives.

Over-Confidence

Some people have an abundance mentality without actual abundance. This can be good and bad. On the "good" side, I like the "fake it 'til you make it" concept. This works marvelously ... as long as you *actually make it* and you're not just faking it all your life, which just cripples your frame. A guy who acts as if he already has the thing he wants will find it much easier to attain it "again" - especially when it comes to sexual dynamics.

On the "bad" side, I'm reminded of the saying: "Before you attempt to beat the odds, be sure you could survive the odds beating you." Some men play the abundance mentality or other confidence-techniques in ways they're not ready for, and when it doesn't work, they find themselves turning to the black pill, thinking the "abundance mentality" concept failed them in one set of circumstances, so it must be a failure in all, so they just give up and assume looks are all that matter.

Broken Confidence

The consequence of failed over-confidence reminds me of circus elephants. Did you know an elephant in the circus (before PITA put the kibosh on all that) could be tied to a 3ft stake in the ground and it will not escape? It could easily rip it out. In fact, if you take a wild elephant and tie it to that same 3ft stake, it'll rip it right out. Why doesn't the circus elephant? Because when it was a baby, it was tied to that same stake. It tugged and pulled and stretched at its rope with no luck. Eventually it just gave up. When it grew and developed the strength and ability to rip the stake out, it wouldn't - because its confidence was broken.

That same danger exists with sexual dynamics both inside the home and out. I remember in my own past being denied sex and thinking under similar situations even years and years later, "She said no in these circumstances last time, so she'll say no again," so I didn't even bother trying. This self-defeatist attitude wasn't helping me ... or her. Or anyone. It just made the world a sucky place to live in. Even shortly after I had just-cause for initiation-confidence and could have had an actual abundance of sex, I didn't believe it was real, so my lack of abundance mentality put the kibosh on my sexuality as hard as PITA did to the circus elephants. Goodbye, poor circus elephants. We miss you.

"Just a little bit more."

All of that leads us to the very real situation of a person with actual abundance, but no abundance mentality. Shockingly, one would think the former would produce the latter, but it often doesn't. I remember reading a quote about John D. Rockefeller, who at one point had 1% of the entire US economy as his net wealth. Insane. A reporter asked him, "How much money is enough?" His answer: "Just a little bit more."

Now, I fully expect Rockefeller had an abundance mentality to go with his unquenchable thirst. But many guys will actually let their quest for abundance control them to a point where they are never satisfied and it creates a scarcity mentality, despite being in the SMP equivalent range of a Rockefeller. I've met guys like this. Sometimes ONEitis is the culprit - because they can have any girl they want, *except that one* who he met before he became "all that."

Abundance and Hypergamy

Women have actual abundance. For the most part any girl who's a 4 or higher could probably walk into a bar and announce, "Who wants to have sex with me?" and *someone* in the bar would be willing to take her up on that offer (barring circumstances that might get in his way). Girls on dating websites have a plethora of male attention - even the ugly ones. On social media, guys will rush to a woman's defense or disproportionately respond to women's posts over men's. I don't need to prove this point, right? We have all seen it.

But let me tell you - 99% of those women, when they were barely pubescent, still got flutters in their stomach at the first guy or two who showed any actual interest in them. Why? Because they hadn't been emotionally inoculated yet.

That same young girl, no doubt, maintained a steady stream of attention from men for years. It may not have always been the attention she wanted, but it was attention nonetheless. This is where hypergamy is born. The constant stream of attention makes the drug ineffective, hence inoculation. Pharmacists are noticing this with the z-pak with bacterial infections. The z-pak has become so over-used that many strains of bacteria have become immune to it, so they have to create stronger antibiotics. When a woman has been inoculated to low-brow attention from men, she needs a stronger, more powerful hit. That means a higher value man. Instead of getting flutters when the 5 gives her attention, she then needs the 6 ... then the 7, and so on. Non-hypergamous men are willing to give them that attention because "the chance of sex is still the chance of sex." Does he intend to marry her? Probably not. She won't get the commitment she seeks. but the sexual attention she craves is coming - and from higher than her market value would account for.

Even if a woman manages to get a ring from the highest-value man in her social sphere, over time she will become inoculated to even his affection and begin to look elsewhere. At this point, lateral moves are a viable option, even in the absence of upward potential ... ergo "branch swinging." This is why there's a V in DEVI. As I assume [/u/hornsofapathy](#) would tell you, there's often value in integrating sexual dynamics outside the bedroom just as much as in it. One of my solutions to this problem is to constantly **expand my playbook of ways to keep life/sex/"the relationship" (whatever that means) interesting rather than stale**. New "tricks of the trade" create new flutters.

Abundance Fatigue

The way women become inoculated to male attention can happen to men with actual sexuality as well. The only difference is that women tend to look up (hypergamy) for a bigger dose, whereas most men I've met tend to look down. They get depressed and nihilistic. Most of these guys had made sex out to be their god, violating the third commandment of poon - "You shall make your mission, not your woman, your priority." For reasons I won't go into here, I'm persuaded that at least in monogamous relationships, making sex from her your priority de facto makes her your priority, even if because of whatever "blah blah red pill blah blah" you don't get sex from her the way she thinks she wants it.

But this applies to non-monogamous relationships too. I remember [a post from a TRP Endorsed Contributor](#) who had essentially "mastered" sexual strategy and had such great abundance - both actual and in mentality - that he, theoretically, could have sex whenever he wanted. The story initially reads like a success story on how effective the red pill is ... until you get to the end and find out that actual abundance turned him nihilistic and horrified.

I'll call this "abundance fatigue." It's when a person experiences abundance to such a degree that he no longer values the thing he now has in abundance.

A bite of chocolate cake is delicious. I have no use for having 12 chocolate cakes in my kitchen. This is why restaurants will sell you a slice of pie for \$9, or the whole pie for \$15 (although there are other aspects of business psychology in there too).

Imagine a meteor shower hit earth raining gold from the sky all over the world. What do you think that would do to the value of gold? Is it going to go up? Stay the same? Of course not. It would plummet. Because when you have more of something than you actually need or care to have, its value diminishes.

Wisdom From Solomon

King Solomon was wise enough that even atheists will quote him. He was famous for having 700 wives and 300 concubines. Crazy. That's a new woman a day for 3-ish years (though, let's face it, it was probably multiple a day, likely even at a time). Yet he writes:

I amassed silver and gold for myself, and the treasure of kings and provinces. I acquired male and female singers, **and a harem as well - the delights of a man's heart. I became greater by far than anyone in Jerusalem before me.**

Then he says, fascinatingly:

In all this my wisdom stayed with me.

What cocky arrogance. I love it. Not only did he have a harem of 1000-ish women, but he was never mentally consumed by all of it. He goes on:

I denied myself nothing my eyes desired; I refused my heart no pleasure

My heart took delight in all my labor, and this was the reward for all my toil.

Yet when I surveyed all that my hands had done and what I had toiled to achieve,

everything was meaningless, a chasing after the wind; nothing was gained under the sun. (from Ecclesiastes 2)

Solomon spends quite some time after this on his diatribe toward the meaning of life, but I won't get into that here. The point is simple: even the wisest man in the world realized the nihilistic end of such pursuits.

This Isn't So Bad

Abundance fatigue can be depressing - to realize that everything you hoped and strived for all this time isn't all it's cracked up to be when you're swimming in it.

But that's actually okay. The reality is that abundance fatigue is usually associated with men who haven't actually "killed the blue." I remember Rollo writing in one of his posts that some men like to take blue pill notions and "sprinkle a little red on it." Some guys get REALLY good at sprinkling so much red that they look pretty doggone red. But when they end up nihilistic because mass-sex didn't fulfill them the way they'd hoped, it's clear that they were still living in their blue pill fantasy world and needed something more. I once wrote a post about **Killing the Blue** - and if I were to re-write it today, I'd have a lot more to add, but one that stands out in this context is the blue pill notion that "women can fulfill us" - even if "women" is an indirect way of saying "sex."

I remember in my early days of having discovered the red pill, I was sex-starved. Constant denials. Sex was once every few months, if-that. We went as long as 18 months with squat (and not the kind you do in the gym). I had in my mind, reading MMSLP for the first time, that by the time I was done, I'd be having sex multiple times a day. And yeah, we got there. Once I realized I had achieved actual abundance - that sex was available whenever I wanted

... I no longer wanted it as much as I thought. I cared more about quality than quantity. It's the same with fasting. I remember fasting for an entire week once. When it was over, I thought about all the foods I would eat. We went to a buffet. I filled my plate and sat down. A few bites in, I was done. Why? Because my actual appetite was nowhere near as big as I thought it was when I was starving. Different people will have different thresholds, but I'd wager every guy here will have a point where he realizes, "X is enough sex."

Back to Poon - **"You shall make your mission, not your woman, your priority."**

Becoming nihilistic from life due to an over-abundance of many good things is cured simply by finding something more valuable to spend your time on than accumulating that which will ultimately disappoint.

If you bother to read the rest of the book of Ecclesiastes, by chapter 12 you'll find that Solomon figured out what he believed to be the meaning of life. You need to figure that out for yourself and then pursue it.

Basic "2-2 Dinner Party" Social Skills

25 February 2022 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

This one's for all you social auti--s out there. Some of this may seem overly basic, but I can think of at least 7 people off the top of my head who would benefit from at least a few of these - and every one of them is relevant for at least one of those people. I'm sure others are in that same boat, even beyond my 7, so here goes.

Social influence is one of the most valuable domains to keep a mastery on. Over the years I've gotten a number of questions about conversational strategy and social skills, as it's one of my strengths. There's a lot of different sub-groups within the broader category of "social influence," though.

Take cold approaches, for example. [/u/TheChristianAlpha](#) is probably the best I've ever seen at this, in-person. I randomly took him to dinner and half way through he had our waitress sitting at our table in tears as he's telling her how Jesus is the best solution to her life troubles. I thought I was great at cold approaches. He put me to shame.

Then there are group gatherings, professional functions, public events, and the like - all which require unique (though often overlapping) sets of skills, depending on your goals for the situation. Do you just want to have fun? Are you trying to build a relationship with someone in particular? Are you just trying to meet new people, generally? Are you trying to teach someone in your group a personal lesson or model a skill or trait for them? There are all kinds of goals you can have, and those should and will affect how you approach your time.

I have a dinner party with a new couple this weekend, and someone else asked about a similar situation (having another couple over for dinner) recently as well, so I'm going to stick with the dinner party context and assume the goal is simple: make new friends. What I do with that friendship later is a separate goal. For right now let's just make sure things go off without a hitch.

10 Dinner Party Tips

1 - Practice "Mayor Game"

Rather than going in crazy depth here, I'll defer a lot to [Jacktenofhearts' comment here](#). Obviously it's a bit different because a two-couple dinner party is not a mass social outing. But in our context it will mean engaging in small talk, even if you don't care what it is. This small talk will be filtered throughout the evening between larger topics, which we'll get to later. **The utility of your mayor game here is to make people *feel* like they're having a good time** through subtle (or, on lesser occasion, overt) supportive gestures rather than trying to push an agenda for yourself. You are pushing your own agenda: "make new friends" and "advance my social network." The mayor benefits from mayor game. But he does it in a way that looks like you're the one benefiting from him. That's why he's so doggone popular.

2 - Don't Dominate

Yeah, I know all you alpha-wannabes think dominating is everything. Domination is a tool. 2-2 dinner dates where you're just trying to build rapport with someone aren't necessarily the best situation for that tool. Domination is great for building sexual attraction with women or respect from men in male-only spaces, but when you put yourself in front of another married couple, the dynamic needs shift away from brute domination toward charm. Mayor game is also highly relevant here.

The mayor isn't dominating the conversation. He's its catalyst. I like to think of my conversational style at 2-2 dinner parties as if I'm pushing one of my kids on a swing. They're the one on the swing, not me. It's not about me. At first, I may have to push several times to get her going, some hard pushes even. But once she's got momentum, it's just a few light taps here and there to keep her from slowing down. If I look away too long and she slows down too much, I push hard again, but it only takes one good push that time. In the end, my daughter had a great time and I didn't have to do much. She gets off the swing and is smitten with what a great time she had with me.

3 - Don't expect help

If I insisted that I be the one on the swing (i.e. dominated the activity) and that they should be priming the conversation for me to enjoy, I'll end up sorely disappointed. Why? Because my 4yr old isn't strong enough to push me on the swing. Even my 10yr old couldn't push me very high. I'm the strong one, not them. Your dinner guests may actually be better conversationalists than you - and if so, that's great. But don't expect it. I used to expect it and it backfired often. Go in expecting that they are conversationally weak and immature. You will be less disappointed and more on your game that way.

4 - Use your wife

She's there to help. Let her help. If she is sidelined in the conversation, (a) she's going to be upset afterward because of your crappy leadership, and why bring those tests and burdens on yourself? But more significantly: (b) your guests will notice and it will affect how they feel about YOU. They came to see both of you, not just you (in most cases). One of my common strategies is the "Have you met Ted?" play from How I Met Your Mother. I introduce a topic, put my wife on the spot (sometimes awkwardly, for hilarity) and say, "You've got a good story on that, babe. Why don't you tell them?" (if I know she actually does) or, "Honey, what do you think of that?" (if I'm being more general). This form of enabling someone else in the conversation is the best way to play mayor game in small settings, priming conversations without dominating them.

5 - Ask lots of questions

The goal is getting to know them and building a relationship. Excellent. Best way to do that is to speak with other people on their terms about things they enjoy. If they, on their own, raise a topic of interest to you, by all means: engage. Share your own thoughts. But always end what you say with a question. Whenever you talk, you should finish your portion of the conversation in one of two ways:

- You slowed down your speech enough, winding down your thought, that they cut you off with their own thoughts (**ideal**)
- They didn't cut you off, so you ask a question to pass the ball

6 - Avoid Awkward Silences

If you finish talking and one of the two above things hasn't happened, the ball is still in your hands. More accurately: the ball is rolling around on the floor without anyone picking it up, and because you're the last one who had it, it's your fumble. If it's not a natural transfer, asking a question passes it. Even if no one answers, instead of you fumbling, it's them failing to catch it. Sure, it can still be a bad pass if you asked a dumb question, but something is better than nothing. Without a question, you haven't passed the ball. It's still your ball.

They may break the awkward silence and steal it from you, but then the impression is: "This is boring. He's just holding the ball. I don't like boring, so I'll grab it and do something." To be fair, I *LOVE* awkward silences. They're great learning and teaching tools. But not when my goal is to get to know someone or build a relationship. Awkward silences are better when you're leading a small group/Bible study/class/discipleship meeting/etc. Use the right tool in the right context. A first dinner party is not the proper context for the awkward silence tool.

7 - One Big Topic, One Backup

Not 5. Not 0. One or two. Your guests may have big topics too, but (per no. 3) don't expect their help. Big topics are things you know *the group* can spend 30+ minutes talking about before changing subjects again. This is hardest with new people. If I were chatting with one of you all, I know I can bring up anything red pill and we can go off for a while. With someone like [/u/praexology](#), I can mention the topic of behavioral study and we're good for 30+ minutes. With my friend Ryan, it's home repair. With John, it's church discipleship. Big topics must be something you're either fluent in, or where you can fake fluency reasonably well. Ideally, your big topic will be something personally relevant for them. For example, if the person's dad is dying of cancer, ask about that and let that spawn

big-topic ideas for conversation.

If you are really struggling for big topic ideas, just ask yourself, "What is everyone on the internet posting about?" If it's Ukraine/Russia, you can go with that. If it's some new BLM outrage, use that one. If it's a celebrity doing something absurd, that's another. The pop-event is not the topic. The philosophical questions and issues the event raises are your big topic.

Example: With Ukraine/Russia, I'd be asking questions like:

- Countries used to war all the time, but our wars lately have been against small factions, not whole nations. Have we really evolved as a people or did we just become complacent in a few decades of general world peace?
- Is there biblical merit to the idea of one nation conquering another in a post-Gospel world where we are citizens of a spiritual Kingdom before any physical one?
- To what extent should Christians actually get concerned with political issues like this?
- Should the US intervene at all? Or is it better to let other nations figure out their own problems?

Notice how these are all questions. You will have opportunity to share your views, but not until after you let them share theirs first. The reason is no. 8, below.

The goal of your "one big topic" is to make the other people feel like you actually discussed something of substance rather than lots of small talk before going home. **You need the small-talk too.** Small-talk matters, especially when it's, "What's been going on in your life lately?" Showing them that you actually care about who they are and what they're experiencing matters. If you only care about their opinions on subjects, but not their own life experience, you will have an obvious gaping hole in the "get to know you" aspect of the relationship. But don't neglect the big-issues that will drive conversation through the evening too.

Put another way: small-talk lets you know what's happening in their life. Big topics let you know who they are as people. How you handle the "big topic" and which topic you selected is vital to them feeling like a relationship is being built. That's the topic that will make them go home and think, "We really got to know them." Without a big topic they will think on the drive home, "That was decent chit chat" and they won't give you a second thought.

8 - Read the Room

The first 20 minutes your guests are over are the prime opportunity to assess who they are. You'll be able to tell if the guy is passive or dominant. You can figure out if the wife runs the show or if she's a biblical helper. You can assess whether they are neat or sloppy. You'll pick up things about their lingo and style of speech. You'll figure out if they're socially competent or inept. Most importantly, you can use all of this information to assess what's safe to discuss and not. Trying to red knight the new co-worker and his wife on the first dinner date you have with him is ... not smart.

Remember, you have a goal: build a relationship/get to know them. Saying something that completely offends them is counter-productive to that goal, even if it happens to be true. *AFTER* the relationship is well-established, you will have room to say offensive/unsafe things and they won't care. But if they're at all like 99% of the world, you will not be given that level of respect up-front. You'll have to gauge their body language, facial expressions, times when they forcibly derail the conversation (especially if it's unnatural to the natural flow).

Another big aspect of reading the room is gauging how well they're responding to the things you're saying and doing. The reason you often want to ask questions about their views before sharing your own is not only because it (a) creates the trust necessary to get away with sharing some of your more "unpopular" views and opinions, but also (b) gives you valuable information about where they're coming from so you can present your "unpopular" views and opinions in a more palatable way, without compromising your goals for the evening. If while you're reading the room you notice that you're cutting them off more than they're cutting you off, you're not asking enough questions

and they're going to *feeeel* disengaged with the conversation, even if they are actually engaging. From there, part of reading the room also means ...

9 - Avoid Taboo Topics

... until the relationship/respect is established well-enough that you know you can pull it off. I've already hinted at this, so I won't go too much more in-depth here. Suffice it to say: power-playing a taboo topic just to see how someone responds is fun. It's a useful skill to have. But as with awkward silences, taboo topics are the wrong tool for early-stage "get to know you" dinners.

10 - Think Beyond the Conversation

Are their glasses empty? Ask if they need more to drink. Did they eat everything on their plate? Maybe it wasn't enough and they want more, but are too "courteous" to get seconds without it being offered. Are they stretching their backs a lot? Maybe it's time to move from the table to the couch. Pay attention to the non-conversational aspects of what's going on in order to be a good host. This form of hospitality will be essential in leaving a good impression. Good first impressions earn influence later.

Women are GREAT at this. But if your wife is the only one doing it, you'll end up in dynamics like I used to be in years ago, where people would think, "We really like her, but R-C is weird." They have to see the leader/helper dynamic between the two of you as a healthy interplay, not as distinct functions. Lead by example in this way. Maybe you offer to refill their cup, but your wife stands up and says, "Oh yeah, I can get that." You led with the insight that they may be thirsty, she helped do the actual work of getting their drinks. If your wife picks up on something like that, play the, "Oh yeah, that reminds me" card and pick something else to lead into, like, "I might want to grab some seconds. Any of you want some while I'm up?" or "Now's probably a good time to pull out dessert anyway."

Activities are a great way to go beyond the conversation too - especially if the guy seems disengaged and his wife is doing all the talking. Most men prefer to **do** rather than talk. My wife and I are big on board games. We keep an assortment that are both complex and easy, so if there's ever a lull in conversation, we have an option for anyone - other board-gamers or people who just want to play a round of euchre. Lots of times the board game collection is even the context for inviting someone over, "Oh, we should totally do a game night!" 75% of the time when we schedule these game nights we never actually play any board games because conversation is great and it doesn't go there. But we're always ready. Other activity ideas could be

- Going on a walk around your neighborhood
- I know some of the guys around here like to use video games. I personally avoid this, as I'm not a huge video-gamer in the first place. But if there's something unique, like my son's VR, that can be a lot of fun. Party games on a TV/game system can also be useful.
- Sometimes I like to have my guests, when they're over, actually help with some aspect of the cooking. This is a bit riskier, but cooking new and interesting dishes is already a hobby of mine, so it's a small way to invite someone else into a world where I am competent enough to carry the activity while still making them feel engaged without an actual burden.

Very Basic "2-2 Dinner Party" Social Skills

25 February 2022 · /r/MarriedRedPill · Archived copy · Reddit

This one's for all you social auti--s out there. Some of this may seem overly basic, but I can think of at least 7 people off the top of my head who would benefit from at least a few of these - and every one of them is relevant for at least one of those people. I'm sure others are in that same boat, even beyond my 7, so here goes.

Social influence is one of the most valuable domains to keep a mastery on. Over the years I've gotten a number of questions about conversational strategy and social skills, as it's one of my strengths. There's a lot of different sub-groups within the broader category of "social influence," though.

Take cold approaches, for example. [/u/TheChristianAlpha](#) is probably the best I've ever seen at this, in-person. I randomly took him to dinner and half way through he had our waitress sitting at our table in tears as he's telling her how Jesus is the best solution to her life troubles. I thought I was great at cold approaches. He put me to shame.

Then there are group gatherings, professional functions, public events, and the like - all which require unique (though often overlapping) sets of skills, depending on your goals for the situation. Do you just want to have fun? Are you trying to build a relationship with someone in particular? Are you just trying to meet new people, generally? Are you trying to teach someone in your group a personal lesson or model a skill or trait for them? There are all kinds of goals you can have, and those should and will affect how you approach your time.

I have a dinner party with a new couple this weekend, and someone else asked about a similar situation (having another couple over for dinner) recently as well, so I'm going to stick with the dinner party context and assume the goal is simple: make new friends. What I do with that friendship later is a separate goal. For right now let's just make sure things go off without a hitch.

10 Dinner Party Tips

1 - Practice "Mayor Game"

Rather than going in crazy depth here, I'll defer a lot to [Jacktenofhearts' comment here](#). Obviously it's a bit different because a two-couple dinner party is not a mass social outing. But in our context it will mean engaging in small talk, even if you don't care what it is. This small talk will be filtered throughout the evening between larger topics, which we'll get to later. **The utility of your mayor game here is to make people *feel* like they're having a good time** through subtle (or, on lesser occasion, overt) supportive gestures rather than trying to push an agenda for yourself. You are pushing your own agenda: "make new friends" and "advance my social network." The mayor benefits from mayor game. But he does it in a way that looks like you're the one benefiting from him. That's why he's so doggone popular.

2 - Don't Dominate

Yeah, I know all you alpha-wannabes think dominating is everything. Domination is a tool. 2-2 dinner dates where you're just trying to build rapport with someone aren't necessarily the best situation for that tool. Domination is great for building sexual attraction with women or respect from men in male-only spaces, but when you put yourself in front of another married couple, the dynamic needs shift away from brute domination toward charm. Mayor game is also highly relevant here.

The mayor isn't dominating the conversation. He's its catalyst. I like to think of my conversational style at 2-2 dinner parties as if I'm pushing one of my kids on a swing. They're the one on the swing, not me. It's not about me. At first, I may have to push several times to get her going, some hard pushes even. But once she's got momentum, it's just a few light taps here and there to keep her from slowing down. If I look away too long and she slows down too much, I push hard again, but it only takes one good push that time. In the end, my daughter had a great time and I didn't have to do much. She gets off the swing and is smitten with what a great time she had with me.

3 - Don't expect help

If I insisted that I be the one on the swing (i.e. dominated the activity) and that they should be priming the conversation for me to enjoy, I'll end up sorely disappointed. Why? Because my 4yr old isn't strong enough to push me on the swing. Even my 10yr old couldn't push me very high. I'm the strong one, not them. Your dinner guests may actually be better conversationalists than you - and if so, that's great. But don't expect it. I used to expect it and it backfired often. Go in expecting that they are conversationally weak and immature. You will be less disappointed and more on your game that way.

4 - Use your wife

She's there to help. Let her help. If she is sidelined in the conversation, (a) she's going to be upset afterward because of your crappy leadership, and why bring those tests and burdens on yourself? But more significantly: (b) your guests will notice and it will affect how they feel about YOU. They came to see both of you, not just you (in most cases). One of my common strategies is the "Have you met Ted?" play from *How I Met Your Mother*. I introduce a topic, put my wife on the spot (sometimes awkwardly, for hilarity) and say, "You've got a good story on that, babe. Why don't you tell them?" (if I know she actually does) or, "Honey, what do you think of that?" (if I'm being more general). This form of enabling someone else in the conversation is the best way to play mayor game in small settings, priming conversations without dominating them.

5 - Ask lots of questions

The goal is getting to know them and building a relationship. Excellent. Best way to do that is to speak with other people on their terms about things they enjoy. If they, on their own, raise a topic of interest to you, by all means: engage. Share your own thoughts. But always end what you say with a question. Whenever you talk, you should finish your portion of the conversation in one of two ways:

- You slowed down your speech enough, winding down your thought, that they cut you off with their own thoughts (**ideal**)
- They didn't cut you off, so you ask a question to pass the ball

6 - Avoid Awkward Silences

If you finish talking and one of the two above things hasn't happened, the ball is still in your hands. More accurately: the ball is rolling around on the floor without anyone picking it up, and because you're the last one who had it, it's your fumble. If it's not a natural transfer, asking a question passes it. Even if no one answers, instead of you fumbling, it's them failing to catch it. Sure, it can still be a bad pass if you asked a dumb question, but something is better than nothing. Without a question, you haven't passed the ball. It's still your ball.

They may break the awkward silence and steal it from you, but then the impression is: "This is boring. He's just holding the ball. I don't like boring, so I'll grab it and do something." To be fair, I *LOVE* awkward silences. They're great learning and teaching tools. But not when my goal is to get to know someone or build a relationship. Awkward silences are better when you're leading a workshop/teaching a class/giving a lecture/etc. Use the right tool in the right context. A first dinner party is not the proper context for the awkward silence tool.

7 - One Big Topic, One Backup

Not 5. Not 0. One or two. Your guests may have big topics too, but (per no. 3) don't expect their help. Big topics are things you know *the group* can spend 30+ minutes talking about before changing subjects again. This is hardest with new people. If I were chatting with one of you all, I know I can bring up anything red pill and we can go off for a while. With someone like [/u/praxology](#), I can mention the topic of behavioral study and we're good for 30+ minutes. With my friend Ryan, it's home repair. With John, it's church discipleship. Big topics must be something you're either fluent in, or where you can fake fluency reasonably well. Ideally, your big topic will be something personally relevant for them. For example, if the person's dad is dying of cancer, ask about that and let that spawn

big-topic ideas for conversation.

If you are really struggling for big topic ideas, just ask yourself, "What is everyone on the internet posting about?" If it's Ukraine/Russia, you can go with that. If it's some new BLM outrage, use that one. If it's a celebrity doing something absurd, that's another. The pop-event is not the topic. The philosophical questions and issues the event raises are your big topic.

Example: With Ukraine/Russia, I'd be asking questions like:

- Countries used to war all the time, but our wars lately have been against small factions, not whole nations. Have we really evolved as a people or did we just become complacent in a few decades of general world peace?
- To what extent should we, as individual citizens third party to what's going on, actually get concerned with political issues like this?
- Should the US intervene at all? Or is it better to let other nations figure out their own problems?

Notice how these are all questions. You will have opportunity to share your views, but not until after you let them share theirs first. The reason is no. 8, below.

The goal of your "one big topic" is to make the other people feel like you actually discussed something of substance rather than lots of small talk before going home. **You need the small-talk too.** Small-talk matters, especially when it's, "What's been going on in your life lately?" Showing them that you actually care about who they are and what they're experiencing matters. If you only care about their opinions on subjects, but not their own life experience, you will have an obvious gaping hole in the "get to know you" aspect of the relationship. But don't neglect the big-issues that will drive conversation through the evening too.

Put another way: small-talk lets you know what's happening in their life. Big topics let you know who they are as people. How you handle the "big topic" and which topic you selected is vital to them feeling like a relationship is being built. That's the topic that will make them go home and think, "We really got to know them." Without a big topic they will think on the drive home, "That was decent chit chat" and they won't give you a second thought.

8 - Read the Room

The first 20 minutes your guests are over are the prime opportunity to assess who they are. You'll be able to tell if the guy is passive or dominant. You can figure out if the wife runs the show or if she's a biblical helper. You can assess whether they are neat or sloppy. You'll pick up things about their lingo and style of speech. You'll figure out if they're socially competent or inept. Most importantly, you can use all of this information to assess what's safe to discuss and not. Trying to red knight the new co-worker and his wife on the first dinner date you have with him is ... not smart.

Remember, you have a goal: build a relationship/get to know them. Saying something that completely offends them is counter-productive to that goal, even if it happens to be true. *AFTER* the relationship is well-established, you will have room to say offensive/unsafe things and they won't care. But if they're at all like 99% of the world, you will not be given that level of respect up-front. You'll have to gauge their body language, facial expressions, times when they forcibly derail the conversation (especially if it's unnatural to the natural flow).

Another big aspect of reading the room is gauging how well they're responding to the things you're saying and doing. The reason you often want to ask questions about their views before sharing your own is not only because it (a) creates the trust necessary to get away with sharing some of your more "unpopular" views and opinions, but also (b) gives you valuable information about where they're coming from so you can present your "unpopular" views and opinions in a more palatable way, without compromising your goals for the evening. If while you're reading the room you notice that you're cutting them off more than they're cutting you off, you're not asking enough questions and they're going to *feeeel* disengaged with the conversation, even if they are actually engaging. From there, part of reading the room also means ...

9 - Avoid Taboo Topics

... until the relationship/respect is established well-enough that you know you can pull it off. I've already hinted at this, so I won't go too much more in-depth here. Suffice it to say: power-playing a taboo topic just to see how someone responds is fun. It's a useful skill to have. But as with awkward silences, taboo topics are the wrong tool for early-stage "get to know you" dinners.

10 - Think Beyond the Conversation

Are their glasses empty? Ask if they need more to drink. Did they eat everything on their plate? Maybe it wasn't enough and they want more, but are too "courteous" to get seconds without it being offered. Are they stretching their backs a lot? Maybe it's time to move from the table to the couch. Pay attention to the non-conversational aspects of what's going on in order to be a good host. This form of hospitality will be essential in leaving a good impression. Good first impressions earn influence later.

Women are GREAT at this. But if your wife is the only one doing it, you'll end up in dynamics like I used to be in years ago, where people would think, "We really like her, but R-C is weird." They have to see the leader/helper dynamic between the two of you as a healthy interplay, not as distinct functions. Lead by example in this way. Maybe you offer to refill their cup, but your wife stands up and says, "Oh yeah, I can get that." You led with the insight that they may be thirsty, she helped do the actual work of getting their drinks. If your wife picks up on something like that, play the, "Oh yeah, that reminds me" card and pick something else to lead into, like, "I might want to grab some seconds. Any of you want some while I'm up?" or "Now's probably a good time to pull out dessert anyway."

Activities are a great way to go beyond the conversation too - especially if the guy seems disengaged and his wife is doing all the talking. Most men prefer to **do** rather than talk. My wife and I are big on board games. We keep an assortment that are both complex and easy, so if there's ever a lull in conversation, we have an option for anyone - other board-gamers or people who just want to play a round of euchre. Lots of times the board game collection is even the context for inviting someone over, "Oh, we should totally do a game night!" 75% of the time when we schedule these game nights we never actually play any board games because conversation is great and it doesn't go there. But we're always ready. Other activity ideas could be

- Going on a walk around your neighborhood
- I know some of the guys around here like to use video games. I personally avoid this, as I'm not a huge video-gamer in the first place. But if there's something unique, like my son's VR, that can be a lot of fun. Party games on a TV/game system can also be useful.
- Sometimes I like to have my guests, when they're over, actually help with some aspect of the cooking. This is a bit riskier, but cooking new and interesting dishes is already a hobby of mine, so it's a small way to invite someone else into a world where I am competent enough to carry the activity while still making them feel engaged without an actual burden.

Stop Pointing the Finger

28 February 2022 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

RP communities are a bit weird about casting blame.

- There's one camp (usually the black pill or MGTOW-sympathizers) who want to point the finger at women for everything going wrong in the world.
- There's another camp (usually those who have been invested in red pill communities for a while) who want to point the finger at men for dropping the ball and abandoning responsibility.

The former have good points because women have done a lot to screw our our world. The latter have good points too because men have let it happen and also done a lot to screw up our world.

There's a third category of people who love to point the finger. Know who they are? **CHLIDREN. Everyone who cares about passing blame is acting childish.**

PARENTING THROUGH BLAME

When has pointing the finger actually helped anyone? You know what I do when one of my kids tattles on another? I discipline the tattler every time. The accused only gets punished if I actually believe the accusation and it's not justified.

When these arguments come up, I have each kid give me their version of the story. I don't let the other kid interrupt while one is speaking. They'll get their turn later. I open with: "Tell me what happened." 99% of the time both kids will start with: "The other person did this ..." Often-times I'll cut that kid off right then and there and ask, "No, I want to know what you did." I'm less interested in the actual event of what happened and more interested in whether my child will be honest and own up to their own contribution to the problem. Fights big enough to make their way to me always have a 2-party contribution. If the kid insists in blaming before admitting their own fault, I cut them off, tell them they lost their chance to tell me their side of the story, and I move on to the other kid (if I'm feeling generous and the situation calls for it, sometimes I'll circle back).

I've resolved many parenting disputes among my 4 children. Them blaming each other has never helped a single one of them. My 10yr old son is smart. He's finally figured this out. When I ask, "Did you do something mean to your sister?" instead of trying to explain himself, he says, "Yes." When I ask him what he did, he tells me straight-up. Why does my son seem to "get it"? Because he's picked up on the fact that...

After he admits what he did, I ALWAYS ask the next question: "Why did you do it?"

Motive matters. But there's a huge difference between him trying to rationalize his way out of trouble and him giving me pertinent facts that I'm asking for. This is one of the most respectable aspects of my son and I love him for it (among many other things).

DON'T BE A CHILD

Christian or not, you should find use in this saying from the apostle Paul: "When I was a child, I spoke like a child, I thought like a child, I reasoned like a child. When I became a man, I gave up childish ways" (1 Cor. 13:11). Men put childish ways behind them.

According to Paul, if you still act like a child, you are not a man yet.

Yeah, I get it. This leads into the very shaky territory of trying to define a "true man." There are lots of opinions on

that. I'm not going to go there in this post. But I can say definitively that a child is not a man.

DON'T BE A WOMAN

The other angle to this is that most people who point the finger do so for a few key reasons:

- They're emotionally upset and blaming is a temporary relief from guilt
- They want their feelings validated
- It averts accountability for one's own actions
- There's an internal pressure toward appearing perfect, and accepting responsibility shatters that projection
- A person's ego may be invested in their own self-image, which is broken when the "fault" rests with them
- A person doesn't want to have to change, and if it's someone else is at fault it excuses one's own imperative to fix the problem or become someone better

Again, not to try to define what a man is ... I can say definitively that a man is not a woman and these are traits most commonly associated with women (or at least ones that are more appropriate or expected for women to maintain and men to grow out of). Just as you shouldn't be a child, you shouldn't be a woman either.

FAULT V. RESPONSIBILITY: A BETTER PARADIGM

Back to my son - you know why I appreciate his approach to being caught in a fight? He accepts responsibility. Even when it wasn't his fault, he (in most cases ... he is still 10, after all) recognizes that he did something to contribute to the problem and owns up to that. I don't get very much, "*But my sister this*" or "*But my sister that*" from him (again, it happens, but rarely). Either my wife or I are aware enough of what's going on in the house to know who's really at fault. We also know our kids well enough to have a pretty good idea what happened, even if we didn't see it ourselves. We know where the fault lies. But my love and respect for my son, and the way I treat him, is based less on whether or not he was *at fault* for what happened and more on whether or not he's going to own up to it - whether he takes *responsibility*.

Likewise, the Bible is pretty clear that God forgives our sins - our "*faults*". But despite this forgiveness, he still expects us to "confess our sins." Even though I'm already forgiven, confession still matters. Why? Because God wants to instill in us a character that takes *responsibility* for our actions. Consider the following examples:

- Eve ate the fruit first. She gave it to Adam and he took it. Adam pointed the finger at Eve instead of confessing and repenting. God cursed him in addition to making him subject to death. I wonder how this story would have played out if Adam had owned up to it and didn't blame Eve for his own contribution to the problem.
 - Paul was a murderer(-helper?) who persecuted Christians and tried to hinder the work of the Spirit. After his conversion do we see him saying, "But, but, but ... God ... that was the old me. It's your fault for not saving me before that"? No. In fact, you'd think he'd try to hide that part of his life so other Christians wouldn't find out what he did, but instead he tells it as part of his testimony. His zeal as a Jew who persecuted the Church is something he boldly reminds the Philippians of (3:6). In 2 Cor. 12 he says he will "boast all the more gladly of my weaknesses" - and just a few verses before that we see that God had blessed him by letting him taste heaven before his death.
 - Joseph's brothers tied him up and sold him as a slave. Despite not being at fault for the situation, he accepted that he had to bear the responsibility that came with his new life as a slave - and God rewarded him for that, making him the second most powerful man in the nation. At no point do we see Joseph whining about how bad his brothers treated him. In the end, he forgave them, loved them, and blessed them.
-

YOU ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR YOUR OWN HOME

Let me add one more to the list above:

- We sinned and ruined the world. Jesus had to bear indescribable torture and suffering to save us. Did he ever say, "But God ... it's their fault, not mine! I'm innocent"? No. He took it as his own responsibility to fix the mess we created. Why? Because that's what leaders do who want their venture to succeed.

In a corporate setting, the CEO is responsible for the mistakes of his employees. A military commander is responsible for what his privates do on the battlefield, even if he's not the one who ordered them to do it. Likewise, a husband is responsible for everything that goes on in his household because **it's HIS household**.

It doesn't matter if your wife is at fault. The husband is still responsible. You're the one who has the burden of dealing with the mess. **Too many men love lording leadership without recognizing the responsibility that comes with it.** I don't just mean the "responsibilities" of leading (though that matters too). Yes, you have to provide, protect, produce, etc. But part of the responsibility is figuring out how to deal with other people's messes - that you are *responsible* for what everyone else in your household does. I'll put on my lawyer hat: if your 8yr old kid hits a baseball through your neighbor's window, who do you think is going to pay for it? You. Because he's your kid and you're responsible, regardless of the fact that your kid was the one at fault. Of course, if he has an allowance or a piggy bank, you can teach him to *share* responsibility, but you are still the responsible person as the parent.

Most things that go wrong in the world are due to failure of leadership. If the way a man leads is not getting the results he wants (regardless of fault), the logical solution is to adjust your leadership strategy. Her job is to decide whether or not to follow. Now, this could lead to a frustrating cycle where a guy keeps changing strategies as his wife doesn't respond to each one. This is insanely rare because AWALT and typically respond well to predictable sets of good leadership qualities. Nevertheless, while secular guys who happened to marry an outlier may actually end up here, there is no excuse for Christian men. Why? Because we have a standard of leadership to stop the cycle.

Jesus' leadership strategy is the optimal one. Changes to our strategy should always be to adjust what we do to conform more to what Christ did. **I don't mean what you think Jesus WOULD have done. I mean what he ACTUALLY DID.** Too many people are ignorant of just how much Jesus modeled for us, as found in Scripture. If Jesus didn't, God did - and we know that Jesus did what he saw the Father doing, so if either God or Jesus did it, we can do likewise. In the end, your wife may still leave you, but at least you can go to God on judgment day and say, "Yes, my wife left me. But I didn't know a better way to lead her than the way you showed me, so I stuck with that and did what you did." I have to imagine God will respect that answer even over the man who manages to abandon Christ-likeness in order to pacify his wife and keep her from divorcing him. "Marriage in tact, God!" is going to be followed by the question: "Sure, but at what expense?" If you had to let her cut off your balls for her to stay, God's not going to let you into his assembly (Deuteronomy 23:1 - yeah, I'm stretching the metaphor, but roll with it).

On judgment day, I don't imagine God is going to care who is to blame. God isn't judging fault. He's judging "each person according to what he has done." Do what Jesus did. Worry less about blame, more about Christ-likeness. Just make sure you're actually looking at how Jesus handled situations, rather than making up hypotheticals of what you think he "would have" done based on some stereotypical notions you have in your head about who you think he was. We have a model. Look to the model, as shown to us through the Bible.

53

UPVOTES

No, it's not okay.

25 July 2022 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

PREMISE

The phrase, "It's okay," has become the go-to saying to anyone who is struggling, even when the struggle is because of their own poor life choices. The phrase is usually appended by, "God loves you just as you are."

It's no secret that the world uses God's love as an excuse to justify poor life choices.

- Overweight? *It's okay, God loves you just as you are. You don't need to lose weight. Be proud of your body!*
- Unable to engage in social situations and make friends? *It's okay, God loves you even if they don't. You don't need them, just him. No need to improve your social skills.*
- Struggling to financially provide for your family? *It's okay, God loves you just as you are. Even the apostles were poor, so you keep on playing those video games all day instead of working!*

MYTH: God loves you just as you are.

FACT: God loves you, despite the way you are.

EXAMPLE

Let's start with body image issues. I heard someone share recently about her struggle. She was afraid that her husband wouldn't love her anymore because she's getting older and gaining weight. She had made poor life choices that put her in a bad position, just as I had earlier in my marriage.

Good thing mainstream churchianity was there to support her! She learned that "God loves me just the way I am" and "I am beautiful, no matter what they say." They're in the Bible. Look it up. <searches> Oh wait, that's actually a Christina Aguilera song, not a Song of Solomon.

The one that does often gets quoted is: "I am fearfully and wonderfully made." And that's true! When God knit you together in your mother's womb (i.e. the previous verse), you were fearfully and wonderfully made. But he's not the one who made you fat and unattractive. You did that after he made you. Just as with Adam and Eve at creation, God can make something good, but we have the power to screw it up.

BIBLICAL

The whole "God loves me just as I am" thing is a sham - especially if you're sharing it with non-Christians. God hates sin. Psalm 11:5 says plainly, "The Lord tests the righteous, but his soul hates the wicked." Psalm 5:5 - "The boastful shall not stand before your eyes; you hate all evildoers." Proverbs 8:13 extends this to us: "The fear of the Lord is hatred of evil." No, it's not a "love-hate relationship" with God. That's awkward human terminology to rationalize clinging onto destructive ties in our lives.

The Bible says that "God shows his love for us in that while we were still sinners, Christ died for us." Notice the tonality here.

- Many people interpret this to say: *God loves all of me, including my sin*, which is an unbiblical conclusion.
- The actual tone and context of the passage reads more like: *Even though we were sinners and God hates sin, he loved us enough to do something to eradicate those parts of us so that we could be in fellowship with him again.*

The primary function of salvation is sanctification, not a "free ticket to heaven," as some claim. The fact that God will not allow sin in heaven is very telling that he does not embrace our sinfulness, but wants it gone.

The irony, of course, is that the way we get "pruned" of our sin (per John 15) is not by trying to prune ourselves (per Galatians 3:3), but by "abiding in Him" (John 15), which the same author later says in 1 John 2:6 defines as "walking as He walked" - i.e. live our lives the same way Jesus lived. How do we do that? The three greats I've often shared before: (1) Love **G**od, greatest command; (2) Love **O**thers, second greatest command; (3) Make **D**isciples, great commission.

REBUTTAL

Now, I'm sure some people will want to argue semantics. "I am a sinner. God still loves me." That's dodging the point. You can't knowingly continue to sin without repentance and expect anything other than God's wrath. Hebrews 10:26-31 is clear on that - "For if we go on sinning deliberately after receiving the knowledge of the truth, there no longer remains a sacrifice for sins, but a fearful expectation of judgment, and a fury of fire that will consume the adversaries." Sure, you may slip up while being continually repentant, as sanctification won't be complete in this life ... but on the bigger picture: *Do you really want to play the semantics game when that kind of judgment is on the line?*

CONCLUSION

"It's okay, God loves you" is not an excuse for failing to change your lifestyle and behaviors. If you're a glutton, learn to control your diet (I know that's one I struggle with, which is why I run/bike so doggone much!). If you have no friends, learn some social skills and get out there. "I'm more of an introvert, so I don't have to," is not an excuse for failing to build the relationships that are necessary to advance the Gospel in your sphere of life. If you're financially struggling, get off the TV and video games and get a second job, or find a way to improve the career path you're already on. I had one friend who was in a tough spot working as a financial advisor. He was pulling 6-figures, but still massively in debt. He got his spending worked out to stop new debt, but the interest on the old debt was still killing him. Know what he did? He got a job working third shift at Steak 'n Shake for a year making \$8/hr - an embarrassingly low wage for him - to make up the extra cash to pay down the debt. His wife was a school teacher and she actually got a summer job to supplement and help.

Whatever it takes, stop making the "God loves me just as I am" excuse and go do what you need to do, prioritizing first God's Work of building His Kingdom.

The Social Imperative Part 1 - "Don't Be Ignored" and Biblical Guardrails

10 September 2022 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

Parable of the Shrewd Manager

In Luke 16, Jesus tells a parable about a manager who's about to be fired. Concerned for his future, he uses his position to earn favor with his master's debtors so they will welcome him in their home after he is fired and he won't be destitute. The master commends him for this and Jesus concludes: "I tell you, make friends for yourselves by means of unrighteous [or worldly] wealth, so that when it fails they may receive you into the eternal dwellings" (v9).

While this parable raises several interesting questions, I'm going to focus on its imperative that we should be building relationships with others *with eternity in mind*. The epistles have no shortage of passages talking about our imperative to connect with others for the sake of advancing the Gospel. One of the things we hammer hard here is the importance of living on mission for Christ. It's why all advice threads require stating your mission. Most guys have caught on now, "I'd better mention sharing the Gospel/making disciples in my mission or the mods will be all over me," but even taking you at face value - **for everyone who is serious about the mission to advance the Gospel and make disciples, social advancement is critical**. Especially if you want to be someone of influence in God's Kingdom/the Church the Bible is clear that such people "must also have a good reputation with outsiders" - and those with no social presence don't even have a reputation at all, much less a good one.

The Basics of Guardrails

So, how does one actually build good social skills? The Bible has some general guardrails on this. For example, there are a lot of "don't do"s in the Bible about how we interact with others.

- Don't covet what they have.
- Don't steal from them.
- Don't lie to them.

These will ruin your relationships, not help them. The Bible also has a lot of "do do"s.

- Be patient.
- Be kind.
- Season your conversation with salt.
- Be gentle.

... just to name a few. Of course, it also has a stricter set of guardrails for unique contexts. For people like Cretans, for example, Paul implores: "rebuke them harshly." For others, certain disciplines are warranted. This is because **as a social network expands, opportunity for conflict inherently expands with it**. Guardrails are not only about how to build healthy relationships. They're also about how to keep them healthy when these moments of conflict arise.

It's important to know the biblical boundaries of how we should/shouldn't interact with others in various contexts - and we certainly won't be creating any exhaustive lists here. That said, Titus 3:1-2 provides a nice summary of some of the most critical interpersonal guardrails. But before we get there, we need to know the context for the passage ...

Let NO ONE Ignore You

Before we can get to Titus 3, we need to know how chapter 2 ends.

- 2:11 talks about God bringing salvation "for ALL PEOPLE." *That's a lot of people!*
- 12-14 then proceeds by sharing the Gospel and imploring us to live according to it. *Are you living what you preach?*
- Paul then continues in verse 15, "DECLARE these things." *When was the last time you declared something in an "ALL PEOPLE" context? Me either!*
- But he goes on: "exhort and rebuke with ALL authority."

Pause there. This is giving me Matthew 28:19-20 vibes when Jesus also implores us to spread the Gospel to "ALL nations," prefacing it with, "ALL authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me, therefore go ..." as if he is giving us that authority that Paul is now telling Titus to exercise. Another way I like to think of this is to imagine you work for a mega-company and the CEO calls you up and says, "Heyo Bob. Can you do me a little favor and get this report done?" Okay, imagine how you'd respond to that compared to if the CEO said, "I am the head of this company. There is no one higher than me. I have all authority over everything that happens with this company. Therefore, I'm telling you to get this report done." How do you think you'd respond to that request? Sometimes we treat the Great Commission like the "Heyo Bob" approach, whereas Jesus used the "All authority" approach, and Paul now refrains it here in the context of the Gospel bringing salvation to "ALL people" (parallel to "ALL nations") before finishing ...

- "Let NO ONE disregard you."

Okay, so you may be wondering why I keep capitalizing "ALL" here. No, I'm not a universalist - I vehemently oppose that notion. I'm drawing context to ALL-encompassing verbiage of who the Gospel is to be brought to and the impetus of Paul's charge to Titus to declare it to ALL people with ALL authority in a manner that NO ONE would disregard him. See the pattern now?

So, when it says not to let anyone disregard you, what does that word mean? Let's define it with a quick Google search.

English Dictionary | Disregard: pay no attention to; ignore

Greek Dictionary | *Periphroneo*: think beyond, depreciate, condemn, despise, look down upon

The ESV seems to be a bit interpretive here to say "disregard," but it makes sense in the context. If you've got a message you're meant to declare authoritatively to all people, you'd better do it in a way where people don't think so little of you that they ignore the message (remembering that YOU are the message, not just the words you speak).

With that said, how many people feel like you've been walking around the world being ignored all your life? How many of you have been "invisible" in the crowd?

I remember going to NYC a couple months ago for vacation. I love Broadway. Ironically, one of my favorite songs I heard (from the Beetlejuice musical) involved the line, "You're invisible when you're me. There's no one to see my truth." Times Square and Central Park are fantastically beautiful. They're also fantastically crowded. How long do you think you, men, would have to sit on a park bench in the Big Apple before someone would approach you and initiate a conversation? Quite a while, I can assure you. Everyone's bustling with things to do. Being ignored is the default state. You must make an **active effort** to change that. You can't just expect it to happen magically, all

by itself.

Our imperative to get the Gospel to ALL people comes with an equal imperative not to let anyone disregard what we have to say - whether by directly ignoring us or ignoring our message because they look down on us with contempt.

Guardrails in One Verse

Okay, NOW we can get to the actual verse, now that we realize its context. Titus 3:1-2 ...

- "Remind them to be submissive to rulers and authorities, to be obedient, to be ready for every good work, to speak evil of no one, to avoid quarreling, to be gentle, and to show perfect courtesy toward all people"

Yikes. That's quite a bit there. Let's break this down, remembering that this is just a summary of some key guardrails, not an exhaustive list of them.

Remind them to be submissive to rulers and authorities, to be obedient

How did Paul do this? When the Roman Empire ordered Christians to be put to death, did he submit willingly and encourage believers everywhere to put their head on the chopping block? Nope. But when he was caught, he accepted his situation without fight. In fact, even when God allowed him an opportunity to escape, he and Silas chose to remain (Acts 16). In short, as one of my friends aptly and succinctly puts it: "submit to your rulers and authorities" = "don't run from the cops."

Why does this matter in the imperative to get the Gospel to ALL people? Because if you're being defiant against your "rulers and authorities" instead of submissive to them, do you think the people who are loyal to those rulers and authorities are going to give you much credibility? In their mind, you're as good as a criminal at that point and they will "disregard" or "look down on" with "contempt" anything you have to say. Paul just implored us NOT to put ourselves in a situation when they will do that. Now he's explaining the guardrails to make sure we don't lose that influence.

For an easy example, consider when Trump was elected and all the liberals were shouting, "He's not MY president." Now imagine one of those liberals, after rioting against Trump, were to come across a die-hard Trump supporter and try to teach him some new philosophy/way of life/belief system that he'd never heard before. Or imagine when Biden was elected and countless people were shouting, "The election was rigged. Biden isn't the legitimate president" - and a republican were to try, after shouting on the street corner about this - try to persuade a Biden-supporter to consider some new philosophy/way of life/belief system that they'd never heard before. Do you think they're going to be likely to accept what you have to say or treat your thoughts with contempt?

to be ready for every good work

Notice the wording here. It's not merely that you must "avoid evil." Too often we are focused on the "don't sin" part of living for Christ that we forget about the "do"s of Christian living. "Good works" can mean acts of service, speaking kindly of others, showing generosity, etc. - the standard "good works" we often read about. But one that's often left off the list: it can also mean the "work of the Gospel" that Paul frequently talks about, which he is engaged in, with several others who he calls into that work with him, and which we are all called into as well.

Even more significant in the wording is that we must be READY for EVERY good work. Both those words need emphasis.

- READY - They're already prepared for us. We just need to be ready for when the time comes. These are the "good works prepared in advance for us to do." It's no coincidence that *IMMEDIATELY* after saying this in Ephesians 2:10, Paul then describes the calling of the Gospel to the Gentiles, the ministry of the apostles and

prophets, the "mystery" of the Gospel being made known by the Spirit of the Gospel spreading beyond the Jews into all the Gentile peoples and how "of this gospel I was made a minister," and that "through the church the manifold wisdom of God might now be made known" ... hmm ... I wonder what the "good works prepared in advance for us to do" might be. Could it have something to do with making sure the Gospel is spread to ALL nations? At least in part, yes. And we'd better be READY for when the opportunity to exercise this good work comes.

- EVERY - Can one lackadaisically pick and choose which good works we will do for God? Can we say, "Eh, God, I don't feel like sharing my faith with that guy today. I'll take the next opportunity"? No. Our imperative is to take advantage of EVERY good work, whether we feel like it or not.

If you feel like skipping one of the opportunities God prepared in advance for you, it's probably because you weren't READY. If you're not ready, it's probably because you don't think it's necessary to do EVERY good work God prepared in advance for you to do.

to speak evil of no one

Simply put, if you are a slanderer or gossip, people won't respect you and your influence for good will be shot. Sure, slander and gossip my *increase* your influence *to do evil*, but never to do good.

to avoid quarreling

Being a quarrelsome person makes people want to avoid you. Proverbs literally says that it's better to be stranded on a roof corner than be around a quarrelsome wife. Do you really think you'll fare much better in a broader social circle than marriage if you're a quarrelsome person?

to be gentle [epieikes: seemly, equitable, yielding, gentle, mild, forbearing, fair, reasonable, moderate]

Ah, gentility. The Bible has a lot to say about gentleness. There is certainly a time and a place for everything. As previously noted, Paul tells Timothy to rebuke some people "harshly." So, gentility is not *always* the only card to be played in conversation. But it's a massively important one and should be our default, unless you know the context demands otherwise. Ecclesiastes 3 tells us that there is a time for all kinds of opposing things - "A time to break down, and a time to build up" ... hopefully we're building up more often than we're breaking down. "a time to weep, and a time to laugh" ... hopefully we're laughing more than we weep. "a time to love, and a time to hate" ... hopefully we love more than we hate. "a time for war, and a time for peace" ... hopefully more peace than war. **In the same way, if there is "a time for gentleness, and a time for harshness," ... let's remember that we ought to be gentle more often than we are harsh.** There's a lot more in the Bible about the importance of gentility than harshness, even though they both have their place.

Simply put, being inappropriately harsh will callous people against you. That's no way to build a social life. Being appropriately harsh through a default of gentility will earn the respect of those who know you.

to show perfect courtesy [prauteta: gentleness, mildness, gentleness] toward all people

It's interesting to me that the word translated "gentleness" has one connotation, but the word that's more directly translated as "gentleness" is re-translated to "courtesy" (ESV) or "humility" (NLT, NKJV). Regardless, the point is doubly-emphasized. There is a common decency to be had. That common decency does not make you weak. Instead, it is a tool to strength your social skills and earn the respect of those around you, which makes you strong. As with all things, it's a tool in your belt - not the only tool, but a useful one. Consider humility and gentleness to be a hammer and screwdriver and a "sharp rebuke" or "harsh correction" like a nail gun. Nail guns are cool and fun. Some jobs absolutely require them. But they're not your default go-to for most home projects. You may be

obsessed with it and find that it's more helpful than most people realize, even in projects some people wouldn't ordinarily think to use them ... but that trusty hammer is still going to need to be at your side, regardless.

TEASER

Okay, now that we've learned about the imperative to build Kingdom-minded relationships and the guardrails around doing that, something else comes to mind: **You can follow all those do-s and don't-s and still not have a vibrant social circle who you're influencing for Christ.** If those "do-s and don't-s" are guardrails on the path to a vibrant and Gospel-advancing social life, what happens if you stay in the guard rails, but drive your car in reverse? Or you've got a broken engine and don't move at all? Well ... staying in the guard rails still won't get you very far. In the next post, we'll hit more of those nuts and bolts of *how to* actually get off your butt and build kingdom-minded relationships with others.

The Social Imperative Part 2 - Fundamental Social Skills and Mindsets

6 October 2022 · /r/RPChristians · Archived copy · Reddit

Yikes - I had half of this written when I posted part 1, but only just now managed to find the time to finish. This post will focus on the very basic, fundamental things you'll need to know to improve your social skills. As I have time, I may include a part 3 with some of the more "advanced" strategies. But first, let's start with a critical question:

Why Isn't This in the Bible? Oh yeah: DISCIPLESHIP

I tried to keep the previous post on why social skills are important as Scripturally-grounded as possible because I knew this one was going to be more pragmatic than exegetical. Is that okay? If God wanted us to know the ins and outs of social skills, wouldn't he have put it in Scripture?

Well ... no. **For one**, unlike biblical guardrails for interpersonal interactions (which are timeless), social contexts DO change over time. Different norms from different cultures, time periods, locations, etc. actually impact whether any particular piece of advice is good or bad. That means this post may find itself quite dated sometime down the line or in some other country, so take that for what it's worth. Paul says to Timothy that Cretans should be rebuked harshly, but tells others to correct with gentleness.

What was unique about the Cretan culture that Paul gives different instructions for them? Social context. He basically calls all Cretans liars (imagine if a church-leader made a categorical statement about a nationality like that today!) and categorically denounces them as deserving of the same level of respect as anyone else. Weird, but true (Titus 1:12-13, if you want to read it for yourself). What he's saying is that sometimes you have to tailor your approach to your audience. Some people can handle a harsh rebuke – and even require it – whereas others may need gentility. Different social contexts warrant a different approach.

Second, and more importantly: **God didn't mention social skills in the written Word because he expected this to be passed on through life-on-life discipleship.** The Bible wasn't meant to be an exhaustive encyclopedia of everything we would ever need to know. For those more pragmatic skills, we see in Philippians Paul saying that he shared his way of life with others who would live in his example, and encouraged others to look at their example, and so on. To Timothy, he says he taught several things that Timothy should pass on - and then he tells Timothy to teach those men to pass it on to others. This "way of life" includes how we interact with one another.

I remember one time being at the house of a guy I was discipling when his wife came home. They started a conversation and she became furious. Plates-smashing-against-walls-level furious. I tried to coach him on conflict-management principles in an aside mid-conversation, but it was hard to get through. A few weeks later, I knew I was about to have a difficult conversation with my wife, so I suggested he come over to see how I handle conflict with my wife. His ability to watch me do it was something you can't get from Scripture because that "pattern of living" and "life skills" part of following Christ comes from the way the Holy Spirit applies God's Word in us, beyond just the text on the page. Scripture is the highest and only absolute arbiter of Truth, but the Holy Spirit is the one who shows us each how to apply that truth in our own contexts - and He uses us to be a model for others.

If life-on-life discipleship (not a typo) weren't so dead in the mainstream church, you would have direct access to skilled people to say to you, "Come alongside me and see how I share the Gospel with my neighbors" and "Come watch me pray so you can know how to do it like I do," and "See me cold-approach strangers to build relationships so you can become skilled at it too."

Because we don't have a pattern of this life-modeling in the Church and we only have "teaching sessions" (whether in a mass-gathering classroom or individually at a coffee shop – it's still all just words), there is a dearth of actual leadership in the mainstream church.

Yes, this post is more "just words." But it's based on lots of experience and numerous errors and successes I've had

along the way. For those of you who happen to live near me, I invite you to come out with me sometime for a focused time of practicing these skills. In the 5-part discipleship model Jesus gives, I can:

- **Tell you what** I do (mostly through this post)
- **Show you how** by doing it in front of you, at a mall, park, store, etc.
- **Let you try** doing it in front of me, and I can give you feedback afterward
- **Send you out** to keep practicing without me, and I'll check in periodically, and
- **Encourage you to pass it on** so that others can learn the skills you develop and so you can master your own skills through the responsibility that comes with teaching others.

This is how I see Jesus discipling others, and social skills are a very easy way to practice this. Sadly, for those of you who don't live near me, all I can do is "just words" – which, I'm sure, is why Paul said in Philippians that they should look to those locally around them to learn how to follow Paul's example, rather than him trying to explain his lifestyle in the letter itself.

Now, onto the actual skills and mindsets useful to build early-phase social skills ...

1 - GOAL-ORIENTED

Before you can be good at building a relational network you need to know a few things. What kind of network do you want? Who do you want to be in it? How large do you want it to be? Will there be intentional tiers of relational depth (acquaintances v. casual friends v. close friends) or only a singular focus? What do you want to accomplish alongside your social circle? Do you intend to lead your social circle or merely participate in it? Are there certain hobbies/interests that you want to center your circle around? All of these questions matter.

For me, I remember hearing stories in my career about my clients or their exes who were "pillars of the community" - the type of people who knew everyone in town. I made that a goal of mine. Before I moved, I had achieved that goal. I could hardly walk into a grocery store without being stopped in conversation with someone. At the most recent disciplehaus (in-person meeting of men from this sub from all over the country), one of the guys I work with got to see a taste of that. We happened to be grabbing dinner near where I used to live ... at 10pm on a Thursday. Surely nobody would be out then, right? Sure enough, as soon as I walk in I saw some of my good friends from a small group I led. The next day, we went to a grocery store in my new home area and I met someone from a congregation I had attended and a conversation ensued.

I tell that story not to brag, but to show that (1) goals can be accomplished once you set them - even big goals, like being known and respected wherever you go (and this is even arguably required to be a leader in God's Kingdom), and (2) in reference to the discipleRship process, it's good for guys I'm working with to (2a) know my life is congruent with what I say it is, (2b) see how I do it first-hand in order to practice themselves, and (2c) be inspired that they can actually achieve goals too. Setting goals is massively important, but life modeling is the fast-track to accomplishing them.

For a quick biblical reference, Jesus blends these two by telling his disciples what their goal should be and then showing them how to do it. He told them from day 1 that their end-game will be to become "fishers of men," then he spent the next few years showing them how to "fish for men" so they could do it on their own once he was gone.

2 - IMMUNIZE AGAINST FAILURE

Let's face it, you're going to face a lot of rejection. The best thing you can do is **immunize yourself to it**. Most

people experience rejection as a frustration they want to avoid. If you're clever enough, you can remap your brain to realize: "Oh, I got rejected once and it hurt. After the 10th time, I kind of got used to it. Having been rejected 100+ times, it doesn't phase me anymore."

Once you're properly immunized to rejection, you no longer have any social anxiety about approaching random strangers. Another rejection under your belt? No biggie. Move onto the next person.

Nobody faced rejection more than Jesus. He is still rejected by countless people today – not randos he doesn't care about, but children he deeply loves and passionately wants to save. He is rejected in the ways it hurts the most. He also tells us to remember that if the world hates/rejects us, it hated/rejected him first – and that we are blessed of we suffer persecution because of him. Don't shy away from this. Embrace that your effort to develop Kingdom-building relationships is a win-win-win scenario: either you (1) win by successfully relating with someone, or (2) win by being persecuted for your efforts to build God's Kingdom, and therefore will be blessed by God, or (3) win by glorifying God by proving He was right when He said we'd face rejection because of Him.

See how there really is no such thing as "failure" when it comes to attempting to develop Kingdom-building relationships? Let your rejections work for you, not against you. Immunize yourself against failure.

3 - BE POLARIZING

In coordination with immunizing against rejection: be a polarizing person. Jesus was, perhaps, the most polarizing person ever to have lived. Nobody has sparked more global controversy than Jesus. Some people devote every fiber of their being to him, while others absolutely despise him. He did this by expressing clear convictions and never wavering from them, and also by being public about them. As Mark Manson talks about the concept in reference to dating (*Models*), rejection from polarization is a GOOD thing, not a bad thing. You're very quickly weeding out the people who you weren't going to get along with anyway ... **or, more accurately, you're letting them weed themselves out.** By being a polarizing person, you're not rejecting anyone. Like Jesus, you embrace all who will come to you. But you're also not bending your convictions to get them to come; you let them decide for themselves and respect that choice once it's made.

The catch here is that we *ALSO* have an imperative to reach all people. No one person will literally reach *everyone*, so there's some give. I'm never going to reach people who only speak Mandarin Chinese, for example (unless my high test scores for the gift of tongues actually come true someday). But we do still have the obligation to "become all things to all men so that some might believe" (1 Cor. 9). This comes in the form of finding commonality with everyone *where that commonality does not compromise the polarizing truth you're bringing them.*

The goal of polarization isn't to cause the people who love you to love you more and the people who hate you to hate you more. That would be a foolish(-ish) goal. The real goal is to quickly find those who will be receptive to you and have no fear or shame when those who are unlikely to "click" with you reject you even faster. You're just saving yourself some time. Be respected by all, but embrace the reality that not everyone will become your best friend. I've had people say of me, "I respect you, but I don't think we'd get along." That's a perfectly acceptable place to be. Embrace it rather than trying to people-please everyone. As the old saying goes, "The fastest way to fail is to try to please everyone."

- **Caveat 1:** Being unskilled and turning people away because you're awkward, mean, have bad hygiene, etc. is NOT being polarizing. It's lacking self-awareness.
- **Caveat 2:** Polarization is a tool in your belt, not a default state. Sometimes there is value in avoiding being polarizing to a particular person whose relationship you find a unique value in. For example: my son is on a soccer team. It would be very bad for him if he polarized his coach against him. Best strategy here is to put the polarization tool aside and keep the coach happy (with some exception, when warranted). Similarly, polarization isn't a skill I want to employ with my kids. Unwavering in my convictions? Absolutely. Weeding out which of

my children I can develop a quick relationship with and which I can't? Bad idea.

4 - PEOPLE ARE LONELY AND ISOLATIONIST BY DEFAULT

Research shows that this is the loneliest generation in the history of recorded data on the subject. Some say it's "despite" the internet providing so much opportunity for connection and relationship, though I often argue it's *because* of it. All the same, social media is designed to make us *BELIEVE* everyone else is at the top of their social game, while statistics show a *COMPLETELY* different picture. My legal education tells me that "statements against one's own interests are more reliable than self-interested statements" (hearsay exception). So, I have to assume the stats are correct: if people are admitting that loneliness is rampant on an anonymous survey, but publicly try to look like they have tons of friends and love in their lives ... the loneliness is probably more true than the "perfect life" projection.

Remind yourself of this regularly. If people are lacking meaningful relationships in their lives (even marriages don't count, if we remember the 60%+ divorce rate) and you are able to offer them a meaningful relationship, **they should be EXCITED at the opportunity to be approached by you with the prospect of friendship**. Framing this in your mind as the context in which you're going out to meet new people can add a boldness that makes building your social circle much easier.

In the end, if they accept your offer of friendship, you've accomplished your goal; but if they reject you, per the polarization principle, they're probably people who you'd have had to work so hard to get to like you that the point of diminishing returns would have warranted cutting off the effort as early in the process anyway.

From there, it's key to remember that our first-world culture is broadly isolationist (which is NOT true of many other cultures, if you're outside America while reading this). We live on our own plots of land with our own immediate family focusing on our own needs. When we do interact, it's usually at arm's length for general social niceties without actually building meaningful bonds.

Because of this, most people in our society aren't raised, much less trained or equipped, to feel any imperative to initiate relationships. This means that **the burden is on YOU to initiate relationships if you want them. You CAN NOT assume others will approach you if they want relationships, no matter how lonely they may actually be.**

5 – AVOID BLENDING IN

In the same way that "be attractive, don't be unattractive" is a non-repetitive, important duality to remember, so also is there an important difference between "peacocking" and "avoid blending in." I won't get into peacocking here. It's a useful strategy in some contexts, but perhaps more advanced or nuanced than this post will get into, so feel free to read up on it on your own. Avoiding blending in is a more fundamental concept that allows people to take notice of you, whether you stand-out or not.

Consider the numerous social norms out there and contemplate ways to deviate from them. For example, if someone asks how your weekend was, you could answer "Fine" or "Good" like everyone else. But you open relational opportunities if you find something *different* to say, like, "It was an interesting weekend." See how they respond (more on this in part 3, if/when I get there).

Or suppose you're waiting in line at a grocery store, amusement park, etc. You've just met the person next to you. Do you stick with a safe, "How about this weather!" or try a unique connection point, like, "You see any good shows lately?" I've said it before and I'll say it again: TV is a simple and easy way to build a fast connection. The way someone's eyes light up when I've seen one of the shows they mention they love ... it's like magic. That awkward weather conversation that they can't wait to run away from has now turned into a dynamic, engaging _____

discussion on what's going to happen to some guy named Luke in the next episode. Connection formed.

I remember having a case in front of a new magistrate who had quickly developed a reputation for churning cases in-and-out in 10 minutes at a time. Rocket-speed for a hearing. He didn't waste time on anyone ... until I showed up. He had cranked out 7 other cases before me by 10am after having opened at 9. Insane. Then I walk in with my case. We got through it in 4 minutes and he urged us out and to call in the next set of attorneys. On my way out, I noticed a TARDIS on his desk and simply noted. "I like your TARDIS. Who's your Doctor?" He shooed my opposing counsel away and had me sit down again as we continued to chat for 40 straight minutes about Doctor Who. He didn't give anyone else that time or attention - but something lit up when he experienced that shared enjoyment.

It doesn't have to be TV either. That's just something that 95% of people have as a common default pseudo-hobby. The key here is that you can't expect them to share your specific hobby. If you have a passion for playing the harmonica or riding unicycles - that's awesome, and that can be incredibly useful at some point. But it's not going to build an immediate connection. Intrigue, fascination, curiosity, etc. - sure. But not a connection. Ones others are more likely to connect with beyond TV are sports, music, hiking/biking/other exercise, travel, theater, etc.

When you stick to "safe" topics and "deflecting" responses, you'll never build a real connection. You just blend into the crowd. When you find different non-normative things to say, people are far more likely not only to engage with you, but also to *REMEMBER* you after the conversation, which is key to follow-up. Speaking of ...

6 – FOLLOW-UP

You may find this shocking, but you won't actually build a social circle if you only ever meet people. **Follow-up is perhaps the most important skill to develop on this list.** After you make the initial contact, if you want to have a Kingdom-building impact on someone's life, you have to keep connecting with them. Unless you are a Spirit-gifted contact-evangelist who can have someone on their knees in prayer during a 30-second elevator ride (and let's face it: even if you are, do you know if they're still following 2 years later?), the actual work of evangelism and discipleship will take time. That means you're going to have to meet up with them on other days.

This also means exchanging contact information. Learning how to number-close in social situations is critical to being influential, unless you know for a fact you're going to see that person again (ex. probably don't need to number-close the guy who sits next to you at work, unless he's about to get fired – or you are!).

Once you've exchanged contact info, follow-up is easy. Call or text a few days later and suggest hanging out. This is even better if you already talked about a shared interest you can do together.

This is made even easier by modern text-messaging apps. Learn how to schedule messages. Meet a new person on Day 1 at 10am. Finish talking at 11am. At 11:05am you type a text message to him and schedule it to be delivered on Day 3. If he reaches out to you before then, great: cancel your message. If not, you've already followed up with him and don't have to risk forgetting. This also works great for situations where you remember in bed at night, "Oh yeah, I should have texted so and so. Oh well, it's too late now." No it's not. Schedule the message to be delivered at 8:56am the next morning. If you let the moment go, you'll forget by morning and people who matter to God, and therefore you, will fall through the cracks.

7 – ASK GOOD QUESTIONS

I'm sure you've all heard of the 80/20 rule, right? Listen 80%, talk 20%. **It's a rule for a reason.** Yeah, there are some situations where it's okay to break it. Sometimes the other person just doesn't want to talk. Maybe they're shy. Maybe they have a well-hidden mental disorder that limits their ability to communicate. Maybe they are just having a bad day. But don't *assume* these are the case. *Assume* the 80/20 rule is the best default in a new conversation until

you have some information or purpose that warrants deviating from it.

How do you maintain the 80/20 rule when people aren't particularly talkative? Ask good questions. It's really that simple.

Jesus asked great questions all the time. The Pharisees wanted to express themselves to others. Jesus repeatedly asks others to express themselves to him. Yes, he taught too. But even many of his teachings were rooted in directed questions.

When I disciple guys, I often give them a challenge: *Teach me something you're experienced at that I'm clueless on – but do it by only asking questions. You may not speak any statements; only questions.* Everyone I've done this exercise with has loved it. They have also found it extremely challenging. Most people aren't experienced at asking questions. I know I wasn't for a long time (and I still have to consciously remind myself at times). But I promise it's a skill you can learn, and when you master it, you will find it will make a MASSIVE difference in how quickly people grow to enjoy your company.

8 – ACTUALLY CARE

Questions are great because they communicate that you care about other people. It shows that you're interested in what they have to say. But it's not enough to communicate these things. **You must ACTUALLY care and ACTUALLY be interested.**

This may sound dumb and obvious, but it's not natural for many people. Especially among the types of guys who find these forums, there's a tendency to put on a show and go through the motions to accomplish your goals. Showing empathy can often-times feel like a means to an end rather than a genuine expression. Don't be one of those guys.

The Bible is filled with statements about how Jesus looked on someone who was lost and loved him, or wept at the death of a friend even though he knew the friend would be brought back soon, or that he looked on a crowd with compassion. He actually cared about people. **If you want to be like Christ, you can't just pretend to care about people. You must actually care about them.**

Many people are intuitive about interpersonal connections. As good as you may think you are at faking it, I'd bet more people see through you than you think. Don't assume you can fool someone. Actually caring about others is the best way to ensure a relationship is formed. If you don't actually care about them, you'll find it too easy to write them off and move onto the next person. Genuine care and concern for them takes "follow-up" from being a tool/strategy into being an internalized compulsion because you can't quickly ignore or forget about people you actually care about.

How do you show people you care? The simplest way is to give them your time and attention in non-attention-seeking ways. Being at the church picnic and talking to the one homeless guy who shows up is fine, but it could also be a show for everyone else around. I just had a client hire me today who said she had spoken to and met with more attorneys than she could count, but was absolutely convinced that I was the one for her. Why? She said it was because I maintained eye contact with her throughout the meeting, I engaged on the issues that were important to her rather than the legal direction I thought her case should go, and I gave her 3.5 hours of my time, even though she only paid me 40-minutes-worth of my hourly rate. She could see that I cared about her case and I cared about protecting her daughter. That genuine care matters to people and it is how relationships get off the ground.

9 – BE OPEN-MINDED

Isaiah 45 prophesies, "I will give you the treasures of darkness, riches stored in secret places, so that you may know that I am the Lord, the God of Israel, who summons you by name." You never know who God will bring into your

life or why. Often-times these people are those you wouldn't expect to be "friend" material in your life. Maybe they're too mean, or too aloof, or perhaps they're too unintelligent, or too socially awkward, or too poor, or too mentally handicapped. Or maybe it's on the other extreme – they're too good-looking, too popular, too rich, too buff, too cool in their leather jacket and sun glasses, etc.

Don't make assumptions about who you can connect with or not. For those you perceive to be "above" you – read the poem of Richard Cory or the numerous novels, short stories, movies, documentaries, biographies of the rich and famous, etc. and you'll see quite quickly that those you think are "above" you still need real relationships that they're often-times not finding in the impressive facades they build for themselves. Yes, their wealth and good-looks may not be a façade (though in many cases it is), but their sense of fullness in life very frequently is. If you struggle believing this, go re-read the section on "people are lonely" (#4) and research the topic of loneliness and the struggles these "upper echelon" people go through.

For those you perceive to be "below" you, remember the types of people Jesus spent time with. Fishermen. Hated tax collectors. Prostitutes. The homeless. The lame. The blind. Lepers. To the tax collector Zacchaeus he even invited himself over. When was the last time you told someone, "I'm coming to your house tonight"? What an embarrassing faux pas! Yet Jesus did it. Want to know why? I can't say for sure, but I'd wager money it's because he knew Zacchaeus didn't have the guts, being a despised tax collector, to think the miraculous, famous, wonderful Jesus would actually be interested in spending time with him. To those you may see as "socially below" you, don't be afraid to make this move. Could you invite them to your house? Sure. That might work. But it could also have the effect of intimidating them even more with how much better you have it than them. Be willing to meet them where they're at.

But more than anything, don't write-off anyone simply because they're part of a demographic that you don't think you'd connect with. The polarization concept is to weed out those who will reject you because of your convictions. However, you *DON'T* want to weed out those who you think will reject you because of social status perceptions.

10 – DEVELOP AN APPROACHABLE DEMEANOR, THEN ACTUALLY APPROACH

I remember a guy in law school who I could swear never showered. I knew 30 seconds before he came near me that he was approaching because his smell hovered down the hallway well before he actually arrived. He didn't have many friends. Can you guess why?

I did befriend him. I actually shared Christ with him and he began reading the Bible with me. By the end of the year, he told me he started attending church regularly. But boy did he smell ... at first. Somewhere along the way I was blunt with him: "I have to ask, when was the last time you showered?" He answered, "In my country, we only shower when we need to." That was a hard conversation, but I told him he needed to start showering every day – and not just rinsing (as was his custom), but also to use soap and shampoo. The smell didn't completely go away after that, but it was better. Tolerable, even.

I remember early in my marriage I had made a similar mistake with my wardrobe. There was a time when I had gained a lot of weight (just shy of 300lbs at my peak), and even though I was the worship leader for the church I was attending, I was showing up with a nice sweater on top and fuzzy stretchy pants on bottom. It was comfy. Jeans were too tight and uncomfortable. What I didn't realize at the time was how embarrassed I should have been at wearing what basically amounted to pajamas when in front of a congregation – and it affected my social presence there. I was weird and unapproachable. People got the impression that I didn't respect them or God because I wasn't willing to dress in a socially acceptable way around them.

Don't get me wrong – again, I'm all for peacocking and not blending in. But peacocks are beautiful, not ugly beasts. Most people would be enamored if a peacock followed them around and approached. Nobody wants that from a warthog. At best, it's an ugly joke.

For other people, your base facial expressions make a significant difference. Some women have RBF (Google it if you don't know – I won't spell it out). Men have similar default demeanors that project an unapproachable presence. I'll refrain something I said above: **YOU should expect to do all the approaching, DON'T wait for others to approach you** ... but nobody wants to be approached by someone who isn't approachable themselves.

Develop a pleasant smile. Practice it in the mirror if you have to. Have a clean haircut. Practice good hygiene habits, including soap, shampoo, and minty toothpaste/mouth wash. Wear deodorant. Use cologne if you need to. Develop a firm, yet comforting handshake – not like you're trying to prove a point with your strong grip, but like you're naturally confident without the need to prove anything. All of these things matter.

COMPLAINING: Men v. Women in Scripture

Women complaining is a fact of life. Men too. But the response is different. For a man, your job is to figure out how to lead through the problem. Getting caught up in frustration at what other people are doing is the fastest way to lose frame and derail your leadership of the home.

Philippians 2:14 is clear on this: "Do everything without complaining or arguing." Sure, we could reasonably interpret this verse to apply to women too, but the expectations are going to be reasonably different. With a man, it's like God talking to a friend. You can be blunt: "Stop whining and move on." It reminds me of God telling Moses: "Why do you cry to me? Tell the Israelites to move on." Not surprisingly, this is not a spousal-like interaction between God and Moses; it's characterized in Exodus 33:11, "The Lord would speak to Moses face to face, as a man speaks to his friend." We see a similar pattern of "stop your grumbling and just do what I say" when Jesus interacts with his disciples over complaints or whiny requests.

But when we look at Christ's interactions with his bride (the Church-corporate) we see a different response:

- Cast all your anxiety on him because he cares for you ~ 1 Peter 5:7
- Trust in him at all times, you people; pour out your hearts to him, for God is our refuge. ~ Psalm 62:8 (in fact, many of the Psalms are David complaining about other people to God)
- Is anyone among you troubled? Let them pray. Is anyone happy? Let them sing songs of praise." ~James 5:13

Why does the bridal context seem to get a pass? Possibly the whole weaker-vessel thing, the same way that between men and Christ, we're the weaker vessel. Point being: when it's to a **BRIDE** (i.e. the Church/whole community), the implication is that it's appropriate to bring our worries, concerns, frustrations, complaints, etc. to our groom. Outside of that marital context, your male **FRIENDS** are best to be direct and tell you to "stop crying and move on."

HOW TO HANDLE IT

In light of the above, I expect women are going to complain to their husbands the same way Israel complained to God or Jesus' followers complained and grumbled at him. It's a fact of life. You have two primary options for responding:

- Pretend your wife is like a friend/man and tell her to get over it.
- Acknowledge she's a bride/woman and treat it like a comfort test.
 - "Oh, that sucks. Must be hard. I can't believe that happened. I still love you. I'm here for you. I can lead you through this."

What are the most common passages cited when Christians are frustrated/struggling and complain about it?

- "The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want"
- "The peace of God which transcends all understanding will guard your hearts and your minds in Christ Jesus"
- "Do not fear, for I am with you; do not be dismayed, for I am your God. I will strengthen you and help you; I will uphold you with my righteous right hand."
- "And we know that in all things God works for the good of those who love him, who have been called according to his purpose."
- "Come to me all you who are weary and burdened and I will give you rest."
- "God is our refuge and strength, an ever-present help in trouble."

- "Because of the Lord's great love we are not consumed, for his compassions never fail."

See the pattern? Yeah, God passes our comfort tests by showing compassion for us in the midst of the problem, but refocusing us on HIS strength and HIS love for us and HIS leadership. **That's how you pass a comfort test - show compassion for the issue and refocus her on your strength, love, and leadership rather than her perceived problem.**

IN THE REAL WORLD

My wife doesn't complain nearly as much these days as she used to. That's great. But it still happens, and I'd be concerned if it didn't. Why has it reduced? Probably because after she quit her job she's not around people in stressful contexts nearly as much. But when it does happen, instead of the annoying coworker or unreasonable boss, now it's the pushy soccer mom or the kid who treated our kid unfairly.

My gut always wants to tell her, "Nothing you can do about it. Get over it." But that's not reasonable. She's not a man and I shouldn't treat her like one. A concept that took me a while to grasp was when one of the MRP guys told me, "Women are like a steam engine. You can't stop the pressure from building. The best thing to do is to give it room to vent, and do so in ways that makes the engine work for you instead of blowing up in your face." Wow. What wise words! In fact, as part of Christ's bride, that's what I'm like when I get passionate about ministry - I've been told a few times I'm like a firehose and that I need God (or some spiritual leader) to hold me and point me in the right direction, otherwise I just end up making everything a wet mess.

When you tell a wife to "get over it" you're reinforcing the world's agenda of turning women into men (i.e. the companion agenda of turning men into women). Often-times the actual subject matter isn't actually the problem, which is why "fixing it" is rarely the solution (cue the "It's not about the nail" video). Women need to feel things. If she didn't have something to get worked up over: (a) she'd have no context to experience your strength, love, and leadership, and (b) she'd get bored, which leads to depression. This is one of the major problems with the modern world masculinizing women: undercutting their emotional expression stifles them, leading to blah-ness or feelings of failure/worthlessness when they aren't able to hold it in ... ergo, depression, anxiety, and a host of other problems many women today struggle with.

When women complain, it creates a context that elicits your ability to show her your strength, love, and leadership.

- If you don't show these things (i.e. you fail the comfort test), her emotions come from the complaint itself and are predominantly negative.
- If you do show these things (i.e. you pass the comfort test), her emotions come from your strength, love, and leadership and help you bond.

CONCLUSION

Instead of expecting your wife to hold it all in, let her cast her anxieties, frustrations, complaints, etc. on you the same way Christ lets you do for him. Does that mean you fail to set boundaries when it goes too far? No. Obviously the whole point is to give you a chance to demonstrate leadership, not door-mat-ship. Don't fall into the trap of thinking you need to control her emotions. Let her have them, but make them work for you instead of against you.

This book by Ichiro Kishimi and Fumitake Koga, based on the teachings of Alfred Adler, is probably the best work I've seen on the concept of developing frame from the ground up (although we may not fully get there in this post, as this is more foundational). The entire work is a process of deconstructing our preexisting notions of processing the world and reconstructing it from the standpoint of operating out of your own internal point of origin. Audio book is on Spotify (may require premium) and reads as a dialogue between Victim Vomit Victor and a Professor.

LIFE IS SIMPLE: I remember Rollo commenting, "If marriage is hard work, you're doing something wrong." This book extends that concept to all of life, and he's right. Imagine a 225lb bench. To many people, that's a lot. To others, it's easy. The weight isn't changing. You are, as you get stronger. If you think life is complicated, that's your fault, not life's fault.

The premise of the book focuses on **Freudian Etiology** (i.e. most modern psychology) v **Adlerian Teleology**. To explain the difference, let's look at a guy who is in a dead bedroom because he is too scared to initiate with his wife (applying the book to my own personal pre-RP experience).

- Etiology is all about cause and effect. He has been rejected by his wife numerous times. The modern psychologist would say that he has been traumatized by all of that rejection and as a result is now incapable of initiating sex, leading to his dead bedroom. Sure, other things may play in, but let's keep this simple and on him.
- Teleology is all about assigning purpose to our experiences. The man has the goal of not having sex with his wife. Wait, what?!? That's right, as absurd as it sounds. Actually having consistent sex with her breaks his mental framework for understanding the existing marriage dynamic and introduces new risks. If she suddenly began accepting his initiation - or even worse: accepting and rejecting inconsistently in ways he can't predict - that's new and scary territory, whereas living in the dead bedroom is the much preferred devil you know over the devil you don't.

In this, Adler denies the existence of trauma, saying that all past events are experiences we use for our present purposes, no matter how severe or mundane. If trauma existed in a cause-effect dynamic like modern psychology purports, we would expect everyone to have comparable reactions to comparable events. But that's definitively not true. People provably respond differently to similarly traumatic situations based on their own present purposes and frameworks for understanding life. In the above context, one person may be traumatized by constant rejection (i.e. old me), whereas another may view constant rejection as a training ground to build confidence (ergo my post: **Initiate Often, Confident Always**). You choose how to assign a purpose to the past experience, rather than it defining you. In fact, "it defining you" can't happen at all without your willful consent.

My post-RP purpose for my past rejection was to build self-confidence. But my pre-RP purpose was to use it as an excuse to stop initiating. **In neither situation did the event change. I changed.** My purpose changed, and that's what made the difference. Trauma doesn't make our lives complex. We make our lives complex. As you change, you can choose to see the simplicity of life and marriage.

EMOTIONS: Just as the past is merely a tool to further present goals, so are emotions. Consider a mother who regularly shouts at her children.

- The etiologist would argue: "You have an anger problem. This is probably brought on by something in your past that caused you to be this way, or perhaps even a genetic predisposition. It is part of your personality. But I can teach you coping mechanisms to deal with your anger."

- The teleologist would argue: "You manufactured the emotion of anger to justify your purpose of shouting. You wanted to shout because you have seen that it causes people to submit, which is what you wanted your children to do. You could choose other methods of accomplishing that goal if you believed they were equally effective."

At this, some people believe they have no choice but to react. "I didn't meant to be angry. She just did this and it set me off." Yet consider the mother getting a phone call while she is shouting at her children. She answers politely, chats for a minute, then hangs up and immediately resumes shouting. Was she really incapable of controlling her anger? No. She only used the tool in the context where she believed it appropriate, and used the tool of politeness where she believed it appropriate. In neither case was she controlled by emotional impulses.

From there, often-times when we weaponize our emotions, we might achieve the goal of momentary submission followed by "the revenge stage," where people passively aggressively (or even overtly) get back at us for compelling their submission. Socially, this looks like civil rebellion to overthrow a government. Personally, it looks like the mother's children becoming defiant, slitting their wrists, or tanking their grades as ways actually in their control which undermine her desires over them and her own public image. They now get special attention and the mother bends over backwards to address these concerns, making her submissive to them. If you respond to provocation, even if you win you may lose through inciting revenge. Better not to let yourself get worked up in the first place.

In all this, "False Freudian Etiology" tells us that our personality is bestowed upon us by nature or nurture and that we cannot change it; we can only cope and evolve it. Teleology rejects the concept of "personality" altogether and instead uses the word **LIFESTYLE**. Lifestyle is a choice. Our choices can change, and therefore we can change.

Why don't we change? Because the devil you know is better than the devil you don't. Change is scary. Even if you are unhappy, it's safer to behave the ways that are familiar to you than to choose a new and untested lifestyle and how it will affect our future finances, relationships, etc. Consistency is safe. Secure. People don't change because they prefer some discomfort and unhappiness in life in order to achieve the goal of safety and security from maintaining our current lifestyle choices.

If you are not satisfied with your life, Adler argues it is because "you lack the courage to be happy" (incidentally the title of the sequel book, which I have not yet read). If you can overcome your fear of the unknown of new lifestyles, you can change and develop any lifestyle of your choosing. Notably: lifestyle is defined by how you experience life in the context you create for yourself, not the possessions you have (more on that later).

ALL PROBLEMS ARE INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP PROBLEMS

This phrase is at the core of human experience. If no human existed, we would have no context for any mental health struggle (only physically induced ones). Even loneliness would not exist because you wouldn't know what relationships were to miss them. Yet the minute we interact with others, that is when room for problems manifests.

Everybody has an innate drive for superiority. This is caused by a healthy feeling of inferiority - when we know that we are operating at less than our best selves and choose to strive to be better. However, this becomes an inferiority *complex* when we make the alternative choice: to give up, believing that past failures will only recur. Similarly, a superiority complex evolves when one feels compelled to publicly boast of themselves or shame others, assuming that they will be recognized as superior, and if others see them this way perhaps they can believe it of themselves too.

- **Example 1: "I don't like myself."** The book references a girl who is embarrassed by her blushing problem. She likes a boy, but is afraid of blushing in front of him, so she never talks to him. She asks the psychologist to solve her blushing problem. He says, "I could, but I won't. Your blushing causes you to find peace in the midst of your dissatisfaction with your present life. If I cure it and nothing changes, you will have no other excuse for your dissatisfaction, lose your peace, and will ask me to give you your fear of blushing back, which I could not do." He suggests the solution is to learn to embrace the outcomes of our desired actions, good or bad, and move

on rather than living in fear of them (future) or letting them define us (past) [i.e. another way to say "outcome independence"].

- **Example 2: "Women don't like me."** Many men think this. The view is not actually a product of past experience. Rather, we use our past experiences as a tool to justify maintaining this attitude to meet our present goal: not pursuing women. Why is that the goal? Because one fears rejection. If you focus on your shortcomings rather than strengths, you can develop a belief that women don't like you, which justifies your lifestyle choice of not talking to them, protecting you from anticipated rejection. The problem is that you're living in the future (anticipation) and the past (pain of prior rejection) rather than the present. In this sense, people find it advantageous to not like themselves or to believe women don't like them, despite the unhappiness it causes them.

From there, all interpersonal interactions come down to whether we view others as competitors or comrades. Mental health problems evolve when we view them primarily as competitors. When our lives don't measure up to what we see in others around us, we make self-protective choices to justify the fact that we're losing **The Comparison Game** to other people. If they are comrades, we can celebrate their victories instead of taking it personally as a sign of our own inferiority.

OBJECTIVES: Adler proposes two core objectives in life: (1) *To be self-reliant*, and (2) *To live in harmony with society*. If one can accomplish these objectives, we will find peace and happiness and be free from mental health ailments. They are supported by two psychological statements: (1) "I have the ability/am enough" and (2) "People are my comrades." If we believe these two things, we are capable of accomplishing these objectives, no matter the life circumstances we are born into or what we possess. What matters is not what we are given or now possess, but how we use them to accomplish these objectives. He further breaks these two down into 3 contexts called "Life Tasks," which we have no choice in life but to confront in relational contexts on some level:

- **Tasks of Work** - Anything sustainable requires other people. Even the job of writing a novel, which seems entirely independent, requires an editor, publisher, marketing team, book stores, etc. in order to make it viable. As such, we are forced into some social context, as it is unfeasible to accomplish without others. These relationships exist only in the context of employment and stop outside the workplace. Even here, the problems are interpersonal. If a man is upset because of his poor performance review, it is not the work that upset him but the condemnation from his superior causing a feeling of inferiority via comparison.
- **Tasks of Friendship** - These are relationships outside the home and workplace. The number doesn't matter as much as the distance and depth. These are people you choose to value simply because of their existence, independent of whatever else they may contribute to your life.
- **Tasks of Love** - spouse, family, bf/gf. These are relationships involving bonds of consequence, making them difficult to break, making us more inclined to control rather than sever them. When we attempt to restrict them (i.e. mate-guarding, jealousy), it is a mindset of control, demonstrating that we view them as competitors and not comrades, undermining our ability to experience love in the relationship, leading to conjuring problems in our lives to justify our choices to control them ("I'm not a violent person, I just get so upset because I love you so much and can't bear when I see you being less than the wonderful person I know you can be"). When they behave in ways that hurt us, we must not run away; we must face it, even if we intend to cut it off regardless the outcome, otherwise we solidify a comparison (and resulting sense of inferiority or superiority) in our lives, for which we then make even more poor decisions to cope with it (unless one understands how to unravel it all).

Think of someone you dislike. Why do you dislike them? The etiological answer is, "Because of these bad qualities about them." Teleology says you have made a decision already that you did not want to be in a relationship with

them (which is not a wrong decision, the book notes), but feel bad about that choice and therefore look for things to dislike in order to justify that choice. Developing a view of others as competitors gives us an escape plan for relationships we don't want to enter into or remain in, but simultaneously hinders our relationships and forces us to remain in The Comparison Game indefinitely.

- **Example:** Wife falls in love with a man. He does a lot of weird things, but she doesn't care/notice and things are great. Months later she's not as happy as she once was. She now wants to leave the relationship. Suddenly the things she did not care about before are reasons why she wants to leave the relationship. **He did not change. She did. And these things are her excuses.**

LIFE LIE: This is when we lie to ourselves and others about our own motives in order to justify our decisions. The student in the book protests, "You don't know me or my circumstances to call me a liar and blame me for my own life circumstances!" The philosopher answers: "You're right. I don't know x, y, and z about you. I only know one thing: *That you are responsible for your own lifestyle.*"

This covers about the first 1/3 of the book material. The next 1/3 will delve heavily into the context of why a willingness to be disliked by others is essential to be free/happy in life, as the desire to be liked comes with social comparisons/expectations that are like chains which control our decisions away from what we would otherwise independently desire/process for ourselves.

This book by Ichiro Kishimi and Fumitake Koga, based on the teachings of Alfred Adler, is probably the best work I've seen on the concept of developing frame from the ground up (although we may not fully get there in this post, as this is more foundational). The entire work is a process of deconstructing our preexisting notions of processing the world and reconstructing it from the standpoint of operating out of your own internal point of origin. Audio book is on Spotify (may require premium) and reads as a dialogue between Victim Vomit Victor and a Professor.

LIFE IS SIMPLE: I remember Rollo commenting, "If marriage is hard work, you're doing something wrong." This book extends that concept to all of life, and he's right. Imagine a 225lb bench. To many people, that's a lot. To others, it's easy. The weight isn't changing. You are, as you get stronger. If you think life is complicated, that's your fault, not life's fault.

The premise of the book focuses on **Freudian Etiology** (i.e. most modern psychology) v **Adlerian Teleology**. To explain the difference, let's look at a guy who is in a dead bedroom because he is too scared to initiate with his wife (applying the book to my own personal pre-RP experience).

- Etiology is all about cause and effect. He has been rejected by his wife numerous times. The modern psychologist would say that he has been traumatized by all of that rejection and as a result is now incapable of initiating sex, leading to his dead bedroom. Sure, other things may play in, but let's keep this simple and on him.
- Teleology is all about assigning purpose to our experiences. The man has the goal of not having sex with his wife. Wait, what?!? That's right, as absurd as it sounds. Actually having consistent sex with her breaks his mental framework for understanding the existing marriage dynamic and introduces new risks. If she suddenly began accepting his initiation - or even worse: accepting and rejecting inconsistently in ways he can't predict - that's new and scary territory, whereas living in the dead bedroom is the much preferred devil you know over the devil you don't.

In this, Adler denies the existence of trauma, saying that all past events are experiences we use for our present purposes, no matter how severe or mundane. If trauma existed in a cause-effect dynamic like modern psychology purports, we would expect everyone to have comparable reactions to comparable events. But that's definitively not true. People provably respond differently to similarly traumatic situations based on their own present purposes and frameworks for understanding life. In the above context, one person may be traumatized by constant rejection (i.e. old me), whereas another may view constant rejection as a training ground to build confidence (ergo my post: **Initiate Often, Confident Always**). You choose how to assign a purpose to the past experience, rather than it defining you. In fact, "it defining you" can't happen at all without your willful consent.

My post-RP purpose for my past rejection was to build self-confidence. But my pre-RP purpose was to use it as an excuse to stop initiating. **In neither situation did the event change. I changed.** My purpose changed, and that's what made the difference. Trauma doesn't make our lives complex. We make our lives complex. As you change, you can choose to see the simplicity of life and marriage.

EMOTIONS: Just as the past is merely a tool to further present goals, so are emotions. Consider a mother who regularly shouts at her children.

- The etiologist would argue: "You have an anger problem. This is probably brought on by something in your past that caused you to be this way, or perhaps even a genetic predisposition. It is part of your personality. But I can teach you coping mechanisms to deal with your anger."

- The teleologist would argue: "You manufactured the emotion of anger to justify your purpose of shouting. You wanted to shout because you have seen that it causes people to submit, which is what you wanted your children to do. You could choose other methods of accomplishing that goal if you believed they were equally effective."

At this, some people believe they have no choice but to react. "I didn't meant to be angry. She just did this and it set me off." Yet consider the mother getting a phone call while she is shouting at her children. She answers politely, chats for a minute, then hangs up and immediately resumes shouting. Was she really incapable of controlling her anger? No. She only used the tool in the context where she believed it appropriate, and used the tool of politeness where she believed it appropriate. In neither case was she controlled by emotional impulses.

From there, often-times when we weaponize our emotions, we might achieve the goal of momentary submission followed by "the revenge stage," where people passively aggressively (or even overtly) get back at us for compelling their submission. Socially, this looks like civil rebellion to overthrow a government. Personally, it looks like the mother's children becoming defiant, slitting their wrists, or tanking their grades as ways actually in their control which undermine her desires over them and her own public image. They now get special attention and the mother bends over backwards to address these concerns, making her submissive to them. If you respond to provocation, even if you win you may lose through inciting revenge. Better not to let yourself get worked up in the first place.

In all this, "False Freudian Etiology" tells us that our personality is bestowed upon us by nature or nurture and that we cannot change it; we can only cope and evolve it. Teleology rejects the concept of "personality" altogether and instead uses the word **LIFESTYLE**. Lifestyle is a choice. Our choices can change, and therefore we can change.

Why don't we change? Because the devil you know is better than the devil you don't. Change is scary. Even if you are unhappy, it's safer to behave the ways that are familiar to you than to choose a new and untested lifestyle and how it will affect our future finances, relationships, etc. Consistency is safe. Secure. People don't change because they prefer some discomfort and unhappiness in life in order to achieve the goal of safety and security from maintaining our current lifestyle choices.

If you are not satisfied with your life, Adler argues it is because "you lack the courage to be happy" (incidentally the title of the sequel book, which I have not yet read). If you can overcome your fear of the unknown of new lifestyles, you can change and develop any lifestyle of your choosing. Notably: lifestyle is defined by how you experience life in the context you create for yourself, not the possessions you have (more on that later).

ALL PROBLEMS ARE INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP PROBLEMS

This phrase is at the core of human experience. If no human existed, we would have no context for any mental health struggle (only physically induced ones). Even loneliness would not exist because you wouldn't know what relationships were to miss them. Yet the minute we interact with others, that is when room for problems manifests.

Everybody has an innate drive for superiority. This is caused by a healthy feeling of inferiority - when we know that we are operating at less than our best selves and choose to strive to be better. However, this becomes an inferiority *complex* when we make the alternative choice: to give up, believing that past failures will only recur. Similarly, a superiority complex evolves when one feels compelled to publicly boast of themselves or shame others, assuming that they will be recognized as superior, and if others see them this way perhaps they can believe it of themselves too.

- **Example 1: "I don't like myself."** The book references a girl who is embarrassed by her blushing problem. She likes a boy, but is afraid of blushing in front of him, so she never talks to him. She asks the psychologist to solve her blushing problem. He says, "I could, but I won't. Your blushing causes you to find peace in the midst of your dissatisfaction with your present life. If I cure it and nothing changes, you will have no other excuse for your dissatisfaction, lose your peace, and will ask me to give you your fear of blushing back, which I could not do." He suggests the solution is to learn to embrace the outcomes of our desired actions, good or bad, and move

on rather than living in fear of them (future) or letting them define us (past) [i.e. another way to say "outcome independence"].

- **Example 2: "Women don't like me."** Many men think this. The view is not actually a product of past experience. Rather, we use our past experiences as a tool to justify maintaining this attitude to meet our present goal: not pursuing women. Why is that the goal? Because one fears rejection. If you focus on your shortcomings rather than strengths, you can develop a belief that women don't like you, which justifies your lifestyle choice of not talking to them, protecting you from anticipated rejection. The problem is that you're living in the future (anticipation) and the past (pain of prior rejection) rather than the present. In this sense, people find it advantageous to not like themselves or to believe women don't like them, despite the unhappiness it causes them.

From there, all interpersonal interactions come down to whether we view others as competitors or comrades. Mental health problems evolve when we view them primarily as competitors. When our lives don't measure up to what we see in others around us, we make self-protective choices to justify the fact that we're losing **The Comparison Game** to other people. If they are comrades, we can celebrate their victories instead of taking it personally as a sign of our own inferiority.

OBJECTIVES: Adler proposes two core objectives in life: (1) *To be self-reliant*, and (2) *To live in harmony with society*. If one can accomplish these objectives, we will find peace and happiness and be free from mental health ailments. They are supported by two psychological statements: (1) "I have the ability/am enough" and (2) "People are my comrades." If we believe these two things, we are capable of accomplishing these objectives, no matter the life circumstances we are born into or what we possess. What matters is not what we are given or now possess, but how we use them to accomplish these objectives. He further breaks these two down into 3 contexts called "Life Tasks," which we have no choice in life but to confront in relational contexts on some level:

- **Tasks of Work** - Anything sustainable requires other people. Even the job of writing a novel, which seems entirely independent, requires an editor, publisher, marketing team, book stores, etc. in order to make it viable. As such, we are forced into some social context, as it is unfeasible to accomplish without others. These relationships exist only in the context of employment and stop outside the workplace. Even here, the problems are interpersonal. If a man is upset because of his poor performance review, it is not the work that upset him but the condemnation from his superior causing a feeling of inferiority via comparison.
- **Tasks of Friendship** - These are relationships outside the home and workplace. The number doesn't matter as much as the distance and depth. These are people you choose to value simply because of their existence, independent of whatever else they may contribute to your life.
- **Tasks of Love** - spouse, family, bf/gf. These are relationships involving bonds of consequence, making them difficult to break, making us more inclined to control rather than sever them. When we attempt to restrict them (i.e. mate-guarding, jealousy), it is a mindset of control, demonstrating that we view them as competitors and not comrades, undermining our ability to experience love in the relationship, leading to conjuring problems in our lives to justify our choices to control them ("I'm not a violent person, I just get so upset because I love you so much and can't bear when I see you being less than the wonderful person I know you can be"). When they behave in ways that hurt us, we must not run away; we must face it, even if we intend to cut it off regardless the outcome, otherwise we solidify a comparison (and resulting sense of inferiority or superiority) in our lives, for which we then make even more poor decisions to cope with it (unless one understands how to unravel it all).

Think of someone you dislike. Why do you dislike them? The etiological answer is, "Because of these bad qualities about them." Teleology says you have made a decision already that you did not want to be in a relationship with

them (which is not a wrong decision, the book notes), but feel bad about that choice and therefore look for things to dislike in order to justify that choice. Developing a view of others as competitors gives us an escape plan for relationships we don't want to enter into or remain in, but simultaneously hinders our relationships and forces us to remain in The Comparison Game indefinitely.

- **Example:** Wife falls in love with a man. He does a lot of weird things, but she doesn't care/notice and things are great. Months later she's not as happy as she once was. She now wants to leave the relationship. Suddenly the things she did not care about before are reasons why she wants to leave the relationship. **He did not change. She did. And these things are her excuses.**

LIFE LIE: This is when we lie to ourselves and others about our own motives in order to justify our decisions. The student in the book protests, "You don't know me or my circumstances to call me a liar and blame me for my own life circumstances!" The philosopher answers: "You're right. I don't know x, y, and z about you. I only know one thing: *That you are responsible for your own lifestyle.*"

This covers about the first 1/3 of the book material. The next 1/3 will delve heavily into the context of why a willingness to be disliked by others is essential to be free/happy in life, as the desire to be liked comes with social comparisons/expectations that are like chains which control our decisions away from what we would otherwise independently desire/process for ourselves.

COMMENTS

Good Enough?

78 upvotes · 23 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

And this is where the upper-levels of dread backfire. The more you dread, the more you see the green grass on the other side.

Fact: **Spinning plates will always give you greater sexual pleasure than monogamy**

- It's often said: "If she's not having sex with you, you're just great roommates. Therefore, sex is what defines the marriage." Fair enough.
- **But the other extreme is also true: If you can have a better sex life by remaining single and spinning plates, the marriage must be about more than sex.**

Why did you marry her in the first place? My hope is that it's more than just, "She was hot and I wanted to tap that every day." If your answer is "because I was a beta turd at the time and didn't know any better; I wouldn't have married her if I knew all this stuff back then," so be it. You married for the wrong reasons and now realize you could have gotten what you were looking for in marriage without getting married. If there's something deeper going on (and I hope there is), do some soul searching, find out what it is, and rediscover your passion, not just your libido.

For many men, marriage becomes almost exclusively about sex. Why? Because they've been starved for so long that it's all they can think about. At a psychological level their perception of what's important shifts. It's like someone living in a third world country during a famine. Most of their day is just doing whatever they can to get some food to survive. Life has a heck of a lot more to it that can really give joy, pleasure, purpose, excitement, etc. than just the thrill of finding moldy bread to eat. But when a random missionary comes by with a bowl of soup, man that's like heaven - it reaffirms the misperception they developed that good food is the epitome of life.

In marriage, many men have been starved of a satisfying sex life - even when they get it, it's not the sex they want. So, they forget that there are other reasons why they wanted to get married to someone in the first place, always thinking of sex instead. If you're legitimately starved, that's fine. But you're not starved anymore. You've got a burger and fries on the table every day and you're upset that it's not filet mignon. What you really need to be doing is leave the restaurant and learn to go bowling or to see a movie. To cut the metaphor: go back to finding things to enjoy with your wife that aren't just about sex.

And STOP cheating on her. That's killing your motivation to keep leading your wife toward where you want her. You could brain-fap all the stuff these girls are doing to you; you don't need them actually doing it to you to know that's what you want or that you'd enjoy getting your fantasy played out. When you're getting that fantasy met through other people, you lose the internal imperative to experience that with your wife. Whenever an internal imperative is lost in a marriage, it is replaced with resentment. That's not very productive.

Now, these other girls are giving you filet mignon because that's what their body agenda tells them they need to do to lock you down (even if it's not conscious). If you were to marry one of them, you're going to start getting a burger and fries a lot more often. Sure, they'll still cook filet mignon every now and then, but that kind of meal is really expensive and not sustainable to have every single day. At the same time, your wife might not know how to cook filet mignon and if you've never asked her for it, she might never bother to learn how to make it. So, tell her you want it and teach her.

If she says, "I'm vegetarian. I don't eat meat, especially if I have to crawl on the floor to cook it," then warm her up to it. I'm still in that process myself, but I have noticed that starting small and working up has made some progress. For ages, my wife was a "missionary or cowgirl, no exceptions" person. Starfish must have been an exciting new position for her. Cue the blindfold. Then some food. Add in handcuffs. Rope. We're still working

our way ... but I really couldn't expect her to just go wild without me leading her in it. That's your job, not hers. You want her crawling on the floor? You're responsible for it. But be patient. No one knows how to cook the perfect filet mignon without first learning how to turn on the grill, sear the meat, mix seasonings, butter-fry, etc. Maybe when she finally takes a bit she'll find she likes it. If not? Oh well, as long as it's still on the menu.

My wife is interested in a threesome, results or regret?

54 upvotes · 18 April 2019 · /r/askMRP

I had a client who started doing threesomes with his wife - both ffm and fmm. She used it as a chance to vet other guys. Guess what happened: she met another guy. What did the idiot think would happen?

I told that story to a buddy. He replied, "Nah, I'd only ever agree to ffm." Sure enough, *We've been doing it your way a few times now. I want to try it with another guy now.* He says no. Over. And over. And over again.

That's okay, I'll just keep on the lookout in case you change your mind. He never changed his mind. She looked anyway, then divorced him when she found the right guy.

"You shouldn't be looking," he often told her. "It's never going to happen," he said. *Hey, if you're allowed to look, I'm allowed to look.*

Why would you ever want to invite that risk? I suppose if you're divorce proof, go for it. Otherwise, I've never known a relationship where it worked out well. I have known at least half a dozen where it ended in divorce. Yay, more money for me.

Teenage Daughter Wants to Spend Time with Friends During my Parenting Time

44 upvotes · 4 October 2019 · /r/askMRP

It's literally my job to figure this stuff out. Legal issues aside, though, here's the practical way to win the fight without dealing with legal technicalities.

1. This is a fact of life, not just your ex's influence. Deal with it. You do have amused mastery and OI, right?
2. Make your house the central hub. Repeatedly offer for her to have friends over during your time. You triple down on the relationship with her, the supervision/oversight in her life, and don't lose your time. Also, she becomes the popular girl, if you know how to host a teenage party. You are a charismatic, conversationally talented man, right?
3. You know about hot moms? Girls do the same thing about each other's dads. Be the hot dad. This will make the other girls want to come over, making the plan feasible. Your daughter will pretend to be embarrassed, but secretly LOVE the popularity you bring her. Hypergamy, right? Let her leech off of your awesomeness like every other woman wants to. You do lift and dress well, right?
4. When you go to the mall, out to eat, to an amusement park, on vacation, etc. have her invite a friend to join you. Then gab it up with them like you're used to being in with the popular kids. You are a socially relevant, high value man, right?

Look. Your daughter was in your frame. Now she's leaving. That's part of life. It will happen no matter what, eventually. But you can control the phase out much better if you invite her friends into your frame instead.

DO NOT do this in response to one of her requests. "How about instead of you going over there, you invite them here?" is a tactless way of telling her she's winning and you're compromising. You be the one to come up with the idea and initiate. Make it part of your regular plans. "I have to go to the mall to buy a doohickey this weekend. You should invite Jenna and pick out a new top while we're out. Tell her dinner's on me."

If you want the legal angle, just ask. But I promise this relational strategy will be far more effective than anything

you could do in court.

A movement?

42 upvotes · 28 February 2018 · /r/TheRedPill

There's a general process for how this always plays out:

1. Visionary: A visionary rises up
2. Growth: People like what he has to say and follow his vision
3. Organization: The followers must organize lest the vision be lost in the growth
4. Institutionalization: The vision gets lost in the growth; people care more about the institution and "movement" than they do about the original vision on which it was founded
5. Recycle: Someone rejects the institutionalization and starts the process all over again as a new visionary; the institution often back-pedals to the original vision to keep from losing members to the new visionary, but because their reason for doing so is not the vision itself, but to keep the institution alive, it doesn't do any actual good

What [/u/Triadus3](#) (OP) is referencing is the fact that RP has organized (hence having a sub with moderators who police the content), but it has not institutionalized and hopes that it never will. Institutionalization is what killed first wave feminism and brought about a new visionary to start the second wave; which then institutionalized and died and a new visionary brought about the third wave, and so on - each more ridiculous and culturally damaging than the last.

By avoiding institutionalization and remaining at an organizational level, RP will not only continue to survive, but it will thrive and bring in by a natural grass-roots method something that would otherwise die if institutionalization had its way. That is, the focus isn't advancing "RP" as a concept - it must always be on the principles that founded RP in the first place.

Sex workers say they have been left out of Canada's COVID-19 response

39 upvotes · 20 April 2020 · /r/WhereAreAllTheGoodMen

I get the tax issue at play here - you don't pay into taxes, why should you get the benefit of them?

But there's something bigger: **The article says sex work there is still ILLEGAL** - that the women are protected from prosecution, but not arrest; yet the men who buy it are fully open to prosecution. In other words, SOMEONE (a man) has to **break the law** and risk going to jail for them to get money from their "job."

They're now complaining that their 100% ILLEGAL income stream is gone and the government should replace the money they were illegally acquiring until they go right back to working their job to get money in a way that makes them immune to prosecution, but the men have to risk having a criminal record.

Why not write up an article on how drug dealers and assassins are struggling and the government should pony up to pay their bills until they can resume dealing and killing again? Oh, and let's say that only the people who buy the drugs or hire the killer can be prosecuted, but the dealer and assassin get off Scott free once the arrest term ends. That sounds fair, right? Am I missing something here?

Now, if Canada is anything like many American states, the immunity from prosecution for sex workers should be relatively limited to those who were sold/forced into that line of work and not someone who voluntarily decides to make a buck off of it. But my legal expertise is limited to American law.

I thought you guys would enjoy this, seeing as it's the weekend and all. It pretty much sums it

all up.

39 upvotes · 3 August 2019 · /r/WhereAreAllTheGoodMen

My dad described this mentality to me once a couple decades ago: "Does he have money and can I bear to look at his face for a few years?"

Girl In My Friend Group Keeps Talking About Threesome w/ Her Fiance and I Don't Think Its A Smart Idea

38 upvotes · 27 July 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

Practicing divorce law, my perception may be a little skewed, but my experience observing other couples says that open marriages or inviting threesomes will *pretty much always* result in a divorce. Why?

- It subliminally (if not consciously) communicates to your partner that one-on-one sex *with him/her* isn't satisfying. So, what happens when options for threesomes aren't available? The subliminal message is that neither of you will be happy with your sex life.
- Feelings of jealousy *always* fester, as it's impossible to balance attention perfectly.
- **The Comparison Game** in FFM situations and hypergamy in FMM situations will totally screw with the girl's mind.
- You're essentially opening the door to your partner having an affair, testing the waters with someone new, with your approval.
- You desensitize your partner to the idea of having sex with other people so that cheating seems more of an expectation than a thing to be avoided.

Tons more ... out of time.

It finally happened to me- I'm being falsely accused of rape.

37 upvotes · 17 July 2017 · /r/askTRP

Lawyer here. I can't speak to every state's laws, but the best thing you can do is actually to establish an ongoing relationship with her, including additional acts of consensual sexual activity.

This is where something like fogging can really move in your favor. Agree with her about the times she said you didn't know how to please a woman, to the extent that you were obviously not successful when you tried. Tell her that you'd like to get to know her better, to understand what turns her on and her wants and desires, and that maybe after the relationship develops a bit you could get a second chance to prove yourself.

In reality, the best defense to a rape accusation is to show an ongoing pattern of consensual sexual activity. So, if you can get her to sleep with you again, numerous times even, she's going to have a really hard time arguing to a judge that the first time was rape but then she decided to come back anyway. It doesn't make logical sense. No jury will buy into that. Of course, this method requires you to be extremely delicate and cautious. If you can't pull it off or you think she might be counter-manipulating you in order to build a case for herself, don't try this.

If you don't think you can pull off the above, your best bet is to go with the standard preparation. That usually means documenting communications, ensuring all communications are through text message, or if you have to do it by phone that you get an app that will record your phone calls. You're also going to want to start telling your version of the story to two witnesses. Although this is hearsay, it can occasionally be helpful behind the scenes, such as if a prosecutor were to talk to the witnesses and they back up your story with the fact that you told them contemporaneously with the events the same thing that you're telling the prosecutor at the time of hearing, the prosecutor might have more leniency and willingness to believe you because your story has not changed from then till now. I would also journal your version of events so that you have it in writing, with a date on that journal,

so that you have additional documentation that you our story has not changed since the time of the events.

If you are very clever and crafty with your wordplay, it might even be good initiating conversation with her in a way that you can record her acknowledging that there was no actual rape. However, many people are not as clever as they think.

If you really want to go extreme, I had one case where my client called the police in advance and told them that his crazy wife would probably be contacting them and filing false allegations. Then, when the police actually were called by her, they immediately treated the matter with skepticism. A forensic psychologist was eventually appointed on the case, who was very, very persuaded in my client's favor by the fact that he had so much confidence in his position that he was willing to contact the police preemptively about the matter. In addition, both the judge and the guardian ad litem were heavily persuaded by this fact, and all of the accusations were thrown out. That said, I've only tried this tactic one time, so take it at your own risk.

Question about my youth group

35 upvotes · 27 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Your story is very inconsistent in the comments and you come off as very whiny. Worry less about what he thinks and does and fix your whininess and ability to self-evaluate.

We're here to help YOU get your life figured out. Not to be your source of emotional validation when someone doesn't do things your way. Yes, the mainstream church is blue pill. That's a fact of life. Deal with it and work toward changing it.

Questions about RPW beliefs from a newcomer

33 upvotes · 26 July 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

ONE

- **Submissive:** Attitude of the heart that you're there to help your man. He sets the vision, you latch on and help make it happen. It does not mean strict obedience, but it does mean that his vision for the family takes priority over yours whenever there is a conflict. Once you understand his vision, you have free reign to move things in the right direction without him telling you what to do all the time, unless he reigns you in.
- **Doormat:** Strict obedience to everything he says, abandoning all sense of self and personal identity, developing absolute dependency on him for your physical and emotional needs.

TWO

- **Requests/Reminders:** You mentioning things when nothing else needs to be done.
- **Nagging:** You mentioning things when he has other pressing issues that require attention. Sometimes "I need a break!!!" is a pressing issue for him. Accept that and let him rest every now and then, particularly from when he gets home from work until dinner's over, or between two tasks. Never ask while he's actively doing something else, as that tells him: "What you're doing isn't enough. I don't even care about that, I really want you doing this." Even if you don't mean it that way, that's how it's often interpreted.

THREE

Your question presumes marriages are meant to be equal 50-50 partnerships. That's not an RP idea, so you'll have to get that out of your head. There are times when it will have that appearance; there are times when he'll have more of the burden; and there are times when you will. Does it ever perfectly balance out? Probably not.

Women tend to do most of the housemaking because they care more about it. I have a standard of cleanliness in my home that I find acceptable. Let's say it's a 7/10. My wife's standard is a 9/10. I do about 50% of the work to make it a 7/10. If she wants to go above that level to have it meet her standard, she understands that's on her because now she's doing something that only she experiences the benefit of. I experience no additional enjoyment out of my home when the floor is vacuumed 4 times a week as opposed to once/wk. I honestly cannot see the difference. I think she's wasting her time. But it makes her happy, so I let her do it. On the flip, while she's doing those extra things, I'm taking the kids out of her hair, usually bringing them to the gym with me, going swimming, going on a walk/jog, etc. This is a different kind of work. I'm not saying she doesn't value her time with the kids, but she certainly places a distinct value on having alone time without them around, and caring for them is a duty that is a high priority for me. So, I'm still taking some responsibility off her plate to do something I value (being with my kids) so she has time to do something she values (raising the cleanliness standard from 7 to 9). This works well for us despite the fact that we both work full-time jobs.

FOUR

The homemaking aspect is going to be there no matter what. One way or another, the house has to be cleaned, dishes need washed, laundry needs done, deck needs stained, walls need painted, that annoying chair needs WD40, etc. There is no option of not being a homemaker. If you don't do it, your husband has to do all of it. Per the above, the degree to which you balance the responsibilities is up to you and your SO. As a RP woman, though, your job is to follow his lead when he's setting out those priorities. If he's a nominally intelligent man, he will understand that your career and financial contribution to the family is one of those responsibilities. But if you put your own vision and dreams above the direction he's leading you, you've got to re-prioritize or tell him ASAP that he's not someone you can submit to and you'll have to go your own way. Stringing him along, constantly battling against him because your dreams are more important than living in a healthy, functional relationship will only make you both miserable.

FIVE

Trusting someone to lead doesn't mean zipping your lip and letting them do whatever you want. As a Star Trek fan, I look at it like a Kirk/Spock dynamic. Kirk is a little (okay, a lot) brash and makes impulsive decisions that seem right in the moment. He goes almost entirely on instinct and experience. Spock is a lot smarter than Kirk and usually comes up with the far more logical plan. In that dynamic we notice three key things:

- Spock always speaks his mind. He will tell Kirk when he thinks Kirk is making a mistake, and will often be unusually emphatic about it for a Vulcan, who isn't supposed to express any emotion.
- Despite being open and emphatic, he always accepts Kirk's plan regardless of the outcome. Sometimes Kirk accepts Spock's advice and commends him for sharing it; other times he rejects it and goes with his gut.
- Although Spock knows he's smarter than Kirk, he realizes that Kirk has separate insights that he and other Vulcans simply don't have and can't understand (usually a "gut feeling"). As a result, Spock rarely views Kirk in a condescending manner, and in the few times he does he always realizes it was a mistake to feel that way or have that perception.

Those three things are submission, in a nutshell. To answer your question, you can't "always trust a man to lead," especially at the start. But as you continue to give him your wisdom and insight and submit to his path anyway, one victory after the next will show you a pattern of living that you can really get behind. If he's really a total idiot with money and makes no victories and just squanders everything, then ask yourself why you're with him. A man like that might have money now, but if he's a garbage leader, he could very well squander all that money and you'll find yourself 55 years old getting a divorce because he blames you for all of his problems, and you've got no retirement to look forward to. As a divorce attorney, I see this happen constantly.

To put it more clearly and in a more RP way: If your man is a garbage leader, he's a garbage alpha. You might be

attracted to him now because of reasons, but those reasons will not last when you get married and he never steps up to the plate. Vet him hard for his vision and leadership and decide fast if he's the kind of guy you believe you can follow. If not, find someone who is, even if it means a lower financial standard of living. You'll be much happier with less stuff and a great guy than with more stuff and a trash leader who expects you to sleep with him all the time.

[FR] STFU, just STFU

32 upvotes · 15 May 2018 · /r/askMRP

Less is more. In these types of arguments, the reason NI is one of my favorite WISNIFG tactics is because it's a lot like a cross-examination in court. It's a guaranteed way to avoid DEERing because you never make an argument yourself - you let the other person do it for you. I follow what's known as the *Pozner Cross*, which is summarized pretty well [here](#).

Here's how this plays out in a marriage:

1. **Be Brief.** This isn't about getting all your feels on the table. It's about bringing closure to a conflict. You can get your feels out in the bedroom.
2. **Be Selective.** Pick your battles. If her position isn't hurting your interests, no sense fighting against it. Or if your position won't benefit from asking the question or making a statement, don't do it.
3. **Use Plain Words.** Don't try to be Einstein. If she doesn't understand what you're asking, she'll start asking you questions back which makes you lose control in the argument.
4. **Ask Only Leading Questions.** Never ask an open-ended question, only yes-or-no questions. In WISNIFG's NI terms, instead of asking "Why is it bad that I ___?" *you switch it to, "Is bad to ___?"* It cuts off her and shows that the conclusion matters more than the hamstering or excuses to try to get around the conclusion.
5. **Never ask a question you don't already know the answer to.** Asking questions to discover answers implies there might be unknown legitimacy to what she's saying. If you're in discovery mode, go for it. In a conflict, you're not trying to discover new information - you're trying to put the matter to rest.
6. **Listen to the Answer.** You know where you want the conversation to end. But she might say something that helps you get there faster. Pay attention to visual cues as well, as I often find that my wife doesn't even believe what she's saying, she just wants to argue a point so she doesn't feel like a total idiot for being wrong. Let her make her point and fog with any validity in it, but go back to your broken record and negative inquiry.
7. **Do Not Quarrel.** Basically no DEERing or tit for tat exchanges. Even more important: **No editorializations.** Editorializations are opinions that comment on a position. If she makes a dumb argument, don't call it a dumb argument. That's just your opinion and obviously not hers. Don't do that. There's very little room for adjectives in conflict.
8. **Do Not Permit the Witness to Explain.** This is kind of the whole point of the Pozner cross. The stereotypical example is a string of questions: "It was dark out, right? There were no street lights? You didn't have a flash light? You didn't even have your phone with you?" Then stop. Because inevitably every young attorney wants to ask the next question, "So how could you see what happened?" And the answer will come blaring through: "Because it was a bright full moon and I had full vision." I've often found that if I ask my wife pointed questions about what she's saying without giving her a chance to provide her own explanation, she eventually gives up on her explanation before she even gives it. The matter is over and I've won her respect because she sees that I know what I'm talking about, but I didn't force my opinion on her - I just asked her questions to get to the bottom of the best conclusion. Of course, if she is right, then there's no conflict in the first place. Why would I fight against what I know is right?

9. **Do not ask the witness to repeat the testimony given on direct.** This is all that, "Didn't you just say ___?" *nonsense that people love to use. You don't ask them what they said. You tell them what they said, "Just a bit ago you said __. Just now you said __.* Am I correct in understanding that you changed your mind?" This isn't accusing her of being contradictory - it's giving her an out to take whichever option you want her to take and not look like an idiot for doing so. Again, the best strategy for resolving conflict isn't to win an argument; it's to make the other side think there's no point in arguing anyway because your way was always going to be the right way and they're the good guy for finally realizing it. I've actually settled cases mid-trial because of cross-examination like this.

10. **Limit Questioning.** Covered above.

11. **Save the Explanation for Summation.** In law, this functions as, "Don't explain yourself until closing arguments." In marriage, since you're the judge and not the attorney, it translates simply to, "Don't explain yourself at all." You just say, "Thanks for all of your insights. I appreciate what you've said. Here's what we're going to do going forward ..."

Of course, the major difference between marriage conflict and court conflict is that if done correctly your wife won't feel like she's being cross-examined. Court is adversarial. Conflict within a marriage should take away the adversarial feeling. If one takes on the frame of "judge" in those moments (per one of my past MRP posts), it's not "me against you" - it's "I respect your authority, am making a request, and am happy to answer any questions that will help you make a wise and informed decision."

If you can elicit that attitude, you can do no wrong. If you agree she is right, then you are humble enough to account for the insights of your helper. If you go your own way, then you're a strong man who knows how to say no to get what he wants. That's a win-win.

More Whining about Sex Robots from the Gynocracy- They are Starting to realize that bitchy, sex denying harpy's can't compete. Time for shaming!

32 upvotes · 5 July 2017 · /r/TheRedPill

Many a psychologist has suggested that horror movies are merely a way for us to release our murderous rage, but in a more sophisticated and detached way than buying a ticket to the Roman colosseum or smashing in another caveman's head. This isn't the first or last time this logic has come up. Sometimes it's healthy, sometimes it's not.

Redpilled Christian marriage and pregnancy-bodies

31 upvotes · 18 December 2020 · /r/RPChristians

"Charm is deceptive and beauty is fleeting," brother. From what it sounds like, your problem isn't keeping your dick wet - it's getting it hard at all. You want to get hard? Abandon your faith to watch porn and hook up with randos ... if that's your priority.

But if your priority is your commitment to God and raising a united household for the large family that YOU want to have, you're just going to have to deal with it.

I'd think with 6+ years in the red pill, you'd have learned stoicism by now. It's the art of maintaining frame - and possibly even enjoying life - in the midst of unpleasant or even torturous circumstances. Your question is like asking, "Guys, I signed up for the army and I love hanging out at base camp with the boys and target shooting, but when we actually had to go to war like we signed up to do, the whole thing kind of sucked and I know that's what I really want to get out of it, but I hate getting shot at. What should I do?" You deal with it because that's what you signed up for. There's no magic wand "abra cadabra" and *poof* it's all better now.

Remember: the purpose of marriage isn't to make you horny; it's to make spiritual offspring. If you signed up to the wedding for a different purpose, that's on you. If you're getting what you signed up for, learn to deal with it

when accomplishing that goal goes through times of lackluster.

I suppose you could try hypnoses too. Good luck.

How do I let go of my slutty past?

30 upvotes · 4 March 2019 · /r/RedPillWomen

This would be a great post for [r/RPChristians](#). I'd answer here, but I don't know how open this sub's mods are to comments that are predominantly biblical in nature.

Does this sub find it a good idea to wait until marriage?

30 upvotes · 26 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

This sub's official stance is that sex outside of marriage is sin. There is a [post on the sidebar](#) that specifically goes into this.

While we recognize that having many sexual partners can increase attraction, as the secular subs have found, it is almost never a necessary tool in order to have a fantastic sex life in marriage. Even on a pragmatic, non-spiritual level, it's important to recognize that a man should have a higher goal than the women he pursues, and sex outside of marriage and multiple sexual partners can, especially for Christians, be counter-productive toward those goals, even while having positive effects on attraction as a whole.

You get shamed for rejecting slutty girls because our culture glorifies women and believes that you should always love every woman and find her beautiful and attractive and value her no matter what negative character traits and attributes they have. Men who believe otherwise are deemed "toxic" and radical extremists or alt right misogynists. It's an unfortunate fact of life nowadays.

Nikola Tesla explains why he never married.

29 upvotes · 24 August 2017 · /r/TheRedPill

The tendency of women to push aside man

and

Then [God] said to the woman ... "You will desire to control your husband" (Genesis 3:16)

God totally called that one.

A letter my Fiance wrote me after I began implementing the red pill threatening to leave?

28 upvotes · 6 October 2020 · /r/askMRP

A Tyler engaged to a Taylor? Look at me gushing over the cuteness.

Where is your frame, brother? This isn't "partially operating in her frame." Literally 95% of your post is you telling us what she said rather than what you're doing. You want us to write a reply that you can copy and paste to her or something? I suppose I can give it a shot:

*Dear Taylor,

Thanks for your letter. It was cute, and I understand what you're saying. I'm going to the gym with a couple guys tomorrow at 6, then have some ideas for a good time afterward. Wanna join?

Tyler

For real: let's assume she's accurately reporting events. After all, you had a few comments throughout, but never denied the facts of what she's saying. Those facts paint you out to be a cold, rigid, idiot. I wrote [this post](#) for guys like you. Consider:

I am so glad that you tell me ... to be less irrational and emotional you are helping me to be a better person

You're trying to turn her into a dude? Funny enough, she equates this with being a "better person," but I'll let the MGTOWs have the commentary on that. She's a woman. Yeah, you can tone her down every now and then, but learn to love femininity for what it is. Embrace AWALT because, whether you like it or not, AWALT.

you tell me you wouldn't love me me if I gained weight

Idiot. You think this is how a guy with a good frame would handle this conversation? That somehow telling her blunt, insensitive reality is the "red pill thing to do"? Just like you're trying to manipulate her emotional sensitivities, here you're trying to manipulate her chances of gaining weight in the future. Yes, you can influence her and set boundaries. No, it's not wise to do so by threats of not loving her. Oak. You read posts on being the oak yet? You can't *only* show strength. You must *also* be a source of comfort, protection, peace, etc. If you can't learn to balance these two, your marriage will fall apart anyway.

you attached conditions to your love

Don't do that unless you're ready to blow things up. You attach conditions to your time and attention. The reality is that they're, for practical purposes, one and the same (especially in a biblical sense). But you're both operating with such screwed up definitions of "love" that what you mean isn't at all what she's hearing. In fact, I'd wager that the word "love" in these conversations has an amorphous, vague disembodiment that doesn't actually mean *anything at all* when you say it, other than generic sentiments that one can only grasp in an intangible, ethereal context without pragmatic application. Nevertheless, the word itself has a great deal of sentiment to her, however impracticable it has become in being understood during your conversations. Vague notions of her getting your "love" should be a carrot, not the stick. Your time and attention are the stick. In reality (biblically), that IS your love, but she doesn't need to know that. Instead, you're communicating in more practical ways that communicate what you really mean without violating her ability to get feels from you.

I know you don't like to sugar coat things but why make the medicine more bitter that it has to be?

By George, I think she's right. This is part of the evidence that your frame sucks. Instead of handling pain and difficulty in a fun, positive attitude, you seem to be acting cold and stiff, like a corpse. Yeah, corpses have a strong frame. Good luck ever getting a rise out of them (except Jesus, of course; he rose). But nobody wants to hang around a corpse, no matter how emotionally stable they are.

I get the impression that your frame is like a titanium fortress guarded by sentry guns and barbed wire. It's overkill. I mean, it's fine if you actually let someone inside, but she's basically saying, "Why would I actually want to be in your frame?" Her entire letter boils down to that simple question. That's what she's asking you.

My belief is that she pair bonded with you, then realized you're not a very fun person. She doesn't actually enjoy being with you; she just enjoys the feelings generated by having a guy like her. You jeopardized those feelings by acting cold in the way you approached communicating your boundaries and she's starting to realize that in the absence of her feels, she may not "love" (whatever that means to her) you after all.

- If you're cool with that, let her go.
- If she adds value to your life and you want her around, fix your frame.

In fact, if you want *any* girl to stick around you for any appreciable length of time, do the latter.

It is not un-masculine to ask rather than to order me

The fact that she uses the word "masculine" at all tells me she's clued in to the fact that you talk to her about being masculine. I haven't met many women who instantly assume a guy does something because he wants to be more masculine. In fact, girls go to great lengths to deceive themselves into believing guys AREN'T faking their way into masculinity. So have you spilled the beans about fight club? Are you telling her all your action steps for being a "more masculine guy"?

The impression I get here is that you've told her *some* of your thoughts on masculinity that you've been learning, and she gets the hint: "He wants to be a masculine man," and is now extrapolating it to this area. You'll fervently deny ever telling her: "Masculine men don't ask, they give orders," and I'm sure you didn't. But somehow you've screwed up in your head that this is true anyway - and she realizes it because girls see through that crap.

But again, this is all a frame issue. Do you want your frame to be the bossy guy or the guy that she and others enjoy being around? Figure that out first. Then figure out how you can get your way within your own frame.

- **Wrong Conclusion:** "It's not enjoyable when your behaviors have to be corrected, so if I want others to desire hanging out with me I have to give up my expectations over them." Idiocy.
- **Right Conclusion:** "I need to find ways of communicating my expectations to others without compromising the way I express myself and the image I want to project to the world."

This is why the red pill community has come up with tactics like AA, AM, cocky-funny, pressure-flip, push-pull, etc. They are all strategies for setting and enforcing boundaries and dealing with emotionally sensitive situations in a way that conveys what you really think, but without breaking frame to do it.

- Her: Will you love me if I gain weight?
- You: No. I will stop loving you if that happens.
- Dull (but for some reason recommended at times?): I do not love women who do not take care of their bodies.
- AA: I thought for sure you'd noticed the way I ogle all those whales on the street. I can't stop dreaming about the way my hands will melt into your folds like butter.
- AM: Aw, look at you getting all worried about our future together. You just keep following my lead and we'll never have to worry about silly things like that.
- Pressure Flip: [Pull up shirt; make her feel your abs/pecs] Would your panties still get wet if these were hidden by blobs of fat?
- Fogging/NI: I know how you're feeling. And we both know that's a difficult topic without easy answers. What prompted the question? Is there anything that's bringing out this insecurity right now?
- Push/Pull: Of course I'd love you. Nothing would ever stop that, honey. [pull] ... and I'd reminisce fondly about our love while screwing my hot, skinny second wife [push]

See all the better ways to handle this question? Some are serious. Others are funny. Still others show the absurdity of the question. But all these other tactics maintain positivity and productivity in the conversation while still giving you an opening to communicate your boundaries without killing her feels in the process. In fact, it's a GREAT opportunity to up her feels.

All of that said, I've been there. When I was blue pill as heck, my wife broke up with me for saying I would break

up with her if she bought a pair of ugg boots. We got back together, mostly because I was a pussy who cried and pleaded for me to take her back, promising never to be controlling again. Even since my red pill days, that's a promise I live up to - because you shouldn't have to be manipulative and controlling about your behaviors. You do you. If she wants to follow, she follows. If not, that's on her. You can't make her stay skinny, and any ways you try might land you in jail. Stop trying to figure her out and start figuring yourself out. Get your frame in order before making any major decisions.

A 2021 marriage date is way too early for you in this process. I was married at 23. I love my wife and kids, but that was a mistake. If I knew then what I know now, I would have done things very differently - not necessarily in marrying someone different, but I wouldn't have been in such a rush. And I say that as a Christian who remained a virgin until marriage, as did my wife. "I want to get my dick wet" isn't necessarily the best excuse for "therefore it's okay for me to make premature major life-altering decisions without thinking on it for a few more years that could totally screw me over if I mess this up."

So much more to say, but that's all I've got time for. If you want to discuss the more biblical/theological aspects of this question, post it on [/r/RPChristians](#).

"I don't feel so good today, so we won't have sex, ok?"

27 upvotes · 17 October 2018 · [/r/askTRP](#)

That's not mere theory. It is a very time honored, well established pattern. Ther only nuance is that many girls do this subconsciously as part of their nature and societal conditioning and not intentionally.

How betas manage to be bf ?

26 upvotes · 4 January 2018 · [/r/askTRP](#)

The beta strategy is not bad at getting a girlfriend. Women have duplicitous desires: (1) sexual attraction and (2) life comforts. This is the essence of the AFBB dynamic. They want one guy to have sex with and someone else to provide the commitment and life comforts.

Women are dishonest with themselves about what they find attractive - and have been for so long that they often don't even know this is happening. They genuinely believe that they will be (or should be) attracted to a "nice guy." Why? Because they predominantly focus on the BB side of the dynamic. They assume that if a guy is capable of giving them all the life comforts they want, then he is a great catch and she should naturally want to be with him. But in practice she only wants to *be with* him, not *sleep with* him. This is why so many women find themselves sexually uninterested in their husbands, developing a common misperception that women are generally less sexual than men. That misperception then filters into women's minds so that they believe it, which actually does affect their sexuality because then they feel free to reject sexuality, creating a negative feedback cycle.

So, women want to be in committed relationships with the "nice guy" (aka: beta) because they don't know any better. Nice guys see how well this works at getting the "girlfriend," so they play that role, totally blind to the long-term ramifications of this strategy. In essence, they believe what women say about their sexuality, not realizing that women don't understand their own sexuality.

The alpha comes along and presents as somewhat of a dismissive jerk. She's totally aroused by him, but off-put by his non-committal nature. In her mind, he can't provide the types of comforts she wants long-term, so she might not want to settle down with him. So, she rides the CC for a while before finding her beta to settle down with. This is the other half of the AFBB dynamic.

I run the [r/RPChristians](#) sub and wrote a post about all of this [over here](#). If you're not a Christian you can ignore the religious aspects of it, but the dual nature on the "man v. stuff" section is pretty applicable to your question.

Dread for women

25 upvotes · 22 May 2018 · /r/RedPillWomen

Insightful and very well written.

FR: The Spousal Support Scam

25 upvotes · 28 January 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

That would imply you added less sexual value to the relationship. Are you the prize or is she?

I had an epiphany this week

25 upvotes · 4 August 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

This is solid advice. RP tells us that attraction is fostered when we see someone of the opposite gender who is capable of fulfilling their role in a relationship. So, a strong, muscular man is seen as being capable of providing and protecting, and things like his income, leadership skills, social status, etc. all play onto his attractiveness because they show he can fulfill these roles. Attractive qualities in women follow the same pattern.

But, I've noticed another force at play. We also find people more attractive if they express the ability to let us fulfill our role with them. As a result, women become more attractive to us if they let us lead, protect, provide, etc. Similarly, a woman will find a man more attractive if he expresses the ability to let her nurture him, help with daily tasks/needs, show off her beauty a little, is willing to have kids, etc. If we try to stifle the biological imperative of our partners, we are left wondering why we're even with them in the first place. Nobody likes feeling useless.

More to the point of your post, I get frustrated when my wife asks for help in menial things all the time ... but if I offer to help and she accepts my offer, it makes me very happy :) I usually make this offer when I feel I can add value to the situation - like carrying heavy bags that would be easier for me to handle than for her, or cooking food (I'm the superior one in the kitchen by far).

But when we're watching a show and she asks me to get her a snack ... she's equally capable of getting her own snack. There's no better value if I do it or she does ... it's not something where I have a natural advantage - I actually have a disadvantage because I don't know what she feels like eating and I list off 5 things before she picks one. So, those requests I'm shutting down now. I'm not happy to help there, and I'm not going to be her door mat either. Not sure if that distinction makes sense, but I hope it helps.

Need help pulling my life together after rape charge

24 upvotes · 9 August 2017 · /r/askTRP

Unless there's something you're not telling us, there's no way you should have taken a plea bargain. Lawyer here - your attorney got lazy, took your money, and ran off giving you the best deal he could rather than actually doing what you were paying him to do. Criminal attorneys are most notorious for this. They scare the heck out of you to make you pay a huge retainer ("You could be in prison for the rest of your life! ... You'd better get me that money fast if you want a chance!"), then realize that once they've already milked several thousand dollars (sometimes tens of thousands) out of you, you're not worth the hassle of going to trial, so they scare you into taking a plea deal that's really crappy, but telling you how amazing they are for getting the main charges dropped - knowing full well that with the kind of evidence you described you'd have been off the hook completely if you went to trial.

Sorry, I get really ticked at those kinds of attorneys.

How do you move on? My guess is you don't have a purpose in life ... or if you do, it's some half-baked American dream cop-out (hot wife, great sex, lots of money, cool house, etc.).

Find something beyond your life from which you derive your value and satisfaction - but not a girl or anything that won't last. For example, if you orient your life around the weather, even if you move to a place with the perfect climate, you're going to be disappointed. If you make a girl your emotional center, she will always let you down (just as you'll always let her down - that's life). I don't recommend a career either.

Personally, I go with the spiritual - my faith in Jesus. This works for me, and I believe it would work for everyone too. But at the end of the day you have to be the one to decide what you want to value in life and then fix your eyes on that goal, taking steps to make it happen.

Without this sense of being part of something bigger than yourself, you'll get lost in your own misery. People who are living in fortunate (or even "acceptable") life circumstances have the luxury of being self-focused, as is the case for many people on this sub. But you're not there. If you became self-focused it will only reiterate on eternal loop all of those aspects of your life that cause you to not like your life right now. Get out of yourself and find a purpose in life. When you do, you will realize that these false allegations mean nothing.

After all, one of the most godly, Christian men who ever lived - the Apostle Paul - wrote most of the new testament of the Bible while sitting in prison after being arrested for false charges. What was his response? According to Acts 16, he was singing songs - and even when he had the chance to escape, he stayed in his cage and kept praising God. In fact, in Philippians 1 he starts talking about how going to prison on false charges was actually a great thing. You - you actually have the fortune of having escaped those charges. But if you can find something bigger than yourself (whether that's Christianity or whatever else you can invest your life in), your attitude can be the same as Paul's, where you're rejoicing and confident even if you would have been convicted.

Promiscuity and pair bonding

24 upvotes · 13 July 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

Seriously ... it makes me angry just thinking about it. The sad reality is that it's not just coming from peers, but from some parents even! I handled a divorce case where the mom was on websites (still married, mind you) where she would find men who would pay her money to go on a date with him with an option to pay more to guarantee the date included "time at a private residence" - as if we don't all know what's really being paid for.

The sick thing, though, was not that the mom was doing this or even modeling this behavior in front of her daughter or exposing her daughter to dozens of strange internet men with no vetting (usually 2-4 per weekend), but that she was actually bragging about it to her 13 year old daughter suggesting that it was a great way to earn money and figure out sexual compatibility with a man at the same time. I can only imagine where that daughter is going to end up 5 years from now.

Getting your wife back after a separation

23 upvotes · 12 January 2021 · /r/RPChristians

I was very red pill (unknowingly) when we were dating, but then thought that I needed to be blue pill as a married man

I'll assume this is poor terminology. I expect what you mean is that you had alpha qualities while dating, but became beta in marriage. There is no going back once you're red pill. You cannot unlearn the truth once you know it.

However, my wife didn't know how to process these changes and wasn't getting the comfort that she needed from me.

Ah, so your initial run at the red pill was to strengthen your frame rather than improve it. A common mistake.

you need to focus on getting HER back

I very much appreciate the "don't go through her friends/family" approach. But I wouldn't make this a focus either. It's very out-of-your-frame.

It might be tempting to immediately call up your cute, flirty, recently divorced coworker and get drinks but it's not a good idea

Well, it's not a good idea if you're going to be tempted. What if I want to share the Gospel with her? Or what if I just want to expand my social circle. You're viewing everything too heavily in the framework of a co-dependent need on having your wife in the same house as you. That's the bad idea I'm seeing.

Unless you're calm, don't call or answer her calls. Take a few minutes, calm down, then call her back.

Ah, so you're learning the art of STFU.

You want each phone call to bring her closer to you

... and then you ruined it.

My wife didn't end up coming back because I logically convinced her to come back, she came back because she wanted to.

Solid. You figured out that she makes decisions on feels.

She came back because I showed her I was changing.

... and then you ruined it. Totally in her frame again. The way you wrote the post comes off as: "I started reading the red pill and it changed me, so she left me because of those changes. Then I started changing in ways that she approved of and she came back. Just do whatever makes your wife happy, guys, and she'll come back!" Please no.

It's easy to blame her and tell yourself that you've been perfect and she's been the cause of all the problems

Fantastic. You're figuring out OYS!

Take a brutally honest look at why she left

... but you'd already ruined it before you even started. Instead of "take a brutally honest look at yourself," it's "why SHE left." Always about her frame and seeing things from her perspective. Let her be the one to set the parameters for understanding how your marriage should operate and fail.

For me, I realized that I'd been way too alpha and that my wife needed some beta comfort that I wasn't giving her.

... and you kept ruining this point. To be fair, even the seculars use the "balance alpha/beta" lingo. But what they really mean is: "balance a strong frame with a comfortable frame." You can be 100% alpha all the time and still be a fun, comfortable person to be around and know how to handle her feels appropriately. The more accurate thing to say would be that you want to remain alpha while learning to incorporate into your frame certain qualities that are associated with beta males - but without actually being beta while doing so. It sounds like you did not take this approach, but it worked for you - and more on that later.

Be agreeable with what your wife wants ... Any time you say the word "no" to her, it's a reason for her to be done with you

Are you not reading yourself here?

When you're not separated this would be a terrible idea, but the rules are different when you are.

No, they're not. Vaginas and female psychology don't magically change during a separation.

Instead of outright telling my wife "no", I instead told her that I was open to looking into that and that it might make sense. Then once we weren't separated anymore my wife looked into it, ran out of steam, and now we're fine.

Ah, so you deceived her into thinking you'd go along with her plan, all the while hoping and expecting that she'd give up on her plan if you gave her several of the other things she asked for. Win for her.

My wife left me because I was too dominant, had a temper, and wasn't comforting

Right. She left because you misinterpreted "improve your frame" to mean "fortify it with barbed wires, turrets, and titanium plating." People like you are why I wrote my "Merry Christmas" post. Learn to have FUN in your marriage. But do it on YOUR terms in ways that YOU enjoy. Chances are, she'll have fun because you are.

You definitely do not want to let yourself go! Become the best version of yourself you can be and when she sees that it will draw her back to you.

Gotta do it all *for her*, right? Everything is *for her*, *for her*, *for her*. Point taken.

Prayer is absolutely critical when separated

Finally - a point I won't dispute.

1. There are no rules.

Except you just gave a list of 9 of them.

We just celebrated our 4 year anniversary and I can tell that she's much happier than she was

Ah yes, because her happiness levels are the true metric of your life's success.

My uncle followed all the same patterns you referenced when his wife left him a few months back. It worked! She moved back in around Thanksgiving time. So, you've got *something* going here. In his case, he has to pay her spousal support in the amount of 65% of his paycheck (yes, HIS check, even though she also works and keeps 100% of her check), plus pay all the housing and vehicle expenses (except her gas - she can pay that one; but he buys all the groceries still) - and all that for the *privilege* of living in the basement and not allowed upstairs except to use the bathroom. She was kind enough to throw a fridge down there, but he has to keep his clothes in a pile in the corner because there are no closets.

But **he got her back**. WOOHOO! He did it guys!

In the meantime his mission is completely shot. He's so focused on appeasing her that it's literally impossible for

him to do give attention to anything else. Even his prayers allegedly "to God" are really prayers to her that only God gets to hear. Transference and all.

When my red pill ex pastor was going through this situation with his wife I asked him a simple question:

- Would you prefer to stand before God with your wife at your side and say, "God, I know I compromised on my mission and didn't do all those good works you prepared in advance for me to do. But I had to keep my wife happy, and that took a lot of time, work, effort and energy - especially after the separation to win her back. But I'm proud to report that despite not doing what you wanted, I was victorious in getting her to stand by my side while reporting to you on the fruit-ish from my life!"
- Or would you prefer to say: "God, I was committed to the work - *oh, hi Bob!* - you prepared for me. I wanted my wife by my side, but she wasn't on board with that work or the way I was leading to get it done, so she left me. - *Dave, you made it! So glad, after all those conversations we had.* - I gave her many opportunities to come back, but just as Jesus let people he loved walk away, - *Grant! So awesome to see you here, brother!* - what was I saying? Oh yeah, just as Jesus let people he loved walk away, so did I for the sake of the mission. I don't know what the right thing to do with my wife was, so I defaulted to what I saw Jesus doing - and Paul affirmed that those of us with wives should live as if we had none. - *Isn't that right, Steve? I'm overjoyed to see my labor for you guys wasn't in vain.* - So, God: my wife isn't at my side today, but Bob, Dave, Grant, and Steve are here because I didn't let that stop me from building your Kingdom."

I'll go with the latter every time.

Now - I've been pretty hard on you in this post because it's generally HORRIBLE advice for 99% of men. But the reality is that it's advice that I've given before and will continue to give again in very select circumstances. If your marriage is crumbling, that's not the time to strengthen your frame. Instead, I've told guys on MRP years ago: "If you want to save your marriage, burn your frame to the ground and spit on it. Hop into her frame and live there for a few months. Do anything and everything you can to placate her. And then - only after doing all of this for a time to re-develop stability - should you begin working on your frame again, this time focusing on quality first before strength."

You've figured this out on your own. I'm sorry you had to get there the hard way. But in a world where you couldn't function for the Kingdom without her - however weak that may make you - that's the choice you made and I won't fault you for that. I just want to make sure other guys reading this realize that the advice you're giving isn't good advice. It's just effective advice at achieving a mediocre goal in a very finite, specific set of circumstances.

Submissive behaviour

23 upvotes · 12 March 2019 · /r/RedPillWomen

I always teach that the best qualities a man should look for in a woman are:

Faithful - That she is diligent with her responsibilities and puts into practice the things she learns, whether from her own self-improvement efforts, things her man tries to share with her, what she learns from life experience, etc. If a woman is not faithful to practicing what she preaches or what she learns, she is not submissive and is only interested in expressing herself rather than respecting others' expressions toward her.

Available - She has to have time to feed into the relationship. In an ideal world, the captain is steering the ship and the first officer makes herself available to him. How backwards would it be if, for example, Spock refused to show up on the bridge when Kirk called, instead expecting Kirk to change his shifts around to suit Spock's needs? If your man is on a mission beyond his pursuit of you - and he's not a good one if he's not - you should be willing

to adjust your schedule to meet his needs, not demand that he meet yours. This is a point that many women miss out on, as most women are so self-entitled and flooded with male attention that they're used to the idea that men should bend over backwards to be with them. Healthy relationships are not built this way.

Teachable - Simply put: let your own beliefs be challenged and be willing to admit when you're wrong. Even if you're very confident in your belief, recognize that you might only be 98% confident and not 100% confident and respect the fact that there's still a 2% chance that you're wrong. I'd play the lottery a lot more if I had a 2% chance of winning every time. It's improbable, but still significant. Being teachable doesn't mean you cave all of your beliefs to whatever he teaches. It does mean that you're willing to give him the benefit of the doubt, entertaining his ideas and trying to understand them from his perspective **BEFORE** you start arguing against his points - and then, if you still disagree, believe and behave as you will. But if you insist on your own way all the time and are never willing to change your views to account for his perspective and a broader view of the world than your own individual view can see, this will be a serious hindrance and make a guy feel like he has no real authority in the relationship and that you don't respect his views or opinions.

Beyond those three core virtues, whether you believe everything it says or not, the Bible does have some good lessons to teach on the subject of submissiveness. While it's talked about in several places, I'll break down just one passage into bite-size sections, and hopefully this meets your request for a "set of points/ rules/ instructions." This is from 1 Peter 3:1-7.

Wives, in the same way submit yourselves to your own husbands

While this passage is only binding on the married, men often won't marry a woman who isn't displaying wife-like qualities before marriage as well, so there's a message here for single women too.

so that, if any of them do not believe the word, they may be won over without words by the behavior of their wives

Most women use the phrase "strong personality" a sugar-coated way of saying they talk too much, much like the saying: "women don't sweat - they glisten." Sweat is sweat. Talking too much is talking too much.

Most often, the reason "strong personality women" talk too much is that they have an agenda and they want to persuade others of that agenda. This passage is suggesting that a better way to persuade a man is through your actions, not your words. Sound familiar? Basic RP concept: *Watch what they do, not what they say.*

[Bonus Points on doing over saying: Matthew 21:28-32]

when they see the purity and reverence of your lives.

That is, the specific behaviors that are going to win a man over to you are purity and reverence. Purity, in this context, does not mean sexual purity - after all, he's talking to wives who absolutely should be having sex with their husbands. He means a purity in the way their lives are clean. If you talk with crass words constantly, or smoke a pack a day, or grind with numerous random dudes on the dance floor - while you're welcome to do these things, instead of communicating "I'm soft and submissive" it communicates "I'm bold and edgy." Bold and edgy might be a way to get a guy interested in you in the first place, as it can set you apart from other women and certain bold, edgy traits can accentuate your SMV - but it's not going to keep him on the hook for very long, and you just might find yourself more likely to hook up over one night stands than attract a viable candidate for a long term relationship.

As for reverence, this is talking about the way you honor others around you. If you try to dominate the conversation or be the center of attention all the time (some of the time is fine), it reeks of self-centeredness and

entitlement and often shows little respect for those around you. Rather than stepping over others to dominate the floor, try empowering others. Two key things that can really help show your reverence for others:

- When you have an opinion you want to share, 2 out of 3 times try stopping yourself, pick someone else in your group of friends, and ask that person: "What's your thought on that subject?" Bonus points if it's someone who doesn't share as much as others in the group.
- Learn to manage your silence threshold. Everyone has one. It's the length of time a conversation can stay silent before you feel compelled to break the silence with your own talking. For some people it's 2 seconds. If they hear 2 seconds of pause, it feels uncomfortable for them, so they just speak up, feeling like they're keeping the conversation going. But if someone else has a threshold of 5 seconds, that person will rarely ever speak up because the 2-second person keeps interjecting before the 5 second person ever feels there's enough room in the conversation to share her thoughts. This used to be a big problem for me, as my threshold was 1-2 seconds for a long time. I intentionally started counting to 10 before answering questions in group setting in order to become better at listening. Surprisingly, while I thought that my "charismatic conversation skills" were winning people over to me through wit and banter (and it did), I had even better relational results when I started employing this technique, as others in the conversation felt like I respected and revered them rather than as if I was trying to impress them.

Your beauty should not come from outward adornment, such as elaborate hairstyles and the wearing of gold jewelry or fine clothes.

That's not to say these things are bad - they're wonderful. But if you rest too heavily on these things, it comes off as vanity.

Rather, it should be that of your inner self, the unfading beauty of a gentle and quiet spirit, which is of great worth in God's sight.

Again, this doesn't mean you should ignore physical beauty. It simply means that if you have no inner-beauty, your physical beauty won't get you very far. You'll be setting yourself up for a string of one night stands, never managing to maintain a guy in a relationship.

Inner-beauty here is defined as a gentle and quiet spirit. The whole "silence threshold" concept is one tactic of developing a quiet spirit. Avoiding coarse, demeaning, or insistent language is a way to develop gentility in how you communicate.

But even beyond talking, a gentle and quiet spirit is communicated best through mannerisms. Are you constantly waving your arms around or nudging people or making faces or rolling your eyes? Or are you respecting others' physical boundaries, maintaining composure through conversation, even when you hear things you don't like, and using softer means of physical contact? For example: if you sense that someone needs a hug, do you shout out: "Aw, come in here. You need a hug!" and then bear hug them, or do you walk quietly over, wrap your arms around and say, "It's okay, I'm here for you"?

For this is the way the holy women of the past who put their hope in God used to adorn themselves.

That is, this is a time-tested and proven tradition for female behavior.

They submitted themselves to their own husbands, like Sarah, who obeyed Abraham and called him her lord. You are her daughters if you do what is right and do not give way to fear.

In more historically remote cultures, they would have used the term "lord" instead of "captain" - the concept is the same. You ever watch a movie about King Arthur or Game of Thrones? You see this all the time: wives

saying, "Yes, my lord" to their husbands. It is an acknowledgment of the authority structure in the home, communicating reverence for his leadership. I don't know many women who would even be willing to say, "Yes, my husband," with a straight face, much less "lord" or even "captain." But this was commonplace years ago - an aspect of historical culture that is lost in a modern feminized world.

More interestingly, though, is the final comment - that you must not only "do what is right," but also: "do not give way to fear." This is where most women slip up and start taking control. Instead of trusting their man to meet their needs, they feel they must take the reigns and get it done themselves. The idea of putting one's entire life on the line in order to "submit" to someone else's plan and trust for their provision is quite daunting. What fears are we talking about?

- Can he put food on the table and pay the mortgage without you insisting on maintaining your career?
- Will he ever actually take out the trash if you don't nag him?
- Will he really treat you well if you choose not to reward yourself?
- Will he provide for your emotional needs if you don't remind him to?

I'm sure you can think of many more, but I'm out of space. Hopefully this helps some.

Divorce Incorporated

23 upvotes · 2 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

keep the Blue Pill chump husband around the house for as long as it takes to build him up as a stereotypical 'man' and then escalate the most marginal conflict as a 'typical' domestic violence incident and he's gone.

I recently went to trial on a case where I represented Father. Mother's attorney coached her that in order to get my client out of the house she had to stage an altercation. During that altercation she had a phone recording the parties yelling at each other, then my client turns his back to her and walks into a room, gently closing the door behind him. She dives in, then repeatedly slams the door on her own arm several times (her phone "conveniently" cut off just before she did this), calls the cops, and shows off the bruises to get my client kicked out of the house. Result? My client is temporarily disadvantaged, but through skillful lawyering, he ended up with the lion's share of the parenting time and paying no spousal support (despite the fact that she was SAH). There are certainly ways to overcome these types of scenarios.

I refuse to fabricate evidence like that. But I do employ what I call the "set them up to fail" method. When you know you're on the losing end of a custody battle, especially when it's a close call, give the other person more parenting rights than they are actually asking for. In the short-term you lose that time with your kids right away, but you make it up a year later. Just make it clear in the order: "This is a trial period to see if she can handle it" (with more legalese and obfuscation, of course). If we've appropriately sized up the other side, we set the stage so that there's no way she can handle the responsibility, as most women are not as capable as single mothers as they'd like to think of themselves. As soon as things start falling through the cracks, we're back at court asking for custody and the judge is all too quick to grant it. "You had your chance and failed. Now it's Dad's turn to try." Statistically, single fathers who are granted custody are far more reliable and have a far more positive impact on their kids' growth and development than children raised by single mothers.

All of that said ...

He says woman. I say, you're f-ed; start planning your exit now.

I've worked with over 30 marriage counselors over the years (that's how I get many referrals). Most of them like

me because I'm anti-divorce (I know, I get crucified in the manosphere for this - I accept it as an inevitability for many, but prefer to save marriages if the option exists), so they know I'm not just trying to profiteer off of their clients. That said, of the marriage counselors I've dealt with there is only and exactly 1 who I will refer clients to - because everyone else (all 29-ish) preaches covert contracts as the solution to marriage problems. This fosters obligation, which leads to burn-out, which leads to worse problems exactly 3 weeks after you stop going to counseling. The 1 counselor who gets it happens to be a woman - and of the several people I've referred to her, all of those people have concluded counseling and are still together (last I knew: happily) today. Statistically, this is a rare commodity, so I still get the wisdom in what you're saying, but I did find the conflict interesting. I have yet to meet a trustworthy male counselor who isn't preaching beta garbage to his clients.

Interestingly, the clinical counseling arena is mostly feminized, but forensics is really darn fair, for the most part. You just have to find a psychologist who relies on objective tests rather than his or her subjective impressions of an examinee. This is the fastest way for men to win custody cases. Why? Because, as it has been said many times before: *All women are crazy*. And my mentor adds: *The Court actually knows all women are crazy. Your job is to prove to the judge that the wife is crazier than normal woman-crazy*.

The common refrain to this is always "just don't get married"

Interestingly, this is the conclusion of the man who wrote most of the new testament: "Those who marry will have worldly troubles, and I would spare you that ... So then he who marries his betrothed does well, and he who refrains from marriage will do even better" (1 Corinthians 7:28, 38). It is also the way I counsel most Christian men: *Trust me: it's better just not to get married*. Although my counsel goes well beyond the reasons typically discussed in the manosphere.

it is precisely this system's goal to disincentivize long term commitment between the sexes

Interestingly, my state has a Supreme Court decision on point saying point blank: "18 years is not a long-term relationship." The conclusion is that courts in my state may not set "indefinite" as the support term for marriages 18 years or less. So, they're telling women, "If you want the big bang for support, you've got to convince him to hang on even longer."

The laws and the social imperatives that crush men are symptoms of a deeper problem that requires a bottom up changing of men's minds about women and themselves.

This is what I advocate to the men I counsel. Yes, the system is screwed up. Although there are exceptions, it is, on the whole, biased toward women. The government will never fix the problem. The solution goes back to my typical strategy of mental aikido - take what your opponent does and redirect it for your own purposes. In this sense, that's where the manosphere teaches, "Fine, let women have their way. Let the divorce laws be what they are. We'll just choose not to get married then." They respond, "But you can't do that! Marriage has been a fundamental part of culture for millenia!" We answer, "Not the way the government defines it today - since 1969, in specific. Let's go back to the marriage laws that existed for those millenia you mention - that's the kind of marriage a guy can commit to." We don't even need to go that far back, but you get the idea. When you can successfully aikido their tactics, they are forced to change their tactics, usually to a compromise.

Sexual Addiction v. Sexual Starvation

22 upvotes · 8 August 2018 · /r/TheRedPill

Yeah, sorry for that confusion. The ability to have sex on demand came with "lift, sidebar, STFU, etc." In essence, improving myself as a man. Even after this improvement, when I still viewed myself as a sex addict and tried to fulfill an ideal that I had created when I was starved, all the while not actually enjoying living up to that ideal.

There have been many guys who have posted about this phenomenon - giving field reports about how having all of their sexual fantasies met still wasn't satisfying them: because a man needs a mission in life beyond his own sexuality.

Clinging to ideologies we had in our beta days - even if we're now fulfilling them - merely means we remain in the same crappy beta frame we came from. It does not prove that we are any better on an ideological or internal level than we were when we first crafted those fantasies. In short, that only makes for a blue pill man who's deceptive enough externally to get laid. Such a man will still be controlled by his ongoing beta frame - the frame of who we once were when we were weak and starved.

By making the mental transition from an "I'm an addict" frame to "I just wasn't getting my fill," we are able to regain control over our sexuality, lessening our ability to be influenced by society or the women we're sleeping with in the first place, and also by the old men we once were.

Sex and Sin

21 upvotes · 4 November 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I'm going to cut you some slack because you're new to the faith. You've clearly got some screwed up ideas about what the Bible says, no doubt from stereotypes rather than the Bible itself. Let's set this straight.

sexual pleasure and pursuing "alldom" is sin

False. Source: entire book of Song of Solomon. Also: Proverbs 5:19 - "may her breasts satisfy you always, may you ever be intoxicated with her love" ... among many other passages.

Salvation demands ... direct their wills away from attaining pleasure.

False. "A man can do nothing better than to eat, drink, and find satisfaction in his work. This too I see is from the hand of God." Ecclesiastes 2:24

self-hate ... necessary to secure grace and salvation ... Christianity demands self-hate and love of God only

False. "Love your neighbor AS YOURSELF" Mark 12:31

For example, lifting weights and building a muscular body are vanity.

False. 1 Timothy 4:8 - "For physical training is of some value, but godliness has value for all things." No condemnation; rather, the implication is that we should seek both, but prioritize godliness.

Sex is lust

That depends on if it's duty sex or desirous sex. Either way, lust isn't a sin. Adultery is a sin. Lust in certain contexts is considered adultery in the heart. The Bible never once outright condemns lust or general sexual desire.

A powerful and wealthy position in society is greed and pride.

False. They can also be a gift from God. David avoided his position as king, obviously having no greed to overthrow Saul or pride to consider himself better than, as he often said, "the Lord's anointed." Yet God made him king anyway. Moses was called the most humble man on the planet (Numbers 12:3) yet was the leader over Israel who made a fool of Pharaoh and all of Egypt. In fact, in the parable of the talents, Jesus implies that positions of leadership are a reward for those who are faithful (Luke 19:17).

Have you been able to find a happy medium?

There is no "happy medium." The secular red pill is merely discovering through observation how God created the world. They get it right most of the time. There are a few things they get wrong from time to time. At the end of the day, if they keep discerning what is true (rather than what they want to self-affirm), their conclusions will end up the same because God's Word is consistent with his creation. There is no medium because we're both exploring an identical dynamic. RPC simply has more information available. The secular world has observation; we have observation plus Scripture.

Vaguely speaking, is there a way to agree with TRP's doctrine of self-love while also maintaining a denial of the temporal world?

TRP doesn't advocate self-love. It advocates a man being able to set his own mission and priorities without being manipulated or influenced by a feminist culture - and then to do with that knowledge what he will. This is why Rollo often says that the red pill is about understanding the truth, not about prescribing a set of behaviors or attitudes. A man can decide for himself what he will do with the knowledge he gains. If he chooses to use what he learns to advance God's eternal Kingdom, as we do here, then he does well in God's eyes.

What does this look like?

Discerning God's mission and frame and living within this fully at all times. Per our sidebar (especially [210 - Mission Matters, Nothing Else](#) and [/u/Deep_Strength's](#) recent post addressing prioritization of a man's mission), this mission-oriented lifestyle will lay the foundation for all other things RP says is attractive to women, including the fact that a man should not pursue women as his mission in life.

Passages from scripture or canonical works that address this matter would be much appreciated.

See above - among many more that I simply don't have the time to look up.

The thing is ... even just reading the "core principles" section on our sidebar would have told you as much, which is literally a recitation of verses that undermine virtually everything you've written here about what it means to be a Christian. And yes, I intentionally withheld these from my examples above just to show that there is a plethora of more content even beyond what I've listed here. Going any further on our sidebar would re-bolster this again and again, all of which is heavily rooted in and substantiated by Scripture.

Alternatively, if you had googled for 30 seconds, you also would have found that virtually all of your views here are wrong. What's very concerning in this is that you come in admitting to being a brand new Christian, yet rather than asking what the Bible says about these things, you just make a bunch of false assumptions as if you've already got this whole thing figured out. I don't blame you. The church has screwed you up, as it has many of us. CHALLENGE EVERYTHING. Even the things you read here. Don't take anyone's word for it - especially not your pastor's. Be an Acts 17 Berean and always look things up for yourself. Read the Bible for yourself and get an idea of what it really means to follow Christ.

Should I look for a christian boyfriend?

21 upvotes · 14 August 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

The Bible is absolutely clear that we should not be in potentially sexual relationships with non-Christians (unless you already were when you were saved). If he's not a Christian, it must be ended. Period. I see no room for Scriptural disagreement on this issue. One passage says that this is like trying to make Jesus have sex with Belial, a false idol.

Stern warning aside, I feel for you. The dating culture is rough. Non-Christians, especially, are going to try to pressure you into breaking boundaries. Odds are, if you're with the wrong men you're going to end up having sex

before marriage, even if you are absolutely convinced right now that you'd never do that. Get with the wrong guy, emotions kick in like heroine, you're so high your inhibitions go away, and you just flow down the river of pleasure.

Get with the right guy and this risk is still there, just greatly reduced. You can both have clear enough boundaries that it never gets there.

How do you pick the right guy? Read a lot of the stuff [/u/RedPillWonder](#) has written geared toward women. Perhaps he'll chime in here too.

Little help - having bitch moments

21 upvotes · 25 July 2017 · [/r/askMRP](#)

This stems from irrational oneitis. For religious purposes, I was very resistant to the anti-oneitis talk for a long time, but I've finally caved. I've never believed in soul mates, but I'm mostly anti-divorce. I'm also 9 years and 4 kids, so not too far off from where you're at, but I'm seeing the turn-around.

When you make her your emotional center, everything she says and does matters to you. You try to break it off, but you're subliminally looking at her as the judge of your life. If she's acting like a hyena getting whipped every time you're in the room, just smile and say, "Aww, that's cute." Pat her on the top of her head a couple times, if you have to. The goal here is to show her: (1) that she can't get a rise out of you anymore, (2) that your newfound emotional core is not her, and (3) that you're going to have no trouble moving on from her, if it comes to that. She doesn't have to know the fact that you'd prefer it not come to that.

My guess is that the first time you do something like this, it's going to get real awkward and she's going to explode even more. "Don't treat me like I'm a pet or a child!" Rant ensues. She gives a bigger reaction because she's stuck in the "more of the same" mentality. She doesn't know another way to break you than to go on an emotional assault. So, when she finishes the second wave, you smile [and this part is key] **WITH NO APPEARANCE OF SARCASM** and say, "So rarely is the sequel better than the original. But ... do you really think you can pull off *Return of the Jedi*?"

At this point, she'll probably cuss you out and storm off. Why? Because she knows her tirade didn't affect you ... at least that's what she believes.

YOU'RE IN THE BOX!

Here's the thing: you're so invested in what she thinks of you that I don't think you're psychologically capable of just shutting that off. Women have a way of putting men into boxes. Think of it like being in high school as the pudgy nerd who stutters around women. So, you hit the gym, develop some confidence, practice some game, and by the end of Sophomore year you're a stud. So, you ask a girl out and what happens? She laughs at you because you're the kid who used to be a pudgy nerd who now thinks he's all macho [I mean, this didn't happen to me or anything :p/s]. You are macho, but she (and everyone else in the school) created a psychological impression of you and they won't let you out of the box they put you in. Try the same man-up techniques during a summer so you go from fat, stuttering nerd to alpha guy with game from one time they see you to the next and all of a sudden they're all thinking, "Woah, what happened to Ders? He's a total hunk now!"

Your wife put you in the same box those high school people utilized to maintain their popularity. She keeps a position of power if you're not allowed to rise to power. Since you care what she thinks about you and how she treats you (and she knows this!), she has a huge incentive to make sure she keeps treating you like you're in the box, even when you're not in the box anymore. She might not be aware she's doing this, but like the first example of the high school kid, you're not gone for 3 months and coming back a hunk ... it's all gradual, making the impact of your change spread out over time and not a major whammy in her face, so she doesn't take it as seriously, unless she stands to gain something from acknowledging what she has noticed all along (and I'm making a huge assumption that you've actually been changing).

CHEATING YOUR WAY FREE FROM THE BOX

The best answer for getting out of the box is simply to realize you're not in the box anymore and to stop caring that she treats you like you're still in the box. Unfortunately, for most guys, "Just do it" isn't as magically helpful as the person saying it likes to think. "Just stop caring." You've got 11 years invested into this. It's not that easy.

So, there's a cheater method I used to implement long before discovering RP. Here's how your combined logical-emotional salvation path plays out (with RP terminology for ease of translation):

- I can't stop caring what she thinks about me. I feel powerless to this fact.
- If she thinks it of me, that's emotional validation that I actually am that way, even if my logical senses know better.
- I must convince her that I don't care what she thinks about me, even though it's not true.
- If I'm successful, then what she thinks about me is that I DNGAF about her tirade.
- If I can convince her that I DNGAF on a consistent basis, she will think I'm a DNGAF person.
- Since that's what she thinks about me, I am now validated in the fact that I DNGAF.
- I must actually not GAF anymore.

Congratulations, you've just escaped the box!

How did you get out? By pretending that you were already out for long enough that her perception was that you're not in the box anymore. Since her perception is what matters most to you, you're actually willing to accept it as true of yourself, as opposed to your previous faking. Since that new perception is that you DNGAF about her perception of you, and that perception is now internalized by you as true of yourself, you never have to revert to going back in the box again. You're welcome.

I am choosing to "revirginize" myself until marriage...

20 upvotes · 22 August 2019 · /r/WhereAreAllTheGoodMen

I hope you enjoy being single

The real problem is that she won't actually remain single. Some beta bux white knight is going to be swept off his feet at the chance to have *any girl* because he can't get the ones he really wants. In the end, she'll get a free ride while he works for the privilege of hoping to have sex with her someday, and she'll secretly be dying inside, wondering how she got stuck with that fat loser while all the younger, prettier girls managed to get hunks even though she's just as young and pretty *at heart* as they are.

Monogamy

20 upvotes · 10 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

The question of monogamy was debated here a lot in the early days of this sub. It might be worth taking a trek back to read those posts, doing a search for "polygamy," specifically.

Biblically, there's never a condemnation of polygamy and many of the great biblical figures were polygamous.

- Abraham had 3 wives: Sarah, Hagar, and Keturah
- Moses was married to Zipporah and an Ethiopian woman
- Solomon was famous for his hundreds of wives

- Gideon had many wives and 46 sons born from them.
- 2 Samuel 12:8 says God gave David numerous wives and offered to give more, if he wasn't satisfied. Moreover, God chose to bless David's line through Batsheba, who bore Solomon, rather than his previous wives.
- God seems to condone Jacob's polygamy with 4 women by using all 4 of them to birth the patriarchs of the 12 tribes of Israel, rather than having them all born from his first wife - and most of the way they got together was from sinful motives in the first place.

In all of this, it's clear that there are obvious blessings on polygamous relationships in **Old Testament** Scripture and scant little condemnation against it.

What does the **New Testament** have to say? Not much. It says that elders must be "the husband of one wife." So, being polygamous disqualifies you from the role of elder. Some people (and with good reason) believe we should all seek the role of Elder rather than being content on the sidelines, and therefore should all seek to be monogamous. I can buy into a lot of the logic behind this reasoning and dare say I agree. In this sense, it's not a choice, but a consequence. You don't intentionally choose: "I want to be polygamous, and therefore I will voluntarily give up my right ever to be an elder." Rather, you make this pursuit, but if you happen to become polygamous along the way, you are prohibited from becoming an elder.

The NT also says that you should avoid engaging in sexual relationships at all, if possible, but that if you're about to sin, you'd better marry her first to sanctify the sexual relationship. In this sense, sex with someone who isn't your spouse is always viewed as sin, but it can be sanctified by marrying the person. The suggestion here is that a 3-way would be, hypothetically, condonable if you're married to both women.

Then there's the matter of Romans 13, which suggests we must submit to our governing authorities. If you live in America, it's unlawful, and therefore you'd be living in defiance to your governing authority to engage in polygamy, thus it's wrong and you shouldn't do it. But what if you and your wife became missionaries in a country where polygamy was perfectly legal? Romans 13 doesn't give the same restraint. Biblically, you'd still have to marry her before you could have your 3-way, but the relationship seems to be technically okay.

A lot of people will point to biblical examples of polygamy and say that it's "unwise" because "the Bible rarely ever shows polygamy in a positive light and there are usually negative consequences to the men who engage in polygamous relationships." That might be true for the men who let their sexuality control them, but there didn't seem to be much negative consequence for Jacob when he birthed the 12 tribes, or for Gideon who got a lot of sons out of it. Even with David and Bathsheba, the punishment wasn't because of his polygamy, but because he took another man's wife - she wasn't single - and then murdered that man, as made clear by Nathan's parable to him. I would say it's incredibly unwise to do something that would disqualify you from having a greater role of influence and authority in God's Kingdom (i.e. becoming an elder - though this means something very different from what modern churchianity calls "elders" in congregations that aren't actually "churches"), so I agree that polygamy is unwise. But is it sin? Only under Romans 13, which is different for each country.

Oh, I should also note that there's a difference between a country that criminalizes polygamy and a country that merely refuses to recognize polygamous marriages. If the government says, "We won't send you to jail over it, but we're not going to give you tax benefits for the second marriage either," then I don't see Romans 13 being a hindrance.

A few more things on poly-sexuality:

First, I assume you're talking about MFF, which are the only forms of polygamy that are actually addressed in Scripture (at least without condemnation).

Second, even under an MFF arrangement, it'd be easiest to justify this if you're having sex with both of them, but not them with each other.

Third, if part of the tryst would involve the women doing it with each other with you watching, there's the question of whether this is homosexual sin or not. If so, then all forms of trysts (which are different from polygamy where there are only ever 2 people at a time) would involve homosexuality, and therefore be sin. Interestingly, the Bible is always clear about two dudes doing it being sinful, but it never says that two women doing it is sin.

- Leviticus 18:22 - two dudes, no reference to women.
- Leviticus 20:13 - two dudes, no reference to women.
- 1 Cor. 6:9-10 - "Do not be deceived: Neither the sexually immoral nor idolaters nor adulterers nor men who have sex with men nor thieves nor the greedy nor drunkards nor slanderers nor swindlers will inherit the kingdom of God." ... no reference to women
- The word "arsenokoitais," which is translated as "homosexual," generally, is also translated as "sodomite," and some translations, such as the ESV in 1 Timothy 1:10, go so far as to say: "men who practice homosexuality" rather than condemning homosexuality for both sexes.
- The closest I can think of that might imply condemnation of FF relationships off the top of my head is in Romans 1, where it says, "Even their women exchanged natural relations for unnatural ones" - but this is an exchange. It is an abandonment of MF sexuality in favor of FF sexuality. That leaves open the question of whether MFF would be permissible because there's no exchange - especially if they're engaging in FF interactions for the purpose of pleasing their husband.
 - Yes, this is weird. No, this distinction between MM and FF sexuality in the Bible is not talked about often. I don't know what to make of it all, nor will I pretend to be an expert, nor will I even suggest that I have even remotely researched this. I'm speaking almost purely off the cuff, so go do the research for yourself before drawing conclusions.

Third, MMF relationships would be prohibited outright. While the Bible does give indications of favorable disposition toward MFF type polygamy, it never references the reverse, and any situation where the Bible talks about a woman having many lovers it's strictly condemned.

Fourth, it's important to bear in mind that marriage is always a parallel between Christ and the church. This can be interpreted a number of ways, but here are the relevant points off the top of my head:

- Some people say that Christ has one bride: the church, and therefore because Christ is monogamous, we must be as well. Polygamy is therefore sin because it communicates a false reflection of Christ to the world - that if Christians have multiple brides, then Christ must have multiple brides too. We must always maintain this reflection. This seems like the most sound conclusion to me.
- Other people say that we are each Christ's bride. Many people personalize it: "I am the bride of Christ and adopted child of God." If that's the case, then yes, Christ, the groom, has multiple brides who are collectively called "the church." In this sense, "the church" is often referred to by Jesus as his Kingdom, not his individual bride. In the same way, a man can have his kingdom in which his many brides will reside. In this interpretation, polygamy is perfectly appropriate (subject to Romans 13).
- The church is prohibited from having other spiritual spouses than Christ, and therefore any form of polyandry is a direct defiance of the image of Christ and his relationship with the church that we are meant to reflect. It

would also be clear idolatry and sinful. Women may never have multiple husbands under any biblical framework I'm aware of.

CONCLUSIONS

1. I will never become polygamous because I don't want to compromise my influence in God's Kingdom, which is my mission, which is more important to me than women. If that means taking on the role of "elder" (if I don't already function in that office anyway), then I want to keep that option open.
2. If you really want to have your 3 way, that may be fine, but you're going to have to marry the second woman first.
3. To marry her would involve moving to a country (or state, if any are out there) where polygamy is not a crime. Last I knew, even Utah criminalizes polygamy, but the cops are inclined to look the other way as long as it doesn't involve minors, human trafficking, or violence.
4. This marriage could be spiritual-only and not necessarily legal, and therefore you could get around the potential Romans 13 issue, but you would still have the spiritual obligations of a husband to his wife, which is a life-long commitment.

Take this all with a grain of salt. It's mostly a thought exercise and not based on in-depth research or study. Again, I'm merely speaking off-the-cuff for most of this. Be an Acts 17 Berean and do your own research.

My husband is now TRP

20 upvotes · 9 August 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

If you do, make sure it's a male therapist. Maybe even insist he chooses the therapist (after all, if he says he's RP, he should be decisive on this, not deferring to you). If it's a female therapist, he's going to go blabbing about how it didn't work to other RP guys and they're going to say, "That's what you get for going to a girl." Of course, if it's a man and he doesn't like the results, he's going to frame it with bias and they're all going to blame the male therapist of being a beta chump who just wants to side with the feminist agenda. So ... your best bet is to insist on therapy, but let him take the lead on it. Set hard deadlines and consequences before you escalate your response to how he's treating you.

Sure, he's going to interpret this as you making him enter your frame - and you are. But if his frame is full of nails and broken glass, he can't really expect you to enter his. /u/jacktenofhearts once wrote up a really good post on this ... something about making a titanium frame that's so barren and uncomfortable that nobody could live inside of it. Search his post history and see if you can find something like that ... you'll find some great stuff in there either way, even if you don't find it.

How do I differentiate friendliness with sexual interest with foreign girls?

20 upvotes · 28 June 2017 · /r/askTRP

I think the other commenters are missing this line:

we have a lot of the same friends and if I f*** up, it might tarnish my social circle

Why do you care about what these friends think of you so much? As is often said: you're the captain of the awesome train. If she wants on, let her on. If she wants off, let her off. If your friends want off, let them off.

Stop trying to manipulate your way into keeping friends. If they stop liking you because you tried to kiss

someone that they happen to be mutually acquainted with ... I'm not even going to finish that sentence because it's so ridiculous.

How to evaluate sexuality compatibility as a Christian with no pre-marital sex and only chaste behavior

19 upvotes · 14 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

There is certainly value in this list. The one caution I'd give is that AWA still LT. If you become unattractive, whatever "compatibility" you think you had will go down the drain.

More to the point: women are often intentionally deceptive, especially when it comes to the lure of their sexuality before marriage. They will make promises that they will not keep (even if they actually intended to at the time). For those of you who know my story, I'm a prime example of that - and I've met many others in that situation as well.

Just because she checks all the boxes doesn't mean she'll turn out the way you think, or that she won't change after you're married.

From there, I go back to the same 4 qualities I have been telling guys to look for in a woman: FAST - Faithful, Available, Saved, Teachable. If you can find a FAST girl, you can instill any other quality in her, including that she will ultimately follow your lead when it comes to matters of sexuality. That is, even if you're not eye-to-eye on sex up-front, if she embodies those traits, you can get her there in time anyway.

So, definitely address the things in this list, but also look for the FAST qualities as your overarching imperative.

Listen up you pricks, we have work to do.

19 upvotes · 16 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I endorse this.

Opinions: Do you ask a woman out to begin dating?

19 upvotes · 13 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Don't "Ask Her Out"

Most Christian guys will say, "You're the man. You should initiate. That's how you lead." While technically correct, this is usually interpreted as: "The man should ask the girl out." That conclusion is something I heavily disagree with.

First, it gets the orientation of the pursuit backwards. Christ makes himself available to us, but the persistent command throughout Scripture is for us to seek God. I did a word study once on every instance of "seek" "pursue" "chase" "draw" and all kinds of variances. For every 1 example of God pursuing us, there were 22 about our imperative to pursue him. Yes, God does "initiate" the relationship, but the Bible is clear that his initiation is an open invitation, not a singling-out. In the same way, a guy should present an open invitation: "Ladies, I'm fair game. I'm going this way, you're welcome to come along." From there, each individual woman must make the choice of whether or not she will accept that invitation.

Second, if a man initiates with, "Will you be my girlfriend?" he is offering commitment freely, which cheapens its value. Stuff I get for free I usually end up throwing away. But if I pay a high price, you'd better believe I'm going to treasure it and keep it around for a long time and make use of it. Modern blue pill dating insists on men offering commitment for free without the promise of anything in return - and even when they do get something in return, women have no problem cutting them off for the next best thing. Because something that's free has no value. Don't cheapen the value of your commitment.

Third, if the man asks the girl out, he feeds into her thirst for validation. Instead of him being the prize, she's the

prize. Instead of him selecting his girlfriend, she's put in the position of power to say yes or no, selecting him. This sets up a harmful authority and power dynamic in the relationship from the get-go.

Fourth, pre-marital monogamy is simply an ineffective strategy, and asking a girl out is assumed in most relationships to imply exclusivity. This cuts a man off at the balls and turns the entire relationship into a huge waste of time if it doesn't work out. As Rollo suggests: use the shotgun approach, not the sniper approach.

Fifth, asking a girl out in the socially scripted manner implies that the relationship will follow a socially scripted result. My guess is that you want to defy social scripting in your relationships and follow a more biblical, mission-oriented approach to your life. Instead of setting the tone of a standard cultural relationship through a standard cultural initiation, defy the social script from the get-go in order to set a new context for how the relationship will be maintained.

The "Join Me" Approach

Bad approaches out of the way, I really liked [/u/OsmiumZulu](#)'s approach, which wasn't all that different from what I suggested privately to you before you posted this. Not only does it show outcome independence, as he suggested, but it also refuses to provide commitment up-front. He invited her to spend time with him. That's it. Time. Not emotions. Not exclusivity. Not high-priced dates. Time.

I recommend guys begin by inviting a girl to join him in something he's already planning on doing, which mitigates this even further - now you're not even giving up your time because you're just doing what you'd already be doing anyway. She's just along for the ride.

If you invite her on a traditional socially scripted "date," like going to the movies or out to eat, you're making her the focus. It's all about exploring "the relationship" and if the two of you will work out. As [/u/helaughsinhidden](#) mentioned, this plays into the imperative culture gives for women to get their feels for free. Instead:

- Suppose you're on the worship team with your congregation. Maybe ask her to come to practice with you and you can hang out afterward. Your focus is on your activity and worshipping God.
- Maybe you're discipling a guy and you suggest she join you so she can see your mission in action, and perhaps learn a thing or two as well. Your focus is on the guy you're discipling and on the mission God gave you.
- Or perhaps you were planning on going to the gym or on a run or biking and you suggest she come along. Your focus is on that bar and how many times you can pick it up, and on honoring God with your body.

She is peripheral to your life and mission. By taking this approach, you're not derailing your life to focus on her for a time. You're inviting her to join you in your life, establishing a clear: "I'm going this way, you can come with me" dynamic, which is what Jesus does with us. There is no room for reversed leadership roles in that type of a relationship.

** When to Commit?*

As for the commitment component - yes, that will come in time. But as [/u/RedPillWays](#) said, this is for her to bring up. Don't offer her commitment freely. If she wants it, she'll ask for it. And you can decide how much you give and don't. The more you give, the more you undermine your own authority and attraction in the relationship, but as you become more confident that the relationship is leading toward marriage (i.e. you can't stop thinking about screwing her and you're not getting red flags), there's no problem with communicating long-term possibilities (not expectations). Just be elusive about short-term obligations.

Suppose she's been hanging around you for 3-6 months and she finally brings up the DTR talk - "Can you define

the relationship for me? What are we doing?" How do you respond?

- Don't: *I know we haven't said it officially, but in my mind we're a couple* - This communicates to her what she thinks about "couples," not what you mean by the word. Her understanding will be highly influenced by cultural norms.
- Don't: *Woman, I'll tell you when there's something you need to know about the relationship* - This approach shows no tact. With the right frame, it could actually be pulled off extremely effectively, but I'm not going to suggest that. It's like shooting an apple off of someone's head with a crossbow. If you hit the apple, it's truly impressive and wows everyone around. But the risk is incredibly high that if you miss you're either going to look like a fool or cause serious damage.
- Don't: *I'm still trying to figure that out myself* or *I don't know* - This shows your own weakness, insecurity, and lack of leadership, vision, or intentionality.
- Do: *I like you. I enjoy spending time with you. I'm not ready to propose yet, if that's what you're asking. God's got me doing some pretty important stuff right now, and that's my highest priority. When I am ready to propose to someone, it'll be to a girl who not only won't distract me on that mission, but actually proves herself indispensable to it. I suppose I'm just trying to figure out if that's you or not.* You can even elaborate this with an explanation about why all of your "dates" are non-traditional and focused on things you already have going on in life and not focused on her.

Notice: you're not committing to exclusivity. You're keeping your options open. You're throwing her a bone with the potential for the relationship, but doing it in the context where the pressure is on her to live up to your standards. It's kind of like Jesus saying, "If you don't *this* or *that*, then you cannot be my disciple," or, "If anyone would come after me, he must *this* or *that*."

That's the conversation you're having with her. You're saying, "Here are my boundaries. It's up to you if you want to be in them or not. It's not up to me to figure that out for you. But yeah, I'm only going to marry someone who is already living in my boundaries."

The Push-Back

If you take the advice above, she's inevitably going to let her cultural conditioning come to the surface: *Well, I want to be in those boundaries. I love what you're doing for God and I want in. So are we dating now? What do you do?*

Now is when you teach. You whip out all that Scripture you've been memorizing on evangelism and start explaining how Christ lived and what inspired others to follow. You bring up the way his followers, like James and John, wanted specific commitments from him and he basically responds, "Back off. You're thinking like the world. I don't think like that." You share with her your concerns with the cultural dating process - a process you're not okay with. You teach her about the feminization of the church and the way cultural has become so backwards in its approach to male-female relationships that you're committed to rejecting the world's model and following what Christ did with his followers. This culminated in a marriage with his bride, but his bride trailed around him for quite a while before he died for her and became one with her.

In short, when she tries to conform your obscurity to cultural concepts she can wrap her mind around, you unwrap her mind in the first place and let her know what you're really about. You don't say the words "red pill," but you let her know what you believe about it all the same, at least insofar as biblical relational dynamics are to be maintained (don't teach her about fitness tests, dread, etc.).

Why do that at this juncture? Because when she's asking for you to define the relationship, she's already

committed. You're early enough that you're not wasting her time if she can't be on board. But you're also late enough that her investment in you has already softened her like clay getting ready to be pressed around a mold. You're also at the perfect juncture where for your own purposes you're going to want to know if she's worth investing any more time in, or if she's a plate you've got to put down because if she's not willing to conform at the peak of her interest in commitment from you, then who knows if she ever will.

Good luck.

Lessons from two divorce cases

19 upvotes · 15 May 2018 · /r/askMRP

The court cares more about what you do than what you look like. OYS, for example, plays out super well. Having rippling muscles can give them the gut impression that you're an abusive douchebag. WISNIFG stuff comes off like pure gold to a judge - especially fogging and negative inquiry. A DNGAF attitude will likely lose you your case. It's all hit or miss and knowing how to paint yourself. Moderate charm works wonders. Too much and it backfires, too little and they think you're just disinterested.

It's important to remember that your judge is 95% or higher likely to be a career beta man or an empowered feminist - both groups who are incredibly resistant to RP attraction methods. The men just don't function like that biologically, and the women judges (although preferable to men judges) will resent you and themselves that they're attracted to what all their peers would call chauvinism when they see it. Either that or they just legit don't like guys like that. The courtroom is a lot like the stage. You have to know your audience and play the part they want to see.

I'm dating two MGTOW.

19 upvotes · 30 August 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

I don't think these guys are actually MGTOW. They seem like normal guys who have been wounded by women in the past, so they're a little more cautious than average about getting close to a woman. This is a very common post-traumatic-break-up phenomenon that we see everyday.

With that in mind, if I'm wrong and they really are MGTOW your solution is to reject both of them because marriage isn't in the cards at that point. You're spinning your wheels with no end goal.

If I'm right, they may still need more time than is worth the investment to get over their wounds, so it still might be a better idea to look elsewhere. If you're committed to making it work with one of them and you think they can get over their issues timely, pick the one you think is more likely to make a full recovery.

LTR had nudes in her laptop from her phone dated June/July. Pussy and ass pics. She has never sent me nudes in our 9 month relationship.

19 upvotes · 28 August 2017 · /r/askTRP

More to /u/throwawayantman, rather than backing yourself in a hole that you'll eventually have to get out with the IT "you got hacked" excuse, I'd start with an opportunity to increase game.

OP should just randomly start sexting her. Send some dirty texts for a bit, then up it to a photo of himself. Se if she reciprocates with the old photos or tries to send something new. If she's with Chad on the side, those old photos are most likely for his eyes only so she'll send something new, hoping that the previous evidence never gets out in the first place, much less her being the one to let it out. If she refuses to send pics at all, that creates an even more interesting conundrum.

At that point, he should take some pics of them together on her phone. Then, when they're together, he can go on her laptop to dig up the pics, explain how the auto-sync works, and then magically discover the racy ones she took much earlier because they'd be in the same folder as the pics he has a legitimate reason for looking up.

In both instances (sexting her or taking pics together and looking it up) he's doing things to enhance the relationship, so he's actually moving forward while getting answers rather than the more neutral/deteriorating option of saying he found them online and then having to explain stuff away that might not come off as believable. Always stick to a plan that seems highly probable/normal over the one that involves unlikely circumstances like a random phone getting hacked out of nowhere.

Your wife is a whore and you should divorce her

19 upvotes · 24 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

there's more to life and marriage than pussy

This. OP's statement that "You will be happier" makes the false assumption that all men assess their happiness levels based on the same criteria he does.

If a man lives in a dead bedroom, his happiness with sex might be a 2, but his happiness with other things might be 10/10. If sex is the most important thing to him, then what OP suggests makes sense. But if he's really low libido and just doesn't care about sex (maybe he's actually the one who's causing the dead bedroom), then how will getting sex with more/different women increase his happiness? Or what if a guy cares about sex a lot, but the totality of other factors that he enjoys about his marriage outweigh the mediocre, yet satisfying sex life he's getting with his wife?

A younger girl. Is this an opportunity or a disaster waiting to happen?

18 upvotes · 14 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

What's your mission? At least you vaguely skimmed Rule 2. But seriously ... I put "**MISSION**" at the top of the list for a reason.

As for your post, imagine me asking this community:

- I want to buy a house. It was built in 2002 and has some of the issues you'd expect from a house built in that year. But I like it a lot. It's a really fine looking house, and the seller's agent gave me some indication at the open house that the buyer might like me to put in an offer. What do you think, should I buy this house?

There's really nowhere near enough information here to make that assessment. Like ... not even close.

Instead, I'll defer to /u/OsmiumZulu's timeless quote here: "If it's not a hell yes, it's a hell no." In other words, **if you even have to ask whether it's a good idea, it's probably not a good idea**. Maybe it's not because of anything in her ... maybe you're just not ready because ... I don't know ... maybe you don't have a **MISSION** yet, so there's nothing for her to follow you toward in the first place.

Sexual Addiction v. Sexual Starvation

18 upvotes · 8 August 2018 · /r/TheRedPill

I like this story. It's part of why I emphasize an undervalued aspect of RP praxeology: a man must have a mission that transcends his pursuit of women.

TRP in the Bible vs. Pop Christian Culture

18 upvotes · 29 July 2017 · /r/TheRedPill

This is why I started the sub RPChristians a few weeks ago. It addresses the low hanging fruit as well as high level concepts and the nitty gritty. I think you'll like it over there. I'd love to see you post this and other high-quality, Scripture-supported posts there :)

So... you got the "I love you but I'm not in love with you" (ILYBINILWY) speech?

17 upvotes · 12 March 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

The list of examples is certainly proof that guys need to be cautious when hearing this phrase. That said, I've also known marriages to recover after the phrase and remain in-tact for a decade after (and going). Some of these guys figured themselves out. Others learned to be bigger suck-ups than before.

But if there's true value in this post, it's this:

When your woman gives you this speech it usually means that all of her feelings for you have not only been drained, but she is also actively seeking to get feelings from someone else

From what I can tell, women don't actively distinguish between "love" and "in love" until something else reignites their passion and they *remember* what it feels like to be "in love" again. Now, that thing isn't necessarily another dude ... but it usually is. It also doesn't mean she's actually screwing another dude ... but it certainly could. But you can be assured that if she's thinking about the difference between "love" and "in love," it's because something else has triggered the "in love" feeling to remind her that what she passed off as "love" for you isn't what she really wants.

I can see someone arguing, "Maybe she's just bored and remembering the good times." Possible, but not likely. I've talked before about how women have retroactive memories - they project their present emotional state on past situations. I can give numerous examples of how this plays out - and most women even admit they do this. If she doesn't love you today, she never loved you. If she's passionate now, you've always been her hunk. So, if she's not "in love" with you now, don't count on it being because she remembers past passion. There's something else triggering it.

Leave and Cleave

17 upvotes · 22 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

No mama's boys. In that culture, it was already understood that women were property and left their parents' house once they married. But because of patriarchal lineage, there was more confusion over whether boys were still subject to their father's house or if they created their own independent family under their father's name and banner.

This passage shows that it was always God's intent that children grow to become independent of their parents rather than eternally dependent.

But aren't we always supposed to be dependent on God for everything we do?

Glad you asked. No, we're not. Total dependence on God is a state of being, not a lifestyle. "Jesus take the wheel" is not healthy theology.

We are dependent because God empowers literally every breath and twitch we make. We would cease to exist if his power did not hold us together. In this, yes, we are always dependent upon God. But transformation means nothing if we depend on God for our character and obedience equally before as after we are transformed. God gives us ownership and agency over our lives through our union with his Son, Jesus Christ, as empowered by the Spirit. We are no longer children in his house subject to his constant badgering. We have a form of independence by virtue of our relationship with Christ, even as the Spirit matures us.

Notice how when our bridegroom came on the scene the Father seemed to bow out of his role of prominence among his people? We are still his children, but Jesus as our bridegroom took the prominent role in how we related with God - because we're not children anymore. That is not to say that Jesus abandoned the Godhead, leaving the Father; rather, it is to say that a husband and wife creating their own bond independent of the husband's household, while still under his father's name, is meant to model the unique way God's people would

relate with him through marriage to Christ rather than through prophets of the Father. We bear God's name, but our relationship with the Father is through the Son, and not directly of our own accord.

Potentially Getting Engaged. Asking for Guidance.

17 upvotes · 25 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This seems like a disaster marriage waiting to happen. As OZ often says, "If it's not a hell yeah, it's a hell no." But I suspect the deeper issue here is that you're misreading her.

Let me ask this: how would she respond if you said that marrying her was contingent on her getting a boob job?

You say:

- She is faithful. Will she faithfully honor this request?
- She is teachable. Will she accept your instruction on why it's important to you to have a wife with bigger breasts?
- She is a strong Christian. Will she submit to her leader's instructions?
- She will basically do anything you ask her to do because she loves you and wants to serve you. Will she do this too?

My guess is she'd probably chew you out for being so insensitive and call you shallow, and likely cry about how she could have been so blind about how her boyfriend was really feeling. You even admit this when you say, "I know it would destroy her if she knew this."

So, when you're describing all of these wonderful traits about her, what you really mean is: "She's so wonderful and perfect in all these different ways! ... when it's easy for her to be that way."

You are experiencing selective perception in your relationship. Your emotional connection to her, most likely because of the pair-bonding you experienced from premarital sex, is causing you to perceive things in a distorted manner. You're seeing weak evidence of certain positive traits and expounding on them as if that's definitive evidence of some grandiose measure that she'd never actually live up to in real life.

I'm not saying you should actually ask her to get a boob job. There's a whole host of personal preference and scriptural issues that would have to be ironed out before you go there. What I am saying is that her reaction to questions like that would be very telling about how great of a catch she actually is.

What's even more concerning is that she's not even respecting you in small ways. For example, you say she has ...

a juvenile tendency to do gross/inappropriate things around her friends (she refrains when around me, but she doesn't have the intention to stop this)

If she's not going to be "faithful," "teachable," a "strong Christian," and "basically do anything you ask her to do because she loves you and wants to serve you" even on something so small as juvenile mannerisms, how much less when it comes to something big and important like a boob job ... not to mention everything in-between.

The bottom line is that you don't seem all that into her, so why are you still investing in the relationship? You marry her, I promise - 100% guaranteed - that around 10 years from now you'll see all the other 22 year olds you could be pulling and how much better looking and more respectful and honoring they would be ... and you'll be wondering why you were so foolish as to have gotten married so soon.

Then again, there is the whole thing that you've already had sex ... so I understand the reason to want to justify your sin by saying, "At least it was with my wife."

Also, why do you want to get married in the first place? Being so new to the manosphere, my guess is that you still have lots and lots and lots of blue pill ideologies about marriage and relationships that you've only begun to scratch the surface on. This really concerns me. Until you've fleshed out all your blue, you're probably not in a right frame to be making a wise decision in the first place.

The blue pill in you is particularly evident in all of your questions toward the end:

Is this normal? Can/should this desire be extinguished? If I did find a more attractive woman, would I even be satisfied then? When does the chase end? I really thought I was ready to marry her. What is keeping me from being content. Should I go through with it? Will these feelings go away eventually? Is this a sign I shouldn't propose? Am I being a huge jerk? Or am I just scared of being locked in for life? I feel like I shouldn't be doubting this. When it's time, shouldn't I be itching to marry her? Or is this all just a consequence of having sex early? I don't know. I need guidance.

These questions show me that you're still being controlled by social expectations on what the "right" thing to do is.

Needless to say, this is expected. That's why you're here! That's why we're here! - to help you weed out the blue. You're right to be asking these questions because that's how you bring these latent ideologies to the surface. But you won't be ready to propose to her until you're at a point where you don't have these types of questions anymore. When you have your own mission and a strong enough frame that you don't care what these other guys in your church - or even the people on this sub - have to say about your life decisions (with confident humility, and not because of stubborn obstinacy) ... that's when you'll be ready to decide for yourself whether or not you should propose to someone.

Until you're at that point, I'd recommend taking a step back.

Should I change my name?

17 upvotes · 7 August 2018 · /r/askTRP

OYS. Own it. It's more glorious when you prove the stereotypes wrong.

FR: The Spousal Support Scam

17 upvotes · 28 January 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

We were defense, so they already presented their case and did just that, and they wouldn't get the chance to present new testimony afterward. That's why the setup worked so well.

And so my journey must begin

17 upvotes · 30 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

This seems more like an askMRP post. Nevertheless, as /u/UEMcGill says, if you want any chance of saving the marriage, you need to make it clear you're not going to help her.

I'm a divorce attorney. I constantly see guys saying, "I don't want to get divorced, but I can't stop her. So, I just want to do right by her and help her get her new life started." I literally had a client of mine tell me this morning that he's willing to give up over \$750,000 in assets to her, leaving himself with nothing and taking on all the debt "just to help her out and get this whole thing over with" - this from a guy who has consistently said that he wished he could save the marriage. These are two totally inconsistent thoughts and if that's what's running through your head (your post didn't give enough information to tell), go re-read NMMNG. Being "nice" probably made her want to leave in the first place. Being "extra nice" now that she's ready to leave will make her "extra happy" about leaving. It's that simple.

Now, it seems like maybe you really don't care to save your marriage. So be it. Figure out what you're okay with and stick to your guns. If your lawyer tells you you're being unreasonable, listen to his advice; otherwise, make it clear to her that she will not dictate the terms of your divorce.

Now, I can't speak definitively as to all states or how every attorney practices, but here's how this will typically go down:

1) She's going to file the case and have you served at work. Embarrassing, but you can deal with it. You'll have to file an Answer and Counterclaim and pay a small filing fee. You'll also need to prepare a series of affidavits that outline all of your assets and debts as well as each of your incomes, and sometimes your monthly budget as well. The assets/debts section will be the most important for you - get this right up-front. You'll also have to fill out a UCCJEA affidavit, which is a national thing (assuming you're in the USA) affirming that no one else has custody rights in your children and stating where they've lived for the past 5 years.

2) She'll have requested temporary orders. That hearing will be about 30-45 days after the case is filed if your court is on the ball. You'll have a quick hearing, or they may ask for written statements instead of an oral hearing. Either way, she's going for temporary custody, debt allocation, and possibly support. The Court will likely issue its order 2-6 weeks after your hearing. Best way to prep for all this is to write up a 3-5 page outline of: (1) her shortcomings as a parent; (2) the day-to-day things you do for your kids; (3) each of your income levels; (4) any opportunity she has to boost her income, if possible; and (5) any ways that she's screwed up the family finances and how you're trying to get things back in order. In each of these, give clear, specific "who, what, where, when, why" details - generalities are not persuasive at all. Saying, "She's an alcoholic" or "she's financially irresponsible" means nothing to a judge. Telling about how she blew \$2,000 on a binge-drinking session at the bars last month gives them something they can work with.

3) After temporary orders are issued (or while the decision is pending) you'll likely get a status conference with the judge or magistrate to talk about the case as a whole. Nothing gets accomplished at these pretrials or status conferences. They're mostly just a judicially mandated way for attorneys to make money and for the judge to remind you to keep working on the case. The biggest help you get out of it is that the judge can give his feedback if you're stuck in your settlement negotiations. If it's legit and good feedback, great. The judge wants to see you settle. The problem is that the judges are often so interested in settling that they'll lie about their own opinions of the case just to push a settlement. So, even if the judge would never actually grant spousal support on a 5-year marriage, he might say something like, "5 years isn't a long marriage, but I might do 6 months or a year of support," just to get you to pony up some money and lower her expectations a tad in order to resolve the thing. They pretty much never say anything totally one-sided unless the law is clear and unambiguous - which in domestic cases it never is.

Usually at one of these pre-trials, if custody is at issue, the court will appoint a guardian ad litem. This person usually has to meet with each parent, observe them with the kids, and meet with the kids privately (if age appropriate), then make a recommendation to the court. The best way to set yourself up for success with a GAL is to give a long list of names of people who can be witnesses in your favor. If the GAL calls them all, maybe he/she'll be more persuaded in your favor. More likely than not, the GAL will fail to call all your witnesses and if you get a good recommendation anyway, no worries; but if you get a bad recommendation, you can now ream the GAL for doing a half-hearted job when a kid's life is on the line. It's a win-win. Other than this, I could write a series of posts on how to communicate with a GAL, but the gist of it is to be honest, avoid the blame-game, and if you're seeking sole custody to throw in the phrase, "In a perfect world, I'd love to see shared parenting with 50/50 time between us, but right now that simply can't work because ..." If the GAL doesn't see shared parenting, 50/50 time as an ideal in your mind, you'll get crucified.

4) You're going to spend most of the time with your attorney on discovery or settlement negotiations - sometimes both. Figure out early if the case is likely to settle so you're not wasting your money trying to settle when it never

will, or litigating when it could be a quick resolution. 99% - a 5-year marriage case should settle. Dealings with the kids will be the difficult part. If they were born before the marriage, you'll have to make sure to have proof of paternity via a vis the birth certificate or an affidavit of paternity, otherwise you get no rights at all. If they were born during the marriage, you're fine. If you meet the following requirements, don't back down from shared parenting with 50/50 time as your bare minimum: (1) you have no serious addictions to drugs or alcohol; (2) you've never committed a provable act of violence against anyone; (3) you have no mental health issues; (4) you have been actively involved in your kids' day-to-day lives for at least the last 12 months (i.e. PT conferences, doctor's appointments, attending extracurriculars, etc. - not just "I feed them dinner, bathe them, and put them to bed"). If she fails in any of these, you might want to consider going for sole custody or at least shared parenting but you getting the lion's share of the time. If it's really bad, go for supervised visits. If you fail in any of these, be prepared for a grueling battle to get the best you can.

5.) If you can't reach an agreement, get ready for trial. Pull together every exhibit you have that you think might actually be usable and put it into a 3-ring notebook organized in order by: (1) income-related exhibits, (2) asset-related exhibits, (3) debt-related exhibits, (4) documents proving separate property (i.e. pre-marital, inheritance, or gift assets), although these can be mingled in with 2 if appropriate, (5) dirt on her (i.e. her cussing you out by text/e-mail, pics of her drugs/alcohol use, social media posts, etc.), (6) things affirming you're a good parent (i.e. e-mails with teachers, records when you took kids to the doctor, pics of you having fun together, etc.), and (7) information showing how well your kids are doing - if they're doing well, explain how you've contributed to it; if they're doing poorly, explain how your spouse is screwing them up and you're trying to fix the situation, but acknowledge your contribution to the problem as well (anyone who is 100% blame is totally not-credible). If you can pull all this together on your own, you'll be saving your attorney a butt-ton of trial prep work, possibly amounting to at least \$3,000 and as much as \$10,000 in work. Of course, let him (and I don't mean him/her - female attorneys are a monster of their own; go with a "him") tweak and adjust the book as he believes is necessary. The better job you've done on your own, the less his tweaking and adjusting will cost because it won't take as long.

Good luck.

Why do college girls lose interest quick?

17 upvotes · 30 August 2017 · /r/askTRP

every time I meet a college girl at a party/bar, and hit them up the next day, they seem way less interested than the night before

Because they're not drunk the next day.

Younger 14 year-old sister is turning into a hardcore feminist SJW. What the fuck do I do?

17 upvotes · 27 July 2017 · /r/askTRP

men raping and sexually abusing young girls

The feminist agenda depends predominantly on fear and shame to control its populous. The fear comes from this type of garbage. They will say: *If left unchecked, all men would be rapists and abusers. That's why society has to set restrictions on men, to help them become functional members of society. If you don't help us, you might get raped too. Oh, and you BP guy over there? I'm not worried about you raping me, but that's because you're a model citizen, exemplifying all the ideal qualities of what a tamed man should look like. Keep being good and maybe I won't shame you for being so disgusting when you fantasize about me alone in your basement.*

How do you help your sister avoid this fear and shame based strategy? More time = more influence. She might take a lot more time than a normal person might, so it might get to a degree when the effort outweighs the benefit,

but that's your call to make. But point out the hard truths about life whenever you see them - not in movies, but in real life. If she gets an orbiter, show her what she's doing - that she has a lizard brain too. If she dates a nice guy and she's not long-term happy, point out why she's dissatisfied and help her do some soul searching. These type of people don't change until they're able to internalize the message to their own life circumstances.

My ex starting to deny me seeing my daughter?

17 upvotes · 29 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

With respect, I'll have to disagree with [/u/BluepillProfessor](#) on this one. You absolutely want to present a DNGAF attitude while simultaneously lawyering up - and don't go for some pansy push-over lawyer either just because he was cheap (don't go for the most expensive one either, they're 99% of the time not worth their salt). Source: I'm a divorce/child custody lawyer.

The DNGAF attitude isn't about not seeing your daughter. It's about not caring whether or not she's going to let you see your daughter. That's a huge distinction. You need to take charge and communicate with your actions (not your words): "I don't care if you want me to see her or not. You deny me what I want, I'll get someone with higher authority than you [the judge] to make you back down and he'll see how crazy you are in the process."

Most states use a "best interests of the minor child" test for addressing custody/parenting time issues. Within those tests there's almost always a factor that says, "The parent more likely to facilitate parenting time with the other parent" and/or "The parent more likely to foster a loving relationship with the other parent."

The principles found in TRP/MRP are going to help you in court. OYS, don't be a slob/dead-beat, manage your finances well, and show upward social mobility. Do those things and the judge will respect you. He will compare you to all the other dead-beat dads out there and say, "I give custody to moms on so many cases where there are real problems like molestation, violence, drug/alcohol abuse, etc.; if there are no real problems with this guy, why shouldn't I let him be an equal contributor in the child's life?"

Now, if the mom is actually mentally screwed up too, you've probably got a good shot at sole custody. File a Motion for a psych eval, take some practice MMRPs to prep for when you're tested (I found one for free online once) and know the outcome in advance, and condition her to fail it (buckle her frame a day or two before she meets with the psychologist ... or even that morning, if possible); and in the meantime, follow the gold rule of custody cases: **DON'T DO STUPID THINGS**. Seriously, I'm amazed at how many people (usually on the other side) think it's okay to do stupid things and that the judge won't care.

Be prepared to pay a few grand to the psychologist to do this, but if you come out looking way better than her, it's the fastest track to custody or at least having the dominant role in a shared parenting plan. I call this "Covert Custody Plans." You call it "shared parenting" to appease the other side, but add a clause that if there are any disagreements, you get the final word. This really means you have custody, but the words "Shared Parenting" appear at the top of the page to feed the other side's ego.

My firm specializes in cases involving psychological issues, so I can say quite boldly that at least in my state this is the path to victory and also to (1) force her to work within your frame throughout future parenting interactions, and (2) make her want you back, so she'll be a lot nicer to you while holding out the hope that maybe something could happen again someday.

Just make sure you've got your stuff together and you're not going to come out having serious mental problems. Most RPer's would likely come off as narcissists, which is a devastating diagnosis in a custody case. Maintaining frame doesn't mean the world revolves around you. Humility is a very masculine trait when expressed from an accurate sense of self rather than an effort to undermine yourself.

Most people incorrectly define humility as "thinking less of yourself" or "acting as if others are of higher worth than you." This is not. Humility is best defined as: "Knowing exactly who you are in relation to the rest of society and living in light of that rather than trying to appear better/higher status than you actually are." From what I've

seen in my limited experience on this sub, this is a very RP mentality that often gets overlooked or even swept under the rug. But my guess is if you ask directly, people will say: "Stop pretending to be higher value in the marketplace and do things to actually become higher value." That's another way of saying, "Quit being proud and arrogant and develop an accurate sense of who you are in society (i.e. humility)."

Genuinely curious about your philosophies. Not looking to debate just want to listen.

16 upvotes · 21 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Very well said! Given that this is going on the sidebar, for future readers, there are a few things I want to clarify:

1) My personal view is that the feminization of the church started much sooner than 100 years ago. I believe the first woman was ordained in 1815, but it really started picking up by the 1850. But I'd go even further back into the middle-ages when romanticized concepts of love crept into the church and began glorifying women through literature, skewing church interpretation of Scripture with the cultural philosophies of the times.

6) It's worth noting that it's more than just that their "teachings" and ours overlap. When an archaeologist uses scientific methods to confirm that a biblical event did, in fact, occur (such as the overthrow of Babylon by the Medo-Persian empire, as one of MANY examples), we don't say they "just happened" to come to the same conclusions as the Bible about the downfall of Babylon. We say that what God said is true and they, through secular means, have explored the evidence of God's written truth within the observable world. This is how it is with the secular RP's examination of intergender relational dynamics. They are studying the reality that God created without **cultural filters that create bias in most "scientific" studies**. They're literally just asking, "What actually closes the deal, and how can we replicate it?" Of course they're going to come to conclusions that line up with the way the Bible says God created men and women. God authored sexuality, hormones, etc. They're just studying God's creation to figure out what we learn through Scripture.

7 and 8 are spot on.

To answer **/u/stupidspoonerisms'** questions more directly:

How would you categorize your philosophies/theology to someone unfamiliar with RP?

We believe what the Bible says. That's really it. We are grounded on theology and not philosophy (a topic on which I have written much). We don't force any one hermeneutic. There are people from all denominations/branches here. We do not aspire to be a particular "denomination" with our own isolationist claims about what the Bible means. We recognize that there are many different valid interpretations of a number of passages.

If you want to say something sets us apart, it's our complete and utter rejection of liberal theology. That is, when people try to infuse cultural philosophies into the way they interpret Scripture, that's where we draw the line.

That said, the most commonly held Scriptural foundation here (which is by no means unique to us) is the view that the Christ-church relationship (and in some aspects the God-Israel relationship) was given to us as a model for the way husbands and wives ought to interact. We look not only at what Jesus teaches, but also at what he does. This is, perhaps, where we tend to part ways with the mainstream church culture, who focuses more on the words than the actions of Jesus.

Would you simply say you're an RP Christian?

Not any more than I'd say I'm a Christian lawyer or that you'd say you're a "Christian reddit user." Your use of reddit is a fact about you, not part of your identity. So, when I attend "Christian Legal Society" meetings they say, "We are Christians who happen to practice law." Here, I'd say I'm a Christian who happens to be RP-aware.

RP is not part of my identity or branding. It's just a context - and a useful one to communicate at various times.

Or is there another overarching name for this type of theology.

Not that I'm aware of. Again, we don't have our own unique brand of "theology." We are just normal Christians who have paid attention to parts of Scripture that others in modern culture haven't given much thought to (for a variety of reasons) - and with a particular emphasis on actually **APPLYING** what we read rather than just ingesting it for academic value.

Personally, I had never heard of RP and it's hard to find online resources or commentaries on your interpretations of scripture.

That's because very few believers have delved into the Bible's views on sexuality enough to produce content exclusively focused on it that aren't tainted by serious cultural baggage. This, of course, makes a lot of sense when you consider how it was culturally inappropriate to speak openly about explicit sexual matters for all but the last 75-ish years of the world's history. It is the feminization of the world that brought on the sexual revolution, so it's not surprising that the content that's been generated on the topic is feminized as well.

To go from a different angle, if I were to write a "red pill commentary" on the Bible, it would look extremely close to a blend of many other commentaries already in existence. I'm not going to read the book of Nahum or Daniel and try to force some "RP lens" into how the book should be interpreted. But there are some passages where a proper interpretation has been lost on those who have been conditioned by culture to have a butterflies-and-rainbows view of who Jesus was and feminized notions of marriage and sexuality. That is:

- **We don't put on an "RP Lens" to Scriptural interpretation. We take off the "Feminized Lens" that everyone else is wearing, then interpret Scripture without that bias.** This leads to many similar conclusions, but a few extremely significant different ones too.

To be abundantly clear: there are **MANY** commentaries that will preach the same things we do. But again, one of our principles is relevant here: *Watch what people do, not what they say*. This is a twist on the "Do as I say, not as I do" motto that's become a popular joke about churches - because many pastors will not live out what they preach. In this sense, you may **READ** many commentaries that preach proper principles of marriage, sexuality, headship, etc. - but good luck finding a body that actually practices them. Congregations will pay lip service to Scripture, but conform their behaviors to culture.

In this sense, let me make one more thing clear:

- **RPChristians is NOT merely about what we believe, but about how we live.**

This is what separates us from the rest of the flock out there. We are committed to living out what we believe about the Bible, whereas many "pastors" and congregations are content to pay lip service, while living their own lives (and leading their flock) on their own philosophies, which happen to be "inspired by the Bible" in the same way many movies are "inspired by a true story" - they will draw from the source content, but put their own spin on it, taking great liberties with the final product.

Is this isolated to reddit?

No, there are a series of bloggers out there who teach similar stuff. The use of secular red pill terminology is probably what most segregates us from the rest of the manosphere Christian bloggers (though each blogger/website/organization/subreddit is going to have its own unique spin on things).

Do you meet up with groups or attend churches with those who adhere to these same beliefs?

Some people do. I have personally led a small group with a handful of guys from this subreddit (primarily over zoom due to geographical issues). But the goal would never be to congregate. My personal missiology involves a **DECENTRALIZED** Church, not the mainstream centralized model. To over-simplify, this means I prefer to send people out into the world rather than trying to get them to congregate in one place.

I let my LTR show me her DM's after she asked me about it. Does that show weakness on my part?

16 upvotes · 21 October 2019 · /r/askMRP

"Sorry, not into MMF. Let me know when another chick DMs you and we'll talk."

Rachel Held Evans, Influential "Christian" Feminist Egalitarian, Dead at 37

16 upvotes · 5 May 2019 · /r/RPChristians

My thoughts are always mixed at these types of things. On the one hand, we have passages like ...

- Ezekiel 33:11 - "As I live," says the Lord God, "I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way and live."
- Ezekiel 18:23 - "Do I have any pleasure at all that the wicked should die?" says the Lord God, "and not that he should turn from his ways and live?"
- Proverbs 17:17-18 - "Do not rejoice when your enemy falls, and do not let your heart be glad when he stumbles; lest the Lord see it, and it displease Him, and He turn away his wrath from him."

But then we have passages like ...

- Psalm 58:10 - "The righteous shall rejoice when he sees the vengeance; he shall wash his feet in the blood of the wicked."
- Proverbs 14:32 - "The wicked is banished in his wickedness, but the righteous has a refuge in his death."
- Proverbs 11:10 - "When it goes well with the righteous, the city rejoices, and when the wicked perish, there is shouting."

I suppose there is cause for both reactions. Any exegetical thoughts on how to distinguish when rejoicing in these types of things is appropriate and not?

Sexual Addiction v. Sexual Starvation

16 upvotes · 8 August 2018 · /r/TheRedPill

In my experience, most people on this sub are not red pill. They crafted certain fantasies during their beta days and merely change their external behaviors pursuant to red pill advice in order to gratify those blue pill fantasies about what type of sex life they always wanted.

This post is for those men who believe they have "arrived," but who still let their old blue pill fantasies about sexuality control their behaviors. They have not yet become their own men, as they're living in the same frame that they allegedly came here to escape. A crucial step in swallowing the pill that many seem to skim over is regaining control over our sexuality and sexual ideology.

Wife wants to take Girls Weekend to Tahoe

16 upvotes · 31 January 2018 · /r/askMRP

all of these things were her idea

I.e. I'm blaming her for my garbage leadership.

Why the heck are you paying that much on rent before your student loans are paid off? My wife and I collectively earn around a quarter mil ... and our mortgage is under \$1,300. Set a budget and enforce it. Learn to tell her no.

I'd just tell her: *Go for it. Have a great time!* Take away her credit cards and remove bank access. "I thought you said I could go?" *Of course you can, babe. You're just not going to use my money to do it. Have a good time on your trip.* Then give a big, but not sarcastic smile. This isn't a joke or a game or a punishment. It's a boundary.

She's getting chubby...

16 upvotes · 26 January 2018 · /r/askMRP

I honestly don't like the idea of dreading her. I want her to find her way to happily, healthily, moving towards a lower weight

This equates to: "I want her to magically stop being a woman and just start having motivations that she's never really had before."

More to the point, what makes you think women don't like dread? At least for the first several levels, it's really only improving their quality of life. Then there's the fact that women don't judge men on their own - they defer to other women to judge their man. So, if she never experiences dread, she'll never appreciate you. When she feels dread, it makes her feel good and happy because she knows she has a man that other women want, and this wins **the comparison game** (noting that this post also more fully explains "positive dread").

Even if I was to institute slow-burn dread, how?

All of the things you listed are you and her in isolation. Dread is about getting other women to vouch for you that you're hot and desirable - because your wife will trust what these other women say about you more than she trusts her own impression (which is usually always wrong due to complacency, among other things).

What you need to do is get out in public more. Screw the farm. Take her for a night on the town and let her watch as the waitress tries to flirt with you in front of her and the girl next to you at the bar keeps checking you out. If you're bold, feel free to initiate these things yourself, but it's far more effective if she sees it "just happen" even without you trying.

Doing more work around the house and farm is great. It shows her that you're a real man - a leader. But it's not going to increase dread if you're not out in public. Go. Do. Be.

A month out from the wedding... Finds TRP... Do I call it off?

16 upvotes · 15 September 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Many people affirm: *Marriage is RP on hard mode*. I suggest: **Marriage to a Christian girl is RP on hell mode.**

I am a Christian man married to a Christian girl. Christianity puts so much anti-sex garbage into a girl's mind that most of them never fully recover, or it takes far longer and far more effort than for non-Christians. This is not biblical. It's just how it is. My wife was raised this way. When we were dating, she passionately promised (sometimes even in tears) that once we were married she would be crazy sexual with me, jumping all over me, experimenting with every position, etc. Never happened. I called her out on it several times over the years, but her answer was always, "I thought that's how it's supposed to work - you get married and all of a sudden you're supposed to magically be okay with sex, but it didn't happen. All the negative programming has stuck with me - and I know it's wrong, but I still can't get over it."

Think about it. She's been told for the last 20+ years of her life: "Don't do it, don't do it, don't do it, don't do it,

don't do it, don't do it, don't do it ... until you're married." But she's not married yet, so that "until you're married" part doesn't register in her brain. She only internalized the "don't do it." It's the rare miracle that gets over that from the morning of the wedding to that night. She will still feel like sex is something dirty. If you're worth it, she'll hamster her way into some justification for doing it, but it will still feel *icky* to her until you can undo the psychological garbage the church has done to her (mind you: I'm saying this as someone fully committed to God, the Church, the Bible - all of it).

Long story short: if you're going to marry her, it's going to be for spiritual purposes, not for "awesome sex with an awesome woman." You have to assume you're going to get garbage sex out of her for at least the first several years - if she ever gets over her psychological conditioning at all. Since you're not a Christian, you're not going to be marrying her for spiritual purposes, so your best bet is just not to marry her.

Add to this the fact that if she continues maturing in her faith, she's going to discover hard and fast that the Bible is clear: *Don't date/marry a non-Christian*. You've only made it this far because she's still very, very young in her faith to the point that she either doesn't know this or isn't mature enough to exercise self-control in her emotional decisions. So, by marrying her you're going to do her a huge disservice and she will live to regret it and resent you for it, unless you come to faith also - and even then you're going to have to mature in your faith faster than her so you can lead her in it. The only other alternative is that you pull her away from her faith, risking sending her to hell for eternity in the process, so that you can get her to satisfy your wishes instead of God's. That'd be a pretty crap move and about the most hateful thing a person could do - so why would you consider doing something so viciously evil to someone who you'd be professing to love on that wedding day? Conclusion again: don't marry her.

FR-Old Man at Church

16 upvotes · 7 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I get terribly annoyed when my pastor says during a sermon, "We all know who wears the pants in the family." He says it like it's a joke, and people laugh, but it's more of a Jerry Seinfeld, "You ever notice how ...?" kind of joke, not a "this is ridiculous" joke.

The church has feminized men for centuries. I have lots and lots and lots of thoughts on this subject, but suffice it to say, I'm really close to starting [/r/RPChristians](#) in the hope that (1) we can make some progress in developing a positive masculine identity within the church and male leadership in Christian homes; and (2) have a place where every third comment isn't, "Get a divorce; ditch her if she doesn't want to respond."

To [/u/chachaChad](#) - As much as it pains me to say it, you're right. Feminism is not the culprit of creating beta men. The church is. There's a long, long history to this (including why it's wrong), but suffice it to say something needs to be done. The best way to fix a problem is to begin with where it started.

Hey guys check out this really neat 3 h YouTube video I watched!

15 upvotes · 14 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Haha, I almost removed this post because of the title, then saw your username and clicked through. Then I thought about side-barring this to give an example of how link posts should be done ... then realized that, while having value, some of the points aren't on-point enough to warrant being on the sidebar because it might confuse some people into thinking that *everything* in the video is endorsed.

The main point of contention I'd have with Fr. Chad is his idyllic views on masculinity. He says men "should" be this and "should" be that in very broad terms that could, in many circumstances, deny men the right to operate within their own frame.

I believe [/u/coachdad8](#) and some of the ECs on MRP got into it over this a few months back - he taking the view that a man's mission must conform to idyllic standards (grandiosity, external, etc.), whereas the MRP guys say a

guy can make up his own mission however he wants, even if it isn't externally focused and it's something trite. Both methods have value in different contexts - the MRP guys will make a guy happier, whereas [u/coachdad8](#)'s method will generally make a man more attractive and give him a context for developing orbiters and to be viewed as the prize whose frame everyone wants to be in.

But from a biblical worldview, the answer seems quite simple: non-Christians **cannot** have a godly frame (Hebrews 11:6), so we should expect them, in one way or another, to have lesser pursuits. For Christians, we **must** be continually sanctified toward Christ's frame (not as an external pressure/imperative, but because a failure of this calls into question the authenticity of the title "Christian" over such a man), which will inherently cause his own frame to become those things which [/u/coachdad8](#) describes.

For more reading on the coachdad8 view, here's his post on the subject, which was generally well-received even though we haven't seen him around ever since:

https://www.reddit.com/r/RPChristians/comments/gatn5d/every_christian_mans_mission/

(Yes, this was a pseudo-meta way to do a write-up on coachdad8's post with a link at the end, mirroring what you did for Fr. Chad's video :)

An Interesting Study Indicates Men and Women Sin Differently

15 upvotes · 17 September 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I bet they're defining "lust" as "having sexual thoughts and feelings toward a woman," haha. Even with a biblical definition of covetous adultery, it probably still makes the list for men, but certainly not ahead of gluttony or sloth - but I'm also a lot harsher on "sloth" than most people.

Where to go from here? Red Pill SO abandons animal in park

15 upvotes · 4 March 2019 · [/r/RedPillWomen](#)

This is illegal behavior in most states, but I know many people who legitimately don't realize this type of stuff is wrong. This is likely particularly true for him, as he may be thinking: "I got the cat from the wild, it didn't work out, so I put it back in the wild." He may not realize the way domestication can ruin a pet's ability to survive in the wilderness thereafter.

Personally, I'd find out if he was ignorant or heartless before making a judgment call.

"I think I was just raped"

15 upvotes · 8 October 2018 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

I didn't think until writing this post: "I should have sent her out to talk to the cops anyway" for this exact reason.

Desiring God Says Feminism Wants to Silence "Real Men"

15 upvotes · 19 June 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

This is ... incredible. I never would have expected as much from [desiringgod.org](#). That's not to say they're always right. I still see two core issues that men should be wary of:

The manly intentionality that had pursued these women during dating had dwindled.

I've never been a fan of the notion that men must pursue the women. This is a weird ideology to me - one that the church espouses en masse that I just can't get past.

If men are supposed to lead and women to follow, what happens if you're moving toward the woman? If you're pursuing her, doesn't mean that you're behind her? Doesn't it mean that she chooses the direction and you keep pursuing after her down that path?

No, a man should lead. The woman should pursue the man. This is 1 Cor. 11:3 plain as day. Christ follows God. Man follows and pursues Christ. Woman follows and pursues man. This is how it ought to be. Yet somehow the church has flipped these. As beautiful as this article is, it misses the point on this one.

'Marriage is 50/50'

This whole section is true ... but he singles out the men. What about the obligations of their wives? Why is it okay to tell a man the burden that he must bear, yet even in the midst of the audacity it must have taken to write this article, he still is too scared to tell women what they must do.

Bonus:

'Your Spouse Is Your Best Friend'

In this section he brushes against the edges, but never quite says it: she is your one-flesh partner. Ever hear the age-old debate about whether or not a guy can be "just friends" with a girl? The debate doesn't stop when you get married, as many women seem to think it's perfectly acceptable to be "just friends" with her husband. Even "friends with benefits" doesn't do the marriage bed justice.

All in all, though, I'm impressed at the bold nature of calling out these lies for what they are. Bravo, John Piper's blog ministry, bravo.

FR: The Spousal Support Scam

15 upvotes · 28 January 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

No, he didn't. But she had already presented her case reaffirming* how she did everything around the house and he did nothing. We didn't bother trying to set the record straight, as that would have worked against us.

Do you guys ever explain to your women why they are the way they are?

15 upvotes · 1 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

In an intellectual: "Let me help you understand who you are" way? No. In a, "Hah! You're kind of like this right now" way? All the time.

When she's complaining about one of her friends or family members doing well in life, I'll pop out the crabs-in-a-bucket analogy. By now she knows what it means when I make pincer fingers at her. When she comments about liking a certain TV character, I'll drop some jokes about her being so into alpha males.

But what you're really getting at is: *Maybe a nice psychology lesson will fix my wife.* It won't. Don't try. If anyone's going to fix your wife it'll be you, not some new (to her) social dynamic theory that she probably won't buy into.

You also talk about RP aspects of women as if they're supposed to be fixed. Most of this is biology. You don't fix biology except through genetic manipulation. If you want to marry a man, turn gay. Otherwise accept your woman as she is and lead her through her troubles rather than trying to turn her into a dude. [Legit mental health issues aside, of course.]

Thought I found a unicorn and reality came crashing down...

15 upvotes · 3 July 2017 · /r/askTRP

A friend of mine used to say, "All women go into a relationship hoping to change the man, and men hope women will stay the same; both are always disappointed."

Divorce

14 upvotes · 16 August 2025 · /r/RPChristians

I'm going to be super blunt on this and say: this seems like useless victim puking. You said you already made the decision to file for divorce. The Bible doesn't list that as an exception to the "no divorce" principle, so it's a sinful choice. Either own it and follow through or repent. But bringing it up the way you did looks like you're just looking for validation from this community.

To soften up a bit, I get it. I see this situation constantly in my career - where one spouse goes mental. And yes, it often happens at accelerated rates at ages 50+, even without any history of dementia or alzheimer's. I've literally got 2 cases right now where parties are seeking divorce because the other developed paranoid delusions. I see the intense struggle my clients have gone through and the massive pain they've endured trying to "hold it all together" for so long, being the one to do 95% of the effort on that front.

But contemplate your own understanding of life, maturity, wisdom, etc. Think about your own emotional status and how it's affected by your perspective on life. Compare that to God's. In the whole "Christ // Groom and Church // Bride" context, how does He see your mentality compared to his own? He sees clearly, but my guess your own concept of reality, morality, spirituality, maturity, emotionality, etc. looks like you're a lunatic to God because you don't see as clearly as He does. Your brain literally can't process all of these things at his level, and so you make constant stupid and foolish decisions, just as we all do - even far beyond what you realize because, as I'm sure is also true of all of us, we tend to think we're far more God-minded than we really are.

Okay, so in that context, how does God deal with us? Does he say, "[u/Dazzling_Result1090](#) - you've gone psycho, so I'm going to bail on my promise to stay faithful to you"? Nah. He bears the weight of our sin, knowing we're helpless to do any better.

Now, if you are worn down so heavily that remaining married is likely to cause an even greater sin (like murdering your spouse, or physically abusing her, etc.) ... then probably better to take the lesser sin of divorcing her and sending her on her way. I won't fault you for that ... it's between you and God if He will. Your call. We're all stuck in lose-lose situations sometimes. But if you can bear through it, just read Hosea and contemplate how much pain and suffering he bore through on behalf of his wife - all for the sake of being able to understand better how God relates with His people, and you'll find that your wife being a nuisance perhaps gives you the same blessing of a commonality with God that few others get to tout, just as Paul proclaimed that he would boast about his weaknesses, and you can boast about how your suffering gave you a unique insight on the person of Christ that you can bond with him over, and in ways that few others get to bond over such shared commiseration.

Clever ways to share the gospel

14 upvotes · 29 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

This is a useful post. None of these are what I'd call "sharing the Gospel" by any stretch, but they are certainly non-forceful ways to let other people know that you're a Christian, which has value. To that end, in light of my [304 post on evangelism](#), I'd consider this post a great extrapolation of the **Aware of Messenger's Spiritual Beliefs** section. The activity that leads up to this awareness is described in that post:

The Christian's job during this phase [...] is to start gradually exposing the non-Christian to your spiritual beliefs. This is best done passively at first. "Sorry, can't hang out Tuesday. I have a Bible study. How about Wednesday?" It's as simple as that. Because they already like you, when they realize you're a Christian this will begin to challenge their stereotypes about Christians.

Why You Must Be Willing to Nuke Your Nuclear Family

14 upvotes · 6 May 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Solid post, brother. I didn't get this for the longest time. I remember my first ever post on askMRP (6/26/17) making the comment that "divorce is not an option for me" and getting reamed for it. Initially, I ignored those

comments on the principle that "they just don't understand my Christian faith." Truth was: it didn't matter if you all understood it or not. The cold, hard truth is the cold, hard truth.

So, 2.5 months later (8/15/17), after sufficiently eating my ego on that point, I ended up writing **Why I'm not afraid of divorce rape**. This one ended up becoming a double-whammy after my wife snooped around and found my account, then started reading all my stuff. Not only was I not afraid of divorce rape - she became actively aware of it, and I didn't have to go Rambo or autistic by telling her.

Of course, I felt like a fool when I actually started reading what the Bible had to say on the subject, as this conclusion was there all along:

- "From now on those who have wives should live as if they do not" - The concept of *the marriage* or, as you put it, *the nuclear family* shouldn't control how we live.
- "But if the unbeliever leaves, let it be so. The brother or sister is not bound in such circumstances; God has called us to live in peace." - Elsewhere the Bible says that if someone is unrepentant (such as insisting on divorce), then we treat them as an unbeliever. So, if she doesn't like my boundaries and insists on leaving ... *don't let the door hit you on your way out.*
- "If anyone comes to me and does not hate his own father and mother and wife and children and brothers and sisters, yes, and even his own life, he cannot be my disciple." - I've got bigger things in life to worry about than someone who's going to distract me from what actually matters. My priorities are higher than my *nuclear family*.

These are all actual quotes from the Bible - and there are more. The point is, even people who have the most adamant positions against divorce should still be willing to put their finger on that button. There's no excuse, and everything short of this undermines everything else you're trying to accomplish.

Am I in the right place?

14 upvotes · 28 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

everyone there will only ever see me as the beta billy I used to be

I hate to break it to you: if you're worried about how everyone sees you, you're still beta billy.

This probably deserves a post/video sometime, but this idea that your historical impression in someone else's mind is a hindrance to you is 99% psychological. You've put yourself in a box that you're unwilling to break out of because of what people will think of you. It's self-generated pressure to conform to previous patterns in your life.

If you start acting different, will people notice? Probably. But if you're not getting the results you want now, don't you WANT them to notice that you're not the same person who got those bad results?

I used to make an intentional effort of doing things out of character in front of others at least once a week. Sometimes it would be saying something unusual. Others times it was doing a different body mannerism. More commonly, it was putting my arm around someone when I usually respected others' personal space. Yes, people acted weird ... then they got used to it and I effectively acquired the power to re-create how others saw me into whatever I wanted it to be.

In reality, I had this power all along because nobody actually forces you into the box you force yourself into. Break out of that box. Next time you see a cute girl, put your arm around her, raise an eyebrow, nod your head and say, "What's up?" with a cheesy grin. You'll get some laughs. She may even call you weirdo or gossip about it behind your back about how "weird" it was that you did that. But she and others will start to think differently of you. And as you continue to show consistency in whatever new person you are, the more they will embrace it.

"But I can't do that! It would be too weird and out of character. I don't think I could work up the confidence to do that." See now that THEIR perception of you isn't the problem? It's YOUR perception of yourself that's the problem.

The advice to change locations is if there are no good options where you're presently at. You're in a mega church. I guarantee there are options. New people are flowing in every week. The baggage you have that's holding you back here will follow you somewhere else. Don't think that changing locations will make your problems go away. Everyone thinks "starting fresh" will be easier. It's not. You lose a lot with it too.

Does anyone here have recommendations?

Yes: get out of your own head. Live in your own frame instead of worrying about how others perceive you.

Teacher reflections on behaviour management

14 upvotes · 26 April 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Penalties and negative consequences do not change future behaviour for the better ... Rewarding the 'right' choices is the most powerful strategy of all ... ignoring the negative if possible

This dynamic is the exact opposite of the more recent testing and experimentation that is coming out. What you're speaking about is the traditional preference for positive reinforcement over negative reinforcement, which is based on the *theory* (that until recently had minimal actual field testing) that negative reinforcement would harm the positive attachment with the authority figure, ultimately losing respect. The exclusion of negative reinforcement as a viable strategy for parenting was birthed primarily from the liberal agenda that everyone should just be nice to each other all the time and never say or think anything bad about anyone else and the world would be a better place full of butterflies and rainbows.

I'd have to dig it up in my office, but the last time I cross-examined a forensic expert on the stand in defense of my client still spanking his kids, I had the guy admitting that there was ultimately very little tested research to back up the long-term effects of positive reinforcement as a parenting strategy, and that, instead, the long-term studies that *have* been done ultimately show that negative reinforcement is a much more powerful tool toward successful long-term behavior conformity.

The study itself looked at dozens of marital relationships as well as separated parents and how the children ultimately behaved and interacted with each parent. The results were identical between the married and non-married parents. In the majority of cases, the father was the sterner disciplinarian than the mother, who was more about being loving/cuddly with the kids. In the overwhelming majority of cases, the children's basic way of life and viewing the world was more consistent with the sterner disciplinarian, and the children exhibited a stronger bond with the disciplinarian. Compared with the relationships where neither parent was a disciplinarian, those where one or both parents were disciplinarians had children who were far superior in their school grades and behavioral reports than those whose parents were averse to harsher forms of discipline.

My personal take, after being a parent of 4 kids, studying the matter independently, and facing it daily in my career, is that negative reinforcement is the best tool for conforming behavior and positive reinforcement is the best tool for building trust and affection within a relationship. You should not have one without the other, and you need to know the appropriate place for when to use them. But suggesting that negative reinforcement is useless and shouldn't be employed is ridiculous.

It does seem like you've incorporated a few mixed theories in here, but overall it sounds like you've drunk a bit too much of the liberal cool-aid they've been shoving down your throat in all those "how to deal with kids"

seminars I'm sure they make you attend or view online in the guise of "teacher training" (aka "let's condition them to be liberals" sessions).

The world we live in

14 upvotes · 9 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Avoiding marriage altogether is an even more sure way to reduce every risk ;)

Trust me when I say that a girl with a "strong Christian background" is still AWALT.

Two traps of the red pill

14 upvotes · 1 May 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Once you identify with the red pill framework you begin to interpret everything through that lens

You're right, but what we endorse here is slightly backwards from what you're implying.

- We don't endorse viewing the world through a red pill lens.
- We do endorse viewing everything through a biblical lens, which happens to validate the things that those with red pill lenses happen to see.

With this in mind ...

Stand firm in your identity as a Christian as a co-heir with Christ, not a red piller or any other identity of this world

This is spot on. This would assume that a man receives his validation from acceptance within a red pill community. Ironically, the red pill teaches the exact opposite: don't look to anyone else for validation - especially not strangers on the internet.

As Christians, we have a slightly different take. We know that there is One who does validate and whose opinion matters more than our own. 1 Corinthians 4:3-4 is incredibly on point here:

- I care very little if I am judged by you or by any human court; indeed, I do not even judge myself. My conscience is clear, but that does not make me innocent. It is the Lord who judges me.

So, when we read in WISNIFG that "you are your own judge," it's useful advice to the degree that it helps us stop looking for validation from outside sources - including a red pill community. But it is lacking in that our own judgments and validations on our lives are ultimately worthless because we will be judged by God's standards, not our own.

However, in this process, as a man becomes sanctified, God's character becomes intertwined with his own. His natural inclinations become godly rather than ungodly, and therefore his self-assessment becomes more accurate in comparison to God's judgment. In this, we should never encourage a non-Christian or baby-believer to be their own judge, but once someone is fluent in Scripture and walking in godliness, the Spirit within them does give them that authority.

To bring it back: you're absolutely right (and even the secular world would agree) that you should not get identity-based validation from the red pill community. I'd even extend this to your local congregation, or even your own internal senses (unless you are mature). Rather, it is perfectly appropriate to seek validation from God and living in alignment with His Word.

From there, the question is: with all the misinformation about Scripture found from one congregation to the next,

where should a man go to learn the standards the Bible gives for men and how they ought to live and model their lives after Christ? This is a community that seeks to be the answer to that question. The validation we give is not one of acceptance into our community, but one of whether or not men are living up to the example set by Christ. I believe this is a perfectly appropriate thing for men to seek and find, for this is the very essence of iron sharpening iron.

I cried when I watched a video about seeing loved ones in heaven

14 upvotes · 15 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

My wife and I had a miscarriage. A year or two ago I had a dream. A middle-eastern man wearing nice clothes showed up at my front door and said, "We don't normally do this, but she really wanted to meet you." A little girl walked up from behind him and gave me a hug.

She was about 7 years old - the age the miscarried child would have been. She also had dark, curly hair like my wife (my 4 other kids all have blonde hair like me) and a bright beaming smile.

We chased each other around my living room, tickled each other, had a pillow fight, and laughed a lot.

After about 30 minutes the man said it was time to go. She didn't seem sad - like she was excited to go back just as she was to come in the first place. She gave me a great big hug and went back to the man, who she seemed incredibly comfortable and affectionate with. He asked her, "Isn't there something you wanted to tell him?"

"Oh yeah, I have a friend and she wanted you to deliver a message for her. Her name is [name] and she wants you to tell her parents that she remembers them, and that she loves them very much and can't wait to see them."

About a year before my wife and I had our miscarriage, the guy who disciplined me in college had a child born with hydrocephalus by that name, who died after only a couple months. It had been years since I'd ever given that (or even my own miscarriage) a passing thought, so the idea that my brain would randomly concoct any of this in such absurd detail is unrealistically improbable.

I am firmly convinced I met my miscarried child, and yes, I did deliver the message.

I may have messed up (F/R)

14 upvotes · 7 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

"I was already going to, we already talked about this you don't have to give orders the second I walk into the house"

This is your first mistake. You broke frame from the moment you walked in the door. This is what we mean by STFU. Her telling you to do something like that shouldn't bother you.

- If you weren't going to do it, then just don't do it. You don't have to tell her you're not or call her out on anything.
- More applicable to this case: if you were going to do it anyway, just do it anyway. Yes, it looks like you're obeying her command. Oh well. Let her believe that if she wants.

Your goal isn't to convince her that you're alpha. It's to be alpha. That means you do what you want regardless of what she says. What she thinks about your behaviors or why you're doing them doesn't matter - her perception will come in time, but it has to happen naturally, not by you trying to persuade her that you're your own man.

The proper frame when you walk in the door is to have a smile on your face and not get butthurt by any commands she gives. Personally, if it were me, I'd have AAd - "Yes, your highness. Shoes at the door, your supreme majesty." Then take your shoes off and go do whatever you were going to do anyway.

I voice this to her then the hamster starts.

i.e. You got butthurt. No, her hamster didn't start. Her feels started. Hamstering is when she rationalizes away poor choices or irrational feelings. Her feelings in this moment are perfectly rational: you're getting pouty and angry at her and she's getting angry back.

"No I just don't know why you have to waste money on food,, and it's not the first time, it's like the third time this month. We are supposed to be saving money so we can get a house in a year or two."

You started DEERING. Don't DEER.

She then gets up in my face and pushes me.

Totally not cool. This is the first time I see her really crossing a boundary. Everything else she did is AWALT stuff. You should just expect everything before this as normal female behavior. She needs to be rebuked for this.

Instead of reacting with anger I go to the couch and sit down.

Wrong. This is still anger. It's just passive aggressive anger instead of physical violence anger. And then you start verging on physical when you start pushing her with your foot.

(they were not, my old ones soles were falling off so they were needed)

Don't DEER to us too.

Nope I needed those for work, food and things I need for work are two very different things...then I continue to STFU

This is the opposite of STFU. You bobble between DEERING when you get angry or passive aggressive silent treatment when you run out of things to say.

She then starts pulling stuff out of left field talking about stuff from months ago

If she's harboring resentment over those things, they're not from left field. They're very current in her mind because she stews over them daily.

She then rips my phone from my hand and we start wrestling on the ground.

Why not let her have the phone? Do you think that wrestling with her is somehow a display of dominance because you can overpower her?

"I want an apology now!!!!" "We'll you arnt getting one."

Yikes.

I eat a wrap with ham and mayonnaise then get in bed.

Is that what she bought? Or are you passive-aggressively trying to shove something in her face by refusing to eat the food she bought?

We do the devotion and she goes back to normal and admits she was acting crazy.

Good on her for being willing to shift to a submissive stance. You're incredibly lucky. Your actions this entire exchange were completely out of line and yet she was still willing to take the fall for it.

We talk and came to the agreement ...

i.e. You broke frame even more and made all your hard-nosed negativity and anger worthless in the end because you still ended up giving her what she wanted out of the exchange. If this was going to be your result, why not just cave to her up-front and not have to go through that mess? If you're going to go through that mess, at least stand your ground at the end.

When I STFU my wife literally goes bonkers.

Correlation and causality, my friend. Imagine a guy saying, "Every time I come home from work, my wife ends up crying. I guess I should just never come home from work anymore." Then you watch him come home from work and every single time he punches her in the face. Was coming home from work what made her cry? Should he really stop coming home from work to solve the problem? No. He needs to stop punching her in the face.

STFU isn't your problem. It's that you didn't STFU and when you thought you did, you were doing it out of butthurt and passive aggressive anger, which is what made her go bonkers.

there are other tools

You need amused mastery. As I often say, this is not a tool. It's a mindset. At some point you need to learn to stop getting upset by her antics and be able to maintain a positive, uplifting frame no matter how harsh she gets toward you.

I get it. Right now you are emotionally incapable of that. I was too when I started. It's hard to have your wife screaming in your face and not have a negative emotional reaction to that. Do you have kids yet? It sounds like you don't, but that helps a lot. Imagine a little 3 year old talking about how he hates you because you didn't give him a cookie. Are you going to get all mad and butthurt over that? Are you going to passive-aggressively give that kid the silent treatment? No. He's just a kid. Are you going to do that to your wife? No. She's just a girl. Don't expect more from a kid than a kid can actually do. Don't expect more from a woman than a woman can actually do.

Idk if my wife is a special case or what

Not at all. Everything you described here is EXACTLY what we mean by AWALT. This isn't proof that she's a special case. It's proof that she's just like every other woman.

me going quiet not rewarding bad behavior just makes her lose her mind even more

But that's not what you did. You DEERed. You acted with passive aggressive anger. You did reward her bad behavior by caving at the end. And even before then, you weren't merely withholding reward: you were actively punishing - and not from a place of strength or authority, but from emotional instability and weakness.

Then watching her lose it makes me laugh which makes her think I don't respect her

Even though you never once mentioned this happening in this exchange, I'll readily admit that you probably had very brief moments when you laughed or felt like laughing. But ...

- You weren't laughing when you argued with her about taking your shoes off
- You weren't laughing when you complained about her buying dinner instead of cooking

- You weren't laughing when you stormed off to sit on the couch
- Or when you were kicking her away with your foot
- Or when you were wrestling her for your phone
- Or when you stormed off to your bedroom
- Or when you got the spare sheets to sleep alone

Or any number of other incidents. You can't have a few isolated moments of amused mastery and think: "Well, I felt like laughing for about 3 seconds right there, so I must have been in a right mindset." That's not how it works. If you laughed it off when she tried to take your phone, you wouldn't have had any risk of DV charges being filed against you.

Honestly Idk what I need to do when these situations occur

Until you can get your emotions under control, the minute you feel yourself getting angry - even slightly - before making a snide remark or complaining about anything, you need to tell her with a smile on your face - even if only a fake one: "I can feel myself getting upset. I don't want to say anything that might hurt you. I'm going to step away for a few moments to pray, then I'll be back and we can continue with our night." Then go into another room and pray.

If she asks you what was making you mad, do not deflect, which will come off as you hiding and repressing anger for her and taint the rest of your interactions that day. Instead, you need to open with: "It's really silly, but ..." and then explain. Conclude with, "There's no reason for something like that to make me angry, and I didn't want to ruin the evening over something like that. There's nothing to worry about now."

If she gets defensive, let her get defensive. Just go about your business with a smile and don't be angry. If you must, refrain: "Like I said, it was silly. You don't need to defend yourself. I'm past it and recognize it wasn't worth getting worked up about in the first place." More likely than not, after you do this 3-4 times she'll stop getting defensive in the first place and there won't be any real issues.

Let me be clear: this is not an *ideal* way to handle the situation. But it is an acceptable middle-ground until you develop a stronger frame.

I have told her about boundaries

Like [/u/redwall92](#) said, don't keep talking about your boundaries. Once she knows them, don't talk about them. Just enforce them. My kids know not to tilt their chairs. When they do it, I don't remind them not to tilt their chair. I send them to time-out. They know the boundary. I'm not going to repeat it. I just enforce it. Do the same with your wife. Talk way less. If she crosses a boundary, until your frame is stronger you just say, "I need some space. I'll be back later." Then you go to the gym and work out.

The only tool I feel I have in the moment is to withdraw time and attention

Right. But you're doing this as a reaction to her behavior. You can never react. Ever.

If your withdrawal of time/attention is seen as a punishment, you just come off as a controlling jerk. The goal isn't to make her feel ashamed or punished for her behavior. It's to make her want to act in a way that would evoke your desire to spend time with her again.

Female Pastors - Some thoughts about it

14 upvotes · 14 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I'll preface by saying that I agree with your conclusion. That said, your backing is weak. Consider this comment less a personal dig at you and more a way for me to openly process some ideas I have on an upcoming post on effective communication.

preacher's wife ... didn't do much for the church

What about all the preacher's wives who actually do hard work? You can't generalize a few anecdotes onto everyone. That's a poor way to make a point.

atrociously bad sermons

I've heard many excellent sermons preached by women. If one of your main excuses is that "women aren't as good at preaching," then you're going to get a lot of objections on that ground alone. At that point you're arguing probability: *women are less likely to preach good sermons than men*. That isn't a very persuasive leg to stand on for most people, and it does nothing to address the crowd who follow the women who actually do preach good sermons. Once again: you can't generalize a few bad women preachers that you've heard onto everyone. This is fallacious logic.

And to be clear: that's all you're arguing at this point: logic. You've only made philosophical and observational arguments, which are inferior to theology, which you rightly moved on to ...

Somehow the modern church decided to stomp over a bunch of verses ... doesn't even care about the Bible at all.

Ah, just like you probably stomp over verses that disobedient children should be put to death and alleged cheaters should drink a vile concoction to determine if their claimed virginity was authentic or not?

"But those are all just Old Testament laws; I quoted New Testament verses" ... Right. So do you let women speak during small groups, which were considered churches in the early days? Do you demand your wife and sisters wear hair coverings? Do you eat rare meats that still have blood in them? Do you check to make sure the animal whose meat your eating wasn't strangled first? These are all NT commands.

"But I can justify why I don't follow those verses!" ... as do those who support women in church leadership. There are many strong cases that can be made. That doesn't make them right. It just means that you're arguing from a position of weakness.

Again, I'm not saying you're wrong - you're just being irrationally dismissive. When you can't understand and articulate from your opponent's perspective, you lack credibility in your own perspective and it sounds like you're just another ignorant extremist, the way the liberal media likes to portray us.

Another brief note on quoting verses without context: wrong application happens this way all the time. After dinner one day, I said it's time to clean the kitchen, and I assigned my son the job of cleaning the table. He put the dishes in the sink then wiped all the spilled food on the floor. I scolded him for this and he didn't understand: "You said to clean the table, and the table is clean. What did I do wrong?" He focused on one isolated thing I said - the part that was to him - and ignored the context that we were cleaning, not making a bigger mess. His application, while technically correct, led to the exact wrong conclusion about what to do. When we quote verses in isolation, without contemplating the greater context of what God is saying and doing throughout His Word, we run the risk of doing the same thing - and if we get the right conclusion, it is merely a matter of accident, not proper interpretation.

Another point: your post mistakenly assumes that preaching is the primary role of the pastor. There is a phrase

that gets thrown around in Christian circles every now and then: "the primacy of preaching." It's not found in the Bible. But somehow this concept has caught on as if preaching is the primary job of pastors. A more biblical approach would be to consider "shepherding" as a whole to be the primary job of pastors. Preaching can be one part of that, but if that's all a pastor does, or if that's seen as his primary role, he is grossly misleading his congregation and I would never follow such a man unless he were open to correction on that point.

So, if a woman is a bad preacher, what if she is excellent - even better than the men in the congregation - at all the other responsibilities of shepherding? Now your preaching argument loses even more weight.

Rather than quoting a few verses without context, the easiest solution is to take the same approach Paul does: point to Genesis. God created men to lead and women to follow. This is something that was not only true in the beginning, but remained true in the New Testament. There are plenty of posts already up on this, so I won't re-hash it all here. By pointing to Genesis, Paul is saying that his teachings were on the order of creation, not on what was most effective in the present culture. When women take roles of leadership within the church, including positional authority over men, they are violating that order of creation.

Simply put: it's wrong because God said so, not because women are lazy leaders or bad preachers. Why did God say so? Because it falls within the design of how he created men and women. Why did he create men and women that way? Because humanity needed a tangible leader-follower structure on earth within a gendered context in order to be able to grasp the leader-follower structure on a spiritual level with Christ within our spiritual marriage context. It all points back to how God wants to relate with us. When we allow women into leadership over men, it leaves the implication that the church can be a leader over God too - and God simply wouldn't have that. And yet in the age when the church lets women lead, we also see the church trying to control what God does and doesn't say, what he does and doesn't act on, etc. The church thinks it *IS* God rather than being an ambassador. That's the danger.

I unknowingly married a BPD... and I need advice.

14 upvotes · 9 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Ah ... good old BPD: my speciality. I wish I had time to do a full write-up. For know, you'll have to settle with this.

BPDs, depending on the severity, have the emotional maturity level of a 7-11 year old girl. They will never grow out of this. Ever. Don't expect her to. The solution is that you don't treat her like an adult. You treat her like a child. I know that sounds degrading to say, but it's the cold, hard truth - and while most psychologists won't put it that bluntly, if you were to talk to a therapist my guess is that the advice she'd recommend would be the same type of advice one would give to raising a child.

"you're amazing, I'm sorry I'm struggling" to "you are the reason for everything that is wrong"

This is true of all women. They will always look to blame someone else for their problems. This is not just a BPD thing. My wife does it too. How I respond: "I'm here for you as your husband, not as your scapegoat. If you want my help through what you're feeling, let's address how you're feeling, not how you think I'm failing." If she continues to blame, I leave. If she shifts to talking about her feelings, I console.

While my wife doesn't likely have BPD, the pattern in these (for me rare) situations is the same as BPD. Rather than passing a fitness test, for BPDs you have to go the next step by converting the fitness test into a comfort test. You do this by redirecting the conversation away from her accusations and toward her feelings. The most essential way of doing this is by holding frame and keeping a smile on your face (but not a smug type smile - a genuine expression of happiness in the face of her emotional assault). Simply put, don't get butthurt. See my 100-level post on an anatomy of butthurt for more on that.

My wife's theory was that Canada just sucked, it was way too dark in the winter and the town we were in it was impossible to make friends

So in addition to blaming you, she's blaming God and the rest of the world for her problems too. Does she recognize that there are countless people who live in Canada who do not struggle with the same emotional issues she has? Point that out and it forces her to grapple with the reality that she might be the one with the problem, not the weather.

so loooooong story short, we moved to California

Lose frame much? ;) My goodness - that's a huge beta move. It's going to take some time to recover from that.

The sunshine DID help. So did the new church. But only really for a spell.

No. The newness helped, not these things. She points to the new sun and church for her renewed emotional state because that validates her previous statements of blaming them for the bad state. The fact that it was "only really for a spell" is your evidence that sun and a better church aren't really what were causing or fixing her problems.

I tried, I suggested, I offered ... she refused, she didn't want to, it didn't work for her

Do you see how far in her frame you are? And then ...

Once my wife started the medication, the rage stopped. The suicidal threats stopped. She wasn't crying and screaming every day or two

Right. She didn't want to do it. She rejected, stalled, ignored, etc. to get out of doing it. Then she did it and it worked. As is often said: women don't know what they want and aren't always the best judge of what is best for their life. Again: she has the emotional maturity of a 7-11 year old girl. I wouldn't trust my kids with making these kinds of decisions. They're too emotional and only think about what they want and not what's best for them. In the same way, **YOU SHOULD NOT BE TRUSTING YOUR WIFE WITH WHAT SHE THINKS IS BEST FOR HERSELF!** Hear her out. Weigh her suggestions and how different courses of action might make her feel. But at the end of the day, you're the leader in the family and you need to lead her in what you believe is best for her.

It's easy to say that she's responsible for her own life. But as her husband, biblically you are responsible for her even more than she is responsible for herself. Take up that responsibility and hold her to it.

BUT it didn't fix the fact that she still has a hard time getting out of bed, still has no purpose, no job, no strong friendships..

Her purpose comes from you. You have to give it to her. Biblically, a married woman's purpose is her husband's purpose. What's your mission? That's Rule 2 for a reason.

She also just got clear of all that other stuff. She's lying in bed all the time because she doesn't have a purpose because you didn't give her one. She has no friends because she was emotionally screwed up for so long that she never made any - and now she has to start from scratch. I'm not surprised that it didn't solve these things instantly. I'd be surprised if it did!

My wife is a beautiful person who has some amazing qualities - She's just also got BPD

Reportedly, sex with BPDs can be great if you know how to work their emotions. So, that's a plus. They are highly emotionally charged. The way to make their emotions work for you is by getting them in your frame.

Frame is exceptionally difficult with a BPD because they have a tendency to view their lives from the outside - as if they're watching things happen to them rather than personally experiencing it themselves. This is because most BPDs have a history of sexual or physical abuse (or other trauma) and their minds fracture their consciousness from their present reality in order to cope with their painful experiences. Because of this, when you're interacting with her she feels like she's watching a movie about a woman interacting with you and she's shouting at the actress what to do and how she should be feeling. It's hard to enter your frame when she's not even inside her own body in that way. Life isn't real to her.

So how do you get her into your frame? You evoke emotional responses. This is different for most men, as we tend to be a source of emotional stability, not emotional volatility. For a BPD you have to do the opposite. At times, intentionally make her mad. At least then she's mad on your terms and in a setting you can control. Other times, be exaggeratedly happy and let it rub off. Tickle her. Tease her. Give her high-fives throughout the day. Jump up and down and do a happy dance when something good happens. There are a number of ways to communicate emotional positivity.

If you are instigating her emotional state, then she is reacting to your instigations rather than you reacting to her default emotions. This puts her in your frame. The stronger the emotions she feels, the more tied to her own reality she becomes. The emotional deadness is when she begins to separate from reality again, and it becomes harder to communicate anything or get through to her when that happens.

The most important thing in all of this is not to dance or tip toe around problem spots. You might be afraid of setting her off, especially with all the emotional problems she already has, you don't want to compound even more on her, right? Bad strategy - and this holds true for all women. The better option is to look at the egg shells on the ground and start jumping all over them, laughing as you do so. At first she'll be mad that you broke her egg shells. And at some point your happiness and laughter will cause her to join you in jumping on the egg shells too and she will have been restored to your frame. Feeling mad for her is better than feeling depressed and a faster route toward her feeling happy again.

Also ... make-up sex is a staple on the shelf for BPDs, but you can't actualize that result if you always tip toe around her prospective anger. She wants to feel angry because she wants to feel something. Let her get it out - just don't let her point it at you. Ideally she points at herself - how angry she is about her emotional situation, about her behaviors, about the fact that she has no friends, about her lack of motivation. Let her express all of that. But if she starts pointing the finger at you, you walk away until she's ready to get down to business again ... unless, of course, there is a genuine issue you need to address. But her evaluation of what genuine issues you may or may not have is not very reliable. Listen to what she has to say on that for a very brief time, but ultimately evaluate with yourself and other trusted men before just taking her word for it.

OK, so I covered more than I planned, but I hope it was worth it for you.

Cuddles are required

14 upvotes · 29 September 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

My thoughts exactly.

FR: The Spousal Support Scam

14 upvotes · 28 January 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I did say it isn't a groundbreaking argument. Just one that was new to this judge. These types of arguments are usually made to legislators, rarely in court.

fun free date ideas for after work?

14 upvotes · 25 July 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

Here are a few things my wife and I have enjoyed:

- Going on walks [cliche, I know; but it's classic for a reason]
- Get some drinks and popcorn, put a Netflix standup comedian on instead of your typical show, and pretend you're at a comedy club
- Arrange a city-wide scavenger hunt; leave clues around your neighborhood, and make the last one end in your bedroom; this doubles as going on a walk if you hide some of the clues in the middle of a park, away from the parking lot; lots of great relational time along the way. For even greater fun, have a friend write the clues and hide them for you so you can both do it together. Offer to return the favor so they don't feel like they're getting jipped.
- Dust off an old board game. Play it on a picnic table in a park with some sandwiches.
- Lug your mattress into the living room, shut off the breakers and tell him the power's out, so you're going to have a living room camp-out for the night.
- Head to a busy street, bring a snack from home, find a park bench, and just people watch for hours. This makes for great conversation.
- Most urban cities have a local theater group that'll do free outdoor plays a couple times a week.
- Go to the mall and put a bunch of ridiculous outfits in your cart and take turns trying them all on without any intent actually to buy any of them. Bonus points if you both agree to put a few items of lingerie in there.
- Go to a playground that doesn't likely have kids everywhere and just bring out your inner-children and nostalgia.

Girlfriend wants to start smoking cigs

14 upvotes · 14 July 2017 · /r/askTRP

That sounds manipulative and controlling. It also implies too much investment on your part. I'd be more flippant: "If you want to smoke, that's great! I'm sure some guy out there will be really into that."

Don't aim for perfect game, the bar for sex is not that high!

14 upvotes · 9 July 2017 · /r/seduction

Doesn't "above average" mean the top 50% by definition? Maybe you mean that it's like a switch and only 10% of men know how to flip the switch into the "on" position, thus the "average" position is off.

HillSong Pastor Carl Lentz' Lover

13 upvotes · 12 November 2020 · /r/RPChristians

In retrospect, Ranin said their relationship was likely a product of the pandemic — “He hadn’t been doing anything for so many months, he hadn’t been onstage, what else was going on in his life?”

You say "spreading the gospel wasn't enough." The problem is: he wasn't even doing that. He was preaching sermons. Mostly preaching to the choir. That's not spreading the Gospel. And certainly none of this rings anywhere near making disciples, even if the Gospel was preached and a few non-believers were trickling in.

This is yet another example of structural churchianity mentality ruining things. The guy is so hung up on the stage being his role in God's Kingdom rather than the field.

RPC Chat - Episode 4: Christian Dead Bedrooms

13 upvotes · 17 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

is duty sex really better than no sex?

That's up to each man and the way his wife approaches duty sex. Is she star-fishing with a frown on her face or fulfilling her duty with a smile on her face? Huge difference between the two.

Think about it - prostitutes give duty sex all the time. There's no way they're actually into it with many of their clients. Yet that wouldn't prevent them from giving their client a wild ride anyway, right?

From there: if a prostitute will do it for \$100, and yet your wife says she loves you and you pay for virtually everything for her ... why should the prostitute who is paid much less and who doesn't love you actually give you a better time than your wife, when it comes to obligatory/contractual sex?

I still have sex with you because I know it is important to you and I know you need it. I may not be super into it but seeing how you are into it I can still do it for you.

Can you imagine a prostitute taking that attitude with one of her clients? How quickly would she be put aside?

My point here isn't to say wives should be like prostitutes. My point is that prostitution should be the lowest form of sex - and yet when wives treat their obligation to their loving, providing husbands, no matter how unattractive she finds him, worse than a prostitute does, how much does that say about the reverse angle of the wife's love/respect for her husband? It means she loves him LESS than the prostitute does, despite getting more from him.

That's insane to me. There are very few excuses I would find acceptable for this type of behavior.

How is one to navigate as a biblical masculine man in a female-dominated workspace

13 upvotes · 4 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Jesus lived in a pretty depraved society too. The Romans were chock full of false idols. Prostitution was commonplace. After his ascent, the apostles lived in a time when the government was ordering the execution of all Christians and literally hunting down and killing the Jews.

Imagine them asking that same question:

Can I really call myself a man following God if I see all these things and do nothing?

The thing is: they were doing something. They were doing exactly what Jesus did and told them to do. They were making disciples.

Discipleship is God's plan for how to sanctify the world. Sure, on rare occasions he can use martyrs, grandstanding moments against a cause, big-name figures, etc. But for the most part, none of the apostles had any claim to fame, and yet their work throughout the world not only put an end to the mass-murder of Christians throughout the Roman empire - by the 300s AD, they actually turned the tables and got the Roman empire to mandate that all people must be Christians. What a crazy turn of events! That couldn't have happened if people weren't making disciples.

... and then they stopped making disciples and the church has fallen apart ever since. Every now and then someone will rise up and restore the vision that Jesus modeled. But on the whole, when we see the church start to crumble and go the way of the world, it's usually because people are more interested in engaging with the words of Jesus than living in the model of the life of Jesus.

You want to do something about all this? Stop fantasizing about grandstanding and getting yourself in trouble. Go find some guys and disciple them not to be like that - and train them to do the same with more guys, who can do

it with more. That's your strategy.

No / Bad Sex - Always His Fault?

13 upvotes · 28 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Been there, done that. In worse of a context than you're describing. I had the same questions and concerns you did. Turns out AWALT, even my special snowflake of a wife that even MRP guys told me was an outlier.

So, is there a possibility that she has a problem?

Of course.

Is it possible that many Christian women have psychological issues about sex being dirty, shameful, or taboo, and that this causes unhealthy sex lives in marriage?

Absolutely. My wife had these exact problems and deep-seated psychological reservations too.

Is it possible that not every marital problem boils down to the man not being "alpha" enough?

Absolutely.

What you're missing in the above questions is that you're ultimately trying to force yourself into a box where you can psychologically accept your fate instead of actually doing something about it.

My kids break things in my house. It's annoying. It's 100% totally their fault. I don't get to have my house free of broken things the way I want. How useful is it for me to say, "Welp, it's not my fault; it's my kids' fault. I guess I'm just going to have to deal with a house full of broken things"? That's not at all useful!

Instead, I'm going to have to take measures that other people may not have to deal with. Why? Because as much as AKidsALT, mine are UNIQUELY like that in a way that surpasses what others have to deal with. So, I I I I I I I I I I (not them) have to take UNIQUE measures in my own house hold to achieve my own goals.

Why? Because it's not my kids' goal in life to avoid breaking things. It's not your wife's goal in life to figure out how to make herself horny. If you want her to figure out how to be horny for you, that's on you. Yes, she's got problems. What girl doesn't? No, this doesn't even sound like a unique problem. It sounds like an incredibly common one. You just haven't figured out that part of your life that isn't measuring up.

Heck, when I first started on MRP, people were telling me over there that my wife was one of the true unique hopeless cases because she was so psychologically damaged about sex by her parents and had so heavily ingrained the "sex is painful" mentality in all of our sexual experiences for the first 7+ years of our marriage that there really was no hope for a turnaround. I was told that she was what Rollo called "outliers" - the few girls who simply won't respond to normal red pill tactics.

It turns out I just wasn't as awesome as I thought I was. A couple months later, everything turned around. Her "this is definitely 100% absolutely a physical pain, not a psychological issue" vaginismus turned out to be a psychological issue that she hasn't complained about once since I'd red-pilled myself.

So, you're in one of two places:

1. Your self-evaluation is off and you're really not as awesome as you think you are; or
2. You truly are among the Channing Tatums and Chris Hemsworths of men and she's got unique problems that

she doesn't care to fix on her own and even Brad Pitt coming onto her wouldn't make her horny, so you're going to:

- (a) accept it and deal with the problem for the rest of your life,
- (b) compromise your faith by divorcing her in the hope Wife 2.0 is more easily aroused than her, and that this doesn't come with some other trade-off, or
- (c) consider the path toward her sexual recovery a journey of unknown duration that you will choose to lead her along.

That being said, because you're so hung up on "she will do this, she won't do that" and "she thinks this or that," I'm about 99% confident you're still living in her frame, and thus the first option is 99% likely. Even if you're in your own frame, she's OBVIOUSLY not in your frame yet. Why not? There's clearly more to this story that we're missing.

EDIT: Also, you ever look into Madonna-Whore Complex?

[FR] Unstoppable Emotional Inertia

13 upvotes · 13 September 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

As I recommend men should be.

Help with over-controlling parents?

13 upvotes · 21 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians

You sound like a whiny teenage brat. How is refusing to clean up a table going to make you more manly? Or more godly for that matter?

Part of being a biblical man is learning to respect the chain of authority you're in - whether that's in a military setting or a family one. I don't get the impression they're abusing their authority over you. I do get the impression that you just have trouble with authority and your dad is doing his job trying to beat that out of you. Take his cue and follow his lead.

When you move out and you're not under his authority anymore, you're free to become a loser who doesn't clean up after himself. Or you can learn to put garbage in the trash and dishes in the washer. It's really not that hard.

Caught wife cheating, she backed out of mediation

13 upvotes · 28 June 2018 · /r/askMRP

To [u/medic_jajs](#), don't involve the kids. Why would you do that to them? Because you want to spare your ego in front of them? Screw that and any guy who does that ... unless they're all 16+ and reasonably mature enough to take it.

Of she makes more than you, you're probably going to win. Have fun screwing her over. She'll plead for you to settle "for the kids." That's where it's a lie. Don't worry about the kids when they're not there. If she wants to hold out because you won't settle, as long as you've given her a reasonable proposal under your state's laws, then it's her refusing to settle.

NC is one of 3 states that retains laws for statutory interference with a marital relationship. Research it and use that. Some lady got a multimillion dollar verdict against her husband's mistress several years ago. She'll never be able to pay it, but it can be nice to stick your thumb up her butt like that.

Hire the Rosen Law Firm if you're near Raleigh, or at least have a consult with them so they're conflicted out.

For those who are married or want to marry: Why?

13 upvotes · 21 December 2017 · /r/RPChristians

You're obviously young, inexperienced, and fairly immature in your understanding of RP praxeology. Many of the things you've said have been specifically rejected by even secular RP. It sounds like you're a TRP guy rather than an MRP guy. TRP is about 90% infantile wannabes who simply don't get it. In MRP that number is much lower and the content is much better. I may not agree with everyone there, but I respect them and acknowledge that in a secular world-view, their way is usually the best way.

As a single guy, I can't expect you to have personal experience with the claims you're making. I've seen MRP mods call guys "autist" for blindly citing a concept while ignoring practical reality in how that concept translates to the real world. You simply don't know because you haven't lived it. That's the danger in being a TRP guy. To that end, I'm sure that's a big point in why you're asking. You see all of this negative propaganda about women and marriage and can't reconcile that with the fact that people - even RP men, and Christian ones at that - are still chasing women and getting married.

That's a question with merit. It's one that deserves to be answered. But your post is like, "I know for a fact that all black people are rapists. So, let me ask you: why do you have black friends?" The foundation of the question is based on a faulty premise, so the way you receive the answers given is going to be skewed by your faulty worldview - a worldview that even secular RP rejects.

TRUTH 1: Women aren't unconditional about their attraction for you.

I think this is what you really meant. A woman's attraction is dependent on what you have to offer her. If you have nothing to offer, she has no attraction. This is, of course, different from love, affection, beneficial behaviors, etc.

When the secular RP world says that a woman "can't love you like you want to be loved," they're: (1) using a different definition of love than the Bible uses, and (2) assuming that men want love in a different way than the Bible prescribes. From a secular worldview, they're absolutely correct. Just remember that they're talking about a different concept altogether than what Christians mean when we talk about love. The fact that you use the phrase "feeling love" tells me that you're processing "love" under the secular definition and not the biblical one. When Paul says "husbands, love your wives," he's not saying, "Have feelings for them."

The Bible says God is love. Expressing God to someone else is sharing love with them. This can mean living in godliness toward someone else, or it could be sharing your faith with someone, or it could be praying for them, etc. **Anything that lets your relationship with God flow to another is an act of genuine biblical love.**

Without God, genuine biblical love is impossible. This means that even secular men are incapable of expressing biblical love, which is why they have to use different definitions of the word to make a claim to "love" in the first place - and yet many RP men would rightly acknowledge that in a secular context the concept of "love" doesn't exist in the first place.

So, while my wife may not have the secular concept of unconditional feelings and behavioral patterns toward me that secular definitions of love reference, she is 100% fully capable of expressing godliness toward me - and she does. **Biblical love is absolutely possible between spouses.** But biblical love does not mean "she will want to have sex with me even if I'm a lazy slob with no direction in life and nothing to offer her." That's a somewhat blunt example of what most men want to be true in their flesh - and that is the sentiment that the secular RP world rejects, as do I.

Truth #2: She is not yours. It's just your turn.

In the Christian world, this simply means that your wife really belongs to God, who has entrusted His daughter

into your care. She's not yours; she's on loan.

But even secular RP doesn't mean that women will always branch-swing. They acknowledge openly that she might remain faithful for life. The concept isn't to prove that women will cheat; rather, it's to say that you have no right to demand or expect her to stay with you indefinitely. You do not own her. She can leave whenever she wants. But she might stay anyway, and a lot of that is dependent on how attractive you are to her. That is all that is meant by this concept. You're taking it further than even the secular world would.

Truth #3: All women can be like that (AWALT).

To say "there are no exceptions" makes me think you're trolling. This concept has been discussed and debated ad nauseam on MRP. The conclusion from every mod and endorsed contributor (which is also my view) is that "AWALT" doesn't mean "no exceptions" - it means that all women have these innate tendencies, but that different women have differing degrees of being able to suppress these tendencies or express them in different ways. As Christians this is generally and obviously true on a number of levels, the most significant being our sinful nature. We all have an inherent sinful nature that causes us to want to sin. But because of Christ in us, we have been freed from sin and now have the ability to deny these impulses within us in order to do what is right and godly instead. In the same way, just as Christ saves his bride from her sinful impulses, so also can a high-value husband give his wife freedom from her "AWALT" impulses - even among non-Christians. That said, for Christians it's much, much easier for women to deny their "AWALT" impulses because even apart from a high-value husband, they have Christ who is the highest value husband and leads them into righteousness. They may still fail (particularly if their "faith" is fake or weak), but their capacity to succeed in overcoming these innate tendencies is much, much, much higher than in the secular world.

CONTEXT CORRECTION

Let me be clear about one more thing. The context of your question seems to come from a place that assumes the point of marriage is love and/or happiness. This is a modern convention. Prior to the last couple centuries (pretty much when the feminist agenda started creeping up), people did not marry for love. Love was something that had to be expressed after the fact of the marriage, not the reason for the marriage itself.

The Bible says that the reason for marriage is to produce godly offspring (Malachi 2:15). In a post-Gospel world, we understand that physical offspring are paralleled with spiritual offspring. So, today we understand that the point of marriage is to reproduce our faith in others. Period. Marriage is not about love; it's about discipleship. Love is an obligation within the marriage. Feelings are a beneficial byproduct of living out the purpose for which God created us. But the answer to your question won't make any sense if you don't understand this context for marriage. As long as you think marriage is about love, you'll never be able to understand why people would marry.

Now to your questions ...

How can a self-respecting man who understands all this go ahead and get married anyway?

Because what you think they should understand is a false rendition of these concepts that even secular RP rejects.

For sex? ... companionship? ... family and/or children? ... love? ... God?

Of course not. It's for discipleship. God designed marriage as a roadmap to understanding how we are to connect with him and reproduce spiritually through him. This is what marriage and sexuality is all about. Most people simply cannot understand discipleship until they have a wife and kids first. But marriage is merely a roadmap,

whereas discipleship is the destination. Once you're at the destination you don't need the roadmap anymore. But very few people find their way there without the map - they might find the general region where the destination is, but never the exact place.

Of course, I should also note that "That's just a lack of self-control" is the EXACT REASON that Paul says a person *should* marry. Further, Jesus says in Matthew 13 that "not everyone can accept this [never marrying] ... but those who can should," meaning that God has designed several people so that they **MUST** marry because of their lack of self-control - that he keeps them from having that degree of self-control so that they will marry.

So, why do you do it?

I married while blue pill and for the wrong reasons. I stay married because I am more effective at fulfilling my obligations to God with my wife than I am without her.

And, for those who are already married - if you had your time again, would you have married anyway?

If I knew all that I know now, I probably would not. But the reason for that is that my marriage was much of the roadmap I needed to acquire the knowledge I have now. Although I had already had the vision for discipleship before marriage, I did not fully grasp all of the issues necessary to make me an effective disciple-maker until after I had my own wife and children. I did not understand how God wanted to connect with me until I had a wife and saw how I wanted to connect with her - for better or worse.

So, if I could retain my knowledge of disciple-making and go back, I would not repeat my marriage - I would remain single. Self control would not be a problem. But if marriage was necessary for me to acquire that knowledge and master this art of disciple-making, I would choose to do it again every single time. Why? Because **MARRIAGE IS NOT ABOUT ME**. You seem to make the assumption that marriage is about enhancing your own life in some way. But what if you embraced the fact that marriage is really meant to enhance God's purposes instead? I think that could totally revolutionize your perspective and open your eyes to the answers to these questions.

Be the Judge

13 upvotes · 19 December 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Every ruling implies consequences for failure to comply. BPP often suggests a withdrawal of attention and affection. I'm sure you would suggest withdrawing commitment vis a vis cheating or divorce as possible penalties after escalation in the offense. Personally, I just do things my own way and my wife eventually follows along, even if she rejected it at first - the relational disconnect of living and moving in two separate directions is its own deterrent for her.

Bottom line: there's tons of information already on MRP about what to do if your wife won't follow. I wasn't intending to re-hash that. This post is more about developing a man's own mentality of his position and authority within the home - one of judge and decider and not of opposing counsel or peer. In my view, this addresses much of the issue many men have with misapplying stoicism and maintaining frame - they think it's about being a stubborn, immovable rock, rather than rising above the argument altogether.

Friend needs immediate help

13 upvotes · 6 November 2017 · /r/askMRP

married 10 years ... He was already wealthy and owned his businesses prior to marrying her

That "royally screwed" bit really isn't so bad when the duration is 10 years or less. He's going to have some solid separate property claims, and support won't likely be any longer than 3 years - 4 if you get a really bad judge.

That's something he can recover from, given that he still has 28 years left of work in him - and his highest earning years are yet to come. Child support will be a pain, but even that can be marginalized if he plays his cards right on the custody/time part to get a decent deviation.

her mental sexual hangups brought on by her strict religious upbringing

Been there, done that. The "beta nice guy personality" that you say only compounds on the problem *actually is the only problem*. Yes, there is legitimacy to the whole sexual repressiveness in many Christian women, but a solid alpha who actually understands the Bible will know how to lead her out of it. This is on him. Send him to [r/RPChristians](#).

One of her biggest complaints is that when he does have free time he is always in the gym.

She's treating him like one of the girl. Crabs in a bucket mentality.

she has even "crashed on his couch" on nights when she was too drunk to drive home.

First, I'm pretty confident now that she's only a cultural Christian and not a genuine one. So, if your buddy is a Christian, 1 Cor. 7 applies if she wants to walk away - he's welcome to let her.

Second, she's cheating. Let her go.

What if a s--- test cannot be ignored?

From what you describe, he's been letting her act like a sole custodian in the marriage, so he really can't complain when she starts acting like a sole custodian now. He's got to take ownership of this and fast.

That said, if the kids start missing school because of her emotional reaction to being told off, that's not going to bode well for her in court. If she does get them to school, he needs to take half the day off, pick them up when they get out, and be the one to start caring for them like a single dad. Married or not, if you want sole custody rights as a man, you need to act like you're a single dad. Period. If you just want shared parenting, then learn to communicate and share the responsibilities during the marriage. But shame on him for letting his housewife become a stay at home mom. Those are two different concepts and the latter is particularly empowering toward women.

sit her down and start calmly but firmly laying out boundaries

That's workable. I'd start by taking her car keys. She doesn't have a job. He can figure out where the kids need to be and get them there. If his job is so bad that he can't take care of his own kids, that's a problem he's going to have to figure out for himself or else deal with the consequences. A man must prioritize. Maybe his job is more important to him. Great. Let him focus on that and lose his control in the home. But if he wants his home life figured out, he's going to have to start hiring some more employees to handle his crap for him at the work place so he can handle his own crap at home.

do not know the appropriate RP response....should you simply default to STFU?

Yes.

that's not always possible

I'm not sure how your wife is forcibly manipulating your vocal chords. Are mutant powers for real now? The blue pill in you is what's still telling you, "I have to say *something*" in the first place - that her actions can force you to do anything you don't want to do. If you want to remain silent, remain silent. You might look like an idiot, but —

seriously - what's she going to do to you? *But her emotions are too much! Won't that just make her more mad?*
Screw her emotions. Do what you want. Period.

Now, is it wise to just sit there in perfect silence like a total idiot? Probably not. Fogging is the easiest place to start. Just agree with everything she says without expressing your own opinion on the matter. "I can see how you feel that way ... I understand what you're saying ... That makes sense ... I suppose my actions could come off that way ..." This can go on forever and is better than just plain silence. Anyone who has read WISNIFG knows how to handle these conversations with fogging and other tactics. That should be the second book you read after NMMNG. Get it done.

she has him over a barrel

This is really just a magic trick - it's a bluff. It's like a random stranger walking up to you on the street and saying, "I have your wife and kids tied up in a van down the street and my partner is going to shoot them if you don't give me your wallet." It's a bluff. His wife and kids are safely at home. But through mental and emotional pressure, the robber convinces the man to act without having to use any actual force. No matter how physically strong the guy is compared to the assailant, the nature of the threat mentally subdues him.

When someone swallows the pill, he becomes aware of these con artist schemes and knows how to shut them down.

He didn't get a prenup so he stands to lose everything to this bitch

Not as much as you may be thinking. A lot? Yes. Not everything - and he has a lot of years left to make it up and more.

How does dread in marriage work when the man clearly has more to lose and that's clearly evident to both parties?

How the living heck does he have more to lose?!?!? If they divorce, she lives high on the hog for 3 years and he has the next 28+. Whoop-ti-doo. If he stays married to this shrew (i.e. she gets her way), every additional year of marriage increases his future losses if they eventually do divorce ... and if they don't, then he loses his chance at a satisfying relationship (given that he won't swallow the pill). So, who stands to lose more? That one's a no-brainer: it's her.

half of everything he owns

None of the premarital stuff. You said he was self-made before the marriage started, so that's going to be pretty sizeable. Any appreciation in value from the date of marriage to the present will be divisible, sure. But he bought himself into that mess. He'll still walk away with the lion's share due to the premarital components. Hopefully he's not dumb enough to have trashed all his records, though.

and likely his kids

That's his own fault. If he abandons his kids for the job, that's a choice he made and will have to deal with. Now, chances are that if he starts stepping up his parenting game now, he'll still end up with 50/50 rights and a sizeable reduction in child support because of it. But he's got to prioritize and figure out his schedule.

She's still young enough (early-30s) and certainly attractive enough to retain a high SMV

Great, so she'll remarry eventually and won't need support for long anyway.

Divorce would mean total and utter destruction for him and hitting the lottery for her

Remaining married is hitting the lottery for her. It means she gets to keep playing queen of the castle, bossing him around, doing whatever she wants, and spending his money while she's at it ... unless he swallows the pill.

Divorce puts a clear end to her payday. It gives her a one-time payout, but she loses all the years and years of future income and growth from him that she otherwise would have had. It also puts a hard cap on how long she'll get spousal support. Sure, it's a nice immediate boost, but she has every incentive to stay with him and keep screwing her friend without getting caught.

You can't hide that fact. You can't fake that divorce wouldn't hurt you.

Does it hurt? Yes. But it will hurt less now than at any other point in the relationship. He's really in a spot where it's not all that bad, comparatively.

He's businesses are family businesses he inherited

Then it's all separate property and she has no claim to them whatsoever (except to the degree of active appreciation during the marriage; even passive appreciation would be his separate property). I'm pretty sure every single state has a law affirming this.

Single Father v. Single Mother Stats

13 upvotes · 2 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Are male clients better off with female attorneys or male?

Male. Most female attorneys seem to have a stick up their butt. They're constantly trying to prove something to someone, but they don't know what or to who, so they just come off as arrogant without cause most of the time. Even when they do have the stronger facts on their side, they don't know how to play it cool. They ham it up stronger than it is, and end up losing credibility, losing ground with the judge, putting the case on more equal terms when they already had it made and they just needed to chill. To be fair, both sexes do this when they're new to the practice ... but I have yet to see a female attorney learn to play it cool even several years into her practice.

This is where RP concepts of stoicism really help in a legal practice. If you can listen to a judge ream you and your client, maintain a stiff face, and walk away saying, "I understand. Thank you, your honor," you just gained a ton of points with that judge, even if she was mad at you before. But for some reason most women can't keep their mouths shut. They try to argue back with the judge (especially if it's a male judge), or they'll roll their eyes (you just won your next motion if the judge sees this), or they'll be whispering to their client while the judge is talking to them as a passive-aggressive "I don't need to listen to you" kind of thing. Eye contact, stoic expression, admission of weakness, and courteous departure (preferably with a smile) are the way to set the right tone for your case. This tells a judge you have nothing to hide and that you can be trusted with how you present your case, not getting personally invested in the matter, and not feeling like you have to over-compensate for weaknesses or inflame your strengths.

As to that "admitting your weaknesses" part - I've only ever met one female attorney who was capable of doing this with any tact. Most of them say, "It's true that we have ___ and ___ and ___ working against us, BUT - here are all of our strengths." This is not an admission of weaknesses. This is an assertion that your strengths outweigh your weaknesses.

Sometimes I walk into a judge's chambers on a case and start the conversation by saying, "Your honor. My client's an arrogant butt hole. The other side has her problems too, but seriously ... this guy really thinks he's the

king of the world. And I'm not saying anything he wouldn't tell you himself - he knows he's arrogant." Everyone in the room has a good laugh as they wait for the "BUT!" When it doesn't come, the judge finally asks each side to present their case. Guess which side the judge usually trusts and believes? The guy who knows how to own his faults.

I've only ever found one female attorney who is the exception to this rule. The problem she had was that she was so much of a pushover that I got everything I wanted out of the case anyway. I don't think girls know how to play it in the middle in a professional context. They're either hard-core fem-nazis or you get the rare overly-submissive pushover.

Would it affect the calculation if the wife's attorney were female or male?

Well, I always size up the other side before I size up their attorney. Why? Because the client ultimately calls the shots and even though I can't speak to the other party, my client can. So, if my client can get through to his wife, we've got a much better chance of settling the case, even if the other attorney plays hard-ball.

That said, if the client is a tough-nut, then the attorney really matters. A good attorney can get his client under control, but a bad attorney will fuel his client's rage because he can make a ton of money doing that.

As for gender roles in opposing counsel, I'd always prefer to go up against men over women - not because I get better results (I usually get better results going against women), but because they don't take everything so darn personally, they're not threatening to report you for garbage that you never did, they're not trying to prove anything to anyone ... you can just chat and have fun with them, and when it's time to do battle, you do battle, straight and easy.

I used to be indecisive, but now I'm sure...

13 upvotes · 20 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

In the past, when she asked what I wanted for dinner, I'd respond once with an open-ended, "Where do you want to go?" If she was indecisive, I'd narrow it down and say, "Here are 3 options. Do you have a preference?" If she still didn't answer, I'd pick (although 90% she'd pick one of the three).

Nowadays, if I actually have one that I want more than the others I won't even wait for her to ask about dinner: I'll just tell her, "I'm picking up Piada on the way home. Do you want the fried chicken or grilled chicken this time?"

If I really don't have a preference, I'll still revert to the 3-options question as my first line (instead of second) and make sure they're all options I'm okay with. If she picks something off the list and I'm into it, I go with it; if I'm not I'll say, "That's a great idea ... for Saturday. Let's do ____ today."

She actually got ticked yesterday when I did this. She started thawing chicken to make a chicken parmesan bake, but didn't have time to cook it. She asked me to cook it and handed me the recipe. I said, "I like chicken parmesan, but I hate cooking it. I'm grilling the t-bones I bought the other day." She got all huffy and complained about the chicken already being *partially* thawed (read: still 75% frozen). I said, "Great. If you want chicken parmesan for yourself, go cook it. I'm making steak either way. Would you like one or not?" She ate it and savored my grilling mastery. We had chicken parmesan today ... it was done by the time I got home from work and quite delicious ... and I didn't have to cook it.

My boyfriend likes that I'm smart

13 upvotes · 11 July 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

Here's the deal: dumb women who aren't submissive are the worst. There is no good reason to insist on their ways.

Smart women who lord it over their men (i.e. aren't submissive) are slightly better but still a pain. 99% of men will hate this unless the man is clearly intellectually superior and both partners love the thrill of the debate.

A dumb woman who follows her husband's lead is acceptable and does not present a hindrance to attraction. Some men actually find the "dumb blonde" thing, for example, quite attractive - the ditsy factor.

A highly intelligent woman who uses her intelligence to support her man rather than control him ... that's entering unicorn territory.

My wife is extremely smart. I'm smarter (she agrees). Her intelligence used to make her compete with mine, which was very frustrating. When I started following biblical and RP leadership principles, her position has changed to respect my decisions even when she thinks I'm wrong or doesn't see the bigger picture (on most financial decisions, for example: she rationalizes an immediate need quite well, whereas I also balance in long-term planning). This has become an absolutely beautiful thing in our marriage because I can delegate things to her with no worry or concern, knowing that she can handle very complex situations, difficult communications with third parties, and on the fly decisions when I am unavailable.

In short, my trust in her capabilities is through the roof, but I have not lost respect or leadership in the process.

A nice quote from my former pastor: **It's not submission until you disagree. Otherwise you're just doing what you would already do anyway.**

Edit: I should also note:

submission is letting him be right even when he's factually wrong

Not all situations are clear cut fact. It's more about perception of fact. For example, suppose you both reach for something on the table and somehow water spills everywhere. Who did it? In your mind, it is undeniable fact that he knocked over the cup. In his mind, it's the reverse.

Submission involves accepting the possibility that you might be wrong even if everything in you says you're right. You'd be surprised how often people are fully convinced of something that is just factually untrue. It happens on the witness stand all the time. They swear under oath up and down that their version of events is true ... then a video comes out that shows the opposite and they are genuinely floored.

There are some objective facts, such as in your example. Submissiveness there is not about ceding to a false reality, but about how you communicate actual reality to him.

How to bring out the Alpha in a Beta man?

13 upvotes · 9 July 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

It is certainly possible to bring out the alpha in him, but at some point he has to want it. Your job is to make him want it and give him an opportunity to practice. Here are a few tricks to try that worked when my wife (sometimes unintentionally) did them on me:

FIRST - Tell him bluntly. Also, explain that, physical characteristics aside, you aren't attracted to a man who defers to you all the time.

SECOND - Let things fall apart. He doesn't lead because he's grown comfortable with you doing it. Break that comfort. Escalate the discomfort if it doesn't work at first. Here are examples in escalating order:

- Stop cleaning/vacuuming/doing the dishes. Let them pile up until he asks you to do them. If he gets mean about it (releasing his harbored resentment - a classic beta trait), just say, "All you had to do was ask," and go do it with a smile.

- Beta guys don't know the difference between being assertive and being a jerk. So, although it sounds counter-intuitive, you have to reward him when he's being assertive in any capacity, even if he's being a jerk too. When he learns that it's okay to be assertive around you, that's when you start helping him filter his jerk qualities out. His re-calibration will demand that he leave one extreme for the other extreme before he is able to find a balance. He is incapable of going directly to that happy balance.
- Stop doing the laundry. When he doesn't have clothes to wear to work, just say, "Oh, I didn't know it needed to be done," and toss him something from off the floor.
- Stop keeping the calendar. If friends want to hang out, forward the text message to him and make him answer it. Don't remind him when the day comes. If you miss it, then you miss it. Your friends may be upset, but you can always pass it off: "He was in charge of setting everything up."
- Toss the bills on his desk and if they don't get paid, let them go unpaid until he gets it done. Yes, you will lose some money by doing this, but consider that the cost of a much happier future together.

THIRD - Fuel his desire to be an initiator. Start with something you know he wants: a physical relationship. Wear something *mildly* provocative and doll yourself up *a little bit more than normal*, but act like you're wearing a nun's outfit. Don't get so dolled up that he thinks it's you passively initiating, though, because then he's just responding and not leading. The slight provocation will start spinning his wheels, but your non-initiation will force him to step up his game if he wants any actual action.

FOURTH - Don't start conversations. If he's not willing to initiate a conversation, let there be very, very, very long silences until he decides it's time to talk. My guess is he's used to you being the one to ask him questions and get the ball rolling. If he asks if there's a problem, just say, "No, I feel great today," and go about your business.

FIFTH - Do your own thing, not the default thing. Netflix and phone-scrolling are specifics, but the broader category is just chilling. He likes chilling with you. That's fine, but he has to lead you in that. So, get up and do other things around the house during the time you would normally watch Netflix. When he's all confused why you're not just automatically doing what he expects, he'll ask you, "Hey, are you coming down to watch?"

SIXTH - Flip conversations. If he asks you a question, put the onus back on him. For example, with that last question ("You coming down?") reply: "*Do you want me to?*" He asks: "What do you want for dinner?" You reply: "*Thanks for asking. I'd rather you pick today.*"

SEVENTH - Master the art of fostering subtle curiosity. This is a very tricky concept to implement, but when a person becomes curious about something, it can consume them until they get answers. This, in itself, doesn't translate to leadership, but there are a great many alpha qualities that come out with this one-track-mind drive. If he's not typically a curious person, making him curious about things more frequently might get him practicing alpha traits without knowing it. For example, something as simple as turning off his facebook app to google the answer to a question (ex. "What else has that actor been in?") gives him a mini-goal and lets him practice immediately accomplishing that goal. Escalate this into bigger things down the road, like making him curious about why you wore that outfit in the third point, above, or why you put on lipstick just to hang around the house, when you almost never do that.

EIGHTH - If all else fails, as a last resort start commenting about situations at work, among friends, on TV, etc. where you see a guy take charge and how you respect that. This can really make beta guys insecure about the possibility that you're cheating, and RP guys are 100% going to tell him you're cheating when you make comments like that ... but sometimes a little reverse dread, highlighting the things you find attractive in a man, could do him a little good.

I hope this helps.

Wife goes on a sex journey to 'find herself'. Is shocked when husband leaves her

13 upvotes · 6 July 2017 · /r/TheRedPill

This is how I interpreted it too. She realized after-the-fact that all of her guys were overseas and not marriage material; his girls were at home and don't have to be marriage material (only guys need to be marriage material, for the most part) ... she put herself in a bad spot and had to *ex post facto* rationalize why he ended up better off than her as a result of her living out her fantasy.

Christians and divorce

12 upvotes · 26 May 2022 · /r/RPChristians

Make disciples.

Abstinence till marriage (Advice/Discussion)

12 upvotes · 23 February 2022 · /r/RPChristians

prioritising my career and hoping to start a family in the near future

and

Mission: I want a big family, with a loving wife and children.

This is what's killing you. I'm with [/u/redwall92](#) on this one. You're wasting your life here.

I get it, though. You're relatively new to the faith. The concept of "mission" is something the Church won't teach you (lots of reasons for that), so you probably won't hear it from many other places, unless you get to know the Bible directly. Anyone who actually reads the Bible for themselves can't miss it.

The long and short of it is: God has given you a purpose. It's clearly stated in the Bible. It is unambiguous. One reason I put "mission" as one of the required stats in the sidebar is because it tells me *IMMEDIATELY* if a person is oriented toward following Christ or just wanting to do their own thing. You are the latter. I have no doubt that you want to follow Christ, but perhaps you just haven't figured out how that looks, so you treat your "faith" as a background thing while your career and family goals are primary. That needs to change first. When you do, everything else follows.

Some of this stems from this problem:

Reading: RPC

This tells us absolutely nothing. Are you saying you read whatever random posts go up? Cool. At least you should read my latest, which I put up just last night and it pseudo-tangentially addresses this mission problem (I wrote it ambiguous enough that I could put it up on the secular sub too, but this Christian crowd should know more clearly what I'm getting at).

Are you saying you've read the sidebar? Then you've probably read **Mission Matters, Nothing Else**, right? If so, you probably forgot what you read. Go back for a re-read.

Or what about **This Sidebar Post** or **This One**?

Or what about even the secular subs' sidebars? I quoted from the 16 Commandments of Poon in my last post, where he says, "You shall make your mission, not your woman, your priority." You've gone even worse and made your *hypothetical* woman AND your *hypothetical* children your priority, *who you don't even have yet*.

How can you lead someone when you're pursuing them? De-facto, that makes them the one leading you. One major reason millennials became so doggone screwed up (and it's getting worse) is because there was a shift in

child psychology that happened in the 1980s in mass-proposed parenting models that emphasized, "Children come first; they're the top priority above everything." This is where our court systems are, it's where most non-PhD counselors/therapists remain, and it's what our churches still teach. It's only been in the last few years that PhD-level research has started showing that making your kids the center of your universe turns them into spoiled brats. Some of the emerging trends are now consistent with what I had been teaching biblically for years: **Parents need to focus on pursuits outside the home to model for their children that there are more important things going on in the world than them.**

Parents who fail this by making their children the center of their universe teach their children to think, "I am the most important thing there is. My parents oriented their lives around me. Others should too." When children don't get the attention from others that their parents gave them, they go to great lengths to get it. Enter Instagram. Twitter. Tinder. All of the post-sexual-revolution mentality that was heightened by the age of the internet. All of this stems from crappy parenting - parenting that put the family first without an actual mission outside the home.

Don't make that mistake. Listen to [/u/redwall92](#) instead of arguing with him on stuff like this - especially when there's a broader cultural adoption of a concept within this community, such as the importance of having a mission beyond your wife and kids. Frankly, I'm surprised [/u/Deep_Strength](#) didn't mention any of this in his comment to you. Start reading the sidebar. You'll get there.

NMMNG married sex pause vs 1 Cor 7:5

12 upvotes · 3 March 2021 · [/r/askRPC](#)

I agree with [/u/SkimTheDross](#) - this isn't something you should have done openly. MMSLP also holds a much more valuable principle: never reject an initiation from your wife.

Now, if your whole marriage is falling apart and sexual issues are behind it, then yeah, it might make sense to say: "Let's just stop trying to force it, take a break for a couple days [1 Cor. 7 says SHORT TIME, not 3 months] to pray about the situation, then try again." I'm not opposed to that.

But you haven't told us nearly enough here to know why this moratorium is necessary in the first place, so I can't vouch that you made the right choice at all. If anything, without the context it sounds like a horrible choice.

23 year old woman desperately looking for help.

12 upvotes · 9 December 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I don't share my faith, as no one cares

Practice the art of invoking curiosity. It's the best skill you'll ever learn. Our obligation is to make disciples. If people don't seem interested, with all that meditating you do, meditate on how to make them interested.

has no job (like most men currently) ... Everyone under 28 yo is in the same boat.

Stop making excuses for him. Lots of people in that age-range have jobs and are continuing to find them.

knows just about everything

Except how to get a job, apparently.

I would say he is the epitome of what you praise here (obviously not perfect)

With rosy emotion-smothered glasses on, I'm sure this seems true. What you're describing, though, doesn't seem to fit with what you're saying.

His only weakness is that he is a very depressive and pessimist person

Ah yes, the man with no frame is the epitome of a red pill man. Now I see what you're saying.

How do I express my concerns and worries to him without being a burden and a weight on him?

Ask him to lead you in ways that will make him contemplate his own issues. If he's struggling with depression, on a day you're feeling depressed (don't make it up or just lie about it), tell him: "I'm struggling with this. I know it's something you deal with too. Can you help work with me on how to overcome this in my life?" He, if he's at all wise, will find value and help in his own struggle through the process of helping you.

All (literally all) the churches and priests here are what you can expect of your typical heretical, feminist, God-loves-you-for-everything, feel-good, wishful thinking kind. No spirituality, love songs, no teachings. You know the deal. So me and my boyfriend resent it. We want to get married but there is no priest that to us, is a man of God and has authority to marry us.

Believe me - no one else holds this sentiment here as strongly as I do. Not even [/u/praexology](#) (though he may come close at times). But it's immature and unwise to forsake the best resource you have for finding people to disciple. Wait ... what's that? You and him aren't actually discipling anyone yet? If that's the case (and I assume it is, as is true for most people), you need to step back and reassess how you discern maturity in the faith.

Back to the point: no person "has authority to marry" anyone anyway. There's no verse that says, "When two people get married, it must be through a pastor/priest." People today get super hung up because it's social custom to marry that way. But for literal millennia common law marriage was a legit thing, and only recently in *SOME* (not all) jurisdictions has this been abolished ... and suddenly churchianity wants to pretend that it was never a thing in the first place. Screw that. Common law marriage was when two people acted like they were married for long enough that the state just deemed them married, even without any other legalities to support that conclusion.

As I think [/u/rocknrollchuck](#) alluded to, your presently-existing exchange of vows and sexual activity already makes you married in God's eyes. I often say that in a biblical view there are only two conditions to create a marriage: (1) covenant, (2) sex. You have both. This is not an "engagement," as you say. It's a marriage. It's just a common law one, in the state's eyes, rather than a statutory one.

What to do? We are already engaged and feel like we are married.

Suppose you do want to legalize it before the state. If it's just a legal technicality to get tax benefits, why does it matter who the officiant is? Like chuck said - go to the courthouse. Or use a crappy congregation leader. For all I care, go have a mormon or scientologist officiate the ceremony. Just because they're cultists doesn't mean their ordination isn't recognize by the state. As I've already said, the ceremonial officiant doesn't change the fact that you're already married before God if you've made that covenant to be so, and had sex to seal it.

I know you will hate me for this ... We are not stopping, and we feel we are actively defying God in that regard. My doubt here is: how to deal with sex if marrying is so difficult?

Nah. We don't hate you for it at all. The only thing this affects is that it gives further confirmation that he's not the mature epitome of masculine Christianity that you seem to think he is. So, you're both fallen sinners. Welcome to the club. The only question is: what are you going to do about it going forward? Embrace marriage (whether already created or soon-to-be) or continue in what you believe to be sinful conduct? Mind you: Romans 14:14 states clearly that even if something isn't sinful *in actuality*, if you believe you're sinning when you do it, it's still sin. So, if you and him are "married," having sex isn't sin ... unless you believe it is, then it becomes sin. But if you embrace a "spiritual marriage," even if it's not solemnized by the government, why would you still

condemn sexual interaction?

But let me be clear here: **When you embrace SPIRITUAL marriage, you have to recognize that you are ACTUALLY married. The fact that you're not technically subject to CIVIL divorce laws doesn't mean you can change your mind several years from now and pretend you were never actually married.** That's why I reference the common law marriage stuff above, even though it really shouldn't matter. Because you have to recognize that this is still just as binding as if you did the whole song and dance.

every church is against God (like we are currently, with sex...)

Right. Hypocrite much? Why be so against pastors who "get it wrong" when you're condemning yourself by the same standard (or perhaps even a harsher one)? This is just making up excuses. I have no idea how you reconcile this cognitive dissonance. Either have grace on these other pastors as you do on yourself to insist that you will continue in what you believe to be unrepentant, sinful conduct ... or deny them your grace and resolve to repent.

But even then: **Have you actually gone to these pastors to correct them?** I'm really put-off by the way you condemn every "pastor" (I know: biblically, they're not really pastors at all), yet abdicate yourself from any responsibility for setting them straight. It's like you're just abandoning any involvement in local congregations at all. Even with your reservations, this is an absurd conclusion.

until me and my boyfriend finish our studies and are able to get a qualified work as engineers (at 29 yo), it's impossible for us so being a family

You're making tons of excuses. The bottom line is this: **It's more important to you (plural) to have the careers you want than the family life you want.** That's the decision you're making. Either embrace that and stop worrying about when you'll have kids, or change your priorities, drop out of school, and get a part-time job sufficient to pay the rent so you can begin the family life you want. Realistically: once you have a few kids, do you plan on continuing to work full-time anyway?

I don't know what my doubt here is, other than, what can I do to stop feeling so defeated about it?

You pick your priorities and embrace them. Stop expecting some magical wand to come in and give you conflicting goals in perfect harmony. Once you embrace the conflict and resolve in your own heart that you will pursue the higher priority to you, the "defeated" feeling should subside. The only thing that's "defeating" you at all right now is your quest to make the irreconcilable reconcilable.

my country will have a collapse in some 5 or 10 years. Widespread unemployment ... How am I supposed to feel good about raising a family in such dire conditions?

Now your job comments make more sense. But they're still just excuses. Your country sucks? Move to another country. I know, I know, "But I can't because of this excuse and that excuse." Don't whine. Let's go back to the prioritization issue. What you're saying is: **It's a higher priority to me to avoid the challenges of relocating to another country than it is to raise my children in better conditions.** Are you okay with that? If so, embrace it and move on - because you're getting what's more important to you anyway. If not, change your priorities and move.

Do I just "enjoy the decline" and keep to myself and family and friends, forming a tight community? That seems like the best course of action...

Ah, yes - the old "get everyone you love and hide in a cave to watch the world burn" strategy. Screw that. You want the world to be a better place? Your country? Go make disciples. That's how it's going to get better. If I'm right about preterism, it's LITERALLY the way things will get better. If I'm wrong and futurism is true, things

aren't going to get better, so why not save as many as you can before it dies completely? Either way, the conclusion is the same.

Hopefully my bluntness doesn't result in hurt feelings. I do think it's necessary to jar you a bit into realizing the unhealthy framework you're approaching your problems from.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (09/02/20)

12 upvotes · 2 September 2020 · /r/RPChristians

PHYSICAL: Home gym set up. Dieting has gone great lately. Losing some of what I re-gained after the close of gyms. I'm also realizing that my strength isn't what it used to be. Instead of 275x5 I'm stuck back at 245x5 with 265 as an ORM instead of my former 305. I'm hoping this comes back quickly, though while dieting I'm sure this will take longer. That said, I did cut back on the dieting because it was causing serious fatigue, which I can't have right now because ...

MENTAL/EMOTIONAL: Hardest thing to do in my life is walk away from my son in the hospital in critical condition. He had a chest infection that was mis-diagnosed as corona (similar symptoms: chest pain, shortness of breath, fatigue, headache, runny nose, etc.). Because it was misdiagnosed for so long (didn't help that his corona test came back positive), the infection was allowed to spread for far too long with the doctors repeatedly telling us to "just let him relax at home until it goes away on its own." Basically malpractice there. We took him to the ER when he started growing a lump in his chest, thinking it was a blood-clot (corona-symptom), and that's when they realized it was an infection. It had gotten so bad it went through his sternum, covering over the bone, and spread throughout his bloodstream.

The doctors did surgery on him the next day to remove as much of the infectious tissue as possible. He still has a giant hole in his chest with a vacuum attached to it to suck out the infection as it spreads so that the antibiotics can kill it faster than it reproduces.

In the beginning, I was at home caring for our 3 girls while my wife sat in the hospital with our son. The intent was that this would keep her stress level down, as being at home and not knowing what's going on would have been more worrisome to her, especially with 3 other kids to figure out. Well, that plan failed. Two days after the surgery, my wife had a vagel response and passed out and got herself shipped to the ER, leaving me to deal with my 3 daughters at home, her in the ER, and my son with no one in his room.

Also, the positive corona diagnosis meant that our household is under quarantine per the health department, so I couldn't take my daughters anywhere near the hospital. My wife and I were the only ones authorized to be with him - no other family allowed. So, my sister-in-law took the risk on the covid issue, hoping my daughters turn out to be negative, and picked them up so I could stay with my son and my wife could recover.

She felt a bit better the next day and decided to stay with my son again so I could get some work done. That failed once again, as the very next day she about passed out again and was sent home to get more rest.

While there was some hope that my son could come home later today, per the infectious disease specialists, the surgery staff just tossed that idea out because my son's digestive system isn't back to normal, meaning he might not process oral antibiotics properly, thus has to stay on the IV at the hospital. They may still let him home in a few days with a home-IV, but it's more probable they're going to hold him at least another week.

- **CONCLUSION:** This is why stoicism and maintaining frame are so important. In all of this, it's obvious my wife can't handle the stress. Yet because of my self-improvement I've been able to maintain the house, keep up with the daily calls from the health department regarding the COVID issue, get in my full work load, cover my son, give my wife the time she needs to rest, keep up with friends/social groups, continue my mission to make disciples ... oh yeah, and still get a full SL 5x5 routine in, as well as running 5-7 miles 4 times in the last week. Every time a new emergency comes up - whether it's with my son, my wife, work, etc., I just smile and whisper to myself: "Bring it on." Instead of feeling stress, I feel like Superman. I am the prize.

I attempt to empathize with my wife a bit more by acknowledging stress and difficulty at times. I do know that my emotional expressivity dips down when I'm in crisis-mode like this, so it's not like there's no impact at all. But on the whole, I'm feeling good and mentally stable. That's my mental state right now.

SPIRITUAL: Still making disciples. Still getting time with God. Prayer is through the roof. Bible study is down. Those are the only substantial shifts - and a welcome trade-off, given how long it's been the reverse.

EDIT/UPDATE: For anyone who comes back and reads this, my son came home from the hospital a week and a half ago. He still has a vacuum attached to his chest and a picc line in his arm to get his meds, but the picc line should be coming out on 9/17/20. The wound vac was initially planned to come out in 2 weeks from yesterday (9/15), but the appointment showed the tissue is taking longer to heal than we'd hoped, so it'll be at least another week beyond that. I've had some major things revving up at work again, so my wife's been a great help taking over with the kids, who are all now back in our home and in school again. Her busy season will be picking up again very soon, so there will be some interesting balancing happening soon, but overall we're in a good state and my son is recovering, even if it's taking a bit longer for his chest than expected.

Religious Gf of 4 years broke up with me a month ago. Messaged me today that she wants to get back together. But she doesn't not want any sex during the relationship. Need advice?

12 upvotes · 2 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Locked until Rule 2 information is added.

Until then, know that when a woman breaks up then wants to get back together, it's her way of saying, "I'm not happy with you, but realized I couldn't do any better, so I'll settle with you and rush back before I lose my chance and you're with someone else."

Also, **THIS SUB DOES NOT ENDORSE SEX BEFORE MARRIAGE**. No advice will be permissible here that supports your apparent intentions of continuing in a sexual relationship outside of marriage. If you believe you are already spiritually married to her because of your intentional sexual relationship, then her "break up" with you is not legitimate and you are bound to her.

What are your views on prenups with Christianity?

12 upvotes · 1 June 2020 · /r/askRPC

I'm a divorce attorney. I HATE the "prenups are planning your divorce" argument because it's absolutely false. It's really the opposite. Since no fault divorce became virtually universal, the default laws of most states encourage divorce, making it easy and painless to get divorced. Prenups add consequences to get divorced, making it less likely that either party will want to. The deterrents usually include things like penalties for cheating on the other spouse, filing without just cause, financial exploitation, etc. It basically penalizes people for doing common sense things that Christians shouldn't be doing in the first place.

You would be an idiot to get married in the modern climate without contractually imposing penalties for basic decency that the default laws of the state will allow people to do without consequence.

If you do get a prenup, the best approach is to tell people: "The laws of our government are not godly. I don't want to subject myself to an ungodly set of laws. So, we're going to use a prenup to create godly boundaries for our marriage and deterrents to ensure we are never motivated for divorce."

Response to "Why Men Hate Going to Church"

12 upvotes · 19 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I thought about removing this post, but there's enough value in the comments to keep it up.

I could do a point-by-point analysis about why this guy's response is chock full of half-truths, but [/u/RedPillWonder](#) and others have already done some of that. I agree with [/u/DeChef2](#) that all the ways he's wrong isn't really the point.

The point here is that YOU are deferring responsibility to someone else. This is why I tell guys not to read commentaries when they are learning to study the Bible. Yeah, commentaries are useful. Yeah, asking your elder what he thinks about something can be insightful from time to time (though not necessarily on this occasion). But at the end of the day, you're only hearing what someone else thinks God told them. Get in the Word yourself and learn to discern what's true and not - and I often encourage people to do this even against my own teachings here.

One of the main points on this sub is to teach guys to take responsibility for their own life, thoughts, beliefs, frame, etc. rather than living in someone else's worldview/frame. You haven't shared a cent about what you believe on the issue or why you believe it. That's what I'm more interested in. I have accepted the fact that most churchianity leaders are more interested in maintaining the status quo than actually challenging the man-made ideologies they've created about who they think Jesus was. I don't care if your elder agrees with a certain point or not. You're the one who's here. What's YOUR take on this? Then let us help YOU figure out what SCRIPTURE says, and not just what a cog in the churchianity wheel says.

But I do want to address this, as it hasn't been stated clearly enough:

He was gentle, kind, meek and lowly. He was a friend of tax collectors and sinners. He was merciful and tender and compassionate. He was in every way the meekest and most gentle and loving human that ever existed. And he LOVED his father with absolute passion and perfection

It's not JUST that they're isolating out individual traits. It's that the traits he references are, in themselves, contextually applied and balanced within the framework of a man on a mission. Let's break them apart. If your elder actually read Scripture without the lens of the sissified Jesus, it would become obvious that ...

- "He was gentle" to some, but harsh with others. To the needy, poor, sick, broken, depressed, etc. he showed gentleness. To the religious leaders, defiant, double-hearted, and even his own disciples, he was often extremely harsh.
- He was "kind" to some, but straight-up mean and offensive to others. Can we really say it was "kind" of him to call Peter satan or to call the Syrophoenician woman a dog? Is it an act of kindness to discipline those we love? Sure, but the more we start expanding definitions beyond their common use, the more our words become useless - and if one starts to do that, there's no point disagreeing purely on word choice.
- He was "meek" in some situations, but proud and boastful in others. Now, one might say, "But he's Jesus, therefore he has the right to be boastful." Yet even Numbers says we have the right to boast that we understand and know God, and Paul boasted of his disciples, and he boasted of the things God did through him, despite the weaknesses of his flesh.
- He was "lowly" in appearance and in his humanity, but also completely divine and of the highest of highs in his status and authority over humanity. Even though he was poor in a financial context, even during his human life he was a leader who had the ears of everyone wherever he went - both friend and foe. He had authority and influence and he used it for God's purposes. So, yes, he was lowly in some ways, but the exact opposite in others.
- "He was a friend of tax collectors and sinners" just as much as he is their enemy and will ultimately be the source of their eternal condemnation if they don't repent. He also drew a clear line on a number of occasions regarding who he refused to associate with. "Anyone who does not hate his father, mother, brother and sister,

wife and children, even his own life cannot be my disciple." He sent away the guy who wanted to say goodbye to his family and the man who wanted to bury his father. He didn't let the rich young man follow him if he wouldn't sell all of his belongings. So, can we really say he was a friend to everyone? Certainly the Pharisees wouldn't have thought so.

- "He was merciful" to some people, yet judgmental and condemning to others.
- "...and tender" to some, while strict and abbrasive to others.
- "... and compassionate" to some, while hostile toward others.
- "He was in every way the meekest and most gentle and loving human that ever existed" in certain contexts, yet embodies the exact opposite of these traits in other contexts. It's not hard to find them.
- "And he LOVED his father with absolute passion and perfection." Of course - and being like him in ALL ways is how we express a comparably applied love. Being like Christ in only a select few ways, while ignoring his likeness in other ways is still un-Christ-like.

Imagine a piece of bread covered in two kinds of mold/fungus. One is red and the other is blue. You scrape off all the red mold, but leave the blue. Would you then hand it to your children and say, "Here, I cleaned off this bread for you. Go ahead and eat it"? Of course not - it's still moldy and disgusting. Just because you figured out how to remove half the mold doesn't mean the bread is any more valuable.

On the topic of Jesus being loving and the "embodiment of love," as many like to say, it's important to remember that the passage actually goes that "God is love." Jesus, of course, says, "I only do what I see my Father doing." While God is love, he also lovingly ordered the deaths of women and children. He lovingly required countless animals to be slaughtered in his name. He lovingly opened up the earth and killed numerous of his own people. He lovingly withdrew his presence from Israel when they turned on him. He lovingly sent plagues on Pharaoh and the Egyptians. He lovingly did much, much more.

So, are we going to expand our definition of love to include a heck of a lot more than what churchianity wants to portray as a sissified sunshine and roses view of God/Jesus, or are we going to use more modern feel-good definitions of love and conclude that God/Jesus is sometimes loving and other times not? Or do we not acknowledge that there are numerous things that the Bible says God hates - including sinners (not just the sin itself - Psalm 5:5, for example)?

Anyway ... enough rambling.

Being a servant sexy?

12 upvotes · 13 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Agreed. Also, churchianity is so hung up on *looking for opportunities to serve*. But how often do we see Jesus telling his disciples, "Let's go find someone to serve today!?" It doesn't happen. Jesus primarily helps those people along his path who are in need and who call out to him. I don't support the "let's go out of our way to find service opportunities" approach.

Instead, I see Jesus out making disciples, and his drive to do so brought him across so many people in need that his compassion caused him to help those who would ask.

This is consistent with James's verse saying, "You do not have because you do not ask." So why should we, as believers, go around giving to those who don't ask? I'm not saying it's bad to do so (though maybe it is!) ... just that it's not at all what Jesus modeled.

This is also consistent with the concept that Jesus's service and blessings were primarily directed to those who had faith. We don't see him serving the Pharisees or asking if Pilate had anyone who needed healed. Instead, we see

that in his hometown he could not do many miracles at all - because of their lack of faith. So, why is churchianity putting so much effort toward serving non-believers when we don't see Jesus modeling this? Rather, Jesus focused his service toward those who would believe in him.

Again, not to say it's bad to serve non-believers (though maybe it is! if Jesus didn't do it, I can't say). But I do know that a life that most directly mimic's Christ's won't include non-believers as the primary target of that service. From the non-believer standpoint, why buy the cow when you get the milk for free? But if you see a community of people who care for each other and have something powerful in the way the community builds each other up - that's something people might want in on.

Tag: [/u/pm_me_great_quotes](#)

The Philosophy Side of The Bible

12 upvotes · 19 February 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Non-Christians find value in reading the Bible all the time. Even if they don't go into it for the purpose of developing a belief system, there are numerous non-Christians who recognize it is a valuable source of human history, poetic intrigue, and food for moral and philosophical thought. Given that many moral debates throughout the world today involve the Bible on one side of the line or other (sometimes both), it would probably be of great interest for someone like you to want to know what it actually says so you can tell when one side or the other is misrepresenting the actual words (which happens insanely often).

That said, don't go in with the intent of trying to find validation for red pill views. Yes, you will find it. But it's better to read the Bible for what it is rather than through a particular lens of what you want to find in it.

The Second Kiss of Death

12 upvotes · 18 June 2019 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

Different wavelengths here. My wife will do the same - and always has, even when she wasn't attracted to me. But there's a difference between her directly responding to specifics and making broader life changes.

- "He told me to shift to x position, so I will," isn't the same as, "Hmm, I really want to please my husband, so I'm going to look into new positions and sexual techniques so I can be a better sexual partner to him."
- "He said I look hot in this outfit, so I'll wear it more often" is different from "I haven't been dressing to please. I need to up my wardrobe so he likes what he sees whenever I walk in the room."

sex... bwfore marriage?

12 upvotes · 7 May 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Props for your patience. This guy's an obvious troll, as evidenced by his post history.

Unrealistic expectations

12 upvotes · 27 July 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Find a woman who is faithful, available, and teachable. Yes, I know that acronym spells FAT - and it's one that I've been using for years. But if you can find someone with all the of these qualities you can instill any other quality or value in them.

For example, suppose you find someone who is already thin, fit, and has a regular pattern of exercise.

- If she's not faithful in following your lead, she may veer off into laziness after a pregnancy, for example, and use that as an excuse to avoid getting back in shape.
- If she isn't available, she'll never set aside the time necessary to do what you're leading her into.

- If she's not teachable, then she won't accept correction from you when you talk to her about her weight.

But suppose you find a chubby girl who is strong in all of these values.

- If she's faithful, she'll join you at the gym and workout alongside you.
- If she's available, she won't use work, tiredness, time with other friends, etc. as an excuse not to go with you or even on her own.
- If she's teachable, she'll accept help and instruction on how to lift, what goals should be, when her progress is not satisfactory, etc.

I've met both kinds of women. It's interesting seeing the stark contrast. If you can find a FAT woman who is already somewhat and has a great set of personal habits to maintain this, all the better. If not, find someone who is willing and able to learn. But you obviously have to be willing to model it first.

Does your religion go well together with rp?

12 upvotes · 19 July 2018 · /r/RedPillWomen

I have done an incredible amount of writing on this very topic, most of which is posted in the sidebar content of [r/RPChristians](#). Although the vast majority of our users are men, we do have a few women who comment regularly, and it was my original vision for the sub to include both men and women who were willing to embrace biblical truth, which is the original "red pill."

To that end, I have made sure to include a post on our sidebar specifically devoted toward women, and most of the theory posts hold value for both genders toward understanding the original biblical basis for many of the red pill dynamics the secular world has discovered the hard way. It's much easier when we have a textbook that literally tells us how God designed the world. But to your interests in particular, the post I'm referencing that's geared toward women was written by one of our moderators ([/u/RedPillWonder](#)) and was originally posted on RPW to give advice to single women wanting to know how best to prepare themselves for a future husband.

The one thing that I would say that may be a significant distinguishing point is that the RPW endorsed contributors have consistently stated that an RPW woman merely embraces the realities of the "red pill" functionings of intergender relational dynamics, but does not necessarily mean that a red pill woman wants a "red pill guy." Our position on [r/RPChristians](#) is that when a man is living in light of complete godliness in his masculinity, then he will embody everything that any woman would desire - RPW or otherwise. To that end, we seek to make godly men first as the solution to all the other issues and problems that get brought up in the midst of the loneliness and longing the singles endure and the brokenness and sexual strife that the married men are seeking to rectify.

That's not to say we're without our problem users. After all, anything with "red pill" in the name tends to attract a certain type of man that the church often frowns upon and rejects. Rather than telling them to stop being men, I'd rather take them with all their rough edges and refine them. Instead of smoothing the rough edges, as the church tries to do, I want to give them a purpose that couldn't be fulfilled *without* a rough edge. So, just be expectant and patient with that as you read through some of the questions and advice threads. Focus more on the comments in reply to these people than on the posts themselves - that's where I believe the community shines :)

Tag: [/u/CleburnCO](#), [/u/19_LadyScarlet_90](#)

27/m virgin, want to lose it

12 upvotes · 7 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Your post expresses a fundamental perception problem in how you view your sin. You assume it is about our

offenses against other people. This is a rational position, given that human laws are meant to protect other people and it's easy to think of God's imperatives on our lives the same way. That said, the two don't translate.

God's imperatives on us aren't about protecting other people, though they can certainly implicitly have that effect. Rather, God's laws are about us becoming the types of people he wants us to become. It is about us reflecting his image to the world. In my 112 post on the sidebar I go a lot more into detail about this - that it's just rules for the sake of rules, but that God wants us to be his image-bearers and to develop the strength necessary to do his work.

If you adopt this view, you will notice that it doesn't matter whether or not it's fair to you or her for you to lose your virginity or for your wife to have lost hers before meeting you. That's not the point of why God condemns sex outside of marriage in the first place. God's purpose is to establish through our lives a model for how the world can understand the relationship God wants to have with his people. Sex before marriage is getting all the benefits without the commitment. This implies to the world that they should also be able to get the benefits of a relationship with God without actually having to commit to Him - that they should get all of his blessings and joy and eternal life and all that without binding their lives to him. This is not how salvation works.

Notice that universalist tendencies - the notion that God will just give everyone the benefits of marriage to Christ without them actually having to commit to Christ - this started becoming a far more popularized doctrine at the same time that premarital sex was popularized and encouraged openly and in the media. This is not a coincidence. Human sexuality reflects to the world how God is to relate with his people. That's why it's so important.

Now, as to you specifically, it'd be easy to say, "But I'm just one drop in the bucket. My influence on the world is so small that it shouldn't matter." But if everyone who ever thought that had gone the other way and made the right choice, that tiny influence would become massive. That's why at every election we see people on both sides of the line trying to get voters off their butts, telling them, "Your one vote does actually count."

Moreover, your life, especially if you identify yourself as a Christian, has a significant impact on how others in your sphere of influence know you. While your conduct might not have a noticeable impact on the world as a whole or on some random person overseas, it will have a noticeable impact on those who God has placed in your sphere of influence. Do not let your behaviors compromise your ministry to these people.

Now, it's easy to argue that you could just hide what you're doing, so as long as your friends don't know it shouldn't negatively impact your ministry. But this is a clear cop-out that doesn't account for:

- The fact that you will know you've sinned, and that you have compromised your faith. In your own knowledge of this, even if you don't intend it, there will be subconscious psychological ramifications on how you communicate with others. For example, you may be more reserved in your willingness to share the Gospel or to reveal to them their own sinfulness, not wanting to feel like a hypocrite yourself.
- It also affects your general spiritual maturity and orientation. When you know that you have compromised your faith in order for worldly pleasure, there is a separation that you will experience from God - one that the Bible says exists, even for the believer. This separation will hinder your fruitfulness and God's ability to work through you on a broad level. For more insight, just take the one example of praying. Do a short study on whether or not God answers the prayers of those who haven't repented and see what you come up with.
- Another thing to worth noting: the more you compromise your faith, the less interested you are in the purpose God has for utilizing that faith within you. You will have less internal compulsion to witness to your neighbors in the first place.
- It also compromises your self-control, causing you to be more likely to commit similar sins in the future - or

even different sins altogether once you develop the mentality that "sin doesn't actually matter as long as I'm not hurting anyone."

Long story short, don't view sin like it's just some set of rules to regulate humanity. It's never been about fairness among human's. It's been about getting God's message of the Gospel of Jesus across the world. You have an important role to play in that to numerous people. Don't darken the corner of the world that God has given you to be a light in.

Re: [/u/rocknrollchuck](#)'s comment - I agree with a lot of what he says. Just know that when he says it's about whether or not we honor God, there's more to it than that. God has a reason for his commands beyond just "I want you to obey for obedience's sake." Understand that reason behind the command and you can much more easily follow the command. In fact, you won't even have to worry about the command anymore because if you adopt the underlying principle into your worldview the command becomes second-nature. This works for all sins and not just sexual ones.

Re: [/u/palmorwrist](#)'s comment - He's right, you're still young. I advise most men to wait until they're in their 30s before getting married, which implicitly means I'm advising them to stay virgins until then. Your SMV keeps rising until around 35 anyway, so you're just improving your odds of finding a top-notch girl. Lots of people marry young - even 15 years young. Finding a 30 year old virgin girl might be tough, but doable. Finding a 23 year old is still pretty easy - and if you're 33 when you meet her, that's still a more than acceptable age-gap. You've got plenty of time.

Re: your reply to [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) - You definitively compromised your values in order to see if she would be weak enough to compromise hers? How does that make any sense? What if she had rejected you? Then she would have proven that she's better than you because you would have made her go through with it (which your actual actions proved), whereas she wouldn't have complied. How would that help? The fact that she went through with it doesn't prove that she's any worse off than you. At the very best, it only shows that she's a woman who followed your lead into sin. I'm not sure how you thought anything good would come from that test. It certainly doesn't prove your quality of being worth a higher value woman, right? I'm so confused at what you were thinking by this and it would have made a lot more sense if you'd just said, "I lusted, I was weak because I'd never had that chance before, so I went for it."

First date advice

12 upvotes · 9 May 2018 · [/r/RedPillWomen](#)

This is what I'm seeing: "I'm crazy about this guy! He's amazing in all these different ways" right next to, "What if he doesn't like the way I dress? Or what if the conversation is dull?"

Realistic worst case is there's no second date. All that means is you met a guy with some really good qualities, but it wasn't a great match - maybe he couldn't lead you in a conversation or didn't care much for your fashion sense. Which is more important to you: the handful of good qualities you saw when you first met him, or dodging a bullet by not wasting time on someone who ultimately might not be a great match? You're putting all the pressure on yourself as if you are the one who has to impress him, but remember that you're supposed to be vetting him too.

Here's the deal with first dates. People feel like they have to *make it work*. There's some implied subconscious imperative that we want the date to end well and everything to work out. I understand where this mentality comes from - because we all assume that we're going to get married someday, so someday we will meet that "right" person, so we hope on each new first date that "this one is the one!" That's also a pretty counter-productive mentality to have. In reality we should go in with the intention of discerning whether this person is marriage material or not.

The first mentality (the bad one) stems from ONEitis and an unhealthy idealization of marriage as a concept, which is at the core of most divorces. It causes people to act outside of their ordinary decision-making patterns in an effort to impress the other person, lest you lose the chance to be with someone because he doesn't like who you are. Even worse - you're doing this before you even know what his likes/dislikes are, and thus you can't even say you're catering to your man. When you have that mentality you're quick to miss a lot of important red flags. Long story short, this is how people wind up in long-term relationships that ultimately fail and either are married and get divorced or never marry and think to themselves, "I just wasted a year of my life on that guy."

The second mentality shifts the pressure. It puts you in a position of wisdom, able to discern more clearly whether or not you actually want to be around this guy. It also gives you the sense to look for cues that you might otherwise miss. Most importantly, it lets you evaluate the original good qualities you saw in him against other things that might be important to you, like whether or not he can lead a conversation or if he appreciates your fashion sense or would make you change your wardrobe. You don't want to be with a guy who makes you become a totally different person just to be with him. But you do want to find a guy who is so great that it inspires you to be more like him. I'm not sure if that makes sense, but that type of mentality can't be had if you're stuck in the fantasy land that he might actually be your future "grow old together husband" (I practice divorce law, so I distinguish between those relationships and people who might actually marry you, but you end up divorced anyway). If he is, great. If not, better you find out at the first date than years later.

As for the practical stuff, the only time clothes really matter on a first date is if you are intentionally trying to get him to sleep with you at the end (which I don't advise). Otherwise just wear what you want as long as it's socially appropriate in light of where you're going.

Don't worry about conversation material. He should be leading the conversation. If he can't, then ask him questions to get him going. If he doesn't ask any questions back and doesn't seem to have anything interesting to say to you, ask yourself: "Is it really worth being with such a dull guy just to get some of the other positive qualities that he might have been faking when we first met?"

All of this is why the advice [/u/JStheHammer](#) gave makes the most sense - by relaxing and having fun you'll be in a much better mental state to see if you actually enjoy being with him. If you're tense about the date one of two things will happen: (1) you won't enjoy yourself, he'll probably notice and feel some reservation and be less into you; or (2) your tension will be oriented toward fantasies about *what could be* that might be lost if you screw it up, so you end up assuming the guy is way better than he actually is - and who knows how long it takes you to realize your first impression was off (it's hard breaking first impressions).

Looking for someone to help with looking over divorce papers

12 upvotes · 16 February 2018 · [/r/askMRP](#)

I don't mind giving general commentary ... but I can't actually give legal advice to anyone in another state. If he wants, I'll give OP a 15 minute scan and 15 minute write up. He's got to put it on a public document share site though, as I won't dox myself by giving away my email.

Be the Judge

12 upvotes · 19 December 2017 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

Good point. This is blue pill ideology at its finest - "I'm only worth what a woman says I'm worth."

Ok ASKMRP, riddle me THIS!!!

12 upvotes · 17 August 2017 · [/r/askMRP](#)

This is why we have monk mode - something I went into before even coming here. I stopped initiating and just

focused on improving myself. When I came out of monk mode, I was much better off.

Think of it like being in high school. There's a hot girl you've been wanting to ask out for a long time, so you butter up to her frequently, but you're fat and geeky and she kind of laughs you off. So, you start lifting, practicing game, and OYS and all that. 3 months later you're a genuine stud. During those 3 months you were still buttering up to her and at the end she's still turning you down.

Same situation, but the 3 months of change happen over the summer when you haven't been around her. All of a sudden, it's not, "Why won't he leave me alone?" Now it's, "Woah! What happened to him! Where did this come from?" You're a whole new person. Why? Because the change is seen all at once, it's not gradual.

Now, that's not a license to go Rambo and apply everything all at once. Rather, it means that before you start trying to reignite your sex life, you've got to change the relationship culture between the two of you first. So, you gradually implement RP, but stay in monk mode sexually while you practice your game on her and lift, sidebar, OYS, etc. She's not thinking about your SMV when you're not having sex. So, when you come out of your shell, it's like you just came back from summer break and "Woah! Where did that come from!?"

But if you're pressuring her for sex constantly before then, she's evaluating your SMV everyday ... so the impact of the change is going to be squat. It's like, "Up .2 here, another .1 there ... did something dumb, so down .1, but up .3 for that ... his body got better, up another .2, but then he said that stupid thing, so down .2, then up some more." These small increments won't wow her and she won't realize the trend because she's not charting them on a scatter-plot graph. She'll notice ups and downs, not the overall pattern of up.

TL;DR - Go monk mode for a while.

Also, don't leave it up to her. She wants you to hand over that power. Screw that. You stay in charge of your sexuality. Go read the post from [/u/reddreadwolverine](#) a bit ago about **intentional discomfort**. Handing her the reigns is a DLV.

How marriage changes things

12 upvotes · 14 August 2017 · [/r/RedPillWives](#)

This would be great if most marriages worked as you're describing. You seem to have lucked out there :)

In reality, once commitment is secured for the woman and sex becomes an expectation instead of a pursuit, both parties have a natural inclination to ease off on how hard they've been trying, rather than stepping up their game.

I'm in the same boat you are - early 30s, married 9 years - and this is what happened in our marriage. I'm also a divorce attorney, so I hear story after story every day about how people start to slack off and "he/she isn't the same person I married - after the wedding everything changed for the worse."

Now, I'm anti-divorce - more so than 99.9% of the country, and even more than 99.9% of Christians, and more than anyone I've known I believe firmly in the value that marriage adds to a relationship and life purpose. So, I don't mean any of this as bad-mouthing marriage; but it's a practical reality of how most marriages flow. The conclusion out of that is, as you say, to make sure you're affirming and appreciating the positive aspects whenever they come along to fuel them to keep coming, and not to reward the bad behavior when your spouse does slack in a few ways. There are ways of doing this without the guy becoming a total control freak or the wife becoming a nag :)

As noted above, there are often exceptions to the rule (and your situation might be one of them), but **the lower-left graph of this chart** illustrates the general trend of how a relationship develops. Marriage is usually the initial pinnacle of the relationship, then as responsibility sets in the emotional fuzzies start to fade until you hit a really low point and wonder, "Was this even worth it?" Then, after you figure out your purpose together (and not just individually, which helps not at all), being on a common mission will foster that excitement for each other once more - even to the emotional degree felt during the engagement/honeymoon period and beyond. But, when I

counsel couples I always advise that this "purpose" cannot be something like, "Make \$____, buy our dream house, have 3 kids, and retire at 60." It has to be something bigger than you - and if it's not, it won't last or have the same sense of fulfillment.

How to get my wife into RPW?

12 upvotes · 11 August 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

She could be so much happier! What do you think?

No way. She's happy enough doing whatever she wants - and she's getting a better husband out of it too. She might not know why or how, but she doesn't need to know.

Finding RPW isn't going to increase her happiness. Entering the RP world is going to decrease her respect for the changes you're making because she's going to start seeing through the magic show for what it actually is. Anything with the label "red pill" on it is bad news for you - even if you never tell her you swallowed the pill (if you have). She's going to start moralizing things and telling you about all the RP stuff she's reading about that she disagrees with.

If you give her a copy of *The Surrendered Wife*, that's going to come off as you telling her she has a problem and she needs to fix it. She won't believe you're interested in her happiness. She also won't believe she can maximize her happiness by doing something you told her to do - especially if it means giving up power. Culture tells her otherwise and I don't get the impression you're far enough along to have deprogrammed her brain to the point where she'll be willing to accept these things.

If you absolutely insist, find one of her girl friends who you absolutely trust to keep your secret, then have that girl friend be the one to recommend the book to her. If she blabs and says, "Your husband wants you to read this," you're screwed. But, if she's solid, she might take it seriously and you can get away with it.

More to the point: **STOP TRYING TO FIX HER**. Get something like 3-4 years into your journey, then if she's not happier, revisit this idea.

How Did I Become the Last Single Person in My Friend Group?

12 upvotes · 2 August 2017 · /r/RedPillWives

As [/u/tintedlipbalm](#) and [/u/StingrayVC](#) alluded to, many modern feminists are at the point where they are starting to realize that their ideologies won't make them happy.

Modern feminism ideals started popping up in the 40s when men went off to war and the women stayed behind to run the country (ish). When those men returned, the wives wanted to stay in charge, but didn't have the cultural pull to do it yet, so they started the movement, which took hold in the late 60s. By 69, the first state (CA) had adopted divorce laws that started shifting the marital power balance back to women and this continued well into the 70s.

With that marital balance shift, women were then incentivized to join the workforce and pursue their own dreams and ideals, which we really see happening through the 80s. In fact, [this chart from the US Department of Labor](#) verifies this shift in the 70s and 80s.

During that 70s and 80s boom (let's go with a flat 1980 as a nice, round average), the working women were still having kids, but they were raising the kids with the new ideals that had been popping up.

- Guess how old those kids are today? Late-30s, early-40s.
- Guess which age group of women are starting to realize that their feminist ideals aren't making them happy?

Late-30s, early-40s.

Their parents didn't care. Why? Because they were already adults when the boom happened. Most of them were already married and their husbands relished the idea of the wife earning some extra income for them while the kids were at school. So, they never saw this downside - it's their children that have been crippled by this idealism. "Thanks a lot, Mom!"

Who else here communicates with ALL women (not just the hot ones) to improve your game/speaking skills?

12 upvotes · 21 July 2017 · /r/askTRP

Yeah, I don't know about that. I get what [/u/rangamatchstick](#) is saying, but showing **too much** interest in those of lower SMV can be a display of lesser value.

It's like being extremely confident in your skills at putting on a clip-on bow tie. Sure, you're super confident, but it's also super easy and not very masculine. The hot girl sees right away that it's a clip-on and has one of two possible reactions: (1) he must not be man enough to tie a real bow tie, or (2) he's confident with the clip on, but I have no way of knowing if he would be equally as confident with a real bow tie, so his confidence doesn't prove anything to me. There is no third option where her opinion of you is boosted by this display.

That said, showing **minor interest or teasing** with those of lower SMV can actually be very helpful. This can cause the hot girl to think: *He's not shallow. He seems like he knows how to help people relax and have fun. But he also seems to know he can do better, which is why he isn't trying real hard. Maybe he really can do better. I should test him and find out.*

Sometimes I resent my pregnant wife because of her past

11 upvotes · 15 September 2021 · /r/RPChristians

This advice is so bad I'm going to issue a 1-day ban just for shock value.

Announcement: Red Pill Christians will now exclusively be a male only space

11 upvotes · 23 March 2021 · /r/RPChristians

Seriously?

Christian 'Red Pill' books

11 upvotes · 12 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

[/u/Deep_Strength](#) wrote one - and that's about the closest you'll find on the market. I know there's one other out there somewhere, but I haven't read it and the link is buried somewhere in our content history.

You have to be careful with calling books on biblical masculinity the same as "red pill." There may be some overlap, but they are still separate venn diagrams, and many authors on masculinity get a lot of things wrong. Consider ...

- **Biblical Masculinity Books:** Talk about being strong, leadership, conquering challenges, and even valuing male sexual desire, etc. ... but can still talk a lot about pedestalizing your wife, ~~servant~~ subservient leadership, etc.
- **Red Pill Books:** Talk about passing fitness tests, expand on concepts of dread and pre-selection, give advice on how to build and maintain frame, etc. - all toward valuing and expressing male sexual desire, among other godly purposes ... and also includes stuff on strength, leadership, challenges, etc.

Also, one of my pet peeves is when someone says, "My pastor/favorite book author/blogger/etc. is RED

PILLED." I ask why they say that. "Because he teaches male headship and submission." I ask, "Oh, really? Great. What does he teach about frame? What does he teach about amused mastery? Has he shared the art of agree and amplify with you yet?" The answers are a blank stare. Because he's not "red pill" at all. Celebrating masculinity and teaching headship is not red pill. It's certainly a good starting point, but still not even a tenth of the journey.

I thought I could get over it

11 upvotes · 23 March 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Excellent reply.

Are there any good podcasts or YouTube series that you guys would recommend?

11 upvotes · 24 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

There are no official RPC podcasts/youtube in existence. There are many secular ones, but you have to filter through Scripture. There are many generic Christian ones on the topic of marriage/relationships, but you have to filter them through what Scripture actually says, which is difficult because they'll tell you screwed up interpretations quite often on what they think Scripture says.

While I haven't gone into it much, [u/OsmiumZulu](#) has pointed out to the mods the existence of <https://itsgoodtobeaman.com> - which directly references the red pill from a Christian perspective. OZ notes: "we have far more in common than we have differences." I have not listened enough to endorse them, but what I've heard definitely intrigues me.

If you're interested, go listen to their stuff, then write up a report on it.

Here's the specific one OZ linked to us: <https://www.buzzsprout.com/266333/1056727> - I will note: I'm a little miffed at the fact that they spend a good chunk of time in the beginning whining about the fact that they want to be able to talk about "Truth" without having to cite the Bible and they get annoyed by people who expect them to cite the Bible all the time. They say, "Scripture is the final authority, but it's not the only authority" - which is technically true, but if leaning too heavily on the second half, it can have severe negative repercussions in their belief and effectiveness. I need to explore them more before I can endorse or nix them.

[ADVICE] My LTR started distancing herself from me for no apparent reason

11 upvotes · 11 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Locked until you update with stats.

Until then: **LDRs are NOT actual relationships**. You are her emotional tampon, beta fall-back. She gets all the feels from you she wants, but without having to express any actual sexuality toward you - and I'm not even talking sex, but seducing you into wanting to marry her in the first place.

So, what you really mean is: "I have a friend who uses me for emotional validation, and now something happened and she's not using me like she used to. What's wrong?" That's your question.

[/u/RunawayGrain](#) is being generous - I give it 90/10 that she cheated on you.

She wants you to wait a week because if she talks to you now she'll feel like a slut - having sex with one man, then immediately going back to her ~~boyfriend~~ emotional tampon. Her hamster won't allow that. But if she waits a week she can say, "I repented, it's behind me. You can take me back now" and suddenly she feels morally justified in this because somehow it's better to confess a week later than right away ... you know, makes the repentance feel more believable, even to herself - "Look, I went a whole week without cheating on you, so I must be all better now!"

FR: The Spell is Broken

11 upvotes · 9 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Great story, brother.

A huge part of my sexual desire was actually misplaced spiritual desire

This right here summarizes about 90% of the spiritual framework I try to teach guys here. You figure this out, you figure out both your marriage and your mission at the same time. Physical reproduction and spiritual reproduction are inextricably linked and should never be viewed apart from each other.

Every time I wanted sex, I would bring it to my wife. Every time I would let it be her decision whether she turned me down.

Consider:

- She says yes, so you start pumping to get yourself warmed up. Eventually you finish by pumping on her. No sin in people who do this, right?
- She says no, so you start pumping to get yourself warmed up. Eventually you finish by pumping (doesn't have to be on her, of course). She's fully aware and watches you doing this. Sin or no?

Same behavior. Same intention on your part. The only difference is in one situation she says yes and the other she says no. What makes her decision the arbiter of your sin?

And if it's not, then, sin to masturbate in front of her (again: your concept of open sexuality, just taken a bit further), then wouldn't this be a top-tier ultimate alpha move to show her that you're going to do your thing regardless of how she reacts to you and that you're not afraid or ashamed to show it?

I thought masturbation and porn were really my only sin

I can't tell you how many times I've see this mentality from guys in the church - especially on places like [r/TrueChristian](#). I wrote a post there once a long time ago comparing sinfulness to a garden maze. You can walk around a few walls, but you end up back-tracking if it's just a dead-end, and the wall is still in your way if you pass by again. But if you just knock down the wall, you'll find that there are dozens more behind it as you continue to journey toward the center - but you couldn't see them because the one immediately in front of you is blocking them from view.

The response? "That's absurd. I know my porn problem is my biggest sin and you're just wrong. If I could beat this, I'd be sinless and you're just ignorant if you think I have other sins." I kid you not - it was frustratingly vicious.

The disillusionment with sex hit me hard.

Part of this is because she's just re-entering the game. On a scale, porn taught you sex is to be in the 8s to 10s, and she's just a sexual infant starting from 0. You have to train her - and then it gets exciting again. But yes, the disillusionment is necessary and appropriate, and even secular RP guys who have the most wild and exciting sex-lives ultimately come to this conclusion. I made a post about how an [Endorsed Contributor on TRP explained why making sex his god ultimately failed](#) - check it out.

Now for the advice ...

You're fit, so you're already playing on easy mode. Good for you. When a guy is playing on easy and still isn't winning, it's usually because he has no skill. In sexual relationships, your skill is your frame.

You talk way too much. You want her to understand you. She won't. Period. **Stop trying to get her to understand you.** I gave up trying to get my wife to understand me long ago, and my life has been so much better off for it. She still wants me to understand her, but that's another conversation.

Understanding is a negotiation game. You cannot negotiate desire. As others have alluded to already, even if she did fully understand you, this only leads to an intellectual adherence. Do you want consensual sex or horny sex? You engage the mind to get consensual sex, you engage her attraction-triggers to get horny sex. Conversation engages the mind, but does nothing for attraction.

Another problem: you get angry way too fast. When you snap back at her, you're butthurt, and that's unattractive. You need to become the kind of guy who can take all of her yipping and yapping, even if it's not true, and crack a joke about it rather than defend against it.

My guess is that because she's your wife you give incredible weight to her opinion of you. I'm also guessing your cultural deconditioning isn't complete yet - you still have some work to do. That's why when you read that article the other guy posted, you had a strong reaction to it - because it clicked together pieces in your brain that you'd never connected before. Is it somehow wrong for Christ to want to use his bride for his own spiritually reproductive purposes? To use us for his glory? Shouldn't we be eager and excited at the opportunity to be used by God as objects for his ends? Yet feminism tells us this is wrong because it hates the relationship between Christ and his bride, so it insists that physical brides must rebel against the way a spiritual bride is to feel toward our spiritual groom.

So, when she accuses you of sexual objectification and you get angry, it's because you know she's right - that you do want to use her for your sexual gratification, but the blue in you somehow still feels guilty for wanting this. Eradicate the blue and finish your cultural deconditioning so that you can read Scripture with a clear mind.

[FR] Straight from the horses mouth ?

11 upvotes · 12 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

My wife is in the same boat. She'll say all kinds of stuff like this. Interestingly, when I'm on my game and the subject comes up, she thinks arranged marriages (i.e. where the father picks a groom for his daughters) are a good idea. When I'm slacking, she'll make comments about how she thinks our girls should date several guys to learn what they want before settling down, which my wife didn't do (I was her first boyfriend). Go figure.

At least on a political level she's always been hard-nosed against feminism. But that doesn't stop her from wearing the "I am woman, hear me roar" shirt on occasion.

Share your experiences with fasting

11 upvotes · 7 May 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Fasting is great for losing weight, but I'm guessing that's not what you're talking about (and if it's not accompanied by broader concepts of diet management, the weight will come back anyway).

Spiritual fasting is something that's been contorted by the church to feed into the emotionalism agenda pushed by the mainstream church. Rather than a discipline, it's now a way someone can go about *feeling* "closer to God." This idea of "closer to God" warrants a broader look, but suffice it to say that the passages I can reference off the top of my head that use this type of imagery are usually talking about non-Christians. As believers, God is already indwelling within us. We are as close to him as we're ever going to get and it's just a matter of what we're going to do as a result of that relationship. The book of James is super on-point with this, as it's mostly written to address the situation of non-believers within the church causing confusion over what it means to be a believer.

So if fasting isn't about becoming "closer to God" what is it about?

OT EXAMPLES

- 1 Samuel 7 - Israel uses fasting as a means of demonstrating the sincerity of their repentance to God after serious idolatry and while they were in the middle of a terrifying war.
- 2 Samuel 1 - Fasting was a way for David and his men to express the sincerity of their mourning at Saul's death, even though he was their enemy.
- Esther 4 - Esther asks Israel to fast for her, demonstrating the seriousness of what she was about to do in approaching the king against his law, and building a communal bond behind this purpose.
- Exodus 34 - Moses fasted while getting the second 10 commandments, which solemnized the Mosaic covenant.
- Joel 2 - God commands fasting and weeping as an expression of repentance at the threat of what the armies of the Lord can do.
- Nehemiah 1 - Nehemiah fasts as an expression of the sincerity of his mourning as he prays for God to let him restore the wall of Jerusalem.

NEW TESTAMENT EXAMPLES

- 1 Cor. 7:5 - Paul commands us to fast whenever a married person stops having sex in order to make sure we don't fall into sin. [How radically would marriages and sex lives be changed if we all followed this imperative?]
 - Note: the "and fasting" part isn't in all translations, but it does exist in the Young's Literal, so I include this one.
- Acts 13 - Paul and other early church leaders fasted while petitioning God to help them understand their next assignments.
- Acts 14 - Paul and Barnabas fasted before choosing which elders to appoint over the church.
- Luke 2 - A prophetess and widow fasted constantly leading up to her recognition of Jesus in Mary's womb, prophesying about all he would do.
- Luke 18 - A pharisee prays in bragging about how he fasts twice a week. This is the only example I see of fasting being a somewhat flippant thing that someone does just to do it, and it's condemned by Jesus here.
- Luke 4 - Jesus fasts in the wilderness while being tempted by the devil. This immediately preceded his public ministry, and can be assumed he was fasting to prepare himself to go public. It's also the only recorded time we have of Jesus fasting.

There are lots and lots more examples, but these should suffice. Some observations and interpretations from these and other passages:

- Fasting is never mentioned as something we do just because we feel like it or merely because it seems like a religious thing to do or because some religious leader (like a pastor or a pharisee) told you to do it. The only example of this is the Pharisee in Luke 18 and Jesus says it did him no good.
- Fasting is always associated with a demonstration of our seriousness and passion behind a specific cause. If you don't have a specific cause you're fasting for, don't fast.
- Fasting is often done in community with others, but it doesn't have to be. Fasting alongside others works in tandem with passages that talk about the power of praying in community rather than alone.
- Fasting is often associated with a need for heavy repentance after a time of seriously nasty sin in our lives. If

you've gone complete dark, it may be a good time to fast to get yourself reoriented - not that the fast is what reorients you; rather, it's what expresses the sincerity of your heart.

- Fasting is often associated with seeking understanding. If there's something you really want to discern, especially if it's mission-oriented and life-altering, that's a great reason to fast.

None of this precludes fasting for dietary reasons. It's not sinful to engage in a secular dietary fast, as long as you're not passing it off as a religious exercise when your real goal is to lose weight. At that point, you're only trying to deceive someone when Jesus says in Matthew 6 that we shouldn't go out of our way to let others know we're fasting in the first place.

Personally, I fasted for 3 days and prayed for 6+ hours a day, totaling hundreds of hours in the few weeks before deciding to ask out my wife. While I appreciate her in my life today, all that fasting and prayer didn't change the fact of all our struggles for the first several years of marriage or all the serious lies she told me about her faith, interests, sexual interests, etc. while we were dating. That doesn't mean I came to the wrong conclusion after fasting and praying that much or that God was telling me wrong. It could be that God was looking ahead to all that would be accomplished through me because of her and decided it was worth it. I just don't know.

My point is simply to say that we don't see anywhere in Scripture that fasting will give us some magical answer or supernatural clarity over what we should do. What it does show, and what I have experienced, is that fasting is an expression of how seriously we're taking an issue, and then we go make decisions and act on them afterward and let God do what he will.

It's like when I was first learning to drive and had no clue how to get home. My dad was in the passenger seat. "Dad, should I turn left?" He stays silent. "I think I'm going to turn left up here. Is that okay?" Still silence. I start pounding on the dashboard, "I just want to make sure you're paying attention. I don't know where to go. You better not let me screw this up. Should I go left?" He still doesn't answer. I turn left. Turns out that was the way home all along.

Would my dad have stopped me if I started to turn right instead? Probably. Did my pounding on the dashboard change which direction would have led home? No. Did my pounding on the dashboard change my dad's mind about how I should drive the car? No. But it did help me - it was a way for me to express to my dad how serious I was being in wanting to know which way to go. It didn't mean I got my answer, but in expressing my sincerity, I somehow still had a better resolve that my dad wasn't going to let me go the wrong way, even in the midst of his silence - because I knew he heard me. "And if we know that he hears us - whatever we ask - we know that we have what we asked of him" (preceded by "If we ask anything according to His will, He hears us") ~ 1 John 5:15.

That's my take on fasting. It's less about changing God's mind or doing a religious exercise, and more about expressing ourselves to God on a specific subject.

What are practical things I can do to be more manly, masculine?

11 upvotes · 5 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Here's my list for where you're going to find the answer to your question:

- Read the Bible
- Develop a clear, concise mission that incorporates making disciples through intentionally modeling your life for specific people you're trying to influence
- Spend time with other men who you want to be like
- Ask someone to disciple you who you believe embodies biblical masculinity in a form that you want to live up to

- Try new things and see if they resonate with your spirit - go hiking, take up fencing, attend a car show ... just new things you don't normally do.
- Take risks. The more risks you take, the more you will feel your heart oriented toward certain directions, and the more faith you will be developing, particularly as you see God pull through. Just don't take idiotic risks, like betting your life savings on 100-1 odds.

Again, these are not things to do to be masculine. They are things to do to discern the way God wants you to express biblical masculinity in your own life.

I could give you a list like:

- go hunting
- wrestle a bear
- participate in drag races
- wear camo
- smoke cigars
- drink dark beer

These things all sound "manly," and certainly men who embody biblical masculinity do these things - but many men who are appropriately biblically masculine don't do many of these things. I hate camo and the thought of going hunting repulses me (not because I care about the animals; I'm just not a wilderness guy), nor will I ever smoke a cigar. That doesn't make me less of a man in God's eyes.

So, I'd be less concerned with what you DO to become a biblical man and more interested in what God has designed for you. What's your mission? That's where you've got to start. Figure that out, then figure out the requirements to fulfill it to your maximum potential. That's going to be your best guide to figuring out what type of man God has created you to be.

There are certain traits that are going to be common, though. A guy who isn't confident isn't going to express the Gospel clearly to the men he disciples. A guy who isn't assertive will shy away at the first sign of disinterest in the message God has for him to share. But you'll learn these things as you follow the above advice anyway, and these are more attributes than practices - and you mostly posted about things you can do.

The submissive wife

11 upvotes · 12 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I like this line of thinking. I may use that.

Submissive behaviour

11 upvotes · 12 March 2019 · /r/RedPillWomen

Only the weakest of beta males is ever intimidated by women.

If the large majority of men in the world fall into this category, sure ;)

Men being intimidated by you is a myth spawned from our gynocentric feminist culture.

Nah, I know countless men who are truly intimidated by even mild-mannered women. This is certainly the norm.

Men being intimidated by women certainly isn't a myth - the fact that they believe they should be intimidated in the first place is a product of the feminist myth.

Addressing the Blue Pill Hate: Manipulation

11 upvotes · 18 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I wouldn't characterize femininity that way. Femininity is just as godly for women as masculinity is for men. Men can pervert masculinity to be expressed in toxic ways, but in its raw form it is good. Women can pervert femininity to be expressed in covert, negatively manipulative ways, but in its raw form it is good.

I want my wife to be feminine. The fight, in this context, isn't against femininity. It's against feminism and the feminine imperative. That distinction is critical.

Counterproductive Desire and the Fallacy of Unconditional Love

11 upvotes · 14 January 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Ok, I'll just do whatever my feelings tell me from now on.

New to Christianity

11 upvotes · 17 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Hi there! Thanks for your post and raising your concerns. Many people would simply object in silence and not have the balls to bring it up in the first place. Props for that.

The way you're framing yourself begs the question: who is your god? It's either Jesus or masculinity and I can't tell which, though it seems the latter.

Let me be clear about this: **If Jesus told us to be beta sissies who live every day to serve the feminine imperative and wait on our wives hand and foot for our entire lives, I would do it.** Period. Masculinity is not my god. It is something I am, not alongside my faith, but because of my faith - because my God compels it.

Mark 8:36 says, "For what does it profit a man to gain the whole world and forfeit his soul?" This could, in context, read: "What does it profit a man to get all the sex he wants and be alpha with bulging muscles if he forfeits his soul?" What's good for the soul is good for the man.

So, make a clear decision: who is your god?

Alternatives to Captain/First Mate

11 upvotes · 1 October 2018 · /r/RedPillWomen

There is no such thing as an "equal power dynamics" relationship. It's not sustainable in the long-term. The closest I can see is post-divorce when I'm drafting shared parenting plans for my clients and we say, "Dad gets to have final decision-making authority over these 3 areas, and Mom gets final decision-making authority over those 3 areas." At that point, they feel like they have equal authority over their children, but (1) this only actually works in divorce, and (2) it's not actually equal authority - it's 100% authority, but divided by category. Plus, each person weighs each category differently, so you can't really compare them that way in the first place.

The fact that you want "equal power" says a lot about your frame of reference. You still hold onto a fantasy that another model can work on a large scale. It can't. That's why as soon as egalitarianism was introduced into modern marriages the divorce rate skyrocketed. There are a few exceptions, but it's usually because they have something else going for them beyond their power structure. That is, the power structure isn't why these exceptions are successful - they're successful despite their power structure.

How do you reconcile TRP with Christian values?

11 upvotes · 6 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

As [/u/Deep_Strength](#) said, you don't. There is no reconciling the things of God with the things that are not of God. There is a hard line that is not to be crossed. Jesus said, "If you're not for me, you're against me" (Matthew 12:30). We don't adopt things that are against God.

I wrote a post a while back about how [there is no "Christian version" of anything](#). That includes anything RP. RPC is not a "Christian version" of the red pill. It's the reverse. The red pill is a secular version of the things the Bible tells us.

As is often said on TRP and MRP, secular RP is merely "men swapping notes." They observe the world, see what works and what doesn't, then share their stories until they come up with doctrines and philosophies that account for all of their various findings.

Imagine I created a computer program to do a ton of really cool things. Now imagine there's a team of experts who are using my program, experimenting with it to figure out all the really cool things I coded the program to do. They start a subreddit to share all the amazing things they're finding about my program. Now suppose I go on that subreddit and start an AMA saying, "I'm the guy who wrote the program. I'll tell you everything it does - what you've got right, what you've got wrong, etc." ... and everyone says, "You're not real. There is no programmer. This code just created itself over time." So, that guy leaves and goes to one of his friends (me) and says, "They've found some really cool stuff, but they're missing it. I actually wrote a manual for all this, but they don't want to read it - they think it's hogwash. Will you start another subreddit that teaches about my program from my manual instead of the piecemeal things that those other guys figured out?"

That's what RPC is. That's why I started this sub. We don't bring secular concepts here. We look at the Bible and explain from the manual how the world works. We use the same terminology the secular folks do, not because they figured it out first or because their way is right, but to reach them. Everywhere the Bible goes, it needs translators to speak the language of the target audience. Just as there are national languages, there are also cultural languages, something like a unique dialect. So, when an RP person says "amused mastery" or "dread," there's a defined meaning there that the rest of the world simply won't get - and if you try to use language from the rest of the world while reaching them, they'll view you as an outsider and not one of them.

Indeed, we are "one of them." We are two factions of people trying to figure out how to use this program that was put before us. The rest of the world isn't interested in doing that. They just want to ignore that a program exists at all, treat it as random happenstance, or even attempt to rewrite the coding, which often results in critical errors in their life. To that end, secular and Christian RP are brothers on a common mission. Our method of executing that mission is where we differ. The secular crowd says "only experimentation." The Christian crowd here says, "Look to the manual first, then experimentation when we can't find the answer quickly enough."

What's most interesting to me is the fact that "the red pill" has stolen its name from The Matrix when the true analogy being developed by those movies is not about male/female dynamics, but about the parallels between the physical and spiritual world, which is only actually addressed by the Bible.

All of that aside, when secular RP says something that we know to be sinful, many people want to say, "Take the good parts of RP and leave out the rest." This is an incorrect reply because it looks to secular RP as the baseline of truth, from which we pick and choose based on our external moral standards from the Bible.

In reality, if RP is about truth, then the Bible is the baseline. When secular RP says anything sinful, it's not that you just ignore that part of RP - it's that those parts aren't RP in the first place. They got it wrong. The manual tells us what's right. The experimenters misunderstood the results of one of their experiments or haven't taken it to its natural conclusion - like when science deems something to be safe, then finds out decades later that prolonged exposure is highly cancerous, such as cigarettes ... and then everyone scrambles to fix their original recommendation.

Lessons from two divorce cases

11 upvotes · 14 May 2018 · /r/askMRP

Every. Single. Day.

How do you "hear God's voice", the non-cucked way?

11 upvotes · 14 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

It's the massive contrast between an unnecessarily harsh tone and a claim of being Christian.

Covert contract?

11 upvotes · 7 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

Let me remove the invisible plating from the elephant in this thread so far: *Life isn't fair*. Whether or not you watched the kids before shouldn't have any bearing on whether or not you go out with the guys after. These are entirely unrelated incidents. If she tries to connect them, your acknowledging this in any way is stepping into her frame.

She seems to think life has to be fair. For some reason you're believing her. Is that how you got ahead in life? By making sure you treated everyone else equally all the time? Or maybe you never got ahead. Maybe you're too busy making sure your co-workers have an equal and fair chance at getting the promotion as you do. "Um, hi, Mr. Lumenthol? I know you're really considering me for the assistant to the regional manager position ... and I really want the job. But I also want to make sure you're considering Teddy too. He's such a great guy and equally qualified." Screw Teddy. Screw your wife. Or to be more accurate: Screw Teddy = Screw your wife.

Tangential explanation aside, you need to get this 50/50 marriage relationship garbage out of your head. It's 100% you. You're responsible for the direction of the marriage. That's a lot of pressure. You need a night out with the guys every now and then. Of course, if you're cheating your wife (and yourself) by putting half the responsibility on her, then yeah, she gets half the say in how you spend your time.

Go OYS. Take responsibility. Get done what you gotta get done, then go spend a night with the guys. If she doesn't think it's fair, good! She needs to learn that life isn't fair just as much as you do. Just don't pass off the responsibility - even passively. You leave the house a mess when you go with the guys and you know she's going to clean it. You've just given her the martyr card to play against you. Don't invite tests you're not ready to pass. Take care of the kids, take care of your home, take care of your business, then go take care of yourself with the guys. Keep it up and maybe she'll take care of you. Maybe not. Either way, where does her perception of the situation factor in? It doesn't.

Do you believe that women hate each other?

11 upvotes · 17 August 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

Definitely not hate. I describe it as a game - *The Comparison Game*, to be precise.

Other people describe it as a "crabs in a bucket" mentality - where every time one crab tries to climb high enough to escape the bucket (stepping over other crabs to get there), the other crabs grab it and pull it down so no one ever leaves. When women try to ascend social circles, other women have a tendency to do things to knock her down a few pegs so instead of ascending she remains within the existing circle of friends.

Most social women have a close bond in communal settings to the degree that anything that threatens their circle of friends is addressed immediately and with full force:

- If one gets a new boyfriend who is poisoning her against the group or is just taking all her time from the group, he is bad-mouthed until she leaves him, or she is shamed or excommunicated until she returns
- If one girl is acting in a way that makes the group look bad, they hold an intervention or shame her or try

other behavior-modification tactics

- If someone in the group is depressed and not spending time with the group, they rally around her to lift her spirits
- If one member of the group isn't pulling her weight toward the advancement of the group's purposes, the group eggs her on so she can become more like them

One way or another, women most often do what's best for their social circle, not just what's best for them individually. We don't see this behavior happening among male friends, who are usually far more focused on individual efforts rather than what's best for the group.

If you're interested, I wrote more about the comparison game aspect of this in another thread on this sub [here](#).

Waiting for Engagement before having sex. Unrealistic?

11 upvotes · 16 August 2017 · /r/RedPillWives

This would be a question worth asking on [r/RPChristians](#). You'll probably be told a few times, "don't have sex before marriage" (and I agree), but if you can move past that you'll get a decent impression of how many guys might be out there who would be willing to wait, as the Christian world is where you're going to find most of them.

Outside of Christianity, it's going to be highly unlikely - and as [/u/Irisandoleander](#) said, if you expect him to be a virgin already too, your dating pool is almost exclusively Christian guys - and beta ones at that. Fortunately, with the right resources Christian men are more likely to be able to grow into their inner-alpha because despite feminization within the church, the Bible still ingrains the basic concept.

I don't mind. I usually just assume most men I meet have had previous partners

I wouldn't cave on this too quickly. If waiting is important to you, you'll do better by a man who finds it important to him as well - independently of you. If he's waiting because of you, that's setting a bad precedent that you're the one who will have to draw all the boundaries in the relationship. So, per RP, you'll likely lose your respect and attraction to him quickly. If, however, he values waiting independent of you, he's operating within his own frame and you will respect him more for being a noble guy. Sure, the pool of men will be smaller, but still not impossible to find.

Stop Being Sitcom Dad (Practical Guide)

11 upvotes · 28 June 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

It's probably worth remembering not to try to fake-alpha things.

For example, beta-me would have told my wife, "You go to little Johnny's birthday party and I'll cut the grass," and then would have done a quickie job cutting the grass and spent the rest of the time lounging around the house in my underwear until about 10 minutes before I thought she'd get home. Sometimes I'd even fake-alpha instruct her, "Call me when you're on your way home so I can start getting everything ready for kid #2's basketball game." In reality, I was telling her, "Give me a warning so you don't see how pansy I'm being."

Then, when she comes home and sees that I've been home for 3 hours and the grass is mowed, but not great, I didn't weed whip, didn't take out the trash, probably straightened up the living room but didn't vacuum or dust, etc. ... she's thinking (and some cases bold enough to verbalize): "What the heck have you been doing all day, you lazy turd?"

This is why the OYS stuff is so essential, and I've only been really engaged in that aspect of things for the past few months - not enough time for her to notice (she has been super pregnant, so there was an implied

understanding that I'd pick up the slack while she was incapable, and still is for another couple weeks in post-c-section recovery).

I was too beta to answer, "I took some me-time." Instead, I'd DEER, "Well, the lawn-mower was acting up, so I had to spend some time looking at it and cleaning out the old grass; then a neighbor stopped by to chat; then this and that happened." Most of it either wasn't true or was exaggerated ... but even if it was completely honest, it was a horrible answer that only came off as excuse-making.

Basically "666" and still no genuine desire from wife

10 upvotes · 23 June 2022 · /r/RPChristians

Mission is doing my work and helping as many people as possible while praying and seeking to speak the gospel boldly. My wife has helped me with this by challenging my thinking and helping me build a household that motivates me to provide.

Let me open with saying this is one of your big problems. Your mission is so vague and useless that you're not actually doing anything, and I'm sure she sees that. This type of mission lends itself to a lifestyle of just living day by day in the work-eat-sleep cycle. The fact that your wife has to "motivate you to provide" for her is a problem too. But I'll assume your mission isn't the problem for the rest of the comments, because maybe I'm misreading something here. But I really see absolutely nothing biblical about this mission. "Pray every now and then, and serve a few people" is NOT a biblical mission. They are normal things you should be doing in your day-to-day life, not the long-game driving force of your life.

You can play games to put her "in the mood" momentarily at various times, but the goals you verbally say you're shooting for aren't the ones your actions are aiming to achieve.

Sidebar/reading

It's very telling that one of the first two sidebar books you read was SGM - before getting to all of the other more foundational books. You then hopped straight into trying these "methods" without having the foundation/frame to pull them off. SGM only works without frame if you're single wanting a bunch of one night stands. In a marriage, SGM only works AFTER you have the foundation for it.

Also very telling is that the RPC sidebar isn't mentioned at all in your reading.

Also very telling is that you completely skipped the "spiritual" section of our sidebar stats requirement.

With that aside, I've been where you're at. "Burning desire" while we were dating turned to, "I was just pretending in order to get you to marry me, I was never actually attracted to you," to discovery of the red pill leading back to desire. In your situation, you're trying too hard to play games to win her over and you haven't actually changed on anything. You're acting like a PUA rather than a man who is evolving. Women can smell a fake a mile away.

You started this road 4 months ago. You've been married for 10 years. If we use the rule of thumb that it'll take 1 month for every year of marriage, you're not even half way to making any actual progress yet. You're expecting her to come around when you haven't even had time to come around yet. You're just playing games at this point and upset that she isn't playing with you - both literally and figuratively.

Here are a few things to work on:

- **FRAME** - You're so invested in what she's thinking and feeling and how she'll respond that you have absolutely ZERO chance of internalizing attraction, which means you have ZERO chance to become

attractive *to her* also. You've been reading RP content for months now and know frame is a big deal to us, yet you still write up a post that's obviously all about her ... how much more when you're interacting with her!

- **STFU/STOICISM** - Stoicism is about being able to bear through pain and difficulty without letting it phase you. It doesn't mean becoming an emotionless robot. STFU isn't about awkwardly remaining silent all the time. It's about not getting yourself into trouble by saying stupid things before you think through them. The changes you're making in these areas are so far from the norm for you that it just comes off more as you trying new games and not as a believable character change - and the whiny way you write makes it clear that she's right for thinking that way.
- **ASD** - You seem to completely lack an understanding of ASD, especially with a Christian wife. You're stuck in the dichotomy of Madonna-Whore Syndrome, where you want her to be "bad," but both you and her also want her to be "godly" too and neither of you know how to reconcile that in your heads - especially her. Just like you're only playing games and haven't actually internalized anything yet, so also is her playing around with being the "bad" girl just an in-the-moment game and you're equally dissatisfied that it hasn't become internalized to make her a nympho. Psychologically, "good Christian girls" aren't sex-craved maniacs in her mind, even though she has those cravings and has communicated clearly that she wants you to learn how to evoke it from her. Figure that out.
- **OI/DNGAF** - You have no OI. You're only 4 months in and still sharing the same whining, complaining crap that you did on day 1. That's like trying to drive from NYC to Oklahoma and asking 5 minutes on the road, "Are we there yet? Getting close yet?" and hearing, "No, it's going to be a while," so you wait patiently for another 5 minutes then ask again. More to the point, you're super hung-up on her responsiveness to what you're doing. You're the opposite of DNGAF.
- **VALIDATION-SEEKING** - Instead of talking about sex itself, you're talking about her thoughts and desires toward you. This makes it clear that you don't want sex from her. You "want her to want sex" with you (and I think you as much as said so in this post or another). This is literally the definition of validation-seeking. You're not trying to fix your sex life; you're trying to feel like a man by getting your wife to treat you like one. The cruel joke of life is that the more you try to obtain this type of validation the less you actually deserve or will ever get it.

Let me be clear: you're doing *some* things right. You're just doing them out of order. You think that because you're in good physical shape, somehow you should be able to skip all the groundwork and go straight to the end-game strategies. This plan will never work. Back to the drawing board with you.

BPD wife - I need a miracle from God

10 upvotes · 20 April 2022 · /r/RPChristians

Why the heck are you still on drugs? Stop that. IMMEDIATELY. I don't care how hard it is. If you won't give this up today, all other advice you get here will be pointless because your drug abuse will undermine whatever other protective measures you take with the court - both in falsified criminal charges (which will become actual, not falsified, when they discover your use) and in the domestic court.

This is the dumbest decision you could possibly make. If you think anything can get better while you're using, you will never accomplish any of the goals you're obviously hoping for. And she will know it, because as long as she has something to dangle over your head like that, she will have power over you and that will undermine any pressure for her to be the one to change because she can do whatever she wants and knows that if you ever try to retaliate against her, she'll just dangle the drug abuse and your custody rights are gone, whereas she'll never get into criminal trouble for all the violence because the courts won't believe that she could actually hurt a guy who is as jacked as you report yourself to be.

What does it mean that Christ is the image of the invisible God and the firstborn of all creation in Colossians 1:15?

10 upvotes · 21 February 2021 · /r/RPChristians

I fail to see the relevance of this post to this sub. So, let me create one for you: if we are designed to reflect the image of God, then Jesus is the first man since Adam to show us what that looks like in human, tangible form. As such, he is the prototype of all we, as men, aspire to be.

Be cautious going forward to remember what sub you're on and that you keep the content relevant.

How much do you share here on this subreddit regarding your personal beliefs about women?

10 upvotes · 24 October 2020 · /r/RPChristians

How much do you care about the reputation of this subreddit from the vantage point of other Christian communities here on reddit?

We've had lots of people hate on us. [r/Christianmarriage](#), for example, will ban anyone on sight who has any affiliation with our sub. Oh well.

At the end of the day, we have to ask: Is our primary ministry to save the lost or fix the saved? We attempt both, but Jesus focused very little attention on the religious haters. They may be saved, but if they want to have incel, dead bedroom lifestyles before they get to heaven, that's on them. It's not at all a reflection of Christ to the world, but there are some people you just can't help.

That said, if I'm engaging with people on other subs, I just don't use RP lingo. It's **INCREDIBLY EASY** to communicate RP concepts tactfully enough and with enough biblical backing (read our sidebar for that) to receive applause from those communities for preaching what would otherwise be condemned if you accidentally slip up and say "hypergamy" even one time.

How much do you share here on this subreddit regarding your personal beliefs about women?

Everything. And that's even with knowing my wife reads all my posts. I have nothing to hide.

I assume the mods struggle with this because they are looked up to by members of this community and they probably don't want to say anything that would upset a significant portion of the community

That's laughable. I can personally guarantee you that not a single one of our mods cares enough about anyone else's judgment of them to withhold what we believe just because some pussy might be offended. What you're suggesting is literally the definition of being in someone else's frame - and I will not let anyone be a mod who breaks his own frame so easily.

That doesn't mean we won't be tactful with how we word things. Certainly there are more effective strategies in varying situations to communicate one way or another.

I know if I were a mod here I would heavily "test the waters" to get a feel for what this community is comfortable with rather than go out on a limb and risk alienating like-minded Christians.

That's why you're not a mod here. What you're describing is a leadership that exists to placate the masses. We are a leadership to direct the masses. People follow us; we don't follow the people. That's not leadership. And I guarantee we're producing much greater spiritual fruit through this community than other subreddits that are 8x our size.

No, your congregation does not preach "biblical headship"

10 upvotes · 12 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Is that not exactly what Christ did for the church?

Hmm ... I'd have to think on that. My gut is to say no, he didn't. He took the punishment for our sin, but not the blame. Otherwise, why would God require that we confess our sins as an "if" condition to his being faithful and just to forgive us our sins and purify us from all unrighteousness? (1 John 1:9, of course). The confession bit is an acknowledgment that we are to blame before we are excused of the penalty associated with that blame.

It's like a parent saying, "I will forgive you and I'll be the one to pay for the window you broke - I just want to hear you admit that you're the one who broke it."

That said, there's a difference between receiving blame and accepting responsibility. In the leader is responsible for his subordinates, it's his obligation to bear the responsibility for their failures, even if they are the ones to blame. After all, it's his *fault* that he let the situation get to that point in the first place, as more effective or "hands-on" leadership may have prevented the problem. The same would apply for the wife. She's still to blame, but the man is still responsible for how his ship runs, regardless of what mistakes she makes. The same applies to the Church - God is responsible for the Church, regardless of our blame in screwing it up all the time.

In marriage, how much control should the man have and act upon?

10 upvotes · 1 August 2020 · /r/askRPC

how much control should the man have and act upon?

How much does Christ force and control his bride, the Church, to do things his way? The very fact that we have a churchianity culture today is a testament to Christ's red pill nature - that he does not control his bride; he merely invites her to follow, then goes about his business. If she follows, he engages; if she doesn't, he withdraws and does his own thing.

I'm not sure if this problem could have been averted if proper vetting was involved and/if the husband was top tier.

The fact of churchianity culture also shows that even a perfect groom can still have a rebellious bride, no matter how well-vetted or high-quality he may be.

When is control good and when is it bad?

The only times I see God controlling anyone in Scripture involve non-believers or those outside his Kingdom. In this sense, I could see employing a sense of authoritarianism over your employees if you're a manager or own your own business. Beyond that, the goal is to make people want to follow you; don't force them. Force rarely results in anything valuable.

But what can we do to not be in this position?

Orient your life in a manner that you don't need others, but you do find them helpful.

New Sidebar Compilation!

10 upvotes · 21 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

This is great, brother. Thanks for putting it together.

How I Communicate Now, Without Words

10 upvotes · 7 July 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I know that even when I was trying to STFU, I wasn't really doing so

Over the last few years I've worked with some guys in real life on this. They had the same problem. Their version of STFU wasn't actually STFU ... it was "I'll shut up about the things I'm really thinking and only talk about things that affirm her and make the conversation go away." Idiots. So now instead of showing her how whiny you are, you're showing her how supplicating you can be and how much you pedestalize her and will meet her every whim. Good job, boys.

At first you really care about them, but after developing Outcome Independence and Abundance Mentality, it changes your entire outlook on giving a shit about them – because you just don't fucking care anymore. At some point you will start to see them for they are... they are just woman things

Like the way women feel when a guy talks about having sex with her. This was my test for the week (day?). My son wanted to hop on Zoom to talk to my mom. My wife insisted I go change the name on my Zoom account because I still had "(Red-Curious)" in my name last time she saw me online. She's embarrassed because I talk about having sex with her on the red pill forums. "I don't want your family reading any of that. That's part of my personal privacy. I have a right to insist on that!" Smile and STFU on that one rather than trying to come up with a witty comeback. I thought about AA ("Oops, too late. I already posted some gifs of us having sex on our family text chain") ... but sometimes STFU is still the preferred option even over a natural AA inclination.

This form of "nobody else is allowed to know how sexual I am" is one of this "girl things" that guys need to get over. A sexual guy is going to talk about sex. She should be so lucky that I'm talking about sex with her. At least that means I'm not talking about having sex with anyone else ... yet.

But if I let her believe that she made the right choice by ravishing her later that night it encourages and trains her to take initiative to please me through positive feedback loops

You're right. This all sounds more magical than it actually is. The reality is that as you become a more competent leader within the home, she learns to fill in the grooves you leave behind. After a while, this becomes second-nature to her and you don't even have to tell her to cook dinner certain nights because she's attentive and aware to what's going on.

Which leads to another aspect I've developed along my journey that virtually never gets talked about: reverse "fitness testing" your wife. She has a role within the house, but women don't always like living within that role. Some have alternative ambitions. So, every now and then I test her submissiveness with tasks that I would ordinarily do myself, but pass on to her instead in order to test her character for taking orders and following direction.

For example, the other day it was something as simple as changing our daughter's diaper. The girl says "I'm wet" and my wife starts walking into the room as if pretending she didn't hear it. "Change her, Babe." She answers, "But I don't want to" and starts walking back toward her room again. Then she stops for about 10 seconds, does a 180 and changes the diaper anyway. In some sense, she was testing me - seeing if by her walking away I'd step in and change the diaper instead. It was a silent, passive fitness test toward me in response to my testing whether she'd fall in line. I believe she realized she was in the wrong (not that I was testing her about it) and decided to make the right choice anyway - but only after she saw that I wasn't caving to fill the void. In this, she realized she had to prove her value to me.

How did I pass this one? Not through AA. Through STFU.

How did she pass my test? Through her behavior falling in line.

Sparking a Husband's Sexual Desire (RPCW)

10 upvotes · 23 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I'm a sucker for a girl in a skirt. And the long hair worn down is 100% on the money. My wife has curly hair, so it's a bit harder for her, as wearing it down does get frizzy, but she's put a lot of work into it and she looks gorgeous to be able to have hair down her back again. She used to do short shoulder-length hair to make it easier to manage and I just lost interest.

So, it's very possible that, as you say, a reason a guy loses sexual interest in his wife is her short hair. It happened to me, for sure (though, admittedly, I'm sure there were other factors at play as well).

Actual Conversations With "Abuse" Victims

10 upvotes · 4 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Right. That's why I specified twice that actual abuse is real and I explicitly limited this post only to those issues where it was never substantiated so as not to conflate actual abuse with these other absurd remarks.

Actual conversations with "abuse" victims.

10 upvotes · 4 June 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Admittedly, a couple of these things are from my own wife during our "dark years." Completely agreed on not letting them define you.

Leading your wife in Scripture Memory

10 upvotes · 20 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I can't up-vote this hard enough, brother. EXCELLENT break-down of the intersection between discipleship and marriage/dating. I'm adding this to the sidebar series. ([Here](#))

Daily Game Plan For Quarantine

10 upvotes · 24 March 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Solid, brother. I assume it's implicit that people should create their own checklists and this is just a springboard to get them thinking. But the point is: be intentional with this time, don't let it just pass by idly - which should apply even when we're not on quarantine.

I am not sure if I should marry my fiancé - advice needed, new to RPC

10 upvotes · 15 March 2020 · /r/askRPC

To say in slightly longer fashion what [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) already said: However you're feeling now, expect it to get worse after marriage - especially if your guy doesn't know how to generate the types of feeling and support you will need long-term to remain attracted to and interested in him. If you've got some buffer on the low end and are willing to take that chance that even after the emotional fade-away hits you'll still want to be with him ... that's your call. But if you're already questioning things now, that's not boding well for things and it's not a chance I would want to take.

Looking for advice, Need help. +Apology.

10 upvotes · 15 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Okay, first thing's first: whether you're in favor of arranged marriages or not, AWALT applies to whoever your parents set you up with as well as whoever you would have picked for yourself.

Your mission is total trash. You say you have read the sidebar here, yet you have still made the idea of finding some good Christian wife your primary mission? You say you've read TRP sidebar, yet the third commandment of poon is: "You shall make your mission, not your woman, your priority." This is extremely basic 101 level stuff.

I'm inclined to believe you were lying about reading the majority of these sidebars in order to get us to take you more seriously. Don't do that. And if you really did read all you said you did, then none of it sank in. Go back and re-read.

Once you've got your mission on straight (hint: as a Christian it MUST incorporate the great commission from Jesus), only then will you have the ability to be truly attractive to a woman. Everything before then is new relationship excitement. If your mission is your woman, she can never follow you because you'll be chasing her. There is plenty on this sub about the orientation of the pursuit, including in the sidebar - especially the content for singles. Go read that.

[u/SeasonedRP](#) certainly did a good job describing the mainline atmosphere in churchianity in first world countries. Bravo to him. This is primarily because mainline churchianity is not biblical. There are large pockets of men who do follow biblical Christianity. This sub is one of them. Our marriages and sex lives prove the effectiveness of the Bible's methodology, which the secular world has learned not from our textbook (the Bible), but through trial and error. Props to them. But don't think there are no exceptions among Christian men and women. There are, and I'm living proof of that, as are many other men here.

Let's get to the point here, though. What it really seems like you're struggling with is a conflicting desire between money and having ownership over your own life. How much are you as a man worth? If you're worth \$300,000, as you said is your grandfather's potential inheritance, then sure. Sell ownership of your life to your mom to get that money. If you are the prize. If you are priceless. If you have the riches of God at your fingertips and just don't realize it yet. Then \$300,000 means nothing. Screw that money and go be yourself. Make your own fortune rather than riding on the coat-tails of others. \$300,000 isn't even a lot of money to begin with. I know countless people who bring twice that much home every single year. You mentioned the possibility of a 6-figure income. Great. You don't need that \$300,000.

As a lawyer who has done a lot of estate and probate work, let me tell you also: if you aren't in the will you aren't getting jack squat. You really think your mom is just going to hand that money over to you if you play nice? Don't kid yourself. My dad and uncle got almost \$750,000 from my grandparents. I'm not going to see a dime of it. Ever. Oh well. I have my own financial course that doesn't depend on that.

how can i shape the girl i am going to marry into the woman i want in the next 3 years

With your current mission, you can't. It's literally impossible. Get a better mission.

From there, don't get so pent up on changing her. Maybe you can. Maybe you can't. Some women will simply never change. Are you okay with that? AWALT, after all.

But at the same time, you don't have to change her. AWALT, remember? All the sexual desire and expression you're looking for are already inside of her. It's just a matter of unlocking it. And yes, sex outside of marriage is sin. But as someone told you yesterday, if you're having sex with an intention to marry, then that creates your union already. So, having sex with her at that point creates the marriage. Your parents may not understand that, but that's how God views it.

All the same, you're really hung up on the inheritance from your grandfather, but what about your inheritance from God that you're putting at risk due to your insistence toward premarital sex? I mean, you explicitly said in your TRP post that you're sexually active, then tried to back-pedal that when you did your first post here, presumably to try to keep us from pegging you on that issue.

After the whole mission and spiritual maturity issue (i.e. thinking you have a license to sin as long as you pretend

it's not sin), the next biggest issue is the obvious blue pill framework you're stuck in that's controlling your life.

- Your mission is to "achieve a solid LTR with a good Christian woman" ... and live happily ever after, right?
- You're incredibly hung up on what your parents think about you.
- You feel trapped in your decision-making by the social frameworks you live in.
- You think you're some unique special snowflake because apparently no one else has ever been in a position of losing out on a financial prospect for becoming their own man.
- You have fantasies of changing a woman
- You're clearly engaging in mental masturbation over what you think things will be like if you can only be *RP enough*.
- You're looking for a quick fix: things you can "act, speak, and do" that accomplish your goals, rather than becoming and embodying what you pretended to have learned.

Your goals for a relationship are certainly appropriate ones. Don't get me wrong on that. But you've got bigger things to worry about in life than these concerns, and those bigger things are actually prerequisites to addressing your peripheral concerns.

But I think you have this notion in your head that the red pill is defined by a highly sexual male-led marriage. These things are a byproduct of the red pill. Not the red pill itself.

The red pill is all about understanding the true nature of intersexual relational dynamics. You do not seem to understand these yet (presumably due to a lack of reading or comprehending or both), because if you did you would already know the answers to all of these questions.

While you're probably not going to like this, you just started your journey and it's going to be a long one. Develop a godly mission first. That is step number 1. If you figure that out, the rest will follow MUCH more quickly. This is clear not only from the RPC sidebar, but even from the TRP and MRP sidebars. No mission, no attraction. Period. Don't make a girl your mission.

If you're in this for the long-haul rather than looking for a quick fix, come back in 3 days after (re-?)reading all the mission posts here with a mission of your own (that incorporates disciple-making) and make a post about it, discussing its viability and your vision for how you'll fulfill it over the next few decades (yes, your mission might change in that time, or be refined, but at least start with *something*).

After that, spend 3 months taking massive strides toward accomplishing that mission, and report back with a field report on the impact that vigorous pursuit of a mission has had on your life.

Once you've done that, you'll be ready to talk shop about many of the other things that you think you're ready to talk about now.

Oh, and don't forget to lift. **Lifting is not a suggestion.**

Young Guys Today

10 upvotes · 13 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I normally wince at sport-hero analogies because of how cliché and sappy they often come off ... but this was a good one.

The "Closer to God" Myth

10 upvotes · 2 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

[u/thechristianalpha](#), [u/rocknrollchuck](#) and I have all discussed just this. Maybe someday.

116 - God is a jerk.

10 upvotes · 25 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

This question has come up so many times that I needed a post on the sidebar to point to. Feel free to add your own thoughts, but if someone asks you, "How do I be confident and assertive and look out for my own interests, while also being a Christian?" ... here you go. The answer, as always, is to follow in God's image rather than try to make up a solution for yourself.

Husband had an affair - seeking feedback

10 upvotes · 23 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Guilt says I did something wrong and need to change

That's actually conviction. Guilt is something a Christian should never experience post-salvation. I wrote more on this [in my 406 post](#).

He is complicated than most men, in my opinion

I'm going to take the other opinion.

Most men would jump at the chance to have their wives desire them and initiate sexual intimacy. He does not. He looks at me cross-eyed like what is wrong with you.

Just because you're a girl doesn't mean you are exempt from Rule 2 and the scrutiny we give to the men around here. What are your stats? That's likely going to say a lot. Weight? Muscular tone? Body fat? Height? Age? Spiritual Disciplines/7 Basics (see 300 series)? How well-read are you on RP relationship material?

AMALT is just as true as AWALT. Yes, there are women who are able to maintain control of their hypergamy to varying degrees, just as there are men who are able to maintain control of their polygamy to varying degrees. But the fact that he actually consummated his polygamous desires shows me that he's more down the AMALT spectrum than you might think. The problem, then, with his wanting sex from other girls and not from you must come from you somehow.

We say to guys all the time: "She's sexual, just not sexual for you" when there is an attraction issue. The wife who rejects her husband constantly would jump all over Chris Hemsworth if he came onto her. [/u/Deep_Strength](#) wrote [The Brad Pitt Thought Experiment](#) post to demonstrate this very point (among others ... my wife's just more of a Chris Hemsworth gal than a Bad Pitts girl). The point is: he has proven that he's sexual, just not for you.

Part of this disconnect is that guys want variety. Our polygamous drive makes us want different women and not just better women. It's why in my job (divorce attorney) I see guys leaving their moderately attractive wife for significantly less attractive women all the time. It's weird. But even worse is when the option to date-up exists too. The totem pole is something like: same person < different less attractive < different & hotter. You'll note that even if you are generally attractive - say you're even a 9 - you're still the same person. After a couple years of marriage, that puts you on the bottom of the polygamous totem pole. A guy will always be more sexually attracted to a different woman - even a less attractive one - than he is to his wife.

The good news is that "different" can be hacked through significant variety, and "hotter" can be achieved through

significant work. But even in all of this, guys have basic standards. If you (generally, I have no idea about you specifically) are a chubster who he sees as a 4 or 5 in his mind, trying a new position or doing it in a new room of the house probably won't get him much more excited than cutting his grilled cheese in triangles instead of rectangles. You have to figure out his threshold first, then cross it, then the game actually begins.

Just becoming "hotter" to the point that you cross his threshold doesn't mean much on its own. He already expects you to be at some base threshold of what he finds sexually attractive - and if you're not, then dysfunction exists. If you've just crossed his threshold, you're still in the "same" category. Nobody gets a prize for not murdering anyone this year. That's just normal. Expected. You being on the positive side of his threshold is what he deems should be just normal and expected, otherwise he wouldn't have married you. If you fall below his threshold, that's grounds for dissatisfaction, but crossing to the positive isn't grounds for reward.

But consider the driver who goes 50 mph over the speed limit on her way home from donating \$10,000 to the local food bank. Is the cop going to be proud of her and give her a free pass? Probably not. Yes, she went above-and-beyond in one area, but it doesn't matter if she's still on the wrong side of his speeding threshold. In the same way, you've got to cross the threshold for your efforts toward variety to start mattering. Once you're on the right side of that line (and maybe you already are), then you start spicing things up with things that he never thought you'd do.

I remember reading a post by Rollo where he's responding to a guy whose sex life was vanilla, then he found his wife's old sex tapes where she's in orgies and doing all kinds of things that she never did to her husband. He wasn't even mad that she'd been with those other guys - what got him was the fact that she was so enthusiastic with those guys and would do things with them that she never offered to her own husband. What are those things that you'd do with Chris Hemsworth that you haven't done for your husband? Those are the types of questions that will add the variety back in. And then be bold enough to act on them. Risk the rejection in a big way.

One last thing on the topic of thresholds - where you are now is already his threshold, with the exception of basic aging. Guys know their wives will get older and will adjust their threshold for that (subconsciously). But beyond that, if his threshold when you got married was a 6 and you were already an 8 and you're still an 8 ... well, now his threshold is an 8. Yeah, there's less room for improvement on your looks, which just means variety is going to play a bigger role.

But if there's one big take-away on this whole comment it's this: **Just as RP tells men to embrace female hypergamy and make it work for them in a relationship, so also should you embrace your husband's polygamy and make it work for you in a relationship.**

When we tell men to embrace hypergamy, we don't mean he should let his wife look for better men to screw. We mean that he should become the best man so that hypergamy causes her to desire him. In the same way, embracing his polygamy doesn't mean letting him look for other women to screw. It means that you should diversify your sexual repertoire so that his polygamy causes him to keep desiring you in new ways.

Tag: [/u/helaughsinhidden](#) (since this is your comment thread I'm piggy-backing on) and [/u/TheChristianAlpha](#) (just because)

The word "nice" comes from the root word "nescire" in Latin, which means "to not know"

10 upvotes · 18 June 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Twisting language has been discussed here a lot, but I wasn't aware of this one. Common ones I bring up:

- I use C.S. Lewis' example of "gentleman" originally meaning "owned land and had a coat of arms" and being twisted to mean a "good man," and thereby society no longer has a word to describe a man who owns land and has a coat of arms. But we added to one of the plethora of words that mean "good man."
- Christian today means "good person" and sometimes comes with the "and attends church" condition. It no

longer means "Christ-like."

- "Tolerant" used to mean "able to coexist peacefully with those of opposing views or demographics." Now a person is "intolerant" if they refuse to support someone else's views.
- Most importantly to me right now: "Church" used to mean "the Kingdom of God on earth." Now it means (a) a house of worship: "that church across the street", (b) a Sunday service: "I went to church this morning", or (c) a group of people who attend a particular service: "a guy in my church."

There are many, many more. "Pastor" is another one that's been bugging me lately - that all these preachers want to call themselves pastors, despite the fact that they're not living up to what the Bible means by that word. But I'll let you keep adding to the list as you find things.

The shocking truth: Betas not only live hell in this life, they often go to hell too. Defining the christian alpha.

10 upvotes · 15 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

This post is ... interesting. You start solid and end passably, but there are so many points in the middle that I wish you'd just have ripped out. My biggest concern is that you present a LOT of your own ideas using christiany-sounding words, but I see almost no Scripture to back up these ideas. This leaves the impression, whether it's true or not, that you are more influenced by culture than the Bible. Even if this sub is the culture that you're being influenced by, you need to stop that. Be an Acts 17 Berean. Don't try to learn the best parts of different church cultures to create your own ideal Christian utopia notions. Stick to what the Bible actually says. Be prepared to give a verse to support the things you say.

They ask how can i benefit FROM the world and not how can a powerfully and spiritually serve THE world

This one's backwards. The standard blue pill man is all about devoting his life to serve others. They're all about sacrifice and will say, "You're not a real man unless you know how to use your strength for others' good." The standard red pill philosophy (especially among seculars) is that there is no moral obligation to use our strength or manliness toward some greater good - that men should serve themselves and seek their own agenda.

At first glance, this seems counter-intuitive to the Christian because we are called to become the "servant of all," just as Christ was, and to serve Christ's agenda after sacrificing our own, right? But if Christ is in us and we are transformed into the likeness of Christ, then Christ's agenda IS our agenda. Seeking our own good, if our desires are completely aligned with Christ's, is the same as seeking Christ's good because our purposes and what satisfies us and makes us happiest in life are the same things that will satisfy him and make him happy with our lives.

From there, serving the world comes down to a simple question: did Jesus serve the world because he had a moral imperative to do so or because that's just who he is and what he wanted to do? If he was doing it because he was trying to live up to an intangible moral imperative of being a good person, he would be beta and certainly not God. His service was an outflow of his character, just as my buying my wife a gift at times is an outflow of my position of strength in the relationship - I don't do it to live up to some standard that I judge myself against or to manipulate my wife into having sex with me, but because sometimes I just feel like buying her a gift and I enjoy taking care of those who have submitted themselves to my leadership.

divine pyramid of authority God--->priest/apostle--->emperor--->patriarch/man--->woman--->kids

Wait. What? Where did God ever say this? The closest I can see is 1 Cor. 11:3, which is much simpler: God -> Christ -> Man -> Woman. Don't stretch the Scriptures.

unconsciously some Luciferian elites that seek a lukewarm pansexualist zombie new age race, maleable for

their upcoming Global leader the Antichrist

Huh? Where'd you get this from? You had a good start to this post, but it seems to be spiraling into wacko conspiracy theory rage garbage pretty fast.

The christian alpha or simply man on a "red pill aware" repenting journey tries to bring forth his best elements to serve God and humanity

See above. Maybe a clearer example, are we (1) *supposed to be* generous, or are we (2) supposed to **BE** generous?

The first suggests that we have an obligation toward those in need - that we must use our strength to help others who don't have all that we have been given. This is wrong.

The second suggests that we have no need to try to meet some standard of generosity. We have no obligation to the world. Our generosity is an expression of who we are - something we do as an outflow of our identity in Christ, not to fulfill an external moralistic standard.

See the difference?

The secular alpha answers only to himself. The christian only to God, his conscience and to those he wronged

So much wrong here. If God is in us and we are in him, we are one, right? If I am one with God, as Jesus suggests, then answering to myself is answering to God. The only distinction at that point is if I'm identifying more with my flesh or my spirit, as my flesh is that part which is not one with God.

We don't answer to our own consciences either. Yes, our conscience can be a WITNESS (i.e. piece of evidence) against us (Romans 2:15), but Paul also says that it is not his JUDGE (1 Cor. 4:3-4).

The secular alpha guards his frame ... The christian holds his frame

Frame is not a boundary that protects us or a core identity that we create defense mechanisms to guard. It is the way we project our worldview onto the world. In this sense, it is less a boundary and more a weapon. It is how we influence the world for Christ, or non-Christians for their own agenda.

This amount of non attachment to even his own wife and kids is what the christian is called for.

While I may dispute your conclusion as to how to attain this, I'll say that this statement is a polished gem in the midst of an otherwise coal-filled post.

Chose a celibate faithful christian woman

Huh? So he "married" a woman that he'll never have sex with? I'm so confused. What's the point in marrying her then? If there's no sex, is it even marriage?

I'm assuming you meant she was a virgin. Huge difference from being celibate.

He teaches by example. Always feeds his kids and wife first, keeps the worst portion for himself, and is content with little. Stoic and minimalistic.

I'm curious why you present this as an example of a "red pillled" man. I'm not saying it's a bad thing to do, but it also implies you have a blue pill notion of "servant leadership" in marriage as some ideal to strive for, which is quite unbiblical - and even some blue pill blogs, like Desiring God, have recognized this fallacy of servant leadership.

How do I let go of my slutty past?

10 upvotes · 4 March 2019 · /r/RedPillWomen

I'll warn: while we do have a few female regulars, it's mostly men. But there are a handful of posts directed toward women and [u/RedPillWonder](#) will be writing one soon on what Christian women should look for in a man regarding relationship market value (as opposed to SMV).

Advice for a girl

10 upvotes · 14 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Ok, I said I'd come back so here goes.

ONE

The first and most important thing to remember is that you're not married to him. This means that you don't owe him anything. Until you're married, your focus shouldn't be on doing things "for him," which can come off as deceptive if it's not a practice you intend to retain for the rest of your life. Instead, you should be living "for God," which will give you an indefinite and life-long, sustainable motivation for living a certain way.

TWO

There's a saying on [r/RPWomen](#) that the "red pill woman" doesn't necessarily want the "red pill man." Their goals are different. Among the secular subs, the red pill man's goal is to maximize his sexuality, and the red pill woman's goal is to maximize her relational satisfaction. There is some overlap where a sexually satisfied man also has incredible relational satisfaction to offer, but this is generally very narrow. Even on MRP, where the focus is for men in marriages and LTRs, it has been said many times that they are not pro-marriage, they're merely anti-divorce-rape. So, they're not really the best candidates for a woman who is looking to get married and remain in a committed relationship.

RPC is different. The goal here, as I have written about on the sidebar, is not merely to maximize a man's sexuality - it's to maximize sexuality in the context of refusing to compromise on higher priorities. Those higher priorities are the things God would have us pursue. Likewise, the RPC woman (though such a forum doesn't yet exist) shouldn't have relational fulfillment as her goal - it should be about maximizing her relational fulfillment in the context of refusing to compromise on higher priorities to God.

For a woman, this is slightly different than for a man because a woman's obligation to God is also to her man - and this obligation triggers on the day of marriage. That is, the way you serve God is by helping your husband. But there is massive confusion when your man is not actually pursuing God the way he ought. To that end, you must choose between serving your husband as God instructed or serving God against God's instruction to serve your husband. Either way is a lose-lose. To that end ...

THREE

The most important thing you can do for yourself is to vet whether or not the guy you're with is actually going to serve God the way he ought. One day you and your eventual husband will be standing before God on judgment day, giving an account of all you have done with your lives. Who do you want to be standing next to on that day? That should drive your selection of a husband. Do you want to be next to the guy who tells God he squandered his life and then makes up a million excuses for him and then you say, "I helped him do it"? Or do you want to be next to the guy who can give a bold account of all he has done, and then tell God, "I helped him do it"?

Now, there are many godly men in the world, and there are many attractive men too. Your job is to find someone who meets both criteria, not just one or the other. If you find an attractive man who is not godly, you will be miserable and have wasted your life or otherwise disobeyed God's imperative for you to serve your husband in order to make something of your life. It's a bad catch-22 that I wouldn't wish on any woman. If you find a godly man who is not attractive, you'll also be miserable. You may accomplish something of importance for God's

Kingdom, but there's a better chance that your lack of attraction to him will be a greater distraction and mitigate or even altogether nullify the good work that God has otherwise prepared for you both in advance to do.

To that end, as I always do, I'll bring you back to the concept of having a mission. Is your boyfriend an RPC guy who has a godly mission, the fulfillment of which he would be proud to present to God on Judgment Day? Or is it something worldly and narrow-minded that doesn't really make an eternal impact on God's Kingdom?

A man can do many things to make himself more attractive to you - especially if he sticks around here and applies what he learns. But if that man refuses to adopt a godly mission or is too small-minded about what God could use him to accomplish, run away fast. Read my sidebar posts on developing a mission and engage in some of the conversations on the help-request threads where we discuss good missions and bad missions and whatnot. This will give you a better feel for how to vet the aim of the marriage. And make sure it's not just a mission he's saying for now, but that he won't care about long-term. You should see him making progress in this mission while you're dating so that he can taste the fruit of progress, or else he may abandon the mission after marriage and responsibility sets in.

Likewise, even if he has a solid mission and imperative to carry it out, look for signs during the relationship to demonstrate that he's a man who wants to work on himself. If he cancels a date with you because he didn't get enough time to go to the gym, that's a good thing! That shows that he has priorities in his life and that he will not idolize and worship you over his own self-improvement. This is counter-intuitive to most women, who think that they want to be the center of a man's universe. But you don't want your man to pursue you, you want him to pursue Christ and for you to pursue him.

FOUR

To that end, let me actually answer your question: your primary duty to him right now should be to pursue him. If he is a high value man with a good mission and who is attractive, any actions or attitudes that try to manipulate him into pursuing you will only backfire on you later on - especially if you get married.

The church has long put out this lie that men are supposed to pursue the women they desire. This isn't biblical. At best, when one of God's sheep wanders away, he'll go reign it in, the same way a husband should reign his wife when she wanders. But go find a single example of God chasing down a non-Christian. I guarantee that for every one of those examples you'll find at least 20 more where God says it's the non-Christian's obligation to seek him. I'm serious: do a word study on "seek" and look for all the times it says we are to seek God as compared to the times it says God seeks after us. Your jaw will drop when you compare it to what the church actually teaches on the matter.

Part of that seeking means letting him set the agenda. If he doesn't want to see you on a particular day, that's his prerogative. That might not make you feel the emotional fuzzies a woman gets when a man makes her his idol, but those aren't fuzzies you should be longing for in the first place. You don't want to be his idol. You want to be his helper. You should want him having an agenda apart from you, and those emotional fuzzies should come from the honor you get in being able to pursue that agenda alongside him - that he chose you of all women in his league to walk alongside him.

Now, obviously if he's an unattractive man this won't mean much. If he couldn't get any other women, then the best you could do is at least squeeze out some idolatry from him because he's not a man of many options, so you could abuse that. But why would you be with such a man in the first place?

Anyway, I'm out of time. I hope this helps.

May her breasts satisfy you always...

10 upvotes · 5 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

married sex life can be great. Still it is a struggle (for me at least) to find my full satisfaction there

Don't say this as a statement. Turn it into a question. Investigate this more. Why is that a struggle for you? What is it about your married sex life that makes you want to look elsewhere? What aren't you getting that you think you need? I agree that "ultimate fulfillment is to be found in Christ," but that can also be easily used as a cop-out by those who (1) don't actually experience ultimate fulfillment in Christ, but need some theology phrase to give them a blind hope, and (2) who also have no plan for fixing the more pragmatic concerns that make them want to rely on that vague phrase in the first place.

What have you all found to be useful in maintaining intoxication with your wife?

Dwelling on some of our better sexual encounters from the past or contemplating what things I want to do to her in the future. I've been off porn for a while now and this re-orientation of my thoughts is part of what made the transition surprisingly easy (see the 400-level stuff on the sidebar for the ultimate cure in a less-vague way).

Another thing that helps is just to do what you want to with your wife in the bedroom. For years I was concerned that if I tried certain new things my wife wouldn't be into it and it would ruin the sexual experience. Something important I learned from MMSLP: by definition, at least 49% of the sex you'll have with your wife will be below-average sex. Once I embraced that concept, I decided it was okay if we had a bad sexual experience by trying something new, on the chance that it might turn it into a great sexual experience. It's failed for me about 3/4 times. Whatever new thing we tried, I ended up not liking it, and my wife didn't care for it much either. But for the other 1/4, it's been great and worth it. Learning new things like that raises the bar so that the average changes. On a scale of 1-10 instead of the average sexual encounter with my wife being a 3 (from years and years ago), it's probably closer to a 6. Instead of our peak capacity being a 6 or 7, like it was for the first few years of our marriage, it's probably up to a 9. There is still some room for improvement, but I know we're getting close to peaking out on how much sex can be enjoyed. From there, once we've raised that peak enough times, if we can get the average up to a solid 7, that's about the next step.

We just have to account for time-constraints. It's not always possible to have a 3-hour edging session with multiple positions. So, then it's just a matter of figuring out how to maximize the rush in shorter amounts of time, which can be done through interesting games. One of my favorites is "Who Comes First?" - you both try as hard as you can to get the other off before you. The only rule is that you're not allowed to intentionally shut off your libido to win. That would obviously defeat the point of the game, as the point isn't to win, but to have sexual fun. Women have a biological advantage in that it's generally easier to get a guy off. But men have a strength advantage in that I can often pin her down to prevent her from doing anything to me, while I have it on her - and this display of dominance usually ends up revving her up enough that I can win every now and then (though admittedly she wins more often than me).

Whatever the case - my point is that there are ways to keep raising the bar, even if you're fairly time-constrained. Sex within marriage only becomes stagnant if the bar gets too low and you see no hope of raising it. But even if it does stop raising because you're at a rational peak level - like your average is a 7 or 8 - although I'm not there yet, I'm guessing things would be satisfying enough that I wouldn't care if it stagnates. After all, there would still be variety, as even great sex would get boring (lowering the bar) if it was done the exact same way every single time.

MRP pushes the idea that you need to "turn her into your slut" but obviously that doesn't jive with our biblical mandate to be her spiritual leader.

Why not? MRP is just using bold and catchy language for "train your wife to satisfy you in the bedroom and to see this as a valuable, important role for her in the marriage." It doesn't mean to train her to sleep around from guy to guy, cheating on you. After all, then she wouldn't be *your* slut. My guess is more that the word "slut"

doesn't sound "Christian" so it's easy to assume that Christians shouldn't do that. I disagree. I'm 100% on board with the "train your slut" mentality - at least as I understand it.

When to work on MRP

10 upvotes · 15 May 2018 · /r/askMRP

You've got some poor word choice here. The reading and processing isn't the work. The *doing* is the work. You work on it 100% of the time, non-stop. If you mean when we figure out what work needs to be done, that's a combination of reading stuff here whenever you have the time and just not being an idiot.

Sleeping Naked

10 upvotes · 5 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I just use the tub.

My dad keeps shit testing me what to do?

10 upvotes · 15 September 2017 · /r/RedPillParenting

I doubt he's s-testing you. The purpose of s-tests is for women to see if you're a strong enough man to be worth their attraction (usually subconsciously). Your dad isn't trying to get attracted to you. He doesn't want to have sex with you.

He's used to having a position of authority. You becoming your own man defies his position. He's testing your frame, but it's not the same type of test as women throw because it's for different motivations. Likewise, you don't respond the same way because you don't want to make your dad sexually attracted to you.

Also, you need to respect the fact that he has legitimate power over you. If your boss starts giving you crap, you don't try to out alpha him the way you would a girl. Again, you're not trying to have sex with him (unless you're working for a hot chick and you really are). You don't want to risk your job to prove a point. Your dad is a resource to you. Trying to out-power him is a quick way to lose what favor he might give you. Instead, he'll probably say, "Fine, go your own way. Don't come crawling back to me until you've learned some humility."

Long story short: Communicate your positions clearly, but respect his authority. If he's giving you crap without a legitimate basis, let him know - but do it with a smile, not in an argumentative way. Master the art of fogging. But perhaps the most important thing you can do is to show him how to be the type of man you want to follow - someone you can respect. Do this through your actions, yes, but don't be afraid to have a conversation with him about why you have trouble respecting him. Don't mention RP, but do let him know: "If you want to get through to me, this is what I need to see in you to know you're worth listening to. If your life is headed a direction I don't want to go right now, I'm not going to follow your lead."

Owning My Shit: My Marriage Is Over

10 upvotes · 3 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

In my state, you can't be sued for divorce while on deployment, and in some circumstances for the first 60 days after return. Any retirement benefits are managed at a federal level, so they should be consistent throughout all states and you wouldn't owe her anything because you haven't been married for 10 years yet. You wouldn't owe any spousal support due to the short duration of the marriage, but you would owe an ordinary child support amount.

Unfortunately, because you cannot control your deployment and it seems frequent, it's unrealistic to expect you could get sole custody, but shared parenting is still very common with military fathers. The courts don't want to penalize someone for serving our country. That said, depending on how hard you went Rambo, that could really work against you.

I'd imagine as a military man this can be really freaking hard because when you're on deployment she calls all the shots and isn't willing to give it up so easily when you return.

As to your questions, there's a split: (1) if you really want to save the marriage, and (2) if you're okay with giving up.

SAVE THE MARRIAGE

(1) Screw your frame. You had a crap frame to begin with. Burn it to the ground and start over - without going Rambo this time. Trying to assert your frame before you were ready is what got you into this mess. Monk mode for you. I know some people here don't like it for marriages, but desperate times call for unconventional measures. Give her several months to a year to recover, and at around the 6 month mark very slowly start reasserting your frame. In the meantime, until she's fully on board with trying to resume the relationship, keep everything in writing and if it has to be verbal record all of your conversations.

(2) Own it. Period. Why would DEERing even be an issue at this point? That's like you're trying to explain away what you did. "I'm sorry, I screwed up ... but" is not an apology. Let her run her mouth and hurl molotov cocktails at you. Sit there and take it. Don't make excuses or rationalize your behavior. When she's done, just tell her, "You're right. These last few days I've been doing a lot of thinking and prayer [even if you're not religious, just say it anyway] and I had an epiphany. I screwed up and was blaming you for everything." Then go into the ways you screwed up, mentioning things that she didn't even list in her rant. That's about the only way she's going to take you seriously again. Remember: the only way this works is if you burn your garbage frame to the ground and start with a new one. And even then, I only give you 10% odds you can salvage something.

(3) Build the best relationship with your daughter that you can now. If she won't let you see her, you can't do much without filing something with the court. In that event, do it as a legal separation. This shows her that your daughter is a priority, while also affirming to her that you really do want to save the marriage, hence not filing for divorce. The legal separation route really goes a long way to showing her how committed you are to saving the marriage. It's backwards logic, I know, but that's how people tend to take it. Legal separation = we need legal intervention, but I really want to reconcile down the road. Divorce = screw you.

LET IT DIE

(1) Resume Rambo again until the divorce is over - but be a tactful Rambo. Blow crap up with her to make her look like the crazy one while you stand your ground and take it. Instead of shooting bazookas at a wall, shoot a pistol at an oil tanker. Mini-jabs that cause massive explosions look great to judges - her reaction won't be warranted in comparison to the stimulus you put in. I recently suggested this to a client whose wife is an alcoholic. He made one small jab: "The kids still don't want to see you because of how much your drinking hurts them. I need to know that you're getting better so I can assure them it's okay to start some supervised visits." Instead of getting her to set off her ankle monitor (which is all we expected or planned - her parents are supposed to be keeping her on lockdown), she gets plastered, crashes her car, is arrested, and now has a new criminal date 3 days after our hearing. Case closed.

(2) Ignore the other people here - you have to apologize. This looks great to judges. Someone who denies their faults in a relationship is totally non-credible on the stand. You lose a lot of pull with the judge. Make that apology, just don't admit to anything that could hurt your case. Don't be too general or else it will seem like a shallow/hollow apology and won't earn you anything. Pick very specific things that won't affect litigation. Set context if you have to. "I'm sorry. I failed you as a husband. I didn't thank you for the little things like when you _____. I didn't give you a hug when I could see you were down. I should have encouraged you when your mom said that stupid thing. I got so hung up on being a dad and loving our kid that I forgot to make you a priority too. I know this won't repair things, but I do want you to know that I'd like to be friends for the good of our child." Judges eat that crap up when she tries to talk about how awful you are. It shifts the "awful" stuff she complains

about from important matters to common marital problems that make her look like she's just overreacting. There is no stipulation on the stuff she'll allege, but she won't deny this stuff, so the judge, rather than choosing who to believe, just goes off of the things that you did agree to, putting you in a much better spot than if you just denied that you were a crappy husband. So, you gain credibility and you also distract the judge away from some of your more serious faults, if the judge falls for the smoke screen.

(3) File for temporary orders and request a psych eval. Then find a practice MMPI test online (there's an old version available - 560 or so questions) and take it repeatedly until you've learned to master which questions cause which results. Find out when she's taking hers and give little toothpick pokes the day before or the morning of. If you really want to get her creeped out, have a friend she doesn't know follow her around the day before. Have him try to be inconspicuous, but intentionally get caught. You have plausible deniability as long as she doesn't know who the person is, but she'll still think you hired a PI. This will set her off and start answering some of the questions in such a way that it presents as mild paranoia.

How not to show butthurt when turned down

10 upvotes · 21 August 2017 · /r/askMRP

I'm having a hard time when getting a no to sex to hide that im mad.

They key is not to be mad. If you're not mad, you won't have trouble hiding anything. How do you do this? Abundance mentality.

I try and act cool and coy but my wife seems to know when im mad.

I was turned down last week. My wife then got into "Oh no, he's probably mad at me!" mode and decided to offer pity sex. I told her, "I don't want sex if it's going to be like that; that's not fun." She answers, "But you're mad!" I said, "If I was mad, would I do this?" then I proceeded to make out with her for about 2 minutes. Then I walked away with a "goodnight." She was smiling the whole time I walked away. Next day? She turned her attitude toward sex around.

Now, the next day didn't go so well because she was impressed at how I didn't get all butt-hurt. It went better because she knew I wanted sex the night before and she wasn't feeling it. So, she decided to gear herself up to feel it. Avoiding being butt-hurt doesn't necessarily increase attraction; rather being butt-hurt removes her imperative to think about sex positively. You're training her to think that sex is a source of stress, frustration, anger, etc. Don't let her associate sex with those emotions - even if you're the one feeling those emotions and not her. If she thinks you're feeling that way, then she falls into shame and guilt and sex (or even the thought of it at that point) conditions her to feel those things.

When he doesn't do what he says he will, when do you just do it yourself?

10 upvotes · 24 July 2017 · /r/RedPillWives

"I'll take it to my buddy ... tomorrow." Yay! Except it's been 3 months.

Most men operate on short-term memory. Compartmentalization in our brains forces this. We put something in a box, then don't re-open that box until we've got the freedom to sit and look at all of our boxes and prioritize which one to open next.

In my marriage, what often happens is that my wife will ask me to do something "tomorrow." When tomorrow comes, I'm picking up the kids from daycare, cooking dinner, picking up after the kids' mess, responding to some work e-mails, and then with the last hour or so, my wife and I cuddle up to a TV show or just sit and chat. All of these things need to get done every day, including that relational time between us. Since those are also fairly

immediate needs that cannot be put off, when I'm scouring my wall of compartmentalized boxes, the ones falling off the shelf are the ones I'm most likely going to pick up and deal with. The result? I don't get done that "extra thing" she asked me to do. It never even crosses my mind.

What's the solution? When I get off work, if my wife has already picked up the kids and started dinner, and the house is in somewhat acceptable shape, I can start focusing on the other boxes that I might have forgotten about. First in mind is that thing she asked me to do - and I actually have time to remember it. If, however, a ton of stuff is done and I find her putting a TV show on, my natural inclination is to think, "Oh, good, we can skip straight to relaxing time and have more of it! Yay!" It also tells me, "She knows other stuff needs to get done, but if she's cool with skipping it for now to relax, then it must really be fine." Frame issues aside in how I'd handle the situation, the reality is that she's mad that I'm relaxing with her and not doing what she asked, but her actions aren't showing this. Instead, if she goes off to do her own thing for a while, I know that she's not ready for relax time, so I start to process my list of to-dos.

Nagging is like tipping those boxes to the edge of the shelf. One thing at a time here and there isn't really a problem as long as you are confident that all of the other boxes are safely where they should be. But if you see several other boxes about to fall, nudging another one closer to the edge is just going to cause insane stress and backlash.

So, here's a quick rule of thumb:

- **REMINDERS** happen when nothing else pressing needs to be done.
- **NAGGING** happens when a non-pressing issue is forced into being viewed as more important than actual pressing issues.

That said, remember that sometimes, "I NEED A BREAK!!!" is also a very, very pressing need if he is over-worked (not just from his job, but in all areas). From the way you describe it, I doubt he is, but I'm only seeing the things you're listing and not the things he's actually doing.

If the issue is that he's just too passive and not owning his home, he needs to develop some beta traits. The best advice I can give is just to let some things fall apart.

- Let the grass grow until you get that fine - then he'll deal with it.
- Let some bills go unpaid - let him worry about the late charges.
- Your computer needs fixed, so you can't play games with him? Stop using the computer altogether. Go find another hobby for a while. He'll get confused and you just remind him: "The computer's broken. I'm not going to use it until I know that playing on it won't make it worse." Don't nag about it with more demands that make him fix it. Just tell him up-front, "This is what I'm doing."
- Your car's breaks? That one you're best just doing yourself - don't compromise your safety because of his laziness. But if it's your car, there's no harm in you taking responsibility for it anyway. My wife handles appointments for her car, I handle them for mine. Why? Because I don't know when her car is making funny noises. I'm rarely in it. I trust her discretion and have delegated that task to her.

I wrote a much longer response in another thread about how to bring out the alpha in a beta man:

https://www.reddit.com/r/RedPillWomen/comments/6m4e5d/how_to_bring_out_the_alpha_in_a_beta_man/djz7a41/

The biological step-mother.

10 upvotes · 7 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Would it be beneficial to the individual, as well as apply feedback to the system, to immediately request the case be heard by a different judge?

This is pretty much holding a gun to the head of your case and pulling the trigger. Clients request this periodically, but there is no worse decision you can possibly make.

- No judge voluntarily recuses himself from a case unless there is an ethical conflict of interests. It is an inappropriate abdication of responsibility and can get them in trouble with the state supreme court.
- Asking them to recuse themselves is taken as a joke. "I don't like how you think. Can I reroll and get someone better?"
- The other side always opposes it because if you want to switch judges there must be a reason that would help them.
- Once you insult the judge that way, he's going to ruin the rest of your case, taking it out on you personally in some way.
- It's professional suicide for the attorney who has to practice before that judge in future cases.

I've only once ever gotten the job done, and that judge now holds a vendetta against me (I only did it because it's a county I rarely go to). I went for it because it was a bullet-proof case and I could have gotten the judge disbarred if he didn't recuse himself. Your evidence has to be bullet-proof.

father convinces the mother of this through emotional abuse ... different maternal structure develops

interesting to see this expanded to go with the other categories you've covered

It's really not as interesting as it sounds, and is exactly what you'd expect. The mother sees the husband/father as a threat and becomes a protector over the children. Rather than her being attracted to his display of authority, she's repulsed by his being a douche. As a result, she doesn't respect him, he doesn't get sex, the relationship falls apart. Although women cheat on men more than the other way around (at least in my cases, it's 60%W to 40%M), this is the one scenario where guys end up cheating about 80% of the time because mom's too afraid that if she gets caught dad will get angry and carry out his threats of stealing the kids. The threats are believable because dad is so charming (that's how he swept her off her feet in the first place) that she believes he can manipulate the courts, and so does he. Dad is so psychologically aggressive and manipulative that mom feels trapped with no way out ... until ...

After his infidelity the woman thinks she has more leverage in the divorce because courts will look down on him for it. She's sorely mistaken because the courts don't give a crap who anyone screws, but she ends up with custody anyway because dad's a douche and everyone can see it. 9 times out of 10 these dads can't keep their mouths shut, so there are clear text message and e-mail logs of them cussing mom out or belittling her. Even if dad is a charmer and smart enough not to leave evidence behind, mom eventually wises up (through legal counsel) and starts audio/video recording him, saving his voicemails, recording phone conversations, etc. all without him knowing, which is legal in my state.

Long story short, these moms become incredibly defensive and withdrawn. They passively-aggressively start building evidence until they can take the guy down, sometimes even intentionally starting fights and arguments to manipulate him into saying dumb stuff to make herself look sweet and innocent to the courts, playing the victim

card. It works.

There's no point going into how these men can re-ignite passion with their wives because they don't want passion in the first place; they want fear and control, and they already have it. Sex is all a power play for them, and not about expressing inner desire.

They don't seem to have a normal bond with *their own* children ... Do you see these cases in divorce court, or do you think they dissolve the bonds by forfeiting upon branch-swinging, thus aren't seen much in your day to day court work?

Being that I deal almost exclusively in cases that involve psychological issues, I see this literally every single day. What you're describing is a woman with either borderline or histrionic personality disorder (or possibly a combination). These women also often have a mood disorder of some type, usually with depressive features. This combination of the mood dysregulation (i.e. inability to control mood swings, illogical mood patterns not grounded in reality) creates a positive feedback loop with the histrionic personality disorder (essentially: addicted to drama), whereby the mood disorder creates drama, the histrionic personality plays off of that drama to cause chaos in their lives, the chaos further disrupts their mood, etc., etc., etc.

The reason I mention borderline personality disorder in there is because borderlines are detached from reality altogether with much of their lives. They almost literally experience life as if they are a phantom in the astral plane looking down at their bodies watching the show with a bucket of popcorn. Most borderlines have been severely abused as children and develop this reality detachment as a defense/coping mechanism, but later on in life it impairs their judgments and prevents them from being able to develop sustainable meaningful relationships, even with their children, and they're often the first to give up their kids in favor of the latest fling in their lives. I have a case right now against a mother doing just that - she abandoned the kids to a schizophrenic father, and I'm representing that father's parents (i.e. the child's paternal grandparents) in getting custody back from the mom.

Here's the thing, bipolar women are usually (1) extremely good looking, and (2) extremely passionate. (1) Because their history of abuse caused them to believe that their body is what everyone wants, so they take care of it and flaunt it. (2) Because, frankly, they're crazy. Because they are incapable of developing long-term relational connections, all of their emotional and relational energies get concentrated in short bursts. These are a serious, serious problem for RP guys because they're exactly what most RP men are looking for: hot and incredibly passionate in bed, usually into all the kinky stuff. They're dream girls for the first few months. But when the depressive mood disorder sets in or she swings away from a passion phase, they'll key your car and screw Chad for no reason at all. Despite much of RP thinking, some of these girls go to Chad not because he's alpha, but because she's literally crazy and incapable of sticking it out with any one guy for too long. Besides, the histrionic nature can't handle the reality of daily obligations in a stable, safe environment.

Not sure if that's what you were looking for, but that's the word-vomit that came up when musing your question :p

Announcement: Red Pill Christians will now exclusively be a male only space

9 upvotes · 26 March 2021 · /r/RPChristians

Biblical structure. I understand that you're not a Christian, so you don't agree with the Bible. But that's how it is. I believe [u/Deep_Strength](#) and Dalrock have written posts on some of the concerns with women being in total authority over each other without a man involved. [u/AnnaAerials](#), who was the original mod/co-founder of RPCWomen was also clear that she did not want herself or another woman as a head mod and believed the men should continue to have authority.

That certainly doesn't mean lording that authority. For the most part, we contribute and have never had a situation where we have objected to or undone a mod action one of the women there have taken. But that general oversight

is still biblically appropriate.

The Church

9 upvotes · 15 December 2020 · /r/RPChristians

The Church is not a lost cause. The local congregational structure is. There are many "congregations" that are popping up nowadays, abandoning the traditional structure for something more biblical - and they're finding FAR more converts than the norm. Bryan Sanders' book *Underground Church* is an example of this, though it's far from perfect.

If you want to build something biblical, and you agree that Jesus is the head of the Church, then you agree we should follow Jesus' model, not the historical model that evolved from 300AD onward, right? So let's look at what Jesus did and emulate that.

Example 1: Jesus had a large crowd constantly following him, so you should try to build a large crowd to follow and listen to you too, right? Wrong. Jesus didn't try to build a crowd. He disciplined 12 guys and was so influential in his community engagement that the crowds wouldn't leave him alone. I can't remember one single passage where Jesus told anyone, "Go get some people together to hear me preach." I do see numerous times where he leaves the crowds to focus on his 12. If you want to live in the model Jesus gave, don't neglect the crowds when they come, but don't make them your priority.

Example 2: In the same vein, Jesus' core ministry model was to disciple 12 guys and let them do all the ministering for him outward from there. So, if you want to follow in his model - who are the 12 guys in your congregation. Are they your elders? Close friends? Either way, are you *spending time with them* the same way Jesus did? Or are you just trying to drive content to them? Too many so-called "pastors" get hung up on teaching content that they forget that relationships were the vehicle through which Jesus gave that content. Are you hanging out in the upper room with your buddies in your congregation? Are you chatting with them while you walk from place to place? Are you giving them opportunities to watch your life and then to try practicing in front of you the things you've modeled for them? These are all things Jesus did.

Example 3: If you really want to stick out from the crowd and go biblical, ditch the "3-5 songs, 30-45 minute sermon, then announcements" ritualism that didn't exist until the 300s AD, and also abandon the "NOBODY better talk while I'm preaching!" lunacy and recognize the fact that (a) most times Jesus teaches crowds, he's interacting with the crowd and asking questions - and there was a culture that KNEW this was acceptable rather than feeling awkward and uncomfortable about it, and (b) when the apostles are engaging with crowds and even local communities in peoples' homes, we see them interacting with the people and not just preaching at them. The very fact that Paul has to tell women to be silent during meetings is evidence, in itself, that people were talking openly during these meetings - he just wanted to make sure family authority structures weren't undermined in this process, as is happening readily today.

Example 4: If you catch on to the whole "focus on your 12" (or however many is feasible for you) and "make disciples" concept, are you teaching them to pass on what they see in your life so that they're not only living it in their own also, but they're also passing it on to their friends, wives, children, etc.? Remember Jesus' prayer in John 17 - "My prayer is not for them only, but also for those who will believe because of them." Jesus was always looking generations ahead - and I can quote several other passages where Jesus and the apostles affirm this concept.

Really, the best thing you can do is to look at what Jesus did - not through the coloration of cultural norms that you're used to because that's what everyone else does. Really look at the Bible and ask yourself: "Did Jesus sing songs before he preached a sermon? Did the disciples do this or even request or expect it? Or is that just something that seemed to work for some, but isn't necessarily a biblical mandate?" And if it's not a biblical mandate, REALLY second-guess yourself on it, because my guess is that if you find yourself *wanting* to do things that aren't biblically necessary, it's most likely because you're *trying* to draw a crowd, which will only be a

distraction for you, drawing your attention away from living out what Jesus actually did. The entire Sunday service structure in itself is founded on cultural premises without a biblical foundation - and ironically so when people who bash Catholics for being married to tradition are guilty of the exact same thing in the way they structure and organize their regular meetings without looking to Jesus and the apostles as their foundation.

Lots, lots, lots more to say on this. I'm going to encourage you to hop into the discord for more chat on this topic (invite link in the sidebar). Perhaps we could even have a walk-and-talk that I could post on the YouTube channel so everyone can benefit from such a conversation, as I think this discussion is more significant than just you or me. And I've already got a few congregation leaders who are starting to catch on to some of these things and adjust their models.

[/u/TheChristianAlpha](#), for example, connected me with his congregation leader at one point. In the chat we discussed discipleship and structure, who concluded that instead of rows to face a singular speaker, they create circles and the meeting is a conversational event. I know a congregation leader in my own area who has done the same thing. I shared with him a lot of the same things and now his body is focused on engaging with one another rather than listening silently to a singular speaker. Yes, there are still teachers. And it's obvious in these types of bodies who the "endorsed contributors" are (i.e. who has authority to teach) from those who are merely sharing their experiences, and yet even others who are there to ask questions, learn, and grow (as all, theoretically, are doing also). It's beautiful to watch these congregations - and I've seen it happen even in bodies of 500+ - it doesn't just have to be small little plants. It just takes more effort to create an artificially small atmosphere in a genuinely large gathering space. But is that effort worthwhile to you?

Again, lots more. Let's keep the chat up, if you're interested.

Post-Divorce Reports

9 upvotes · 21 September 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Go for it.

Decoding towards a better world?

9 upvotes · 6 August 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

if someone knew how to decode the word and translated some aspects into our modern way of thinking

You're going to have to explain what you mean by this. The Bible isn't written in code. It is meant to be understood. Yes, there are debatable issues, but there are already LOTS of resources out there for understanding both aspects of the debate and how each are reconciled with our understanding of the world, science, human nature, etc.

to show that there are no contradictions between the sciences and the word

Again, those resources already exist in mass quantities.

could give some humans a key to understand it in a more abstract way

I don't follow. Why would we want a very practical, relevant, understandable book to become more abstract? Or do you mean to say that the way you connect other people to the Bible would be "unconventional"?

e.g. scientists, such that they could potentially start the journey of exploring the word themselves and then might be able to see the truth themselves

As above, there are tons of resources that are designed to help justify the Bible through scientific means. I don't

support those books, personally, as it puts the Christian in the scientist's frame rather than God's, trying to use their worldview as the foundation for proving God, which God never purports to do. But many people have gone and done just that anyway.

Would this help to turn the world into better place? Or would it open Pandora's box, since it would enable anyone smart and powerful enough to even more evil manipulation?

What I'm reading in this is: *I can make the Bible say whatever I want it to say by interpreting it in unique ways. Is it good to eisegetically interpret the Bible for someone in a way that makes them more agreeable to what it says, or is that dangerous because other people would use the same interpretive method to make the Bible say all kinds of horrible things that it doesn't actually mean?*

That's what I'm hearing. The answer is simple: **NEVER EISEGETE THE BIBLE.** Thank you.

Should some things better be only found by those that seek them instead of being given away for free?

Now that's a fascinating question. [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) and I have long held the view that when things are free or cheap, they are not valued. Participation in a congregational unit, for example, is free. It costs nothing. They exist in abundance. If you get kicked out of one, you just go to another. As such, there's little to no personal investment in seeing it expand when differences occur. But something that you're invested in and which will cost you something to get, keep, or you'll lose it if you leave - that has a power that's valuable.

But if you're implying that we refrain from preaching the Gospel unless someone specifically asks to know it ... then I disagree.

The Perversion of Critical Theory: Nadia Bolz-Weber

9 upvotes · 15 July 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I like this post. I don't share the same "gospel of works" concern that ENTPunisher did, though I can see how he'd get there through your post. Rather, I see you saying that this "critical theory" concept is allowing faith alone to be segregated from any imperative toward holiness.

That said, I get a lot in this about why "critical theory" is dangerous, but you might want to expand on exactly what it is. I don't see that in this post, which can make it hard for someone to know how to avoid it. Are you suggesting it's bad to be critical of authorities at all? I suppose we need to shut down this sub, if that's the case, for challenging numerous authoritative structures - not the least of which is the congregational, institutionalization of churchianity that self-professes to be God's Kingdom on Earth.

FR: Potty Train Your Toddler

9 upvotes · 22 May 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Fantastic. While you didn't lay it out as clearly, this reminds me of the same process of 208 and [/u/chaddownunder](#)'s recent post ...

I talked my wife through what I was going to do

You told her what.

I just asked her to watch while I give it a go.

You showed her how.

I took on the role of mentor and instructor, teaching my son how to use the potty and teaching my wife how

to potty train a toddler

You let her try.

By Sunday night, my wife was equipped, empowered, and ready to pickup where I left off.

You sent her out.

... and while you didn't mention it, it's only a matter of time before she meets some other mom struggling to potty train their child and she's teaching them what you taught her. She'll be passing it on.

This is discipleship. Sure, it's not on a subject you'll find in the Bible. But that's the point of life modeling. It's not just about biblical disciplines. It's about the discipler's entire way of life that gets passed on. And now you know how to repeat that process for such things as having quiet times, better sex, sharing her faith with the neighbors, etc.

whenever she asked for my leadership, direction, or help, I took it as a sign of her weakness. If she was actually a good mother - I told myself - she wouldn't need my help

This is key that you recognized this. I went through that as well. But the reality is that God didn't design her to function without your leadership. It's not that she's incompetent without you. She's incomplete without you. And your emotional stability in the midst of the situation is what gives her strength to be stable.

Now ... what are the actual potty training tips? I didn't have much problem with my first three, but my 4th and final child (daughter) is 2.5 and seriously struggling with consistency. She'll go if we make her, but she won't tell us when she has to go. We've tried the trick of making her run around the house with no diaper or pants ... still doesn't work with her just yet.

Is it worth it?

9 upvotes · 29 April 2020 · /r/askMRP

It takes two to argue. So how are they happening often if you're STFU?

You sound very in her frame too. You care too much about what she thinks and "keeping the peace." How fluent are you with amused mastery? It helps you enjoy the tension rather than being stressed out by it.

Some people hate the pressure of tip-toeing around egg shells. Others find it a fun game to see how long they can go before cracking them. My 4yr old is the type of person who would stomp all over them just to watch them crack, giggling all the while. Be at least the second, if not the third ... but definitely not the first.

Ultimately, only you can decide if it's "worth it."

Need some advice, long post. And apologize for the scatter brain

9 upvotes · 26 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

she usually doesn't want to. And I don't know when to ask

Are you only allowed to ask when she wants to?

Women respond best to sexuality when they feel sexual. They feel sexual when you express your sexual desire toward them. The stronger your sexual desire, the more sexual they feel. A sexual desire that's turned away by,

"I'm not feeling it today" is so weak it's hardly going to make any panties wet.

This is all on the sidebar. Have you read it? 104 ...

One of the most powerful libido-stimulating factors for a woman is believing that she's irresistibly sexy to the point that people will fight for (or even against) her ...

Corollary 2: Your wife needs to know that she is so irresistible that you will fight through any barrier to get in her panties - even barriers that she herself puts up.

She barely touches on me unless I point it out. She has recently figured out what she likes in bed, but it's only in bed and never out.

Once you have kids, most women are over-stimulated with physical touch. Their kids are touching them and hanging on them all the time and they just want to have their bodies back to themselves for a while. This is normal. Your kids are still pretty young. It gets better as they grow older and become less clingy.

I often invite my children to cling onto me instead. This serves a few purposes, not the least of which are: (1) reducing the amount of physical touch that over-stimulates my wife, and (2) building a stronger bond with my kids through physical touch. Yeah, you're gone a lot of hours. So am I. When you get home, deal with it. You have to be a dad too.

Right now she's bored. She's getting too much of the same. You have to change it up and make her interested again - and part of doing that is pushing past comfort zones, like learning to say yes when she puts up a soft no.

I want her to feel free to ask for sex of me and me of her

Hormones fade over time. Women start to get them back sometime in their mid-late 30s or early 40s (or so reports go) before menopause kills them again. The real problem is that you were enjoying the high-hormone phase where she was spontaneously horny and expecting it to last forever, whereas women, on the whole, tend toward being sexual responsive, not spontaneous. This is a new dynamic you're going to have to figure out. She's not going to change. You will. Yes, part of that can turn into her initiating again once she's not bored with it anymore, but she's probably so off-put by how disinterested you seem when she puts up the slightest barrier that she's just not attracted anymore.

I'm rather skinny ... with a slight belly

I'm not sure how this makes any sense at all. You mean you're overweight in your abs, but have scrawny arms. Also, why aren't you lifting? You seriously don't understand how huge of an impact that will have on your sex life. It's not a magical cure, but virutally every guy who goes from skinny or fat to jacked seems to think it's magic because of how effective it is.

Not looking for judgement, just helpful advice.

Part of helpful advice means people weighing and measuring your situation - which IS JUDGMENT. We have to judge what you're doing wrong and right to help you figure out how to improve. This is a really bad attitude. Hope and expect judgment. I love the attitude of one of my clients when going in for her psych eval: "I don't care if they diagnose me with all kinds of crazy problems. I'd rather know than not know so that I can get help and be a better parent for my kids." She WANTED to be judged, even if it meant a barrage of negative criticism. Expect it and embrace it.

What you're really saying, though is, "I'm too weak to take insults, so please go easy on me." To that, learn to toughen up. There's no situation where developing a stronger ability to handle difficulties is going to make your life worse. There are lots of situations where failing to do this will make your life worse.

Emotional connection

9 upvotes · 25 April 2020 · /r/askMRP

A woman feels emotionally connected to a man when she is attracted to him and he gives her the tingles. It's really that simple. All the other stuff around here is a playbook for giving the tingles. Things from my playbook that make my wife feel "emotionally connected" to me (in no particular order):

- Teasing her
- Tickling her
- Kino
- Picking her up off the ground
- Really good sex
- Rubbing my hands through her hair or scratching her head while sitting next to her
- 10 second kiss

Should I keep going? You get the idea. Notice that none of these requires talking. Conversation does not generate emotional connectivity unless it's an emotionally charged conversation. You can't create a positive emotional charge from conversation alone because conversation is a medium for emotional exchange, not a generator. It might be able to enhance or shred apart whatever positive momentum might have been there before, but you'll need action to be the initial generator.

Also note: if you're an unattractive guy, all of these things are going to come off as creepy or disgusting. They're things she tolerates, not things she enjoys. You lifting? Wearing cologne? Decent deoderant? Getting regular hair cuts? Trimming your nails? Reasonable fashion sense? You should be figuring all that stuff out independent of her anyway.

How would you ask out a girl if you are always around friends when you see her?

9 upvotes · 2 December 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Why do you need to get her alone in the first place? Are you too nervous/shy/embarrassed/whatever to communicate your thoughts in front of other people?

"What if they reject me?" is a question TOTALLY in their frame. So what if they reject you? Do you not have abundance yet? If you don't, you have no business getting worked up over asking out a girl in the first place.

Also, check out my post: "initiate often, confident always." It'll really help you out here.

Also, hone in on what [/u/TheChristianAlpha](#) and [/u/RedPillWonder](#) said - good stuff there. Just don't leave room for confusion or interpretation in how you ask or make it seem like a joke or any other type of self-defeating defense mechanism.

How would you ask out a girl if you are always around friends when you see her?

9 upvotes · 2 December 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Don't make it humorous. This leaves room for plausible deniability, which is a display of weakness/low-value. A strong man just says what he wants. If it doesn't work, he doesn't play it off as a joke to "save face" - he owns it

and moves on.

Also, if you leave any room for it to be taken as a joke/ironic/sarcastic/humorous, you're making it easier for her to reject you by creating the plausible deniability FOR HER. Why do her work for her? LMR, ASD, certain types of fitness tests - these are all founded on women utilizing plausible deniability as their primary strategy for doing what they want. Don't be like a woman.

Teenage Daughter Wants to Spend Time with Friends During my Parenting Time

9 upvotes · 4 October 2019 · /r/askMRP

Good insights. Better than letting her slip from his frame into her friends', though, is to bring the friends into his frame too.

Using RPC principals as a last resort for my sex starved marriage.

9 upvotes · 17 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Mission first. You didn't mention your mission, which tells me you either don't know what it is or it's not important enough to your life to be worth mentioning - and this also means that she doesn't know what she's following you toward. Life becomes mundane like this.

I'm in the process of moving right now. I'm literally taking off the next 2 days to pack and ship. The last month has been stressful, exciting, difficult, fun, crazy, nostalgic. These are all powerful emotions - and having something BIG going on in life produces all of these. Byproduct? Horniness levels are up.

A few months back, there was drama at our congregation causing us to leave. This brought in a host of good and bad emotions dealing with the exit and the prospect of finding a new congregation. Result? Horniness levels were up.

I could keep going on with examples like this. Women are addicted to *THE NEXT THING*. If they don't know what *the next thing* is, they go crazy with boredom. First she wants a man, then she wants to get engaged; then it's getting married; then it's to have a house; then kids; then she wants them in all kinds of fun activities; and on and on. If there's nothing to look forward to, she's mad. Women have retroactive emotions, so if she's in a bad mood now, her memory of past events will be as if she was in hell.

I was planning a Disney World trip with my wife once when she was in a bad mood. We were talking about our last time there: "It was awful. The heat was unbearable. The lines were so long. The kids were obnoxious. I want to go again for their sake, but this trip is really going to suck." The very next day she's in a positive mood, talking to my sisters and suddenly: "Oh, we had so much fun eating at Cinderlla's castle. And I remember how great it was when the kids did this and that. I can't wait to go back."

It sounds like your wife is presently in emotional blah mode right now, so her entire frame of reference for the past, present, and expectations for the future are blah too. Blah is not sexy. In her mind, "blah has its moments," so she'll still seem happy in short bursts during blah mode, but if the excitement about *the next thing* is gone, "blah" is going to keep being her general context for life, which generates no tingles.

To get out of "blah" mode, you need to have something major that's creating a combination of stress and excitement for her. Ideally, this should be related to your mission. If your mission is disciple-making, start a team at your congregation, get her in it, and share the ups and downs that come along with this. Every time each of you finds a new person to disciple, and you chat with each other about the progress your guy/gal is making and what you want to cover next - and then eventually see them branching out to disciple someone new, these are exciting conversations to have, and ones that she knows makes a difference for eternity. Instead of "we bought another house," which can feel like a big deal in one context, it's "souls are being saved and we're building eternal relationships," which she knows matters in every context.

If your mission is something else, get a better mission. In the meantime, actually do something about your

mission and invite her along. Maybe your mission is to write a book. Actually write that stinkin' book and have her give you feedback on it. Maybe your mission is starting a company. Get it off the ground, start making sales, and ask her to help you run the books. Maybe your mission is to become the world's best bowler. Start going to the bowling alley and take her with you to get feedback on your form and to be impressed by how many times you can gutter that thing without throwing a hissy fit. Whatever your mission is, get off your butt and start doing something other than work, eat, sleep, repeat.

Once you've got her moving alongside you on a mission that's both stressful and exciting, step up your dread game. Get physically fit, dress better, wear cologne - and the faster these changes happen the better. Eventually, become more social - and not just with guys. Chat with girls and guys alike. Christians have a tendency to view women they're not married to like they have a plague. Call it cooties or whatever, but it's not real. Go talk to them. Get IOIs. Develop your own confidence in talking to women - and as you develop that confidence, you'll be more confident in the way you initiate with your wife. If she sees that it's authentic confidence and not a face you're just putting on, she's going to respond to that. Or not, but you feel great about your life anyway because you're on top of the world at that point. Besides, you've got more important things to do with your mission than worry about whether or not some girl is going to spread her legs.

If you're at the point where you realize you could cold-approach and close in a matter of hours, if you wanted, her sexual denial will feel petty to you. You will be able to start having some conversations with her that would break other marriages into pieces. Indeed, she may want to break away entirely, deciding that avoiding sex with you is more important to her than keeping her marriage together. Oh well. You've done everything in your power at that point, and if she wants to leave, let her leave. Otherwise, if she's willing to start making some changes, great - and most often, if you're attractive enough and she knows it, those changes will start happening faster than you'd expect. Some guys mistakenly assume that their own improvement should automatically start causing her to improve too. It doesn't. Some guys think the 1,000 foot rope should start reigning in with enough time. It doesn't. You actually have to grab the rope and start pulling it at some point. You have to compel her to change before she'll start changing. But once you put the imperative to change on the table, let her take it from there. And for the love of all that is good in the world: be tactful in how you communicate all of this. Don't be Rambo. Be silver-tongued.

But right now I'm guessing you feel a lot of pressure to make things work. You feel like you're stuck with her and blew your one shot at marriage. If you tried to develop that type of confidence now, you'd fool yourself into thinking you were genuine, but she'd sniff out the insecurity anyway. After all, she's a woman. She has a pretty good idea of how many other women want you. In fact, she has a pretty darn pessimistic view about that because she knows you better than those other women do and she's already past the NRE phase, so she's probably going to scoff at the idea of other women wanting you, thinking, "That's hilarious. If they only knew what I knew about him, they'd be singing a different tune." That's why you have to become so authentically desirable first before any of this actually works - and that's not just from your physique, although physique is the biggest help. A man with a desirable mission and a rock solid frame with your basic stats should have no problem pulling her attraction at will.

So, while your stats are not ideal, and you should certainly follow [/u/rocknrollchuck](#)'s advice, I'm more persuaded that your issue is related to your mission and your frame, mixed with some lingering blue pill ideologies. Get those straightened out alongside your physique and you'll be well on your way.

Based on what I know of red pill thought it seems like this sub recommending marriage over living as Paul did being single is illogical.

9 upvotes · 4 June 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

This sub recommending marriage

Please point me to the post where any mod did that. The closest you'll get is [/u/OsmiumZulu](#)'s rare comments that marriage and child-bearing is an easy way to populate the world with more Christians. But even that is a far cry from recommending or promoting marriage. As [/u/Deep_Strength](#) noted, this sub (at least insofar as the leadership is concerned) consistently maintains a 1 Cor. 7 approach to the benefit of singlehood over marriage.

when data point's to women often losing all interest in their man after 4-6 years in a relationship

The data I've seen and even personally collected points to 6-24 months - much faster. Divorce most often happens at the 7 year mark. That aside, these stats are looking predominantly at blue pill men because 99% of the people surveyed are blue pill. Take the same metric exclusively of red pill men and I'm confident you'll see a very different result. I say this as someone who has been married for almost 11 years and has 4 kids.

resentment due to the woman not really wanting to have sex

Again, only applies to blue pill men.

due to the choice of women %80 of time

While that stat was true in 2011, most people have misinterpreted why that's the case. Not worth getting into here, though ... just know that I'm a divorce lawyer and it's not as simple as women being the ones who want to leave all the time.

quarrelsome wife

Unless you're a red pill guy who knows how to get his wife in line.

marriage is a concession of God to provide an outlet for sin

Wait ... what?!? Marriage was created by God before sin entered the world. I'm not sure where you're getting this, theologically. Also, while I think I know what you mean, sex within marriage is certainly not sin.

often leads the Christian to put their spouse above God

That's the risk, per 1 Cor. 7, and why we/Paul recommend against marriage. But for those who are already married or will inevitably be married, being red pill sufficiently mitigates this risk.

how marriage can be recommended as the default life goal for Christians

I assume you haven't read our sidebar. I have written **REPEATEDLY** that the default (and only worthwhile) life goal of **EVERY** Christian should be to **MAKE DISCIPLES**. Marriage and child-rearing is a road map that can be tossed in the trash once you've arrived at this actual destination - though some people keep it around because they enjoy amateur cartography anyway.

marriage gives woman most of the power

Marriage doesn't. Marriage laws do. We've had many conversations here about the difference between spiritual marriage before God and legal marriage under the state's laws.

by default makes them head of the household

Not sure how you reach that conclusion in a biblical context. Are you assuming every woman will abandon her

faith? Or that women aren't hypergamous?

Red pill guy's can try holding frame all they want, but women know they have the final word granted by the power society gives them

So much ignorance here. This is only true if hypergamy is false.

she will see herself as the actual head of the house due to the legal power's marriage grants her

Let's be clear: marriage in America is not pro-women or anti-men. It's pro-lesser-earner, anti-higher-earner. Simple solution: make sure your wife has a job, like the Proverbs 31 woman did. The more she earns, the less teeth divorce rape has. I've helped many men divorce-rape their higher-earning wives. It's a gender neutral system (at least insofar as finances go). It just happens to be that there's a disparate impact on men because on the whole there are more men, culturally, who are willing to invest their lives to build high-earning careers than women.

it's become clear to me that women like the power the legal contract gives them

Wouldn't you? That's the same thing as the masses of people supported by welfare saying they will vote for whichever candidate will keep giving them their welfare checks. Duh.

it's not honestly possible for a man to be actually the leader as the sidebar here suggest while in bondage to a contract that gives the woman all the real power

You misunderstand marriage laws. More importantly, I get the impression that you have no clue how hypergamy works. That's okay. You can learn. While some women can overcome certain behaviors that hypergamy would push them toward (ex. riding the CC, cheating, attention-seeking, etc.), no woman can eradicate the underlying hypergamous desires. That's like saying a man can somehow stop himself from ever wanting sex again, even when a supermodel is reaching down his pants.

As is often said, red pill men don't try to change the system. They make it work for them. In the case of a red pill man, hypergamy isn't a threat to his marriage - it's the tool he uses to keep his marriage and sexuality in tact. Hypergamy is what keeps his wife from looking elsewhere. If she's already got the best guy she can ever get (i.e. a red pill, high-quality man), the thought of doing anything to lose him (i.e. the power of dread) would only degrade her to a lower quality man outside the marriage, so she becomes submissive and sexually devout to her husband as a way of keeping him happy with her. She's the one trying to hold the marriage together - not him. That's how a red pill marriage works - and how it should be, biblically.

the woman will lose all interest in the man she now controls

Except she never controls a red pill man.

some will suggest the Girl that has actually been transformed by the holy spirit as a unicorn

Nah, the Holy Spirit only transforms the spirit/mind, but the flesh remains a slave to sin (Romans 7:25). So, I often reject guys who make this claim. Also, there's no way for a man ever to know if his girl is actually transformed by the Holy Spirit or just faking it (intentionally or otherwise).

Now, it sounds to me like you are pretty new to actual red pill theory. That's okay. So, when you say you don't fully believe red pill theory or "AWALT," I take it to mean that you reject your own perception of what you think the red pill is all about.

Spend some time around here and I'm guessing you'll end up agreeing with a lot more than you'd think - especially as you see the Scriptural groundwork of everything we discuss. As I often say, we aren't trying to reconcile secular red pill theory with the Bible. We just look at the Bible and nothing else, which happens to say the same thing that the secular world has discovered about creation through observation and testing. Application of what we learn is where the room for conversation opens up. "If this is true, what should we do about it?" And the possible realms of application are as vast as there are people - though the good ones are always produced from what we know to be true and are not merely tangential.

1920s were not an evolution of justice, but the beginning of our end. Take women's votes away.

9 upvotes · 1 May 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I agree with a lot of what you say, but your attitude is very disturbing. The cause for downvotes was probably not "feminine brain washing and conditioning," as I'm sure most of us would agree with the underlying philosophical premise you're taking; rather, it's the way you approach the issue that warrants down-votes. You have no tact or eloquence. Develop these skills and you will be incredibly more effective at getting people to rally behind you instead of against you.

As the Bible says, do not give power to women and children.

Chapter and verse, please. I'm not saying it's not there - only that such bold claims must always be supported with ACTUAL references. From my recollection, it takes a few theological steps to reach this conclusion and there is no verse directly on point that says, "Thou shalt not let a woman or child vote."

We also have to be careful not to assume old testament Israeli culture was somehow always ordained by God as his way of doing things. Just because the Israelites in the Bible did it doesn't mean it's godly. They defied God all the time. Sometimes he punished them, sometimes he didn't. Focus on what God said, not on what people did.

All in all, you've got some good points, but it's buried beneath so much anger that it's hard to take you seriously. A post on conversational tact is warranted. You make an emotional appeal rather than an intellectual one. You're treating men like women, and in some ways acting like a woman yourself. Calm down, take a few deep breaths, and process your thoughts before writing on controversial matters. You will be far more effective.

[F/R] That escalated quickly...

9 upvotes · 4 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

You stop chasing her and start pursuing Christ and see what happens? Now she's pursuing you. But it sounds like your model is still pursuing women, generally, if not her specifically. This still seems a problem to me. You should be meeting women through the pursuit of your mission, not as a separate and distinct thing from your mission. Go share the Gospel with women. Ask other women in your church to share the Gospel alongside you. Lead a small group and ask a woman to help you do it. There are all kinds of mission-oriented ways of connecting with women. I'm not sure why you'd still follow the pussy-chasing strategies of online dating.

I don't ask girls what they want to do or when they're available. I project that I'm a busy guy (because I am) so they should already know that my time is limited; if they can't fit themselves into my schedule, or at the very least offer another day/time they're available, then their interest in me isn't where I want it to be.

Amen. Glad to see you're getting it.

I did a poor job with kino

On a first date with an allegedly mature Christian woman, this is perfectly acceptable - even a good thing. You don't have to use every tool in your box on the first date.

I continue to talk to other girls and set up a second date with one I had met previously

Why is that girl not getting as much attention in this post as Samantha?

so kino was next to impossible

Again, it's just a second date. Don't ramp up physical escalation too fast with an allegedly mature Christian woman.

She laughs and says "I wouldn't do that, I'm just a tease." ... she even mentioned being good in bed

This is all ASD and plausible deniability. She's saying: "I'll totally have sex with you right now, but I don't want to feel like a slutty sinner, so I'm going to overtly communicate my boundaries to feel good about myself, but create the conditions where he's likely to cross my boundaries and I can conclude: 'It just happened. I got swept away in the moment. I'm not a slut - I told him my boundaries, but he just pushed me too far.'" She will never take responsibility for the way she encouraged you to push her fake-boundaries.

"he's the first guy I've gone out with that wants to talk about Jesus and it's a breath of fresh air."

That made me smile. This is something I don't think the secular world will ever understand.

"to sober up"

Okay ... so apparently the parts of the Bible about being sober-minded and not getting drunk don't matter to the two of you? Gotta own up to that and work on it.

"You can trust me, I'm only like this at first until I'm comfortable with you. I would never cross that line."

I don't track with your assessment. You know her better, of course, but everything you're writing tells me that she's not merely looking for sexual validation. She's trying to get you on her hook and she plans on chilling out after you're wound up in her web. She wants you chasing after her pussy and she's using every sexual tactic she has to get the blood rushing to your head so that you can become her beta bux who will do anything to get what she has to offer.

Does she legit want it too? Absolutely. You're clearly a high value guy to her. That's why she's trying so hard. Does it make her feel validated? Yep. But she can get that validation anywhere. This is a power play, not just a validation trip (though validation needs are always inherent in these exchanges for women). That's just my interpretation, though. Maybe there's more going on than you've mentioned here that would change my mind if I saw it.

Based on some of her comments after, it was clear she needed validation from me in a sexual capacity. In her mind, we didn't need to have sex, but she needed to know that I wanted to have sex with her.

Look at your preface there: "Based on some of her comments." Don't give too much stock to what she says, even if you think you're playing psychologist. This woman has already proven she's intentionally deceptive. She claims she has boundaries, then she crosses them. She claims to be a mature believer, but is chasing dick instead of Christ. I've heard scant little about the women she's discipling or the non-Christians she's sharing the Gospel with or the small group/Bible study she's attending. It's like the conversation went far enough to check off that a few spiritual things are happening - but even in your own recount, you're not emphasizing any of these aspects about her, probably because they're not prominent enough in your impression of her to be worth mentioning in your description. I all-too-often hear, "She's a mature, godly woman," about someone who happens to be quite the

opposite - and you've even as much as said so in this post:

she was a devout Christian. How she was behaving was completely contrary to that.

You follow?

"Am I going to see you again soon? I really want this to work."

Translation: *I want to see you soon. Instead of me bending to your schedule, why don't you start ponying-up to mine. I want more of the validation you have to offer, but I want you to start giving it to me on my terms instead of yours.*

PUMP THE BREAKS GIRL

Correct response.

"Work's more important than me?!"

Translation: *You're supposed to pedestalize me now that I've given you a taste of what sexuality with me could look like.*

"Ugh, you're the worst."

Translation: *I can't resist you and you're going to make me work for this because the freebie attention I get from other guys just won't compare.*

Now, let's get down to business.

First, I have no idea why people are saying to "next" her or stay away. AWALT. They're basically telling you to go find a unicorn. Screw that. Unicorns don't exist. Could you vet for someone better in time? Sure. But that doesn't mean this woman is a bad find simply because she has several of the same traits that all women have.

Second, you've got to move out of her-focus with your dates and onto mission-focus. Going to a restaurant or bar are her-focused. Your attention is entirely on her. She's not following, she's soaking, like a sponge. She says she does service projects. Maybe you're going to do one too, and you invite her to join along. Maybe you're discipling a guy and you invite her into one of your meetings so she can see what discipleship looks like and he can see how you interact with women. Maybe you're in a Bible study and you ask her to join you. I don't know the specifics about your life, but right now all of your attention during your time with this girl is on her. That's what's feeding her validation and giving her power to keep you on the hook. Shift your gaze from her toward your mission and bring her along and see how well she follows then.

Third, and this should go without saying: you need far clearer boundaries. Don't be a girl. Don't fall into the "it just happened" mentality with her. You know well in advance that she's a temptation to you. Are you going to run toward temptation by stage-setting your dates in such a way as to facilitate more sexual activity, or are you going to stage-set them in a way that is non-conducive to physical contact?

Fourth, it appears that your temptation-threshold is quite low. You feel like it's high because you managed to say no to further escalation with her, but you also have your hands up her crotch and are hot-and-heavy at only the second date.

Fifth, you're not enforcing your boundaries, communicating to her that she can do whatever she wants with you. You had your hand on her thigh, she shoves her vag into you. You pull away, but instead of enforcing the boundary you keep making out with her, rewarding her with more endorphins for her effort rather than cutting

her off. If you can't enforce your boundaries and you reward her efforts at trying to break them, she's going to keep trying harder and you will be the one to break, not her.

Sixth, and most importantly: **you have mentioned nothing about her willingness to follow your mission.** I have no clue if she's just looking for relational validation or if she's looking for a leader to give her a purpose in life and a pathway to living it out. Clearly your mission has nothing to do with the interaction between the two of you, other than very vague notions that you both are willing to talk about Jesus - and you're also both quick to forget him when it's convenient.

All in all, this sounds like an exciting prospect. With better direction in how you lead the relationship and clearer enforcement of your boundaries, I'd be interested in seeing where this goes. Don't blame her for breaking your boundaries. Expect it. It's on you to lead in physical contact, not her to withhold. I get the impression that you're looking for excuses by creating contexts where it's easy to drop your boundaries. Don't do that. Stay strong and this could be a decent prospect. What about the other girls? Why all the attention on this one?

WOTSM - Withholding Ejaculation?

9 upvotes · 31 January 2019 · /r/askMRP

Goodness ... and people say I'm the one who over thinks things.

How to date "evenly" as a Christian

9 upvotes · 1 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I'm somewhat disappointed with the answers in this thread so far. /u/YayLove came close when saying that relationships aren't an exchange - but then she (he?) blew it by saying to focus on giving.

Exchanges certainly happen in relationships and marriage, but that exchange is not the point. It is incidental. The fairness of these exchanges stops mattering when you contemplate the larger things at work.

This faulty "exchange" concept, I believe, comes from the "love tank" model of relational counseling. This view says that each party has a "tank" and that if someone's tank drops too low, they will be unhappy and want out of the relationship. It teaches that each party must fill the other's tank for the relationship to work, or else the other person won't be happy and will want to leave. In this model, each person is responsible for the other person's love tank. Given that each person's experience of the relationship is based exclusively on his/her own tank, it also fosters a highly competitive nature. Rather than ensuring the other person's tank is full all the time, it incentivizes each person to keep the other person's tank at a mediocre level - just enough that the negative consequences don't kick in - and then do whatever else they want with the rest of their time.

In another model, people view relationships as having a joint tank. Each party fills it with a different color - one red, another white. It is a joint effort to keep the tank full, but the color inside the tank is a good indicator of who's doing more to keep the tank full. This isn't an accurate picture of reality, though, because there is no collective emotion - each party has their own emotions, though they do influence one another.

A better way to look at it is the biblical way, doing away with tanks altogether. God gives the man a mission. The man's mission should be big enough that he recognizes the value of having help. He invites others to help him. At some point he starts wanting to have sex with some of the people helping him. One of them it gets so intense that he decides to marry her to legitimize their sexual relationships.

Here's the deal: if you're off **actively looking** for a relationship, you're already in a state of subservience. In today's deregulated sexual marketplace, women by default view themselves as the selectors. They sit back, let men come to them, and they decide if the man has enough to offer her to be worth the effort of locking down his

commitment. If you're actively looking, you're just another man in their queue - unless you're going after unattractive women who don't have anyone in their queue.

Now, if you enter that woman's queue, she thinks (reasonably, in light of the sexual marketplace) that her very existence is the exchange you get for all your effort. The value of her time and attention is the "equal exchange." If you don't buy her dinner, so be it. She won't give you her time that day. If you don't pay for her movie ticket, she'll find another guy who will. If you don't give compliments or massage her feet or whatever, she doesn't need you. Women operate on a tank-filling relational mentality and assume that your tank is always full just by virtue of her being around you, but that you must actively make effort to fill her tank.

This is where hypergamy is actually a beneficial thing to men. If women were not hypergamous, then there would be no recourse for a man. He would simply be compelled to keep playing this game, vying for her attention, filling her tank only to be left in the cold when his runs empty.

But because women are hypergamous, they always want what is better. If a man is pursuing her, he is, by default, viewed as being lesser. If a man is present in her life, but shows no clear signs of interest, it indicates that he is greater. That's how the hamster rationalizes his disinterest. After all, there are a million guys who would be interested in her, but not this one, so he must be capable of achieving a higher standard than all those other guys; and if he has that capacity, he must be a better guy than all those other guys, and therefore she wants him more than the other guys.

So, when you intentionally pursue a relationship with a woman, you are telling her: "You are in demand, at least to me, therefore I am willing to pay a price to get you." At no point in this transaction is there a communication: "You must pay a price to get me" or "You must pay a price equal to the price that I'm paying you." See how the transactional "equalizing" view of relationships makes no sense in this model?

If you don't pursue her, though, she is left thinking: "I am not in demand to him, but he is now in demand to me. Therefore, I must be willing to pay a price to get him." That price is her submissiveness, following his leadership in the relationship. At no point should she be thinking, "Now that I have paid him my submissiveness, he must pay me back something so that we're paying equal amounts to each other." Instead, the man is rightly in the biblical position of being the head of the relationship.

To be clear, in biblical times, virtually all men had more value to offer women than women had to offer men. They were very sexist times, by modern standards - and I'm only commenting on the actuality of it, neither in a condoning of all their practices, nor condemning them. It is what it is. So, the man was always the prize because men had more rights. They were capable of earning an independent wage. They were capable of owning land apart from inheritance. They were given positions of decision-making in tribes and councils. Women were excluded from these things, and thus the sexual marketplace always presumed that the man had more to offer the woman than the woman did the man.

Deregulating the sexual marketplace through countless feminist political victories has shifted this balance away from what we see in the Bible on a pragmatic level, though the theological fact of God's intentions - which Paul reasons from creation and not from culture - remains unchanged. This is where most confusion now lies because as Christians we have a proper theological framework we must follow (which is the red pill praxeological understanding of how a sexual marketplace best functions) compared against the pragmatic reality that women can easily create their own value apart from a man, and therefore have no societal incentive to follow the theological framework the Bible lays out for intergender relational dynamics (i.e. essentially, the leader/helper dynamic).

Nevertheless, the red pill view is still to make women chase you rather than you chasing them. This is the biblical view, as we are to chase Christ rather than waiting for him to chase us down every time we stop our feet and slam the door in his face. It is also evident in the order of creation, as Paul explains.

To that end, the pragmatic solution for you is simply to make yourself as attractive as possible, make yourself

available to women who you want to notice your attraction (preferably through inviting them to join you on your mission, apart from actual dates, as the opportunity to get to know each other and foster attraction), then let them start sending IOIs your way as you flirt back.

I've heard story after story of guys who employ this type of methodology and find that their girlfriends are actually the ones who are paying for their meals, buying them clothes, new TVs, stereos, etc. That's not to say you should be attracting women just to get these things from them; but the point is that you don't have to be stuck in the "equal exchange" model or the "I must give, give, give" model - you can make the sexual marketplace work for you by being in high enough demand that a woman, now being able to self-generate value, would spend that value on you just for the right to say she's your girlfriend. Again, what you *should* do or *actually* do is up to you - but be the guy who *can* do that if he wants.

Tag: [u/deep_strength](#) [u/redpillwonder](#) - as this is a theory-heavy comment and I wrote it in a rush, so feel free to correct any mistakes.

The Consciously Crazy Wife

9 upvotes · 29 October 2018 · [/r/askMRP](#)

Thanks for the reply. This is good. I love the nail video and have shared it with many people as well. It's a safe way to communicate a somewhat fundamental RP concept that people would reject if you gave it in more direct terms.

I've been suggesting she change jobs along the lines of what you suggested for years, but I haven't escalated it beyond anything more than a mere suggestion. Honestly, her busy seasons are some of the best times for me. I get all the time with my kids, it reinforces in her mind that I'm the leader in the home and can run the ship without her - and therefore she's there not to run the ship for me, but to help me do it - and yet I still get sex at the end of the day ... and don't have to deal with her craziness 4 months in the year (2 for each busy season). So, I'm a little hesitant to have her switch jobs with how much I enjoy the busy season dynamic on my end and these weird blow-ups are only about twice a year anyway - especially when she's adamant that she doesn't want to change jobs either. But perhaps it would have greater value in the long-run.

Oh the irony...

9 upvotes · 3 October 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I have been probating an estate where a guy fraudulently stole a bunch of money from the estate. I've been garnishing him for years. Two months ago he fled the state, canceling our garnishment and leaving us with absolutely no way to find him. He could be anywhere in the country. He essentially got away with the other \$79,000 we never got to collect from him.

One of the beneficiaries of the estate lives on the other side of the country. His wife got rear ended on her way to work two days ago. Guess who hit her ...

The frame of Christ

9 upvotes · 9 September 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

This simple sentence is ther foundation for why I started RPC in the first place. I like your concise way of putting it.

Sous vide starbucks eggs at home.

9 upvotes · 18 July 2018 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

Is this RPW? I'm so confused. I tried to look for some hidden metaphor, but must be as dumb as my neighbor's mom if there actually is one. Ok, let's roll with it. Cooking is one of my hobbies too. Best meal: T-bone with my homemade jabenero cilantro lime sauce over brown garlic rice ... and golden honeydew melon for dessert. That

melon ... I have a weakness.

Seriously though, I cook because I want to control what I eat. I do cut and bulk. I started a cut this past Friday. Didn't tell the wife. Wife drives through fast food today and asks what I want. My golden honeydew melon, of course. Response: "Wait, now I feel guilty. Am I allowed to eat anything if you're not?" My reply: "You can eat whatever the heck you want. I'm eating my melon." Guess who suddenly decided she needs to diet and tone up?

RP Christians Sidebar "Handbook" (Download Links)

9 upvotes · 10 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is actually ... far more professional-looking than I was expecting. Well done, sir.

New SBC President JD Greear Urges Evangelical Men to Apologize to Hurt Christian Women for 'Toxic Church Culture'

9 upvotes · 19 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

If it's really only about physical abuse and rape, I'm fine with this. What's frustrating is the broad and widely unclarified extent to which his words can be taken. If a husband is beating his wife and the church stands by knowingly and allows it to happen, they're right to apologize and repent. But that doesn't mean the rest of us should bear the burden of false assumption because of these few outlier cases.

Lessons from two divorce cases

9 upvotes · 14 May 2018 · /r/askMRP

It seemed too niche for MRP. It doesn't have mass appeal - only to those who are self employed and contemplating divorce. I used to clog MRP with lots of stuff like this, some even lower quality. I'm trying to avoid that nowadays.

Plate hides that she has a boyfriend, he finds out she was cheating with me, and now he's harassing her and me to speak to me. Should I even bother speaking to him?

9 upvotes · 14 March 2018 · /r/askTRP

So you make a play against his masculinity ...

Finding a RP Church/Fellowship

9 upvotes · 20 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is the answer. And if you're truly alpha, people will follow your lead naturally anyway. You will earn influence with the leadership and transform your church by the example you set.

To OP: don't try to find a red pill church; make one.

The most feminized holiday of them all ... what to do, what to do ...

9 upvotes · 10 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That's a solid answer. I'm not a fan of Covert Contract Day either.

Wife had abortion without telling me

9 upvotes · 4 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

There aren't even words for what had happened here. Unfortunately, on Reddit all we have is our words. So how can we use them to help you?

My gut reaction is to use them to knock some sense in you for marrying an unbeliever and getting lost in you blue pill ideologies. But I know that speech would probably be more than your heart can handle right now. We're here

for you.

How can a man not be a beta bux if the woman is traditionally supposed to stay home and raise children, buy groceries, etc.? Doesn't the man have to provide for her to take care of the family?

9 upvotes · 5 December 2017 · /r/askTRP

Having a wife who doesn't work is the easiest way to set yourself up for long-term divorce rape. Either go MGTOW or marry someone who will contribute financially as well (preferably where you earn no more than 50% more than her - i.e. you make 60% of the joint, combined income or less). That said, even with a wife who is a financial contributor, there are still roles with regard to housework. I usually break it up into two categories:

- Improvement: Things that will show a lasting impact, like fixing the deck, remodeling the bathroom, fixing the law mower, etc.
- Maintenance: Things that will need done again in another day or two, like dishes, laundry, picking up clutter, dusting, vacuuming, etc.

Now, guys should be doing some maintenance stuff too, like mowing the lawn and opening tight pickle jars. Likewise, wives tend to like painting walls. Oh well. Figure out your own balance. The improvement/maintenance dichotomy works well for my family.

But at the end of the day, if you're married you want to treat the house like it's yours. Not "our house" or "your house, but she has rights too." It's your house. Legally this is an insane position to hold, but that's what's going to keep her interested in you. Women want to "have it all together" and they get jealous when they see other women who "have it all together" and they don't. They tend to marry men who they think "have it all together" so they can latch on to his success. Great. This is actually a good thing. That's hypergamy at its finest working for the betterment of the high-value men.

But what women fail to realize is that nobody "has it all together." That standard is a phantom that simply doesn't exist. If a guy imposes too much responsibility on his wife, she will buckle under the weight of it. That's why beta husbands are so frustrating and end up with crappy sex lives and a nagging wife. She feels responsible for all the work and since you're not getting it done, she starts nagging and complaining for you to do it.

Solution? OYS. Treat the house like it's your house, not "hers" or "ours" or anything of the sort. Notice how most girls get excited when the guy invites her: "Move in with me"? It's not, "Let's get our own place." Sure, that exists, but it's rare. It's usually him asking her to move in with him - to join in on his life. Act like the marital home is your bachelor pad and you just happen to let her and the kids live there. Of course, moving in with you means taking on some responsibility, and you'll delegate that to her as you see fit - but it's your responsibility, not hers. That's how you continue being the guy who "has it all together."

And when she notices a butt ton of things that aren't meeting her expectations you simply say, "You're here because you want to live with me. You don't have to live with me if you don't want to." To that end, if my wife comes up with something she wants done that isn't important enough for me to act on or delegate to her (example: re-painting the kids' rooms when the current paint is perfectly fine), she runs the idea by me. If I say no, that's the end of it. If I approve the project, I make it clear, "Go for it, but getting it done is on you, on your own time." She's okay with that. Result? The sheer quantity of "extra projects" we had immediately reduced to realistic levels, as opposed to before my RP days when she'd start a million things and never finish any of them and I'd get roped into doing it all for her. In addition, the house is now conforming to my expectations of what a house should look like. But of particular significance is the fact that my wife is no longer stressed out of her mind trying to "have it all together" because I'm the one responsible for figuring out what needs done and delegating tasks - not her.

If your wife ever has to ask you, "Honey, can you take out the trash and mow the lawn?" (or even worse - creates a "honey do list"), it's because she sees herself as the one responsible for the house and delegating tasks. How often do you give her a to-do list? In most marriages, that almost never comes from the guys. At best, it's usually, "Can you hand me the hammer?" If you're not telling her what to do, she's telling you. You decide which end of that you want to live on, and that sets the tone for who she sees as the leader in the relationship.

She's not your's it's just your turn

9 upvotes · 17 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

But ... but ... but ... that's what the Bible says. Of course, not necessarily the way RP means it, but this is a truly biblical concept. If you're both saved, you'll both be in heaven. There's no marriage in heaven to one another because we are the bride of Christ - and that is our identity for eternity.

Your wife is on loan to you. She's not yours for eternity. She's just yours for right now. She has been entrusted to you by God, just as the servants in the parables of the minas/talents were entrusted things by their master. And eventually, when the master returned, they had to return what was given to them to be his once more. You are a steward of what God has given you - and that includes your wife. Are you going to return her in the condition you found her, or are you going to lead her into being fruitful upon Christ's return?

Parallel aside, let me clarify what I think the MRPer's are trying to say. They don't mean that all women will cheat or divorce you, as your post suggests. They mean that there is no absolute guarantee that she won't do those things. Because that capacity exists, however remote, you can operate on one of two assumptions:

- **Useful Assumption:** She'll leave you for a better man if you're low-enough value and she gets the chance.
- **Non-Useful Assumption:** She'll stay faithful to you no matter what.

There are, of course, gradations in-between, but the further you get toward the latter, the more you'll put yourself at risk of proving the former.

Now, I'm speaking speciously right now. The latter assumption is not actually "non-useful." It has positive aspects about it, just as the "useful assumption" has negative qualities. The "useful assumption" can be a serious hindrance to pair-bonding and developing the type of intimacy that husbands and wives are meant to experience in order to model the intimate love between Christ and the Church (note: if you've read SGM, this is the E in DEVI). The "non-useful assumption" is actually useful in fostering this.

But like I said, there are gradations in-between, or even ways where you can fully embrace the useful assumption without compromising your ability to be authentic, vulnerable, and intimate with your spouse - all things that, to some degree, need to be implemented in order to become the oak. The primary draw-back of assuming your wife is yours and will never leave you is, of course, that it compromises your internal imperative to be a better man - *if maintaining your marriage is a significant motivator to you*. As to whether or not that *should* be a motivator to you - that's a different question that depends heavily on how you interpret 1 Cor. 7.

The point is: the benefits of following the useful assumption drastically outweigh the negatives, particularly when taken in the context of all other principles, and even more so outweigh any limited benefits of making the non-useful assumption. So, even if you know it's not true, sometimes it's worth telling yourself something anyway because of what it helps you become. It's like my son, who is 6 years old in 3 days and terrified of the dark - so he tells himself, "I'm brave; nothing will hurt me," to overcome his fears. Both of those claims are mildly false, of course. He's a little brave, but his bravery is outweighed by his fear. Something very well could end up hurting him. Like in *Donnie Darko*, a jet engine turbine could fall into his room with no warning. I can't promise that won't happen. But telling himself something that's technically not absolutely true, he's creating a psychological -

even spiritual - condition for himself to become what he needs to be. There is value in this. So, even if "all women cheat" or "she's not yours, it's just your turn" isn't technically 100% accurate for every relationship that ever existed across time (except to the degree of my starting explanation of this comment), sometimes we just need to tell ourselves something to help us get to the right frame of mind.

This will be addressed in much greater detail in the "circles illustration" in 400-level content (if/when I ever get around to writing it), which emphasizes making the shift in our frame from finding our satisfaction from worldly things which fail us and into Christ, who will not. "She's not yours, it's just your turn" is a way of saying, "All things human will fail eventually - accept that as a reality of life" ... and when we accept that as a legitimate possibility - and from the perspective of eternity, an actual, genuine, biblical reality - only then can we truly stop relying on human conventions for our satisfaction and begin looking to Christ, who is the only source of eternal, unending life and fulfillment.

Lastly, I'd love to quote all of Micah 7:1-7, but suffice it to say that he's referencing a society where sin is generally rampant around. He's still talking to God's people - Israel, but he says to them, "Do not trust a neighbor; put no confidence in a friend. **Even with the woman who lies in your embrace guard the words of your lips ... a man's enemies are the members of his own household.**"

Romans 3 comments that even back in Jesus' day, Paul describes their society the same way Micah 7 does when it says, "The faithful have been swept from the land; not one upright person remains. Everyone lies in wait to shed blood ..." and so on. As for the part above, even Jesus talks about how his coming would cause strife in the household (Luke 12:51-53). In other words, Jesus is saying what RP is saying, "Don't put your trust in people - not even your own family; learn to put it in me instead."

Tag: [/u/XReverenceX](#) and [/u/Whitified](#) - for some Scriptural *umph* to what you're saying.

[FR] Shit tests are for fun

9 upvotes · 12 October 2017 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

What's more amazing is the fact that women say no all the time with no remorse, yet men still seem to think this is hard or wrong somehow when they try doing it themselves.

Delete Your Social

9 upvotes · 26 September 2017 · [/r/TheRedPill](#)

This goes along with the concept that women have retroactive emotions. How they feel about something in the present affects how they felt about something years ago.

My wife actually admitted this to me. She absolutely loved when we took the kids to Disney World 3 years ago. She had a blast and was glowing with how great the whole vacation was, seeing the kids' reactions, etc. Several months ago, she was frustrated by a lot of things in life. I tried to remind her that there are good days as well as the bad, and brought up how great the Disney trip was and how much our kids loved being there with her. Her response: "That was a horrible trip. It was too hot and muggy, we waited in line forever, the kids were whining and screaming the whole time. It just wasn't fun and I'd never do that again."

Well, that's a *faaaaar* cry from how she was feeling while actually there. What happened? She retroactively applied her present emotional state to her past experiences. What a horrible way to live.

Yet just this past weekend she was happy and having a great time. My sisters brought up the idea of going to Disney and she was once again beaming with how great of a time we had before and how excited she is to go again, and was even asking me if we could schedule to go next year.

Point is: however a woman feels at present affects how she feels about the past too. If you were a garbage beta,

but can convince her in the present that you're someone new without directly telling her you've changed, she'll start to interpret your past behaviors in a new way. Truly idiotic beta moves you used to pull will now be viewed as heroic sacrifices that you made for her good. This is one of the bizzarrities of the female hamster, but it does work.

Question I always had about Christianity (but every pastor/priest is too bluepillled to answer)

9 upvotes · 11 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

WHERE'S YOUR FOUNDATION?

Let's remember that the Bible is God's word. We don't try to justify what God says to what RP says. It's the other way around. So, if God says, "Gynocentrism is good and you must all be gynocentric," then so be it. We must obey. Of course, if God had said this, he would have wired men and women differently to a point where RP wouldn't exist in the first place. I just want to make clear which is your foundation: the Bible or RP praxeology. You can only pick one, and it sounds like from the way your question is worded that you're picking RP. Fortunately for you, although conflicts certainly abound, this is not one of them.

OWNERSHIP

Women were considered property. Their rights were typically derivative through the men who owned them. When a woman was left a widow, she was scorned in society unless/until she remarried. At the time, the term "widow" even became a derogatory term for any person who was marginalized or impoverished. This is why God had to make specific laws for their protection (Ex. 22:21-22; Deut. 14:29, 16:9-15, 24:17, 19-21, 27:19). These protective laws are not signs of gynocentrism; they are a safeguard against abuse.

The same was true of female children as for adults. Male children, however, were not "owned" as property. Jewish culture believed in an age of accountability. Prior to this age, a child must be completely subject to his parents and could not be held responsible for his own decisions. After that age he gradually became his own person. That said, even prior to the age of accountability, male children had more rights than most adult women, except in rare circumstances.

When the old testament uses the word "slave" you really have to look at the context. There were two primary types of slaves: (1) conquered people of foreign nations who worked for you, and (2) indentured servants.

- The first kind were not typically owned at an individual level. They were owned at a governmental level. It would be akin to Pharaoh owning all of the Israelites using them to build bricks for governmental buildings, etc.
- When an individual owned a slave, it was usually because the "slave" could not live independently. He would offer a life of labor in exchange for provision for life (a parallel to the church). Consider: God established the "year of jubilee" which involved freeing every slave. Yet slavery continued after this. Why? Because they were there voluntarily, not by force.

Lastly, it's important to note that "ownership" of a person did not mean the same thing as "ownership" of a hammer. Women were certainly viewed as lesser, but they were also loved and cherished so long as they remained faithful and dutiful. Modern feminism would have you believe that "women were property" = "women were treated like toilet paper to use and throw away." This is an idiotic position.

CONTEXT FOR CIRCUMCISION

The whole of the Bible is about God building a nation for himself; the Gospel is the key that makes this possible. His plan for this has always been discipleship. His physical nation was always meant to parallel his spiritual kingdom. Physical reproduction and child-rearing were to parallel spiritual reproduction and child rearing.

God's first command to Adam and Eve was: "Be fruitful and multiply; fill the earth." Jesus' final command before ascending was: "Make disciples of all nations," basically meaning, "Be spiritually fruitful and fill the earth with my disciples." Connect this with all the times Jesus talks about bearing fruit or the way he talks about "disciples" as people who have been "born again" (John 3, for example) and how the apostles took this pattern and called their disciples their "children" and referenced themselves as "fathers."

Interestingly, when humanity first started filling the earth God still wiped it away. Malachi 2:15 explains why: he didn't want any offspring; he wanted "godly offspring," and that verse says that this is the whole purpose of marriage.

- **The entirety of the Bible is about filling the world with disciples - and the Gospel of Jesus is what makes that possible.**

With that understanding firmly in place, you'll see now why throughout all of time sex has been considered the epitome of human existence. God designed the human body to enjoy physically reproductive acts more than any other type of physical pleasure in order to point us to the reality that in our marriage to Christ, spiritual reproduction (evangelism) and child-rearing (discipleship) is where we should find our greatest pleasure and ongoing joy.

WHY CIRCUMCISION?

The Basics

Given the whole of the biblical narrative, it makes sense that the covenant would have to do with sex. You seem to mistake God's intent in utilizing circumcision being "painful and might potentially have numerous negative consequences" as God's rationale. Bearing in mind the fact that it actually has far more positives than negatives, this misses the point of what God's trying to do.

Circumcision today is taken as a given in many parts of the world. So, a circumcised man does not look down at himself while having sex and think, "I'm weird - I'm different from the rest of the world." In ancient Israel, this is exactly what they would have thought. They knew they were unique among the nations. Every reproductive act would have been a reminder that they belonged to God - and that their reproduction was to be for God's purposes. Remember, God wanted "godly offspring" (Malachi 2:15), and circumcision was a reminder that their reproduction was to be consecrated to God for that purpose. Malachi was only verbalizing what the Israelites were meant to understand all along.

Circumcision, then, is a physical representation of what God does to a person's heart. It's easy to reference Romans, where Paul talks about this, but let's not forget that he's really quoting Moses (Deut. 10:16; 30:6) and Jeremiah (4:4; 9:25-26). The physical act of consecrating a man's reproductive function to God is meant to highlight the way we are meant to consecrate a spiritually reproductive lifestyle to God. Jesus then says in Matthew 7 that the fruit we bear (i.e. spiritual reproduction) is how we can discern who is in Christ.

RP Rant

This is the crying shame in finding people who are genuinely "low libido" and why having a sexually denying spouse is so detestable. It breaks down the very core of what God is trying to exemplify to and through the church on a spiritual level, telling them instead that reproduction is not important; we should be more focused on simply maintaining the internalized relationship between spouses instead.

Is it any wonder, then, that the church cares so little about training people up for evangelism and instead we focus exclusively on "how to have a better relationship with God," just as many women ignore sex, focusing only on "having a better relationship with her husband" not realizing that sex is the key to making that happen?

Also, when is the last time you've seen a church teach men or women how to improve their sexual technique? Compare: how often do you see churches teach men and women how to improve their spiritually reproductive (i.e. evangelism) techniques? And even if they do preach evangelism technique: how many actually make a lifestyle of it who don't already have a healthy physically reproductive lifestyle?

More of the "Why"s

Why something so private? - Because it is meant to be internalized as between God and each person. It creates a communal identity, but simultaneously emphasizes the personal nature of the commitment within that community.

Why a sexual part? - In addition to the reasons above, remember that most other religions were using sexual practices as a core religious rite. When one was circumcised and would attempt to engage in a religious sexual rite apart from God, that reminder was present and would be noticed by all and a direct condemnation to the man who ignored it in favor of such idolatry.

Why cutting off flesh? - The shedding of blood has long been associated with covenant-making in the old testament. Also, the foreskin literally covers up the most important part of the reproductive organ. Circumcision takes a man from a pseudo-hidden reproductive member to one where the tip is bold and prominent - and it does so by cutting off the flesh. Likewise, our spiritual reproduction should be bold and prominent within the spiritual body of Christ and this happens by cutting off the flesh (i.e. sinful nature).

Why not women? - Because Israelite society was a patriarchy, regardless of what your atheist friend may believe. The Bible shows that God typically sets up a chain of command: "I'll relate with you, you relate with them." This is discipleship. A clear early example is Exodus 4. Moses tries to defer to Aaron and God says, "No, I'm going to communicate to you; you to Aaron; and Aaron to the people. This happens in discipleship relationships all throughout Scripture.

We see this same setup occurring in a marriage context as well. In Genesis 2 God communicates with Adam, who then relayed to Eve. In 1 Cor. 11:3, "The head of every man is Christ, the head of a wife is her husband, and the head of Christ is God." We also see that God views sanctification (as opposed to salvation) on a familial level, where the faith of the husband/father is imputed over the home so that he wouldn't be considered "unclean" in his relationships. In essence, God works through the man, who then works through his family. This is also evident in 1 Cor. 14, where men are to engage in the church directly, but women are to learn and engage through their husbands (v. 35, specifically).

So, it makes sense that God's covenant would be with the man (circumcision), and the man would have a covenant with his wife (head coverings, per 1 Cor. 11).

Can RPChristians use real dread?

9 upvotes · 5 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

In moderation, lower and mid-levels of dread are perfectly appropriate. Upper levels (like actually cheating) are totally prohibited.

Healthy dread is really applying preselection to your marriage. Preselection is the concept that a woman perceives a man's SMV as higher when other women are attracted to him because she assumes that these other women know something about him that she doesn't. This is usually a way for women to vet a guy before ever meeting him. But in a marriage context, *if a man has been changing* it can cause his wife to think, "If those girls take notice, maybe there's something more to his changes than I've realized," and she will become more attracted to her husband as a result. If the man is not substantially changing, she will only think, "Hah! Those foolish girls. If only they knew what I know about him."

If you check my comment history and scroll through a few pages doing a search for "dread" you'll find a lot more on the subject.

hurt her so much that I would look at other women like that and think those things

Were you telling her you wanted to have sex with the singer? What were "those things" and how did she know you were thinking them? Otherwise, it's an unreasonable request to assume you'll never think another girl is attractive, so shut that down right away. That's not a dread issue, it's a frame issue.

followed me into my marriage

Yeah, I had that too. Hopefully you're past that now. If not, be open and honest and deal with it. Ask this community for help (read 201 and 202 first), but also find people in real life to help you with that.

according to Jesus it was lust and therefore adultery

Possibly. It depends on what you actually thought. "I thought was really hot" is not lust in a sinful sense. The word Jesus uses for "lust" is *epithumeo* (coveting), which is not *moicheia* (adultery). It's not lust until your heart is at the point where you would act on it if you had the opportunity. Again, check out 201/202.

bouncing one's eyes away from anything sensual that is not your wife ... made my wife hotter

This does work. I tried it for a bit. But it's also unrealistic. Sometimes I have a super hot client and I can't just never look at her. Other attorneys I practice with are like that. There are countless people you have to interact with. I know there are tricks to get around this, but you also don't want people to think you're totally awkward. That's going to stunt you in other areas.

Plus, I'm a major advocate for the notion that avoiding sin is not the same as conquering it. We should run from temptation, yes. But we should not let fear of temptation control us, or else we're still giving sin the power to be a slave-driver over us again. You run from temptation you can't resist, but plow through with perseverance that which you know you can conquer. That's how you get stronger.

how can that mindset be compatible with traditional, red pill dread?

You'll note that the first 6 levels of dread are all within your marriage only. Many people have commented on MRP that a healthy marriage should hover between levels 5 and 6 and you should only have to go higher if you've got an exceptionally difficult situation. Nothing in the first 6 levels contradicts the practices you're trying to apply.

All of that said, I agree with [/u/shr3dthegnarbrah](#) - dread isn't about her believing you want other women; it's about her believing that other women want you (again, a variant of post-wedding preselection).

Why do girls love pop singers with beta male blue-pilled lyrics like Shawn Mendes?

9 upvotes · 23 July 2017 · [/r/askTRP](#)

Let me add this:

You have to remember that these lyrics are usually sung by hot celebrity guys who are in peak physical shape and dominate the room wherever they go. Because of their celebrity status, they have all the confidence/alpha/physique that would ever be needed to fulfill most RP criteria, and their SMV is so high that

they don't put up with crap - they find someone else.

Now, when the hot alpha guy who gives them the tingles is singing all this beta stuff ... that's like a double whammy. It's tingles and fuzzies at the same time in extreme measure.

To be clear: when girls listen to these songs, they're not getting pictures of the geeky orbiter in their head, as if the words were coming from the drooling classmate who stands out her window. She pictures them coming from the guy she has the hots for, combining the best of both worlds.

Critique my wife's ultimate shit test

9 upvotes · 9 July 2017 · /r/askMRP

MRP principles are supposed to foster attraction and increase your SMV. You are obviously having the opposite effect. From what she describes (if her perception can be trusted), you're too alpha. MMSLP talks about this.

[/u/cholomite](#) said it best:

Tingles without fuzzies won't last. Fuzzies without tingles are worthless.

You have built your entire relationship on tingles. This is the biggest issue I've seen since coming on MRP. Most people are from TRP where fuzzies don't matter at all, or they're beta guys who have already mastered fuzzies. As a result, most of the stuff that gets pushed here is the need to alpha-up. Your need is to beta-up, and you're not going to find many posts about that.

Learn to give her some fuzzies and she'll settle down. Go re-read (assuming you already got through it) MMSLP's chapter on good beta qualities and report back.

How do I get a life?

9 upvotes · 28 June 2017 · /r/askTRP

I'll ditty [/u/chachaChad](#). As a former porn, video game, and food addict - those things only breed complacency. Give up your coping mechanisms and you'll have nowhere to turn but the real thing.

- You want a good life? Stop trying to live vicariously through a pixelated character by giving him a good/exciting life for you ... doesn't matter if it's RPG or FPS or sports games. Everyone condemns living vicariously through your children as a cheap way to happiness ... it's even cheaper when you're living vicariously through a fictional world - and also leads to a bigger crash when you realize the futility and total lack of long-term value in your life. Do I still play games every now and then? Yes, there's nothing wrong with it. In fact, I still play all kinds of stupid apps on my phone during mandatory pauses throughout the day (bathroom, waiting in line, etc.). But as [/u/chachaChad](#) says, you do that out of your excess, not to avoid responsibility. For now, you need to go cold turkey so that you control your gaming instead of letting it control you. Use those pauses to start reading content on the sidebar instead (my app-ing cut down by 90% when I discovered TRP/MRP and it's going to stay that way until I'm done with the side-bar) - not just the top posts, but the actual books. I just started. Join me.
- You want a good relationship? You didn't say you did, but I'm 99.9% sure you watch porn fairly regularly. It's fairly inevitable for guys with your MO. If you're placating yourself with fake relationships, you're never going to see an urgency to make something of a real relationship. Believe me, I did this in my marriage for far too long. I'm new to RP thinking myself, but just being a rational human being led me to these conclusions long before I made it to this sub. Guess what ... when I gave up on porn, I actually started wanting to have sex with my wife again. Weird, huh? I've still got a lot to learn, but it doesn't take much to realize that porn is probably the number one thing in your life placating your drive to have the life you want. "If things go back, I can always jack off to feel better about myself." That's a sure-fire way to beta-land.

- You want a high, but you're not happy with weed? That's because weed is a substitute. I mean this literally. Your brain has receptors for different types of chemicals. Weed puts chemicals in your brain (THC, namely) that mimics the substances those receptors are meant to bond with, causing the synapses to start firing as if the real thing were there. The problem is that it starts changing your brain chemistry to prefer the fake thing over the real thing. Your brain was designed for the real thing and the fake thing promotes complacency. Stop it.

See the pattern? Can't get the real thing, go fake this, fake that, fake over there, fake here. You're trying to live a fake life, get fake pleasure, feel fake emotions. I'm not going to pretend that the real thing is the answer you need, but for now it's the answer you want. When you get that and it's still not satisfying, then there's room to go deeper and find out what your life is really missing.

The one thing I'll note that's probably different from the advice you'll hear from other guys is this: **stick it out with your parents** for that two years.

Why?

- I'm in decent shape, and most people are still telling me I'm 2 years away from having the body necessary to make RP theory actually feasible in the context of a committed relationship (I'm married). So, it'll give you time to get in shape.
- It's going to take you a while to get through the side-bar. If you can't jump straight into the RP life anyway, you might as well give yourself time to learn and start practicing in small ways before diving in head-first and wasting a ton of money on an apartment, utilities, etc. in the process.
- Most importantly, (as alluded to in the last point) you know your life sucks right now and it's going to take a lot of money to jump-start you in the direction you want to go with your financial situation (i.e. saving for retirement, paying down debt, buying a decent house, car, etc.). Living with your parents gives you an opportunity to save what you otherwise would be paying for rent, which should ideally be set aside for a down-payment rather than blown on weed and booze. Let's say you would have gotten a crummy apartment for \$500/mo in rent. Save that for 2 years and you've got \$12,000 just from rent savings alone. Add in another \$3k for utilities, food, and other misc. self-living expenses you'll be saving and you've got a nice \$15,000 for a down payment. This goes up when you're not buying new video games as soon as they're released, a couple grand a year on pot, alcohol, etc. Maybe even only put \$10k into a house and \$5k on a car and you'll be in great financial shape, hugely boosting your confidence, and you might even have some excess if you cut those bad habits.

Now, you say your parents live in the middle of nowhere, so here are some suggestions:

- Find the nearest big-city and become a regular somewhere. Use this as a place to practice RP stuff while you're getting your finances in order. It's safe because you won't really know anyone there, and yet it sounds like you want to be back in a city eventually, so you'll be getting practice in a context in which you intend to live when you have your brand new "Grand Re-Opening Day."
- Don't want to drive that far? You've probably got a butt ton of woods around. Buy a gun and shoot squirrels and raccoons and stuff. I can't stand hunting, but I've never been a FPS gamer either. You like FPS, do the real thing rather than the fake thing (just don't shoot at actual people - stick to non-protected animals and make sure you follow the law with what you can/can't kill).
- Far from the city = lots of grass and streets to take up running/jogging/hiking. This kills two birds with one

stone: exercise + hobby.

Saying "my parents live in the middle of nowhere" is the same as saying, "I'm incapable of making the best of a crappy situation." That's the same as saying, "I'm a pansy beta who can't take ownership of my life or figure out what I want to do." Stop making excuses. Just do it.

It's probably also worth mentioning: your life **WILL NOT** get fixed overnight. That's why I recommend you stay with your parents. If they want to give you a free ride for a little longer, take advantage of it until you're ready to have the "Grand Re-Opening" of your new life. But in the meantime that means you have to trudge through being a little bored, then learn to be okay with being bored. Placating yourself with weed, porn, and x-box is your way of saying, "I'm too weak to overcome boredom. I might as well give up."

Seriously. What would Jesus do.

8 upvotes · 27 February 2022 · /r/RPChristians

STFU. It takes two to argue, dude. She doesn't respect you because you DEER like crazy and don't have a mission she's actually excited to be on.

My mission in life is please God.

What you do to please God is your mission. This is just a vague statement.

How I am going about that mission is by becoming the best version of myself.

Good - you took it the next step to something active. I respect that. But do you see how your mission is so introspective that she has no actual place in it? How will she be able to boast to God on the day of Judgment about what you two accomplished with your lives if all you accomplished is, "I got better at being me," and she says, "Yeah, all I did was help him be himself better."

All I really want to achieve in life is to know my fully and know God as much as he reveals to me.

Very low bar. Once you've read the Bible once, you will know what God has revealed to you about himself. You may not understand it all at once, but that's not even the point. The point is that God's going to judge you **by what you've done**. 2 Cor. 5:9-10 says that even the believer will be judged by what we've done: "so that each one may be recompensed for his deeds in the body, according to what he has done, *whether good or bad*." God's going to care a lot less about how much you know him than he will in what you did with that knowledge about him.

Consider the man with the talents. Matthew 25:24 shows that he knew and understood his master: "I knew that you are a hard man, harvesting where you have not sown and gathering where you have not scattered seed." Okay, so what did he DO with that knowledge? Verse 25: "so I was afraid, and I went and hid your talent in the ground. Here, you have what is yours." **He did nothing with it.**

Your mission, as worded, is to become this guy right now - to know God, but not a single speck of what you're planning on doing with that knowledge. Are you going to produce in others what God gave to you? Or are you going to keep what God gave you, hide it so you don't lose it, and hope that knowing your master and not losing what he gave you is enough. Because what happened to that guy in the end of the story?

I assume you should know better than this. But, again: as-worded, your mission is not a mission at all, or it's a worthless one at-best. Your mission is really more like a first checkpoint on the way to what your mission actually ought to be. Read Matthew 28:19-20 for more insight on what your mission should be, because Jesus gave you a mission.

Okay, with all that out of the way, I'm with **/u/rocknrollchuck**. **You would be a FOOL to go to this party.** Don't do it.

Right now, she's wearing the pants in the relationship. You say you're "definitely a leader amongst my peers," but you're clearly not in your own home. She has absolutely zero respect for you. That is the problem you need to fix first. Nothing you do will help until you start earning respect. That starts with becoming respectable.

This is the reason I opened my comment the way I did - because learning how to STFU, stop DEERing, and getting on board with a mission that actually matters to eternity are all great starting points for you to become a respectable Christ-follower.

Until then, what good can attending this thing actually accomplish?

Part of me feels like I should go because Jesus gives us grace especially when we do not deserve it.

Jesus actually told a parable of a wedding banquet in Matthew 22. A king invited a lot of people. They disrespected him and wouldn't come. Did the king have grace on them? Nope.

- "The king was enraged. He sent his army and destroyed those murderers and burned their city" (v. 7)

You're caught in this blue pill mainstream churchianity mindset that "Christians should be nice all the time, and anything we do that could possibly upset someone else - especially someone we are supposed to love - is automatically sin."

Horse crap.

You know what Jesus said when some guy wanted to say goodbye to his family before following? "No one who puts his hand to the plow and looks back is fit for the kingdom of God" (Luke 9:62). Do you think Jesus did the "nice" thing and waited for that guy so they could all go on their way together? Do you think he said, "Oh, I should love your family too and even go with you while you say goodbye"? No. The impression the story gives is that these people ended up not following him - or if they did, it's because they relented of their position.

Doing the "nice" thing here is not the "Jesus" thing in this situation.

You need to start doing with your life what Jesus wants you doing. Figure out how to make disciples. Join the discord here and get involved in conversation (i.e. voice chat). Share what you're learning. Tell us what relationships you're trying to develop with non-Christians or younger believers and we'll help build you up. We **WANT** to build you up. But right now you need to be torn down a bit because the way your life and marriage is built at this point is damaged enough that instead of a few minor tweaks, you need to start from the ground up.

Once you're doing something meaningful with your life and you've developed a solid frame (again, things we can help you with), you will be in a better place to re-engage with your wife. Until then, your primary job is just to keep the peace. This is best accomplished through STFU and avoiding DEERing. Minimal contact, if possible. Give us 30 days with you and we'll get you to the point where you can engage in a healthier way (any longer than that and your separation will seem too status-quo and make it harder to recover).

Abstinence till marriage (Advice/Discussion)

8 upvotes · 23 February 2022 · /r/RPChristians

Okay, you're way too emotionally invested in this. You do need a time-out.

Is it crazy that I actually want a kind of "controlling" husband and do the stereotypical "woman's place" stuff?

8 upvotes · 9 March 2021 · /r/RPChristians

Plot twist: OP never identified as a woman ;) Now re-read the post, haha.

How to vet for virgin woman quickly without wasting time?

8 upvotes · 20 January 2021 · /r/RPChristians

Some good advice on this thread, but this hasn't been hit on yet.

- **I could ask a girl on a first date: "So, are you a virgin or are you slutty trash?" and have her begging to come home with me later that night, regardless of the actual answer.**

The reason? I have the frame for it. You don't. You attempt that and people will think you're "a judgmental repulsive woman hating jerk for even asking." Put an attractive guy with a strong frame and high social charisma in front of her and she gets a completely different response: *Oooh, this guy's making me horny because he's so bold to ask something like that.* See how that works?

As [/u/FrRustyShackleford](#) said:

Keep reading the sidebar and learn social skills, like not asking right up front if a woman is a virgin.

This is key. You need to work on your frame, starting with social skills. Just because you find out she's not a virgin doesn't mean you can't find other value in maintaining an ongoing social interaction with someone - and you don't have to "break it off" right then and there like a moron, the timing of which certainly evokes you to write things like:

I learned it seems to offend a ton of women if not all, probably even virgins, because it's kind of a thing where they will think I'm a judgmental repulsive woman hating jerk for even asking that would "throw them out like trash, based off their sexual past that they were forgiven for and move on to the next girl and that I lack grace and understanding of it because I want a virgin," as one girl put it.

As [/u/praexology](#) would say - even if she's not someone you intend to marry, there's still value in engaging in male-female energy exchange (MFEE - I'll encourage the use of the term here), not to mention the social circles she might open up for you through all of her friends and connections that you'll be exposed to. The broader your social circle becomes, the easier it is to find what you're looking for.

The reality is that you seem to lack any serious social skills. Not only is your fitness completely out of whack, but if you don't even have the charm and charisma to compensate for it, you might as well give up before you even start. Unless you're a millionaire - then your beta provision might get you someone who will sell her virginity to you for a shot at collecting half of your millions a few years after your wedding.

Other than that, I endorse what [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) wrote. Short and to the point. Don't ignore good advice just because it's succinct.

Loving my wife like Christ loves the Church

8 upvotes · 17 October 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Stats: 30 years old, 6'0", 185, bench 100, squat 100

As [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) noted, this is where you've got to start, brother. If you're so fixated on making your wife happy all the time, don't you think she'd be happier with a more attractive/in-shape husband?

Yes, I'm picking on this one peripheral issue that you think isn't the point of your post because it shows the problem with your post: you're only focusing on the areas that are culturally acceptable to discuss openly.

Consider ...

That means if I meet all her needs

You don't think she needs a husband who's strong enough to open the pickle jar? Or protect her and the kids from threats? Or carry a bag of rocks from the car to the garden out back?

and expectations

Doesn't she expect you to be physically fit? If not, why does she expect so little of you? Do you really think it's healthy in your relationship for her to have such low expectations of your physical fitness?

If I'm the best husband for and to her

Imagine the first day you met her. Sitting next to you is an identical clone of you with all of your life experiences, memories, personality, etc. ... except he's extremely physically fit. Between you and this hypothetical clone, who do you think would be the better husband for her? The one she's more excited to be with? The one that makes her happy to see sitting on the couch waiting for her to cuddle up into his arms? And if that guy is the best husband for his wife, shouldn't loving her partially mean becoming more like that man?

Now, I'm saying this on your terms. But your entire way of thinking is completely in her frame. Do you really think it's best and most loving to do whatever makes someone else happy and meets all their expectations all the time?

- Would God be loving to humanity if he always met our expectations and did whatever we asked of him? He doesn't. Does that mean he's not loving?
- Would I be a loving father if I gave my kids candy and junk food every time they wanted it, never made them do any homework, and let them play video games and veg out on TV all the time - because these are what they perceives as their own needs and expectations and as what makes them happiest?
- Are you a loving husband if you try to give your wife everything she wants and make her happy all the time and you orient your entire life around her expectations?

Obviously not. Show me in the Bible where it says anything remotely along these lines. The Bible does compel husbands to love their wives. You've got great answers from [/u/Deep_Strength](#) and [/u/RedPillWonder](#) showing that "love" in the biblical sense isn't what you're describing here. Figure that out, THEN you'll be on the right path.

The reality is that Jesus doesn't sit around and pine over whether or not he's making us happy enough. He has purposes that go beyond us, the fulfillment of which has the passive byproduct of his grace and blessings toward us. I often ask people: Who did Jesus die for? Us or the Father? Scripture is clear: he died to glorify the Father and as an expression of his love and duty to the Father. Yes, we are third party benefactors of his death and resurrection. But it was the Father's love for us that sent his son to die; whereas it was the Son's love for the Father that compelled him to follow through with it. The Father sets the rules, but he gave the Son to be our example - to live as one of us that we might know how to live toward the Father.

Jesus does not love the Church the way you describe in this post. Let me emphasize this:

- **You're confusing modern cultural relationship philosophies with biblical love.**

Don't do that.

My story. Am I on the right track?

8 upvotes · 14 September 2020 · /r/RPChristians

none of my beliefs had come from a personal study of the Bible and that almost everything I believed involved me simply accepting another human's interpretation of scripture without checking it for myself

So you identified the problem. How long ago did you actually start trying to solve this issue?

hour of church before the preacher even opened the Bible. When he did read the scriptures, it was usually no more than 10-15 verses that seemed to be handpicked to support the sermon

Yeah, that's pretty much every mainstream congregation. It's partly why I don't even call them "churches" anymore. Instead of teaching God's Word, they're teaching their own philosophies and using God's Word to support it. Be cautious. The only way to safeguard against this is to know the Scriptures inside-out for yourself first. This is why I often don't even encourage people to attend a congregation until after they're already mature enough to start discipling people. I address this in my second "walk and talk" with [/u/paexology](#) on YouTube. It's posted on this sub somewhere, if you want to listen in.

I'm still not as consistent with my Bible reading as I should be, but I'm taking responsibility for my own faith now, and trying to become the man I need to be.

Great. Post in OYS and join the discord. It's a more interpersonal means of connecting with this community in a way designed to help people in your situation flourish.

You're on the right track. Keep it up. Just don't get enamored with ONEitis for this new congregation. Learn HOW to study Scripture first (see my 304 post on the sidebar) and then start working it out for yourself rather than assuming this congregation is going to give you all the answers just because they preach chapter by chapter rather than topic by topic.

As men, you need to do better

8 upvotes · 22 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I'm on the edge of my seat: did he get what he asked for?!?

RPC Podcast Episode 6: Fitness Tests (and a crucial announcement)

8 upvotes · 30 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

We do have a Voat site reserved, if needed. We are obviously not using it yet and have not migrated our content at this point.

Sparkling a Husband's Sexual Desire (RPCW)

8 upvotes · 23 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

The "RPCW" tag in the title means it was written for the women over there. I just know there are some women at RPC who haven't migrated there too yet. It's probably better to say nothing, but if you want to show it to your wife, that's your call, just exercise extreme caution in how you do so.

Instead of, "This is from a blog I read. Read it," it's better to go round-about: "Someone sent me this link and asked what I think of it, but I'm not a girl so I don't really think that's my place to say. What should I tell him?" That's generally much safer and distances you from the sub ... and yes, by saying this in the comments I've now screwed over every guy who already used that excuse to show this to his wife! - so use the actual RPCW version of the link that doesn't have this comment in it or you'll dox yourself to her.

So you're being honest, I'll be "that guy" - *Dude, here's a link to an article. What do you think?*

https://www.reddit.com/r/RPCWomen/comments/he0fcl/sparking_a_husbands_sexual_desire/

OYS - Where Progress is Made (06/10/20)

8 upvotes · 10 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

PHYSICAL

1. 6'0". 230lbs. 19% BF (higher than a couple months ago). Current lifts are unknown; immediately before corona lock-down I was doing BP: 275 x5, OHP: 175 x 5, SQ: 335 x5, DL: 335 x5, Row (dumbbells): 200 x5.

All lifting (including body weight) has stopped pending work on the playground I'm building for my kids. I'm usually too exhausted to do much more once I'm done for the day (11-12hr days on weekends; 2-4hr days on weekdays after I'm done with work and feeding the kids dinner). On the plus side, hauling lumber, torquing wrenches, squatting to drill stuff, etc. is taking the place of a lot of that.

It's also easier to diet when I'm so busy. I'm less inclined to snack at night while I'm so tired. I'm also working through lunch to get back to the playground project, then working on that through dinner. Unfortunately, this means eating a mid-sized dinner at around 10pm, which is never great to eat that late at night in the first place.

MENTAL/EMOTIONAL

Working on the audio series has been fun and engaging. Less thought has been going into content than I'd have hoped, and more toward the nuts and bolts of editing and uploading the videos.

I do still make time to hang out with my guy friends each week, which has been stimulating. I disciple one guy who comes over every Tuesday and we go on 7-8 mile walks while chatting about Scripture, sin issues, marriage, masculinity, and, of course, making disciples. Those conversations, and others like it, keep me on my toes with exploring how a godly man lives in light of the life circumstances that come up.

I did lose frame with my wife a few weeks back. Something was out of line and I took the cold shoulder approach so as not to deal with it, focusing on other things. While normally the behaviors were fine, this wasn't a case of, "I've got more important things to do than deal with a shrew," rather, it was more: "I'm mad at you, so I'm going to go do other things now." Huge difference. Glad that hasn't resurfaced in a while, nor has there been cause for it to.

My Tuesday guy came over yesterday and helped us put up the tube slide. He's a solid handyman - built an entire addition on his house by himself without plans. He commented on how impressed he was with what we were building and that we were able to do it together. "My wife and I get along great - no arguments ever except in one situation: when we work on stuff like this together. Do you guys have that problem?"

My wife answers, "We used to. John would never do things my way, and it used to make me so mad. Then at some point a few years ago I just realized: if I just stop and let him do what he's going to do, it always gets done and I'm always happy with the final result, so why am I fighting him on this?" That is what we call the wife entering her husband's frame.

SPIRITUAL

- AoS: 10. Never a problem here. The fruit God has given me is well recognized.
- QT: 4. I have not been spending much time *with* God. When I do, it's more focused than being present.
- BS: 6. Not as high as past months, but still present. The focus has been less on diving into a particular passage in solitude and more on meditating on applicable passages that come up or going in-depth on certain things with my brothers in Christ.
- SM: 2. I'm not in a season of prioritizing this. I intend to bring it back when the playground is done and I'm

back to extended times of running/walking with my kids. In fact, I'm looking forward to having my son help me review verses during our running times, and my daughter when she finishes learning how to read (she's on the brink).

- Prayer: 3. Little to no effort here. I pray at meals and occasionally when a request becomes apparent. This goes in with QTs being low - I've set aside time *with* God for the moment.
- Evangelism: 7. I'm building new relationships with people in my neighborhood and advancing conversations with existing relationships.
- Fellowship: 10. My social game is on-point right now, especially in light of the corona situation. I recognize the support I have from fellow believers constantly and am encouraged to grow and doing the same for them.

My mission is ongoing and not faltered. That said, I've certainly back-slid in my efforts to stay in touch with my pastor, who I had intended to get to know better in order to get him on board with making disciplers too. Corona hasn't helped that process, though we were still texting occasionally for a while. I need to follow up. Gotta do that today.

If you are struggling with repetitive sin, especially if you're a coomer, you need to commit to scripture memory.

8 upvotes · 19 February 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Often-times people will find immediate freedom from an issue and be incredibly excited about it for weeks, believing they have discovered some secret that has eluded the masses for centuries. Most of the time, these same people regress, discovering that their miracle solution wasn't quite as miraculous as they thought.

Scripture memory certainly helps. I would even say it's essential in overcoming certain sins. But as [/u/Cloudy_Pirate](#) noted, it is not sufficient in itself if unaccompanied by other things. I have addressed addictive sin issues more thoroughly in the 400 series, giving a more solid theological foundation for addressing these than the more common "churchianity-approved" behavioral modification fixes.

That said, the post still adds value and I am grateful OP is encouraging others to memorize Scripture. As I noted in the 300 series, I believe it is one of the most under-appreciated of all the spiritual disciplines.

How would a turnaround for the church look like? Making it more RP than Feminist.

8 upvotes · 21 December 2019 · /r/RPChristians

You can't convert a modern congregation to biblical principles because modern congregations aren't even a biblical structure in the first place. You'd have to close shop and start something completely new.

That said, you can start something new within an existing congregation. That's the best route.

[Serious Question] What is the proper way to treat a female these days?

8 upvotes · 30 November 2019 · /r/RPChristians

[u/fictitiousfishes](#) once commented that 99% of God's will for our lives has already been told to us through scripture, so there's really no point getting hung up on praying constantly for some divine revelation of your purpose. If you're in a bizarre or unique situation, sure. But why do you think you're so special that God would give you special revelation for your life to tell you the same thing he's already said in the bible that you're not yet doing in the first place?

Start making disciples. Do the things you know God wants you doing first. Then if there's some other unique purpose to augment the underlying mission of disciple-making, let God tell you that in his own time. But if you aren't doing what he's already told you, why would you expect him to tell you more things?

It's like when my kids say, "I want to help. What can I do?" *Clean your room.* "I don't want to do that. What else can I do?" *Clean your room.* "I know, but how can I help you with this other thing you're doing?" *You don't. Clean your room. When that's done, come back.*

The goal for Christian husbands whose wives deny them should not be sex but their wife's repentance

8 upvotes · 30 October 2019 · /r/RPChristians

So much gold in this. Well done! One thing that needs to stand out more than I expect people will give it credit for:

Yes, sin is offensive to God, but God is not hurt by any man's sin.

So much guilt, shame, self-condemnation, etc. could be overcome if people could just understand this. It's one of the driving principles behind the entire 400 series.

I mean, I hope 99% of guys here understand at a very basic level that frame means a guy isn't upset or hurt by the ways other people try to offend him or rile him up - and how much more when they do it without meaning to hurt him! And if we, as mere humans, can have that kind of frame and God is the epitome of frame, wouldn't it make sense that God is even more masterful in his ability to express these traits and therefore be authentically immune to our efforts to disappoint him - or even more so when we believe we have done so unintentionally?

Point being, anyone who believes they've somehow hurt, upset, or disappointed God through their behaviors is frustratingly arrogant to think they have that kind of power over God's emotional state.

Are there any good podcasts or YouTube series that you guys would recommend?

8 upvotes · 24 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

The first two might hack you off but they are more criticisms of secular red pill than of what you're doing here.

We discussed those posts as a mod team. Anyone who has spent time here can see that they simply aren't familiar with our content, and that's okay. I see this on [r/TrueChristian](#) all the time - and I always openly invite people to dialogue with us when these situations come up.

The fact is, there's not a lot of good content for Christian men out there. If these guys are trying hard to put out biblical content, I applaud their efforts, even if we don't see eye to eye on everything. As always, be an Acts 17 Berean no matter whose content you're reading - even my own. But if Christ is preached - and I mean the real Christ, not the feminized version culture puts out - I rejoice.

[FR] Unstoppable Emotional Inertia

8 upvotes · 13 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

60 hours a week is only 4 weeks a year. She normally works 28. She also gets 8 weeks of PTO (8! ikr?) each year that I don't get (I get paid by what I bill, and soon will be a partner in my own firm). Between us, she has the easy end of the deal and she knows it.

I see you mention occasionally to various guys - including to me on some of my past posts: "she's trying to work AND has to deal with kids" as if all working moms are playing the single mother, but adding a job as well. Our situation is the reverse: I play single dad, but with a full time job.

She knows it too. One of the places where I dropped the ball was over the weekend. She was working. I was scheduled to be in the office all day to prep for that second trial. She couldn't handle it, so I resolved to stay home

with the kids all day and just work from 8pm when they go to bed until 4am, then get up at 8 and repeat.

She comes out of our home office for the first time at 6pm with her jaw dropped and says, "I think you missed your calling."

I said, "At being a stay at home dad?"

She got furious and stormed right back into the office without a word. After the kids were down she explained that the comment upset her because: "I feel like I'm just a paycheck right now - and a pointless one at that. You're the dream dad. You're better with the kids than I am, better at keeping up with the house than I am, better at maintaining the calendar and connecting with friends and meeting the neighbors and even at making money, which is the one thing I do really well. You're better than me at everything and I just feel useless."

I replied: "Yeah, you married a stud, but everything I do would fall apart if I didn't have someone helping me do it. It's not a competition over who's better. We're on the same team. Michael Jordan was like a one man team, but if he was actually just one man, he'd lose every game. You're the forward who passes the ball and I'm the point guard who scores the baskets and gets crowned MVP. Do you want to fight to be MVP against me or win the game?"

She said she wanted to win and felt a lot better to know it's a team effort.

For some, your framework makes sense. But the red pill man bears a heavier brunt of the load and we shouldn't passively assume his wife handles everything for the kids and the house and all he does is work. That's likely true of most blue pill marriages, though, as the husband hasn't taken ownership of his house and kids yet.

Who Are You?

8 upvotes · 3 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Good question, brother. It reminds me of the time my mom pressured me in college about studying more. I kept talking about my spiritual endeavors rather than my academic ones. She said, "Just don't neglect your studies; that's why you're at college in the first place."

I replied: "Mom, even if I flunk out and became homeless, the other homeless people will still need Jesus."

You see, even long before my red pill awakening, I had some base awareness of the mission-focused imperative of the Christian life. Even with a wife and kids, I'm perfectly fine having everything stripped away - because my identity is not in any of that stuff in the first place.

What is my identity? I'm a child of God, bride of Christ, and apostle of the Spirit. These will never change, no matter the context.

Rethinking about MGTOW as a Christian

8 upvotes · 26 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I'm an attorney in those very courts as well. Bear in mind that nobody in the courtroom knows what actually happened, much less the stenographer or translators. Simply put:

- I see many cases where actual abuse has occurred.
- I have seen many cases where the woman is making it up. The most obvious one is when she admitted to 7 witnesses shortly before trial: "None of that actually happened. My attorney just told me I had to say that in order to win custody of my kids."

The stenographer didn't actually witness the man doing these things. He didn't jump over the table to attack his wife (though yes, I have seen that happen too). What she means is: she heard a case and believed the wife over the man. Notice you're talking to a woman. Who's she more likely to believe? Innate bias gets in the way here.

More to the point, there's no absolute proof of anything. Most of "science" and "statistics" on the subject are based on asking people questions and hoping they give honest and impartial answers. But if a woman feels like she was abused by her husband without him actually hitting - how will she answer that question?

I've had numerous of my own clients tell me they are domestic violence victims and that they have suffered physical trauma due to their husband's abuse. Then later they tell me he never laid a hand on them. How can they reconcile this? "I felt like I was being physically abused." or "He was so mentally abusive that it made me sick to my stomach and had a physical impact on me." This is not physical abuse.

But because this is all question and answer and the answers are subjective to the feelings of the women answering the questions, there is no science that will give you a clear answer.

But if you check my ancient post history (I'm too lazy to dig it up), you'll find that men are actually victims of domestic violence more often than women are. They just don't report it. Men are actually likely to suffer physical harm at the hands of a woman than a woman is at the hands of a man. They just don't report it.

The only place where men do beat out women on the domestic violence scale is in the seriousness of the physical harm. The instances that involve "serious bodily injury" (which usually means overnight hospitalization) are statistically higher for men against women than women against men. But the instances of cuts, bruises, being hit with a baseball bat, etc. are higher for women against men.

But there's a deeper underlying problem to your philosophy here. You're allowing culture to dictate your views on gender and sexuality. **DON'T DO THAT.**

Let the Bible inform your view. If you're going to be a "MGTOW as a Christian," as your post identifies, look to Scripture. Let 1 Cor. 7 and Matthew 19 inform your position rather than cultural statistics.

The more I think about it, the more genius that God's creation of man and woman becomes

8 upvotes · 12 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Someone's finally starting to understand the theological framework of most of my writings ;)

Well done, brother. And this extends not only through the Christ/Church marriage, but also the Father and his children parallel as well.

Audio: Matt & Lauren Chandler

8 upvotes · 29 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I was going to remove this for being a low effort post, but I think it's worth keeping up just so people read your reply here.

Need Opinions from Married RPs: Is My Wife Gaslighting Me?

8 upvotes · 23 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I told her I loved her and I would seek counseling for the behavior and be try to be conscious of it

You beta up and ...

Since then she has been pushing me away

She becomes disinterested and unattracted. Not surprising at all.

My wife lists some things I did, then they ask me or tell me what I could have done differently, I agree, come up with suggestion on doing things differently

More beta, beta, beta.

All of that seems normal conflict resolution

Which is why the norm is to get divorced. Because normal conflict resolution is **BAD conflict resolution**.

"marriage isn't about keeping score"

Have you read MMSLP? He talks about the prisoner's dilemma game that gets played in marriages. Yes, it's absolutely about keeping score. Notice the one who advantages by hiding the score is the one who always says it's not about keeping score. You get ahead and suddenly she's going to lash back with all your faults and score-keeping is right back on.

"you need to chase after her"

Have you read [109 - Pursuit, Seduce, Initiate](#) or [the Orientation of the Pursuit](#) section of this sidebar post?

"you need to be the strong one"

I love this double-standard. Men are described by their physical strength. Women are known for their emotional insightfulness. Ask any women who is more attuned to their emotions and better with comprehending emotional issues? Most women will unanimously shout out: "WOMEN!" But when it comes to emotional issues, it's right back to, "Well, you men should be better at handling that than us." They want all the glory of claiming to be more emotionally inclined with none of the responsibility.

But yes, you are to be the emotionally stronger one. You're acting like a pussy with the way you're dealing with this emotionally. Oh well. Regardless, being "emotionally strong" doesn't mean you tolerate anything and everything she does to you. It means you stand up to her and have the emotional fortitude to withstand the way she lashes out at you. That's what emotional strength means.

and never get an apology or some kind of indication she wants to change the behavior

You get all butthurt because she didn't say she's sorry? Saying sorry is something I make my kids do because they're children. But I do it for the sake of the humility of the one who needs to say it, not the emotional fragility of the one who hears it. No kid actually cares when someone says sorry. They think "sorry" is a joke and a cop-out to avoid punishment - and it is. I actually don't do this with my kids anymore because it's childish and nobody functions that way in the real world - and I say this as someone who works in the legal system where people are actually screwing up in ways that matter all the time. Forget about ever hearing, "I'm sorry." It's a worthless phrase.

As for getting indication of her efforts to change, that's a legitimate request. The problem is that you're chasing her so hard that there's no imperative for her to change. The Cardinal Rule of Relationships says that the one who needs the other the least is the one with all the power. Right now you're communicating to her that you need her desperately and you'll do anything to keep her at your side. She doesn't give any indication of needing you. Result? She holds all the power and everyone sides with her.

You back off and create a hard stance. Yes, she may leave you. But you have to decide if it's better for her to go

in order for you to get your life and a shred of dignity back or if you're going to keep pussyfooting around her every whim to avoid dealing with your abandonment issues.

Every time we talk to resolve conflicts we can never get to a point where we both come up with things to do to improve

Because talking doesn't solve problems. Doing does. You're too indoctrinated into the modern psychological model that talking and reaching an understanding and all that garbage is the answer to everyone's problems. That's why the second rule we teach after lifting is STFU. Yes, there needs to be a sidebar post on this. Talk less. Do more.

When you're *doing* to the point that you're insanely attractive compared to any other guy she could get, the dynamic will shift. But right now she's trained by society to believe she could get another comparable or better guy at the drop of a hat. At 8 months into the marriage, she's not very invested, so it's not a big deal for her to leave - and it certainly sounds like spiritual maturity is high, so I wouldn't bank on that being what keeps her around.

but I certainly do not bear 100% of the blame

Sure, but blaming her does you no good. You can't control her. Your pastor can't control her. Your counselor can't control her. Heck, half the time she's so hyped up on hormones that she can't even control herself, and even when she can control herself, she's not self-aware enough to know what she wants that she'd control about herself in the first place. So, you do you. Act as if you are 100% to blame and go fix it - not the way she wants you to, but to get the life that you want. If she follows, she follows. If not, you can't control that.

It has gotten to the point now where she and the mentors have basically implied I'm the problem, and I need to make all the changes, and if she's unresponsive and doesn't feel like participating in the relationship on some days then that's somehow my fault too and I should just be grateful she hasn't divorced me already.

Yeah, because you've already been screwing up and if she were a more worldly woman she probably would have divorced you already. Be a man. Not the one she says she wants, but the one her vagina actually wants.

at this point I think I'm being gaslighted

No, you're just subjecting yourself to blue pill authorities as your mentors and guides. The blue pill ruins lives. It is strong and they will not change their teaching. Get out from garbage mentors and figure out from Scripture how to be a man.

I wanted some MarriedRP opinions

Married 11 years. I went through everything you mentioned in your post and more. I found the RP and the dynamic changed, exactly as everyone here predicted.

Do you agree, or do you think I should stay in the marriage and accept more responsibility for the state it is in?

Remarriage after divorce is sin. So, let that be your guidepost if you're contemplating divorce. Are you okay remaining perpetually single? Go for the legal divorce and honor the spiritual marriage that remains afterward. You want to make things better? Man up. Become attractive (again?). Let her tail you around or walk away. You've got more important things to worry about in life than whether or not your wife leaves you. And if you believe otherwise, then you have a crappy perspective on life priorities and your role in God's Kingdom.

Older female Virgin

8 upvotes · 15 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

You've already got plenty of the validation you came here to get, so I'll not refrain that bit. Let me simply say that it's okay to be validation-seeking. This is a very feminine trait and it's natural for women to seek validation. When we push men away from validation-seeking it's because they're men and the expectations on them in this regard are very different.

Another thing worth noting: while I advise men not to seek relationships with women (they should focus on their mission), my advice toward women is extremely different: your focus should be seeking a man, not your own mission. "But God gave me a life purpose to blah blah blah," sure. Even if you filled in "make disciples," as I've met many single women who would - that still doesn't impress me as a mission to put over finding a man. Why? Because God created women to be a helper alongside their man. Christ sought God, men seek Christ, women seek men. This is the order of things in 1 Cor. 11:3. So, while I would likely give a guy a hard time for making a post about wanting to find a wife (as I often do), as a woman this is a perfectly appropriate thing for you to be concerned with.

But here's the deal: you could get married tomorrow if you wanted. That's the reality of being a woman in today's world. But you don't get married tomorrow because you have standards over which guys you'll marry. You want a high quality man, not a loser living on the streets. Somewhere in the mix, you're going to come head-to-head with the fact that what you have to offer is fading, while what you expect is staying stagnant.

The cold reality is, as most of RP talks about, that women hit "the wall" at around age 28 - this magical age when a woman's looks have been at a plateau for some time and are about to start dropping down-hill. Guys base most of their initial impressions of a woman on her looks, so this is significant in finding a spouse. Women get about a decade (18-28) when their looks are at a life peak. However, very few women are emotionally or mentally ready to get married during the first several of those years, leaving them a peak marriageable time between ages 22-28 before things get difficult. If you want to date for 2 years beforehand, you should start a relationship between ages 20-26 with the guy you'll eventually marry (preferably sooner). You're beyond this, which means you're going to be fighting up-hill on the dating market.

That doesn't mean things are hopeless. "The wall" isn't a cliff that you drop off of when you hit the other side. It's more of a hill. You went up hill. You walked along the summit for a while. Then it's a gradual journey back down the mountain. You're not jumping off the edge, so you still have time to look.

Here's the thing, though: you acknowledged, that you were overweight during some of your peak years. This means that you may not have actually hit your life summit yet. You've missed the chance to optimize your life-potential, but your present-potential might still be higher than your pre-wall years - and that can really work in your favor. So, if maximum primping could have gotten you to a 9 at age 23, after age 28 maybe your max is now an 8. If you were a 5 or 6 during your early 20s, there's still room for improvement and to open up a sector of the marketplace that was previously closed to you. Most guys would beg to be with an 8 and virtually all guys would be happy to marry a 7. You just have to put in more work to get there than the younger crowd will - not just because a slowing metabolism makes you literally have to work harder, but because you have to take advantage of the features you can control to a degree that makes up for the ones you can't (facial development, elasticity, perkiness, etc.). You can't rely on natural looks alone, you've got to accentuate - and be willing to keep this up through marriage if you don't want your guy feeling tricked or deceived. I will note: I believe that in the absence of deformities any girl can become and remain at least a 7 through age 35.

Now, all of that is more just to catch a guy's first interest. We all say you shouldn't judge a book by its cover, but the fact is that 99% of people will judge a book by its cover anyway. So, do you want to follow the advice of

what you philosophically believe should attract a person or the advice of what actually will attract a person? That initial hook matters. I've spent literally dozens of hours working on a singular hook for some of my larger writing projects in the past. Why? Because the hook matters more than the substance of the story. You can write the best book the universe has ever known, but if you don't have a good hook no one will ever read it or care to discover what they're missing. And here's the thing: they won't care, but you will. A high horse attitude about it doesn't change the fact that you're the only one left in the cold.

After the initial hook, this is where you can really shine. You're late enough in life that by now you should have a reasonable direction in a career, which means you should have a financial incentive for a man to stick with you. Even if he wants you to be a housewife, knowing that you *could* go back to work if the situation called for it is a huge bonus. It also means he's going to be less afraid of divorce rape because you have an earning capacity, alleviating some concern toward marriage. It also means that you should be close to debt-free and won't come with the baggage that many other women will have. Being a "strong, independent woman" type is certainly going to push guys away, but if you frame yourself as a woman who has been trying to store up wealth to enjoy with her husband when she meets the right man - well, now you've just become a good bit more appealing as a long-term relationship candidate. Attitude is everything here.

[/u/TheChristianAlpha](#) already linked to the post that I would have, so reference that again - but try to find the qualities that give you an advantage over younger girls and really play those up. At the end of the day, if you want to pursue marriage with a man, if you can't offer the prospect of increasing beauty post-wall, maximize your present beauty first, then wear on your sleeve all the other things that you have to offer a relationship. Don't hide the draw-backs, as you want to maintain honesty and integrity in the process; but certainly let them know you're bringing something to the table even beyond your looks. At the age of the guys you'll likely be dating, they will most likely be able to get looks from a number of girls. And that's going to be one of their primary criteria, so you certainly have to have those too - but what you have to offer beyond that is what will make you stand out from the crowd in a post-wall dating market.

From there, your virginity is one of those things that absolutely makes you stand out from the crowd. There have been countless posts in the last couple years on this sub about whether or not Christian virgin women even exist after the age of 25. And there's always an assumption that if they do exist, it's because something's wrong with them. Be the woman who has overcome whatever was holding you back so that you have both a clean slate and virginity to offer. For a mature Christian guy looking for a girl in a narrow age-range (i.e. instead of looking 10-15 years below, he's looking 2-7 years below), virginity can be a huge asset that makes you stand out from the crowd.

But remember: the odds are always working against you. Say 15% of self-identified Christian men in the world are actually mature believers (I'm being unbearably generous; it's probably really less than 2). Suppose 25% of them are still single and 80% don't have kids yet. Now suppose (being generous) 50% of them are acceptable to you from basic appearances. Now suppose 10% of them are still virgins. And let's pretend that 25% of them are generally a good relational/personality type fit with you. That means if you're not set on virginity, about 0.375% of men are marriageable. In a church of 1,000, there would be 3-4 guys who might fit this criteria. If you did want a virgin, the church of 1,000 might not have anyone to offer, but the church of 10,000 would have 3-4 guys. The only other place to compromise that would seriously boost your odds is in spiritual maturity. Are you okay with marrying a guy whose faithfulness is limited to attending Sunday service, maybe leading a Bible study, and praying over meals? Or do you want a guy who is actually going to make a difference for God's Kingdom?

Remember, someday your husband will be judged before God and you'll be standing next to him saying, "I helped him do it." More important than who you want to help is what you want to help do. Most women think, "Well, I just want to be with this guy because we love each other. We can figure out all the Christian stuff later. I can coax him to church enough times until he gets it." Which would play out great if the Bible ordained women

to be leaders in relationships and congregations actually "got it" in the first place. But I wouldn't bank on this philosophy of dating. I know too many women who have a passion for advancing God's Kingdom yet who are stifled because they married a man who couldn't care less or is perpetually stagnant in a safe, comfortable place in his faith.

But now I'm rambling, so on to your questions:

Is it more of a red flag to be a virgin at my age than not be a virgin?

Not among mature Christian men. This is an asset you should take advantage of when putting yourself out on the marketplace.

How should I discuss my standards as far as waiting for sex?

Date 2 or 3. Be clear.

"I have never had casual sex"

Don't sell yourself short. You're catering your appeal to spiritually immature men. If that's what you bait, that's what you'll get.

Recent Christian, about to just give up on women.

8 upvotes · 2 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I'm extremely low on time, so let me just hit this one point:

I've asked god to bring me a good wife

The responses so far are, essentially, "be patient." Sorry to those other responders, but this is garbage advice. There's extremely little premise in Scripture for the view that God is just going to make a wife magically appear on your doorstep saying, "Here I am. Propose now and we can be happily ever after!"

I don't see any reference in your post to having read the sidebar. Check Rule 2, as that's really vital to our ability to help you. There are plenty of posts on here that address what you're going through.

it just makes not want to ever bother with women again

This is the anger stage. You have expectations of women. They're not met. You're mad because you can't find a woman who isn't a woman. Does that mean you just give up on women altogether? That's definitely one conclusion - and one I often recommend.

But at the same time, my kids can be awful brats a lot of the time. They don't love me for me. They love me because I do fun things with them, or because I buy them candy, or let them play on my lap. I've asked them directly before: "Why do you love me?" None of them responded "Because you're my dad and I value you as a person." Know what they said? "Because you give me things. Because you buy us good food. Because you have candy."

I knew kids would be like that too. I guess I should just tell people to give up on kids because they are stressful and won't love you for you. Right?

No. Because we still like having people around, even if they aren't everything we hoped and dreamed they would be. Even guys who "get it" are still going to want to get married. It makes no logical sense, but it's a reality of life.

They know the true nature of women, yet are after them anyway. *Sigh*. Accept it or don't. But there's no point getting mad about it.

A tree is a tree.

A kid is a kid.

A woman is a woman.

I don't expect my kids to be adult philosophers. I don't expect my wife to love me like I love her. But I can enjoy their company all the same.

The world we live in

8 upvotes · 10 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

miss out on having children and sex

I understand ... and this is perhaps the hardest line to help people cross when moving from blue to red. They (you?) still have these fantasies in their heads about wanting things that culture has told them to want.

When did Jesus and his purposes for your life stop being enough? Or maybe you never tasted them as enough in the first place - I really don't know.

Children, sex, companionship - these are all things that are good if they happen, but they should never be your life goal. And if you have a higher life goal, they become a distraction, as Paul mentions in 1 Cor. 7, which is his primary Spirit-inspired reason for urging people to remain single. And yet cultural norms toward marriage/family life seems to hold more influence in people's lives than the Holy Spirit these days.

If you insist on getting married, limit it to a spiritual marriage and not a legal one. This is the best way to mitigate the risks. The legal risks are certainly still there in a variety of ways, but at least you're giving it your best shot. A "relationship contract" could also help, of course. You couldn't call it a prenup because you'd never have nuptials in the first place. But I'll let your lawyer figure that out.

Care to talk about any individual instances or theories you have about AWALT?

I've shared my story here a number of times, but I'm a shining example of this. I don't mean to imply that my views are tainted by my own story - I assumed I was the exception to the rule for a very long time and was only sufficiently persuaded otherwise after hearing countless similar stories.

When I was dating my wife, she seemed a solid believer. She knew a lot more about the Bible than 95% of the other women I'd met. She disciplined other women. She faithfully attended Christian meetings and Bible studies and even led women Bible studies of her own. Other women looked up to her and wanted to be like her.

While we were dating she would talk about our shared passion for making disciples. I was on staff with the Navigators at the time, a ministry organization focused on disciple-making. We discussed what things might be like if she joined staff with me, which was a real option at the time. She would tell me of her daily quiet times. We'd pray together. She'd talk about the women in her life who she was trying to share Christ with. My discipler, who had led her in ministry team meetings for 3 years and knew her well, said that she was a rare find and that if he wasn't already accounted for, he might have pursued her himself. As far as "mature Christian women" go, every outward sign from the 5 years I knew her before I proposed pointed to her being an actual unicorn.

Oh - and the physical passion. I made it clear to her up-front that once we were married, I expected sex to be a frequent and passionate thing. She responded, "Don't worry. When we're married, I'll be jumping all over you!"

She talked about trying various positions. Oral. Toys. Bondage. You name it (except for anal - never been an interest of mine). Like I said: unicorn.

Sounds great, right?

A couple years into marriage and I notice she's not living up to any one bit of all these things she always talked about - either spiritually or sexually. I confront her about it and she makes excuses. She's not even living even remotely close to what she was like when we were both single - before we were even dating. It's like everything went out the window and she was a totally different person. We had that conversation many times: "What happened?"

After years, she finally fessed up: "All that 'make disciples' stuff - it was all a lie. I had been faking it for years to try to trick someone like you into marrying me. Part of me wanted to believe it all, but it's just not me." The same thing came out at about year 7 of our marriage regarding sex: "I'm just not attracted to you. I never was. Even when we were dating I wasn't attracted to you. I just said that stuff about sex because I knew you wouldn't marry me if I didn't say that and act that way." I remember one point around the same time when she was even in tears over how our marriage had been falling apart, saying, "I look back at our pictures from when we were dating and first married and you were incredibly attractive - I don't know why I didn't see it then, or why I didn't care. I ruined everything by faking the foundation of our marriage and nothing we have is real."

She has also had times throughout our marriage - especially early on - when men have hit on her and she openly acknowledged that she was more romantically interested in them than in me at the time.

Those revelations were devastating to me. Here, I had prayed literally over 200 hours in anticipation of asking this girl out and vetted what I believed to be better than any man had ever vetted a woman in the history of vetting. As Paul bragged of his pre-Christ accomplishments as being "a Hebrew of Hebrews" and lists his other accomplishments - I could brag the same way of my vetting prowess. And yet AWA still LT.

It doesn't make me mad or upset anymore. I just shrug, chuckle inside my head and think, *Yep, AWA truly LT.*

For the record - that's not how things are now. While I didn't go into as much detail about some of this stuff, I did write a lot about the turn-around in my marriage after discovering RP [in this thread, where I share my testimony and "RP-imony"](#). I'll let that post finish the story for you.

Women Feeling Threatened by Hyper-Sexualized Social Media

8 upvotes · 30 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

We cater to biblical truth, not the feminine imperative. Just because we allow women and want to raise them up in godliness doesn't mean we're catering to their cultural interests. Teaching godliness to a woman is inherently against the feminine imperative, which seeks to trample over what God has said.

Open Letter to a Christian Incel

8 upvotes · 28 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

How does a Christian guy interact with women?

As people who can help you fulfill your mission.

I'm in a tough spot here, do we go out and interact with women in general (ie day or night game). Or do we sit back and only try and date in the Church with the hope of marriage?

This is still coming from a blue pill mentality. You have a desire to meet a wonderful girl and get married and have kids with a nice house and cozy Christmas mornings in front of a tree.

The red pill isn't about giving you strategies to meet your blue pill fantasies. You have to kill those fantasies. If they happen, great. But you can't be blue, sprinkle some red on your life, and hope that works.

To that end, the whole "hope of marriage" and the insistence on pursuing "day or night game" or "try and date in the Church" stuff just makes no sense. Why would you TRY to do that in the first place? The only rational conclusion is that you are still clinging to some ideal of marriage as a primary pursuit in your life. This comes from culture, my friend, not the Bible.

My question is how do Christian men interact in the dating market?

By not interacting in the dating market. Dating is woman-focused. You go to a restaurant, all your attention is on her. You go to a movie, it's just the two of you. You play putt-putt, everyone else gets ignored. Traditional dating exists to spur on romantic feels. The secular RP world, which only pursues sexuality, has concluded that the best thing to do is to fuel those feels to get sex. It's an effective strategy.

But if you have a priority of waiting until marriage to have sex, the focus entirely changes. Female emotions are fickle, so the emotional investment you get from her on the first date won't remain two weeks later, much less two years later - or however long before you're married. Result? Every time you date a woman without the intent of having sex at the end of the night, you're fueling her feels without getting anything in return. So, while this works great for the secular world, who does intend to bang her before the night is out, dating is quite different for the Christian because you can't cash-in on those feels you're fostering, making dating almost exclusively a form of female-worship.

Now, some guys will say that they just enjoy the company of women too - that they get feels from it also, and therefore it's worth it. Go for it. You do you. Just be cautious that 99% of the time those guys aren't getting the feels because they genuinely enjoy her company (though they certainly think that's what it is). They get their feels because they enjoy the validation of knowing that an attractive woman enjoys their company. This validation-seeking is extremely counter-productive and will ultimately kill her attraction to you in time.

Lastly, some men will go into the dating world thinking, "I want to have sex eventually, which means I have to get married, which means I have to date around to find a wife." This is their big excuse for saying that it's perfectly appropriate for Christian men to actively seek dating relationships.

I'm not buying it. First, it falsely assumes that sexuality in marriage will live up to your expectations. You cannot be outcome independent in this type of a situation. What if the girl you marry decides that, no matter how much red you sprinkle into your life, she's just not interested in sex? Sure, it's sinful rebellion. But it happens. You can't control that. And now you've either just committed your life to someone who will be a constant disappointment to the reason you married her in the first place, or she's going to end up leaving with half your stuff.

Second, most men who make this claim haven't even started making their first disciple yet. They haven't won anyone to Jesus, and they're not individually discipling any new believers into spiritual maturity. So, if you're pursuing dating before you're pursuing the great commission, what does that say about your true priorities?

Third, even if men do have their priorities in order, by making an intentional pursuit of dating a second, third, fourth, or whatever priority - as long as it remains an intentional pursuit, you are making it hard for a woman to follow you. If you are chasing after her, she can't be following behind you. The only way that works is when you look like a dog spinning in circles chasing its own tail. That's lunacy.

Fourth, the goal of "I want to have sex someday" inherently assumes that sexuality has some power over you, rather than you being master over it. Deny yourself and take up your cross. Don't tell God, "I'll follow you, but only if I get to have sex someday too." If you're doing what God wants you doing, and God wants you to have sex, then you're going to end up married. That's why I say in my posts that even if a man specifically avoids looking

for a wife, as long as he remains dutiful to God by being a godly man who cares for his body, leads God's people well, efficiently runs his home, etc. - 99.9% of these guys are going to end up getting married anyway, even without looking. Why? Because so many girls are going to want them that they're going to end up in a compromising situation where they eventually say, "We're going to need to get married before we go any further."

These guys aren't trying to find a wife. Potential wives are trying to find them - and they will chase such a man to the ends of the earth if they have to. And these women find out about those men because those men are making disciples through a vision that includes the need for women to help him. The more he invites along, the more women are exposed to him, the more are attracted and will try to tempt him, which is when marriage becomes a viable option.

This is all on the sidebar too: [How to Find the Girl You Can't Keep Yourself From Banging](#).

How do/will you raise your kids?

8 upvotes · 26 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians

There's a lot to be said about parenting. But to stick to the limited issue of electronics, I agree with the other guy that most people have grand ideas that rarely last when they actually have kids.

I'm less interested in bubbling away my kids from cultural norms and more interested in teaching them how to live balanced and disciplined lives within culture. A main goal of parenting is to teach your kids to be able to thrive on their own when you're not around. They need to taste life in the real world to do that. The bubble method is extremely counterproductive to this goal.

[FR] The importance of the basics

8 upvotes · 16 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I was close - got down to 14% body fat, everything else covered. I bench 290 at my most recent ORM test. I earn 6 figures. I disciple guys regularly. I wear nice cologne everyday. I stay well groomed. My lounge wear around the house could use some improvement, but I'm in professional and business casual attire most of the time my wife is around anyway. I wouldn't suggest this if I wasn't willing to live it myself.

What I will note is that there are still times when my wife will turn me down. It's rare anymore, but it does happen. I could muse for hours about what the possible reasons might be, getting wrapped up in the psychology of her frame ... or I could rule out my body fat % as a contributing factor and try again. If the problem goes away, I saved myself all the trouble of mental masturbation over the issue. If it doesn't, at least I've ruled out a possible cause and am in better shape for it, making it easier to get past whatever the actual cause might be.

The point is: difficult or not, don't worry about what your problems are until the basics are handled. I'm not super hung up on 12% body fat like some people are - I just want the 6-pack. I've got 2 showing, but I'm more about the aesthetics than the numbers.

The same thing applies to [/u/saveTheFirstWorld](#)'s comment - 250 or 225, I don't really care. If your muscles show, you're good. My wife recently commented during sex, "I love holding onto your bicep while you do that," and at another time, "It's really amazing how you can just pick me up and pin me against the wall like that." Is a 225 bench going to get you that kind of strength and bicep size? Maybe. It depends on your height and your wife's weight. Again, I'm less worried about the exact numbers than the concepts of what I'm addressing. The same thing can go for income (where budgeting and planning are bigger factors than the threshold itself) or disciple-making (where the fruit produced by your disciple is more important than the quantity of people you disciple).

EDIT: I should also note that the guy I referenced in my post was single with no kids. These goals should be INCREDIBLY attainable for a single guy without kids. Get married and add 4 kids (i.e. me) and I agree that

they're much harder to attain - but still not impossible.

Question on leading someone into becoming quality wife material

8 upvotes · 12 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I truly admire your consistency and growth, Phil. I really enjoy reading your updates, even if I don't respond to all of them.

How do I approach this as a brother in christ

Invite her to do things that are mission-oriented, not romance-oriented. Are you leading a Bible study? Ask her to join you. Are you discipling a guy? Get her input on something you're discussing with him (whether or not you take her input seriously is up to you) and ask her if she's discipling any girls. Are you interested in feeding the homeless? Ask her to meet up at a soup kitchen with you to serve together.

I know the drive can be a bit of a pain, but if she's truly interested, she'll join - and you'll be processing in a context that isn't leading her on because there is a bigger purpose to what you're doing. You can even tell her up-front, "This isn't a date. It's a service/ministry/whatever opportunity. But it's also a chance to get to know each other a little better as a result."

effectively determining the answer

This sounds like you're saying: "I want to know if this is God's will before I start something." You won't know, unless you have the gift of discernment of spirits. Have I shared the frame illustration here yet? I don't think so. Here it is, for reference: <https://i.imgur.com/z2I84a2.jpg>

if the answer ends up being no from me, I can be as blameless as possible.

She's going to blame you no matter what. She's already emotionally invested. When her emotions come crashing down - whether it's by you rejecting her now or by natural descent after marriage, she's going to blame you. Period.

I think what you really mean is that you want to do it in a way where her blaming you won't be justified. To that end, always be blatantly transparent. As long as you communicate overtly and tell her exactly what you're thinking, she can never get hung up on you and claim you were just stringing her along.

What steps can I take to see if she's someone that can be led and molded?

Invite her to follow you, per the above.

Essentially, if I can show her christ, and live/encourage in such a way that she becomes closer to him, and as a result, lives less for the world, and more for God.

That's a great sentiment, but it's also such a vague standard that there's no way for you to really get the answers you're looking for. How will you know when she's "closer to him" or "lives less for the world"? What if it's a temporary phase she's going through in order to attract you? What if it's real? What if your standards for judging closeness to God are actually off in the first place and you don't discover it for years?

Stick to specifics. Invite her to do things that are outside of her sense of normalcy and see if she's willing to follow and learn what you have to offer. Be very practical.

is there any ways or signs to determine if this is happening?

I think I already answered this, but the answer is yes and no. There are all kinds of signs to indicate one thing or another. But no, those signs are valueless if they're not tied to practical observation and reality. They become mere wishful thinking. Never trust signs. Trust consistency.

I'm approaching this situation from a level-headed and God focused perspective for the first time in my life, and my feelings are not the ruling or deciding factor

That's great to hear, brother. You should, of course, have some feelings. It would be ridiculous to start a relationship if you didn't. But it's good that those aren't what's controlling your perception of the situation.

That said, in your level-headedness, are you evaluating how anything in this situation will be advantageous to your mission? What's the answer there?

Initiation Conversion Rates

8 upvotes · 7 November 2018 · /r/askMRP

Geeze ... and I thought I was over-analytical.

It's not either/or. Beta behavior can certainly contribute to the issue, but the fact that she's still recovering from pregnancy is almost certainly contributing to the issue as well.

Women are more prone to want sex when they feel sexy. They put an incredible emphasis on their weight toward feeling sexy. Until the baby weight is almost completely gone, she's going to feel insecure about her looks and be less interested in sex.

Don't fall into the trap of false flattery here. Your job isn't to tell her she's gorgeous even with the extra lbs, secretly hoping it'll make her feel sexy again. It's to live in your own frame. If you're skillful enough (which I wouldn't assume is the case), do something to draw out her insecurity, then AA it into oblivion. Works like a charm.

In the meantime, delete your app and just do what you want to do. If she says no, do something else you want to do. It's not that hard to figure out.

Boldly sharing the Gospel - is it unloving?

8 upvotes · 30 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

1/2

This comment probably won't be what you want to hear, but I think you're man enough to take it. There's a difference between being tactful and pussyfooting around the truth. So, when you say:

"But Chuck, can't you soften it up a bit? Can't you just tell them 'Jesus loves them' and leave it at that?"

you're creating a false dichotomy that shows either (a) your lack of understanding of viable alternative models, or (b) an intentional strategy of straw-manning to prove your point.

I know you're a big fan of the Ray Comfort model of evangelism, and we've had many conversations about it early in this sub's life. The concerns you're bringing up are among many on the list of why I've told you in the past that I don't think it's a good method and that it's a pretty off-putting model of evangelism. That said, I don't have any data to back up my conclusion other than my own experience - and I know that many people have had different experiences with the Ray Comfort model. So, I can't say with authority that you must stop using it, except on theological grounds. I can say, though, that the push-back you're receiving here is consistent with my experiences with that model.

The Gospel of Sin Management

Perhaps a more serious contention against the Ray Comfort model is that it emphasizes only one aspect of the Gospel - something Dallas Willard, in *The Divine Conspiracy*, calls "the gospel of sin management." This is when someone preaches the Gospel as if Jesus' primary function on the cross was to save us from sin, leading to the unwarranted, yet natural logical next step that the goal of the Christian life after that is also to manage sin - the less sin, the better a Christian you are.

In reality, sin and the law don't matter anymore. And while one might preach this as part of their Ray Comfort presentation of the Gospel, the foundation of the person's salvation in that model still falls back on: "I have sinned. I can't overcome my sin on my own. I need a savior to save me from my sin and the consequences thereof."

The gospel of sin management is a gross misinterpretation of the Gospel itself. My red piller pastor even argues at times (though he himself is not yet convinced even) that those who follow this interpretation of the Gospel may not actually be saved at all. I believe a more biblical view of the Gospel is that it's not about what we're being saved away from, but what we're being saved toward. Yes, that inherently means turning away from sin, but the goal isn't to turn away from sin. That is merely an inherent byproduct of turning toward righteousness.

An easy way to picture this is that you're standing in the center of a circle with 360 doors around you - one for each degree of the circle. Only one door is righteous, all of the others are sin. You're facing and walking toward a sinful door. You recognize that it's sin, so you turn away from it. Which way are you facing now? Well, you could be facing toward the righteous door ... or you could be facing toward any number of other sinful doors. Turning away from sin doesn't actually put you in any better a spot than when you were walking toward it. The only way to ensure you're not turning toward another sin is to find the door of righteousness and start walking toward it. Turning away doesn't help; turning toward does. And when you do that, it's impossible for you to be walking toward a sinful door.

Now, if the door at 46 degrees is the righteous door, then as you approach it you're also going to get closer to the sinful doors at 45 and 47 degrees - deviating your course can still result in sin. But as long as your eyes are set toward righteousness, you can stay the course. If your plan is simply to move away from sin, you're just going to keep spinning in circles until by pure luck you happen to face the righteous door. I don't want to base anyone's path toward salvation on pure luck. We shouldn't be teaching merely that "Jesus saves you from your sin" as the foundation of the Gospel because it still fails to give people an actual purpose and pursuit - and "follow Jesus" as the usual tack-on appendage to the Ray Comfort model, or the misunderstood recitation of "go and sin no more," as Jesus said, simply doesn't do anything to help people figure out which door is actually the righteous one.

Sin Management and Assurance

Now let me be clear about this. There are two versions of the gospel of sin management:

- That the primary reason Jesus died is to save us from sin, and this is what we should communicate most emphatically through the Gospel.
- That the point of the Christian life is to avoid sin as much as possible.

The first lends itself to the second one as the natural conclusion, but even if it didn't the first is still an incomplete gospel in itself. The Ray Comfort model of evangelism pushes this incomplete picture by using the following steps: (1) get them to admit that they're sinners, (2) show them that their sin dooms them to hell, (3) share Jesus as the solution to their sin problem, and (4) invite them to repent of their sin and believe that Jesus saved them

from that sin.

Some people are wise enough to add a step 5 - point them in the right direction. But this still leaves sin management as the primary foundation of the gospel and their faith. You submit to type 1, but assume it's okay because you're at least pointing them away from type 2, although the "point them in the right direction" bit is usually underwhelming and uninformative in any practical measure.

In the reverse, some people rightly recognize a more complete picture of the Gospel - that Jesus came to do a lot more than merely save us from sin. But then they get stuck in a horrid rut of only preaching sin-avoidance after that anyway. Why? I can only speak from my own experiences (especially among the Catholics), but I get the impression that it stems from the whole "man looks at the outward appearance, but God looks at the heart" dichotomy. Because we can't see the heart, we create outward appearance indicators to discern who is saved and who isn't.

This is actually appropriate to do. After all, in Matthew 7 Jesus recognized that we couldn't see the heart of a person (on which grounds he would tell even those with great outward appearance "I never knew you, away from me you evildoers"), so he gave us a clear external test that wasn't based on sin, but on fruit: "By their fruit you will recognize them." By now on this sub it should be painfully obvious that my interpretation of what Jesus means by fruit is not (a) the fruit of the Spirit, which Paul hadn't written yet, or (b) general good works, which Jesus condemns as a model in the very next few verses, but (c) the same thing he always means when he talks about fruit in every other parable: evangelism and discipleship - that is, when the Gospel springs up within us and starts producing seed (a defining characteristic of fruit) that will fall to the ground and be planted in new soil.

This all, of course, leads me to the conclusion that sin management is a horrible indicator of a person's salvation; rather, the fruit (evangelism/discipleship) blooming from a person's life is that external indicator. It is not what actually saves a person, but it is the only outward sign we can have to develop an assurance in someone's salvation, which is why Jesus gives it as the exact test for discerning whether or not a prophet is true or false.

And if this greater mission of disciple(r)-making is Jesus' prescribed model for finding assurance in our salvation, why would we resort to a sin-management presentation of salvation in the first place? Should we not, instead, communicate to people a broader view of the mission that they are being called into - that their lives can have purpose and a meaning and that this purpose, when pursued, has the answer to all of their problems? After all, the Ray Comfort model only addresses a person's sin problem. It won't address his loneliness. It won't address his fear of rejection. It won't address the way his uncle molested him when he was younger. It won't address his anger at the world. It won't address his feelings of insignificance. It only addresses their sin and leaves little hope for anything else.

This is why I present The Lens Illustration in the 400 series as my primary means of sharing the Gospel nowadays. It connects deeply with something that matters to most people, then ties the solution into the greater role that they have to play in God's Kingdom. Instead of preaching the Gospel as a means of eradicating sin, it emphasizes (without ignoring the eradication of sin) the reconciliation we have with God as the foundational cure to a person's present felt needs. Instead of re-focusing them on a need that they don't perceive they have yet, it hits them where they're already feeling it and gives them hope where they most need it.

The Bigger Picture

The gospel of sin management is dangerous not because it's false (it's not), but because it's only a half picture that presents itself as the full thing. Jesus didn't only die to save us from sin; rather, saving us from sin is the natural consequence of opening the "righteous door" for us to live by. In an overly simplistic and still limited way, we must at least present that the point of eradicating sin wasn't for sin's own sake, but to reconcile us with God. God had a bigger purpose than just defeating sin. Defeating sin was only the necessary means through which that purpose could be accomplished.

I'm a big advocate for the importance of having a mission. What do you think Jesus' mission was? In my view, "save people from sin" was merely a necessary step in a larger purpose that God had in mind when he first sent his son.

Was recommended to cross post from MRP.

8 upvotes · 29 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Points 3 and 4 don't really influence much of your post. It seems like you're just trying to brag for the sake of bragging, then asking a question on a totally unrelated issue from your lifting/boxing history. There's no reason for those to be half the post. "I'm in incredible shape and do competitive kick boxing" would suffice.

As for your wife's tantrum, they're always going to come no matter how far along you get. My sister commented to me once that she does this kind of crap on purpose because she likes it when her husband stands up to her - and that she does it *more often* during times when she knows he's more likely to do so. That is, the more alpha he is, the more bratty she acts. Not every girl plays it that way, but just accept this as the norm. It's not always a sign she wants to divorce you.

Now, my wife just pulled something similar yesterday. Instead of your game/rules comment she just called it out directly. Conversation starts on the way home from church with her saying she wanted to talk about her work hours. I said "OK." She got upset that I just said "OK" and didn't follow-up with more. I set a boundary: "The kids are in the car. I don't want to have that conversation in front of them. Let's feed them lunch first." We enter the driveway and just sit in silence for 2 minutes (I was answering a work e-mail). I ask if she's ok and she doesn't answer, so I get the kids out of the car and start cooking them lunch.

She comes in 5 minutes later screaming her head off about how I'm not supportive of her. Now, this is totally out of left field and not consistent with the facts, so I use some negative inquiry: *What did I do that was unsupportive?* Her answer: "You just said OK." NI again: *What's wrong with agreeing to have a conversation with you about your hours?* She had no answer and spits back: "I know I'm being crazy and I have no rational basis for feeling this way. I just know I don't feel like you're supporting me right now." I agree: *You're right, and I have no intention of supporting bad behavior.*

She got even more heated after that, so I just STFU and let her talk. It's all "you this" and "you that." The last one was, "You're so mean!" That one actually made me laugh, as I replied: *You're right, I'm the big bad wolf. Want me to start huffing and puffing?* She rants some more. I STFU, smile, and nod. That set her off: **"You're so manipulative. You have this power over me. It's all one big power play and you're just flaunting that you have all the power and I hate it. You know I have no power over you, but when you just stand there like that, it's like you're waving all your power in front of my face."**

Now that was bizarre to me, as I hadn't said anything in something like 3 minutes (the wolf comment). So, I employ some more negative inquiry: *What did I just do to manipulate you?* Her: "That look. You just act like everything's normal. This is not normal!" Me: *I'd be happy to smile some more to brighten the mood.* Her: "No way. I know that smile. I hate it when you smile while I'm feeling like this." Me: *Fair enough. But I'm not going to yell and scream at you either. That wouldn't help anything. And apparently having a positive attitude or just being normal are manipulative. So, there's no way to win. Conclusion?* I smile again: *If I can't win, I'm just going to do whatever I want and you can come back whenever you're ready.* Then I went back to making the kids lunch. She storms out of the house saying she's heading to the mall to buy some new work clothes. I don't chase after her. Note: I used to chase after her when she did that. Then I stopped and she'd get furious that I didn't chase after her anymore. Now she knows this as the norm.

Literally two minutes after storming out, she comes right back in, acting much softer. Her vernacular changed gears. Instead of "you ... you ... you" it becomes "I ... I ... I." Once she started describing how she was feeling

(comfort tests), I walked over, held her in my arms, kissed her forehead, and said, "Everything's going to be fine. Just trust me. I got this." Honestly, I have no idea what "this" is that I said I "got," other than life in general. It didn't matter. She just needed to hear some catch-phrase that sounded emotionally uplifting. That was the end of it. She was happy and fine the rest of the day.

Did I handle this perfectly? Probably not. But my wife's "You're so manipulative. You have this power over me" line is probably coming from the same place as your wife's, "I don't know what game you're playing or what the rules are, but I'm going to find out" line. She's recognizing at a conscious level that there's a power struggle at play and that you're winning. That's a good thing.

The fact that she doesn't know the game is a farce. She knows the game. She's just so used to winning all the time that when you start taking the lead, it feels to her like you started playing a different game altogether because her playbook isn't getting the same results. It's not a new game; you're just a better opponent. She's used to a clear pattern of "if I do x, I get z result." In reality, the equation was: "If I do x and he does y, I get z result." You had been doing y for so long that she thought it was the first equation - that your response was a constant. When you changed y into f, $x + f$ does not $= z$ anymore. The same rules still apply as have always applied. Math hasn't changed. Hypergamy hasn't changed. But the man changed.

So what's going to happen from here? She's going to try to figure out what your new variable is. And when she gets that you switched to f, she's going to change herself to get z as a result - because that's always the conclusion she's aiming for.

Math aside, what do you do from here? Whatever the heck you want. That's the bottom line. And if she's got your number figured out, you can either accept that she's figured you out, but stay that number because you like it ... or you can keep changing your number to keep her on her toes, always adapting to suit you. Either way, you're doing what you want.

Is there a chance she may just walk away, giving up if she can't find a way to "win" or get to z again? Sure. But you seem at peace with that. That's her sin, not yours. The Bible may not give you grounds in this situation to file for divorce, but it doesn't say that you have to prevent her from filing for divorce either - other than the general Matthew 18 process of confronting her of her sin and asking her to repent (in a peaceful and loving way, of course).

On Biblical Justice and Rape

8 upvotes · 10 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

As [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) alluded to, this is a misunderstanding. The passages usually referenced to support this conclusion are Deuteronomy 22:28-29 and Exodus 22:16-17, neither of which references rape specifically. In deuteronomy, it says, "and **they** are found out," implying that she went along with it too. Likewise, in the Exodus passage, it references when a man "seduces a virgin," implying that she was allured by him. I'm not convinced that either of those passages are talking about rape victims - at least not exclusively.

More to the point, God didn't command that she marry her rapist. God's position remained consistent as with the rest of the Bible: she is under her father's headship and should do as her father instructs. If her father instructs her to marry the guy, so be it. If not, then not. The presumption here is that a father loves his daughter and would not marry her off to someone if he didn't legitimately believe that was best for her. This is affirmed by Jesus's assumptions on parent-child love in Hebrew culture in Luke 11:11-13.

"I think I was just raped"

8 upvotes · 8 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

In the end, it's not a "some skepticism" thing. Even if everything she said were true, there is no evidence of rape whatsoever.

When she first knocked, I shared healthy concern and empathy, despite any skepticism. It was after my wife told the story of what really happened that my attitude changed.

That change was not toward contempt for my neighbor, who I long to see find Christ. I encouraged my wife to use this as an opportunity to love her and eventually share the gospel with her. Rather, it was joy at my wife's discernment and not just blindly empathizing with another woman's false allegations just because she's a woman.

Should I keep this girl around to potentially LTR later??

8 upvotes · 16 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

What you want out of a relationship is something that most women cannot or should not give. The women who do challenge their husband's behaviors are the ones who are doing it to control them. It is very rare to find a woman (even to the point of non-existent) who challenges her husband purely to help him strive to be better. You're not meant to follow her lead in becoming the man she wants you to become. 1 Cor. 11:3 is clear: you follow Christ, she follows you. That's it. Your challenge and conviction should come from the Spirit and other godly men as you continue to read and engage in the Word.

Now, that's not to say it's wrong to have a wife who challenges you either. This can be beneficial if you're a strong enough guy to maintain frame in the midst of it, which you might be. But I promise you, you're looking for trouble if you actively seek that in a relationship. As /u/TheLZisTooHot said, you've already got a unicorn. If you try to fly any closer to the sun, like Icarus, your wings will melt and you'll get burned.

Why do I say this? Because of the obvious reason: **you have ONEitis**. Your ONEitis is preventing you from viewing the "other girl" accurately. You're only seeing what you want to see. Now, she may be a wonderful option too. But it's also clear that she's into you and all this crap about her prioritizing you over her friends or dropping what she's doing to go help you at 3am - that's her trying to get in your pants. That's not *who she is*. It's who she is *when she's trying to impress you*.

ONEitis is very deceptive. It will cause you to think and feel things that will eventually fade away and become untrue. Could this "other girl" be better for you in the end? Sure, it's possible. But right now you have a choice between what you know to be true and great about girl 1 and what you think might be true and even greater about girl 2, but you don't really know because you're clouded by ONEitis and can't trust your own thoughts/feelings. Between the two options, which sounds wiser right now?

Let me also reaffirm what /u/pizzalover24 said, as it was very insightful: you're clearly two different people, depending on which girl you're around. As he said, the dynamic was pretty clear to me too: "feeling content to be led by your friend whilst you lead in your LTR." Which dynamic is the biblical one? The one where you're leading the relationship or the one where you're being led by a girl who uses her position of strength to coddle you when you fall? The latter is incredibly tempting because subliminally it seems like it'll be an easier life. She's got it made and you want to leech onto her successes. In reality, you've got to be the man who's got it made and have a girl who wants to leech onto your successes, not one who is independent of you.

Women are meant to mold to their man. This means the relationships that work best are the ones where the woman adopts her man's identity. That's why she changes her name to his. It's why people start calling them Mr. and Mrs. [Groom's first and last name]. It's why men introduce themselves by their mission in life (which for most is their career), but most women introduce themselves by their relationship to other people (wife, mother). It's why women usually moves into the man's house. Seriously, when's the last time you talked to a guy who introduced himself as a husband - or even as "so and so's husband"? But I do hear women regularly introducing themselves as a housewife or just a wife in general or as "so and so's wife." If you're looking for a woman who

will not mold to you and who isn't wanting to adopt your identity, you're asking for trouble.

Now let me be clear, I'm not telling you who the better option is. I'm giving you principles to help you make a choice. In my mind, it's clear who that choice should be - and you should darn well stop nagging the girl for being a girl. Praise her for it and go get some male friends to challenge you, rather than trying to turn your girl into a man. [/u/rocknrollchuck](#) is spot on here. But at the end of the day, you know the ins and outs of your own circumstances, your own standards, your own desires, etc. better than we do. So, maybe there's other stuff factoring in that you haven't told us. I'm fine accepting that and if you want to go off with girl 2, that's your choice and I support you in that as well.

But here's the thing: you need to make a decision and make it now. You can't wait for girl 2 to break up with her LDR and string girl 1 along all the while. If you want girl 2, let girl 1 go and either go for girl 2 now and cause her to breakup with this new guy, or wait it out and see if she ever leaves him (not a great option).

But when you're making that decision, weigh heavily any ways your ONEitis may be affecting your judgment, and look to biblical principles about what a wife should do and be, not what you want her to do and be. In the end, your present motivators will change over time, but biblical principles for marriage will remain stable. I'd bet my life on biblical principles over my own perception every time. And to be clear, "biblical principles" doesn't mean *who knows more* about the Bible or *who lives it out* better. It means *who is more willing to live within the roles God has prescribed*. If a woman is faithful, available, and teachable, you can disciple her into becoming anything you want. But if you're looking for someone prefabricated so you don't have to disciple her into anything, then you should never expect to get more than what you buy.

The Role Of Your Wife (Assuming You're OYS Already)

8 upvotes · 13 June 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

This is partly why I believe Paul recommends people not marry. Before we had the Spirit, marriage was meant to be a parallel to help humanity understand their relationship with God. Post Gospel, that only becomes a necessity for people who don't get it right away. For example:

- You ever get upset or bitter that your wife won't sleep with you? How are you doing at evangelism? Maybe God's showing you how he feels.
- Ever get frustrated that you do the lion's share of the work around the house while she sits around? What are you actually doing to contribute to the church and advancing God's kingdom?
- She spending all your money and not acting grateful? Are you receiving God's blessings and not thanking him?

You should get the point. The primary spiritual purpose of having a wife is to help us understand where we're falling short with God. 9 times out of 10 if your wife is doing something you don't like it's because she's following your lead and the example you set for her based on how she sees you interact with God. That's a huge function.

In all this, note the funny way the creation of woman is worded in Genesis. God knew all along he would create her, but for some reason still words her almost as an afterthought. It's like God did intend for man to be on his own, but then decided there were some things that would necessitate help after all. You're living in that. You're mostly doing it on your own and are just now trying to figure out what those other things are.

My best guess? Sex. God gives the command in Genesis 1 to have so much sex that they fill the whole earth with generations of glory-bearers for God. That's what Adam couldn't do alone. Today, in the wake of the gospel, Malachi 2:15 and a populated world, that job has transitioned to our spiritual imperative in the great commission to produce spiritual offspring and raise them to do likewise through a ministry of discipleship. If the command to

fill the earth has been fulfilled in a physical sense (and I believe it has), then woman's job has transitioned, as with all things, to the spiritual parallel of disciple-making.

Your wife's primary job is not to keep the dishes clean. It's too help you on your God-given mission to make disciples.

How can she do that? Here are a few ways my wife does that for me:

- covers things with kids and house when I'm meeting with guys
- preps the home when I'm at work and she knows I've invited people over
- works off and on full/part time to ease some financial constraint so I have the capacity to meet with more men
- builds relationships in the church and community to expand our joint social network, as these people ultimately join our small group or I end up disciplining the husbands of the women she meets
- she discipless women herself, thereby directly enhancing my mission for the family by reaching a half of the population that I cannot otherwise reach safely.

Apart from these mission-oriented things, when it comes to day to day living, like others have said and will keep saying, delegation of tasks is huge. But I do not advise simply creating a consistent, set pattern.

Consistent set patterns will give her a sense of equality and ownership. You're not the leader over her, you're the guy who is responsible for the stuff she doesn't have to do. This then fosters a sense of competition over who does more around the house. It doesn't matter if you're the sole or primary breadwinner; in her mind if she's doing more at home, it's unfair. This is exasperated when you have kids and she begins to view herself not as a housewife (a title defined by her relational context to you), but as a (part time?) stay at home mother (a title whereby her self identification is independent of you). This is not a trite semantic thing. The word choice here actually does present significant psychological implications.

In one of my first posts on MRP I talked about dealing with the stressed wife. My recommendation, which worked for me, was to tell your wife: "For the next week you are to do nothing productive unless I tell you to do it. If i don't tell you anything, then you are just to have fun. Watch Netflix. Go out with the girls. Whatever. Just nothing productive." Then just assign her a list of tasks for the day.

It doesn't matter that your list of tasks is just as much or more work than she used to do. She will be much happier. For women, thinking about what needs to get done is more stressful than actually getting it done. By taking this approach, you are forcing her to let you take the reigns back.

If you succeed, she will be impressed and recognize that you're more capable than she previously believed. Women have an inflated sense of self worth. I have made it clear to my wife many times that I'd be just fine without her. "I don't need you in my life. But I do want you. If I need you, you'd have no clue whether I keep you around because I love you or because I need something from you. The fact that I don't need you, but that you're still here should mean something to you."

Of course, if you fail - a kid goes to school without lunch, the electric bill doesn't get paid, etc. - she'll scoff and marvel at her own self worth. But if you maintain fake and rightly express you failure as a necessary part of learning what needs to happen and how to lead the home, you'll be back in the "if you succeed" part again.

Setting expectations for fat loss and muscle gain

8 upvotes · 27 April 2018 · /r/askMRP

True gains are not achieved in a linear fashion, so I'd be cautious on that. You want to go through cycles of

bulking and cutting. This is much more effective at body-sculpting, whereas linear gains usually develop more of a runner/swimmer build. That's cool if you want to be the skinny guy who pops a few veins. But if you want to be impressive and stand apart, you're going to want actual muscle mass and not just weight loss.

I started with 28% body fat just under a year ago and am sitting at 14% today. So your template going from 29% to 17% in a full year seems to be selling yourself short. But I also don't know what your schedule looks like and how much time you have to commit to this or how devoted you can be to dieting. I eat like crap most of the time, so my improvement is even with only about 2 months of actual cutting. If you can diet more consistently, I'm sure you could do much better.

As far as lifts go, starting from a bench of 135, for the first 6 months I saw my bench press go up by about 5-10lbs per week. After 6 months I had a series of illnesses and a surgery that made me go in a cycle of having to constantly rebuild up to my previous max again. I presently bench 285 as my ORM. My goal for next month is 300, after which I'll start a heavy cut-diet again.

Similarly, my squat started at 155 and my deadlift at 135. I upped those incrementally until now, where I'm sitting at 365 for a 3-rep max on each. For some reason illness and surgery really don't cause me to lose much in the way of leg strength, so that wasn't much of a problem and I have been able to increase steadily.

I mention the lifting side more because given your starting weight most of your improvements will come not from losing weight, but from gaining muscle. It's doable, just be committed. If losing weight is a priority to you, though, then add a bit of cardio at the end of each lifting session. I try to run 2.5-5 miles after my SL 5x5 routine, which functions as a calorie dump to offset some of the trash I eat with my kids ;p

Steven Anderson on women's roles according to the bible.

8 upvotes · 31 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

He was posted here the first week this sub was up. I've listened to most of his stuff on YouTube. His gender role views are decent, but he also has a lot of heretical and bad theological views that this sub should not support. Tread with caution.

How do you stay interesting with a child?

8 upvotes · 23 January 2018 · /r/askMRP

Rule 1: Don't let the kids dominate your life. With my clients there's countless stories of people who cater their entire lives to their kids through numerous extracurricular activities, meeting up with friends, controlling what you eat, when you go out, what movies you see, etc. Obviously a modicum of caution needs to be employed, like not watching a horror movie with the kids around. But on the whole, don't let the kids dictate who you are as a person and how you interact with the world.

Most child psychologists agree that exalting kids above yourself is detrimental to their eventual perception of their place in the world. This is why so many males are now man-children and it's why we have millennials who don't know how to toughen up and get a job done. You need to teach your children through your lifestyle that they are not the center of the universe. This will help them later in life and help them see what it will take to at least become the center of their sphere of influence, rather than just assuming it will happen naturally before the crash and burn. Main point here: invite your children into your world at least as much or more than you enter their world. This is massively important for their psychological well-being long-term and also keeps you from being boring.

Rule 2: OYS. You have no greater ability to flaunt your newfound OYS powers without verbalizing them than when you have a kid. If you follow Rule 1, you're already doing a lot of the same stuff with kids that you were doing before kids. You're still going out to eat. You're still going to the movies (I have 4 kids: 6, 4, 2, 6 mo - don't tell me it can't be done). You're still chilling at the mall or making weekend trips to the amusement park or

whatever. But all of this only works if you have your act together.

If you rely on Mommy to take care of the kids you're going to develop serious Madonna-Whore complex and find that all these activities aren't fun because rather than enjoying the activity, she's going to be worried about whether or not you packed diapers, the baby has a change of clothes, how to deal with whining and crying, etc. More concerning, if you make her do everything with the kid, she's just not going to have the energy to go, and if she does go she's not going to be into it and you're going to get bored. Be a man. Be a dad. Don't separate the two.

Rule 3: Frame. Don't just maintain frame. Manipulate everyone else's frame. No matter what you're doing, you be the one to set the atmosphere. My dad did this with me constantly when I was growing up. At sports games, he joked with my friends alongside me. When I had friends over, he played video games and watched movies with us. On field trips, he chaperoned and set the agenda in both active school activities and the down time/filler time. I loved that about him. My house was the popular place to be, not because of me, but because people loved being in my dad's frame. Friends always wanted to come over. Even after I went off to college, my dad maintained lasting friendships with many of my friends far longer than I did.

In the midst of all of this, my dad's real agenda was to influence the people who were influencing me so that I wasn't led astray. In many ways, he was parenting the entire neighborhood just for my sake (along with my siblings, of course). This took some effort, but his influence trickled beyond the kids to their parents as well. Not only was he having the time of his life just enjoying spending time with his kids and our friends - he was also positioning himself as the most popular guy in town, who everyone else wanted to be around also.

Where Is The Good?

8 upvotes · 12 October 2017 · /r/askMRP

The good is definitely there. I came from a true DB. Between 2014-2016 my wife and I went 18 months without having sex at all. I was obese. Other areas of life notwithstanding, with respect to my marriage I was probably more beta than anyone you've known or heard about. I mean that seriously, not as an exaggeration. I took pride in being the most beta guy out there and tried to out-beta all the other betas. I got some sense of validation out of knowing how "nice" of a guy I was and that I was truly unique in the world.

Starting mid-2016, shortly after nominal starfish sex returned, I decided to start making some improvements. It began primarily with taking steps toward my life mission, economic gains and spiritual growth - mostly fixated on understanding biblical masculinity, which was the source inspiration for everything thereafter. In December I added home leadership skills to the list and being more assertive. Then in February 2017 I added cardio. In April I added personal grooming and taking care of the house. In May I added dieting. In June I added lifting. Mid-June I discovered RP for the first time and started reading like crazy and started implementing OI and refining prior things into a more clearly defined frame. In July I added gaming my wife, 10-second kisses, AA/AM, abundance mentality, etc. In mid-August I started implementing a dominance mentality, and you can chart some of my progress from [r/RPChristians](#) since then. In all this time ...

- **Lifting:** I went from benching 160 as a soft max to 285 as a hard max (just hit that this past weekend)
- **Body Fat:** I dropped from 28% to 15%
- **Frame:** I went from serving her every need and never asking for anything in return to (1) being comfortable saying no, (2) not budging on life decision issues, and (3) having her in a position of serving my needs, while also (4) demonstrating appreciation, attention, and affection on my terms and not when she asks or demands it
- **Sex:** I went from none at all and being a resentful, butthurt moron to 90% "yes" when I initiate and weak initiations by her (still can't figure out if I should try to improve this or just accept being the only initiator - too many conflicting opinions on this sub on that topic). Even after her c-section and me really not expecting squat (due to the several months of sexlessness before the birth and the 6-week doctor recommended recovery

period), after implementing a few basic RP principles on top of the foundation I'd already laid, she was ready to go (albeit while maintaining the doctor recommendation to avoid PIV).

- **Kids:** They used to be clingy toward their mom, loud, and obnoxious and I'd have to ask 10x before they'd do anything (they're ages 5, 3, 2, and 0), but now the three oldest (even the 2 year old) do things the first time I ask - and on the few times they don't, they know the consequences and I follow through rather than being the "fun dad" who gives them chance after chance and makes their disobedience a joke. Result? Wherever I go, that's where they want to be.
- **Work:** This has always been pretty solid, but I've increased my income about 20-25% in the last couple years.
- **Mission:** More progress in the last 9 months than I made in the 3 years before that.
- **Influence:** I used to be a failed extrovert who tried to engage with people and just couldn't connect. People just want to be around me now. Men and women alike, whether from church, work, at the courthouse, in the neighborhood - they just come up and chat even when I don't initiate, and sometimes all it takes is eye-contact and a nod and someone will cross the street to talk. I've been asked to teach classes at my church. I've had men ask me to disciple them. When I ask people to do things, they do it.

All of this is probably somewhere between that \$1,000 win and the \$32,000 win [/u/GargantuaBlarg29](#) mentioned (great comment, by the way). I feel great - better than I have since I've been married. In minor vanity, it also makes me smile to know that in every way I'm stronger than I've ever been in my life (previous max bench was 275 in college) - this alone makes me feel like I've conquered the world, and everything else is just icing on the cake that keeps getting added on layer after layer.

That doesn't mean frustrations don't come or that I don't have questions or confusion about how to take things to the next level. I need to use lifelines every now and then and am not too proud to do so. I also try to avoid bragging about how good things are for me all the time (biblical humility and all that), but I must say: life is good.

beginning of the end?

8 upvotes · 15 September 2017 · [/r/askMRP](#)

i am fully aware that we need to supply SOME beta to our partners in order to let them know we care.

What you really mean is an alpha expression of qualities that are more commonly employed by betas.

fell off the ship in a few areas

If this is happening at all, she's going to take those "SOME beta" moments not as comforts, but as signs of weakness.

i feel like i havent made any of her needs a priority

This is where you need to learn alpha expression of beta-associated qualities. Going to her family's events isn't inherently beta (or alpha). Going *for the purpose of keeping her happy because you're afraid she'll leave* is what makes it beta. Going *because you want to do good things for a girl who's good to you* is alpha. Reward good behavior, withdraw from bad behavior.

she feels like i dont care for her / love her

Because you don't. You're clearly a selfish brat who doesn't understand the *reward good behavior, withdraw from bad behavior* dynamic. You're sucking her for all she's worth and prepping to move on to the next girl. If that's

your play, that's fine. But "i don't want to just throw the relationship away" implies that's not really your play.

Axiom: *Tingles without fuzzies won't last. Fuzzies without tingles are worthless.*

You're only going after tingles. You sound like you've gone Rambo, trying to apply RP too much too fast when you're not ready. She's mad because she has, by your own admission, treated you great. But you act like her "great" treatment is the norm, so you're not rewarding it - but when she stops acting so great you punish her. If she thinks she's only ever going to get the stick and the carrot doesn't exist, she's going to go find someone else with a carrot.

what is a man to do at this point?

Learn to reward good behavior.

do i continue to fight?

If you want to, yes. If you don't, no.

do i need to focus on her needs and be more empathetic and hope i earn her trust back?

This is the beta mentality I referenced above - "I'll do anything because I'm afraid I'll lose her." Screw the "hope I earn her trust back" and find another motivation for "focus on her needs and be more empathetic" such as: "I'm a powerful guy and I like to use my power to reward people who are good to me."

it seems like the bold-RP alpha i have portrayed myself to be has caused more harm than good

You haven't portrayed "bold-RP alpha" at all. You've portrayed "insensitive, self-centered jerk."

or was i simply not leading in an alpha way by disregarding the needs of my significant other?

Spot on.

i am hear to listen and hopefully save this.

Screw that. That mentality is what's keeping you beta.

Internal dialogue: OYS vs. What would Chad do?

8 upvotes · 7 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

Cut the 50/50 attitude. I just wrote this in another thread to [/u/alwaysdoubledown82](#) - and maybe this comment can help him too.

"If she cooks, I'll clean" is garbage thinking. It's your house, your food, your dishes, your sink, your time. For legal divorce purposes, yeah, it's probably all 50/50. But it's a crap life worrying about divorce laws all the time. Plus, if you're a high value man why would she ever leave you? And if you're leaving her, you have the forethought and context to prepare.

My point is, unless you're in a divorce, treat everything as if it's yours. You clean the dishes because they're your dishes, not because she cooked and you're trying to be 50/50 fair. It's 100% you. If she wants to use your stuff, what value is she contributing? If she wants to eat the food you buy, what value is she contributing?

If you change your mentality from 50/50 to OYS, that's going to be your biggest step forward, not asking

WWCD.

OYS as a Mindset

Let me be clear about this - and I invite other MRPers to reprimand me if I'm stretching this concept too far. OYS in my book is not just about "owning" in the sense of taking care of it and being responsible. It's a mentality. When we see OYS threads, they're often about what a guy does to take care of his house and improve his lifestyle. That's a small part of it.

The real value of OYS (and the only way it's indefinitely sustainable) is when you view it more as a literal ownership, not a figurative "I should take care of *OUR* stuff" sense. It's not "some things are hers, some are mine." It's not even *her and your* stuff (i.e. co-ownership). Unless she contributed value to get it, it's your stuff. And even then, if you already paid her for that value, she can't double-dip and get your payment plus still identify with a thing as hers.

EXAMPLE 1

My wife did a great job during last busy season at work and earned herself an extra \$500 bonus. I rewarded her by buying her a new oven, which cost well over \$500. When her bonus check came in she handed it over to me, understanding that the family finances are mine - even what she earns. She contributed an extra \$500 in value to the family with her hard work.

I could have let her keep her \$500 bonus as her reward and done nothing else for her, in which case she's happy to her company for rewarding her.

Instead, I took the credit for rewarding her, channeled how I wanted her to be rewarded for that value rather than how she would have spent that check, and now she's overjoyed with appreciation to me at the new oven **I BOUGHT HER** (as opposed to her company) and I still get the \$500 check to spend however else I see fit. Plus, since I do most of our cooking, extra benefit to me (hence spending more than \$500 on it).

If I wanted to, I could have also just taken her bonus check and given her nothing, and I've done that before too. But most of the time I like to reward good behavior so she keeps up the good behavior. This will remain true for the \$3,500 bonus she's about to get in her next paycheck. I'm not going to go out and buy her \$3,500 worth of crap. I'll find other ways to reward her for adding value. But if I reward her with my love, affection, gifts, appreciation, etc. and then still let her spend her own bonus money - she's double-dipping, getting twice the reward for the same work, and at my expense.

Contributing Value

The bottom line in my example is that I see everything as my stuff. If you continue to see it as "our" stuff you're subconsciously going to revert to a 50/50 mentality. You'll expect her to do half the chores, half the cooking, half the cleaning, etc. If you see it as your stuff, you'll realize that all the responsibility is on you, but that if she wants to make use of your stuff she has to contribute value to you.

How does that value work? Maybe you do 100% of the work around the house and contribute 100% of the income and she just lays around all day waiting to give you the best sex of your life every single day multiple times a day. Maybe sex alone isn't enough value for you, so if she wants to keep living in *your* house, eating *your* food, and watching *your* TV, while scrolling social media on *your* phone that you let her keep in her purse all day - she needs to start contributing other value. So, she cooks you breakfast every now and then. She vacuums the floors. She cleans up after the kids. She works a job. Is this enough value to you?

Sex as Value

Or is she thinking she can add enough value to you that she can ignore sex? If she has the 50/50 mindset, sex ends

up not fitting into the equation because she doesn't see it as the same as all the other household chores (nor should she treat it like a chore). She'll expect you to do your 50% around the house, but since she's already contributing her 50% (or she probably really thinks she's doing 80%) she sees herself as a high-value contributor in the home, so why should she care about sexually gratifying you or herself even? That's a separate matter to her.

If you deviate away from the 50/50 mentality to an OYS mentality, you're the one who dictates where you find value. Right now she's following a pseudo-objective standard. "You do this, I do that." In her mind, *this* has the same objective value as *that*. But what if *this* has more value to you than *that*?

EXAMPLE 2

My wife constantly tries to get affection and appreciation for doing things that she values and I don't. I've had to communicate to my wife repeatedly (sometimes even verbally), "That's great that you vacuumed the house three times this week. I'm glad you find value in that. I don't. I'm fine if it's only vacuumed once a week. You did the work, you're reaping your own reward from it. But don't expect me to pamper and reward you for something I don't value. You want pampering and rewards? You know what I value in the marriage. Go do those things instead."

She usually gets all huffy at me and says, "Well, you should value it!" I ignore her. Sometimes she'll add, "It's not fair, though, that if I do that extra work you still get the benefit of it even if it's not something you would have cared to do yourself." Sometimes I'll ignore her and go about my business. Other times I'll note quickly: "I honestly can't tell the difference between vacuuming the carpets 1 or 3 times a week. You're the only one who experiences that value."

In the past, she still harbored bitterness over this for me because I was still flawed in my execution. After refining things since discovering RP, she hasn't brought this stuff up once. Instead, she's focusing more on the things that she knows I value. That's a huge win.

Effort v. Value

It's worth noting briefly that effort $\neq$ value. If something takes 8/10 effort for her to complete, but I only get 3/10 enjoyment out of it, that's only a value of 3/10. She feels like it should be an 8/10 because of all of her effort, but over time is now realizing that value is based on the result, not the work put in.

Decent sex might have a value of 7/10 for me, but only has an effort level of 4/10 for her. Great sex might be an 8/10 in effort, but gives 10/10 in value. When she's contributing less effort than the value her effort produces, she's in golden territory.

The problem is that most women don't understand this effort-value dynamic. Why? Because they're living in a 50/50 dynamic, not an OYS/value-based relationship. If you succumb to the 50/50 mentality, you'll never be able to pull her out of it.

I'm dating two MGTOW.

8 upvotes · 30 August 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

Just posted another comment - but I don't think they're actually MGTOW. Have to jet right now, but I might come back to this question to actually answer it instead of deflecting for now :p

[FR] I'm getting on top of this... Still need to work harder

8 upvotes · 28 August 2017 · /r/askMRP

sharing the load 50/50

In a woman's mind, you will never be "sharing the load 50/50." She'll always assume it's 51/49 at your very best

case scenario. In reality, you should be responsible for 100%. Delegate to her as necessary, but the responsibility is yours. I just linked this for someone else too, but [here's for more reading](#).

I didn't do it for you. I did it because it needed doing.

This response has worked well for me too ([see here](#)).

I'm still not getting the AA/AM to work properly for me. STFU only works for so long until they learn that play and go harder at you.

If those are your only two moves, that's why. Add fogging and negative inquiry into your routine. They're far, far easier to pull off with little/no experience, but can go a long way in taming a conversation rather than letting her escalate it by being totally aloof with STFU.

An added bonus: If AA/AM aren't natural, fogging and negative inquiry buy you some time for her to keep talking until she sets you up for an easy AA. Once you take a few easy openings for a quick AA, you'll start to notice responses quicker and quicker.

Could I have defused this hamster faster? I'm not sure I could ... need to improve AA/AM

Yes, fogging will be your best friend for a while here while you figure the rest out. Go back and re-read WISNIFG. Camp out there for the next month while you're lifting.

Also ...

SO: attitude ... Me: [attempt at hug, shrugged off]

Why are you rewarding bad behavior? My wife has come home with a bad attitude a few times. My response? "Cool, you're home. I'm heading to the gym. Be back in a couple hours." I don't like going to the gym late at night, but it beats dealing with her bad attitude - and it doubles as a fix to her attitude. I get home, she sees that I got stuff done while she was gone (i.e. applied OYS), I come home and her attitude is gone and she's buttering up to me.

Never underestimate the power of withdrawing your presence.

Your wife is a whore and you should divorce her

8 upvotes · 24 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

You might be surprised how many LL guys are here for reasons other than sexual strategy, as I've gotten PMs from a handful and would wager there are many more who haven't been inclined to PM. Otherwise, good points :)

Your wife is a whore and you should divorce her

8 upvotes · 24 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

This only makes sense if you value things outside the marriage more than you value things inside the marriage. I'll grant that AMALT in their desire for sex with different women. But for some men this isn't their highest desire. So, I'd chalk this up to the "leave the rest" in the "take what works for you and ..." conversation.

That being said, what you're really getting at here is comparing a *useful mentality* against a *non-useful mentality*. Assuming your wife will never leave you or cheat on you is not useful. If anything, it's a self-fulfilling mind-set because the way it causes you to act increases her desire to leave/cheat. Assuming she can and probably will cheat

on you at some point is useful. It compels you to improve your life.

So, religious issues aside, if you can be happier outside the marriage, leave the marriage. But if you're happier in the marriage, stay in the marriage. Telling other men that their greatest happiness can only be found in what makes you happy ... no thanks. I'll decide that one for myself.

Do the majority of people you know cheat on their spouses?

8 upvotes · 16 August 2017 · /r/ExRedPill

Cheating happens in a lot of relationships, and that number is increasing regularly ... but it's certainly not the majority. As you've noted, TRP plays this up, but I think you're misinterpreting why it's portrayed the way it is.

TRP takes the view that one should promote useful ideas and ignore ideas that aren't useful.

- **Useful:** *Live as if your wife might potentially cheat on you someday.* She may not, but if you accept this as a possibility, you'll be more motivated to keep working on yourself to foster your relationship with her and her attraction toward you instead of other men.
- **Not Useful:** *Assume you've got a catch who will never cheat on you.* It may be true, but you have no way of knowing 100% for sure. So, if you take this as a given, many guys will be fine, but others will be seriously hurt when their expectations of fidelity are crushed.

100% of guys can derive some benefit from taking the first view, whereas some guys will get crushed with the second view. Most people on TRP, of course, won't explain it this way. Because of how people are sociologically conditioned, if you leave any room for the non-useful view, they will give others the benefit of the doubt and slip into that, taking the risks that come with it. So, TRP pushes the useful view as a means of defraying people from slipping into a non-useful frame of mind. Because most posts on TRP or askTRP come from relative RP-noobs, they don't realize how this agenda works, they just see a bunch of guys pushing the useful view as if it's an absolute, so they start believing it's an absolute and it develops into the actual definition of a *factoid* - something that's not necessarily true, but gets repeated so often that people start believing it's true.

In reality, the "useful" and "not useful" views are not the only options - there are any number of positions to take in-between, where one can maintain a healthy view of humanity (thereby rejecting the TRP-pushed "useful view" as an absolute) while simultaneously taking caution to guard one's heart against the harsh realities that cheating does sometime happen (thereby rejecting the social stigma that we must all have blind faith in our SOs).

As a dating mechanism, it's probably wise to lean much more heavily on the useful view. But once the relationship develops, the useful view has the unintended side-effect of generating phantom stress in a long term relationship. The guy always has subliminal concerns that prevent him from growing into commitment. TRP doesn't care about this negative view; most people there are fine with abandoning marriage and any interest in LTRs, which is why the useful view is still 100% advantageous in their eyes. For the rest of us who actually do care to maintain consistent LTRs (including those in MRP), the balance is weighed differently.

Question about fogging

8 upvotes · 16 August 2017 · /r/askMRP

Her: you're a piece of sh-- for flirting with X you know that?? Why would you do that?

Start with fogging:

- "You're right, I do act that way sometimes, don't I?"
- "I can see why you'd feel that way."

- "I guess what I did would look like that, wouldn't it?"

If she won't let it go, move into negative inquiry:

- "What is it about my actions that caused you to think I was flirting?" [not quite NI, but a reasonable precursor, pressure flipping to make her be the one to explain herself/justify her accusations, not you]
- "What is it about my flirting with other people that makes you react that way?"
- "What is it about my flirting with other people that you think is bad?"

Keep the string of NI up until she either caves by revealing her actual insecurity or acknowledges that you're not "bad" - you're just doing things she doesn't like, thus it's a personal preference difference.

Her: "It's bad because I'm supposed to be the only one you give that kind of attention to!"

You: "What is it about my giving attention to other women that is bad?"

Her: "Because I'm your girlfriend."

You: "Why does you being my girlfriend make it bad for me to talk to other girls that way?"

Her: "Because it might cause you to cheat on me, so I don't feel like I can trust you."

Personally, I prefer to save AA for this moment. If you pull off AA right away, over time she thinks you're just being evasive all the time and she can never be intimate with you. But when you use negative inquiry to get at the root of her insecurity, she's opening herself up to you - and then you give her the affirmation she needs in a playful way.

You: "You really shouldn't trust me - I've been hiding lots of things from you ... <move in close and whisper> things I'm going to do to you someday that I just can't say out loud."

In the alternative, you can treat her depth of response as a sincere comfort test, telling her what she wants to hear [i.e. avoid the "agree" part of AA], but still keeping it playful.

You: "Cheat on you? <grab her neck-line and look down her shirt> Who could cheat on that?!?"

Your confidence in the delivery is what matters most (I've found this out the hard way). If she feels like you're making a joke, you will have abated the issue, but she won't believe you and you'll have done nothing to quell her insecurities - her jealousy will fester. Sell it right and she'll drop the issue and start getting all tingly.

Advice on living together

8 upvotes · 2 August 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

Shouldn't the captain analogy be reserved for married/engaged men and women?

Married, yes. Engaged, no. Engaged is the same as saying, "In contract." Like when you buy a house, it's not really your house, and you can technically get out of the contract at any time by giving up your deposit money. So, yes, being "in contract" is a step-up in commitment from just flirting with the idea of buying a house, but until closing day, the deal is not sealed.

Any of you ever had enough SMV to tell an annoying woman to fuck off without social consequences?

8 upvotes · 9 July 2017 · /r/askTRP

I'm confused ...

I helped her for a while because it was my job

...

she even rationalized it was my job to help her

If it's your job, that's not her hamster. I'm guessing what you mean is that her expectations went beyond your job requirements.

Look, I have a job where I have crappy clients. Being a divorce attorney, nobody is happy. Ever. It's my job to help these people no matter how much they whine and complain - and every single phone call is whining and complaining. I have to maintain frame because (1) that's how I win cases, and (2) that's how I build trust with my clients.

I get fed up with it sometimes, especially when they cross some lines that most other clients don't cross. Instead of cussing them out, you develop your interpersonal management skills, set clear boundaries, and inform them of the consequences of crossing those boundaries. When they still cross them, you don't chicken out on those boundaries.

Instead, you lost frame by letting her get to you. Frame isn't just about picking up girls. It applies to numerous areas of life, including your career. Your boss will not respect a pushover. Whiny co-workers will not respect the boundaries of someone who can't draw a clear line and enforce it.

Sectarian issues finding relationships?

7 upvotes · 25 January 2021 · /r/RPChristians

First, if you're still in "I gotta find a wife" mode, your thinking is off. Read my "finding the girl you can't keep yourself from banging" posts on the sidebar.

Second, sectarianism within the Church is stupid and unbiblical.

Third, women will adapt to your frame if you're an attractive, competent leader. Who cares whether they think differently from you before they're in your frame?

Children before marriage

7 upvotes · 25 January 2021 · /r/RPChristians

This is the way. I have spoken.

3 Year RP Field Report

7 upvotes · 25 December 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Without taking a firm stance, how would you reconcile that view with 1 Timothy 3:4-5 - "for if someone does not know how to manage his own household, how will he care for God's church?"?

Matchmaker, matchmaker, make me a match

7 upvotes · 18 December 2020 · /r/RPChristians

It's super blue pill to expect someone else to go find you a woman.

Like most of the arranged marriages in the OT times? Genesis 24 comes to mind. I don't think the distinction you're making is a red/blue one.

I think the laziness in the online approach is the blue pill problem. And even that can be red pillled if you're using the online marketplace not as a substitute for in-person approach (or even your primary approach), but as a low-cost, high-opportunity resource at your fingertips for expanding your social network and increasing your number

of orbiters/plates.

But I do agree with the bottom line: the options in online dating are going to suck compared to the options in person.

Loving my wife like Christ loves the Church

7 upvotes · 17 October 2020 · /r/RPChristians

when I hear things like this...

OP is not a mod or endorsed contributor. He doesn't speak for the sub. What you've expressed is more along the lines of what we hold to. If you find a mod or EC who has posted anything along the lines of what OP wrote, let me know and I'll personally deal with it.

Don't Be Autistic

7 upvotes · 24 September 2020 · /r/RPChristians

If there wasn't clear data showing that women prefer muscular men over runner/swimmer builds, I'd agree with you. But you have to remember that the red pill is still a praxeology of intergender *sexual* dynamics. So, what attracts women inherently has to be part of that dynamic.

Do you have any concerns about how it seems like this view errs on the side of control of your wife over her personal growth and freedom?

7 upvotes · 15 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

you don't care about God or his vision only yourself

Founder of the sub here. If you spent even 10 seconds looking around, you'd see that about 90% of what is taught from myself and even several other mods/ECs is about living up to Christ's mission: to make disciples of all nations.

This level of ignorance makes it abundantly obvious that you are not actually reading what's taught here; you just wanted to stereotype and rile people up. No trolls permitted here.

I feel stuck

7 upvotes · 12 August 2020 · /r/askRPC

My mission is to start my own brand of outdoor clothing/equipment and to act in films in order to influence culture in a more positive way instead of culture influencing us.

Here's your first problem. Your mission sucks. Yeah, it's your mission. If you claimed to be a non-Christian, I'd say go for it. But if you're in Christ, that should change.

When guys like /u/Praexology and I ask what your mission is it's not because we want to change your mission or see how disciplined you are in fulfilling whatever it is you're doing. It's because we want to see how far of a gap there is between what you want for your life and what God wants for your life.

I have not hidden from men what a narrow/non-existent gap looks like - and many men have taken the hint and give me a fake mission for themselves just to appease, because they know what we're looking for here. But let me reiterate this again: **"Go therefore and make disciples of all nations."** Got it?

Now, if that's what Jesus wants from your life, why does your mission not reflect this? Because you want

different things from your life than he does. This is where guys like [/u/redwall92](#) hit the nail on the head. You clearly have blue pill fantasies about what your life should look like that aren't aligned with reality. And 99.99% chance: the reason you're not getting your blue pill fantasies fulfilled aren't because they're unfulfillable, but because you make them your goal instead of Scripture.

Matthew 6:33 - "Seek first his Kingdom and his righteousness and all these things will be added to you as well." It's not that hard. What are you doing for the good of the Kingdom? It sounds like you're only focusing on the righteousness component and ignoring the Kingdom-building aspect. You can't seek your own righteousness and ignore seeking God's reign across the earth and think you're still going to get the promises afforded to those who do.

Watch sermons about 4 times a week. I don't read the Bible as much as I should

Seriously - this is another huge problem. Stop being a sermon junkie. You ever see the hand illustration? [Here's an over-simplified version](#). Working from pinky to thumb, your engagement in the Word becomes deeper and more alive. At best, you're hearing and maybe reading on rare occasions. I'm extremely doubtful that you're actually studying the word. I'd wager what you'd call "study" is really topical research, and the two aren't even close to the same. You've already said you're not memorizing, which inherently means you're not meditating on the Word either. The full illustration would involve asking you to hold a Bible with just your pinky and (if we're being generous on your self-assessment, we'll also let you use) your ring finger. Can you even do it? If you can, how easily will the Word be snatched away from you if that's all you've got? Add in the others and your grasp on the Word becomes more firm and can't be stolen away.

Stats: 5'11" 25yo. 155lbs. Deadlift 180 squat 195 bench 185 triceps 45 both arms bicep curls

These numbers are extremely awkward. [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) - you ever see someone who benches more than he can deadlift? Or who squats more than he can deadlift even? This is all kinds of backwards. And you're curling 45s? Stop working those biceps and get the rest of your body in shape. You've been around these parts for a minimum of 8 months, brother. My bench went from 135 to 250+ in 6. What's the holdup? You say you're hitting the gym. I'm guessing you go, do your comfortable routine, then hit the showers. Do you actually have mile-markers you're striving to accomplish or not?

STFU in real life goes well. Maybe that's why I'm posting here so much. In regards to STFU with women around, I used to be quiet a lot but lately I've been trying to open up and socialize to learn what it's like to communicate. I feel like an autistic sometimes

... no, it's not because you didn't go the college route. It's because you are conflating STFU with being socially incompetent. STFU doesn't mean you withdraw from social situations to reddit, only making time for the friends you knew when you were 5 years old. I'm glad you're trying to open this up. You say you attempt number-closing for practice every now and then. Shift gears for now to broader human relationships. Instead of number-closing, try friend-closing. Get some new people in your sphere of influence. My guess is that these people you chill with either (1) aren't a good influence on you, hence why you're stuck in a rut, or (2) they're fantastic role models, but they don't have enough of a voice in your life to influence you for the better. Either way, the solution is to move away because if whatever good influence they have to offer (if any) isn't working, find someone else who *can* help you.

After Christ revealed himself to me was when my life changed in a positive more successful way but I became this hermit.

That's because you caved to churchianity idiocy that tells new believers to cut off everything from their old non-Christian lives and start fresh. Total garbage. A good book to counter this mentality: *The Insider*, by Jim Petersen

and Mike Shamy. It addresses the way believers should be encouraged to maintain their "insider" role with non-believers rather than ditching everyone for Christ, which pushes non-believers further away.

I guess I need some encouragement?

No, you're validation-seeking. You want to know there are other guys in your shoes so that you feel less bad. "See? It's not just me!" Just because someone else's life sucks worse than yours doesn't mean your life is better than it is. Don't look for comparison. Don't look for validation in camaraderie over lowliness.

What you need is a kick in the butt. Start focusing your life on something that matters. Get your mission figured out above all else.

No, your congregation does not preach "biblical headship"

7 upvotes · 12 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

If a guy wants to take the more physically demanding tasks, go for it. That's his prerogative. But good luck finding a verse that obligates him to do so. Besides, mowing the lawn is hardly what I'd call physically demanding. If you're talking about hauling bales of hay, that might be a different story - but even then I'm sure [u/willow-girl](#) would have some words for you. Even my own wife, who has practically never lifted in her life, has proven a competent helper on major construction and home remodeling jobs - enough that she'd be capable even without me. But you show me a routine household job that's too physically demanding for a woman to complete reliably and I'll be happy to reconsider.

A picture of a relationally solid church community

7 upvotes · 11 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

This is some scary stuff here - and holy cow do you have rosy-colored glasses on. This is about the most blue-pill congregation I've heard of lately ... so why are you promoting it here? I mean, I can see how your leaders thought this was a good idea, just like most blue pill churchianity leaders think they have some fantastic ideas ... but there are HUGE concerns that I expect will have massively negative long-term consequences. I started writing up a long response to individual points, but deleted it and opted to go for a more categorical reply, as there's literally so much wrong with this that even I can't write at that length. Enough other people like [/u/RedPillWonder](#) have done that well enough.

First, many of my concerns would fall in the category of skepticism. Frankly, I call BS on any implication that the congregants are actually living up to even half of what you're describing here - and you already acknowledge so much wiggle-room in the post itself that I'm more inclined to believe that you're speaking from a place of "congregational pride" (the churchianity "I love my congregation! Everyone should praise my congregation for how great it is!" view) than of actual objective information. And you even acknowledge in a number of places that you're basing your information on subjective observation rather than being privy to the backroom discussions (I've been in both and they rarely line up).

In this, most congregations tend to keep things that would negatively reflect on the structure hush hush. I'm not surprised you have a rosy view because you've probably been fed a rosy view the same way North Korea has its citizens believing they're following a physical deity who happens to be a fat idiot, and that they're the greatest nation on earth, despite being totally screwed up.

What I really hear about all of this is: The pastor preaches a lot of really strict rules and "cultural expectations" about relationships from the pulpit, which gives the impression that people are actually living them out in their private lives outside of Sunday services, without any actual objective evidence that they're doing so.

These conversations always lead to the same result: "You can doubt the veracity of what I'm saying if you want,

but the fact is that I'm here and you're not and I know what I see is true." Then, of course, you give no reference to anyone to visit the congregation and confirm for themselves if it's all you say it is.

Second, most of the descriptions you give for your congregation are no different than any other congregation, especially if there's an absence of enforcement ... which you wobble wobble on, not wanting to commit either way because either answer would call out BS on many things you've said. If there is enforcement, then it's a pharisaic culture. If there's not, then it's identical to every other congregation that preaches a high purity culture. So, instead, you vaguely say that "some things are rules and other things are culture," and only give an example of the one thing that's obviously cultural without sharing which ones are actual enforceable rules.

Virtually every congregation I've ever attended encourages physical purity, setting curfews, being marriage-minded in relationships, use of accountability software, marrying young, short engagements, etc., etc. I see nothing special or unique in here, except in regard to some rather extreme concepts that, if enforced, would really shed a negative light on the congregation from a biblical standpoint.

Third, the other chunk of concerns I had were because there are a number of things that are directly contrary to the red pill.

1. Sniper mentality is encouraged. Any effort to maintain a shotgun approach is condemned.
2. Husbands are encouraged to "help" their wives. You claim they teach "headship," but all I'm hearing is the same weak complementarianism every other congregation pushes.
3. They're trying to "keep hypergamy in check" by controlling women's behaviors rather than making hypergamy work for a man.
4. They encourage "long distance relationships." **Long distance relationships don't exist. This is literally Rollo Year 1 stuff.**
5. Encouraging people to marry young - i.e. when a woman is at her SMV peak and a man is at his lowest, rather than the man is at his peak. This puts men at a huge disadvantage and far more prone to marital dissatisfaction by his mid-late 30s, and especially by the mid-life crisis age-range (mid-late 40s).
6. A complete opposition to any *mystery* in the relationship because husbands have to make sure their wives know every single thing they ever text to another woman, or can never be alone with someone of the opposite gender.
7. "Serious spousal conflicts" still exist at all. Seriously, that's the biggest red flag that shows this congregation's views on marriage are less effective than the red pill concepts we teach from Scripture here. I know Rollo has written that he can count on one hand the number of "serious conflicts" he's had with his wife. Since becoming red pill, I can count them on ... well, I can't because it hasn't happened yet. How about you, [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) - any conflicts for you? I know you've commented on that before.

There are others I'd mention that are less "anti red pill" and more "unbiblical" - like the idea that "children are raised collectively" (seriously, that's some BLM garbage right there).

Fourth, and **MOST IMPORTANTLY**: I don't see any indication that anyone is actually discipling anyone else. In fact, every time you talk about discipleship within this congregation I started to cringe because the context makes it clear that you're using the same watered-down garbage that countless other congregations do. To be fair,

the watered-down version is still better than nothing at all, which is where many are still at.

The biggest trigger phrase for me was: "centralized babysitting a few days a week at night, so that couples could go and do evangelism, discipleship, etc." This language represents a complete misunderstanding of how Jesus made disciples. Again, to be fair, I get more vocal at congregations that come up with these half-measures than those that don't do it at all ... the whole "be hot or cold, but not luke-warm" concept. Jesus didn't make disciples by casting the kids aside and having one-on-one conferences with someone to discuss the topic of the week. The children ran around and he prohibited them from kicking the kids aside. When I disciple guys (especially those who are local), **I actively WANT them to see how I interact with my kids**. How else are they going to learn to interact with theirs? Through a lesson and filling out a worksheet I prepared? That's a joke. Discipleship is from life-modeling.

You said you're single, so you may not get this yet. But when you do have kids, do you imagine that the way you'll raise them is through weekly one-on-one sessions for an hour or two where you teach them everything they need to know for life, and then you send them on their way to be by themselves until the next meeting or the random call-ins you might have throughout the week? Of course not. You'd go to jail for child neglect. And many jurisdictions (for court purposes) are now even acknowledging purely psychological issues as grounds for child neglect, even when you take care of their physical needs.

CONCLUSION

What you've described is exactly what Robert Glover talks about in NMMNG - that when a Nice Guy's strategy doesn't work, instead of changing it he doubles-down. He tries even harder at the exact same thing that's failing. Your congregation has done exactly that. They have doubled-down on all the same blue pill garbage that all the other congregations tried and failed at.

I'll note: there's very little discussion in this post about how hot the sex is among the married couples. Of course, you can't - because you're not allowed to talk about that ... especially as a single guy, that kind of conversation might *tempt* you. I'd bet money it's no better - maybe even worse - than the typical congregation.

Tag: [/u/rocknrollchuck](#) - I see you didn't comment in this post, but I'd be curious of your thoughts.

Make it easy for your spouse

7 upvotes · 14 July 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I'm always glad when you put a post up because I know it's going to be good.

making it easy for your spouse to do what God commands

Part of this is actually giving them an opportunity. For the longest time, I thought that by having no expectations over my wife I was making life easier for her. In reality, by having no expectations or commands for her to follow, she had no ability to do what God called her to do in our marriage: submit and follow. This was incredibly unsatisfying for her and infuriating for me when she was acting upset with me and couldn't explain why because it doesn't make logical sense for a woman to be upset with a man whose primary goal is to make her life easier. Yet that's biblical truth for you - always confounding the wise.

So, part of making it easier for her was to start giving clear direction in our life/marriage so that she actually had the opportunity to be a submissive follower in the first place. Taking away those things literally made it impossible for her to fulfill her role.

If they see their spouse improve, they assume it's short-lived ... And in the end, as at the beginning, they reap

what they sow.

I just want to point out that this is often self-fulfilling prophecy. For most people who don't understand the 1,000 ft rope scenario, they assume their spouse should catch on quite quickly to the self-improvement trend you're trying to start. When it doesn't happen right away and the negative-spouse is skeptical about it all, they refuse to catch on, discouraging the positive-spouse and bringing them right back down. In most of these cases, if the negative-spouse had a positive-attitude and assumed that the changes were for real, a positive feedback loop could be started rather than negative normalization occurring.

Do you think God has a good grasp of human psychology and behavior?

Do you think the Creator understands male and female nature and all of its expressions?

Do you think that when He gives commands to each spouse, that He's doing it because it's not only right but because it works?

Or do you think He just likes seeing each spouse jump through hoops and act all crazy and get out of sorts at times?

Fantastic logic here, brother. Well said.

Another layer to all of this is to make sure you're not improving *FOR* your spouse. Yes, it is good to make things easier for them, but if your goal in doing so is to conform their behavior, you're living in their frame. The story is about them and the climax your life is building toward is whether they will change or not. If, as a man, the big even that you're working for in life is getting your spouse to change, you have a lame life. For a woman, this is somewhat the reverse, especially if your man is spiritually weak. For those women I know who are more spiritually mature than their pseudo-Christian husband, the single most powerful thing that they can look forward to is the transformation of their husband - because that sets them on the proper path without having to play the God v. spouse game. But for men, we have bigger fish to fry than figuring out if she'll change or not. Yes, encourage that change. Work toward her sanctification. But Jesus's goal as a groom was not to sanctify the church - it was to get the Gospel to the nations. Sanctifying the Church was one of the things in the process of accomplishing that goal, but it's not the goal itself. Don't make it your primary goal either. Instead, let the sanctification of your wife be a waypoint that, while not necessary, is substantially helpful. Yet even Jesus said that if the Church wouldn't, the rocks would cry out.

RPC Podcast Episode 7: The Importance of OYS

7 upvotes · 10 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Fair enough. You could go without your video if you want. Or do a non identifying picture like oz.OZ. Your call when we get there though. Just know the invitation is outstanding.

Feeling discouraged with many churches' support of the Black Lives Matter movement, including my own.. Are there any truly alt-right/conservative churches left that don't buy into this?

7 upvotes · 2 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

This is what I've been trying to tell people. I have a degree in statistical methodology, which is the study of how statistics are gathered and what they mean when applied to real-world conclusions. It's incredibly disappointing to see how so many bad statistics are put out - not that they're false. Many of the statistics the media references are true. But they only investigate far enough to confirm their biases and then stop. They never ask the questions: "Why might this be happening?" or "Is there something more at play?" unless it advantages their liberal purposes.

Corona is a great example of this. I just had a conversation with another user who was quoting death rates in the 5% range, which is ludicrous, as it causes most of the 20-49 year old people on social media to think that 1 out of 20 of them who get corona will die. Yet that statistic is true, so why shouldn't they believe that? Because out of those 5% virtually all of them are 80+. Anyone between 20-49, according to one study, really only has a .0092% chance of dying. Whoop ti doo. This is what misreporting statistics does.

You're finding the same truth being uncovered by looking deeper into the half-truths to discover the other unreported half, and that's an essential work that modern liberal media journalists are uninterested in doing because it crushes their narrative and loses them viewers.

While I wasn't a very big fan of them either, I was very sad when Fox News was bought out by Disney, as there is now no major network that doesn't have a liberal boss.

Anyone else frustrated with their church leadership re: COVID?

7 upvotes · 30 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I'm going to reiterate what I just said on another thread:

- **YOUR LOCAL CONGREGATION IS NOT "THE CHURCH"**

It's a dangerous mentality to confuse the two. This mixup between congregations and The Church is what shifted CHRISTianity to CHURCHianity, which was the pathway to the feminization of mainstream congregations.

The Church in Scripture is the whole of God's Kingdom. The congregation structure we have today is a tool that The Church has utilized to aid in the spread of the Gospel. It's a good and useful structure. But it's not a necessary one. It's one we could leave in the dust and never look back and be perfectly fine.

I wrote this post a couple months ago, sharing my frustration with the "let's get our Sunday services back!" obsession that has occurred with the coronavirus shutdowns. The premise is simply that too many people have become so obsessed with the structure of the church (i.e. the congregational tool) that they have abandoned the mission of The Church and believe it can only be accomplished through that tool. This is the same thing as a plumber who worships his pipe cutter so heavily that he uses it for everything, even in ways it was never meant to be utilized ... and the result is a total disaster.

Explaining the Double Standards around Sex

7 upvotes · 14 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

If by "train wreck" you mean "mods and ECs have drastically improved their lives, marriages, and sex lives and are making more of a difference for the benefit of God's Kingdom than they were before," sure. In the meantime, trolling isn't permitted here - and yes, that rule does apply to you insofar as this sub is concerned. You're welcome to read, but your commenting rights are being revoked.

Explaining the Double Standards around Sex

7 upvotes · 13 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Hysterical. The blogger uses the exact same mental gymnastics women use in order to avoid saying the church is feminized. So cute.

How do I approach my husband about this issue?

7 upvotes · 18 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Please make your comments in a single comment. Clogging the thread with 4 different comments won't be permitted going forward. If you think of something after you make your original comment, except in rare

circumstances, just hit the "edit" button and update your original comment.

Bible Studies for Men's small group

7 upvotes · 22 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Why are there so many Bible study groups, but no Scripture memory groups? Try something unique. Pick a book of the Bible and try to memorize it together. Talk about it as you recite it to each other.

Philippians has 102 verses. That's 2/wk. Say your group is 1/4 of a year. That's 8 verses/wk to memorize. Very doable. I GUARANTEE you will find more value out of this than everyone showing up after reading the passage once, pretending they actually studied it in-depth, and proceeding to BS around some ideas they had on the spot about what a few things mean.

Raise your expectations and see if they follow. Make it a challenge. Be better than the rest of churchianity.

Was gonna go on mission this year, and now they changed the staff. I don't feel like going

7 upvotes · 14 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Was gonna go on mission this year

Huh? You're not on mission every day?

It is wrong for me to think this way? When it comes to serving in mission

YES! Because your mission isn't about where you go. That's just context. Your mission is to make disciples wherever you are. Some people go to do that, some people stay to do that.

The reality is: you can't actually make a disciple on a 2-week mission trip. It took 3 years. Are we so arrogant to believe we can do in 2 weeks what he spent 3 years doing - and it took him that long even with his top picks of all the people following him at that point. You're going to go among strangers and think you're somehow going to meet someone brand new, not really have much selective option in who you meet with, and think you can accomplish anything at all?

Short-term "missions" trips are not about the people you're going to meet. Every pastor I've ever spoken with about this issue ultimately agrees with me on this (often begrudgingly, as they like to hold onto their fantasy notions for as long as possible). That's not to say they're bad or fruitless. The fruit just isn't in the people at the destination. It's in what happens in your own heart as a result of you going. It's about you seeing that there's a broader world out there that needs the Gospel and how you can have a global vision through even local mission.

You don't want to go on the trip? Don't go. Or do. It really doesn't matter. Whether you go or not doesn't change the fact that you have a mission right where you are. Are you going to accomplish it or not?

Why Men Hate Going To Church

7 upvotes · 14 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Solid, brother. I had been meaning to write a post parallel to this, focusing primarily on the idolatry of the congregational structure, made even more plainly obvious by the present lockdown. Maybe I'll hold off a bit to let these words here settle in for guys.

For now, let me piece together something for you that might even further enhance your ~~church-going~~ Sunday-service-attending experience:

As a Bible believing, Jesus following, hardcore Christian man who's mission in life is to evangelize and make disciples of ALL people, I'll admit I attend church mostly for my family

Great. Perfect mission. Now, part of making disciples is helping the spiritually dead/young learn to be like Jesus, then follow him just as you do. So, what if I told you I wanted to help you on this mission and I could gather for you dozens, hundreds, or even thousands of people who are:

1. Hopelessly lost and misled, desperately needing someone to help them follow Jesus.
2. The people I would find for you would have already communicated at least some desire to want to follow Jesus, so you don't have to worry about filtering through hundreds of people to find a few who are ripe to disciple.
3. Many of them will be non-Christians, but who still have a desire to become saved (some perhaps already thinking they are).
4. I could also find for you others who, with a little guidance from you, would enthusiastically help you disciple everyone else in the group.
5. That I'd make sure this group would be conveniently located within a reasonable driving distance from you and others in the community so there would be no geographical barriers.
6. That I would already be priming these people to want to go out and make a difference in the community, so that when you're ready, after training them, to send them to make more disciples, the foundation will already be there for them to do that.
7. The only catch is: because I gathered them, they'll be loyal to me and you'll have to build some relational clout with them before they'll follow you. Don't worry, though. I may not be discipling them alongside you, but I'll certainly support your effort and encourage others in what you do.

If I could create such a place for you, and you wouldn't have to exhaust any effort at all in gathering such people or finding them, wouldn't that be a fantastic resource for advancing your mission so you wouldn't have to start from scratch?

This should be your mindset walking into Sunday service every week. It is a tool. Someone has done all the hard work of creating it for you, saving you countless man-hours of relational networking social discerning, heart-orienting, etc. Take advantage of his misguided hard-labor for your Christ-guided missional efforts. Now go.

When do you know that they're the one?

7 upvotes · 10 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I was fascinated when a former pastor of mine mentioned at a small group once, his wife at his side, her hand on his leg: "I love my wife. If she died, I would be sad. But my life would not be over. I have bigger things going on in my life than her, and she knows that - and those are the things that keep me going. I'd mourn for a time - it might be a few weeks, it could be months, but I'd ultimately be fine. Why? Because I don't need her. I need God. I want her, but my emotional well-being does not depend on her."

He was one of the earliest precursors to the red pill in my life. He eventually left full time ministry and opened a cigar/dark beer shop (seriously: no light beer permitted; it was one of his rules). I was very sad when he relocated to do that.

Don't use a virus as an excuse

7 upvotes · 20 March 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I just wrote this in another thread:

My setup ...

- A stationary bike. **This is the one I use; goes for \$200.**
- A bench. **This is the one I use. \$100.** Note: I don't have the bar, I just use it with dumbbells.
- Some dumbbells. Highest I have are 45lb. **They're \$90 for a ste at Walmart.** That said, I probably need to get a couple more sets - 45s aren't enough to curl with anymore, but 100s would be perfect for doing heavy sets of the standing row and high-rep sets on the bench.

Now, I've bought these things over the past few years, not all at once. But even if you do have to buy it all at once, the point is that you can get basic crap for pretty cheap that will get the job done. The things I mentioned here should be enough to at least do maintenance work and collectively would be around \$400 (with tax). I'm paying \$75/mo for my family gym membership that we can't use anymore. If yours is comparable and this lockdown ends up lasting into summer, like some people are projecting, you could easily break even. While you might not get AS good of a workout as you will in the gym, you'll have access to keep using these things indefinitely even when you do go back to the gym. At that point, you have options. If you don't have time one day to drive to the gym, you have alternative things to do at home that knock off the 20+ minutes on your round trip.

I should add - the stationary bike is a great way to multi-task for a slow calorie burn while watching movies or playing games with my kids. I've been able to get a lot of work done on it too - phone calls (as long as I keep the pedaling slow), setup a laptop on a nearby TV tray, text and e-mail clients from my phone, etc. For reference, I usually bike an average of 30 miles a day 6 days a week during these times I can't go to the gym, plus anything to do with dumbbells and body weight.

The Truth About Porn

7 upvotes · 5 November 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I agree with [u/iseeitnow7](#). Your thoughts here only apply to the degree the wife is actually willing. Your question implies that her obedience to God should appropriately depend on her getting what she wants from her husband first. This is a wrong framework.

I do agree that a man should not look at porn and that this will have a negative impact on his marriage. My point in this post wasn't to prove otherwise. It was more to show that there are other more damaging things to marriage than porn use and porn is simply the church's go to scapegoat for blaming men so they don't have to blame women.

At first glance it might sound like I'm trying to point the finger at women, but that's really peripheral. I'm more interested in relieving men of the pressure and stress of beating all that risk and blame because that in itself is a lot of what's keeping them on the hook with porn in the first place, among many other unattractive qualities in their life.

The Truth About Porn

7 upvotes · 5 November 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Haha. In fairness, I edited that in at the end after realizing I didn't have time to edit the whole post.

[FR] "Happy Life, Happy Wife" & Empathy Theory

7 upvotes · 17 October 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I can't prove this, but at least in my life it's the trend

When you give the examples in your life to go with it, we call those field reports. Individually, they are only

anecdotes. En masse, we get enough of a sample size to start understanding with statistical reliability how people actually function. This is the essence of the red pill's method of discerning its praxeology. Don't just state your conclusions: give the stories to back them up as field reports. This is where the true value of posts like this come in. Skipping to the conclusion causes skepticism - a thing I was guilty of early in my RP journey.

Women, generally speaking, are more empathetic than men. (meaning they are capable of feeling what other people are feeling without the original stimuli.)

With your given definition of empathy, I agree whole-heartedly. But there's a reason I call them "emotional empathys" rather than "more empathetic." Empathy in modern culture doesn't mean the technical definition you gave; rather, people take the term to mean that women care more about how other people are feeling and wanting to help them without selfish interest. Among women, this may very well be the case. Women are highly caring toward other women. Women do not share the same affection for men - (especially?) even ones they are in romantic or marriage relationships with. Conversely, men have a very strong track record for showing great concern for the well-being and feelings of the opposite gender, and men tend to be slightly more affectionate toward the plight of other men than women are. On the whole, by the way culture uses the word, men are actually more empathetic in the sense of being caring and sensitive toward others, but women are more prone to your definition of the word. So while your definition is correct, be cautious on how you word yourself when speaking of this term, as it's going to cross signals if you don't include your definition next time the way you did here.

Women both empathize consciously, but they also emphasize unconsciously. Or better said they are not always in control of their feeling empathy for others.

Correct: and they may resent others for the way they empathically experience negative emotions that they don't want to pick up on, even when the person communicating those emotions had no intention of doing so.

Empathy works negatively. "I'm sad because you're sad." But also positively "I'm happy because you're happy."

Spot on.

Women typically value group success over individual success and will dampen personal ideas/feelings/motivations for the sake of the group.

This is only true among women. It is not inherently true when their grouping is their husband or boyfriend, as their sin nature for control takes over as the default, unless they are highly mature or naturally/conditioned with discipline to reign this in.

she unintentionally empathizes with my mood: relaxed, calm, and jovial

I'm curious how much of this was her just not wanting to do something to increase her stress or rock the boat. In my experience neutral emotions, like "relaxed" and "calm" do not communicate through empathy as well.

Women like to feel *something* over *nothing* whenever possible. So, if they have the option between frustration and anger v. calm and relaxed, they will exhibit calm and relaxed. So, the positive vibe you put out has to be stronger than her frustration/anger for her to side with it. Again, though, that's just my experience.

I told her "I'm planning on being in a good mood tonight ... try it out and let me know

Personally, I'm not a fan of verbalizing this. But if others want to test this and find similar success, I'm happy to change my mind. My wife's response, though, is typically that she can't just flip a switch and change how she's feeling, and suggesting that she do so only makes her more furious. If I just do what I'm going to do without

telling her to follow, she follows anyway, as her mood subconsciously adapts to mine. Telling her what I'm doing undermines the process because bringing it to the conscious defeats the value of the subconscious process. At that point she must consciously want to be in a better mood, and many women would prefer to revel in their frustration, believe it or not.

she was in a significantly better mood, I could tell she was still stressed

This makes me more persuaded that she's in a "don't rock the boat" frame of mind rather than true empathic absorption. You were there, though, not me.

"I don't know how you always have a cool head when I'm like that. It's frustrating." (Here she is trying to get me to feel her feelings. Nope, sorry girl, no can do.)

Good on you. That's something my wife gets frustrated about too. I wrote about it about a year ago here: https://www.reddit.com/r/askMRP/comments/9sfxb/the_consciously_crazy_wife/. That's also the first post my wife read when she snooped into my reddit account, haha. Fun times.

If I'm worried or anxious, she's allowed to be. (But I would never show it on purpose/in my right mind.)

You're missing out on a good opportunity here. You're also forcing your wife to bottle up her anxiety when in reality you should give her small outlets here and there to blow off steam before the pressure builds too greatly. Her emotional levels will certainly match yours over time, but the capacity of her emotional system is much smaller than yours. So, while you might be able to go through a few doze cycles before hitting a maximum pressure capacity, she might be able to handle 10 before she's ready to blow. You'll discover this after you're married. When you're ready, you'll also learn the art of strategically getting her angry so she can release that pressure.

Happy Life, Happy Wife

When people mention the actual cliché, I often word my response: "You're right, a happy wife does make for a happy life. But a happy husband is what it takes to make a happy wife."

Overall, solid field report. Thanks for sharing!

Hey there @mgtow_judge, here's another profile for your Instagram, and while you're at it we'd appreciate you mentioning our sub every once in awhile. Thanks!

7 upvotes · 12 October 2019 · [/r/WhereAreAllTheGoodMen](#)

I just assumed she was punctuationally illiterate and didn't realize commas went between those words.

Is there a subreddit for people who are real christians but don't go to church?

7 upvotes · 1 October 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Since this is only locked and not entirely removed, let me be clear on a few things:

- Sunday services are not "church." Take them or leave them at your discretion.
- The Church, proper, is God's Kingdom on earth, which includes every believer you are in fellowship with.
- Every time I meet with other believers who I have a meaningful relationship with through Christ, I am "going to church," whether it happens to be in a building on a Sunday morning, in a coffee shop in the afternoon, or in my dining room on a Wednesday evening.
- Despite this difference between biblical and mainstream vocabulary, mainstream congregations still have

immense value and a man would do well to assess the value they can add to his mission and make use of it.

- It would be virtually impossible for a man to have a thriving discipler-making ministry in the absence of local congregations doing the hard work of gathering together hordes of people who are willing, at a very base level, to say they want to follow Jesus.
- If you cannot find people worth discipling on your own, or in the event that you still need to be disciplined, if you can't find someone to disciple you - then you need to be part of a local congregation to help you find these people.

Finding a women in California

7 upvotes · 16 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I'm also [blah, blah, blah]. I'm trying my best atleast. But every relationship I've been in has failed

Translation: "I've got some great qualities. Why can't women just love and respect me for that?" Because women don't love men the way men love women. Men are okay with women who are genuinely trying, even if they fail. Women are only interested in men when they actually succeed in being able to offer them something that they get out of it. Men love idealistically; women love opportunistically.

The only legit, submissive women I dated was

... every last one of them. All women are innately submissive. They've just conditioned themselves out of it. It's like Romans 2 saying that all people have a conscience, but some people have calloused their conscience (per Romans 1) to the point where it's not even recognizable - but it's still there, hidden underneath all the sinful conditioning of the fallen nature.

Never forget the fact that all women are, by default, designed to be submissive. It's just a matter of drawing this out of them. As [/u/Deep_Strength](#) noted, teachability is critical. Finding a non-selfish, non-opportunistic, non-feminist woman who doesn't feel entitled to boss men around - who is also attractive ... well, that's virtually impossible. But in my estimation, about 1/3 of people I meet within biblical congregations meet the FAT criteria (faithful, available, teachable). That's much better odds than looking for what you're looking for.

I stopped praying for a good biblical women 2 years ago and just accepted that I might be single forever.

This is a false dichotomy. Did Karl Benz run around saying, "I've been looking all over for years to find a car naturally existing in nature, but having not found one I accept that I may be without an automobile for the rest of my life"?

No, he went out and invented the flipping car and revolutionized the world for all of us.

Some guy along the way from Adam to the PUAs to the TRPs to the MRPs to here has figured out how to invent a unicorn (hint: I'm pretty sure it was Jesus) and then taught other show to recreate the process that we now talk about here on RPC. You don't find a unicorn, you make one. But if you insist on looking, then you're right: expect to be single forever.

It's better than being stuck with a controlling self obsessed women like the last few I've dated.

If they stay this way for longer than a few dates, it's likely that you're not attractive enough to demand their submission. There are stories upon stories told on the RP forums of even the most heinous feminazis bowing in submission to attractive men. I don't know where you are in Cali, but if it's LA, then you've really got to go above and beyond due to pretty much everyone being in top physical shape all the time. Hypergamy is a comparison

game, not a quest to find a self-actualized man. If you're around other highly attractive people, expect to have to be more attractive than them to get hypergamy to work for you.

I

Confronting the myth that you have to “earn sex” in marriage, and that if your wife deprives you, or worse, cheats on you with another man, it is completely your fault as a man for not being “red pill’d” enough to stop her. This attitude is blue pill’d, and takes away responsibility from women.

7 upvotes · 11 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Are you kidding? You talk about real world scenarios, but then give totally fake examples to prove your case.

Orthodox Jews and Muslims absolutely do have these problems. I haven't researched among Muslims as much, but I know several (usually my clients - I just had a hearing with one this morning) who tell me the ins and outs of their marriage and culture. After all, it's my job to see this stuff. The women are just as rebellious in American Muslim culture as they are in American Christian culture.

For Jews, research the concept of the *moredet*. Here's a good article:

<https://jwa.org/encyclopedia/article/legal-religious-status-of-moredet-rebellious-wife>. They had to create whole legal systems to deal with their "untame" women.

The difference here is that we don't live in Israel or under Jewish/Israeli or Sharia law. We live under American law. If the legal system were to be different, then sure, compelled submission is different. Go change the legal system then. Good luck. If you want to be subject to a better legal system, go move to one of those countries that have better marriage laws.

The problem is that you want the best of all worlds, but you don't have the power to create what you're looking for. Go to a country with better marriage laws and you're going to find all kinds of other problems, like dealing with the Taliban or horrible economic structures.

At the end of the day, we don't get to create our own ideal government unless we ourselves are the revolutionary. Otherwise, we're stuck among the options we're given and the consequences that the laws of those options brings. So you decide what's more important to you: better marriage laws or decent economic structure and not having to worry about Muslim terrorists bombing your city? It would be great if we could have the best of both worlds, but that's not the choice we get.

So either be a revolutionary, start your own country and dominate the world until you have respect to earn a seat at the UN ... or make do the best you can in the country you're in and stop wishing that you were in another country that you really don't want to live in in the first place.

Tag: /u/rocknrollchuck

Monogamy

7 upvotes · 10 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I

getting my wife to buy into the idea

Frame, frame, frame.

Does she trust you to be a man?

7 upvotes · 17 June 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

While it's an interesting exercise, this list could be replicated for pretty much any virtue other than trust. For example, I could say MRP is all about conquering fear:

- Drunk Captain: fear of the ship crashing
- Doesn't clean up after himself: fear of living in a pig sty forever
- Fat and lazy: fear that she'll never be able to brag to her friends about him
- Finances a mess: fear that the mortgage won't get paid

You get the point. That's when you say, "Ah, but isn't fear just based on a lack of trust?" Sure, so let's pick something more bizarre to continue the list: MRP is all about comedy ...

- ONEitis: When you're pathetic, she's laughing at you, not with you.
- Not growing/developing: You have to be making progress for her to feel relaxed enough in the relationship to laugh with you.
- Not OYS: Too much crap to get done to have time to laugh.
- Whining: instead of laughing.

Or what about dancing?

- Not setting or maintaining boundaries: Without proper boundaries you step on each other's toes too much to dance effectively.
- Can't pass fitness tests: She dances her own way and won't follow your lead.
- Can't identify fitness tests: You can't tell when she's stealing the lead from you on the dance floor.

Trust is certainly a tool that you can use to work for you. But I don't think it's as central as your post implies.

New York state lawmakers introduce bill to decriminalize sex work...

7 upvotes · 11 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

While your conclusion sounds good in theory, and I'd love nothing more than to believe you're right ... I think this is one of those situations where the practical impact of a thing doesn't turn out like theory would predict. I may respond more fully if I find the time.

Two Principles for Younger Men...

7 upvotes · 8 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Good post. Two things come to mind:

First, "pursue excellence" makes sense from a general secular perspective on getting women. "Make disciples" works better from a biblical framework. After all, that is what we should excel at. Being effective at making disciples will, of course, involve excellence at many other areas of life as well.

Second, there seems to be some disconnect between "pursue excellence" and "don't do things to make yourself more attractive." Pursuing excellence intrinsically makes you more attractive, which you even acknowledge. I think what you meant to say is that you shouldn't try to be more attractive to women to get more women because then you're living in the frame of women. "What do women want from me in order to find me attractive? Let me go do that." That's the female frame. "Let me do what matters most to me. Oh, women happen to find that incredibly sexy?" That's your own frame.

How to take women's votes away to save them and society.

7 upvotes · 2 May 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Many men seem a bit scared and desperate.

Sure, about half a percent. Yes, that's still many, but the overwhelming majority of men are blind and supportive. Be careful not to give false impressions about the status of things - it really ruins credibility.

"since women affect the market as the main consumers they can boycott entire governments etc vote or not)"

This is ludicrous. People will always need to buy clothes, food, etc. Even at its best, feminism couldn't undermine the value of human entertainment and the way that people will compromise their values to keep spending money on going to the movies, buying TVs, eating out at restaurants, having nice furniture, etc. Again, don't overstate your position - this loses lots of credibility.

The point is to present and manifest patriarchy as benevolent patriarchy.

While I don't disagree, let's remember that the overwhelming majority of the world is non-Christian (even if they self-identify as believers). Without Christ transforming their lives, do you really think unbelieving men are capable of maintaining Christ-likeness in the way they would express patriarchal authority? Paul tells us the answer in Romans 3: no. "No one does good, not even one." Apart from Christ, there is no hope of anyone making the right decisions. That's the whole point of the Gospel - it's why we need Jesus in the first place.

So, a predecessor to anything you're suggesting is that men must be saved before a patriarchal society can work, right? Without Christ it's doomed to fail. And if you were a woman, would you rather your fate in your own hands or in fallen man's hands? For that matter, as a man, do you think other men want the responsibility for the fate of all women on their shoulders, or do you think they're more likely to take the easy path and let the women take responsibility for themselves so the men can breathe easier? From a non-believing perspective, that's a no brainer: take the easier life without the responsibility.

red pill men can boycott women

No, that's what MGTOW men do. There's a huge difference. I agree that men should avoid marriage whenever possible - focus on your mission for Christ first and above all. But I would never deny men the right to get married. Paul says in 1 Timothy 4:1-5

- Now the spirit expressly says that in later times some will depart from the faith by devoting themselves to deceitful spirits and teachings of demons, through the insincerity of liars whose consciences are seared, who forbid marriage and require abstinence from foods that God created to be received with thanksgiving by those who believe and know the truth. For everything created by God is good, and nothing is to be rejected if it is received with thanksgiving, for it is made holy by the word of God and prayer.

Don't be that guy.

Also, and [u/OsmiumZulu](#) can expand on this more if he likes - how do you think boycotting women is going to play out in the long term? Suppose you get a huge following - Christian men en masse stop getting married, so they stop having sex, so they stop having babies to raise up as more Christian men. To quote OZ elsewhere, "Sure, Christian man, don't reproduce. The global leftist elites would love nothing more."

1920s were not an evolution of justice, but the beginning of our end. Take women's votes away.

7 upvotes · 1 May 2019 · /r/RPChristians

This reminds me of a recent conversation I had with my wife. She's a staunch republican, through and through. She gets incredibly worried about liberals ruining our country, often making comments about moving to some other more "traditionally conservative Christian country" (as if such a place actually exists without incredible other sacrifices).

I showed her the stats at one point - that **56% of women identify or lean democrat, while only 37% identify or lean republican**. That is, there are over 50% more women who identify/lean democrat as compared with republican.

I asked, "With this in mind, would you give up your right to vote if you knew it meant getting your republican candidate into office?" After all, 48% of men identify/lean republican as compared with 44% who identify/lean democrat - and I bet those numbers would be even more disparate if there wasn't an existing political agenda influenced by women voters.

She didn't have an answer. She said she wouldn't want to lose the right to vote, but she also believes in what's best for the country, and tried to argue that there must be some other solution.

1920s were not an evolution of justice, but the beginning of our end. Take women's votes away.

7 upvotes · 1 May 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Interesting observations. Now interpret them for me.

Where can i add some dread?

7 upvotes · 29 April 2019 · /r/askMRP

The point of dread isn't to make her think you're screwing around with other women. It's for her to know that you could if you wanted to. The thought that you could get a better woman than her at the drop of a hat keeps her motivated - it means that you're the desirable one in the relationship, which affects her desire for you. Jealousy for jealousy's own sake doesn't do squat for your sex life. Even if you were actually cheating on her, that fact alone isn't what makes her attracted to you - jealousy just makes a person emotionally hysterical. The attractive factor that accompanies jealousy isn't the jealousy itself, but the reason why the jealousy crept up in the first place. That's why we don't call it jealousy game. Dread encompasses more than the dread of what you might be doing when you're gone - it's the dread of recognizing the relational imbalance and the fact that you can get all your needs met elsewhere, making her either (1) expendable, or (2) step up her game so she becomes indispensable.

Thoughts on Tim Keller Book Excerpt

7 upvotes · 9 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Our intense relational capacity, created and given to us by God, is purposely not fulfilled completely by our "vertical" relationship with him.

I'd like to see a reference for this line. He won't have one because it doesn't exist. I can provide several, though, that say that God is sufficient to satisfy us. This line may have been true before the cross (ex. if he tried to use Genesis 2), but certainly not once the veil was torn. Conclusion: This is blue pill cultural conditioning.

marriage is for helping each other to become our future glory-selves, the new creation that God will eventually make us

While it may have this impact, this is, again, not a scriptural conclusion. At best, one could argue that God created all the members of the body of Christ to be united as one spiritual body, and that marriage is the closest

thing we see on earth to what this might look like. However, Jesus' saying that marriage will not exist in heaven proves quite definitively that physical marriage on earth does not inherently reflect our future heavenly state better than if we were to remain single.

So, then, he must mean that it causes us to become spiritually more alike to God's intentions for us, a la sanctification. But what about the countless relationships where two people actually pull each other down and destroy the purposes of sanctification in each other's lives? He'd have to be kidding or pretend that these relationships don't exist - and they are far more common than the sanctifying kind. So, once again, he's got to be in a blue pill fantasy land to believe that marriage is what causes people to become more godly, as they will eventually be in heaven. The marriage is not what does that; the interaction patterns expressed through godly marriage are what do this, and you can have those same interaction patterns with others outside the context of marriage to be sharpened into Christ-likeness, otherwise we would have to explain away Paul's sanctification process, or any other disciple who remained single.

As for the purpose of marriage, Malachi 2:15 proves him wrong, as it clearly identifies "producing godly offspring" as the purpose of marriage, not sanctification. While sanctification can certainly happen in marriage, it is no more the purpose of marriage than it would be to say that God's purpose for the church is to be sanctified, not to make disciples. In reality, sanctification is the refining process for the disciple-making mission, just as sanctification of the spouses is a refining process for their mission to make disciples.

One must be able to say "I see your flaws, imperfections, weaknesses, dependencies. But underneath them all I see growing the person God wants you to be."

Absolutely. Agreed there.

This is the essence of true spiritual friendship, eagerly helping one another know, serve, love, and resemble God in deeper and deeper ways.

Again, where's the reference for this? Let me provide a reference for my definition of "true spiritual friendship" - Philippians 2:2 - "Being like-minded, having the same love, being one in spirit and in purpose."

- like-minded: that is, we share the mind of Christ as the operative framework from which all we think, do, and believe flows.
- same love: that we love God together, both in a corporate and individual sense.
- being one in spirit: that we have the one Holy Spirit that unites us, creating a common spirit of the koinonia oneness we have with one another.
- and in purpose: that we share the same commitment to the great commission - the purpose Jesus gave to each of us before he ascended.

True spiritual friendships must incorporate each of these.

Sanctification is a group project, and most intense between two spouses

It can be, yes. But it doesn't have to be. When it is between two spouses, it certainly can be intense, though I have found a greater intensity of sanctification with my brothers in Christ than I have from my wife - and as a man I believe this is appropriate. Ephesians 5, on the other hand, indicates that this should be reversed for wives: that the husband does have the primary role of sanctifying his wife, as Christ does the church.

experience of marriage will unveil the beauty and depths of the gospel to you. It will drive you further into reliance on it. On the other hand, a greater understanding of the gospel will help you experience deeper

union with each other as the years go on

I could not agree more with this statement. This is excellent. As I always say, physical marriage between spouses parallels the spiritual marriage between us and Christ. The one true advantage of physical marriage over singleness is that it gives us a clear road map to better understand the relationship we have with Christ through the Gospel. Amen to this point!

Everyone comes into marriage with an idea of gender roles and expectations.

To make a small jab, a couple of my fellow mods, even, aren't immune to this ;) I prefer to break all such roles and let the man, who is the head of the household, decide for his own house what those roles should be, within very broad boundaries prescribed by Scripture (i.e. headship, husband sanctifies wife, etc.).

God originally intended men and women together, in full participation, carrying out God's mandate to build civilization and culture

Goodness, sounds like the church's job, right? Oh yeah, because that IS the marriage God always intended. Funny that he says "originally intended," but leaves no room for God's changed intent to have this function fulfilled through spiritual marriage with Christ rather than physical marriage.

Neither sex has all the characteristics necessary to fulfill this alone, only in complementary union can mankind achieve God's purposes

Correct. Like our union with Christ.

The gospel calls both women and men to "play the Jesus role"

WHAT? THE? ACTUAL? FUECERSLLEKREJSLEFJSIFSDK? How does he justify this with passages like Ephesians 5 et seq. and 1 Cor. 11? Again, I want to see his references.

men modeling sacrificial authority and women modeling sacrificial submission

Theoretically, yes. But based on what I know of his other writings about what he means by sacrificial authority, ABSOLUTELY NOT.

Here's the thing. Most men look at everything their wives have been nagging them to do for the last several years and when they finally do it, they say, "Look, I sacrificed for her and got it done." Keller would applaud this. "Good job. You finally set aside Sunday football or afternoon video games to serve your wife." In reality, most men are just crappy passive leaders. They should be doing these things not as a sacrifice to serve their wife's interests, but because it's their freaking house, their dishes, their lawn, their broken-down car, etc.

Now, I know you - you own your own business. You want to see your business grow, right? So, when a client hires you for a project and you do the project, do you say, "Look how hard I sacrificed for you!?" No. That'd be idiotic. He paid you. It's your responsibility to do it. That's not a sacrifice. That's the job.

In the same way, God forgave us all our debts and gave us a ticket into heaven, then says, "Now I have a job for you." Paul says in Romans 1 that he is "obligated." How else do we understand obligation than a responsibility that comes with salvation? Responsibilities are things we do because it's part of who we are in light of what God has entrusted to us. We do not "sacrifice" anything when we live up to these responsibilities; rather, we are acting appropriately in light of all that we have received, just as if your client were to pay you the money up-front. Your position is still better than you started. There is no sacrifice - you have not decreased your status when you live up to responsibilities in honor of an arrangement you agreed to enter into. Enough on this tangent.

All of that aside, this is further verification, as I wrote to [u/StrivingforTruth16](#) over [here](#): "Tim Keller is a brilliant apologist and philosopher. He's not the best theologian." Notice that virtually all of his arguments in this excerpt are philosophical, springing from Scripture, not an interpretation of Scripture itself. That's a very dangerous sandbox to play in.

Submissive behaviour

7 upvotes · 12 March 2019 · /r/RedPillWomen

Glad to help. [r/RPChristians](#) might be a good place to get more red pill information within a Christian context :)

Boyfriend of 2 years having issues with going to work

7 upvotes · 4 March 2019 · /r/RedPillWomen

You're battling the dilemma between present feelings and future fruit. Right now, he's a tree caught on fire. You've decided to rest in his shade, as you'd expect to do from any other tree. To some degree, the fire makes things a little exciting. You want to know if the tree will burn down or somehow it'll come through and prove all those fantastical underdog stories we see in the movies. But probabilistic reality is that the tree will burn down. It will not bear fruit. And if you're resting in its shade without concern for the fire, you're going to burn with it.

You say, "I know he loves me." How is he expressing that love? Is he expressing it as a provider? As a leader? By modeling a lifestyle that you would want to follow? No, he's probably expressing it with words and professions of emotion. Watch what he does, not what he says. Saying he loves you means nothing if he's not *doing* anything to prove it.

While I'm open to hearing more information, if I go solely on what you've expressed here, he most certainly does not love you. At best, he's using professions of love toward you because he'd rather burn with someone, taking them down with him, than burn alone.

Does becoming more feminine attract men?

7 upvotes · 4 March 2019 · /r/RedPillWomen

Your look is like a modern art gallery - it's impressive and I enjoy looking at it from the other side of the glass, but I'd be content to move on to the next piece until I find something that takes my breath away. You look cool, not sexy. Sexiness is what will attract a man, cool can contribute to keeping him. You're going to have to find some balance in your look and when you express different aspects of your fashion.

Also, don't change to a sexy look just to attract a man and think you can go back to your original look all the time. A guy will leave pretty quickly if he feels like he was deceived and the sexual attraction factor is gone.

My Anger Phase

7 upvotes · 24 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

For many this may be true, but there are also a lot of church leaders who are very anti-sex but still glorify women. Their goal isn't sex. They're just genuinely screwed up by feminism and think that's what will put butts in their seats.

Learning to Let Go of Doubt and to Trust in a Partner?

7 upvotes · 22 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Why do I always envision the worst from a partner?

Probably too much time reading TRP without understanding TRP. Lots of guys there - and on any RP forum - tend to play the "don't trust women" card too much, without balancing it with what you *should do* instead. That's

right: be more interested in what you do than what you don't do. That's a general rule of life. In reality, when one understands and internalizes the red pill, the question of trusting a woman shouldn't even come up.

That is, you don't have to worry about whether or not she's cheating on you, or if she doesn't have feelings for you, or whatever - because her actions and emotions don't control you. If you're that emotionally invested in what she feels or thinks or does, then you're investing your emotions in the wrong place. Invest them in Christ, not her. Period.

- Suspect your girlfriend is cheating on you? No biggie, you've got 3 other girls you've been priming who are all into you.
- Wife is screaming her head off over something stupid, like not taking out the trash? Oh well. You've got amused mastery, so you recognize how childish she's acting and don't get wound up in her emotional hurricane.
- Not sure if the girl you like will say yes or laugh at you for asking her out? You've got more important things to worry about - like disciple-making - so it's really just a fun game to see which reaction she gives you.

There are no "but"s here. This is really simple stuff. The point of RP isn't to get you to distrust women. It's to get you to a point where you don't rely on your trust in women. That's a huge distinction.

Question: The perscription

7 upvotes · 22 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Lots to say on this, but for now let me just note: the red pill is truth and understanding. It is not a lifestyle or set of behaviors. There are behaviors that truth compels. If you discovered that bread suddenly has a 90% chance of giving you cancer and you don't currently have cancer, what would that knowledge do to your diet? Or if you discovered that eating raw brussel sprouts every day for a year would cause a leprechaun to show up at your door with a pot of gold, a wish, and a funny little dance, you'd start eating brussel sprouts, right?

The prescriptions we do give are not exhaustive possibilities, but they are common sense sense things once the truth is discovered.

- what if you discovered that having a 6 pack and bulging pecs would make your wife horny for sex with you all the time - would you do it?
- what if you discovered that learning to tell her no and laughing through her temper tantrums and emotional outbursts would cause her to respect you - would you do it?
- what if you discovered that disciple making would give God more glory than anything else you could possibly do and God would increase your influence on this earth because of it - would you do it?

See the point? Some of these things are no brainers. But like [u/rocknrollchuck](#) said, the specifics are going to be different for each person and their situation - and the list of general responses to every possible situation would be so long that we simply couldn't write it all. If we do give specific suggestions, it's in response to a specific situation. Even at that, Rule 2 is there for a reason.

It's like I say to all those people who ask incessantly: "Pray that God helps me learn his will for me today ... and tomorrow ... and the next day ... and for those random times that I just don't know what to do ... and ... and ... and ..."

God is less interested in telling you his will and more interested in helping you become the kind of person who doesn't need to ask in the first place. That is, your character will be so aligned with God's that your natural inclinations will be the right choice, whether you have divine prophecy about it or just pulled the idea out of your

butt.

We are doing the same thing with men. We don't give men behaviors to follow. We develop character. We create the foundation, not the structure atop it. Every man can make his own temple. We lay the concrete for him to get started.

HOW TO GET YOUR NEW YEAR OFF TO A GREAT START

7 upvotes · 27 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Well done, brother.

Christian Redpill books

7 upvotes · 25 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians

If it helps, I'm breaking my book into three parts.

1. The first part will be conceptual in nature, much like The Rational Male.
2. The second will be practical advice for singles.
3. The third will be practical advice for married men, much like MMSLP.

My writing style in book format is much different than on reddit posts. It is far more personal and story/analogy driven with significantly less verse by verse proofs of my points, though that is still there when applicable.

All books will be written to the uninitiated, on the assumption that those already well versed in the manosphere would be in less need of such a book in the first place.

Book 1 is about 60% done and on hold for further development until late January. It is divided into three parts currently titled:

- (a) Fantasy Land - an in-depth look at the misguided state of dating and marriage relationships. The focus is less on broader cultural issues and more on specific destructive beliefs and patterns people wind up in.
- (b) Welcome to the Real World - an in-depth look at many fundamental biblical and sociological concepts that the church has blinded itself to - the truth behind the idealism that was explored in part a.
- (c) Transitioning - what it takes for a man to open his eyes, moving from fantasy land to the real world.

These are all subject to change. I'm done with a and part way through b.

Worried about never being in a relationship

7 upvotes · 20 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I'd give more, but [u/RedPillWonder](#) really gave a great reply already. So let me say this instead:

You're still living in blue pill fantasies. That's ultimately going to be your biggest hindrance to making any real progress. You give too many flips about dating and relationships. Your post reeks of having fantasies of finding some great girl and getting married and having kids and putting them through college someday, like your dad did for you.

It's not wrong to want these things, but you're too emotionally invested in them. I'll leave this to [/u/sic_redditr cruiser](#) to post more on, but emotional investment isn't all that different from financial investment. You take your money, give it to someone else to control, and hope that they do better with it than you would have. With emotional investment, you're placing your emotional state at any given time in another person or ideology or institution and hoping that they will do better with your emotions than you would. If you're investing

your emotions in God, that's a wise investment. I'd do that every time. If you're investing them in the hope and idea of getting married someday, that's a bad investment. Ideologies don't care about you. They're not looking out for your ultimate well-being. They will not give you the return you're looking for, except by chance and accident.

How do I know you're struggling with this type of blue pill emotional investment problem? Two factors: (1) your depression issues, which almost always come with bad emotional investments; and (2) your statements on college being your "light at the end of the tunnel." That is, you had an emotional investment in the idea that college would be better than high school. The thing is, that investment didn't pay off. You only think it did. In reality, your college experience is not *better* because you invested so much emotion into it. Chances are, you probably would enjoy college even more if you weren't emotionally invested in the outcome. Or at best, you're getting the same experience you would have gotten even if you hadn't emotionally invested yourself in that ideology of what you thought college life would be like.

Now you're doing the same thing with women. Don't do that.

Be your own man. Be in control of your own emotions. If you aren't a good emotional manager, just like some people aren't good financial managers, the solution isn't to outsource your emotional stability to others, which always comes with a price and a risk. The solution is to become a better emotional manager in the first place. Be the king of your own world. Don't invite someone else to come into your world to rule it for you just so you can feel better. Feel better by liking the world you rule and making your kingdom a land you like in the first place.

But at the end of the day, if you're emotionally invested in ideologies and not managing your emotions on your own, the depression will continue and whatever girl you end up finding will learn to despise you - especially if you trick her into marrying you while you're like that. With this in mind, to answer your questions:

Is it a problem that I have never been in a relationship or kissed a girl?

No. It's only a problem if you make it one. It's not a flaw, it's an opportunity. Some girl wants to laugh at you for it? Own it. "I just haven't found a girl worth my time. I still haven't, honey." Move on.

But to break down and start kissing girls just to get over the stigma so that you can appease what others think about you and not have to worry about admitting you've never kissed a girl ... that's about as beta blue pill as it comes.

should I pursue women or give myself some more time to work on myself?

What's your mission? Don't work on yourself. Work on your mission. That might mean preparing yourself more adequately to pursue your mission. But don't make a girl your mission. Your mission has to be bigger than you and your hypothetical family. In the meantime, until you have a mission, you have nothing to offer a girl anyway. So no, don't be pursuing girls until you know where you want to lead them. Otherwise you're inviting them to follow you on an exciting adventure chasing your own tail. No girl wants that.

My worry is that if I continue to not have been with a woman it will be a red flag for the lady I'm pursuing in the future

Not if you own it. Right now you're in a scarcity mentality. You are in "I feel like I need this" mode. In reality, your mental state should be, "I'm the prize. I haven't found anyone worth my time yet."

The thing is, you might not actually be the prize yet, which is why you're stuck in need mode instead.

- Need mode is like coming out of a fast. It's been days since you've eaten. You're hungry. You see some food that's not particularly your favorite, but any food is better than no food, so you eat it anyway. Sure, they're dead calories, but at least they're calories.

- Abundance mode is like coming out of that same fast and realizing that the reason you were fasting was to drop your body fat. So, when you see that same lump of dead calories, you snub your nose at it. You don't need that in your system right now - it would be counter-productive to your end-goal. You're going to wait until you can make it out to a nice steakhouse to get a T-bone and broccoli, savoring the deliciousness of protein and green - the meal you really wanted, not the dead calories you would otherwise have placated yourself with.

You don't need to be with a woman. You do need to figure out what you really want to accomplish with your life - something you'd be proud to tell God about on Judgment Day - and then start taking steps to accomplish that. The journey there is where you're going to find her. More about that on the sidebar in posts you've allegedly already read ;)

Hosting a Board Game Party

7 upvotes · 1 November 2018 · /r/RedPillWomen

Party Game: Imaginiff

Strategy Game: Diplomacy

Team Game: Pandemic or Forbidden Island

One v/and Everyone Else: Letters From Whitechapel; Mystrium (two best board games in existence, IMO)

Group Interactive Movie: Hidden Agenda (PS3) - it's basically a movie that you collectively influence by voting through an app on your phone to reach one of several endings

Nibbles: Chips and Queso

Queso Recipe: 1 brick of Velveta, 1 regular size jar of Pace thick and chunky, 1 cup of green olives, 2 cans drained Rotel tomatoes and green chilis, 1 can hormel chili (only thing that might not be gluten free, if that's an issue), red hot (to taste)

The Consciously Crazy Wife

7 upvotes · 29 October 2018 · /r/askMRP

Yes.

"I think I was just raped"

7 upvotes · 8 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

"We made sure she was okay until the police arrived- I hope justice is served fairly. It was a bad night."

I would hope the dangers of false rape accusations would elicit a greater concern than this awful neutrality. If she was actually raped, I'm sure your take-away would be very different. But given that the story ends with her talking to the police about getting a guy arrested on a false rape charge, suddenly neutrality is better than an impassioned defense of the victim. Interesting.

Married Red Pill - Husbands submit yourselves to your wives...

7 upvotes · 3 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

The idea of mutual submission is very new in human history. Even after the rise of literacy, when people became able to read and interpret the bible for themselves and the varying denominations started coming up for every new theological concept ... male headship persisted as their nearly exclusive way of interpreting the bible. Then culture changes and all of a sudden their meaning of the bible changed to ... hmm ... smells fishy.

I'm not as concerned with one wrong interpretation (though this is certainly a big one) as I am with the fact that you just assume in your original post that mutual submission is biblical without even questioning it - and that your trust in this particular man, who you've likely never met, puts you in a position of blindness. Read Acts 17 and tell me what it says the Bereans did when Paul - author of most of the new testament - tried to teach them. Tell me if they were scolded for this or commended.

Just some things to think about :)

Preachers your listen to

7 upvotes · 25 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Just me, God, His Spirit, and His Word. That's not to say preachers don't have value to contribute, but I always find myself more interested in what God wants to tell me than what he told other people.

Suitable Mates in Church

7 upvotes · 14 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

You've got some impressive stats, my friend. Physically and monetarily it seems like you're in the prime of your life to find a top-notch girl. It's nice that you have a big pond, but if you're not attracted to anyone in your church, it's time to start looking outside your church.

What's your mission in life? It sounds like the American dream is that mission for you. Whatever you end up deciding, your mission will help you better target your pool of candidates. "Church" is an easy default answer because it's where most Christians are found, but by developing a clearer mission you can expand your social network to a degree that both advances your mission and puts you in contact with other women who you might not otherwise have gotten to know.

OZ wrote a fantastic guide on your exact question, which is posted on the sidebar [here](#). In that post, he references some pretty dismal stats about finding the right girl in church. It's rough. So, he gives some great suggestions for ways to tilt those odds in your favor:

- Relocate
- Change your social network
- Lead something at church
- Look outside your own denomination
- Get involved in non-church groups and activities
- Improve your perceived abundance
- Use the internet
- Import
- Be willing to date younger

These are all great.

Another thing I always recommend is to raise someone up. Unicorns don't exist in the wild, but they can be made. Secular RP talks about "training your slut" ... on RPC I'd call it "evangelize and disciple your godly slut" or whatever tamer language you might prefer.

To be clear, I **DO NOT** recommend evangedating. Don't engage in romantic relationships with non-Christians on

the hope that they might become saved. But you can evangelize to a non-Christian on the hope that she might one day become date-worthy. The distinction is which comes first. In evangedating, the relationship precedes salvation. In evangelizing-to-dating, the focus is on a woman's salvation, which precedes any actual relationship. This can be quite delicate, but I'll tell you that I know many, many, many truly godly men and women who are only saved because an attractive person invited them to a Christian event. For many of these people, they never even ended up in a relationship with that person, but the invitation alone was enough to get them moving in the right direction. This includes the guy who disciplined me.

Ultimately, my best recommendation is to expand your social network. Make good use of meetups.com for an easy way to filter people without the feel of online dating. You can either join bible studies through there or you can join a writing group or an ultimate frisbee game or whatever. It's a great way to build your social network in a low-commitment environment and scout for potential people without the impression that it has to hop immediately into a romantic relationship, which happens with online dating or asking someone out who you met at the bar or a coffee shop.

I hope this helps. Good luck and God's blessings, brother.

Pre-Marital Sex

7 upvotes · 8 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I'm pretty sure I'm the one you read posting that theory. To be clear, I predominantly proposed it only as that: a theory. I was ultimately not persuaded in full. I am now convinced that marriage does require an active covenant, just as the Church's relationship with Christ is covenant-oriented.

To that end, I would ask: did she have a covenant with these other men? If not, she has merely engaged in a reproductive act with someone other than her would-be husband. This is troublesome, but it is also not unusual for Christ to accept the same from his bride.

Throughout history God's people - whether through Israel or the church - have engaged in idolatry, even to the point of proselytizing (spiritual reproducing) in favor of those foreign gods. Many people today still engage in spiritual reproduction with other gods, yet Christ welcomes them with open arms.

For example, suppose Bill Nye, a prominent proselytizing atheist who has made an intentional effort to convince people away from Christianity - imagine if he broke down and decided to submit himself before Christ. Do you think Jesus would say, "Sorry, but you've done too many bad things with your old gods, so I refuse to accept you"? No, he accepts us with open arms.

That doesn't mean we are obligated to accept non-virgins. God still preferences the pure. But it does leave the option open for those in your situation to marry one another.

Of course, this all comes crashing down if she had a legitimate covenant with any of the previous men.

[Discussion] Love After MRP

7 upvotes · 22 May 2018 · /r/askMRP

This would be fun to discuss on [r/RPChristians](#) - but from a purely secular vantage, love means something very different and that definition often differs from person to person.

The RP position is generally that women cannot love men the way men want to be loved. Their love is not for *him*; it is for *what he has to offer her*. Sometimes that can be emotional alone. Other times it requires some modicum of tangible contribution - good job, good sex, good parent, good physique that she can show off to her girl friends, etc. 99.9999% of the time, once the guy stops offering what she expects out of the marriage, he gets the famous line: "I love you, but I'm not in love with you." This womanese translates to: "I don't love you, but I'm going to tell you I do in vague terms because I don't want to feel like I'm a bad person."

Now, I could go on for pages about how the ancient Greeks and philosophers of old define love, but in all my studies I find three core principles:

- **PASSION** - Some people like to define love as a feeling - an emotional excitement at being with someone else. In my view, this is one component of love, and most likely the least of the three. I have yet to meet a relationship that can maintain NRE for longer than 2-years post-marriage. After that, the passion always converts to the practical, but comes back in waves. One of the most beneficial things RP does for men is teaches them to set aside this illogical passion (which is always the source of ONEitis) in favor of a more grounded perspective on relationships - one that can still involve passion, but is not dominated by it.
- **COMPANIONSHIP** - You've probably heard people say: "Everything about the other person is perfect, except the sex!" Despite the fact that they're lying to themselves, those on the more honest end of the spectrum are the people who probably do have a genuine love through their companionship. Their expression of love is not through emotion and sex; it is through their behaviors. They like doing things together. They laugh at each other's jokes. They comfort one another when they're down. Their love is not defined by how they feel; it's defined by what they do and how they act toward the other person.
- **COMMITMENT** - The final expression of love is on the strength of the bond in the face of adversity. We see story after story of adventurers who are in love and will travel across a world, fight dragons, and sludge through swamps to be with a woman, despite the fact that he's nowhere near her and thus isn't getting the emotional bubbles and they're not expressing companionship with one another. In modern marriages, these are the people who have been dealt a raw hand in life, aren't particularly excited about the relationship, but who will never give up.

Everyone works through some combination of these. Here's how those combinations play out:

Singular

- People who are only passionate and have no companionship or commitment are basically just hooking up for one-night stands or short-term relationships. If they do get married, it won't last for long.
- People who are only seeking companionship often find themselves in dead bedrooms where they tell themselves, "I have a roommate, not a spouse," and they get divorced.
- People who are only committed end up in miserable long-term marriages and wish they weren't so afraid to commit suicide.

Double

- If you lack passion, but have the other two, you fall into the "everything's great but the sex" relationship. That causes a lot of internal bitterness that starts to taint even the well-intentioned interactions you otherwise have with your spouse. These people stay married, but something is forever lacking and disappointed.
- For others, companionship is what's lacking. They live totally separate lives, each doing their own thing. The fact that their lives are oriented in different directions often even gets in the way of their otherwise mutual lust. There is a sense that the relationship just isn't going anywhere and even great sex and a strong commitment can't fix the problems in their day-to-day lifestyles.
- If you lack commitment, people end up cheating on each other and getting divorced as soon as times get hard or when the next best thing comes along.

Scales

In my view, the ideal is, of course, to have some balance of all three. The problem is when a person weighs too

heavily on one of these at the expense of the others.

- An over-emphasis on the commitment aspect of a relationship can make you become a weak and needy beta that kills her passionate feelings toward you. Over-commitment also makes a man disillusioned about how committed his spouse might be. But under-commitment keeps people out of LTRs altogether, which often-times might not fit within a man's MAP. For example, there are countless articles explaining why it's difficult for single guys to get certain jobs or go into politics as compared with married men. Fun fact, there have only ever been 2 guys who were single when elected president ... and one of them married while in office.

Marriage/LTRs provide a distinct social advantage that can provide value to a man's life, but it also means the commitment scale can't be set at 0 if a man wants to reap those advantages. A 2 or 3 out of 10 might be more appropriate - more if the threat of divorce rape is particularly strong under the facts of a marriage. And note that "marriage" is not the same as commitment (despite mistaken female beliefs) - it predominantly exists to give an incentive for those in the advantageous position in a relationship not to break their commitments.

- An over-emphasis on ...

... and I'm at work and ran out of time.

Need help with possible divorce.

7 upvotes · 16 May 2018 · /r/askMRP

So you married a sugar mama and got all whiny when she didn't act like you're the sugar daddy. Seriously? What did you expect when you married a woman 5 years older with a more established position in life and you're still in school?

I understand women behave like children

That's for other people. Your girl doesn't behave like a child. She behaves like a man. Why? Because you're not behaving like a man. Just look at how you describe her:

- She's the one who makes the demands and sets the expectations
- She's very smart
- She's very hard working
- You expect her to support you
- She employs overt dread on you
- When things are hard she STFU and walks away

Here's how you describe yourself:

- You disagreed with TRP philosophy and idolized marriage
- You're the one to receive the demands and live up to her expectations
- You're lesser in intelligence than her and obviously (from the context of your post) more emotional
- You look to "love" as what defines your relationship with your wife
- You expect her to support you rather than you being the supporter
- You're complaining that you're not appreciated

No wonder neither of you are happy ... she's a woman stuck acting like the man in the relationship, and you're the actual man, but you're acting like a little girl. Nobody can be satisfied in a marriage like that.

reading TRP since I was 18 ... TRP is basically engraved into my brain

This is all that comes to mind

You have learned absolutely nothing. You have applied absolutely nothing. Your post reads like your 3 years or TRP reading can be summed up as: "Get buff and express no emotions whatsoever under any circumstances." The first part is true, the second part is not ... and even though you seem to think that's what TRP is, you still fail at that. It's not about expressing no emotions - it's about controlling which emotions you express and presenting your emotions in the most advantageous way to your interests.

Get divorced if you want to, but your problems are going to go with you. Start reading the sidebar again, but pretend you're on day 1 and you've never read any of it and assume everything in it is describing you perfectly, even if you would otherwise think, "I've already mastered that." You didn't.

Is there anything we as young men we can do to slowly dispel a Jezebel spirit with RP principles?

7 upvotes · 29 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I'm not sure I understand the problem. You dated a girl at work. It didn't work out. You've got some lingering oneitis you're not quite willing to admit to, so you can't really let her go. Everything else is unnecessary detail and musings.

If you read someone else's post that simply said, "I still have a little oneitis for my ex. What should I do?" how would you answer that user?

Now, you're going to deny it's oneitis and claim you're fine with moving on, right? Then just do it. If there is no oneitis, this shouldn't be bothering you.

Matthew 16:24-26 interpretation by RPChristians?

7 upvotes · 5 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

How should one interpret this as a Christian that is RP?

The same way every other Christian should interpret it: the way Jesus meant it.

Let me break this down:

If anyone wishes to come after Me

I.e. you can't claim to be a Christ-follower (or "Christian") if you don't meet the following ...

he must deny himself and take up his cross and follow Me

I.e. he must set aside his own ambitions, put them to death, and adopt mine instead. In the context of the first part above, it's clear that Christ's ambition is to get people to follow him, just as our ambition should be to get people to follow us as we follow Christ (1 Cor. 11:1), ergo discipleship.

For whoever wishes to save his life will lose it

I.e. if you're only concerned about maximizing your own earthly life, you'll eventually lose your earthly life anyway

but whoever loses his life for My sake will find it

I.e. if you set aside your earthly life for my purposes, having killed your own ambitions in exchange for mine, then you'll actually find life for yourself

For what will it profit a man if he gains the whole world and forfeits his soul? Or what will a man give in exchange for his soul?

I.e. worldly pursuits mean nothing; only that which has eternal consequence matters

SUMMARY: The RP Christian should abandon his own mission and adopt the mission of Christ to make disciples of Christ. We should model that mission for others, just as Christ modeled it for us. We should be leading the next generation in such a way that they learn how to lead the subsequent generation.

Also, how would one tie this in with boundaries and frame when it seems to be emptying of the ego (kenosis)?

This passage is not about humility, ego, attitude, etc. There are other passages for that. This one is simply about whose mission you're following. It suggests that men should abandon their own worldly pursuits and follow in the example of Christ, adopting his mission for our lives instead of our own. It says nothing of ego.

Now, if you want to get to passages like Philippians 2:3, that's a different conversation.

What do you think? Shit test or not?

7 upvotes · 6 February 2018 · /r/askMRP

Girls play with narrative crafting. Don't be a girl. Your response was fine.

Personally, I prefer positive emotional responses over neutral ones. A month ago my wife asked the same of me: "Can you go warm up the car?"

Answer: *Sure thing, babe.* She goes off to do something else. She goes outside and comes back in after finding the car still off.

Her: "I thought you were going to warm up the car for me!"

Me: *I did. In fact, I did you one better.* I pull out two hot wheels I was sitting on and tossed them to her. *I warmed up two cars for you!*

Her emotional reaction went from ticked to playful angry. No lingering issues when she got home.

FR: The Spousal Support Scam

7 upvotes · 28 January 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

It's more that attorneys don't typically think this way when crafting arguments. Our job is to interpret the law for a judge, not argue why the judge should ignore the law or change it. So, once a status quo is developed most attorneys argue to maximize what the status quo would give their clients.

The documentary commented that the reddit incarnation of the red pill differs from the MRA incarnation in that it doesn't seem to change the system, rather we want to use the system to our own advantage.

That's what got me thinking about how to utilize the existing laws to work for men rather than against them, without actually changing the law, which I doubt I could accomplish. This type of thinking is unnatural when it defies the status quo ... and as smart as I sometimes think I am, even I didn't think of it on my own without inspiration from others who vie against the status quo - how much less is someone trapped in a blue framework going to think up red positions/arguments on his own?

TL;DR - judges will listen to arguments like this, and I'm sure I'm not the first one to use this argument, but it's rare for them to come up in the first place.

Preempting the DV charge.

7 upvotes · 14 November 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

The federal wiretap act only applies to active/ongoing communications, not past communications on a server or in an e-mail database or otherwise saved on a computer. The Electronic Stored communications Act does protect people from third party disclosures (i.e. Google can't share the contents of your e-mail), but does not protect any information to the degree that it is stored privately (i.e. can be accessed by a home computer).

That said, people do have a reasonable expectation of privacy. When a person conducts themselves in a manner that leaves their privacy knowingly vulnerable, they no longer have an expectation of privacy. So, if your wife frequently lets you use her phone or laptop (as mine does) or otherwise shares her password to access those things (as mine also does), then she has no expectation of privacy for your use of those items until she changes her password and declines to tell you. Moreover, if she leaves her password for her e-mail saved on the device, the use of which is not private, then utilizing those passwords is also not a matter of privacy.

To quote a popular case, *Hazard v. Hazard*, a wife entered her husband's e-mail and read communications between him and his attorney. The Court noted: "Husband voluntarily placed this content in the computer to which Wife had access. This effectively allowed the contents of the letter to be communicated to Wife the same as if Wife had overheard a conversation of Husband with his attorney."

That said, although there are likely no federal implications for violation of constitutional privacy rights, individual states may impose their own restrictions. I can only speak to my state, which does not have any such additional restrictions beyond the constitutional right of privacy. To be cliché: *consult an attorney in your locality for more relevant information to your own state's laws.*

EDIT: **This article** is insanely helpful in figuring out marital privacy rights, if you're concerned.

found this on facebook

7 upvotes · 31 October 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

This was my gut reaction. If they are having sex even, my guess is that she just lays there soaking it all in, making him do all the work to get her off, and then she looks at him with a condescending smile and says, "Well, go ahead ... get on in and finish yourself up too, I guess."

[For Singles] Getting Laid Like a Christian (part 1)

7 upvotes · 31 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Haha ... that's pretty much the exact reason this sub exists. 99% of content out there for Christians falls in the "sold short" category. I've known at least a dozen marriage counselors, I've talked to pastors about their views on things, heard sermon after sermon on the topic, read numerous books ... and it ultimately all fails.

From what I gather, the reason they mostly fail is because they tend to treat marriage as its own box in isolation from the rest of everything else men and women are to be doing in life. When we do that, however well intentioned we may be, we're at least subliminally (if not directly) communicating that marriage is an end in and of itself - that marriage for the sake of marriage is worth pursuing.

That's why I try to hammer home the idea that men need to have a purpose in life outside the marriage. If he makes his wife his purpose, how can she fulfill the reason God created woman in the first place: to be a helper?

Another big problem with marriage advice in the church is that it tends to put all the responsibility on the man.

"You're the leader. You're supposed to sacrifice for her like Christ sacrificed for the church" - and then they only look at the crucifixion as the only example of how the relational dynamic should work. "See? Christ died for the church because he loved his bride so much. Women, shouldn't you respect him for his willingness to sacrifice so much for you?" But this attitude fails to realize all the other aspects of what Jesus was doing in his life. The Gospel isn't just about how awesome Jesus was in sacrificing for the church - it is a call for all people to lay down their lives for the sake of something bigger - to advance the cause of a Kingdom where we're going to spend the rest of eternity.

If a husband and wife are too nitpicky over who does the dishes more often, they've already lost. If we have a full, eye-opening perspective of what God is trying to do through marriage (Malachi 2:15), the trite things stop mattering. We care less about whether the deck is swabbed to perfection or the cabins have been dusted and more about navigating around icebergs and keeping the ship on the narrow course to our destination, picking up as many passengers adrift at sea as we can along the way. This is the only way marriage can truly work - when we're living out the purpose for marriage that God gave us.

Edit: I should also add that it's not just general "marriage advice" here. Most people here are in marriages that have suffered at one time (if not currently) severe sexual dysfunction or dead bedrooms. This is pretty much the opposite of what God expected from marriage. In fact, being "one flesh" is how he defines marriage in the first place ... so marriage without sex is kind of self-defeating.

So, a lot of stuff here is also targeted toward resolving that problem. But getting a mission beyond pursuing your spouse is always going to be the first step to success, even in that context.

[For Singles] Getting Laid Like a Christian (part 1)

7 upvotes · 31 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Rule 1: You are not seeking to befriend, date, court, or even marry a woman. Those are simply the means to an end: sex.

Well, the primary purpose is to find a helper to assist you in fulfilling your mission. But given that Paul says in 1 Cor. 7 you'll be more capable of this if you remain single and the primary reason to marry is if you "burn with passion for one another," I see your point. To that end, if you're married and not having sex, this will totally cripple you as a person and be the single most influential thing in preventing you from fulfilling God's calling to make disciples. But once you do have a stable sex life, the real goal of the marriage is toward spiritual reproduction - the thing that sex (physical reproductive acts) was always meant to point toward in the first place.

purity is not the same thing as asexuality

This is a solid line that I wish more single Christians understood - my old self included.

You should be teasing her, dropping a neg or two if she is especially attractive or full of herself, and holding concrete frame as she throws tests at you

I do want to clarify:

- Negging employed as a means of playful teasing is constructive. This is done best when your negging isn't actually true or only has a hint of truth and she knows it. Most women actually like this and desire it.
- Negging for the sake of calling someone out on their sin and getting their pride in check can also be constructive. This only works if the negging is actually true. Most women (or people in general) don't like this or desire it, but it's necessary for spiritual maturity anyway.

- But negging for its own sake, as a rote display of dominance to inflate your status over hers ... I would be far more cautious there and really examine your motives and the potential psychological harm you may be causing - particularly if there's no actual truth to the negging or it's not connected to a sin issue. For example, if she doesn't have an inflated ego about her looks, negging her about having a big nose (especially if it's a normal size) isn't going to be constructive and would probably not be a godly tactic to employ.
 - For fun, the Seinfeld episode *The Andrea Doria* addresses this issue perfectly - showing how a man who negs can be really attractive to a woman, but how unhealthy certain types of negging can be if done in an ungodly or inappropriate way. One of these days I might write up a post on all the truths inherent in Seinfeld that many people just seem to miss ... or not.

Should you test for theological compatibility? Should you verify she is "wife material"? Yes, of course. But that can be later down the line. Start with getting her attracted to you.

I used to object and think, "No, you're better off figuring out if you're theologically compatible first." There's merit to both sides. But I do now see the value in developing the attraction first, as this is more difficult to foster and lends itself to greater influence in discipling your girl. The more attracted she is to you, the more likely she will be *Faithful*, *Available*, and *Teachable* in a relationship with you. Simply put, trying to find a girl who is *already theologically and spiritually where you want her to be* is going to be a one-in-a-million shot. You're better off finding someone who's Faithful, Available, and Teachable and leading her into godliness.

I explained that my mission was more important than her.

This is another central key that most Christians miss. Why? Because most don't have a mission in the first place.

Failing to resist temptation is simply breaking your own frame and succumbing to hers.

Well said. Let me extend this to all sin: *Failing to resist temptation is simply breaking your own frame and succumbing to the enemy's - Satan's, demons, 'rulers and principalities' and all that.*

You don't want a shrew without a sex drive of her own.

Ah, but this is what many Christian men get anyway. It's how the church raises women to be - my wife is no exception. When you say, "They want sex," I know that at their core, this is true, but that for many, many, many women in the church this desire is so heavily repressed and shamed and criticized that it may never rear its head again ... particularly if the husband isn't competent enough as a leader to help her overcome the repression.

I am simply explaining why it is so alluring for men

Exactly. That's why SGM references the emotional aspects of sex - that it's not just rote physical pleasure; it's the need to feel wanted and desired. 2 seconds of skimming [r/deadbedrooms](#) will affirm this as well.

So how do you find these magical unicorns (hot Christian women who want sex for their own pleasure's sake)? That is a subject for a future post

I'm eager to hear your thoughts on this one. [This thread](#) from a couple years ago always amazes me and is worth researching - especially [this comment](#) coupled with [this addendum](#). Good research for that upcoming post! The top comment by [/u/3kindsofsalt](#) is also well worth a look.

Wifey misses the feelz

7 upvotes · 23 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I have dealt with this exact conversation. In fact, my wife brought up this notion again last week. Here are a few things to note:

FIRST: You can't control how she feels, therefore you're not responsible for her feelings. Assuming you're OYS and living out your faith, you're ...

- giving her a good life
- giving her the means to have an impact on eternity through your God-given mission
- faithful
- happy and fun to be around

There is no commandment: "Thou shalt open your heart to your wife and tell her everything so she can feel good and intimate." Don't try to take personal responsibility for her inability to feel intimately connected to you. If you want to be vulnerable with her, go for it. It may actually help. But you are not Scripturally obligated to do so.

SECOND: Stoicism doesn't mean walling off emotion. I'm not sure what it used to look like when you were vulnerable with her or what that word means to the two of you, but "be stoic" is not the same as "be a cold, emotionless robot." Stoicism is more about exercising restraint and self-control during unpleasant or painful experiences. It's about maintaining self-control, rather than letting your emotions get the best of you.

THIRD: The only real biblical basis for emotional intimacy being part of a Christian marriage is the example we see in Song of Solomon. But that's not a command: "Your marriage must look exactly like this!" It's more an example of a relationship from which we can draw principles. That said, we do see that physical intimacy is what creates the marital bond between husbands and wives - both at a physical and spiritual level. Genesis 2 references the "one flesh" concept as the defining concept of a marriage, and 1/2 Corinthians 6 both talk about the spiritual bond that is formed during sex. If your wife wants an emotional connection to you (again, something you can't control), it's her responsibility to work that out based on who you are rather than trying to control you to become the type of person she thinks she can have that connection with.

The first time my wife mentioned this I was still pretty new to the RP world, so I mostly just fogged and STFU like you did. She kept hammering the, "Why are you being so cold?!?" line and I just kept fogging and pressure-flipping, "You're right, I am being cold. Do you have any ideas on why that might be?"

Rather quickly, I started adding back in all of the positive emotions that I should have been expressing rather than being robotic. Of course, I thought I was expressing those before, but it wasn't coming out as clearly as I believed at the time. Expressing the positive range of emotions abated the issue, but even then this past weekend my wife brought the issue up again - this time slightly differently.

Instead of complaining about my emotional state, she began by affirming all of the ways that I have improved and that I'm generally a more fun person to be around ... but this time was complaining about how being told "no" on occasion and me taking the lead on several major life issues was making her feel powerless and controlled, and that she couldn't feel connected to me because she no longer understood what was going on in my head. She said, "You're changing so much that I just don't know who you are anymore and I don't know how to be your wife." I was expecting her to say that she didn't like who I was becoming - but that line never came.

Then she went somewhere weird [noting that at this point in the conversation I had yet to actually talk]: "I want to follow your lead and be the submissive wife God calls me to be, but I don't want to feel controlled either. I also don't know what it means to be submissive - I see that word talked about a lot in general, but there are no clear examples to show what a submissive wife does or what it means to be submissive. [Nod to [/u/slipknot_is_metal](#)] I

want to know you and feel close to you, but I don't know how to do that if you're processing everything yourself and then just doling out responsibilities to me and the kids to put whatever it is you're thinking into action. I want to be part of that process."

I interpreted a lot of this as a good sign, but also as a fitness test. It tells me the 1,000 foot rope is reeling in more and more, but also that she's finding some kind of angle to dig in for more power. To that end, I'm happy to give her some. After all, Jesus delegates decision-making authority all the time - and I had been doing that. But what I'm not okay with doing is feeling like I have to spill my guts every time I have a thought about how to lead the family or stay on track with our mission.

The easy solution, which I implemented over the weekend, was simply to ask her lots of questions - get her feedback on the things that I'm processing. I then filter what she tells me and lay out a plan of action. For example, we're part of a team that's organizing a church conference in February. I have a lot of ideas for this and the group looks to me to develop most of the content. I know this stuff inside and out, whereas my wife is brand new to all of it. So, although I have a ton of stuff planned out to share at our meeting this Thursday, I asked my wife for her thoughts and input too.

Although I won't be implementing most of what she said, where she had valuable things to contribute, I will give her credit for these things. The group doesn't need to know that I thought of these things first. I want my wife to feel like part of the team, so I'm letting her take the credit for her ideas, as I have enough of my own to contribute that she never mentioned.

Interestingly, this put the whole issue to rest (so far, at least). What I've found (and I knew this before, but have seen it now again in a new context) is that "emotional intimacy" for a woman isn't about getting to know you deeply; it's about getting to share herself *to you* on deep and important issues. She wants to feel like you include her in your deep, processing core - that she matters to you there. It doesn't mean you're opening up the side panel and letting her inspect your harddrive, video card, and all the nuts and bolts or test them to see how they work.

So, long story short, my advice is to start finding important life issues and ask her questions about it. Probe deeply and ask her to really think long and hard. When her deep emotional core is engaged and she's expressing that *to you*, that's when she will feel that emotional intimacy, regardless of how transparent or vulnerable you are. If what she says aligns with what you think is best (whether you already thought that or she legit changed your mind, it doesn't matter), implement it and give her credit for it ("That was a great idea!"). For everything else, just do what you think is best anyway, and if she complains, just say, "I heard what you had to say, I thought about it, and I decided to go a different direction. Thanks for giving me some things to think about - I appreciate your insights and look forward to continuing to talk about these things."

Now, there is room for vulnerability on top of this. If you legitimately need help - invite her to be the one to help you. If you're struggling with sin, ask her to keep you accountable. If you're feeling sad and can't get out of a funk, ask her to cheer you up. Don't make her responsible for these things. She doesn't want to be responsible. But she does want to help. The husband is the leader and responsible one; the wife is designed by God to be his helper. Let her fulfill that role (see [102 for more information on that](#)).

Fucking Divorce

7 upvotes · 26 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

We have no legal documentation written up yet that says she can move out

She doesn't need a legal document granting her permission to move out. What you're talking about is a motion you'll have to file titled: *Motion for Exclusive Use and Occupancy of the Premises*. These are only granted (1) if one party has already moved out voluntarily, (2) if there is violence between the parties, or (3) if there are children involved and the hostility between the parties is affecting the well-being of the children.

That said, here's some advice.

1. If you're going to chew her out, as [/u/JDRoedell](#) said, don't do it over text. This makes you look like a wuss. Be a man. Say it to her face. Also, why would you chew her out in a written forum that she could then show to a judge? Idiocy. If you say anything negative or try to address these issues, either pay an attorney to draft it for you (because you obviously can't write tactfully yourself) or do it in person to minimize the risk of being recorded.
2. How do you get from "Sure it could be nothing" to "I'll talk to my lawyer"? It sounds to me like you got butthurt with no real evidence of anything happening and she's thinking, "Geeze, that idiot's so insecure ... maybe I should hook up with his friend. He's probably a much higher-value man anyway." Let me re-word that to make this clearer: *You're the one who is causing this problem.* She's just being her normal self. You've given her nothing to work with and decided to chew her out and lawyer-up for her being a girl. If she actually cheated and you have proof, great ... I get it. But you're flying off the handle over nothing.
3. Upvote to [/u/SteelToeShitKicker](#) because I get the impression that you've made no progress here. Since February? In 3 months, from June to September, I pulled my bench up by over 100lbs. You've had 7 1/2 months. The internal confidence from getting buff should, even with no other improvements, have put you in a stable enough spot to handle this crap, yet here you all getting butthurt. Even if your lifts have gone up, you've made no progress in any other area. Why? Because this vent session proves it:
 - Can't AA (or you would have told us about it when you responded to her crap excuses)
 - No amused mastery (butthurt = the exact opposite)
 - No abundance mentality (because you say you want her gone, yet care way too much that she's leaving)
 - Haven't read WISNIFG (if you had, you'd know how to fog/broken record through this stuff) ... or if you did, you didn't understand a single word

As far as divorce input goes, I don't nearly have enough information to provide any help. Length of marriage? Kids? Incomes for each of you? Assets? There are just too many variables not given. The best I can say is to file your motion for exclusive use and occupancy right away so she can't move back in part way through.

"I dream women will one day have the same rights as guns!"

7 upvotes · 21 September 2017 · [/r/RedPillWomen](#)

What was the person even thinking in the first place?

Love and Respect Bible Study (semi-RP)

7 upvotes · 11 September 2017 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I'm pretty familiar with the book (been a long time, though). My recollection is I was very disappointed because it seemed to be imbalanced in how it approached relationships. Specifically, in the dichotomy between (1) sexual attraction and (2) emotional comfort, it focuses almost exclusively on the emotional comfort angle. Although it brings up sex, it's more of a passive thought than a main point.

In my experience, most men come to believe their wives respect them through sexual submissiveness and desire. If a wife doesn't desire her husband sexually or isn't responsive to his sexual advances, that's the leading cause of a man feeling disrespected. It communicates to the man: "You're not enough of a man for me to want you." The book then talks about how to fix a man's feelings toward his wife by fixing the relationship without really getting into the nuts and bolts of the sexual attraction aspect.

The result is that if "men are the gatekeepers of commitment and women are the gatekeepers of sex" - it's teaching both men and women how to enhance their commitment while doing very little to enhance their sex life. The result is that if one were to apply the book steadfastly, the relational commitment ("ahava" love in the Hebrew) might improve by 5 points for every 1 point that the couple's sex life might improve.

To that end, there is an implicit (and if I recall, maybe even an explicit) covert contract being promoted: *When husbands love their wives and wives respect their husbands, you'll get great sex.* But what if the wife, who doesn't actually respect her husband, doesn't care to get better sex? She has even less motivation to respect her husband - or if she does, she channels her respect into things that feed into the "emotional comfort" part of the dichotomy, while the couple is left without anything that actually increases sexual desire between the two of them. It is a false assumption the book makes that men loving their wives will somehow prompt respect (by ending the crazy cycle and ushering in the rewarding one), and therefore sex will abound. The book is right about shifting from a crazy to rewarding cycle, but the "sex will abound" implication is misplaced. I have tried these tactics repeatedly throughout my marriage to no avail, leading me to a different path, which ultimately got me to RP.

But I openly accept any correction here, as my memory may be hazy and I read it at around the same time I read 5LL, which has a host of similar issues.

I'm dating two MGTOW.

7 upvotes · 30 August 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

I keep feeling like people are making a big deal out of them telling me what happened with their ex-girlfriends.

Well, the title of your post implies that this is the most important element. But from what you've described here, they are absolutely NOT MGTOW.

They seem like men who have learned their lesson as to how to vet women and looking for better qualities, does that make sense??

Perfect sense :) That's not MGTOW - that's just normal men who have some baggage. Most people have some baggage from past relationships, theirs is just a little above average - not even to the point of being an outlier.

From that end, your post is really: "I have two guys who are interested in me, which do I choose?" That's a much easier question to answer because the psychological implications of them being MGTOW aren't at issue. It's simply: which do you want more.

As for the other question you asked, you might naturally attract guys who have a history dealing with troubled women because maybe you have some trouble and baggage to yourself as well. *No More Mr. Nice Guy* talks about how certain types of guys love to find women with a problem and then try to fix them or be the solution. It makes them feel important and needed (but is also very unhealthy, even though they don't do this consciously). I don't know enough about your life to verify this, but it's the best guess I've got without more information.

Weak pastor comment

7 upvotes · 24 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

believe that their duty has been fulfilled

This. I hate this attitude with a fiery passion. Evangelism is not a duty - it's a lifestyle. As soon as it becomes a box that we can put a check mark in for each day or week or however infrequent one thinks is appropriate, we have lost the intimacy and ecstasy God intended evangelism to produce. It's duty sex in the context of spiritual

reproduction instead of physical reproduction. God doesn't want duty sex with us any more than we want it with our wives.

Which reminds me of another interesting point: starfish sex. Most people think that God wants us to just "stop and be completely empty" so he can do whatever he wants to with us. This couldn't be further from the truth. "Let go, let God" isn't a call to spiritual starfishing. It's a call toward active submissiveness. Men want their women to let them take control in the bedroom - to be able to do with her as we please; but we want her to be an active participant in that, not dead weight.

Your wife is a whore and you should divorce her

7 upvotes · 24 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Fair enough. At one point that was true, as I'm sure is the case for many (most?) men here.

Ok ASKMRP, riddle me THIS!!!

7 upvotes · 17 August 2017 · /r/askMRP

Simply put, monks are celibate. Be celibate. TRP uses it most often when guys are so sex-obsessed that they can't rationally focus on improving themselves. So, they're told, "Stop all efforts at trying to get sex and just work on you." In TRP that usually gets applied as "avoid trying to pick up girls," because it's almost impossible to keep sex off the brain. That said, practicing game is impossible if you do this, so a total "closing off" is not helpful.

In MRP terms, I understand this more to be that you shouldn't be forcing or expecting sex for quite some time. If it happens, great, but don't necessarily use it as an opportunity to practice all kinds of new things - just enjoy it for what it is until you've improved yourself enough that you can try something new with the confidence you'll need to pull it off.

In my life, my wife and I went 18 months without sex. For the first 6 of that I kept trying in all the beta ways I knew how. Then I just gave up. *Giving up is NOT monk mode*. It became monk mode for me when I realized I could potentially start re-engaging with my wife, but I intentionally declined to do so because I realized I had a lot more work to do before she would be doing it out of desire rather than obligation. I didn't want obligation sex. So, even after sex eventually happened again, I didn't pursue it - I just worked on me. At the tail-end of this phase, I discovered RP and started implementing things, which jived with all the self-improvements I was already making, but helped me focus my efforts. Almost immediately, things started changing with my marriage/sex life.

I described it best like traveling from CA to Pike's Peak in Colorado. Everything I had done before RP was like traveling the horizontal distance. Then, as I was already at the foot of the mountain, RP is what it took to start my ascent. That's when my monk mode ended. Monk mode is the horizontal distance to get to the mountain. If you try to ascend before you get to the mountain, you'd better have magical wings or you're just going to keep jumping and falling right back down. Get to the mountain first, then ascend. That's the purpose of monk mode.

Fogging, Amused Mastery, Agree and Amplify

7 upvotes · 16 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Good write-up. But did something happen to make the third section get all choppy?

Either way, this is a nice trifecta. With my particular wife I find that these actually work well in succession in a single conversation. AM gives me the mentality needed to hold frame, perceiving what she's doing/saying in a right context. Whatever she's complaining about, I'll usually start with fogging coupled with a technique I call "repeat and clarify" to demonstrate that I fully understand what she's saying (mastery), but my attitude still conveys that it is not as big a deal as she is making it out to be (amused), yet without belittling her in that process.

From there, she usually is happy just to be understood and she'll pick up on the AM and say things like, "I'm being silly, aren't I?" That's when I'll AA - "Sure you are. Let's both get a little silly tonight." Having been

understood and given a fresh perspective predominantly by my body language (I barely say anything during most of her rant), she's in a good mood again and receives the playfulness well.

If she insists on posing whatever she's ranting about, I like applying negative inquiry repeatedly to get to the core of the matter, then AA it away (if I know I can pull it off in confidence at the time, otherwise it's back to fogging and STFU). By waiting until she reveals the core of the issue, instead of her feeling like I'm being dismissive she gets validation where she really needs it, even though she was clueless about the core issue initially herself.

If I'm really on my game, I know her better than she knows herself, so my line of negative (sometimes mixing in positive) inquiry leads her down a path where I already know the conclusion - I just need to get her there without blabbing the answer to her up front. It makes a huge difference if I can help her figure it out I her own ... which is probably akin to amused mastery anyway.

Career beta...just took TRP.

7 upvotes · 15 August 2017 · /r/askMRP

I believe in God. You don't have to for this to make sense, but read Job 38:1 to the end of the book. For context, Job is stuck in a really crappy place in life. His family dies, his entire fortune is plundered, his body is covered in boils. If anything could go wrong, it has gone wrong (and this was part of an intentional plan). Job starts questioning God with all that "Why?" garbage. God's answer to Job is the ultimate RP answer. It starts ...

Who is this that obscures my plans with words without knowledge?

Your plans are what matter; she can't tell you what to do.

Brace yourself like a man; I will question *you*, and *you* shall answer me.

Pressure-flipping.

Where were you when I laid the earth's foundation? Tell me, if you understand. Who marked off its dimensions? Surely you know!

Amused mastery - God's getting playfully sarcastic about how trite this issue is in comparison to the bigger picture, and ultimately refuses to answer Job's questions.

[God:] "Will the one who contends with the Almighty correct him? Let him who accuses God answer him!" Then Job answered the Lord: "I am unworthy - how can I reply to you? I put my hand over my mouth. I spoke once, but I have no answer - twice, but I will say no more." Then the Lord spoke to Job out of the storm: "Brace yourself like a man; I will question you, and you shall answer me."

God's pressure-flipping and amused mastery worked. Job STFU and gave up, even though God never answered his accusations. So, God pressure-flips some more:

Would you discredit my justice? Would you condemn me to justify yourself?

This is what most wives do: they spin their hamsters to find a way to make you the bad guy, even when they're the one making the unreasonable request. She can do the whole ebay thing herself, but she doesn't. Instead of faulting herself for her laziness, she faults you to justify her not doing it.

Job's final conclusion?

Surely I spoke of things I did not understand, things too wonderful for me to know.

Become that wonderful to your wife - become that high-value and display that same sense of amused mastery at how trite this "ebay purchase for your wife's mom's friend" is in the grand scheme of your lives.

Of course, in the end, God doesn't do this just to stifle Job as some peon. God loves Job and ends up blessing him greatly beyond pretty much anyone else alive in that day. In the same way, bless your wife ... just don't put up with her garbage or feel like you have to answer her questions and challenges. Bless her on your terms, not hers. She'll value it more that way anyway because people value what they can't control. If she can control what you give her, it's cheap - she knows she can get what she wants when she wants, leaving it with no value to work for. If you decide when and how you're going to bless her, then your goodwill gets its value back.

Got married prior to discovering TRP. Now having sadness over the feeling of "not having had sex with enough women."

7 upvotes · 10 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I know what you're feeling - as I think should be the case for any Christian who has ever watched porn. The fact of watching porn is often one's "safe" way of acting on the desire to be with other women without many of the associated risks. So, wherever you hear of Christian men struggling with porn, know that you are not alone.

Personally, my n-count is 1: my wife. Yes, I have had the thought of having "missed out" on things before, but it doesn't take me long to remember where that thought is coming from - and it isn't God. My wife has actually expressed the same concern, although relationally and not with sex. I was the first guy she ever officially dated (also the first she ever even kissed), and at one time she said she wished she had been in more relationships to see if I was truly the best guy for her or if she just settled (that was several years ago - she doesn't think this way now).

Here's the deal ... and I'm going to be blunt with the rest of this post, so feel free to tell me off if I'm way off base. You make a few allusions to this "strong conscience" thing and express some fairly legalistic tendencies with the way you talk. I'm sure you'll want to get defensive about this, but roll with me for a second.

In the prodigal son story, you're the older brother. You see all the younger brothers who got to squander their inheritance - and indeed you did squander some of yours too (two brief excursions, to be exact), just not as much. Then you see how they got invited back into the fold and became fully-equal heirs again. This leads you into conflicting emotions: (1) that you deserve something for your faithfulness (i.e. a more satisfying sex-life), even though you did have two other Ns before marriage, thus weren't actually fully faithful (you seem to justify this with some modicum of pride in how low that number is and how long it took before you lost your virginity); and (2) a resentment against your younger-brothers who got to squander what God gave them, and yet still be welcomed back with open arms, wishing you could have gotten away with that too.

But your legalism won't let you get away with it. You know better now. You've seen younger brothers come and go and you know what's right and wrong, so you can't go cheat on your wife to get your fun days in anymore. I mean, really - if you wanted to, that's your answer. Go cheat on your wife with dozens of girls. Get out all your fun, then be welcomed back by open arms. But your legalism tells you that this would do some irreparable damage to your relationship with God and you wonder whether or not you would be welcomed back at all if you so blatantly defied him after such knowledge of the truth - and these are legitimate concerns.

The bottom line is that your behavior of faithfulness is likely not a product of abundant love for Christ - it's a product of legalistic self-entitlement coupled with resentful jealousy.

If I'm right, knowing the cause of your problem is 90% of the way to figuring out the solution. The other 10% is always the same: preach the Gospel to yourself daily.

I don't have time to get into it now, but I utilize something called "The Lens Illustration" to help people see how

the Gospel applies to specific situations like these. That's probably still a couple months out, as far as my post series is concerned, but maybe I can accelerate it a bit or share in a PM, given that these types of things are coming up all the time.

Another thing that is probably worth noting, which is a clue as to the legalism and self-entitlement attitude I'm picking up is this:

It's obvious that God wants me to remain faithful to my wife, and only my wife, and it's something that she honestly deserves.

Any time I see the word "deserves" I immediately think: "The only thing we truly deserve is hell." We don't deserve God's grace or mercy. We don't deserve each other's affection, attention, loyalty, provision, etc. We deserve hell.

Get that "deserve" thought out of your mind and you'll start to overcome some of the female-worship mentality you seem to have toward your wife (also evidenced by the way you distinguish her from American girls - as if she's better, therefore is a *beautiful snowflake*).

Why is this significant? Because when you worship your wife as a female, yet she's not satisfying you - what's the natural conclusion? Worship other women. Maybe if you had more females in your notch count, you'd be satisfied, right? Have a healthy view of your wife and you'll have a healthy view of other women as well. This will lead you to the conclusion that only Jesus satisfies, not women.

Again, I may be totally off-base with all of this. So, take it for what it's worth. But as someone who's been where you're describing, take it from me that the Gospel is ultimately the solution - learning how to apply it in specific situations is what seems to confuse most people.

Divorce Incorporated

7 upvotes · 2 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

The US abolished common law marriage some time ago. Some states will still presume joint ownership of certain assets of actual ownership is ambiguous, but things like retirement accounts, spousal support, etc. are off the table.

Of course, the real answer is a well crafted prenup - best of both worlds.

Prenuptials

7 upvotes · 19 July 2017 · /r/askMRP

Divorce lawyer here. In my state, pre-nups are usually a solidification of already existing rights, except as to spousal support. So, if you want them to have real value, you need to know what types of issues are significant and negotiable where the court will actually let you get out of the statutory default. You cannot pre-nup custody or child support issues away, so that just leaves property division and spousal support.

Property Division

Property division is usually split into two categories: separate property and marital property. Marital property is usually defined as "anything that's not separate property." It's always split 50/50 unless such a split would be impossible or inequitable. For example, if the parties have a house worth \$250k (paid off) and a retirement account worth \$250k, you can't just do a this for that. The retirement account likely has tax-consequences to withdraw the money, so has to be tax-effected. The house isn't liquid and an attempt to liquidate the money from

it would cost realtor fees, brokerage fees, transfer tax, etc. So, although they technically have equal appraised values, you have to deal with all that stuff in the prenup or otherwise accept the fact that any marital components will have to be divided like-for-like. This gets ridiculous when one person insists on keeping the house, but has no resources to pay your half of the equity.

Separate property (in my state) is defined as (1) anything owned before the marriage, (2) received as a gift to one spouse only, even if from the other spouse, or (3) received by inheritance. Your pre-nup had better have an exhibit at the end identifying all of your assets and all of hers, otherwise you're wasting your time on the property division section. Really, preserving separate property is 90% of the value of a pre-nup.

It's also worth noting that you'll need some provisions on conversion of separate property to marital and vice versa, as well as a statement on how to deal with commingling. For example, suppose you have a paid-off \$75,000 starter home you're bringing into the marriage. You live there for a while, but after having kids you sell it and use the money to pay for a down-payment on a \$250k home. You then proceed to pay the mortgage out of the marital funds. By the time you're getting divorced a decade later, the house is worth \$300k. How do you want your separate property component calculated? \$75k flat (the court's assumed method)? \$75k + pro rata value of the appreciation? Or did you screw yourself because the new house has both your names on it, making it look like you gifted the \$75k to become marital property?

The third key property division factor is passive v. active appreciation of separate property. If you are bringing \$250k of your 401K into the marriage and 10 years later it's worth \$500k, who gets the \$250k of growth? If all of the growth was from passive (i.e. market fluctuation) appreciation, it all remains separate under most laws. But what if you kept contributing to that account after the wedding day? Now you have no way of knowing how much is market growth and how much is from the dollars you put in that are technically marital. You screwed yourself and will likely get stuck with only \$250k as pre-marital.

Also, the FIFO rule says that the first money in (which is your separate property) is the first out. So, if you pay \$50k into your 401k during the marriage, then withdraw that \$50k later, the presumption is that the \$50k withdraw came from the \$250k of separate property, not the \$50k of joint property. Pretty awesome, right? /s

Spousal Support

Every state is different, so I can't comment too much here. Most courts will not enforce a "no spousal support under any circumstances" clause. In my state, if the court determines a clause to be unconscionable or predicated on a lack of information, then that clause is stricken and the court does what it wants. How does this play out?

Suppose at the time you're married you're earning \$25,000/yr working as a manager at McDonalds. 10 years later, you're running a couple dozen franchises in your city and banking a cool mil/yr. The court's going to nix that "no spousal support" clause without batting an eye. Why? Because the wife was ill-informed at the time of the true earning capacity you had, and therefore was not competent to make an informed decision.

So, you've got to put qualifiers on that crap. "No spousal support for so long as husband earns \$500,000/yr or less. If he earns more than that, only the excess beyond this may be calculated as income for spousal support computation purposes."

Also, duration and modifiability are key. In my state, it usually works something like this:

- 0-5 years: no spousal support, 1 year if the court feels for her
- 5-10 years: 1-3 years of support depending on the judge's feels
- 10-20 years: about 1 year of support for 3 years of marriage (rule of thumb; flexibility based on feels)
- 20-25 years: about 1 year of support for 2 years of marriage (apply previous rule if the judge doesn't like her)
- 25+ indefinite

If you want to constrict this stuff and just go with a 1/3 rule flat, put that in there. Don't give the option of indefinite support. That said, be prepared that a judge can strike that clause to smithereens if your wife ends up being a 60yr old woman with no education, no work experience, and is really struggling with her health. Bonus points if English is her second language and she's good at faking a lack of comprehension.

As to modifiability, my state presumes that support awards are non-modifiable. This means that even when you retire, you're stuck with the same support amount. Sometimes this can work in the guy's favor, like if he gets a decent number for a short duration and he knows he's going to get some raises and promotions in the near future. But for the most part it sucks and there's relatively little risk that the court will ever modify support upward anyway. They tend to take the position that if you earn a promotion after the marriage, she didn't contribute to that promotion, so you keep the raise rather than it going into support calculations all over (this doesn't apply if it was something anticipated at the time of the divorce). So, it's usually best for the guy to stick with a modifiable order, especially if the marriage is long-term (note: in my state the supreme court said that 18 years is NOT a long-term marriage ... go figure).

NEVER EVER EVER EVER EVER FORGET: A pre-nup is almost always void and unenforceable if she does not have her own private, independent attorney review the document and sign off on it. Do not think you will just manipulate her into signing it over a fancy dinner. If her attorney doesn't sign it, it's almost certainly getting thrown out of court. Her attorney will review it carefully. These negotiations aren't fun and I've seen people call off the wedding over prenup issues. If she doesn't want to get an attorney involved because she trusts you ... screw that, give her someone's business card (without you calling them first!) and make her dial the number right then and there.

What does TRP say on women's orgasms?

7 upvotes · 10 July 2017 · /r/askTRP

I have experienced this with my wife. Women's feelings are always "in the moment." They often even impute their present feelings on past events. For example, many women totally love the first 5 years of marriage, then things slow down, then they're bored and angry ... then by year 10 suddenly they never loved you at all and they were just faking it with all-star acting skills those first 5 glorious years.

In the moment that was the best thing ever. Out of the moment she wants breakfast and to get the laundry done. That's all. Get her back in the moment and she'll be ready again. My wife has told me before, "I really love having sex when we're actually having sex ... but when we're not I just don't think about it or care. You have to get me into it. Once I start getting wound up I'll keep going."

Why do men ditch their friends when they get a GF?

7 upvotes · 10 July 2017 · /r/askTRP

Your theories probably all have a hint of truth for different guys. But, as /u/dr_warlock said, the bottom line is that they're all junk reasons regardless.

A guy should not ditch his dudes unless those dudes are really bad masculine figures as well. He will not be able to maintain masculinity to keep her attracted if he doesn't have male influences in his life. Big-4 addicts do not count as "male influences." I consider the big 4 to be: (1) porn, (2) food, (3) video games, (4) drugs/alcohol. Avoid being one of those guys and avoid spending time with those guys if you want to have a chance. Otherwise, get better male friends or be a better male friend.

In addition, the girl will get sick of his smothering at some point, even if she likes it at first because of the mutual honeymoon phase. Smothering will destroy an LTR. Also, a girl needs to know a man has his own world that he can invite her to join. If he's joining in on her world all the time and not maintaining his own, he's entering her frame instead of her entering his.

If a guy ditches you for his girl, he's not the type of male role model you want to seek to be like. I don't care how hot his girlfriend is - don't look up to him and think, "If he could get her, I need to be just like him!" No. Find a guy who's actually a guy and can keep his world together despite having a girlfriend.

Should we get married?

7 upvotes · 3 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I'm a divorce attorney, so if anyone is ever interested in an AMA (either here or on TRP/MRP) on the whole "divorce rape" thing, let me know.

Obviously no one here can tell you whether or not it's good to marry this particular girl. We don't know her, you do. But as far as the institution of marriage ... in general, I'm 9 years in and despite sexual issues (which is how I got on MRP), I do believe marriage is well worth it - but only if you're truly committed and it's not just a tax thing while you still act like it's single. You'll get a lot of junk here about, "If she doesn't like it, she can divorce you." If you go into marriage with that attitude, you will most likely end up divorced. Even if the sex is great and you click well, a few big fights and one mental break-down and your relationship is over ... let the "divorce rape" commence (whatever that means to you).

"The Red Pilled"

7 upvotes · 29 June 2017 · /r/TheRedPill

Jesus was a pretty smart guy. Christian or not, this is good advice all around.

In Matthew 12 he says that when a harmful spirit comes out of a person it goes away for a while, wanders the desert, then realizes how much better things were when it was in the person, so it returns. When it finds the house empty, it re-inhabits it, bringing 7 others with it, each more worse than the original.

I'm not saying video games are demonic or anything of the sort. I play video games sporadically when I have excess in my life. Nevertheless ...

Lessons to learn:

- You probably internalize your addiction as your problem. What if you took the mentality that something external is trying to coerce you to play video games? For many men, this creates a much clearer sense of urgency. Instead of a will-power struggle as someone like [/u/mallardcove](#) accuses, it becomes a battle against a force in the world trying to destroy you. It's a man test. Are you going to fight against it or succumb?
 - If it helps, I'm sure we've all seen TV shows or movies that reference this concept: the villain uses some kind of technology or power to placate the world to his advantage. I'm sure there are more recent examples everywhere, but growing up I loved the movie *Batman Forever* (1995), which explains this perfectly: the Riddler builds a machine to sap everyone's energy while they watch TV to use it for his own nefarious purposes. You're Bruce Wayne. Are you going to suit up and fight him or are you going to glance at the tele and feed into his scheme?
 - Externalizing the problem awakens a competitive drive; keeping the problem internalized forces you to beat yourself up which can be good if you have the right mentality, but can be very harmful if you have a lot of guilt, shame and self-loathing in your life, which will also greatly reduce your chances of developing your motivation.
- Most people can't beat addictions because they keep the house empty. They succeed for a while, but they've left a hole open in their lives and never filled it with something new. As a result, temptation toward the addiction will keep coming back and back and back, and each time it will get harder to kick it out again because you're conditioning yourself for that exact pattern. You're blasting out your steel-frame vault and turning it into a revolving glass door.

- Even when you do invite something new in, you don't let it make its home there. It's just a guess and you're testing the waters. You're not letting it blast down walls, remodel bathrooms, and paint the living room. You're telling it, "Come on in for now and let's see how this works," but secretly reserving the possibility that it might not last. Why? Because your addiction keeps knocking at the door saying, "Don't worry, I'll be here when you realize you don't like your new guest as much as me." If someone's hung up on their ex, it's impossible to buy all-in with a new relationship, even if the new one is way, way better than the garbage your ex threw your way. This is no different.
- The "7 others even worse" is all the baggage you develop from failing. By having given up on your efforts to kick out your addiction and letting it back in, now you (1) have proof that you are weak-willed, (2) are ashamed of your failure, (3) feel guilty for doing something you know is wrong, (4) become insecure in the belief that other people judge you for your failure, (5) have to hide yourself to avoid that judgment, precluding the development of real relationships, (6) hate/are angry at yourself for not following through, and (7) have persuaded yourself that if you try again you're likely to fail again, so "What's the point?" ... or otherwise that if you try again, it's okay to fail because now you've learned to deal with the first 6 things I just mentioned and every time you get more and more numb to them.
- The "new" thing has to be healthy that's going to kick out that harmful crap. If you kick out a harmful habit for another harmful one, those dudes are best bros and are going to willingly open the door for one another, so you've just done nothing for yourself. Giving up gaming to take up pot smoking or porn is a recipe for disaster and failure.

Now, at the end of the day I don't believe it's possible to defeat addictions without Jesus (I'm currently writing a book on this). But I do believe it's possible to control addictions or redirect them. So, take that for what it's worth. Go find some other positive thing to re-focus your addiction into, like lifting, healthy dieting, productive hobbies, improving your career, etc.

Vaginismus & Concerns About Wedding Night

6 upvotes · 6 October 2022 · /r/RPChristians

Mission - Excel in my career as an actuary, raise a healthy, God-fearing family, live out my heritage, and constantly improve.

If you're at all familiar with me, you know I can't let this go. Read Matthew 4:19 - "Come, follow me, and I will make you fishers of men." Now, re-read your own mission. Jesus said if you follow him you will become a fisher of men. Is that part of your mission or not? In secular red pill, trying to "excel" and "constantly improve" sounds like a good mission, but it's ultimately aimless. What standard are you comparing yourself against to know you've improved? If there is no standard, there's no way to know if you've improved or gotten worse. If Christ is your standard, then Christ-likeness is your mission - you are improving to become like him. This includes not only becoming like him in "sinning very little" - there are some people who commit very few "sins" yet their lives look nothing like Jesus. It must include also adopting purposes aligned with Christ's purposes. Look at my previous comment before this one in my history. I go into more detail on this in there, but the short-and-sweet of it is that you can't "raise a healthy, God-fearing family" if you aren't leading your family the same way Christ leads the Church - and you can't say you're leading them as he does if you haven't adopted the purposes he had. His purpose was to build a Kingdom for Himself, called the Church (capital C). It is our job to do that also, which is expressed through the great commission: "make disciples of all nations."

The only thing I need a woman for above is raising a family.

When God gave Adam a purpose he said it was not good for him to be alone and said, "I will make a helper

suitable for him." If your wife has nothing to do with your mission than give you children and be a mom, you are severely limiting the role God has for her in your life. If your wife cannot do what God designed her to do, she **WILL** become restless and dissatisfied with you and your marriage will be greatly troubled. Nobody can be satisfied in life who is not able to live out the purposes for which God has designed them.

More to the point, if your mission is so small that you don't need your wife's help on it, then you aren't thinking big enough for God's Kingdom. I've always loved this quote from Dawson Trotman:

Do you know why I often ask Christians, "What's the biggest thing you've asked God for this week?" I remind them that they are going to God, the Father, the Maker of the Universe. The One who holds the world in His hands. What did you ask for? Did you ask for peanuts, toys, trinkets, or did you ask for continents?

I want to tell you, young people, it's tragic! The little itsy-bitsy things we ask of our Almighty God. Sure, nothing is too small - but also nothing is too big. Let's learn to ask for our big God some of those big things He talks about in Jeremiah 33:3 - "Call unto Me and I will answer you and show you great and mighty things that you do not know."

Think on that for a while and re-contemplate your mission. If your only ambition for God's Kingdom is to have a cozy little job with your cozy little family and to "improve" in some ambiguous way that doesn't really speak to what you're improving toward ... how do you intend to answer to God when you are called to give an account of your life on Judgment Day? Make no mistake, the Bible is clear that believers will be judged according to what we do also, not just the unbeliever. Here's a very brief (under 4-minute) video that will go further into what I'm talking about: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LA_uwWPE6lQ (Francis Chan ... good stuff).

Onto the actual question ...

My question is about **vaginismus** (involuntary tensing or contracting of muscles around the vagina, which can make sex impossible).

Can ... but doesn't always. In most cases, sex is still possible, but painful. My wife and I dealt with this early in our marriage. It's a predominantly psychological issue that can (and usually will be) self-resolved in time as the fear and anxiety of penetration resolves. At first, it's a nasty feedback loop because the anxiety heightens the tension, which then increases the pain, which then justifies the fear and anxiety so it's remembered the next time you go to have sex. But the pain typically goes away once penetration is complete (it's only during insertion that it's a problem, for most people), which makes it easy to adjust to the initial pain, knowing it'll go away - and as that initial pain becomes a quick over-and-done, the anxiety goes away because it normalizes. When the anxiety alleviates, the vaginismus alleviates with it, and will eventually cease to become an issue altogether.

At the risk of being crass, have you ever taken a dump and wiped your butt too hard and your sphincter tenses while your face makes a weird grin? It doesn't actually hurt in that moment, but you feel like it's going to, and it's an awkward feeling altogether, hence the look of pain across your face even though you're really fine. That's not too different from vaginismus. You and she note you're virgins, which means she's not used to having anything outside of her control penetrating her, and that's going to cause an initial reaction. But the same way you can learn to wipe yourself without wincing, she will, in time, be able to experience a comfort with sex.

I've never heard a case of vaginismus that didn't naturally resolve fairly quickly (a matter of weeks). In my marriage, it was probably longer than most, for unique reasons. But even in our longer-term circumstance, it self-resolved without the need for any dilators. It's more common than you might think for virgin women to be unable to have sex on their wedding night, or even during their honeymoon.

She has been using dilators for a few months with some progress, but she expressed frustration that she can't fit the final size (i.e. close to me) no matter how hard she tries not to tense up.

You also have to remember that this dilator method is in a vacuum. My guess is that she's not particularly aroused while using them. Arousal causes natural lubrication and greater elasticity. I expect she's using lubrication with the dilators, but it's nowhere near as effective as natural lubrication. When she is both aroused and naturally lubricated, things will be MUCH easier than in the sterile-ish dilator context.

My recommendation: on your wedding night, do your best to try to make intercourse happen. Start slow and minimize any risk of anxiety. Get her worked up before you contemplate insertion - preferably even to the point of finishing once from external stimulation alone. Don't get worked up about it if insertion doesn't work out. If she feels guilty that she couldn't have intercourse on your wedding night that can create a painful negative psychological association with sex that will take you years to overcome. No shame or guilt over the issue - just keep working at it. Make it a fun experience playing with each other's bodies - both in having other ways to enjoy sex while working through the issue, and also in working toward actual intercourse together. Treat it more like a tease than a problem.

Interactions on this sub

6 upvotes · 28 February 2022 · /r/RPChristians

To tweak a semantic issue that might resolve what [/u/rocknrollchuck](#) said - men and women can both be at fault in different ways for crappy marriages. But fault is a stupid and worthless thing to waste time assigning. Pointing the finger has never once helped my kids better their relationship with each other. It won't help a husband/wife better their relationship either.

What really matters more than fault is responsibility. A CEO of a corporation is responsible for the mistakes of his subordinates because he's the leader. A military commander is responsible for what his privates do, even if he's not the one doing it. A husband is responsible for everything that goes on in his household because it's *his household*.

It doesn't matter if the wife is at fault. The husband is still responsible. Most things that go wrong in the world are due to a failure of leadership. If the way the man leads is not getting the results he wants (whether he's at "fault" or not), the logical solution is to adjust your leadership strategy. Her job is to decide whether or not to follow.

Now, this could lead to a frustrating cycle where he keeps trying one strategy to lead his wife after another and nothing seems to work, so he just keeps spinning his wheels. This is an insanely rare circumstance in general (because AWALT), but for the non-believing red pill guys it's a real one if he's married an outlier. As Christians, we have a position to stop the cycle ...

Jesus' leadership strategy is the optimal one. Changes to our strategy should always be to adjust what we do to be a little more like what Christ did.

In the end, the wife may still leave the man. But at least he can go to God in the end and say, "Yes, my wife left me. But I didn't know a better way to do things than the way you showed us, so I stuck to that and only did what I saw you doing."

That will be the best position a man can be in, when he's at God's judgment seat. In that scenario, God's not going to care who's to blame. He's not judging fault. He's judging "each person according to what he has done." Do what Jesus did. Worry less about blame, more about Christ-likeness. Just make sure you're actually looking at how Jesus handled situations, rather than making up hypotheticals of what you think he "would have" done based on some stereotypical notions you have in your head about who you think he was. Jesus and the Father did a LOT more and handled a LOT more situations than most people realize. We have a model. Look to the model.

Interactions on this sub

6 upvotes · 28 February 2022 · /r/RPChristians

also, you can always just choose not to engage with people on the sub you don't want to interact with

What? And let someone saying bad things about me have the last word without me defending myself? No way.

Abstinence till marriage (Advice/Discussion)

6 upvotes · 23 February 2022 · /r/RPChristians

people actually discussing my questions vs people finding ways to insult someone new for not using the "mission" section properly

The real issue here is that you're not comprehending the way that your mission (or lack thereof) is contributing to the issue you're asking about in the first place. The concepts are inextricably intertwined. By addressing the issue with your mission, we are leading you to a better path for handling the issue you're talking about.

Imagine someone banging their head against a wall and complaining that their head hurts, asking for help curing the headache.

One person says, "Stop banging your head against the wall," and you say, "That's not what I'm asking about. I'm asking about how to make the pain stop. Stop wasting my time with stupid talk about banging my head against a wall when this post is all about how to cure the headache."

Okay, now those of us who are talking about mission are the ones saying, "You have a mental health disorder causing you to engage in masochism and you need to resolve that psychological issue." We're taking the immediate problem a step further to the underlying issue at the core of what you're struggling through.

If you can realize that, you'll be in much better shape.

Abstinence till marriage (Advice/Discussion)

6 upvotes · 23 February 2022 · /r/RPChristians

New to the faith ?? Did you read my post or are you just here to rant?

Juxtaposed with ...

I started my celibate journey this year

Translation: "Before this year, I didn't actually take my faith seriously." Conclusion: "Treat like someone who just started taking his faith seriously in the past year."

You might have a history of biblical knowledge, but that's not what I'm addressing. I had a massive wealth of biblical knowledge stored up from being raised in the church, but wasn't actually saved in high school. All that knowledge was impressive to pastors and seminary professors, but was used for the wrong purposes and was doing more harm to my life than good because it was misapplied. Once I figured out what the Bible actually said and began to have my heart aligned with Christ, I realized that most of my storehouse of knowledge was tangentially relevant to actual Christian living in the first place.

I'm not saying this to diss you. I'm saying I've been there too. I'm not issuing a condemnation on you any more than I would have myself when I was in your shoes.

But yes, figuring out what you're actually going to do with your life is going to be the singular most important

place for you to start. I'm curious to see what you come to when you reach that conclusion.

Given your conversation with [/u/redpill-cool](#), I'm half tempted to ban you for a short while for being a wuss who can't handle some pushback without losing frame. Sometimes a time-out can help with that. But, as valuable as his pressure is, I know he can come off as a dick sometimes too (not always a bad thing) and the conversation was entertaining enough to read that I'll let it all go anyway.

Announcement: Red Pill Christians will now exclusively be a male only space

6 upvotes · 25 March 2021 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

One of the goals of this announcement was to help build the community at [r/RPCWomen](#) by funneling more content toward them which would otherwise have been expressed here. By making this a male-only space, when women post things, it will be much easier for mods simply to reply: "Great question/interesting situation. This isn't the place for this, but we'd love to see it posted on [r/RPCWomen](#)." Before the rule-change, there was little room to force these comments over there. Perhaps it's the lawyer in me, but I like having a publicly-available rule in place before I start enforcing it as a matter of policy.

Dropping the Shield and Finding the Truth

6 upvotes · 21 March 2021 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Solid post, brother. I've definitely times of feeling in the muck - even recently.

But a wise man asks God to remove the scales from his eyes as he begins the new journey. A wise man knows the ego is there attempting to reflexively protect him from any discomfort or risk. The ego can act like a shield protecting you from what is in front of you, but like a shield it can obstruct your view as you hold it up

This bit has been my prayer and lesson as of late. Great way to word it.

Husbands and Hindered Prayers

6 upvotes · 10 February 2021 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I often note that the way we relate with our spouse is a physical representation meant to point us toward understanding the spiritual relationship we're meant to have with Christ. Is it any surprise, then, that I can predict with great accuracy what a man's weaknesses in his walk with God are by the way his wife treats him? Women follow their husband's example. If you show no respect to God, she will show no respect to you. If she's nagging and pestering you to do things for her, it's probably the case that your time spent with God is nagging and pestering him to do things for you. I'm sure you can add to the list yourself.

If you can't have a quality relationship with your spouse, it's hard to imagine you're going to have a quality relationship with God either. That's why passages like 1 Timothy 3:5 or 1 John 4:20 make it clear that we have to have a healthy relationship with those who are physically present in our lives as the pathway to having a healthy relationship with a spiritual God in his spiritual Kingdom.

If a man is oppressive toward his wife and not loving toward her, he's not following in the direction of those passages. Granted, the way I'd define "oppressive" is drastically different from the way most women today will claim to be "oppressed" - so take that word in a biblical context, not a modern cultural definition.

How I Overcame Porn Permanently

6 upvotes · 2 February 2021 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I'm going to go with no. In a very, very broad sense, if something is put in front of me, there's still a choice to get rid of it, which is a conscious decision. But I do not sit at my computer at night, for example, and feel like I have

to make a conscious choice to avoid putting on porn. The thought doesn't even cross my mind anymore.

Do you have any concerns about how it seems like this view errs on the side of control of your wife over her personal growth and freedom?

6 upvotes · 15 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

"How do I become worthy enough to be followed?"

Even that's off. That still feeds into the blue pill notion of the man needing to be worthy of his woman, as if she sets the standard he's trying to live up to.

Rather, the things that a man does to pursue Christ and the joint mission he has called us to follow are the exact same things that will make others want to follow us - including women. It's not about being worthy to lead her; it's about being dutiful to Christ.

This is why Jesus succinctly says, "Seek first His Kingdom and His Righteousness and all this will be yours."

Put another way: Jesus says there's no marriage in heaven. So, your relationship to your wife isn't something eternal - it's earthly. In Matthew 6:33 Jesus is saying, essentially, to make God's Kingdom your priority rather than the worldly kingdoms, and when we do so God will make sure the worldly things are addressed the way he sees fit. In my view, that includes whether or not a man's wife follows him or leaves him.

Again 1 Cor. 7 - "Let those with wives live as though they have none." You don't become a great leader *so your wife will want to follow* because your pursuit of Christ should be as if you didn't have a wife in the first place. Her pursuit of you should be because of your pursuit of Christ.

No, your congregation does not preach "biblical headship"

6 upvotes · 12 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I figured as much ;)

Is Church attendance a command from God?

6 upvotes · 1 August 2020 · /r/askRPC

The Church is the totality of God's people who hold unity in the Spirit and assembly in heaven. The congregational structure is a tool utilized by many within the Church because they believe it will facilitate greater growth. It is the only useful structural aspect to the Church available to the majority of the world - but as useful as it *can* be, it has the equal potential to be harmful when viewed as a substitute for discipleship rather than a fishing pond for disciples. Those who forsake the congregational structure are just as foolish as those who create an unhealthy co-dependence on it. The issue is not whether or not to participate; it's how to participate. If the structure is non-existent, continue meeting with others in another context that's still available.

I'm not aware of a command to listen to sermons. I am aware of commands to preach and testify. While no one is obligated to listen, we are obligated to be competent enough to be on the other end. If "faith comes through hearing the Word," I'm not sure how you're going to gain that competency unless you're: (1) being discipled (preferred), or (2) prayerfully studying and applying the Scriptures on your own (which will inherently be incorporated into #1 if it's done right), or (3) listening to sermons about what God taught someone else. Pick one. More if you can. I've listed them in the order of efficiency and effectiveness.

I will also note that [/u/1timothy47](#) wrote a post a couple months ago on [/r/disciplemaking](#) about how **being discipled is a luxury, not a necessity**. I know it's appropriately ambitious to *WANT* to call it a necessity, the reality is that it's not. Many people simply don't have competent people around them to be a discipler in their lives. Or, as that post notes, viewing it as a necessity could cause an unhealthy co-dependence on the person being discipled, killing the discipler-maker's abundance mentality as he feels like he *must* make the relationship work

rather than being willing to walk away from a poor selection to find someone FASTER.

Episode 10 - No Frame, No Game Part 2

6 upvotes · 31 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Haha. I'm tempted to just for the hilarity.

Episode 10 - No Frame, No Game Part 2

6 upvotes · 30 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Learn to hold your frame, brother.

I think you're confusing a lot of biblical passages. But if you can show me one that references it being sinful for two people to hug - married or unmarried - I'm all ears. To address the most obvious issues:

- **Lust:** This sub has covered it a million times. Lust is not sin. Adultery is sin. Covetous intent (translated "lust") toward someone in an adulterous context is adultery of the heart, even if not the physical act of adultery. There's no evidence that this couple is lusting after each other or that they're unmarried. That may just be you imputing your own lack of self-control onto them.
- **Sexual Arousal:** Being sexually aroused is not sin. Seeing an attractive person and getting a hard-on is not sin. It doesn't become covetous lust until you start plotting how you would act on it. If someone gets aroused by the clip, so be it. If they masturbate for 1 second while it rolls by, or go back and pause the video, that's their issue.
- **Causing Others to Stumble:** I'm sick of hearing the way this passage is blown to exaggeration in the modern church. The reality is that we ALL cause people to stumble ALL the time - implicitly. What Jesus is referring to is the person who does so intentionally. This is why you can't take Matthew 18:6 away from 18:7 - it's inevitable that people will stumble, whether we intend it or not. The problem is when someone attempts to cause it. Jesus clarifies again in verse 10 that he's talking about people who "despise one of these little ones." I seriously don't think Jesus was telling people that we must always walk on egg shells around anyone and everyone else for every possible inclination that might cause someone to sin. For that matter, Jesus himself turned water into potent wine - "the good stuff" - knowing that people would get drunk on it. Are you going to tell Jesus that he sinned for causing someone to stumble because of what other people did with the content he made available to them? The theological issue you run into with the exaggerated interpretation of the "causing others to stumble" notion is that you're allowing other people to decide when you're in sin. How THEY interpret what you do or make use of the content you create somehow makes you, whose actions and intentions are otherwise blameless, does not have an impact on your own internal state any more than the fact that people used Jesus's wine to get drunk made him culpable for their sin.
- **Above Reproach:** As with other issues, many pious church-goers love to exaggerate what this means, suggesting it prohibits a Christian from doing anything that could possibly be interpreted as sin. That definition would be impossible to follow because everything can be interpreted as sin by someone. In this, even a completely 100% flawless leader who is fully sanctified to perfection and never sins again could still be removed from his position of authority because someone misunderstood him. That interpretation is out. Once again: our guilt is not defined by the actions or thoughts of others. So let's go a step down and re-interpret Titus 1:6 to mean that a leader is prohibited from actually sinning. Yikes! Even then we still would end up with absolutely 0 leaders in the church. Even Paul, who wrote Titus and admitted to his own sinfulness, would have had to recuse his position as an apostle if that were the case. So, if Titus 1:6 isn't referring to the appearance of sin or the actuality of sin, what IS it referring to? The Greek is aneγκλέτος, which was a legal term used to refer to someone who was acquitted in court. That is, being "above reproach" in the aneγκλέτος sense meant that no one had basis to file a law suit against them. For the record, others suggest that the

concept (rather than the word itself) is simply that an overseer should not do anything that brings shame upon the community in a way that would affect the church's ministry to outsiders.

Long story short: I continue to disagree with you and it seems we have some fundamental disagreements on Scriptural interpretation - you taking the more cultural notions of the passages, while I try to stick with what the passages are actually saying, coupled with common sense and an understanding of the words being used.

New Sidebar Compilation!

6 upvotes · 21 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Unfortunately, I don't think I ever did finish the 400 series. Thanks for the reminder!

RPC Podcast Episode 7: The Importance of OYS

6 upvotes · 9 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

That means a lot from you. You interested in joining us sometime?

Sparking a Husband's Sexual Desire (RPCW)

6 upvotes · 23 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Physical appearance - Create a schedule that involves time at the gym, running, body weight exercises, etc. so that it's planned in your schedule. Once you have a good body, it takes time to lose it, so it's not like it can be gone overnight - you just have to keep up with it, generally. Set clear rubrics for yourself not to cross. One rubric I have for myself is that if my belly goes out further than my pecs, it's time to cut. That standard doesn't work for women quite as well ;) but you get my point. Count belt loops. Use a scale, if you must. Just set a standard that you know you have to change-gears when you hit that line.

Kino - Rearrange your furniture that's conducive toward physical touch. Instead of having a separate arm chair in the living room, move it to the basement, replace it with another decorative piece, and force yourselves to sit on the couch together. Other than that, there's very little that makes this naturally consistent beyond the fact that the more you do it, the less awkward it will feel, the easier it will be to continue.

Clothes - This one's easy. Literally throw away items of clothing that you know are counter-productive. You will HATE doing this. But trust me: it's for the best. Just save enough that you can paint or do yard work in ;)

Attitude - You just have to do it and make it a part of yourself. What might help is to study the Madonna-Whore Complex and realize that your non-seductive lifestyle is bread from too much ASD (anti-slut-defense). That is, you're presenting a false attitude about who you are in order to appear more innocent than you are - especially if you crave sex more than he's aware, which directly proves that you're hiding your sexuality. Embrace that this is a "disorder" of sorts, when perpetuated with your husband in the context of marriage, and embrace a more sensual, seductive attitude as the cure. Ultimately, balance is still helpful, of course. But sometimes to get away from one extreme you have to live in the other for a time in order for the middle to feel appropriate.

Dialogue - Read a lot about the subjects you want to dialogue about. The more you ingest about it, the more it's on your mind, the more you'll want to talk about it. At that point, it's second-nature rather than being something you have to work at.

Ambiance - This is inherently consistent as it requires effort to change the ambiance back once it's created.

Sexual Association - Again, once the association is created, it doesn't go back unless you drop it dead forever. So, this one doesn't require much habit-building - only to get off the ground.

What would you do if you were suddenly single?

6 upvotes · 21 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

This comment makes me smile.

What would you do if you were suddenly single?

6 upvotes · 21 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I've literally asked myself this exact question a few dozen times over the last couple years. I'm glad you put up a post on it. It's the proper frame of mind for married men to be processing their sexual goals and why they may not be achieving them.

Just thought I'd post this here if any of you want to chime in and shed some light!

6 upvotes · 20 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I see this misnomer in Christian circles all the time. The verse doesn't actually say sexual sins are worse. It just points out one way in which they're unique. Inevitably, some smart-Alec tries to quip that verbal sins are actually worse because "if anyone can tame the tongue he is a perfect man, able to keep his whole body in check" (a la James 1 or 2). But even that doesn't say it's the worst sin - only that it's the hardest to beat. So, someone else complains that all sins are equal, implied in James where it says that breaking one command makes you guilty of breaking them all ... which it doesn't quite say. It really says that breaking a command makes you a law-breaker, regardless of which command you break, and thus your need of a savior is the same regardless of the severity of your sin. Then there are the sins God calls abominations, which are impliedly worse than those that aren't identified that way.

But I'll cut that rabbit trail off.

Why does sexual sin FEEL worse than other sins ...?

Remember that God's first command to humanity was to multiply and fill the earth in number (Genesis 1:28). Malachi 2:15 clarified that God wanted godly, spiritual offspring filling the earth, not merely warm bodies. In this, human sexuality on a physical level is paralleled with spiritual reproduction. Just as sex/raising kids FEELS like the epitome of humanity's physical existence, so also should spiritual reproduction/child-rearing (i.e. evangelism and discipleship) ACTUALLY BE the epitome of humanity's spiritual existence. It is what your soul was created for. It's called the GREAT commission because it's so GREAT and massively important in everything that God has been doing from day 1 and will continue doing until the final day.

So, when something perverts the image of how God intends to accomplish this master-plan of discipler-making across the earth, we should very appropriately FEEL off about it in more significant ways than anything else.

Alternatively, on a more psychological or bio-physical level, one could argue that pair-bonding, hormones, etc. create strong emotional ties that influence our feelings about sexual matters more than other matters, hence the heightened anxiety about sexual sin over other forms of sin - even worse ones.

what does it really mean to sin against your own body

When you have sex with someone, you become one flesh. Your body and theirs are one. So, just as you sin against your own body in the way you pervert how it is to be used, the way you're perverting the other person's body is also a perversion of our own because their body is also your body in that "one flesh" union.

vs sinning against God

I usually understand the NT concepts of "sinning against" in a colloquial sense. When Jesus says, "If your brother sins against you," he means that you've been offended and need to reconcile. Similarly, when Paul says that you sin against your own body, he's saying your body has been harmed in some way and why would you do that to

yourself?

When David speaks in Psalm 51, "Against you, you only, have I sinned," after killing Uriah, committing adultery with Bathsheba, and getting their baby killed, I believe he is praying, meditating, and speaking introspectively out of great sorrow. I'm sure he felt incredible remorse at the situation, as evident in the way he mourned over his child's life and lamented when hearing Nathan's conviction over him. He wasn't saying this in an emotional burst to avoid responsibility for the harm he caused to Bathsheba's life or his deceased child's life or to Uriah in his slaughter. He was saying it while fully embracing these things, as evident from the rest of the chapter of Psalm 51.

What's significant here is the frame issue David mentions in Psalm 51 itself. To give the completion of that phrase from 51:4, "Against you, you only, have I sinned and done what is evil **in your sight**." You see, David didn't owe any obligation to Uriah or Bathsheba or his child to follow their standards of morality. It doesn't matter what any of them thought was good or evil because David wasn't a subject of their standards. He was only subject to God's standards, and therefore God's expectations were the only violation that actually mattered.

To be clear, my wife has standards for me. All women do for the men in their lives, otherwise the red pill wouldn't exist. But I know that I am not subject to her standards. If she sets a standard that says, "I believe it is immoral for my husband to tell dad jokes to our kids" and I tell a dad joke, I have violated her standard. But is that sin? Obviously not. Because her standard doesn't decide what is or isn't sin for me. The only things that can decide that are myself (Romans 14:14) and God's standard of faith (Romans 14:23), especially as expressed through Scripture.

But what if my wife has a standard that I shall not beat her bloody? If I choose to beat her anyway, have I sinned? Of course. But was it a sin against her standard? No. Because her standards don't define sin. Only God's do. And God commands me through my faith not to beat my wife (or at least compels me through my own individual conviction of the same), so it would be sin against God's standard, not against my wife's standard. Thus, the sin is against God alone, even though my wife is the victim of my sin.

Now, this sounds like a lot of crazy theology, but it's really quite normal. I'm a lawyer, so I see this constantly. A husband beats his wife. This isn't a "sin" in a legal context. We call it a "crime." What a sin is to God, crime is to the government. The government says not to beat your wife. When a man does this, what happens when the wife decides to drop the charges? The state says, "Too bad, we're prosecuting them anyway." She fights back, "But I'm the victim. The crime was against me. I should get to say what happens to my husband." Yet the reply is always the same: "No, his crime was against the state. If he is a violent person, we have an obligation to protect everyone within our state, not just you. You were the victim this time, but if there is no punitive measure, someone else may be the victim next time and we must pursue charges to ensure that doesn't happen."

This is how it is with God and sins against him as compared with "offenses" against others.

I haven't actually done a word study on this yet, but I'd be curious how the Hebrew of Psalm 51:4 compares with the Greek words that Jesus and Paul use for "sin against." I know it's two different languages, and it wouldn't likely change my end analysis, but it could possibly confirm it.

The point is: sexual sins do distort your own body, but it is God's standard that you have violated which makes it sinful. So, I interpret the passage to mean that we are the victims of our own sin, while the sin itself is still against God only.

Others have already addressed the ways in which we are victimized by our own sexual misconduct, so I won't rehash any of that.

What do I need to learn from here since I came from the og TRP?

6 upvotes · 20 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

This.

RPC Chat - Episode 4: Christian Dead Bedrooms

6 upvotes · 17 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Fantastic. This whole topic probably deserves a post in itself. You want to write it? If not, I'll put it on my list ;)

She simply doesn't want to / isn't willing to put in effort with her husband

To re-bolster a point from my previous comment: even if she did overcome the obstacle that you're presenting, it still doesn't go the next level of actually showing (even if only by faking) enthusiasm in the process.

I remember a time when my wife was clearly unenthusiastic. I had a seriously hard time finishing and it was bothering her. I asked, "Can you at least try moaning or doing something?" She looked disgusted and insisted that she wouldn't fake it and that if she didn't actually feel like moaning, she wouldn't.

At the time, frustrated though I was, I agreed with her. Looking back, there were countless times that I had faked things with her in order to enhance her experience. Many couples role play, the entire point of which is to be fake to enhance the experience. What it really communicates is that she cares more about her own comfort in self-expression over the pleasure and happiness of her husband.

Some women are able to have sex not because they're particularly aroused, but because they find it enjoyable to please their man and to watch him as she takes an active role in his pleasure. I am often like this in the reverse. I find most of my excitement in sex not from pumping my dick a million times, but from seeing the way I can please my wife and ultimately watch her orgasm. Yet women are so solipsistic that this option doesn't even register for most of them. And what does that say about the degree to which a woman contemplates the needs of her husband in relation to her own? Not to say I define love this way, but most women do - they will incorporate some concept of "putting someone else's wants/desires/needs/whatever above your own." Then sex rolls around and it's self-absorbed with no willingness to set their own thoughts/needs aside in order to please him. "The fact that I give you even starfish is enough of a sacrifice," they think. It's sad.

doesn't want to risk (perceived or real) an issue at work, or cause friction in the friendship, etc.

Right. This goes back to my very old post on the comparison game. How outsiders perceive her is more important than anything else to her.

She knows she can (often) "get away" with it with her husband

This, I believe, stems from the "I conquered, what's next?" mentality. We see this all the time with PUAs. They have sex with a girl, then ghost her. Once they've "conquered" her they become disinterested and move on to the next girl. For women, the "conquer" isn't about getting sex (which is as easy as breathing for most women). It's about getting commitment. Once she has that, she prefers the commitment of the next best guy she can get. She loses interest in the man she has already conquered.

This is why dread is so important. If she believes the game is over - that his commitment to her is faultless and never at risk of his sinfulness winning over him - then she will believe her victory to be final and the boredom sets in, unless she can set new goals separate from the ones she was taught to employ while single. While single, she's taught to pursue commitment from a man. While married, she must be taught to pursue her husband's mission and set aside the dating games - and yet it is still vital for the man to keep her on edge with at least passive dread so that he wins over not only her mind (toward his mission), but also her body (through attraction and desire triggers).

Explaining the Double Standards around Sex

6 upvotes · 14 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Exactly why I left it up.

Actual Conversations With "Abuse" Victims

6 upvotes · 4 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

No, as I haven't revealed any personally identifiable information.

RPC Video Chat

6 upvotes · 4 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

We definitely want to do that. It works best if we can do that through YouTube live, but that requires 1k subscribers to your channel first. We do plan in the very near future to start having uniquely authoritative guests join on the chats.

Who should you listen to on RPChristians?

6 upvotes · 20 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

His flair specifies that he's an "MRP Mod" and therefore his endorsement is to the degree of his familiarity with MRP. That said, even endorsed contributors get things wrong sometimes and shouldn't be relied upon blindly. There are things I've written on this sub that were off-base and should be modified, including in some of the sidebar content. Always test what anyone says.

Does Man Really Findeth A Wife?

6 upvotes · 19 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

They're usually spoken of as being mutually exclusive because most men commit so much time and emotional energy into dating/relationships that it becomes a distraction from your mission.

On the sidebar I wrote a 2-part post on "How to Find the Girl You Can't Keep Yourself from Banging." In it, I explain how you can simultaneously explore interest in women without compromising your mission. The problem is when you prioritize that search over your mission, which is where most men go wrong.

Christian 'Red Pill' books

6 upvotes · 12 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

What do you hold as the Red Pill standard?

I'm not sure I understand the question. My [Defining the Red Pill for Christians](#) post might address what you're asking.

The principals you just spoke about or marriage principals in the Bible?

The red pill is not religious. When people say things like "the Bible is the true red pill," they're speaking colloquially, not intending to redefine a secular term. The red pill is understood by the broader community to be "the truth," whatever that may be. However, as the general red pill communities have experimented, they have determined a set of concepts that they believe to be true. These concepts are generally not opposed by Scripture, and often directly supported by it (though the way some people utilize that knowledge is certainly sinful).

When I talk about the "red pill" I am referencing the fundamental truths about intergender relational dynamics as they actually exist. When I reference "secular red pill," it's specifically toward those things which they have concluded about what they believe to be true on that topic. When I say, "as Christians," I'm referencing something that primarily comes from Scripture and not necessarily a conclusion the secular crowd will reach on

their own. Yes, there is immense overlap between the two, and that overlap is where the "red pill" exists.

Are the principals you talk about in the Bible?

Yes. Much of it is on the sidebar - amused mastery, fitness testing, preselection/dread. These are all exhibited in the way God interacts with his people in both the Old and New Testaments. If we are to be godly or Christ-like, we ought to exhibit them in the same relational contexts. So, if the Father does it to his children, we do it with our children; if Jesus does it with his bride, so should we also do it with our own wife.

If not does that discredit the Red Pill concepts we know

No more than we would say " $2+2=4$ " is "discredited" by not being in the Bible. I refer to this as the knowledge hierarchy: theology is at the top, then comes science/observation, and philosophy/logic is at the bottom. The three often work together in agreement, but where they don't, the hierarchy must be maintained. So, if God were to miraculously make 2 fish + 5 loaves of bread = ridiculously more than 2 fish + 5 loaves of bread, then scientific/mathematical reality bends to theological truth of what actually occurs. If philosophy tells us that punishing kids is bad and we should only use positive reinforcement, but observation and testing over long-term studies shows that this actually produces unstable adults who can't maintain jobs because their work ethic sucks ... well, observable reality shows us that our philosophies on what *should* work is not the same as what *actually* works. This is the hierarchy.

Most things produced by the secular red pill is in the "science/observation" category. What we teach at RPC is in the theology category whenever possible, while still embracing pragmatic reality on those issues for which the Bible is silent (which is surprisingly much less than you'd think).

if they are in the Bible how have they been missed by the church/pastors etc.

Because pastors/churches congregations have ceded to a "CHURCHianity" mentality over a "CHRISTianity" mentality. They love the *church* so much that they devote themselves to what is best for the *church* and not necessarily to *Christ*. This makes sense, as this is where they earn their living and receive their life validation. It is inevitable that the interests of an institutionalized body of people will be divergent from the interests of Christ. When this happens, pastors have sided with what's good for "the church" over what's good for Christ because they can easily rationalize new ways for interpreting the Scriptures about Jesus to justify their focus on the things that will keep the church alive. But if you go in the reverse, focusing on Christ, there's no way to rationalize away the fact that you'll lose lots of people along the way, and a sizeable portion of your budget and income with them.

Jesus experienced this tension too. He had people congregating around him the same way congregations congregate around a pastor each week. He loved the crowds. He cared for them. He taught and helped them. He healed among them. But when the interests of keeping the crowd interested and growing diverged from his actual mission of making disciples, he started saying things like: "You can't be my disciple if this" or "If you want to keep following me, you must do that," and he ultimately sent many people away, prioritizing truth and his purpose over maintaining the numbers of his followers.

a lot of Red Pill concepts are in the Bible we've just feminized them or skipped them all together

In the end, this phenomenon occurs because the overwhelming majority of people in the world are not actually studying the Bible. They're only receiving the Word from what their pastor teaches. Even most small groups today are not actual Bible studies - they are sermon-centered, discussing in groups what the pastor taught.

This is why it's so significant that Paul mentions in 1 Cor. that he intentionally did not ask for a dime from them while ministering to them - because he didn't want to pervert the authenticity of his ministry to them. He didn't want to burden them with the financial obligation to those who preach the Gospel. As soon as someone's financial

means becomes dependent on their content and structure, the content and structure are compromised.

From then on, anyone within that content/structure who does not actually study any of this for themselves will have a filter in how they view content. They approach things with the mindset, "This is what I believe to be true. I read a verse that seems to say the opposite. That must mean that the verse doesn't mean what it says; rather, there's another way to explain it. Let me look at other verses that support my view and then I can feel better about writing off that other verse, and I can rationalize it away as some culturally outdated piece."

I used to do this all the time. But the more I became skilled at studying Scripture, the more I realized that ideas generated from cursory reviews of a passage were inconsistent with the facts I discovered from a more in-depth analysis of what's actually being said.

To that end, there are different levels of engaging with the Scripture:

1. Hearing it from your pastor.
2. Casual reading, as in a quiet time/devotional.
3. Discussion-based reading, where you talk about a passage without actually studying it, and call it a "Bible study."
4. Weak Bible study, where you attempt to study, but your study skills are extremely limited or you're using the wrong tools (like cultural lenses) to study the passage.
5. Actual, skilled Bible study.

Only the 5th will produce results along the lines of what we discuss here. Sadly, even among this crowd, most people will only get to #4 - they'll just opt to use an "RPC lens" instead of a "cultural lens." While it will get them more accurate results, it still does very little to help them learn to discover proper results for themselves in their own lives beyond the things directly addressed here.

Why You Must Be Willing to Nuke Your Nuclear Family

6 upvotes · 6 May 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

This reminds me of a comment [u/redpillcoach](#) once made to one of my field reports:

STFU, smile, and nod. That set her off: "You're so manipulative. You have this power over me. It's all one big power play and you're just flaunting that you have all the power. I hate it. You know I have no power over you, but when you just stand there like that, it's like you're waving all your power in front of my face."

I think I just came. Sorry, what was that? Something about you having all the power and the wife complaining about it blah blah blah.

No / Bad Sex - Always His Fault?

6 upvotes · 28 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

How fluent are you with the concept of frame?

Has anyone seen dynamics change lately

6 upvotes · 28 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Are you lifting? That might explain why women are being nicer.

ABC FOR XYZ

6 upvotes · 16 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Moses is usually my go-to example. God forbade the entire generation that he took out of Egypt from ever entering the promised land. If the promised land is a physical representation of the spiritual concept of heaven, this would be like the pastor whose entire congregation would be going to hell for being so rebellious and refusing to listen to the pastor, all the while letting him stay in charge.

Does that mean we condemn Moses as a horrible, ungodly leader? No. It means the people refused to follow his lead. That just happens sometimes - and Moses is still hailed as one of our greatest models of a godly man and one of only two people referred directly in Scripture as someone who was a friend to God.

Most Christians Do Not Love Women

6 upvotes · 2 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I'd add the fact that Ruth's intentions were also not to build a successful career for herself. Rather, she set her eyes on the highest value man there (the owner of the whole place) and seduced him into marrying her.

Props for the last point. Well put.

So... you got the "I love you but I'm not in love with you" (ILYBINILWY) speech?

6 upvotes · 12 March 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

True. Everyone thinks they're the exception to the rule. That's why it's so important to understand the foundation of hypergamy as a universal compulsion within all women. Yes, some can control it better than others, but the impulse will always be there. When men can understand that she's not unique and special among women, they're more willing to be honest to themselves about these types of things.

I always tell my clients: if you don't know what to believe, the safest route is to assume the worst and operate as if it is true, but hope for the best in case you find you're wrong.

Intro

6 upvotes · 9 March 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Welcome, brother. Here are a few thoughts:

Read: NNMNG, MMSLP, post series through 200s, plus others.

I know you're still new, but WISNIFG really has to be on this list. With how you describe your ability to handle conflict, this is your #1 greatest need right now.

While I am committed to my wife, it is driven by duty, not by passion.

Given how quickly you got married, pregnant, etc. it sounds like you didn't lack for passion early on. What changed? What would you need to see in her to restore the passion? Do you feel passionate about other things in life? Other women? Or has your capacity for passion faded with time?

If she goes low for her own reasons ... But if there is even a slight reason that it might be my fault

Notice the frame issue here. From what I gather, you're hung up on her perception of you in these moments. I imagine she walks into the room all upset, gives her fake little lines: "I don't want to talk about it" followed by "You'll just get upset and things will be worse," and then you proceed to comfort her and tell her you'll listen, and then as the complaints roll in you realize how irrational she's being, so you start to DEER and she winds up thinking: "See? This is what I knew would happen!"

This is a ploy many women play. The frame issue is that you're worried more about her blaming you than you are about whether or not you were actually at fault. How do I know? Because you DEER. When you DEER, you're trying to convince her that you weren't actually at fault, trying to change her perception of you. But if you are content in your own behavior, you can listen openly - and if you are at fault, you'll learn something and improve; whereas, if you're not at fault, you'll feel no pressure to change. But the minute you start DEERING you enter a game of perception shifting. And when her perception is that turf, who do you think is going to win that battle every time: you or her?

At this point, I am just trying to figure out my mission. I know what parts of it look like, but I can't get the big picture.

Let me describe this for you. Imagine a utopian kingdom. Think of Asgard from the Marvel series (pre-Ragnarok) - highly technological, defenders of the multiverse, abounding in compassion and generosity, all acting in harmony for the good of one another.

Now imagine some tragedy happens - like Thanos' coming - and wipes out the entire population except for a select few. Odin wants to see Asgard restored to its former greatness. He finds bountiful land with sustainable provision for billions - trillions, even - yet there are only a few thousand living there.

You live on Earth as an emissary of Asgard sent by the King to call the evolving race of humanity to become the new generation of Asgardians - and upon entry to New Asgard they will be transformed to be like the Asgardians themselves, down to a genetic level. You see all the pain and suffering on Earth and know that there's this free, open invitation across the bifrost for anyone who would love to live in paradise as an Asgardian, and Odin has given you a specific region of Earth in which you are sent to recruit - and if you fail in this task, you'll have to answer to Odin for why.

You could deflect and say, "This other guy is also in my region and he's better at recruiting than me, so I'll just tell people to go listen to him instead." But you also realize Odin may not be pleased with this abandonment of your personal responsibility to the mission he gave you.

Also, the Kree are recruiting from humanity with lofty promises of fun and pleasure, only to turn any humans who join them into slaves toward the expansion of their own empire. Being an Asgardian, you see that the Kree are tricking everyone and it's only a matter of time before they take more ground. This is why Odin first sent a wave of emissaries in the first place - to save the people from slavery to the Kree, inviting them to the paradise of Asgard instead.

As one of these emissaries and a loyal recruiter of Asgard, where do you start? What's your goal? What plan do you have to expose the lies of the Kree without coming off as a crackpot who has no credibility? You have to make a living because Earth doesn't recognize Asgardian currency, so you have a day job while you're there - and it might not be lucrative, but you know when your mission is complete you'll be unimaginably wealthy in Asgard due to your loyal service. What are you going to do with your life in light of all of this? That's the bigger picture.

I was teasing, she took it to heart, and tells me that I make her feel worthless. I told her that if I thought she was worthless, that I wouldn't waste my time.

I used to give the same reply. It's a mistake. You say this because you think it's what she wants to hear to be comforted. "You are worthwhile! You are valuable!" This communicates: "You deserve my love!"

But she doesn't. And God doesn't communicate these things to us. Instead, he says things like, "While you were

still sinners [i.e. worthless], Christ died for you [I loved you anyway]." How much more powerful is that? That God's love for us isn't because we're worth it, but that he loves us even though we are worthless! That's some powerful love. That's a love that can be trusted.

Throughout all of Scripture we repeatedly find things like the list in Romans 3 that affirm our worthlessness and God's total lack of need for us. I started communicating this to my wife at one point in my journey: "I don't need you." It confused the heck out of her and she hated it for a time, before realizing the corollary: "But I'm still here because I want you."

You see, if you need her - if she is of such great value to you that losing her would somehow hurt you - then it is impossible ever to distinguish whether you appreciate her for who she is or if you simply go through the motions of appreciation in order to retain what she can offer you. This is an unhealthy ambiguity. But remove your need, just as God doesn't *need* us, and suddenly your love is more reminiscent of that of Christ. She could be utterly worthless and vile, and this not only give her even more room to appreciate your love toward her, but it also gives you room to let your love toward her be a redeeming force toward those things she offers which you actually do find valuable.

To be clear: for a long while my wife was hung up on feeling worthless because I didn't appreciate what she brought to the table. In reality, she had the capacity to bring things to the table that I actually valued, but she wanted to work on things that SHE valued instead, and then she was upset at me for not valuing the same things as her, so when I didn't appreciate her self-gratifying lifestyle that ignored the things I valued, she felt that I didn't appreciate her at all, and therefore she became worthless in her mind. In reality, she simply had to shift her efforts toward things that actually were valuable in order to receive my appreciation.

In the same way, there are countless people doing what they think God values - attending many church services, serving in children's ministry, joining the latest outreach event, participating on the worship team, etc. But God says, "Those are the things YOU want to bring to the table, but not the things I've actually called you to. Sure, you can keep doing them, and I do get some peripheral benefit from it, but it's still not what I really want."

That's like the wife who perpetually decorates the house, spending her husband's money to do so, but refuses to have sex with him, then is totally shocked when he's upset with her. "Isn't this your house too?" she argues. "Don't you also benefit from living in a more beautiful home that I've decorated for you?" And yet he replies: "I'd rather you spend my money on some lingerie and help me build a family. A better decorated house is nice, but it's pointless if we're not raising kids to enjoy it with us."

Or in the Asgard example, you tell Odin, "No, I have not recruited anyone. But I knew how much you love the humans you wanted me to invite to Asgard, so I decided to use our advanced technology to serve humankind by building for them nicer homes, lightening their work-load through our technology, and causing them to be kinder to one another through our moral teachings. Doesn't this make you happy, even if no one has agreed to cross the bifrost with me?" Odin can only reply: "You've wasted your time. We can teach them all these things in Asgard, but if they will not be with us, the Kree will snatch them away, even unwillingly, and you haven't made any progress in making Asgard a mighty kingdom again."

Our work is toward God's Kingdom, not merely the individual components of the nice things we can do from time to time. Never forget that bigger picture.

My normal response all these years would be to ask "What's wrong?". I haven't done that for 3 months. But I don't yet have the frame to either be confrontational, or jovial and pull her out.

There's nothing wrong with asking that question. It's useful at times. I'm not sure why you'd avoid this - you just need to be prepared not to let her answer create a pressure that you can't handle.

As for being jovial, an example of one time I took the "jovial" approach to pull my wife out of it and into my good-mood frame is she was sulking about something, mad at me over trifles. I teased her, exaggerating about her having a giant frown on her face. I said she should be happy and needed to smile, but if she wasn't going to switch to a smile on her own, I would do it for her. So, I picked her up and flipped her upside-down and shook her a bit saying, "See, now that the frown is upside down you're smiling." She started laughing and the kids got riled up saying, "Daddy, do me next!" and by the time she was upright again she was still smiling.

Q&A on Sexual "Brainwashing"

6 upvotes · 19 February 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I'm a question-answerer for gotquestions.org. Sometimes, if the question seems relevant to the sub, I'll post what someone asked and my response.

Dating friends vs. dating women you don't know entirely well

6 upvotes · 16 February 2020 · /r/RPChristians

You're missing the rule 2 information. What's your mission? There's no problem dating from your friend pool, but you don't even have that. And without a clear mission and strong frame, even when you do get friends, the relationships will be shallow and directionless.

Too many guys want to skip building the foundation and go straight to chasing girls.

For nonchristians, that's fine. The chase is practice, and if they can get laid a few times before they're actually worth it, they say, "All the better." But if your goal is sex within marriage instead of sex alone, then the foundation matters more than the chase. If you intend to stay pure, the chase doesn't get you sex, but does give her feels - and you end up getting emotionally entangled with someone only to find a few years of improvement later that you could have done much better (though by then you're probably too blue pill to admit it).

This is what I pick up as your issue. Get back to the foundation.

Q&A With an untrusting wife

6 upvotes · 11 February 2020 · /r/RPChristians

If you're asking whether women go to hell for denying their husbands, I don't believe that's the unforgivable sin. If you're asking if it's sin, yes it is. Even Jewish culture had a term for these women: *Moredet*. Research that for a more historical take. Otherwise, the New Testament should show that Christ gives freedom for men to manage their own homes appropriately within biblical standards as they see fit.

Q&A With an untrusting wife

6 upvotes · 11 February 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I had considered it. [u/deep_strength](#) and [u/redpillwonder](#) seem to be handling the blogging front well enough. Anything I would blog about I'd just put here anyway. I do plan on starting a podcast soon. More info on that soon - hoping to begin in a month or so.

How would a turnaround for the church look like? Making it more RP than Feminist.

6 upvotes · 21 December 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Just be cautious of some of his extremely unbiblical views along the way.

Mission

6 upvotes · 12 November 2019 · /r/RPChristians

This is beautiful. Let me be clear: **THIS SUB DOES NOT ENDORSE COMMUNISM.** Though I/we may

have strong preferences, socio-economic structures aren't something the red pill or Christianity specifically prescribes.

That said - I have often said things very much like this about my commitment to the great commission to the small groups I have led.

What's also interesting is that just as you say a man with this kind of drive for his mission is marriage-material, as soon as he gets a wife her aim will be not for the great commission to be the focal point of this speech, but that she would be the focal point of this speech from her husband. That's the conflict between God's design in women and the curse - that she wants a man with this passion for something, but she goes awry when she tries to shift that passion to become about herself.

The Truth About Porn

6 upvotes · 5 November 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Amen to that.

Using Kanye as an ice breaker

6 upvotes · 4 November 2019 · /r/askRPC

Good tip, brother. Really, any cultural topic can be used this way.

- Political election: Ask about the candidates and the conversation inevitably ends up in issues of morality and you can ask where they get their moral framework from.
- Popular movies: Ask about a difficult decision the main character had to go through and what they'd do. Transition it to whether or not they've had to make difficult choices in their own lives.
- Video games: You're playing call of duty and racking up kills. You ask, "Ever wonder what real war is like? I just popped that guy's head off. What if he had a family?" You joke at first, but transition to tragic events that have happened to you and ask the person on the other end of the mic the same thing. Ask how they manage tragedy in their lives.

The key in good evangelistic conversation is to find a proper balance between disclosure and prompting. 90% of the conversation should be you prompting them to share their thoughts/beliefs/feelings/etc. with you. Your disclosure back toward them is best if you use your prompting to make them curious about how you would answer your own questions, then when they actually ask, you answer with the Gospel. Not a pushy, "You need to believe this too!" kind of way (though that can come later), but a simple, "Here's what I believe and it changed my life" way. Notice I use the word "disclosure" and not "preaching" or "proselytizing" or anything of that sort. Because all you're doing is acting as a witness - the role God gave us in evangelism.

Killing the Blue

6 upvotes · 28 October 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Servant leadership is a concept most often addressed in Christian circles, and discussed from time to time on [r/RPChristians](#). The framework usually goes something like this:

- There are egalitarians who believe the biblical authority structures are culturally dated and therefore those passages can be ignored. Modern culture claims equality among the genders within marriage (while implicitly elevating women). They suggest if the biblical authors were alive today, they would have catered to the modern generation through egalitarianism.
- Complementarians find a balance between caving to the feminine and maintaining biblical consistency in the form of servant leadership. They acknowledge that the man has biblical authority as the head of the household

and that the wife is to submit to that authority. However, they then suggest that the way a man should lead is by always putting his wife's interests first, and therefore if there is a conflict in the home the man gets the final say, but his say is wrong if he doesn't submit his position to his wife's desires.

That's servant leadership in the modern church. It's a gross misrepresentation of the actual relationship between Christ and the church. Easy examples to dispel this: (1) Does God/Jesus cave to every single prayer request to win the lotto or get a promotion? (2) When the rich young ruler refused to sell his possessions, did Jesus cave and tell him he could get into heaven anyway? (3) When the man who wanted to follow Jesus asked to bury his father first, did Jesus undermine his own boundary to make a "loving" exception for the guy? I could go on. The point is: it's not how Jesus relates with his bride (the church), so it shouldn't be how we relate with our bride either.

Now, if this "certain group" you're referencing isn't a Christian one, I'm not sure how else to tackle it, as I've only ever heard this concept come up in Christian circles. If the secular world is onto the notion of servant leadership, I'd be interested to hear their thoughts.

To be clear: servant leadership is fine as a concept in itself. I agree with it. It just needs to be expressed with common sense. It's not "slave leadership." It's "servant leadership." You are not bound by the expectations of the people you serve, and as long as you have a strong frame that has no problem saying no to their expectations, you would do well in earning the respect of those under your leadership by incorporating a heart for service as part of your leadership model. Just don't let them dictate the terms of how you do that.

Killing the Blue

6 upvotes · 28 October 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Every man should set his own. Yes, my wife is aware of mine. To be clearer, though: this was referencing conditions on a man's expression of love to his wife, not necessarily the boundaries over which he will divorce his wife.

On that, when people discuss this in churchianity, they always quote "Husbands, love your wives" - stop. They often leave off the "as Christ loves the Church" bit, which is a limiter. We aren't called to love our wives in ways or circumstances when Christ does not express love toward the Church.

Those who do keep quoting will add, "who gave himself up for her," and then stop again, leaving out all of the sanctification-oriented language from the rest of the section, as [/u/deep_strength](#) often discusses. That is, a husband doesn't sacrifice just for the sake of sacrifice and unconditionality. He sacrifices when it contributes to the sanctification of his wife.

Amused Mastery, Outcome Independence, Agree and Amplify, Frame, etc.

6 upvotes · 21 October 2019 · /r/askRPC

Amused Mastery - Approaching a situation from a higher perspective that lets you appreciate the light and humor in it, while simultaneously conveying a depth of insight that transcends those caught up in the immediacy of the circumstances.

- "My ways are higher than your ways; my thoughts are higher than your thoughts." When we let ourselves escape the immediate frustrations we deal with and see from God's perspective, our attitude in difficulty shifts from frustration to appreciation and intrigue.

Outcome Independence - Not getting hung up on rejection or acceptance on a particular occasion.

- "Whether you turn to the right or to the left your ears will hear a voice behind you saying, 'This is the way, walk in it.'" There's no one clear, definitive outcome. People make choices and God leads us on. Don't get hung up on what choices you make and whether they're right or wrong, and certainly don't get in a tizzy over someone else's choices.

Agree and Amplify - A technique for responding to accusations or conflict that combines fogging (agree) with cocky/funny by amplifying the thing you agree with to an absurd degree so as to make light of the accusation/conflict rather than getting upset by it.

- "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision nor uncircumcision has any value ... As for those agitators, I wish they would go the whole way and emasculate themselves!" Jewish converts were accusing the Gentiles of being ungodly because they would not get circumcized. Paul pressure flips and says, in essence, "If you're so hung up on circumcision, better go cut the whole thing off." A godly man is not easily angered; rather, he can maintain good humor in the midst of difficult situations.

Frame - Your best self as projected to those around you.

- See Jesus any time the Pharisees try to challenge him. He does not cave to trick questions, but instead conveys the point he wants everyone else to hear, and while refusing to cave to the pressure of the pharisees he draws everyone else into seeing things from his perspective and being impressed by him, making himself the center of everyone's story rather than each person being caught up in their own life affairs.

I'm not sure how you see these concepts as "not separate from each other." Yes, one naturally helps the others, but they are completely distinct in themselves.

[FR] Initiate Often, Confident Always

6 upvotes · 15 October 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I love that quote! I may steal it sometime. But also: when applied to a singular woman, this is a covert contract: "If I keep <blank>, eventually she will <blank>." She may never. What are you going to do then? Do you have options?

[FR] Initiate Often, Confident Always

6 upvotes · 15 October 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Beautiful application! Just make sure the rejection isn't because you're spiritually unattractive (i.e. preaching hellfire and brimstone), haha.

My introduction

6 upvotes · 25 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

who I am now along with the new struggles I face while becoming a better follower of christ

I'd recommend editing your post to add this information to this post as well. Currently, it just comes off as creepy and troll-ish. But I do believe you're legitimate. But rather than merely sharing your past just to share it, tell us more about who you are today. How has Christ changed you? How have you grown in being the man God created you to be? What applications have you taken from Scripture or this sub or your own research or fellowship with other believers that have helped you? These questions are what benefit the community when you answer them :)

Could someone say anything about the statements this guy is making concerning the validity of the Bible?

6 upvotes · 20 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

no presuppositions

... is impossible. As an alleged Christian, he assumed that defaulting against his faith was the same thing as not having presuppositions for his faith. Notice that he references **NO EVIDENCE AT ALL** to the contrary

positions, showing that he's only looking at evidence against the faith, not evidence for it. This is, in itself, inherent evidence of bias.

Another clear evidence of bias is that his "research" resulted not in questions on the existence of a god, as he claims, but in refutations of the Bible itself. This tells me he was probably googling things like, "Is the Bible true?" This is not a ground-up, unbiased approach on the existence of God himself. It is a look into sources that address the Bible specifically, which will, of course, be incredibly biased one way or another. He didn't hear about the epic of Gilgamesh by conducting particle accelerator experiments to discern the origins of the universe or happening to come across it in a library somewhere, completely by neutral accident. You only find sources like that when specifically looking for refutations of the Bible.

Oh yeah, let's not forget the title of the post. First sentence: "NEUTRAL perspective." Title of the post: "from the atheist position." These two are completely incompatible and shows that he was really trying to go in with atheist bias to understand how they'd reach their conclusions.

More likely than not, I'm about 95% sure this guy has been an atheist all along and merely pretended to be a Christian converting to atheism just to get the reddit karma.

old testament is based off of previously written mythology

More likely: the events actually happened and different people groups interpreted the events differently. Most people (including non-Christians) take these additional texts as evidentiary support FOR the claims the Bible makes about the events actually happening, not evidence against them. The non-Christians who do this simply say things like, "Yes, there was likely a huge flood. The Babylonians thought their god did it, and the Christians assume their god did it. But the fact is, it was just a big flood." This still doesn't do anything to disprove that the Christian God did it. It only proves that other religions try to give their god credit for it instead.

Moses and the ten commandments was based on Hammurabi

Hammurabi had literally hundreds of laws. You don't write hundreds of laws and forget to put "do not murder" as one of them. But you'll also note that several of the 10 commandments are conspicuously absent from Hammurabi's laws. In fact, I'm pretty sure Hammurabi doesn't reference commandments 1, 2, 3, 9, or 10 at all - and that's half of them right there. The others aren't worded the same, but are basic things: "honor your father and mother, don't kill, don't commit adultery, don't steal, don't bear false witness."

many many many evidences about how the flood couldn't have happened given evidence from, zoology, archeology, paleontology and and other fields of study

Right. And there can also be found many many many evidences for the fact that a flood did exist. When I've done the research, personally, the evidence for the flood seemed overwhelming, even in light of non-Christian research on the topic.

Perhaps the most popular is the centrality of oil deposits to where the Ark likely landed. All those middle-eastern countries that we're drilling up - where do you think they got their oil from? Animals decay into oil - especially when buried under water (example from even a secular/liberal source). Why would there be a huge concentration of animals in the middle-east in the general areas that Noah probably landed in? Hmm ... I've heard rumors that this is how Rockefeller became the first billionaire - by logicking his way through the Bible to figure out where the oil would likely be. But I haven't actually seen a source to verify that.

the exodus couldn't have been real

Well, obviously it couldn't have been real. Science tells us that a man can't turn a stick into a snake, or make water turn into blood, or cast boils across a land with a word, or make water stand upright for hours. I mean, it's

not like God can do miracles, right? /s

Most "proof" against the Bible only counts as proof if God is bound by the laws of science. If it is possible for God to perform miracles that transcend scientific understanding, then the majority of arguments against Scripture go away because most of those arguments are simply: "It's not scientifically possible."

logical fallacies and how creationist arguments tend to be very circular in nature, with arguments from incredulity

This is where I get ticked off at most apologists. Instead of defending the Bible on God's terms, they fight against atheists on their own terms. I often talk about the wide gap between:

- philosophy/logic < < < science/observation < < < theology/divine revelation

If you try to use logic or observation to prove things that transcend logic or physical observation, you're always going to come off looking like an ignorant idiot. Stop using the wisdom of the world to try to persuade non-Christians. It's a bad idea. It never works. It's idiotic. Sorry, [/u/rocknrollchuck](#) - but this is one of the huge flaws with people like Ray Comfort. The better option is to stick with what the Bible says and defend its integrity, not to try to prove that science supports God's existence too. It does, sure. But most people who try to use it for that purpose have no clue how science and our faith actually overlap, so they just come off like idiots saying that "the banana is the worst enemy of atheists because it fits perfectly in the human hand" (a la Ray Comfort).

creationists misrepresent the opposition a lot of the time

Oh, because atheists have never misrepresented the Bible. If misrepresenting something is proof that the misrepresented thing must actually be true, then every atheist has just proven the Bible true. You'd have to be a moron to follow that logic.

"But Red, it was more about the fact that Darwin said the quote, but still believed it was science anyway." Uh huh ... but what makes Darwin right about every crazy theory he's ever had?

a lot of the gospels were written MANY DECADES after Jesus purportedly lived

Yeah, because most Christians assumed he would return in their lifetime. When they realized that wasn't the case, they figured it was time to preserve eye witness testimony before they died and the truth was lost through second-hand accounts.

Okay, so I'm out of time, but let me leave you with this.

Suppose a husband and wife are fighting. The wife throws a chair at him, but he moves out of the way and it hits the wall, making a hole. It's obvious the situation is not safe. The husband grabs the kids and vacates the house to make sure they don't get hurt as collateral damage.

While he's doing that, the wife calls the cops and accuses the husband of domestic violence, using the hole in the wall as evidence, saying he threw the chair at the wall, trying to hit her because he was so mad, and she's terrified for her life.

The cops show up and tell him what the wife says. He writes up a statement saying the exact same story she says, but that she threw the chair at the wall, not him. Now, how would you respond if the cops said any of the following:

- "I don't see any proof that the chair is what caused the hole in the wall, so you both must be lying. No chair was ever thrown at this wall, and we are extremely confident of this."

- "Husband, she told her story first, and your story is so close to the one she told that you must have just copied what she said, so your story must be completely false. You're lying. You obviously threw the chair."
- "It's clear that someone threw the chair at the wall. There's no reason for both of you to lie about this. But, I can't tell which one, so we're going to have to figure out who's lying or telling the truth by examining other aspects of your stories - but we will acknowledge that yes, a chair was thrown at the wall."

Which option sounds the most reasonable to you?

An Interesting Study Indicates Men and Women Sin Differently

6 upvotes · 18 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Yeah, no thanks. I don't buy into that definition either. The fact is, lust itself is not identified as the sin. Adultery is the sin. Lust, in the context Jesus provided, is considered adultery. And if you want to get into the Greek and Hebrew words that make up the whole lust/coveting concept, I doubt you'll find much about procreative desire. This is muddling theology of sex with theology of desire without any real reason to do so. That's just bad theology.

Opinions: Do you ask a woman out to begin dating?

6 upvotes · 13 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Not at all. After all, Jesus is the most polarizing person who ever lived.

As I understand it, Manson's concept of polarizing is that to be attractive to some, you're inherently going to become unattractive to others. Becoming more politically conservative might make you more appealing to a conservative girl, but make you an automatic no-go to a liberal girl. Right? Some women ride the fence longer than others, and a guy should take action to force them to make a decision.

The classic pickup mentality is that it's all a numbers game. Even the best PUAs get rejected a lot. So, they teach to keep getting rejected and rejected until eventually you get a close. A normal guy might get rejected once every 6 months because that's all he ever initiates. If he goes through 5 rejections before getting to "yes," he just wasted over 2 years. PUAs will bounce through a dozen rejections in one night to get the close - and all they need is one a day. The more time you spend in the "gray zone," the less time you have to move on to a girl who might actually become receptive.

That's the man-chases-girl model. But the girl-chases-man model can follow a similar pattern. Instead of initiating toward sex or asking them for a date, you're inviting them to join your life. That's all.

The goal here isn't to minimize rejection, though this model certainly does have that added peripheral side effect. It's to see whether or not women are compatible with your lifestyle and mission for Christ without you, as a man, having to change your lifestyle to suit what you think will please her or keep her happy or make her want to keep dating you.

But this lifestyle itself is still absolutely polarizing. Many women will see how committed a guy is to making disciples, for example, and decide that she's just not into that and leave. They're on the rejection end of polarization - and that's okay, because you have abundance and an attractive guy has plenty of other women on the attraction side of polarization and are really drawn to a spiritually mature guy who is making a difference for eternity with his life.

Perhaps the greatest confusion in my comment is the possible assumption that a man should only be inviting women to follow him who he views as marriage prospects. This is what mainstream churchianity teaches, and it's ineffective and has no biblical basis. In my blue pill days I actually used to be an extremely strong advocate for

this position, but I see now that it's all grounded on hollow implications based on philosophical thinking about the Bible rather than theological thinking straight from the Bible. Jesus's model is straight from the Bible and theologically sound.

To that end, a guy should be asking numerous women to follow him at all times - not just when they show interest. Contrary to Manson's position, I believe this even extends to women that a guy is not attracted to ... *if he doesn't otherwise already have an abundance of attractive women*. The reason for this is simply that women know women, and the more women you spend time with, the greater your preselection value, the broader your network of women, the more likely an attractive women will enter your social circle and find you attractive.

In the meantime, be willing to put off girls who are never going to be compatible with your mission in the first place, so you're not wasting time on them. This is being polarizing. It's also being effective. But it doesn't have to mean asking multiple girls out on dates to begin a romantic relationship. It can simply mean inviting multiple women to join you.

Remember that Gillette commercial?

6 upvotes · 3 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Well, in the history of the shaving industry there has never been any competition ever before ... so, you know ... this is kind of a new thing for there to be more than one brand of razor on the shelves. Right?

No Real Man Fallacy

6 upvotes · 25 July 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

What if Scottish law said, "A true Scotsman is one who is a Scottish citizen and maintains residency in Scotland"? Well, now there's an actual code from people with authority to decide who is a true Scotsman and who isn't.

But then someone can complain, "But he's not a true Scotsman, in my book." Now we're back to the question of whether amorphous social norms hold more definitional authority than a governing agency. So, the governing authority could write a statute, "No person shall hold anyone to a different standard of a 'true Scotsman' than our law dictates," and then proceeds to list sentences for committing such a crime. So, outside their jurisdiction anyone can say anything about what qualifies as a 'true Scotsman,' but enter their boundaries and you're off to Scotland Yard.

Is there a book somewhere out there, written by a person or people with governing and judicial authority over men everywhere which happens to define what a man is, and which imposes consequences for those who reject the standards found in that book? Oops, that's a conversation to have elsewhere.

As far as the manosphere goes, I'm pretty sure if someone wrote a post here on MRP all about how "real men don't cheat on their wives," the post would get removed pretty quickly - because someone somewhere in authority has determined that a guy *can* cheat on his wife and still be a *true man*. Heck, if he buys into the view that men are inherently and bio-psychologically polygamous (as I do), he's even more a "true man" for expressing his polygamous nature.

Similarly, if someone wrote a post about how you can pedestalize your wife and serve her every whim and that doesn't invalidate you from being a "true man," that post would also get taken down. We could call it trolling, but the fact is that the majority of men actually believe this and might just be trying to preach their philosophies to a crowd that disagrees with them.

My point is more to say that there are individual pockets of governing authorities within the manosphere that have jurisdictional authority to enforce their own definition of manhood - however broad or small that definition may be - and that these definitions absolutely do get enforced. So, while it's easy to say that no one is the arbiter of what qualifies as a "true man," there are still always going to be standards somewhere about what different

groups find to be acceptable messages about masculinity/manhood and what aren't. And people in those positions of authority will decide what messages their readership will hear on the subject and not.

And that's not a bad thing. I'm all for allowing autonomy to people within their own domain to govern as they wish. It's the same mentality as minimizing a federal government to empower the state governments to figure out their own issues. But along with this means that there will never be a general consensus throughout the entire manosphere on certain topics, and we just have to be okay with that. Some people aren't, hence the screwball stuff with the 21 Convention and Rollo and all that, along with many of the other fissures that have happened in the manosphere.

One of the consequences of putting a bunch of guys in a chatroom together and pointing them all toward becoming alphas is that eventually people will start trying to AMOG each other with their own views and definitions of the concept of masculinity. I'm with you - this is best avoided, and it's actually a pretty beta concept of people end up caring too much about that issue. But it's inevitable all the same.

This was a question during my class. wondering what others thoughts were.

6 upvotes · 12 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

prove that water baptism is not normative

But it is normative. Christians engage in water baptisms all the time. I think you meant "*should* not be normative."

But even that is a bizarre question, given that the apostles continued to model the practice - except perhaps Paul. If you want to make a case against water baptism, 1 Cor. 1 is the best argument you can make: "14 I thank God that I baptized none of you except Crispus and Gaius, 15 so that no one may say that you were baptized in my name. 16 (I did baptize also the household of Stephanas. Beyond that, I do not know whether I baptized anyone else.) 17 For Christ did not send me to baptize but to preach the gospel."

But even this argument is unpersuasive at saying it shouldn't be a normative practice because (1) even Paul baptized, despite it not being his particular calling, and (2) he recognizes that the other apostles were doing baptisms and seems to accept that as a norm.

More concerning is the exegetical framework you're starting with. You have a premise: water baptism shouldn't be normative today. You are looking for examples in Scripture that will prove your premise. This is the definition of **EISEGESIS**, which is when a person imputes their own beliefs into the way they interpret Scripture, as opposed to **EXEGESIS**, which is when a person looks into the text of Scripture itself to influence their own beliefs. Don't get caught doing eisegesis. It's the single most dangerous practice a Christian can engage in.

Now, the more common use of the thief on the cross in the context of baptism is the soteriological question, not a question of normative practice. You can't use an isolated incident to prove norms because, by definition, norms are observed over numerous samples across a demographic. But most people are interested in the question: "If the thief on the cross wasn't baptized and yet was saved, does that mean baptism isn't necessary for salvation?" That's the soteriological question.

There are a lot of different views on this. The Cathodox branches believe firmly that baptism is a prerequisite to salvation, whereas most Protestants say it's not. I can argue both sides fluently, though I am firmly convinced that it is *not* a prerequisite for salvation. But that's a much longer explanation than I care to get into right now.

Cold-approach? Day game? Night game? What are the specifics?

6 upvotes · 1 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

"Game" is a contested topic here. I'm all for it, as I'd guess [u/OsmiumZulu](#) is as well. [/u/Deep_Strength](#) is against it. Part of it is that we're probably using different definitions of "game."

In my view, "game" is anything and everything you do to develop short-term attraction with a particular woman. This includes all of the prep-work that is involved, which could be considered "setting up the game." Lift. OYS. Have a mission. Confidence. Be successful. Etc.

If I had to guess, the parts of "game" that deep cuts out are the in-the-moment efforts that are made to get a girl horny. Some guys reject game because it can be inauthentic. Personally, I embrace it because it's fun to play. Role playing in the bedroom is incredibly and intentionally inauthentic, but it's still fun and something worth doing if you want to do it. In the same way, even inauthentic aspects of game are perfectly fine if you find them fun and want to do it.

As for the "how to" of *game*, check my post history for my "Married Man Game" posts. I've done at least 3. I don't recommend sexual game for singles.

That said, certain aspects of non-sexual game can apply for the purpose of generally attracting women toward yourself. But I personally do not take the view that this should be an intentional pursuit for singles, per my post on "Finding the Girl You Can't Keep Yourself From Banging" (sidebar, if you don't want to scroll through my post history). So, I don't encourage actively gaming multiple women. As a result, I'm not all that interested in talking "game" strategies for Christian singles, though I'm certain that there are many others here who would. [/u/macmeeler](#) comes to mind - and he's probably got some great advice for you on that front.

What I do encourage is keeping numerous women in your daily (or at least weekly) social circles on mission-related activities, and being an attractive man among them. You don't have to be trying to "game" them to win them over, but if you have fun doing something that could be called "game," then go for it. If you do it for the purpose of finding someone to marry, that comes off as pretty blue pill to me, and could ultimately undermine your effort. But if you do it simply because you find it entertaining, then by all means throw all caution to the wind. But this would lead to the conclusion that "game" for a Christian single man will be unique to what each man enjoys. Try out a variety of techniques and see what you enjoy. I'm just not the guy to go into those techniques for a single - first, because I haven't practiced many of them as a single (especially since being red pill), and second, because I find the intentional pursuit of marriage to be a blue pill notion in the first place.

No Wife / Why Women Don't Need You / Do not marry her...

6 upvotes · 26 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

You're right. He isn't here in good faith - and hasn't been for as long as I've known him. His goal is usually to trash the purposes of this sub and tell people they just need to be more godly ... after admitting to sleeping with a girl just last week. Bad faith. I'll stay out of the conversation. [u/deep_strength](#)'s reply is enough for OP to go on.

The only thing I'd add is that Bobby's stats on how bad marriages are today are looking at 90% blue pill marriages where the guy doesn't know the first thing about attraction. He says 90% of marriages are sexless flops where women do as they please ... yet 98%+ of marriages are blue pill. Hmm ... then he wants to tell the red pill guys we've got it all wrong? Try getting better stats within our own community. Ask the MRP/RPC mods and ECs how their marriages are and let that be your data. You'll get a massively different result.

On Marriage And Mission

6 upvotes · 13 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

This kind of sounds like the guy who wants sex, so he crawls in bed after his wife is already asleep. He nudges

closer. He moves his foot over so it's touching her foot. He scoots in a bit closer. Then he puts his arm over her to cuddle. Then he gradually slides his hand across her waist. Little by little over 10 minutes he starts playing with her waist line and eventually slides his hand inside her pants. She wakes up and says, "What are you doing? If you want to do something, just do it, but stop screwing around like this."

This "ease her into it" mentality with regard to what *you're doing* is usually based on a fear of how she'll respond if you're just direct and up-front with her. Don't be that guy.

If you want to "ease her into it," you do it the way Christ does with our sanctification. He tells everyone up front: "Be perfect." He knows what he expects. He knows what his mission is and tells it to them from the beginning: "Follow me and I'll make you fishers of men." But when the disciples dropped their nets, he didn't say, "Okay, there's a man. Go fish."

Clear, bold, up-front. That's how Jesus did it. Then he gave a lot of patience and grace as he was preparing them. Clear communication followed by patience and grace seems wiser to me than the "ease her into it" approach - and it's what has worked for me.

I'd most likely just have a conversation: "I have been praying about what God wants to do with my life. I've decided the only thing that really matters is fulfilling the great commission. Nothing else I do in life will carry on into heaven. So, that's what I'm going to start doing with my life right now. You interested in doing it together? Don't worry, I know it'll take time to figure out what we're doing and learn from other people who are more experienced at this stuff. But I don't want to get to the end of my life and think I haven't accomplished anything that made a difference for eternity."

Tag: [/u/SkimTheDross](#) - as I think I'm really answering your question here too.

Helping the predominately but not exclusively gay guy

6 upvotes · 8 May 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

[/u/ChadDownUnder](#) gave a great reply - especially the bit about a woman being an accessory to your mission for Jesus. People today get too hung up on sexuality as if that is the source of their identity. "Gender identity" is not an actual thing - it's a term of art. Gender identification is probably a better word. I'm going to go off-topic a bit here to set up some context, as I believe this is an important issue worth discussing.

Identity

Your core identity is found in what you were created to be. If I build a car in my garage, it's a car. It doesn't matter that someone puts a dress on it and takes it to the prom. It's still a car. Why is it a car? Because I created it with an engine and seats to ride me around. Now, if it lacks the ability to drive me around, it's no longer a car. We could call it a broken car for convenience, but at that point it's really just an organized hunk of metal and wires. It doesn't become a car again until I fix it and it can perform the functions of a car.

You are created by God to make disciples - produce spiritual offspring. This is what defines you and all of us. If you're not doing that, you're at best a broken human, at worst an organized lump of cells that can think. Who you want to have sex with doesn't define you - your creator defines you, and he gives you that definition by what you were created to do, which is make disciples. The person you marry should be someone that advances that cause.

Sexual Missiology

If you marry a man, you undermine the integrity of the mission. I've often noted that God designed physical marriage to be a physical "copy" or "shadow" that can help us grasp the outline of what a true spiritual marriage with Christ looks like. This is particularly true in our expression of sexuality. Just as the God-given biological imperative between a husband and wife to procreate through having lots of sex, so also does Jesus want to spiritually procreate with us. The Bible says that:

- When God's Word is planted in us, we will produce a crop 30, 60, or 100 times what was sown (Matthew 13)

- When Jesus talked about being one with us (as a husband is one with his wife), it was part of his prayer commissioning the disciples to go into the world and make more disciples (John 17)
- When the Holy Spirit comes on us, we are compelled to be God's witnesses all over the world (Acts 1:8)

No matter how you slice it, our spiritual groom entering us results in spiritual procreation. Physical marriage between a husband and a wife is a reflection of God's relationship with the church and this missional imperative.

Homosexual relationships cannot reflect this. Procreation cannot occur. If the Bible endorsed same-sex relationships as a reflection of Himself and His relationship with the Church, it would completely undermine the imperative toward spiritual reproduction, devaluing the great commission. That is, if God authorized marriages in which procreation is an impossibility and still allowed it to reflect his image, then that would mean God is okay with a sterile church that never reproduces - that the church isn't Christ's bride, but his "bride or groom," and that as long as we feel like being a groom-groom with Christ, then we no longer need to share the Gospel with anyone else because the "love" we feel for Christ would be more important to us than the procreational imperative of Malachi 2:15 - "And why did the Lord God make them one with a portion of His Spirit in their union? To produce godly offspring."

To be clear here, physical marriages were only a "copy" or "shadow" of the heavenly thing (Hebrews 8/9), which is spiritual marriage to Christ. In essence, it's a road map to help us understand what God was getting at all along. So, I'm not saying every couple who doesn't have babies is sinning and denying God - because the option of spiritual reproduction is directly available to them without the need for physical reproduction to help them understand how to spiritually reproduce anymore (an advantage of having the Holy Spirit that people before the veil was torn didn't have). But we still do want our lives to reflect God's relationship with his people as best we can.

With that context in mind, the purpose of relationships is to lead toward spiritual reproduction: evangelism and discipleship. This is something you can do on your own with Christ, but a wife is someone who can help you in this role. Anything that you do or don't do in the relationship is evaluated in the context of whether it helps or hurts your ability to live out this purpose.

Should I tell a potential woman I find attractive about my predominant sexual inclinations before dating / asking them out?

That depends. Will doing so in any way make it easier for you to make disciples alongside her? Will it help her make disciples better? Will it affect her ability to help you make disciples? See how this evaluation works?

- If I'm asking: "Should I beat my wife?" The answer is no. This is a poor reflection of God's relationship with his people because he doesn't beat on his church, and therefore negatively influences your representation of God to others, and it also sets a poor example for the people you're discipling, hindering your mission.
- If I'm asking: "Should I lie to my wife?" The answer is no. This is a poor reflection of God's relationship with his people because he doesn't lie to his church, and therefore negatively influences your representation of God to others, and it also sets a poor example for the people you're discipling, hindering your mission.
- If I'm asking: "Do I have to disclose everything about my thoughts and feelings to my wife?" The answer is still no. This is a poor reflection of God's relationship with his people because he doesn't tell us every detail about all of his thoughts and feelings - only those which are individually directed toward each of us, and even then not often - and therefore doing so would negatively influence your representation of God to others, and it also sets a poor example for the people you're discipling, as they'll be inclined to model the same behavior, hindering your mission.

How do I reconcile, given my sexual preferences, that I (i) wait - to see if a given relationship I could flourish in (ii) not wait - ask them out / start dating without true personal conviction that they're someone I can love?

This is, of course, RPC, which means we've got to take a red pill approach and this is a very blue pill question. You're saying, "I really want to get married" - but the red pill isn't about making your marriage fantasies a reality. It's sexual strategy. As Christians, sexuality inherently implies marriage, so I see how it's easy to confuse the two. But my general advice is to avoid marriage in the first place. It's a raw deal for most people and comes with a lot of societal baggage that you'll never plan on, no matter how many blogs and internet forums you read. Most importantly, as Paul notes in 1 Cor. 7 - it distracts you from your mission.

The beauty in what [/u/ChadDownUnder](#) is saying about a woman being "an accessory" to your mission for Christ is that it keeps the mission the focus. Right now, I have no clue what your mission is or what steps you've taken already toward living it out. This tells me that you distinguish your desire to date/marry and your desire to fulfill your mission (if you even have one) as if they are somehow separate things and not inextricably linked.

Then, when you ask about relationship advice without any reference to your mission, it makes me think you want a relationship just because that's what everyone wants - because society is gung-ho on pushing everyone into relationships and you've bought into the lie that getting married and having sex someday is what's going to make you happiest in life. This is a supremely blue pill mentality and a fantasy that will never become reality, no matter how down-to-earth you believe you are about it.

So, before getting hung up on if/when to tell a girl this stuff about yourself, I'd start with the question of if/when you should even start dating girls in the first place.

How to take women's votes away to save them and society.

6 upvotes · 3 May 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

If you think this started with our generation, I'm even more persuaded that you have no understanding of the bigger picture. You must understand history if you want to grasp what it will take to move a nation. The feminization of society has been happening over centuries and this generation of men aren't even close to the first to screw things up. Read [/u/Deep_Strength](#)'s book - he covers all of this in great detail in the first few chapters with clear citations.

Women Feeling Threatened by Hyper-Sexualized Social Media

6 upvotes · 30 April 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Before this is a red pill sub, it is first a biblical one. Period.

Men have sinned. This sub seeks to restore them to God's original design. Women have sinned. This sub seeks to restore them to God's original design.

What society tells us about how men and women should be viewed and treated is inconsistent with what God intended. We're trying to restore God's intentions - that's all. Yes, the feminine imperative started when Eve ate the fruit and God cursed women to want to rule over men, but ordained that men should rule over them instead. But the reason this sub is for both men and women is more to do with a restoration of all the world to godliness, not just men, though men must be the ones to pave the way before women-kind will follow en masse (there are individual exceptions among women who are already willing to defy their cultural imperative).

What's ironic is that our message here is far more pro-women than the feminine imperative ever could be. People are only as satisfied as the degree to which they live up to the purpose for which they were created. In his book, [/u/Deep_Strength](#) notes a research study on the paradox of female unhappiness - that women today, despite all their "liberation" from the "patriarchy" and all that other crap, are actually more unhappy today than they were a

few decades ago. Why? Because you can't be satisfied if you're living outside of your design.

It's not enough for men to return to their God-given design. That is only the starting point. After men have been restored to godliness, women must follow. Women must also be restored to their God-given design as well. Just as this sub has started with a predominantly male user-base, this is necessary because men must pave the way. I do hope that sometime down the road, after there has been a restoration of biblical masculinity among men across the world, that this would inspire women to rise up and want to band together toward a restoration of godly femininity. This sub can be the springboard for them before an RPCW could ultimately be created - though I anticipate that this would still be years away.

Is the Catholic Church blue-pilled?

6 upvotes · 21 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

This really depends on what you mean by "blue-pilled." Some people like to say Catholicism is "red pill" because they endorse headship. A majority of Protestants could make the same claim, but red/blue isn't defined by whether or not you endorse headship.

The red/blue dichotomy is one more focused on the distinction between reality and culturally infused ideologies and the frame from which a person operates. With that in mind, yes, Catholics are equally subject to harmful blue pill cultural ideologies the same as Protestants and Orthodox - perhaps even more so.

What are practical things I can do to be more manly, masculine?

6 upvotes · 6 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Tim Keller is a brilliant apologist and philosopher. He's not the best theologian. His view of marriage, as I recall, embodies the same deformed view of complementarianism that plagues most mainstream pastors, specifically blending in ridiculous notions of "servant leadership" in a way that assumes the man must pretty much always sacrifice his own desires and directions in life to keep his wife happy when she wants something different from him.

While he has a lot of great content, his stuff on marriage is, as OZ put it, trash.

Masturbation when your wife withholds: Go, or no-go?

6 upvotes · 5 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

The first few sentences in, I'm thinking, "This is good stuff - why did this get down-voted?" Then you started going off the rails.

Testosterone is not a cure-all, and you can't gauge a man's T-levels by the way he types. There are many high-T men who are still blue pill beta AFCs.

Also, women say no to highly masculine, high-T men all the time. While hypergamy is not particularly complex, we can't oversimplify it either.

The whole "Jezebel spirit" thing also gets way overused. Is it out there? I'm sure. But at some point it stops becoming a spirit unique to Jezebel that others take on, and instead it starts becoming just the "woman spirit." AWALT.

Breaking the Nice-Guy: Take Ownership, Ask For Help

6 upvotes · 13 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

not a believer

That's where it's got to start. While you can make headway with her as a rule of general attraction, if she's not a

believer she will never be on board with the Christ-given mission of making disciples. If she's not on board with your mission, she'll never follow. Your marriage will ultimately be doomed.

The good news is: if you're following Christ and you can get her to follow you, she'll be following Christ. That is, if she learns to trust you, then she will trust Christ vicariously through her trust in you. It's not a perfect solution, but it's a place to start.

What are the differences of single and married Red Pill content?

6 upvotes · 13 March 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Other good answers here that I won't refrain. As far as community information goes:

- TRP: a few gems lost in a sea of wannabe-men with the emotional maturity of a 5 year old who can't decide whether to complain or brag, and often are more interested in thinking than doing.
- MRP: more interested in discussing what works, what doesn't, and getting results.

I believe there are some differences of opinion even among the mods on this, but I get the impression that MRP has three base positions (not mutually exclusive) toward the balance of TRP and being married:

- MRP is not a pro-marriage version of TRP; it's TRP for guys who don't want to get divorce raped
- MRP is TRP tweaked for guys who want to incorporate traditional marriage into their MAP for whatever idiotic reason they come up with
- MRP shows what would happen if a guy applied his knowledge of TRP praxeology over an extended period of time instead of quitting every time a relationship got difficult

Difference in priority with spouses

6 upvotes · 27 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Go over to [r/deadbedrooms](#) or talk to a divorce attorney and see how functional a marriage is without sex. Before getting into the specifics ...

This whole project is hogwash.

First, "Ten Dates for Mates" sounds highly effeminate - especially if this is what you're supposed to be doing on your second date. Is one of the dates "dress up in lingerie and have sex in a new place in a new position?"

Probably not. They're probably a bunch of emotional conversational pieces highly geared toward the way women tend to experience love and connection. Your list shows that the things that typically get accomplished on dates are all at the bottom of your priority list:

- mutual activity is, itself, the date
- understanding and tenderness are the feelings that are meant to be facilitated by dates
- intellectual closeness is meant to be fostered by the conversation on the date

The higher priorities on your list are things that happen as an inherent part of day-to-day interaction and not something singled out for date nights.

More significantly, though: **this exercise FALSELY presumes that what she says is an accurate reflection of how she will think, feel, behave, etc.** Watch what she does, not what she says.

"While we discussed ... she explained ..." Don't trust it. Women rarely know what they actually want. Very few are truly attuned to their feelings. The wise ones will admit in a crisis: "I have no clue what will make me happy"

right now." More commonly: "I'm not happy because you don't do enough around the house to help and there's so much pressure on me" - and then you ramp up your chore game and she's still unhappy, so she moves on: "I'm unhappy because you're not supportive and encouraging enough to me." So, you start speaking kinder words and tell her what she needs to hear when she's down, so she moves on: "I'm still unhappy because I don't have the freedom to do the things I want to do in life." So you start covering the kids more often so she can go out with her friends or spend a day shopping at the mall, so she moves on: "I'm still not happy because I met another guy when I was out with the girls and I wish I was married to him instead." See how this works?

Women are inherently progressive thinkers, whereas men are inherently content. They're always looking to the "next thing." I joke with my wife that she has "next-thing-itis." There's always something big on her mind that she's looking forward to, and as soon as she gets it, instead of being happy and content, the next words out of her mouth: "That's great, but now I want ..." [Side note: do you notice the progressive v. conservative dichotomy and the parallels between the masculine state of being from the feminine and how this affects our political landscape in America?]

This makes sense. Women are directional people. They want to know that they're going somewhere. God created them to be followers, so if their man isn't a dominant leader in the home, they're going to pick their own destinations to follow. They must always have something to follow. I'm not saying this is a bad thing, it's just how women are. But it also means that in the absence of strong leadership in the home, their perception of what they want in life or a relationship is in a constant state of flux - as soon as they get one thing they want, their priorities change to want something else - some other (often intangible) goal to pursue. Don't fall into that trap.

How do you avoid the trap? By setting the agenda. Why have her create a priority list at all? You create your list and say: "These are the things we will prioritize in the relationship." You're welcome to get her input on whether or not anything should be bumped around, but at the end of the day this is your marriage to lead, not hers.

Let me be clear: **This exercise is EXTREMELY egalitarian in nature.** It presumes that her priorities for the marriage should be just as important as yours and that you must work together to understand each other's desires in order to for the marriage to work. This is total garbage. You need to set the agenda and let her know: "I'm not going to ignore your needs, but here's what this marriage is going to prioritize." Let her follow you.

While it's not the measure, it's an important observation to recognize all the same: I can say from personal experience that my wife is WAY WAY WAY happier in our relationship since I stopped asking my wife what would make her happy and I started telling her. "Babe, I know you've been having a rough time and you think x would be a good idea. I bet you'd actually be a lot better off if you did y instead. Give it a try and let me know how it goes." She's discovering hobbies she never knew she'd love and is quitting the litany of numbing activities that she previously wavered between.

Bonus points if you point her to things that are both entertaining and actually matter for eternity. Women want to know they are needed, and if you can find a cross-section between personal enjoyment and purpose fulfillment, you'll have led her to true satisfaction.

Well, I ran out of time and can't get into my thoughts on the specific categories, but suffice it to say I'd echo exactly what [/u/helaughsinhidden](#) said.

Flair System Update

6 upvotes · 26 February 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

MRP seems to manage just fine and they're well over those numbers. What's unscalable is monitoring user-/self-assigned flair, as we simply can't keep up with everyone who flairs themselves. Thanks for looking out, though!

Nofap

6 upvotes · 26 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

The 400 series directly addresses this, as well as a couple posts in the 200 series and my post on "sex starved v. Sex addicted." The content is here. Just take a look around.

Validation and Interdependency

6 upvotes · 11 January 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Assuming it's a legit question: when I go to church (which is not every Sunday), it's because I want to, not because I have to or because I want to impress anyone or prove how good of a Christian I am.

But this stems from a larger framework issue on how I define "church." The Bible doesn't reference a Sunday-morning congregational meeting. Although that can be a church too, modern services are a very incomplete picture of what we see in the Bible, which was not service-based, but relationship based.

To that end, my attendance at Sunday services is because I see those as a tool for me to accomplish my purposes. Some pastor has already done the hard work of gathering people together, and I utilize his hard work to advance my influence in the community.

We've done it, guys. "Traditional Masculinity" is now officially deemed "harmful" by the American Psychological Association. High-five to culture!

6 upvotes · 11 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Nothing wrong with that ;)

We've done it, guys. "Traditional Masculinity" is now officially deemed "harmful" by the American Psychological Association. High-five to culture!

6 upvotes · 11 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Why even listen to these twats?

Because it's my job to stay current on issues of psychology and parenting, as it comes up constantly in the courtroom in divorce and custody cases.

I agree that the APA screws a lot of things up, but every psychologist, psychiatrist, counselor, etc. who practices in the country is obligated to follow the rules and guidelines that they produce. Every forensic psychologist who makes a recommendation of who gets custody must follow the APA guidelines for what they can and can't do in psychological evaluations and custodial recommendations to courts. Every psychological test used to assess custody cases, criminal defendants, and ethical violators will be assessed using tests that the APA creates. Every school that trains psychologists seeks APA accreditation if it wants to remain competitive.

Should we listen to them? Not if this is how they go about their research. But the fact is that people do - and awareness on a public level matters.

The Christian Brad Pitt thought experiment

6 upvotes · 22 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Excellent post. This is a very needed reminder here. Fleshed out some more with scripture, this could be sidebar material. Note: Jesus IS Christian Brad Pitt in a spiritual context. True believers will do anything and everything to pursue him no matter how they feel in the relationship, even when he tells us no.

The only thing I want to clarify is that some men objectively can never be Christian Brad Pitt. The framework still works though because the idea isn't the man specifically - as wealthy, as famous, as good looking, etc. - but to be in the top 1% so you're at least playing in a reasonable league by comparison.

A Unique Situation

6 upvotes · 6 December 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Why is this on MRP and not askMRP?

You're too controlling. You wanted a non-monogamous relationship. You got one. You wanted to have sex with other people, so did she. That's what she's doing.

She was never yours. It was just your turn. You felt great while it was your turn. Now your turn is over. You can either man up and keep riding for however long it lasts - and the in process probably maximize that time as well ... or you can whine like a baby about how bad the "intense pain" is and be totally disgusting to her and all other women. If you're lucky, maybe a few women will screw you out of pity for your sob story.

Where do you start? At the gym.

Relationship agreement - what do you think?

6 upvotes · 26 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Surprised it hasn't been said yet: **You can't negotiate attraction!**

A woman will follow you because you're a high value man on a mission worth following. She won't do it because of some legally unenforceable document she signed when you first started dating. As soon as the terms aren't favorable to her interests anymore (i.e. she finds someone with a better obligation/reward dynamic), she'll branch swing.

Boldly sharing the Gospel - is it unloving?

6 upvotes · 30 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

2/2

For example, if a country is at war, "kill the bad guys" might be an essential part of winning the war, but it does nothing to explain why the war is being fought in the first place. The goal isn't to kill bad guys just because they should be killed. There's a reason why the countries are at war in the first place. Or suppose I want to backpack through Europe. Buying a backpack is probably an essential step in the whole process - I can't backpack at all without an actual backpack. But the point of my wanting to backpack isn't just so I can go buy a backpack. There are a million other bigger reasons and the backpack itself is necessary, but ultimately incidental to those reasons. Sin-management is the same way.

So, what was Jesus' mission? If I had to put my perception to words, I believe Jesus' mission was: (a) to glorify God (b) by establishing a kingdom for God on earth (c) that would carry on into eternity, (d) which he would accomplish through a reproducible model of disciple-making, (e) living out that model to provide an example for other people to live up to, (f) and that in doing all of this he would overcome, in the most glorious way, the spiritual forces that have been at work against God since the beginning, (g) enabling us to take part in this plan by defeating sin's mastery over us (h) so that we are capable of fulfilling our role in this greater plan.

Notice that in all of this, stopping our sin is something of an aside. It was a necessary step toward the actual goal of utilizing us as the tools through which God's greater purposes would unfold. Managing/conquering sin is not an end in itself. It is merely a means to something bigger. Popular philosophy will tell us that "the journey is what matters, not the destination." This isn't true in the Bible. Yes, the journey matters - but it only matters to the degree of where we're actually going and what we're accomplishing. Sin-management, whether on a soteriological or sanctification level, is merely a way-point or small stretch of the larger journey - not even the entire journey itself, and certainly not the destination. So, when we preach from the get-go that being "saved from sin" is the whole point of salvation and a relationship with Jesus, something much, much bigger is lost.

Captain Save-A-Ho Soteriology

When we preach the Gospel in a manner that assumes "Jesus saves you from sin" as the underlying foundation of faith and why Jesus died, we make the whole story about us.

To bring this to a more red pill parallel, imagine a guy who finds a messed up woman that he's really attracted to. She's had sex with over 100 men, she has a dozen children out of wedlock, STDs up the wazoo, she's strung out on drugs, cheated on any man she's ever been in a relationship with, and she's a Grade-A "I'll never submit to a man" feminazi. Should he marry her or not? I'd hope that pretty much anyone - even the bleeps - would tell such a guy to run for the hills, regardless of whatever emotional connection he might feel to her.

Any model of evangelism that assumes Jesus' primary goal on this earth was to save us from sin is like telling that guy: "You'd better marry her. After all, that's what Jesus would do." And, in fact, the gospel of sin management does preach this as what Jesus did. If we ignore the overarching plan that God had in sending Jesus to die in the first place, we're telling people that Jesus was really into this psycho crazy harpy, so he married her with the goal of saving her from all her past struggles.

This is the definition of the "Captain Save a Ho" concept. This is exactly what NMMNG preaches AGAINST doing - and rightfully so. This limited view of the Gospel is incredibly dangerous and undermines virtually everything we preach here at RPC and is at the core of why feminists have been able to manipulate the Gospel into something that would compel men to marry the first single mom or post-wall CC-riding alpha widow they can find.

What did Jesus do?

By now I've deviated from the more public resistance to the Ray Comfort model of sin-management evangelism that you were referencing and gone into deeper theological issues with it. Let me pull it back for the end.

We're not under the old covenant anymore. Hebrews 8:13 makes that clear. So, trying to use the law as a motivator for someone to want to seek Christ is already standing on shallow ground. Yes, it makes us conscious of sin. No, becoming right with the law - even if that's by grace through faith - is not the end-goal. If you communicate to someone that Jesus's function was to make you right with the law again (assumed by the fact that you emphasized the ways they weren't right with the law as the foundational premise for the conversation), all you're going to do is reinforce the notion that Christianity is just about a set of rules. Anyone who looks at those rules is going to feel judged and condemned - and rightfully so. There is no love in this.

There are countless better ways to address the Gospel that doesn't involve the law or condemnation as the foundation. Jesus' strategy was to give people a purpose - a mission bigger than themselves that they could commit to. He shared it with them, he showed them how to do it, he let them try, he sent them out to do it on their own, and he commissioned them to pass it on (208). This discipleship model of sharing the Gospel was the way he lived.

Did Jesus preach against sin as well? Absolutely. He called lots of people to repentance. Did he ever confront people with their sin as a foundation for getting them to follow him? I can't think of any examples. I know of several times that he calls out people for their sin, but I don't recall many (any?) of these people following him afterward. This tells me that Jesus' plan wasn't to do this as an evangelistic effort (or we would have to conclude that he was a wildly unsuccessful evangelist); rather his confrontation of people with their sin had another purpose entirely.

The woman at the well often gets pointed to as a clear example of Jesus confronting someone with their sin during an evangelistic conversation. But notice the foundation of the conversation was first on Jesus establishing

himself as the living water - that he would have to indwell within her, sustaining her of life. This is part of the reconciled relationship with God that I reference as a more fundamental foundation for the conversation. Then notice that he doesn't actually condemn her for her sin or call her a sinner, as Ray Comfort suggests. He doesn't say, "You sinned, therefore you need me." It's not a logical leap. He's merely displaying his prophetic godliness to her and the conversation moves on without any further discussion on that point toward a larger mission that God was creating - "A time is coming and has now come," he begins, then paints a broader picture of the development of the church and calls her to be part of that picture.

Alternatives

I have obviously already presented my discipleship-evangelism model as a preferred foundation for sharing the Gospel. That is: give people a purpose bigger than themselves and show them how that purpose rectifies all of their problems. This is, in essence, what I do with virtually every person who has asked a question or sought advice on RPC. "What's your mission?" I ask. Then I give them a purpose - the same one Jesus gives them - and present it as the solution to all of their problems. My goal is to orient them toward Christ and the mission he has for them, and solving their problems (including their sin problem) is an incidental, yet highly desirous byproduct of what they'll experience if they take my advice. So, while you have been evangelizing through blunt communication - and I often rejoice that you do so! - I am doing the same thing from a different angle that focuses on the long-game through immediate reorientation.

That said, I recognize that the long-game isn't always practical and may not meet the need of the hour. Regardless, even in a short-game model of evangelism there are basic principles of communication that can make a huge difference. I completely agree with the previous objector that copy-pasta is highly impersonal and can make someone feel like you're preaching at them without actual care for them, rather than moving toward Christ with and alongside them.

When I was first being discipled, Justin taught me several principles for evangelism (which I haven't shared on here before, but might someday). One of them was: "Always get permission first" - either implicitly or explicitly. He would then explain that when you create a context for sharing the Gospel with them, they can't be pushed away from Christ or get a negative view of Christians when you do what they just invited you to do. It mitigates all of the potential harm while still allowing you to speak boldly and freely.

It also often personalizes the message. I love how you often open these conversations: you ask if the person knows Jesus. That's a first-step toward personalizing the context for the message. The next question you should be thinking is: *What will make them want to know Jesus better?* Where it can go dangerously wrong is when you shift gears away from their perceived need and you go into sin-management, telling them what need they should be dwelling on instead of the one they're actually experiencing in the moment. Your plan is well-intentioned, as the consequences of their sin, if left without the Gospel, are certainly grave - and this cannot be overstated. But if they don't connect with the sin-management framework for perceiving their greatest needs, they're going to reject the Gospel and accuse you of judging and condemning them. This isn't their fault for being too weak to handle hard truths. It is evidence of a need for greater tact in how to present the Gospel.

Losing feelings for my wife

6 upvotes · 26 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Good answer - especially the last few lines.

But Rojo-Gringo demonstrated his own love for his wife in this: while she was still cold to him, he sacrificed for her

Right. I just want to be clear: God's sacrifice for his bride was uniquely designed to fulfill his own purposes,

intentions, and glory. He did not sacrifice because the church deserved it or because he somehow has this beta infatuation with us, pedestalizing our needs. He does it because he has a higher agenda, and the fact that we get to be benefactors of that agenda is incidental to his glory in the whole process.

Eight questions for the RPC community in other countries

6 upvotes · 16 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

1. I know many women who verbally express regret, but without privy to their marriage, I have no clue how sincere this is or if it's merely a verbal assent to something they later learned to be a biblical issue. That is, they might say they regret it, but not actually feel any internal remorse and have only changed their minds based on biblical persuasion. They do advise their daughters not to live in sexual indiscretion.
2. See above. My personal guess from the very few examples I've seen is that it's merely an intellectual framework shift about what's right and wrong, not that they actually feel internal remorse (though I can list a couple who genuinely did).
3. For many guys, they don't view themselves as settling. If a woman is sleeping around that much, it's probably because lots of guys want her. They view themselves as the one who finally "locked down her commitment" (which is, of course, a very feminine approach to relationships). They say things like, "Plenty of guys wanted her, but I'm the one who finally got her."
4. I'm not in the position of vetting anymore (already married), but there are some women who I would say have sufficiently repented that the remaining consequences are greatly reduced, although they are never completely eliminated.
5. The fact that the first 15 of those years they're probably not all that interested in sex yet anyway. The temptation for sex really picks up around age 15. As for that point to marriage, the way you've framed the question presumes that sex is a primary goal in a Christian's life. It's like asking, "How do you help men come to terms with the fact that they may have to wait 15 years before they get to play putt putt?" If their life goal is to play putt putt, that's going to be a problem. If they have more important things to do, it's going to be sidelined anyway. The fact that sex is idolized in modern culture as an epitome pursuit of human existence doesn't mean it's that way from a biblical perspective. Get people within a biblical framework of prioritization and the sex craved culture gets sidelined.
6. Yes. Easily. They just have to have something they value more than sex that is both active and in conflict with sex. If sex is their highest goal in life, it will be impossible to avoid sex for that long.
7. I object to the "even Christian ones" to the extent that it assumes there is no difference between Christian and non-Christian women. Among genuine believers, there is certainly a stark statistical difference. Where they become indistinguishable is when you look merely at women who self-identify as Christian, which doesn't mean they actually are. A woman who continues in unrepentant sin - especially sexually - is to be regarded as a non-believer and excommunicated from the church (Matthew 18; 1 Cor. 5). The thing is, many women who are already outside the church keep calling themselves Christians and many churches won't enforce Matthew 18/1 Cor. 5.
8. Absolutely there is emotional and spiritual neutering happening. I'm not sure of anyone on this sub who would say it isn't happening. The issue isn't what the Bible teaches, though; it's what churches are teaching.
 - The church's thought process goes something like this: *Men are prone to sex outside of marriage. The Bible says sex outside of marriage is bad. In order to get men to follow the Bible, we must take any measures necessary to prevent them from having sex outside of marriage. Conclusion: shame all sexual impulses for single men so that they will feel so much guilt at having sexual thoughts that they won't escalate to acting on

them.

- The Bible's thought process goes something like this: *Men are prone to sex outside of marriage. This is bad. In order to get men to be obedient, God gives them a framework within which to live - a mission. Anyone who lives for that mission, within that framework, will inherently be fleeing from temptation. That framework embraces the fact that men will have sexual desires anyway, but gives marriage as an opportunity to express their sexuality without allowing it to become a dominant distraction away from their mission.

The first bullet there is most often expressed by pastors like Andy Stanley, who preached about how he remains faithful to his wife: *refusing ever to be alone with a woman. Ever.* He talked about how it was awkward when he would get picked up at the airport and the driver would be a woman and he'd have to call the driving company to send another driver who was a man - that's how extreme he took it. His rationale? "If I set the bar so high that even failing my own bar would still be not sinful, then I know I will never fall into actual sin." Know who else used that same rationale for their lifestyle? The Pharisees. And Jesus condemned them for it (Matthew 15:9/Mark 7:7), as did Paul (Colossians 2:22).

The church now applies that same rationale: "If you want to avoid acting on your sexual desires, you have to go above and beyond what the Bible requires to stifle those desires so that way even if you do break your own standard, you'll still be pure." This is absurdity.

On Biblical Justice and Rape

6 upvotes · 10 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

1/2 - Long Reply Incoming

Okay, so to back up briefly, the OT law was never historically divided into three types - that came afterward. For as much as Paul talks about the law in his epistles, if there were a historical segregation, he would have mentioned it. Instead, we see him arguing over and over and over again that the non-Jews were not subject to Jewish law. He speaks in broad terms, even as to the most fundamental and basic, most important laws they had, like circumcision.

In Acts 15 there was a council that met to decide what laws would be imposed on the Gentiles and not. Paul was present and presumably argued against imposing any laws at all. James brought up the concession to limit it to just a 3/4 (depending on how you interpret it) OT laws - and this was made not as a command that those were the only laws to be retained, but as a concession to maintain peace and unity between otherwise warring factions of Jew and Gentile within the church. Paul's real view on this becomes evident when, years later (presumably after the hostilities died down), he writes in places like 1 Cor. 8 and Romans 14 (among several other places) that even those OT commands that were forbidden to the Gentiles in Acts 15 are really permissible as long as it doesn't violate one's personal convictions or we're not causing our brother to sin (ex. eating food sacrificed to an idol: forbidden in Acts 15, but permitted in 1 Cor. 8).

The Acts 15 council made no reference to moral laws being preserved. They only listed 4 out of the entire OT testament. And given their status as a peace-making concession rather than a theological conclusion, I have to assume that the whole of the OT law is no longer applicable to anyone who is a Gentile.

Accordingly, when you ask:

Why do we follow some of the Old Testament laws, but not all of them? Aren't you just picking and choosing which laws to follow?

No, I'm not picking and choosing any of them. I'm following Paul's conclusion that they are all rendered moot by the new covenant. From my reading of the Bible, this seems so plainly obvious that I'm not sure how so many Christians miss it.

Many want to point to Matthew 5:18 and only quote: "until heaven and earth disappear, not the smallest letter, not the least stroke of a pen, will by any means disappear from the Law" as their basis for assuming the law is still applicable. But they leave off the last 4 words of that verse: "until everything is accomplished." What were Jesus's very last words before dying? "It is finished" (John 19:30).

When Jesus died by the law, we died to it with him (Romans 7:4), and thus the law no longer applies to us. "You are not under the law, but under grace" (Romans 6:14).

I know this only answers the "picking and choosing" part of the question, and I could spend 3 more comments here, so I'll just move on and if there are any more questions I can address them.

Moving into a post-Gospel world, I believe the law of the Old Testament is no longer binding on anyone - none of it. Not even the 10 commandments.

That doesn't mean that there are no standards we should live by. It merely means that the old testament and the old covenant are no longer that standard. Paul replaces the legal standard of morality with a spiritual one - more on that in a second.

I want to be clear that I'm not talking about soteriology right now, as I'm assuming we all already agree that the old covenant did utilize the law as part of its soteriological model, but that the new covenant utilizes grace as its primary vehicle through which salvation would be found. So, when I talk about the law as a standard, I don't mean merely for salvation (a point on which I assume we already agree), but as a list of rights and wrongs from a moralistic lifestyle perspective.

As I've noted on this sub before, I don't believe the law ever existed to point out wrong things simply because God things bad things are bad, but to restore us to be the people God had originally intended. "Bad" or "evil" or "wrong" is not an eternal, innate concept. In the beginning was God and God alone. When God created Adam and Eve, there was no sin or evil. That was introduced *ex post facto*.

I often ask people whether God created the law for himself or for man's benefit. While there is truth in both arguments, most people appropriately answer: for man's benefit. Jesus gives this example when saying, "The Sabbath was created for man, not man for the Sabbath." If God didn't want us to break the law simply because "Mmm, that's bad, m'kay?" then how are we to benefit from it? How does that help us? It doesn't - it would be for God's own nuisance value that he wants us to keep the law (as if we actually held enough significance in the grand scheme that our behaviors could be a nuisance to God).

Instead, the point of the law is to help us to become the kinds of people God intended when he created humanity in the first place. The old covenant was not about avoiding bad things merely because they were bad, and thereby saving ourselves by managing our sin. It was meant to develop a positive, affirmative character that was oriented toward godliness.

- The command "do not steal" isn't about stealing being part of some higher moralistic list of "no no"s; it's because God wants us to become the kinds of people who don't need to steal in the first place.
- The command to keep the Sabbath isn't about it being wrong to go to work or help your donkey out of a ditch on a particular day of the week; it's about being the type of people who are able to appreciate and enjoy what God has given us instead of working ourselves to death.
- The command not to covet our neighbor's wife and possessions isn't about some darkness that grows in a person's heart; it's about making us the kind of people that are content with what God has given us so that we don't become envious of those who are given more. God will have grace on whom he will have grace and mercy on whom he will have mercy (Romans 9, I think?). Some of the workers in the parable of the talents/minas got more than others - and that's totally at the master's discretion. Coveting isn't bad for

coveting's own sake. It's "bad" because a person who covets isn't living up to the type of person God wanted him to be.

Now, in the OT and even through the Gospels, humanity had a significant disadvantage. Here's how this works:

- Originally, God revealed himself to humanity by telling us who he is and what he expected. This is how it is through most of the OT, as occurs through the law and the prophets as external indicators of God's intentions for mankind.
- When humanity couldn't accept that, God came down to show us who he is with a real, tangible example in the person of Jesus. We had God incarnate walking the earth explaining everything to us and showing us what it looked like to live it out in practice. But that still was not enough.
- Jesus says, "It is better for you that I go because unless I leave the helper will not come to you" (John 16, I think). That helper is the Holy Spirit. Instead of telling us who God is and what he expects (OT) or even showing us (Gospels), the Holy Spirit changes the game by entering into us, becoming one with us, and transforming us into who God is and what he expects of us (through Spirit-led sanctification).

To that end, the OT law is obsolete because God no longer communicates his expectations to us through such things. He uses the Holy Spirit internally within us.

Tag: [/u/lololasaurus](#) [/u/neytax](#) [/u/BobbyMcKee](#)

Married Man Game Part 2: Teasing

6 upvotes · 8 October 2018 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

The main thing is just not to bring it up independently of her. If she brings him up, fine. If you do it, it tells her you're thinking about it.

The same works in reverse, though. I was getting fitted for a tux for a wedding several months ago and the girl at Men's Wearhouse dug her nose into my neck, took a deep whiff and said, "You smell really good! I just want to keep smelling you." My wife brought that up, trying to tease me about it a few times, but the fact that she kept bringing it up on her own made it clear the situation struck a chord in her. For her it's fine - it's one of many ways a woman initiates by creating context. For guys, you can't do that.

As far as actual teasing, when she brings it up try saying, "I can't tell if you want me to punch him in the face or invite him in our bedroom, so I just want to make this clear: I'm fine with two chicks, but not with two dicks."

Need Some Help with a New Guy

6 upvotes · 1 October 2018 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

You start one.

Better Beta Divorce Strategy

6 upvotes · 27 September 2018 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

Yeah, my state has the separate and apart for 1 year rule too, but most people want to file sooner than that, so I don't often present it as an option.

As for the "other strategies" for dealing with a more agreeable spouse, I think you'd be underwhelmed with whatever I'd write up. It's typical negotiation strategy. Of course, there are nuances that I employ to get advantages that most attorneys are ignorant about, but that's more an awareness of the laws and rules of taxation

than anything even a well-studied layperson would be able to follow along with.

I'll give a quick example. I have a case recently where I'm representing the wife, who has close to \$700,000 in retirement assets. Her husband has stock in his company worth \$1,000,000 that he intended to be his retirement. I convinced the opposing attorney and her client to give my client \$150,000 extra of the marital assets so they'd both be sitting at \$850,000. Sounds fair, right? Until you notice:

- The additional assets my client got came out of their joint savings (not sure why they stockpiled it so high), which is a post-tax asset, as compared to the pre-tax nature of the retirement and investments.
- Because of the way my client's retirement assets were stored (mostly roth with some traditional IRAs) the post-tax value of her retirement accounts would have been around \$600,000. Because the husband's stock was all pre-tax, his post-tax value would have been close to \$700,000. He should have only given \$50,000 to equalize the post-tax values. He gave my client \$150,000 instead.

That's not really a "strategy" for winning a case. That's just being good at what I do. So, I'm not sure I could do a post on stuff like that because there would be so many nuances. The post would read more like a lesson on tax and investment accounting that would bore everyone to death and my only real conclusion would be: "Pay attention to tax effecting on your assets" because anything beyond that would be so nuanced to each specific situation that it wouldn't have enough broad applicability.

we have to wait and see exactly which magistrate we draw. our strategy will be partially based on which one

This is absolutely true. Not only does each magistrate have his/her own opinions on how to handle discretionary issues, but I have different relationships with each one too, so my own personal connections and reputations can influence a case. There are 2 magistrates and 3 judges in my county who will bend over backwards to trust whatever I say, even if the evidence is thin - because they know from history with me that I don't lie and I maintain frame even in the face of someone cussing me out, screaming in my face, giving death threats, and in one situation even charging across the court room at me. The magistrates/judges who have seen me maintain a respectable (as opposed to taunting) smile through these types of things are charmed/enamored with my frame as the attorney - something parties can't pull off because they don't have enough face-time with the judges/magistrates. But there are others who only know me by reputation, so I haven't earned that personal credibility with them. As such, I have to employ different strategies to (1) build that reputation in the long-run, and (2) trick the other side into giving me opportunities to show off my positive charm in the face of hostility and adversity. Of course, there are some cases where those opportunities just never come up, so I have to (3) read the magistrate well and learn how to cater to his frame of thinking.

Better Beta Divorce Strategy

6 upvotes · 27 September 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

based on your experience, i would like to hear your advice on how the man initiates and executes divorce for no other reason than "that's what he wants"

As a technical legal matter, you have to have grounds for divorce. Incompatibility is the only real neutral ground, but state law mandates that it be by agreement only. So, if she doesn't agree to get divorced, you have to use another ground. The most common one is gross neglect of duty. Of course, this is a legal technicality because no court will ever preclude parties from divorcing.

In the scenario you gave, instead of saying "I would be happier if I got a divorce" (which is what you're insinuating: "that's what he wants"), you'd have to frame it as being unhappy in the marriage and give some basic evidence for why you aren't happy enough in the marriage. It wouldn't have to turn into mud slinging. It could be

as simple as, "I found someone else and I want to be with her."

Other than proving the grounds for divorce as a matter of legal technicality, most cases will follow the same basic strategies. The one laid out in this post is particularly effective with highly contentious and mentally unstable women. But there are other strategies that work better if you have a more agreeable spouse or if she's not the type who wants to roll around in the mud.

The main point to remember is that frame stops in the courtroom. No matter how charming you are, you're just one of a few hundred faces the judge has on his docket. By the time your case comes up, he's probably processed thousands of contested divorce cases - and you're not going to be the one person to change his framework for processing the next case. So, you have to enter his frame and win in that frame. Where your frame starts to matter is in the pre-litigation process. Attorneys and GALs are far more susceptible to influence than the judges and magistrates are - not to mention your STBE. Let your frame dominate those interactions, pulling them into your way of thinking. But as soon as you step into the courtroom, you pander to the judge's way of thinking and show him why you measure up to the judge's standard better than she does. That applies regardless of who follows first.

Jesus says "Follow Me" - an example of the correct frame of relationships

6 upvotes · 26 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Paradigm changing.

Bonus content for further study: pursuit, seduce, initiate post on the sidebar.

does Jesus pursue me or us?

If we're already married to him (i.e. saved) and we wander away into sin, yes. Otherwise, no. Especially not to initiate a relationship.

This is a very MGTOW type of argument

No, because MGTOW aren't expecting women to follow. Jesus does expect his bride to follow. He just doesn't get worked up when people don't. He shows them the door and moves on.

maybe in a secular way - how much of my time and attention moves towards doing things that I think will get me more women

This is the definition of being purple pill. You have blue pill fantasies. You sprinkle some red pill concepts in your life as a strategy to fulfill those blue fantasies. Then you complain it's a lot of work for the payout. You're still blue pill when you maintain this mentality. The fact that you sprinkle in some alpha doesn't change the color of your underlying framework.

if we are honest, if there was no chance of getting a woman from any of these things or we were celibate - many of these activities we take part in, we would not be doing

This was literally the first post in the RPC sidebar series. Yes, I would continue doing all of these things even if my wife divorced me and I couldn't remarry. Why? Because she isn't my reason. That's blue pill. I have internal motivations for why I do what I do, which don't depend on her. I'd venture this is true of at least all of the mods and several other guys as well.

Very happy I found this forum

We're glad you're here. I'm very interested to see your development and if you'll dive head first into the red at any point soon. Peace, brother.

Difficulty accepting my new reality.

6 upvotes · 21 September 2018 · /r/askMRP

That's because you're in her frame. If I were you, my framework for perceiving the balance of responsibilities would be: "This is my house, my kids, my dinner to cook, my deck to fix, my car to repair. She's the girl I send out to get me my money so I can take care of business."

[FR] "Lost" Frame for the First Time in a Long Time.

6 upvotes · 11 September 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

From the first episode of Ozark:

Drug Cartel Leader: When I was nine years old, I started working for my parents' grocery store. Wasn't a big store, but it fed six kids. We had four cashiers. Carlotta, our best, maybe 30, started there when she was 15. She was loyal. The kind of person you call 'Aunt' when you're nine years old, because she was always there. Always with a smile. And then one day, my father's closing up and he sees Aunt Carlotta slip five dollars' worth of pesos out of the till, into her pocket. He could not believe it. 'Why? Why, Carlotta? If you needed the money, why didn't you just come to me?' Carlotta was a proud woman. Not too proud to steal, but proud. She had four kids, no husband. Her youngest one had asthma. Said she needed the money to buy medicine so her boy could breathe. Cried like a baby. Swore she would never do it again. Begged my father not to fire her. Begged. Mr. Hanson, what should my father do with Aunt Carlotta?

Mr. Hanson: Five dollars? You tell her if it happens again, she's gone. you put her on probation.

[Mr. Hanson gets killed. Later in the episode Jason Bateman's character answers.]

Cartel Leader: You never answered my question. What should my father do about a woman who steals from him? A loyal woman. A mother. With him 15 years. What did my mother make him do?

Jason Bateman: Fire her.

Cartel Leader: Why?

Jason Bateman: It's not the first time she stole from you.

Cartel Leader: What was it?

Jason Bateman: It's the first time you caught her.

OP has no idea how often his wife actually crosses his boundaries. This is just the first time she got caught.

What is love?

6 upvotes · 20 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I contemplated putting that in the post itself, but thought I'd give this community more credit ;)

Advice for a girl

6 upvotes · 13 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I would be cautious of any of the secular subs. [r/RPWomen](#) used to be solid but has devolved a lot in the last year - both in terms of secularism and overall quality of content.

[u/redpillwonder](#) is working on content directed toward women that I think he plans on posting here too.

In the meantime, there's a post in the sidebar directed toward women that he wrote which is excellent. I'll also give a more complete reply when I'm not on mobile anymore.

Overcoming lust/porn problem? (+ introduction, been lurking for a while now)

6 upvotes · 9 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Thanks for the introduction! I really appreciate those stats, brother. You've got a solid body and mind about you and your spirit is oriented in the right direction. This is good news to hear for a newlywed man. You have an opportunity to lay a good foundation from the start that many of us lacked until years into our marriages. In a lot of ways, your story reminds me of my first 6 months of marriage.

I was worried that we would end up having a sexless marriage—completely irrational

That's her frame talking. Sexless marriage are a perfectly rational thing to expect. They are extremely common. But if she can convince you it's irrational, then you'll drop your guard and she takes over.

when my wife isn't interested in sex I'm not really phased. I just move on and initiate again later.

Atta boy!

two weeks ... ended up sliding into porn

Geeze, if I didn't know any better I'd say that's a pretty low threshold. Of course, I know many guys who can't make it past 2 days.

Ok, let's get down to business. First, go back and re-read 202, then immediately the 400-series. In conjunction, they can give a new biblical perception of a longstanding problem. One of my favorite lines from 202 that you seem to be struggling with: "But then you realize that it's silly to assume that guilt could save you from...becoming guilty."

You obviously feel guilty about what you've done. This guilt is putting you in other people's frame. If you want to get past porn, **YOU** have to be the one to do it. If you're living in someone else's frame, you're not getting past your porn problem; they're helping you get past their problem with you looking at porn. See the difference there?

I know you have a problem with it too. Don't get me wrong on that. But seriously, feeling guilty over it isn't going to make you ... not guilty. Remorse is not the same thing as repentance, despite popular belief. Repentance is repentance.

How do you repent from something like this? Well, I just wrote a whole post on that titled: Sexual Addiction v. Sexual Starvation. Satisfy your sexual cravings and see if you're still looking at porn. I've known guys who would have sex with their wives and then immediately turn around and watch porn 15 minutes later. I was one of those guys for a time (though not for addictive reasons). Are you that guy? It doesn't sound like it. It sounds like when your sex-life with your wife is up to snuff you're just fine.

This tells me that you simply had a time of sexual starvation. It's like when you're fasting and you hit the 5 day mark and you see someone who isn't fasting eating something delicious. You know you want a bite, but are you strong enough to resist? Some people are, some people aren't. Are you going to hell for goofing up on your fast?

No. Are you going to hell for looking at porn? No. If you were, then Jesus' death would have no meaning - it would be powerless to save you from porn. Are you suggesting that your draw toward porn is stronger than Jesus' power to save you? I assume not.

Let me get back on track.

ONE

Once you accept that Jesus bore your guilt, you should stop feeling guilty. That's step one. Look at porn tomorrow? No sweat. Confess, repent, and move on.

In *Practice the Presence of God*, it was said of Brother Lawrence, "That when he had failed in his duty, he only confessed his fault, saying to God, 'I shall never do otherwise, if You leave me to myself; 'tis You must hinder my falling, and mend what is amiss.' That **after this, he gave himself no further uneasiness about it.**" Adopt this attitude.

TWO

When you have adopted an attitude that is not controlled by internal guilt over your actions - that rightly recognizes that your guilt is on Jesus, not on you and that your refusal to relinquish your guilt to the cross is an offense against Christ himself - that is when you will be able to live in your own frame. You will be able to decide for yourself under your own motives, independent of the expectations your wife, your mentor, your Bible study, your accountability partners, your pastor, or whoever else might hold over you on this issue. You need to be at a point where you can tell them with a straight face, "I masturbated to porn last night. It was wrong. I repented. I'm fine with it and right with God. Pass the creamer." If you feel compelled to have an emotional reaction to it, you're still in someone else's frame.

THREE

Once you've accepted the Gospel that Jesus bears your guilt, and developed your own frame on the issue, you need to set your mission. This is the real solution to the porn problem. I am 100% convinced of this. I've seen dozens of books on the topic of curing pornography and none of them have produced any consistent results. I have disciplined dozens of men through this issue and received fairly consistent results. A lifestyle of evangelism and discipleship cures a lifestyle of porn. That is your mission.

Why? I might as well make a post about this (and I was just about to write a post on something else - look how you got me distracted now!). I'll give you the brief synopsis real fast and then get that post up soon.

- Matthew 12 says that if you successfully cast an evil spirit out, if your house remains empty, it'll come back and bring more crap with it even worse than itself. Point: you can't just kick porn out of your life; you must fill that void.
- The Bible gives us three things that can fill that void: the Word of God, Jesus, and the Holy Spirit. Sound familiar? Oh yeah, that's the trinity. Weird how those are the only good references the Bible makes to something indwelling within us.
- What happens when those things indwell you? Acts 1:8 says that when the Spirit comes on you, you'll become a witness to the world. John 17 Jesus prays that his disciples would be found in him and he in them - and this in the context of him sending them into the world as disciple-makers. In Matthew 13 Jesus preaches the parable of the sower and explains that when the Word of God enters into the good soil, it produces a crop 30, 60, or even 100 times its yield.

Let's recap: kick the demon out; replace it with Father, Son and Spirit; doing this, per the Bible, always results in

a lifestyle of evangelism and discipleship.

Why else does this make perfect sense? Because your sin is prompted by a desire for physical reproduction. But the Gospel says that the physical things of this earth are satisfied in Christ on a spiritual level. So, what you long for in a physical way, Jesus satisfies in a spiritual way. So, instead of looking to physical sex to gratify you, look to spiritual sex. What is spiritual reproduction? We call that evangelism. And what is spiritual child-rearing, which pretty much the entire world agrees is the ultimate source of joy in life? That's called discipleship - and 3 John 1:4 agrees, "I have no greater joy than this: to see that my children are walking in the truth."

So, go make disciples. Bear fruit. Don't drop the ball on this one. Just starting this process won't cure you, but running it to completion will. I am very, very confident about this result and it has a proven track record with at least 15 of the 37 guys I've discipled over the years (on my way to the 60 yield!) who are now making their own disciples and seen the freedom that comes with this. Now, that's only 41% - but most of the other 59% never went on to produce disciples of their own, content only to be discipled ... *sigh*. So, I'd wager the success rate of this method is probably a lot closer to 85-90% - and it's possible that some of those guys simply hadn't seen enough fruit in their lives when I last saw them, but have since overcome their struggle as they continued making disciples after my time with them. So, maybe it is a 100% success rate. Who knows.

My testimony and RP-imony

6 upvotes · 7 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Glad to have you with us. Yes, there have certainly been additional layers of emotional intimacy and oneness as well. As I continue to be assertive and lead in the relationship, this causes my wife to trust me more and more. As that trust increases, her sense of pressure and self-stealing of responsibility in the home (as all women do) decreases to a point where she knows her role and is content with it. She would like additional responsibility, which I give from time to time, but she no longer just reaches for it without asking, like a kid trying to take a cookie off the counter. This sense of knowing our own roles is what fosters a sense of unity in a spiritual sense, just as unity in the physical sense requires a clear understanding of our physical makeup ... otherwise you get into crazy things like pegging and fem-dom.

To re-word myself more clearly: men and women are different shapes meant to fit together both on a physical and spiritual level. If we change our physical shapes, either sexual oneness cannot be had or it's perverted into something unnatural, like pegging. Likewise, if we try to change our spiritual shapes, spiritual oneness cannot be had, or if it is, it's perverted and unnatural in God's eyes and not fruitful to His Kingdom. In either case, both physical and spiritual oneness created from unnatural unity cannot result in offspring - whether physical or spiritual.

Because of both personal sin and the influence of sinful society, most people enter marriage with their spiritual shapes distorted. Women are like clay - they bend to whatever mold they're put up against. Without a man, society is that mold, which is why women care so much about what others think about them and why they're usually very interested in conforming their man to societal expectations - because they've spent their entire upbringing conforming to society, especially if they had weak fathers. So, as I fixed and strengthened my shape and increased my influence over my wife, she molded to fit my spiritual shape, making spiritual oneness possible. This has resulted in a level of emotional and spiritual intimacy that I previously thought impossible.

Life advice and direction needed.

6 upvotes · 3 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I always tell men to start with their mission. It sounds like you have a plan for the future. That's a good thing. But as far as missions go, it's a garbage one. Your "mission" right now seems to be: "Get a job I actually like and that's conducive to having a family." That's a waypoint, not a mission.

When you're dead, what do you want to be able to tell God, "This is what I did with my life: ..."?

That's is the answer to your first question. If you're not moving toward Christ, you're moving away. The reason you can't grow toward Christ in an environment like this is because your goals aren't God's goals. You have a destination in mind, not a direction. Christ is moving. If you have destinational thinking, by the time you arrive he'll already be gone - and that's even assuming your short-term goals are even where he was at one point in the first place. You'll always be playing catch-up.

When your head and heart are rightly oriented toward the pursuit of Christ through a clear and unambiguous mission He has assigned to you, then you will find it much easier to avoid sin and pursue Christ. Why? Because instead of planning the next time you can sin, you'll be planning your next steps in that mission. As I've often said: *The way to avoid sin isn't by trying to avoid sin, but by proactively doing the things Jesus wants you doing in the first place.* It's the pink elephant thing. I tell you not to think about pink elephants. If you try to stop thinking about pink elephants you're going to keep thinking about it, despite your hardest efforts. If you just go do something else, you'll successfully stop. In the Christian life it's only slightly different: everything is sin except God's intentions for us. So the only way to stop sinning is by discerning God's intentions for us and proactively doing it. Trying to avoid sin as a reactive measure to temptation will fail every time.

As for meeting quality Christian women, there are a million ways this can be done. Most of that content is already up on the sidebar and [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) has done a wonderful job breaking this down. I won't rehash what has already been said there.

Is it weird to hit up a girl you know on instagram?

6 upvotes · 10 July 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

You're right that this post isn't Christian-related in the sense that it's not a unique issue that Christian men struggle with. But the concept of how to approach girls isn't necessarily addressed by the Bible directly in the first place. So, should he ask these questions to secular guys, a feminized church, or guys who actually know what they're talking about? I don't think he did wrong by posting here.

What he did do wrong was fail to give any actual relevant information. To [/u/DarqueKnight](#) ...

1. Stats? What's your height, weight, body fat, each of your lifts?
2. Have you read the RPC sidebar? What about the MRP sidebar? A lot of this stuff is already covered in principle in those posts and the comments as well as the books and BPP's podcast. They may not address the exact question you asked, but by the time you've mastered these concepts you'll be the type of man who wouldn't need to ask this question in the first place.
3. What's your job? How are your finances? What's your career path/prospect look like for the future? Do you have anything to offer her?
4. What's your spiritual background? How are you at the 300-level disciplines? Do you memorize Scripture, have daily quiet times, pray regularly, etc.? Do you consider yourself spiritually mature? Are you sharing your faith with others?

Without this information, all we're doing is giving dynamite to children. This will be a new rule effective immediately.

Should I be approaching random girls? If so, where?

6 upvotes · 28 June 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I get the heart behind what you're saying - and it makes a lot of sense to me. That said, this type of approach often results in people being pushed further away from Jesus. There are more tactful ways to address evangelism and discipleship.

By parallel, if evangelism is the "pre-marriage" process in a person's relationship with Jesus, then that means that the pre-marriage process in our relationship with a prospective spouse should also be addressed more tactfully.

I do agree with your premise, though: that we already have a spiritual imperative to cold-approach people for the sake of the Gospel, so why get so worried about the non-imperative reasons we concoct for wanting to meet someone?

What your wife wishes she could say to you but can't because you're a bitch

6 upvotes · 14 May 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

More likely than not, she gave up on finding her perfect AF, decided to look for a BB to settle down with, fantasized about what marriage might be rather than taking a hard look at what it actually would be with this particular guy, and voila.

For women, reality is not reality. Perception is reality. And perception in their minds begins with fantasy.

I'm at a loss...

6 upvotes · 7 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

OK, I just read your MRP post from 4 months ago. What progress have you made since then? You got some moderately helpful advice there (albeit cliché), so what have you done with it? My first inclination here was to ask how you're doing on putting on muscle mass? If you're not getting into the kind of physical shape you need to be in, why would you expect her to do the same? How much has your bench increased? Your squat? Deadlift?

Back to this post - she realizes she's a big part of the problem. Great. Let her do her thing. Why are you so worried about fixing her still?

What I'm guessing happened is she said something like, "I finally realize I'm a big part of this" and your insides start screaming, "Finally! I have an opening to change her! I better take advantage of this while it lasts." Don't. My wife has done that several times throughout our 10-year marriage. That plan never works. Your goal isn't to change her. It's to be an inspiration for her to want to change herself.

Now, this is a fine line. I get it. Some women will still see you for the sack of garbage you used to be and say the changes are too little, too late. Others will see how much you've improved, assume they can't compete or keep up, so they'll divorce you anyway just to avoid feeling guilty/ashamed every day for not being able to hold her weight. This latter part is especially true among Christian women who are told that they need to meet certain standards as a wife and there is intense spiritual shame (internalized, not necessarily from external sources) they place on themselves when they don't meet that standard, which often causes them to want to give up rather than go through the hard work of improving.

If she's in either one of those places (and it seems like this past weekend she jumped from the former to the latter), then the answer ... doesn't change. Let her figure herself out. If she comes to you with questions, answer them. There's no sense stone-walling someone who actually wants help. But in the absence of her directly asking for your involvement, your job is simply to be awesome and keep improving - to be the source of inspiration for her to do what you're doing.

I don't know if you've read much of the sidebar here, but 108, 109, 110, 205, 208, 210 - and then basically all of 300-level stuff ... this stuff comes to mind.

- 108 - You're at that "low/turning" point and it's probably because you don't have a clearly defined mission that she's on board with.
- 109 - Because she probably expects you to be pursuing her and you haven't developed a frame where the status quo is her pursuing you.

- 110 - Because you still care too much about your "marriage" as if your "marriage" is a thing of its own. It's not. There's you and there's her. "The marriage" doesn't mean squat. So figure out who you are and where you're going and just go do it, then let her trail along if she wants. "The marriage" is not a higher priority than either of you individually.
- 205 - Because obviously you don't know how to communicate in a way that she can receive it.
- 208 - Because you haven't learned to lead the way Jesus did, which starts with example and gradually phases into her adopting the practice on her own and becoming excited about it.
- 210 - Because I haven't see anything from you about your mission in life other than that you want to decrease her standard of living and move away from the place where stuff happens and into boredom ... yeah, she's really going to be into that. You're an introvert, so that excites you. Maybe she's not as introverted as you think she is.
- 300s - Because I get the impression that you don't have consistency in your spiritual life. You don't yet seem disciplined, and you don't have a mission that your pseudo-disciplines are directed toward fulfilling. Go back to the basics and master them. When's the last time you memorized more than 2 verses? When did you last share your faith with someone? Other than a church event, when did you last spend over 30 minutes in prayer?

The sidebar is there for a reason, but your post is so short (even with reference to your situation from 4 months ago) that I really can't tell much about where you are other than to note that if you were where you seem to think you are, you would have known better to include a lot more relevant details. Check out [this post](#), for example. He talks too much about his wife's issues, but other than that, right from the start I know his physical make-up and progress, his mission, his job/income, how much of the RP material he's read, his role within his church, his efforts to pursue Christ, etc. With that context I can much better evaluate what's going on. We can't tell you what to do if you don't tell us what you've done and where you are.

I hope some of this makes sense. If I had to take a stab in the dark, I'd say the best way you can get her to change is simply to invite her along for the ride whenever you're in self-improvement mode. If you're going to the gym, ask her to come along. You both make more than enough to afford a gym that has childcare. If you're going to do some mulching, ask her to join you. If you're going to cook dinner, suggest she helps.

You obviously don't want her around because you're not attracted to her. In your mind you seem to be thinking, "What can I do to make her more attractive to me so I want to be around her again?" But being around you is going to be what makes her do the things that will make her more attractive to you.

For Singles: Finding the Girl You Can't Keep Yourself From Banging

6 upvotes · 26 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is actually a really good question - and one I probably should have fleshed out better.

First off, I have also written a post with an official stance for this sub that premarital sex is and will be considered sin (although definitions of marriage may vary). As such, sexuality is meant to be embraced in the context of marriage, not before marriage.

More to your point, that doesn't mean singles should shut their sexuality down either. Rather, they should prioritize it. Embracing sexuality for a single person doesn't mean making it one's highest priority, as secular RP suggests. It means accepting the fact that we are sexual beings and therefore should not feel guilty for having sexual urges, which the church often attempts to do to us.

The question on the table, then, is what the single person should do with those urges. Should he fervently seek a wife? My post above makes it clear that I think the answer is no - and I am as confident in this as Paul seemed to

be when he wrote the same things in that chapter (1 Cor. 7), "I have no word from the Lord, but I give a judgment as one who by the Lord's mercy is trustworthy."

To that end, a single person should avoid marriage at all costs, but in doing so not feel guilty for having sexual urges. But when those urges become overwhelming with another person to the point of inevitable sin, then it should be embraced fully with Paul's blessing that such a person does well to marry - although he notes that the one who stays single "does even better."

To summarize: embracing sexuality first means not feeling guilty about having sexual urges, and then means embracing marriage and sex when one's urges would otherwise lead into sin, and then after marriage to embrace it fully and completely within the bounds of that marriage.

As a point of clarity:

if we are also operating on the RP assumption that any romantic relationship is based at LEAST partially on sexual attraction, how does repressing that desire make us any different from the Nice Guys who divorce their sexuality from their interactions with women outside the bedroom?

Scripture is the premise, RP is a praxeology that fills in the gap where Scripture doesn't otherwise speak ... and most of RP is first found in Scripture anyway. My point in saying that is simply that we don't try to force RP and Scripture to coincide as if they are both infallible truths. Scripture is primary truth, RP is secondary when there are no conflicts with Scripture.

You also seem to assume that a man is pursuing romantic relationships in the first place. If you remove the romantic relationship from the picture as a goal in itself (as my original post suggests), then that "at LEAST partially on sexual attraction" part doesn't come into play either. All relationships are platonic until sexual tension increases to the point where it can't be platonic anymore. The goal here is not to foster an increase in sexual attraction (which I believe is one of the main reasons for how screwed up relationships are today); rather, it's to let the mission drive each person's life context and to allow sexual attraction to build on its own. This is how to avoid dead bedrooms, whereas people who cultivated sexual attraction as singles realize after marriage that they can't keep it up indefinitely, as body chemistry changes, women pass the wall, menopause enters the fray, children get in the way, etc.

The traditional secular/worldly method inherently implies a bulge of sexuality early in a relationship that will fade. Secular RP sexual strategy attempts to mitigate this by making the man as attractive as possible and to encourage him to give the woman many opportunities to respond to his sexuality ... but there will still always be a fade/decline after the early parts of the relationship as the honeymoon phase/new relationship ecstasy wears off. My proposal cuts out any up-front sexual tension and allows it to develop naturally in a way that increases sexuality after marriage rather than inherently lends itself to a gradual fade over time.

How do you circumnavigate modern dating and its standards and at the same time follow God's plans

6 upvotes · 14 March 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

[/u/OsmiumZulu](#) is on the brink of posting something that I'm guessing will really help you, so stay tuned. In the meantime, I also added his original post directed toward singles to the sidebar - it's WELL worth the read.

As for Christian dating, [/u/ruizbujc](#) made a facebook video blog post about this a couple years ago, which I fully agree with: [EDIT: redacted to avoid doxxing].

The brief summary is that if physical marriage with a spouse is paralleled with spiritual marriage with Christ (per Ephesians 5), then it's likely that the physical pre-marriage process (i.e. dating) should parallel the spiritual pre-marriage process (i.e. evangelism). To that end, what principles do we see in how God draws non-Christians to himself or in how we, as his bride, go about drawing others into relationship with God?

Examples:

- "While we were still sinners, Christ died for us" - we were imperfect when God decided to pursue us, so don't look for the "perfect" woman. Instead, God utilizes the relationship to raise us up into maturity, and so should we raise up a godly woman worthy of marriage if we can't find someone already perfect.
- Jesus constantly says things like, "If anyone would come after me, he must ..." or "Anyone who does not ____ cannot be my disciple" - This is him setting expectations and boundaries, just as we should set expectations and boundaries in dating relationships.
- God's purpose in drawing a person to himself is not just to tease them, but to bring them into eternal relationship with himself. Likewise, we should not be pursuing relationships just for the fun of it; we must always have marriage as an end-goal if we're engaging in romantic relationships, otherwise you're wasting both your and her time.
- "No bad tree can produce good fruit" - Fruit is our reproduction. If someone isn't spiritually alive (i.e. a non-believer) they cannot spiritually reproduce and God will not reproduce with/through them. Likewise, you shouldn't engage in reproductive acts with someone before marriage either.

A Guide to Manipulation - Part 1: Are You Being Manipulated?

6 upvotes · 13 March 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

You seem to be forgetting the years and years of deeply ingrained blue pill philosophy that men have been raised with for decades or more. There certainly is a component of manipulation, but I also included the caveat for a reason, as you appropriately noted.

There's also a big difference between (1) when these things internally originate from within you, as you describe, and (2) when someone does not have a frame of reference of strength and maturity (i.e. most beta men), and therefore is easily susceptible to experiencing these things when prompted by others.

Or are you suggesting that the feminine imperative, hypergamy, etc. is a hoax?

The Cost of RP and the Benefits of Community

6 upvotes · 7 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Amen.

How to approach sexual relationships as red pill christian entering my 20s?

6 upvotes · 4 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I agree with what you're saying in premise, but there are still lingering effects on a psychological level that will affect the marriage. This has been proven true again and again and again by countless Christian couples post-repentance who acknowledge that there were lingering effects that were difficult to overcome and still impact their marriage. I've broached this subject with every small group I've led and the conclusion is always the same.

You're right that other character traits can really mitigate that negative impact, but it's also not wrong for someone to prefer a relationship that won't have those issues to begin with.

How to deal with silent treatment

6 upvotes · 2 February 2018 · /r/askMRP

Yes. That's exactly what this means. If you're really a lawyer, like me you want to get to the bottom of everything. That's incredibly helpful in our profession ... not so much in home life. Turn that drive off and just be you.

For the next six months follow this suggestion: **NEVER** plan anything for the two of you. Plan things for yourself. Invite her to join you when you feel like it. If she does something else instead, so what? Stop trying to control her, even when it's for her good too.

If you live your life one way for the next 6 months and you're inviting her along and she consistently doesn't want to live your life alongside you, let her go.

How should one phrase to a woman that they don't want to have premarital sex, however, you still want to pursue the relationship?

6 upvotes · 29 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I think [/u/Taipanshimshon](#) is referencing "dead bedroom." The "let's wait until marriage" conversation and boundary is not the cause of a dead bedroom; rather, it is the blue pill ideologies that the people who hold this boundary subscribe to which causes the dead bedroom.

So, to answer Taipan, you can have this conversation and avoid a future dead bedroom simply by rejecting the blue and embracing the red. If he's alpha enough, he won't want for sex in his marriage, even if he sets a precedent of abstinence during their pre-marriage relationship.

I prefer to think of it as the longest period of edging ever, rather than training each other to be sex averse. If the actual desire for sex is killed during the relationship because of the abstinence, then the man's not dating her right.

FR: The Spousal Support Scam

6 upvotes · 29 January 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

This particularly client probably spent close to \$35,000 on his case in total. The difference between a 50/50 allocation of income and the result we got ended up being approximately \$3,000/mo in savings, which is \$36,000 per year. Given that it was an indefinite spousal support award, after life expectancy (assuming no modifications), that's close to \$1,000,000 over his remaining lifespan.

When comparing the monetary savings with my fee, though, it's also worth noting that in the absence of counsel there are other crap things a court often does to a man. I've seen cases where guys have lost 70%+ of their income to the woman - not because the judge intends this division, but because the wife's attorney conflates the numbers to reach this result while convincing the judge that this really is a fair 50/50 result. So, instead of pumping in "\$70,000" as the girl's take-home income and "\$30,000" for the guy (which no judge would approve), they persuade the judge that the husband is devious and lying about his income and cheating on his taxes, etc. and that he's really earning not \$100,000 total, but \$140,000 total. Accordingly, with a wife who earns nothing, her fair share should be \$70,000. The pro-se male litigant tries to argue the accuracy of his income and shows his W-2s to prove it, but the judge believes the wife when she makes up a story about him doing odd-jobs on the side, such as off-the-books consulting or remodeling people's bathrooms, etc. The bottom line is that he has to pay \$70,000 in spousal support even though he only earns \$100,000/yr and the judge thinks this is a 50/50 allocation.

Given that I don't know what the other side would have argued (and likely won on) if my client had no counsel or garbage counsel, I can't really quantify that aspect of things - but suffice it to say that his net savings over the rest of his life do skyrocket well above the million dollar mark when you account for this factor too ... not to mention the property division side of things, which follows a similar pattern.

Hypergamy in the Bible (Song of Songs)?

6 upvotes · 25 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

There are certainly examples of hypergamy in the Bible, but I don't think this is one of them. Here's how I read this passage (correct me if you think I'm making a mistake):

- 8-9: Men: "Our little sister has small boobs, how can we get her a man? I suppose we'll just have to distract from her chest with jewelry and clothes."
- 10-12: Solomon's Girl: "I used to have small breasts too, but a while back they grew big and Solomon loved to look at me, so there's still hope for her. Consider: Solomon leases his vineyard out to others who pay him a lot of money, but keep everything above the fee. Likewise, my man has given me a lot, and I enjoy the fruit of his generosity and make myself beautiful with it so that I can keep giving back to him even more than what I enjoy."
- 13: Solomon: "Good message, girlie. I love it when you talk like that."
- 14: Solomon's Girl: "Now go, little sister, and be attractive to men."

The point of 10-12 is two-fold: (1) to let them know that the girl is still young and might grow her boobs in, and (2) that it's her man's job to give her the means to be attractive, and she should give back to him by using her attractiveness for his good. This is not hypergamy, it's red pill truths for women.

Hypergamy is also more than just "go for the guy who gets you sex." It's both ends of the AFBB dynamic. So, Ruth shows the clear BB side of things in barking up Boaz's tree, even though he was an old man and she could have gotten a far more attractive guy. Boaz shows some serious beta traits, but also had a lot of comforts and security to provide.

The AF aspect is more evident in someone like Potiphar's wife, where Genesis 39:6-7 says, "No Joseph was handsome in form and appearance. And after a time his master's wife cast her eyes on Joseph and said, 'Lie with me.'" In verse 10 we see her trying "day after day" to get him. Potiphar was the BB and Joseph was the AF. Why? Because of his looks, we're told. I'd presume it's also because of his dutifulness.

Remember that women have two competing desires and hypergamy plays at both of them, hergo AFBB. This is all covered in 102 :)

How do you not be wise in your own site and Red Pill at the same time?

6 upvotes · 25 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

The context of Romans 12:16 is in the middle of how to handle relating with those we consider enemies. The verse before references those who persecute us, the verse after references those who do evil to us, the verse after that references those who have wronged us to the point we seek vengeance, the verse after that references how to handle our enemy, and the final verse in that paragraph references overcoming when someone does evil to us.

In that context, everyone agrees it's gravely unwise to overestimate your position over an enemy. Even secular war generals understand this. But in a spiritual war, specifically one where our target is the heart and not the flesh, we are incapable of defeating our true adversary or saving their captives, who work like slaves for them, if we are so standoffish as not to be able to earn a position of influence in their lives. Instead, our humility is what will earn their trust. Our refusal to show favoritism among class systems will earn their respect.

The proverbs passage is not comparing our self-evaluation to other people, but against God himself. So, from that angle I'd hope we all agree we should not presume to be wise in a conversation with God.

What you're really getting at, though, is something deeper which is more directly addressed in Philippians 2:3, where we are instructed to consider others to be of greater value or significance than ourselves. Interestingly, the top 5 translations on biblehub.com all give different phrases there: above, better than, more significant than, more important than, surpassing.

This stems from the idea that Jesus first preached to the apostles: "For he who is least among you all is the one who is great" (Luke 9:48).

Jesus isn't trying to give them a formula for how they can become great. He's ripping away the formula and standard. He's saying, "You don't get what makes you great in God's eyes, so stop worrying about who will be great because it'll never make sense to you."

To that end, I could say that a pew-sitter who leaves service on Sunday morning and ignores his faith the rest of the week is almost certainly the "least" among believers in his congregation (assuming he's even genuinely saved in the first place). Let's assume he's also homeless, penniless, rejected by society, etc. Now he's really, really the least. But we also know he won't be great in God's Kingdom.

But Jesus is also saying that the head pastor who preaches every Sunday morning and is eventually promoted to denominational leader and oversees countless churches, etc. - he's not the greatest either. God uses a different standard altogether and *intentionally trying* to rise to the top violates the standard and prohibits us from being considered great.

To that end, if we consider ourselves better than others, or live in such a way as to become better than others (for that purpose, that is), then we have already failed. But if we consider others as more significant than ourselves ("better than" I think is a weak translation), then our humility in accepting the role God has given us does make us great in God's eyes, regardless of how insignificant that role may be.

Consider all the great people we know as prominent believers today. Andy Stanley, John Piper, John McArthur, Francis Chan, David Platt, etc. Do you know who it was who shared the Gospel with that person? Who discipled them? Those people are small, small links in the chain who never get recognition, but I tell you they were every bit as important to God's Kingdom in what they did for these other men as what those men themselves are doing. And if they were humble in fulfilling that role and Andy Stanley is conceited in fulfilling his because he loves seeing how many people show up to his church every week (not to say he is) ... then that makes his discipler greater because the man who discipled him has all the credit for what Andy Stanley is doing, having been a spiritual father responsible for getting Andy Stanley to where he is, but does not compromise his humility in the process.

How do we reconcile this with the RP attitude of seeing ourselves as the prize? Because the concepts are applied in two different contexts. Our humility is meant to be among our brothers for the purpose of considering our own worth to God's Kingdom. Our confidence to our wives is a reflection of the fact that we are more suited to lead her than any other man who might be in her life.

Remember the point of Romans 12:16 is to live in harmony with one another. We are not to be competing. How many men in your church are competing against you for your wife's affection? My guess is none. To that end, you're not at risk of overestimating yourself as against an adversary.

As for the Philippians and Luke passages, a man's own estimation of his rank in God's Kingdom does not affect the value he contributes to his wife. We can't know where we rank with God. All we can do is be faithful and humbly accept the role he has given us. In the context of fulfilling that role, I know I'm getting the job done.

To be clear, here's the dichotomy:

- On the one hand, I know and accept that I am not the most spiritually influential person in the world. In fact, there are others in my wife's sphere of influence who are probably capable of and actively doing more for God's Kingdom than me. I don't know who these people are or how God is valuing each of us, but I accept when I meet any given individual that God can do more through that person than he does through me - and when I disciple men, this is the goal I have in mind for them. This is the humility Paul and Jesus compels in us to consider others as having greater significance in God's Kingdom than ourselves.

- But I also know that irrespective of my position in God's Kingdom, I am the highest value man in my wife's life (or most women around me, for that matter) based on a much wider variety of factors than rote spiritual ranking with God. The fact that I'm an assertive person, on its own, puts me in the top 10%. Add to that the fact of my being the strongest guy in my church (maybe second, never tested the bench of that bulky bald dude), most intelligent, in the top tier for active/involved fathers, relationally humble, etc. and I'm easily in the top 1%.

This doesn't mean I'm more significant to God than these other men. It means my wife should rightly find me more attractive than these other men. I cannot control my spiritual significance - that is for God alone to assign to me ... but I can control my attractiveness. To that end, I cannot take pride in what I cannot control, but I can certainly be the prize within what I can control - and there is no shame or lack of humility in having that right perception of myself, particularly if it improves my marriage to do so.

But if I go off acting like I'm a "better Christian" than someone else or that I'm "more important to God" than someone else, then I have left the realm of humility.

Remember: Humility is not thinking less of yourselves; it's thinking accurately of yourself. Because we cannot know our spiritual status/rank, the Bible tells us just to assume others are higher. But when it comes to all of these other things, I can say with perfect accuracy where I measure.

Also, the "I'm the prize" attitude is a comparison of your contribution to the relationship (not God's Kingdom) as compared with hers. Between the two of you, are you the lucky one or is she? Remembering that context also alleviates much of the concern of being prideful or arrogant with respect to other men in the church. Because of our innate role as men in a marriage relationship, if we lead rightly and are godly, we should always be the prize, not her. This is how it should be, and this is how she wants it.

I remember in the days after I had gone beta I made a comment to my wife: "I'm so lucky to have you. Everyone must be thinking, 'How'd he get such a great girl by his side?'" She was offended at this and was deeply troubled because she (by virtue of hypergamy) wanted others to believe she had married up, not down. She was then paranoid for a year after that with the idea that people really did think that and that she could have done better. That was one of the dumbest mistakes I've ever made in my marriage and one of my first RP lessons in my pre-RP days.

Wife addicted to weaponized sex; impending divorce

6 upvotes · 6 November 2017 · /r/askMRP

that's her last tool that still works on me

That's the problem, though. RP is about sexual strategy. It's mostly about sexual dynamics in a relationship. RP doesn't revolve around whether or not you have stimulating conversation or fun vacations or enjoy similar hobbies. It's about sex. If she can still use sex to get to you - *that's the whole of RP right out the window*. None of your other improvements matter. AWALT. The next girl will weaponize sex against you at some point too. It might take 2-3 years before she learns she has that power. But if you don't figure that crap out now, you're in for a sore disappointment in your next relationship too.

Wife addicted to weaponized sex; impending divorce

6 upvotes · 6 November 2017 · /r/askMRP

Well, you could have that conversation with your lawyer too ... they just wouldn't ethically be allowed to represent you afterward.

Seriously, though, you sound so butthurt it's hard to imagine that passing "tests are effortless now."

You say you like her a lot, but that's only because your sexual frustrations are so blindingly large that you can't even see all the other minutia about her that you can't stand. Even if you could solve that problem, I can all but guarantee you'll see another issue almost immediately afterward. We're all imperfect, broken people. Despite what the feminist agenda says, 49.55% of the population aren't excepted from this rule.

Magical last minute thing? Beyond divine intervention, no. She probably needs at least two years of dialectical behavioral therapy from someone who has experience (and success) treating personality disorders. Last I knew, there were only 3 people in my entire state that met that bill. So, don't get your hopes up. I think the world record for overcoming these types of things is somewhere around 5 years, but some psychologists theorize that it can be done in 2. My guess is that the rinky dink therapist she has now hasn't given her an MMPI-2 yet and isn't treating her for any officially diagnosed issue. More likely than not, she's just dealing with typical stress management, anxiety, and the normal garbage that doesn't actually help her improve; it only helps her cope with the fact that you're Satan and she's married to you and it's all your fault but she feels stuck (her therapist's attitude, not mine).

Advice to a married recovering beta on initiating

6 upvotes · 22 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

You're at where I was early in my RP journey. My wife will respond to my initiations well, but her version of initiating is still, "I'm not opposed to it today if you feel like you need to." From the good guys at MRP I've learned to accept the fact that women aren't designed to be initiators - so unless you have one of the outliers, plan to get weak starts from her.

But it sounds like your problem is with her response to your initiations too - which is fine. The fact that she's not shutting you down is a good sign. That said, we'd need more info in order to really figure out where you should start. I wouldn't be surprised if there was some Madonna/Whore going on, probably church-induced sexual repression, maybe just a good old fashioned 1,000 foot rope ... really no way to know without more details.

- Height, weight, lifts, body fat?
- At what point in (a) your life and (b) your relationship were each of you saved?
- Which of you is more spiritually mature? How often do you each have quiet times? How often do you each spend more than 15 consecutive minutes in prayer? How often do you each [fill in the other 7 basics from 301]?
- What types of tests is she giving you?
- How's your OYS?
- When you do have sex, is it starfish or hot monkeys?

Between the two books you're looking at, I consider WISNIFG a prerequisite to MMSLP. It doesn't have to be, but the order of how you should be working on things just flows so much better. After all, the first level of dread is passing tests ... you don't get to gaming your wife until a few levels later. Gaming is more fun and gives faster results. But start building the house before the foundation is solid and it will crumble and you'll be starting over again ... and from a worse position.

Deconditioning the wife who is disgusted at your touch - 10 Levels of Kino

6 upvotes · 13 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Fair enough. But I'm guessing you haven't experienced this problem in the context of a relationship you want to keep. For some of us it's worth it.

Sleeping Naked

6 upvotes · 6 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Hah ... I thought "humble brag" had to have some "humble" in it.

Sleeping Naked

6 upvotes · 5 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I like that. I have select days where I intentionally sleep with the kids. When I'm ready for bed, sometime around once every 2-3 weeks I'll grab a kid and bring them down to the basement (spare beds there) and we'll put on a TV show and fall asleep to it. But they know that if they ever ask me to do this, the answer will always be no. They have to wait until I choose to do it on my own. It makes the times extra special, knowing they get it because I want it and not because they asked, while simultaneously teaching them to follow Daddy's lead and not be beggars/complainers (a problem they suffered from for a while).

Sleeping Naked

6 upvotes · 5 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Nah, her mom thinks all Catholics are going to hell, so they've always been Protestant ... but point taken all the same.

Looking for resources on modern ways to walk into Christian marriage without the state involved. Are there any foolproof ways?

6 upvotes · 3 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

How is this even remotely "unfair?"

Because you're only considering asset division. It doesn't honor her time spent with the kids because she has effectively sacrificed her ability to have the same level of income as you. So, although you walk away with approximately equal assets (accounting for separate property), after the marriage you're going to continue earning income at the highest rate you were ever capable of earning, whereas she's going to be earning at much less than if she had been employed full-time during the entire marriage. So, because of her service in the home during the marriage, she's ruining her life in the after-marriage under your plan by virtue of there being no spousal support.

much more righteous and just than extreme divorce rape.

How are you defining "extreme divorce rape"?

I am mainly trying to protect myself from no-fault divorce and divorce rape which can pull the rug out from underneath me and leave me less able to provide for my children's future

I very much empathize with what you're saying. I get it. I position myself intentionally in the best position to avoid divorce rape as well. But I do that by ensuring I'm doing everything I can to further my wife in her career. Let me assure you: as a divorce attorney, I can say definitively that this is the best way to proof yourself from divorce rape. Marry someone with an equal or higher income-earning capacity and you'll be divorce-proof. Now, as [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) just posted elsewhere, you're going to have a harder time keeping your wife loyal if she's not only good looking, but a high-earner as well. She'll know her value to men is extremely high at that point, so your value will have to be even higher to keep her - and if you can't keep up in the finances make sure you're ahead in other areas. But remember: the finances are where divorce rape happens most of the time, so if you get a girl who's on-par or better in finances, you're going to have much lower risk.

What I don't like reading is the "I'm doing this to provide for the kids" line. When you're paying alimony, you're

giving your ex the ability to provide for the kids as well. You can't pretend it's all on you. If you're in it because you want to tell your kids, "I buy everything for you and your mom does nothing," that's kind of self-defeating if the reason she can't do anything is because you've done everything in your power to prevent her from having the financial resources to help the kids directly.

Child rearing costs would be documented and split 50/50

Equal split only makes sense if you both have equal incomes. Every now and then I see people try to pull this 50/50 split off with differing incomes and it never works. The higher-earner usually ends up spending far more lavishly than the other because they don't have any care or concern for the budget of the other person, then the lesser earner can't afford to keep up, gets behind, gets stuck in contempt of court, and is ultimately taken advantage of. % income split makes more sense. If you make \$80k/yr and she makes \$20k/yr, then you pay 80% of child-related expenses and she pays 20%. In the end, even this is relatively unfair to the lesser earner because if there are \$10,000 in expenses for the child in a given year, then the lesser earner only has \$18,000 to live off of, whereas the other still has \$72,000 to live off of. So, the lesser earner is eating into their essential budget to pay for the kids whereas the higher earner is only spending from their flexible budget to make it work. Couple that with the fact that the higher-earner is probably buying Abercrombie clothes and expecting reimbursement when the lesser-earner can really only afford Walmart clothes, and the distinction starts to become more obvious.

protecting myself from the insane current laws

Which laws, specifically, do you believe are insane? I have yet to get any single red pill guy to be able to answer this for me. They always end up giving fact patterns and saying, "It happened to a friend of mine," but none of them can point to any statute or case law ... so they end up turning the concept of "insane divorce rape laws" into some boogeyman that everyone is scared of, even though no one really understands what it is or what it looks like.

The only true incidents of divorce rape involve custody issues where women lie in court - and that's not a law issue, it's a lawyering issue.

My dream would be that divorce does not occur and that I have a healthy, happy, God-honoring marriage that helps raise loving, healthy children.

Being constantly worried about divorce is counter-productive to this goal. It's also counter-productive toward being RP in general.

I am not naive enough to think that I can escape that simply by looking for the "right woman" and vetting hard enough

Very true. But what you can do is commit to living like Christ in your marriage and if you end up suffering persecution vis a vis "divorce rape," then the Bible tells you to consider yourself blessed by virtue of having suffered because of Christ.

I hope you can see my true heart in the midst of this and help direct me to some sort of working possibility of entertaining the idea of marriage without putting my neck on the chopping block.

I do see your heart in this, and I value and appreciate your concerns and the desire to do right by your wife during the marriage. That said, I think you have some misperceptions about "putting your neck on the chopping block" based on misunderstood propaganda from the MRA. I have yet to read an accurate summary on the state of divorce law from any red pill thread, which is why I tend to be the guy who writes those now. Bear in mind, I say this as someone who is a divorce attorney by profession.

Is this a good example of leadership?

6 upvotes · 20 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

I advised against it ... She did it anyway

How is there even a question on if this is "a good example of leadership"? No. No, this is not a good example of leadership.

if this is a ploy

No. She's lazy. She took the easy way out. She doesn't give a crap about you or your improvements and she doesn't believe you'll keep improving. Be honest, have you plateaued in your physical fitness? Once you're under 13% BF, you're welcome to plateau. Until then, there are no excuses for not making progress each month. Result? She doesn't respect you, so she's going to do whatever she wants. Getting the surgery was a test and you failed, so don't tell me she's not testing you or rarely does so.

I know the redpill advice, want to hear yours.

6 upvotes · 15 September 2017 · /r/ExRedPill

In other words:

- Improve your physique
- Improve your career
- Improve your social network
- Improve your game
- Improve your ability to read people

This is the RP advice he says he didn't want to know. Not to say you're wrong - these things all work and are probably the best solution to his problem. It's just interesting that it's all straight from the RP handbook.

Cheating means you are a "Beta Faggot"

6 upvotes · 25 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I see WISNIFG all over this post.

shamed for not sticking to a commitment that benefits

Compared with: "You have the right to change your mind."

shamed for steadfastly adhering to a commitment that doesn't [benefit you]

Compared with: "You have the right to be illogical in making decisions"

Whatever you cannot say No to is your master and makes you its slave

See the title of the book: WISNIFG

Your wife is a whore and you should divorce her

6 upvotes · 24 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

To be clear, he's addressing men who whine about being worried about this - not men to whom it is actually happening. His first paragraph also generalizes into an AWALT mindset beyond just the target group. Plus, even within the target group, he's still making the decision for them about how to assess their happiness. I get your point, though.

Just found you! Devouring the links on the right but I need help and I need it soon.

6 upvotes · 22 August 2017 · /r/askMRP

Everything I came here to say. The weight-lifting analogy is great.

[/u/awaythrow99912](#) - If you've got yourself in a rut, and she's not in that rut with you (i.e. she has options), you can't magically prevent her from walking away. Accept the fact that until you're in a position to lead her, she will feel free to do whatever she wants.

Any effort you do to try to control her or lead her before you yourself are someone worth following will not only come off as going Rambo, as [/u/justpickanyusername](#) mentioned - it will also train her to develop an amused mastery over you, when you should be having that attitude toward her in time. She will think, "Look how cute he is, trying to tell me how to run my life when he's a train-wreck himself." The alternative is that she just becomes a harpy - either way is bad for you.

FR: Having The Prenup Talk

6 upvotes · 22 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

child support calculators

Cannot be changed. Period. That said, clever attorneys can work their way around this. For example, if the woman is working at \$X/yr at the time the prenup is executed, but the parties agree she's going to quit her job to stay at home and raise kids, etc., the parties can agree in the prenup that for any calculation purposes she will be imputed to an income level no less than \$X/yr. So, you can't get out of the calculation, but you can agree that the calculation will include favorable numbers for you based on realistic scenarios.

alimony calculators

My state doesn't have a set calculation - it's mostly in a judge's discretion based on a myriad of factors. That said, they tend to default to a % of the after-tax cash available to the parties as a baseline number to work from.

More to the point, you *can* agree-away your spousal support obligation entirely as long as the agreement is not unconscionable to enforce at the time of the divorce, in which case the provision will be deemed void and a normal support obligation will be put in place.

The way around this is similar to what I mentioned for child support above. That method works, but you can also do the inverse - set \$Y/yr as an amount that the parties reasonably anticipate husband may earn and that support calculations shall only apply based off of the excess beyond that number. Because the parties agree that they're contemplating husband's potential income to be that high, no one can argue later that the provision is unconscionable because "I couldn't have known what I was waiving." The only basis for unconscionability at that point is if you have someone who is mentally or physically disabled, which is a circumstance that cannot be foreknown - and even then you can put provisions to account for this.

I'm not sure if that's what you were asking, but I hope that helps. As someone else noted, this all varies from state to state. That said, you can also mutually agree as to which state's laws may apply. So, if you find a state with more favorable divorce laws, you can potentially hire an attorney from that state to draft the pre-nup and both of you could execute it as under that state's laws. Bonus points if you actually get married in that state (destination wedding). I've never actually tried this, but it's a theory I'd love to see litigated. I think you'd have to have at least

some base/minimum contact with the state to justify using its laws, but I don't recall actual residency being one of those requirements.

What doesn't work is assuming that without a prenup the divorce court will follow the laws of the state where you were married - or country. I constantly see guys from the middle east trying to divorce their wives in my state and thinking they can just leave her homeless and destitute. They'll argue, "We were married in the middle east, which allows me to do that." The judge says, "I don't care where you got married. You chose to live in Ohio. You chose to file divorce in Ohio. You're following Ohio law for as long as you live in our state."

Tag: [/u/crimsonkodiak](#) and [/u/VladimirPoontin](#)

How can I work on feeling/becoming more vulnerable?

6 upvotes · 16 August 2017 · [/r/RedPillWomen](#)

growing up I was made to feel ashamed and embarrassed of my emotions, even positive ones.

I definitely feel you on this one!

Vulnerability is the pinnacle of a process that starts with understanding yourself in the first place. [Note that in the following I'm using "you" in the general sense.]

Know Thyself - This may seem basic, but many people are so emotionally repressed that they don't even feel what they should be feeling, or they don't know how to recognize their feelings when they come out. This was me for a while. If you've got baggage, work it out. There are lots of books about this (I'm writing one myself), some therapists can be of help, or even just letting your spouse know that you're emotionally repressed and confused can help.

Feel Thyself - Once you can identify when you're feeling something and what it is, actually let yourself feel it, starting alone if you need to. Practice evoking these things if you can. Sometimes that's uncomfortable, but cry it out in a room by yourself if you have to - or just laugh uncontrollably for no reason. Let it out.

Show Thyself - Begin letting basic emotions show openly in your relationship. Trickle little things in here and there as you feel safe. Don't do a total dump on your spouse because you are suddenly able to. Ease into the process.

Transparency - Once expressing yourself is natural, be completely open. Hide nothing. Be tactful about how you do it, and don't do it "just because." You don't have to be transparent with every emotion, but if it's something important, relay it and explain why you're feeling that way (which you should now be able to do).

Vulnerability - This goes beyond transparency. Transparency is about disclosure. "I'm feeling this way. I feel that because _ happened. It's affecting me in this way: _." Vulnerability goes one more step by inviting the other person to participate: "Will you help me with this by doing _?" or "Do you have any suggestions on how I can address this issue?" or "Can we be a team in working on this together?" It could even just be a request for co-experience: "Can you just hold me for a bit while I process what I'm going through?"

Transparency fosters trust. Vulnerability fosters intimacy.

Why I'm not afraid of divorce rape - and how to get yourself there too.

6 upvotes · 15 August 2017 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

You're making "most judges" statements based on 2 cases where you may actually know the details. Compared to the thousands of judges and millions of cases each year, this is fairly ignorant. You're bitter and jaded. I understand that. But don't extrapolate your experience to everyone else without personal knowledge. All you're doing is giving the feminist agenda more power by choosing to believe in their boogeyman.

Why I'm not afraid of divorce rape - and how to get yourself there too.

6 upvotes · 15 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

On financial matters the judges in my state will always go 50/50 even with allegations of abuse. What I described would hold true even if my wife were out for blood. With allegations of abuse, that only affects patenting issues and there has to be clear evidence for it to happen, although she got me kicked out of the house initially on testimony alone. But that's only a small setback in the grand scheme.

Full time potential rather than current part time work

Yes, this always happens in my state (at least in the 17 counties I've actually practiced in). The only exceptions are nurses and school teachers. Nurses only get imputed to 36 hours (3 12hr shifts) and teachers aren't expected to get summer jobs.

The claim that going full time harms the kids gets made often but I've never seen it actually hold weight with the judge **EXCEPT** when one of the kids has severe physical or mental health issues requiring 24hr attention.

What do you follow up with when she says ...

As a Christian, if a spouse is intent on leaving, there's nothing wrong in letting them go. The two times I've proposed this the wife flipped out on the guy - ticked beyond measure. But she was also dependent on him (he doesn't need to employ this tactic if she's financially on par with him), so she sticks it out because he won't leave and she has no finances to leave. After a week when she sees he's still trying to make the marriage work, she finally buys in. Both couples are still together today (after 3 and 5 years) and the husband is essentially divorce proof (one calls me back periodically to make sure he's not doing things that will harm the arrangement if she were to file).

The Taming of the Shrew: A Red Pill Analysis (X-Post from TRP)

6 upvotes · 4 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I first read this play during a Shakespeare class led by a feminist. It was interesting, to say the least. Her view was that Kate was actually the dominant one in the relationship. (?!?!?!?!?!?!?!?!?! - the hamster at work).

She pointed to the fact that in a couple scenes Kate is clearly just acting, even though she intellectually knows better. The argument is that society forced her to be in a bad position (she didn't have much choice but to marry this man), so she upped her game with a different manipulative tactic to force her "Pet" to be the kind of man she wanted.

She wanted a powerful man, so she got him to be powerful with her. She wanted money, so she used her submission to win them the bet. In the end, she appears tame, but it's all just an act to get what she wants - and if he starts to slip, ceasing to be what she wants, then she'll destroy him like the shrew she never stopped being - the side of her she merely controlled to her strategic advantage.

My feminist teacher believed that Kate was Petruchio's better in every way and that her tactics were a form of reverse manipulation. In her eyes, the story was one of female power, as Kate could play the game forever and she believed Petruchio would one day wear down, unable to maintain his masculine bravado, which she believed was really all just an act to tame her. In other words, she sees them both as putting on acts to tame the other, but believes that Kate is actually the one who makes out in the end.

That's obviously all a bunch of hogwash. In reality, she was obnoxious for no valid reason. How did Petruchio deal with it? He became even more obnoxious. "Do you see what you're like?" is what his every action screams. "You want to be obnoxious? I can be even more obnoxious - and I can keep it up longer than you can."

That said, I do agree and find it interesting that he never fully broke her spirit. He wanted a submissive wife, not a broken one. He still wanted her fiery passion, and he got it. But instead of that fiery passion being directed against him, it's directed against his frenemies - those whose lives opposed his values, who he loved but to whom he had to prove a point, and be the victor at that.

One of the key points, of course, is that Petruchio, by the end, clearly actually cares for her. In the beginning he's all, "I couldn't care less for her - just give me the money." By the end he's affectionate and you can sense a sparkle in his eyes for her. This is part of what made my feminist professor believe that Kate actually tamed him. In reality, I see it as him getting what he wanted (money) and all that was left for him was to enjoy his newfound bride. That's not to say money is more important than women; rather, his happiness was not in the money itself - it was in her. We'd be fools if RP denied us the right to be pleased with our wives - to find happiness in the marriage. This does not make one tame; it makes one mature. As for her, in many ways she matured too - but her maturity, no doubt, involved being tamed.

Should I start dating now or wait?

6 upvotes · 3 August 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

Let me add brief RP theory to the wonderful common-sense approach everyone else is giving.

RP says that low-value women tend to find low-value men and high-value men will gravitate toward high-value women. Right now you have no value to offer a man, except your looks and physical attention (i.e. hugging, making out, sex, etc.). These things are a dime a dozen, so on their own they aren't high value, and they alone will not get a guy to commit. As much as you may want to use it for that purpose, there's always going to be another girl at least as pretty as you are who he can find who will be more sexual with him.

If you start dating around now, and especially if you begin having sex now, you will become "used goods" and your value will go down because you will have relational and sexual baggage that you're bringing to the man you will eventually marry. As your value goes down, the quality of man you can get will also go down. As a result, you are less likely to pull the kind of guy you want to be with into marrying you and you'll have to "settle." Don't go down that path.

On the other hand, if you focus on advancing your education, gaining meaningful life experiences (stories you can tell later), developing an attractive body and healthy eating habits, researching things you'll find in this and other subs about how to be a great partner to a future spouse, etc. - those things will add value to you. You'll be able to pull higher quality men. So, when you're 18, 20, 25 ... whatever ... when you're ready to get married, you'll have more options open to you and will feel far more confident in being able to find the kind of guy you will ultimately want to be with, and you won't feel pressured to "settle."

In short, avoid things that will lower your value (like having sex or dating around too much) and do things that will increase your value (education, hobbies, life skills, etc.). This is what you should be focusing on. For more insights, type "monk mode" in the search bar on this sub and see what comes up. You should be in "monk mode."

201 - Healthy Sexual Desire v. Lust/Coveting

6 upvotes · 26 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Well, that word "intent" doesn't actually appear in the Greek. The ESV added that to better capture the essence of *epithumeo*, which is more directly translated as coveting, as evidenced from the Septuagint and other non biblical uses of the word in the culture at the time. So, yes, "intent" enhances the translation, but since I was going to the Greek anyway to show why the English doesn't adequately address what's being said (including in the ESV, despite it being better), which English translation I used seemed moot.

SO is bitchy and disrespectful too often, should I leave?

6 upvotes · 24 July 2017 · /r/askMRP

She will become just like her mom if you end up acting just like her dad. Be different from her dad and you'll get a different result. It's that simple.

Strong, but odd frame - Is the relationship salvageable? Absolutely. But it sounds to me like you don't know how to invite her into your frame. If I take you for your word, I'm guessing you've built a strong frame, but she has a pretty strong frame too. More likely than not, your frame isn't square like most frames, it's got all kinds of jigs and jags. Her frame also has those same jigs and jags, but in reverse, so that way you can both stand in your own frames, close enough to touch, but without forcing either one of you to buckle.

To put it another way, you've developed a strong frame, but the boundaries of your frame aren't shaped the way you want. As a result, the life you're framing inside doesn't have smooth edges; it just looks kinda weird. No picture looks good with a jagged frame, no matter how strong and well-crafted that jagged frame may be. You need it to be shapely and ornate, like it was built by a master craftsman who pays attention to minute detail.

Get a new frame; forget fixing the old one - Here's the thing: it's much easier to break the frame you've got and buy a new one than it is to whittle or smelt the old one into proper shape. Can it be done? Yes. But it's going to take a lot of time and my guess is that if you want an LTR, you don't want to wait as long as it'll take for the whittling/smelting process to finish to find out if she is willing to drop her jagged frame in exchange for your new, better one. In theory, she'd be dumb not to trade up that way, but the hamster can spin the wheel some other direction and it might not work out. You're better off tossing what you've worked on and just implement a new frame now.

Invite her into your frame; don't just fortify it - I read an old post once by [/u/jacktenofhearts](#) that chewed out a guy for building a titanium frame that wouldn't buckle under any circumstances, but he forgot to put pillows and blankets inside to make her comfortable once she got in. When you get your new frame, make sure you're staging it like you want someone to live inside.

You can't just approach her one day and say, "This is how it's going to be from now on. You're welcome to do things my way and get a great life as a result; but if not, here's the door." That's a quick way to weed out someone, but you're more often going to lose the baby with the bath water when you do that.

If she's looking for marriage, that's akin to apartment shopping. Doing a walkthrough of a barren, empty apartment isn't very appealing. When the apartment is staged for being live-in ready, people can already visualize what long-term life will be like there. This warm, inviting nature will make her want to move into that place rather than staying at her current apartment until she finds something better.

Also, if the apartment is empty, if she does buy into it she's doing so because of what she envisions the place is like. That means she might rest in your frame, but she's doing it in her vision of what your frame looks like. You're losing a lot of control there, and if you try to take it back you're going to get a lot of resistance and she might ultimately conclude, "I signed up for what I thought resting in your frame would look like. Obviously I misunderstood that. I'm gone."

If it helps give context, I envision the frame itself as being all of your alpha traits. The interior decorating is all your beta traits. You're saying, "I'm the leader. I have boundaries and expectations. If you follow those boundaries and expectations, this is the type of love, affection, and sap you can expect from me. It may not be the sap you want, but it's what this oak produces." Then, let her decide if she wants what you have to offer or not. Once you've got that lovely ornate frame and that oak frame is oozing delicious sap that women want to lap up, you'll probably find better options anyway. In that regard, be happy you're not married yet - you still have an easier time keeping these options open.

[Update] How do I catch her cheating. Looking back what a wast of fucking time !

6 upvotes · 20 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

You're probably a good person to answer this. From a Christian perspective, a cheating spouse is a big deal. But from a brute RP "hard core navy red" perspective, why should the husband care?

If she's withholding to save herself for the lover, I get that. But suppose (as is true for many women) that the affair is making her feel sexual again and she hamsters it as: "Now I want sex all the time and it's igniting things with my husband again too! Isn't that a good thing?" So ...

- Her husband's getting it more often
- Her husband gets it better
- She's learning new things to try in the sack
- The new guy doesn't have a proven pattern of comfort-provision and he's just using her as a plate ... she's fine with this, so she's still not likely to leave her husband [take this as an assumption]
- Men spin plates all the time and this is assumed to be okay; so why not her?
- Assume she's being safe and STDs aren't an issue.

Is it just sparing his pride at that point? And if so, does that mean that "kill the ego" only applies to some things, but it's okay to get all butt-hurt when your wife is cheating on you?

I mean, if the husband is finally getting what he wants, why should he care what's happening behind his back to make that happen? After all, isn't that the whole point of Rule 0: *Women don't want to see how the sausage is made; they just want the sausage*. Does this concept not apply to her too? Why is cheating a definitive line?

These may sound like stupid questions, but I've only ever really considered the matter from a biblical question where there are more "objective" reasons why this should matter. Why should this matter to the non-Christian husband whose wife is finally screwing him better and more often than ever before?

My boyfriend likes that I'm smart

6 upvotes · 12 July 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

I'm not sure it's *only* present in 'dumb' women

You're completely right.

I wonder if your wife has been more feminine, youthful, or 'ditsy' as she has grown to trust your lead.

My wife has never been ditsy, but trusting my lead has certainly made her act and feel younger and more feminine :)

creates latent dread without increasing anxiety to unproductive levels, women generally become happier

This is because of the comparison trap. I have read absolutely *nothing* about the comparison trap on any RP forum, so I doubt it's a RP endorsed concept, but it's one that I have found to be a relatively infallible truth about every single woman I have ever met in my entire life (i.e. AWALT). That said, I'll try to explain it with RP foundation to it anyway, if that helps.

- Basic hypergamy says that all women prefer to date up (i.e. get the best guy they can). The higher his SMV the better; and she will, if circumstances permit or don't obstruct, swap out guys as soon as one with a higher SMV comes along.

- Preselection is the concept that women's perception of a man's SMV includes a factor for how other women view him. If other women find him desirable, there must be something about him that you don't know yet.
- At first glance, preselection appears to be only for women eyeing a guy they've never seen before - they have to get their impressions from other sources because they haven't yet had the chance to talk to him and find out what he's really like - they just know if other girls like him, there must be something there. That said, this works in marriages too because when a guy starts improving his SMV, if he has been fairly low-value for a while but starts getting attention, the wife might be clued into the fact that there is more to his changes than she has noticed as of yet.
- Now, this preselection concept assumes competition among women. The fact that other women are interested in this guy means he has value, and the woman needs to beat out the other women to get his attention. The comparison trap takes this concept a little bit further and says: *Women have an innate drive to outdo other women in the aspects of their lives that matter to them. How good their husband is always matters.* Something like how good a woman's job is might not matter at all to a SAHM, so she won't feel the need to compete with a working mom on that front; instead, she will compete with that working mom as to how happy and successful her children are - because that's something that does matter to the SAHM (and probably also the working mom, making it a two-way competition, which increases the emotional investment for the woman in the competition).
- So, when you say, "latent dread ... happier" this is what I see. Dread is essentially the concern that other women want what you have. This is not a negative or bad thing for a wife to experience - it's something she **WANTS** to experience. When she experiences that dread, it is an internal sign to her that she is winning the comparison game. Other girls want her guy, but she's the one who locked him down. This is why "latent dread" can make a man incredibly sexy to his wife - not because she's scared of losing him, but because he's the trophy she gets to waves around to all the other girls that she is the champion of the comparison game.
- This is readily distinguishable from more overt versions of dread, where the woman is controlled by fear of her man and not pride in her man. Fear causes a woman to try harder and harder to control and manipulate her man, whereas having a healthy (as opposed to arrogant) pride in her man will cause her to submit and become more feminine with him, and will drastically increase her happiness levels. After all, who wouldn't like to be the champion of the most important emotional game women will ever play?

I'm not sure if all that makes sense, but helping my wife win the comparison game is something that has definitely amplified her attraction to me at various times throughout our marriage. Unfortunately, it wasn't until recently (last 6 months or so) that I could actually articulate what was going on to make it an intentional effort.

Don't aim for perfect game, the bar for sex is not that high!

6 upvotes · 9 July 2017 · /r/seduction

Haha, true. That would certainly be much more accurate, but much more confusing to people who haven't taken a statistics course.

Don't aim for perfect game, the bar for sex is not that high!

6 upvotes · 9 July 2017 · /r/seduction

I see what you're saying. To use a slightly different model, though, suppose 80% of people are clueless about fixing cars, 15% of people have a basic level of competency, and 5% of people are very proficient. The 15% are not "average" because of their basic competency. Instead, "average" means being clueless. So, in your model, when you say "60% average" you really mean "60% basic competency" whereas the true "average" (or to use the mathematical term: mean) has a low degree of basic competency at game and someone who is "above the average/mean" could still be in the "basic competency" level ... unless it functions like a switch instead of a

sliding scale.

How to bring out the Alpha in a Beta man?

6 upvotes · 9 July 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

I totally understand the need to have a comfort threshold. I was just highlighting things that helped me start to step it up at various points. I don't think my wife forgot to pay the bills intentionally. Feel free to drop things off the list that you don't think would work ... add them back if you get desperate.

That said, with your suggested approach I'd be concerned that it would be interpreted as, "She's the boss. She had too much work on her plate. She asked me to help. I will comply like a good beta." He's not actually learning to lead in that scenario ... He's just getting better at following your lead.

Help

6 upvotes · 9 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I didn't even need to get to the third paragraph to start seeing BPD here. And yes, BPD usually develops from people who have been abused as a child. It is a coping mechanism whereby they create a detachment from reality to deal with their pain and trauma. They have an almost literal out of body experience whereby many of their outbursts feel to them like they're a third person in the room watching something exciting on TV with a bucket of popcorn - because that's how they dealt with the abuse of the trauma when they were younger.

I deal with borderlines on a weekly basis. When negotiating with borderlines in my profession, I have found that the most effective tool is fogging. Here's how my typical communication pattern goes, which works with anyone, but especially borderlines:

- I see your point. I agree with you when you say ____.
- Here's something I can do to address that problem.
- If I work on addressing that problem, would you agree to work on this problem too: ____?

There is **ALWAYS** some truth in what they're saying, no matter how irrational and deluded they are. Borderlines escalate problems when they feel like they're not being understood. It's the same reason kids yell and scream all the time: *If I don't get what I want, maybe saying it louder will get through to them.*

Maintaining frame is also huge. Borderlines (especially ones with histrionic features) thrive on high-intensity emotions. The more emotional you get, the more emotional she gets. That emotion is a drug to her, so she'll do anything to get a reaction out of you, and it is totally unsatisfying when you keep your cool. When I'm in conference rooms at court and borderlines are screaming in my face and literally bouncing all over the room because they don't like my proposal, I just keep smiling. When they're done: "I see your point. I agree when you say _____. *Here's something I can do to address that problem. If I have my client do that, would you agree to work on this problem: _____?*"

If you're not interested in negotiating anything back for yourself (i.e. you just want to calm her down), here's a trick that works with my non-borderline wife. I would hope it works with a borderline too.

- She's raging mad, yelling at you, crashing dishes against the wall, etc.
- Ignore her words; just go hug her until she calms down (usually about 15 seconds); put her head side-by-side with yours so she can't see your face
 - If she tries to talk, let her, but don't respond.

- If she tries to pull away, hold her tight. Her efforts to pull away are a test of your frame.
- Lean your head back, look her in the eye, brush her hair away from her cheek and put your palm gently on her cheek.
 - Don't let go of the hug with the other hand or you may lose control and she'll pull away.
- With your hand on her head, pull her head toward you and kiss her cheek where your palm was.
- Lean back again, look her in the eyes and say, "I love you and appreciate that you are intensely passionate over this issue. In this moment, you are over-reacting and I would like to continue talking when we can have productive discussion."
- Give her a kiss on the forehead and walk away.
 - if she lets you go, the next time you see her in a calmer environment you **HAVE TO** re-raise the issue; this time it will be on your terms. Have an action-plan ready to go for how to solve the conflict, showing simultaneously that: (1) you care about her concerns; (2) you understand her perspective without validating the thought itself or how she handled the situation [don't underestimate the importance of this in any argument]; (3) you will take charge of the situation so she doesn't have to be the one to worry about it anymore; and (4) her over-reaction was not going to solve the problem. This is a perfect quadfecta (and if I really took the time to think about it, I could probably come up with 2-3 more benefits), but I feel like 99% of men miss the opportunity by forgetting to re-raise the issue on their own terms.
 - if she follows you, still yelling and screaming: repeat all of the above until she doesn't know what to do. If that doesn't work or ...
 - if she doesn't let you leave in the first place ("No! I'm not over-reacting. This is seriously an important issue. How can you not see that?!?" Proceeds to block the door.) ... fog. "I agree that this issue is important. You're right, we should be spending more attention on this issue. I actually have an idea for how we can address the issue," and then pull an action plan out of your butt, even if it's a crappy one. If she doesn't like it, let her make some adjustments. The point isn't to come up with the perfect solution; it's to show her how idiotic her over-reaction was when you could come up with a solution to the problem literally on the spot and you can all tweak the solution from there. This has the same benefits as the first option ("if she lets you go ...") except #1, as it usually comes off as you brushing the issue aside quickly, which is outweighed by the other benefits.

Now, if your wife really does have BPD, she may never get to the point of actually talking about it, even in that last step, or even after several iterations of this hug-kiss-calm-kiss method. Why? Because she isn't looking for answers, she's looking to *feel something - anything*. For BPDs, negative emotions are better than no emotions. As a result, they stay enraged even when there's no reason to do so. At this point, the better option is to engage in a little emotional redirection.

- Start with my HKCK method (suppose it's a 3rd or so iteration of it in a single fight)
- When you get to the part of kissing her on the cheek, go for her lips instead.
- Repeat the "calm" part
- Instead of a kiss on the forehead, go back for her lips
- Push her against a wall (with your embracing hand still behind her, now between the wall and her back)
- Restrain her against the wall and stare her in the eyes
- Kiss periodically and see how she responds

- Escalate to sex as appropriate

I've never tested this second part, but from what I know about how borderlines think, it seems like it would actually work. You probably won't have any actual physical desire for her in the midst of her craziness, so you're probably not going to want to do any of this. That's the exact problem though: you're not an adequate passion-sparring-partner for her. She wants someone whose emotions ramp up like hers, who can be crazy and feed into all of her turbulence. So, if you have no other way of calming her down, redirect that negative passion and aggression into something positive that she will enjoy. Although it makes no logical sense to me whatsoever, and I've never been a fan of it, borderlines love angry, passionate, rough sex. I'm not saying this is your wife, or maybe she's the exception among BPD women, but if she follows the norm, redirecting her explosive outburst into angry, rough sex is the answer. The dopamine rush afterward will calm her right down and she'll forget what was getting her so upset, often times even realizing that she had no real reason to be upset in the first place.

Now, you know I couldn't leave this one unaddressed. When you use the Bible/God as a manipulative tool it comes off like a kid screaming, "I'm going to tell Dad!" My son does this all the time when his sisters aren't doing what he wants: "I'm going to tell Dad! You'd better start helping me clean the living room!" That totally undermines the respect and authority you've been developing. Yes, God is a higher authority. But God delegated that authority to you in Ephesians 5 and (more notably) 1 Cor. 11:3, "the head of every man is Christ, and the head of the woman is man."

If you've ever had a management-type position, you'll know what it's like when you delegate authority to someone, but they keep running back to you saying, "They're not listening to me!" Your response is usually, "I gave you the authority to deal with it because I know you can handle it. Now go handle it." If you're acting like that employee to God, using his authority rather than the authority he gave you, that's not respecting the management style he established. If your wife sees that you're not respecting God's management, why should she respect yours or your interpretation of God's Word in the first place?

If she really is ignorant of what the Bible says about respect and submission, an argument is not the time to bring that up. You should read 1 Cor. 11 or Ephesians 5 together as part of a joint devotional or couples Bible study.

Not going to go into it here ... but do you disciple your wife? Do you have a firm grasp on Jesus' established pattern for disciple-making? If so, are you implementing it inside and outside your marriage?

I've found that 99% of problems Christians face are resolved by developing a lifestyle of disciple-making, rather than merely the advice received or given through discipleship or application thereon.

Frustrated with LTR's lack of non-sexual investment

6 upvotes · 6 July 2017 · /r/askMRP

I had one impression from the very first sentence and every sentence after that affirmed it: You need to read NMMNG.

You may have already read it. Great. Read it again. You're living your life EXACTLY with Nice Guy Syndrome. The core frustration of Nice Guys (per the book) is that they feel like they give more than they get. His premise is that Nice Guys live on this one core principle:

- IF I hide my flaws and present myself in a way that I think you will like,
- THEN you will love me and meet my needs.

You're living with this core covert contract, which is parallel to the Nice Guy Syndrome:

- IF I become RP
- THEN she will be attracted to me and put forth more effort

OI OI OI OI OI OI OI OI OI OI OI OI

She can smell it on you. Women aren't idiots. They know when you're giving to get. She sees you putting forth a little effort and thinks, "Okay, I guess I'll have to put in a little effort too."

When you live on this anticipated exchange, you're functioning as co-equals. You both have an equal responsibility to step up your game to attract one another. This is not sustainable because it does not come out of abundance. It comes out of emptiness. You're empty because you're not getting from her what you need. She's empty because she's not getting tingles from you (fuzzies are more of a placation; they neither fill nor drain her, but they do drain you to give them).

You need to develop an internal motivation for becoming who you want to be - something that happens whether or not she's giving you the sex you want or massages or anything. If she feels like you're just pandering to her, you're giving her power to judge your improvement and establish how she should respond - and she knows this. If you start living your life independent of her, but inviting her to join alongside, unaffected by her response, she will be attracted.

It may not all apply, but a lot of this is addressed in great detail in what I just posted on [r/MarriedRedPill](#), titled "The Biological Step-Mother."

Difference between the two?

6 upvotes · 2 July 2017 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

I'm only in a few days further than you, but my understanding is this:

- TRP = bang all the girls (by being the best you), settle down only when it suits your desires, and even then keep your options open and leave her when you're bored
- MRP = be the best you, this is how to get your LTR/wife attracted to you again; if she still rejects you, let her go or keep raising your SMV (even if you don't intend to use it outside the marriage) and hope for the best, but be super OI because you can't change her, only yourself

Wife threatened to take the kids from me over a non issue. Need advice

6 upvotes · 26 June 2017 · [/r/askMRP](#)

My wife tried to make that threat against me once. It was one of the few times when my alpha-side really got to shine in its natural spotlight: I'm a divorce attorney. Ain't no way was that gonna fly.

I really can't explain it (though I'll try), but when your wife is fuming mad at you over something like that, no matter how internally wrecked you are (and from what I gather, if you've been taking TRP for any length of time, you shouldn't be; but let's say you are wrecked) ... just go over and:

- hug her for about 15 seconds, counting it out if you have to; remain silent during this time, even if she tries to talk (let her, but don't respond)
- lean your head back and brush her hair away from her cheek and put your hand on her cheek briefly
- lean in and kiss her cheek
- say, "I love you and appreciate that you are intensely passionate over this issue; but in this particular moment

you are over-reacting and I'm not going to let it get to me."

- peck her on the forehead
- walk away with a smile
 - if she lets you go, the next time you see her in a calmer environment you **HAVE TO** re-raise the issue; this time it will be on your terms. Have an action-plan ready to go for how to solve the conflict, showing simultaneously that: (1) you care about her concerns; (2) you understand her perspective without validating the thought itself or how she handled the situation [don't underestimate the importance of this in any argument]; (3) you will take charge of the situation so she doesn't have to be the one to worry about it anymore; and (4) her over-reaction was not going to solve the problem. This is a perfect quadfecta (and if I really took the time to think about it, I could probably come up with 2-3 more benefits), but I feel like 99% of men miss the opportunity by forgetting to re-raise the issue on their own terms.
 - if she follows you, still yelling and screaming: repeat all of the above until she doesn't know what to do. If that doesn't work or ...
 - if she doesn't let you leave in the first place ("No! I'm not over-reacting. This is seriously an important issue. How can you not see that?!?" Proceeds to block the door.) ... fog. "I agree that this issue is important. You're right, we should be spending more attention on this issue. I actually have an idea for how we can address the issue," and then pull an action plan out of your butt, even if it's a crappy one. If she doesn't like it, let her make some adjustments. The point isn't to come up with the perfect solution; it's to show her how idiotic her over-reaction was when you could come up with a solution to the problem literally on the spot and you can all tweak the solution from there. This has the same benefits as the first option ("if she lets you go ...") except #1, as it usually comes off as you brushing the issue aside quickly, which is outweighed by the other benefits.

It's also worth noting that with this path you'll never get the "he's just trying to fix everything!" argument. If she calms down after the soft affection, you're not fixing anything ... you're being exactly what she wants to see in a man: simultaneously affectionate and dominant. Then, the re-raise of the issue blows her away. If she forces you to deal with it on the spot, as long as you're convincing enough on the "I agree that this issue is important. You're right, we should be spending more attention on this issue" part, the burden shifts to her to prove that you're not meeting the exact need of the moment that she's demanding you address - but you're subtly shifting dominance in the conversation away from her and onto you by throwing her off balance. Because, most women are emotionally-driven, they will pretty much never adapt to this tactic. It will continue to throw them off-balance every single time because when they're in the heat of anger like that, they usually lack the ability to think logically enough to remember how they told themselves they would react the next time you tried to pull this on her. More to the point, most women simply like this tactic enough that they wouldn't want to defray you from exercising it in the first place.

I've done this with my wife over a dozen times in the 9 years we've been married (4 years since I developed this tactic) and I've never seen better results in any other approach. Although my wife is generally frigid (for reasons I have only started to look into, leading to my recent discovery of this sub and its companions), I can only think of one time after doing this where she hasn't tried to initiate sex with me that night or the next day. Beta me rejected her at those times and we haven't had a fight like this in almost a year, so I haven't had the chance to respond differently with another attempt :p That's probably one of those things I'll have to change if it comes up again.

I should also note that I didn't develop this approach as a result of any TRP/MRP thinking, as I didn't know this sub at the time (only discovered it today), so it may not entirely jive with the philosophy here, as I had other huge sources of influence at the time (and still do). So, take it for what it's worth.

Tag: [/u/BluepillProfessor](#) (random mod, since I'm new to this whole TRP/MRP thing and wouldn't mind feedback on my approach)

The Courage to Be Disliked

5 upvotes · 1 May 2024 · /r/RPChristians

Glad you find it helpful. This book is basically all about figuring out how to live in your own frame, but assuming you've already been fully indoctrinated by the world's way of thinking and trying to undo all of that. The first 1/2 is mostly tearing down wrong ways of thinking and the rest is about how to rebuild it correctly. That's the overarching framework.

To what extent is a wife allowed to withhold sex and affection if she doesn't feel supported emotionally?

5 upvotes · 10 September 2022 · /r/RPChristians

Our mod [/u/RedPillWonder](#) already wrote an entire post on this subject, so I'm going to defer to him for most of my thoughts on the main angle of this:

https://www.reddit.com/r/RPChristians/comments/hd1v5a/worthy_of_love_earned_respect_and_other_biblical/

In short: **"God's commands are not conditional."** That sums up the main point. God didn't say, "Thou shalt not murder ... unless you have a good reason, then it's okay." God didn't say, "Do not steal ... unless your neighbor is a bad person, then he's got it coming." God didn't say, "Do not deprive one another ... unless they're being mean to you, then it's okay."

But to address the side-angle of your post, I agree with Deep here too. The Bible is fairly clear and (as RPW notes) "God's commands are not conditional" ... but in modern society, it's rare to find people who are willing to hold women accountable for sinful behavior unless it's a "major" sin issue. Even if they have a technically true/accurate theology on the matter, most congregation leaders will make any number of excuses to avoid rebuking women. Examples include:

- That's really her husband's job, not mine as her pastor/elder/friend/small group leader/etc.
- She's not my wife, so I shouldn't be alone with her and I can't rebuke her in public because she's not a leader.
- They haven't escalated to me in the Matthew 18 process and until they do I'd rather stay uninvolved.
- The sin wasn't bad enough to warrant my involvement.
- That's really a family issue and not a spiritual one. Even though it involved sin, the family dynamic is what really needs addressed, not the spiritual one.
- Counseling would be more helpful than a rebuke, so we'll skip the rebuke and just hope she finds help. Maybe I'll encourage counseling and stay out.

The list goes on. But perhaps the most degrading is in a previous congregation I attended a woman was caught cheating on her husband. Multiple times. With several different men. This went on for years. The leadership knew about it, but allowed the woman to remain involved as a volunteer in multiple ministries and lead a small group, and instead said it was the husband's fault that she cheated because he didn't show her enough affection. So, the ultimate "slap in the face" excuse I've heard is: "I don't need to rebuke the wife when she sins because I'm sure it's really her husband's fault and he should get the rebuke instead of her." The reality is, biblically, *EVEN IF* they're both in sin they should both be confronted about it.

Of course, it's worth noting that "rebuke" doesn't always mean a harsh word. It can (Titus 1:13, "Rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith" as one example), but the preferred starting path is: "If anyone [including women] is caught in any trespass [not just serious ones], you who are spiritual, restore such a one in a spirit of *GENTLENESS*," or 2 Timothy 4:2, "reprove, rebuke, exhort, *WITH GREAT PATIENCE* and instruction."

The problem is when people start with this gentle approach and it doesn't work and then they say, "Welp, I already did the rebuke thing, so my job is done," without ever escalating to a sharp rebuke for those who are unrepentant and continuing in their sin.

Another complication is that many people will be "repentant" verbally and correct themselves long enough to make it seem like the problem is solved on the surface, but very quickly go back to what they were doing before. This, then, "excuses" (at least in their mind) the leader from escalating to a "sharp rebuke" because the person is viewed as "repentant - trying, but failing" instead of being willfully defiant. This is exacerbated by the fact that when someone is confronted about their sin by an authority, extremely few people will be defiant about it - virtually everyone will play along, even if the lesson never truly sinks in (i.e. no internalization of the repentance), and even if they themselves believe their own repentance, despite it not sinking in. So, the response to the confrontation usually seems genuine (in the absence of a personality disorder), and without the ability to discern whether it's internalized or not, the "spiritual leader" who is engaged in the confrontation will usually give the benefit of the doubt and presume internalization, which is NOT the same thing as good-faith intention.

One more thought ...

Failing to provide for someone materially is more serious than failing to provide for them sexually (at least in the short term), but I still think its a relevant point: the husband and wife often bring different provisions to the table

The husband does have a biblical expectation to provide, but the obligation for sex is mutual. It's expected, biblically, that the wife should also desire her husband enough that Paul had to command husband not to deprive her the same way he commanded her not to deprive him.

While this may seem trite, I've known several people who were jaded by their wife's denial and when she did finally initiate sex, *HE would then deny HER* as a "stick it to you" and "I don't want your pity-sex" type response.

Psychologically, this is counter-intuitive on a number of levels, but most obviously that you should want to *encourage* your wife to initiate, not discourage it. This type of reaction conditions her to associate her initiation with the husband's rejection, which is a frustrating experience that she will be less likely to repeat. More significantly: on a biblical level, this is also the husband rejecting her inappropriately. It's not a one-sided responsibility, and trying to play stubborn mind-games with your spouse only digs you into a deeper pit, both psychologically and biblically.

Does it make sense to marry as a man with high earning potential?

5 upvotes · 14 May 2022 · /r/RPChristians

I'll echo this and add reference to all the 1 Cor. 7 stuff that always comes up with this question.

Stop Pointing the Finger

5 upvotes · 28 February 2022 · /r/RPChristians

Well-said.

Abstinence till marriage (Advice/Discussion)

5 upvotes · 25 February 2022 · /r/RPChristians

Often whatever your focused on is going to be wrong anyways because that's why you are in the situation you are in. If you were focused on fixing the correct things you wouldn't be here asking for advice in the first place.

This line is gold. You could write a post on that.

What's the end-goal?

5 upvotes · 4 November 2021 · /r/RPChristians

"Put serious money into a Church, and you'll care about it a whole lot more."

I've heard this type of argument a lot before too and there are some good points to be made from it. I think it makes a lot more sense when we personalize it, the same way the other expenses listed are personalized. It's YOUR beachside house. It's YOUR Landcruiser. It's YOUR crypto. But it is NOT your "church" (unless you are actually the pastor).

In this, investing money in someone else's venture doesn't achieve the same result. Many people support local congregations for the very purpose of not wanting to be invested in any other way, as if financial contribution eases their conscience and gives an excuse not to get personally involved in ministry. In my experience, I've seen countless major donors and even people who are poor but giving large %ages of their income to their local congregation who are otherwise very nominal in their involvement. I used to be the treasurer for a congregation and noticed exactly this.

So, my recommendation would be to invest your finances in YOUR ministry, not someone else's. This is what will make you more personally invested. /u/paexology put down some cash to set up his place to host disciplehaus. That's his personal ministry. I've done likewise, accelerating my construction plans with my basement a few years in order to host men also. This is personal to us. I remember one congregation preaching:

- *We're actually doing fine on funding. Please don't tithe to us anymore. Instead, I want you to take half of what you're giving to us and start spending it on your own personal ministry instead. Use the money to host a cookout in your neighborhood. Buy pizza for your co-workers so you can build relationships and share the Gospel with them. Purchase Bibles for those you know who don't have them. Get creative. But above all, be personal with your tithe.*

This was a powerful word that I continue to apply at various times in my life to this day. While I may have a day-job, I'm also a missionary just like Paul as a tentmaker. I find it hard to imagine he wasn't using his own money to fund his own ministry. I also find it unlikely that while receiving tons of support, he was turning around and sending his wages to one of the other apostles only to ask for support from other people still. Too many congregations play that money-shuffle game, giving support away then claiming they don't have enough support.

What are we investing in ... Are they conformed to the mission or are they in themselves useless pursuits ...?

Along those lines, my suggestion is that the money should be put into the work of the Church, not primarily to an institution that calls itself "a church" (lower case). Sometimes these overlap, other times they don't. Personally, about 10-20% of my giving goes to my local congregation, about 60-80% goes to fund actual discipler-makers on staff with various ministries, and maybe 10-20% supports my own personal efforts.

Sometimes I resent my pregnant wife because of her past

5 upvotes · 15 September 2021 · /r/RPChristians

They've got you on the wrong track here. You had the right idea initially - no need to bring this up. You have to make peace with it yourself first before you go blabbing your mouth to her. Otherwise, your emotions are bound to get the better of you and things will almost certainly get worse - either because you'll look weak or because you'll look butthurt or it'll affect your frame in some way, or any other number of possible issues.

Don't do marriage counseling. There's a reason that modern marriage counseling strategies haven't done anything

to halt the rapid acceleration in divorce rates over the last several decades.

Sometimes I resent my pregnant wife because of her past

5 upvotes · 15 September 2021 · /r/RPChristians

This.

And I don't mean that dismissively of OP. I mean that fixing the mission will likely solve his problem. We get emotionally invested in the things that matter most to us. Right now, sex is what matters most to OP. How do I know? Because his mission sucks and he's here complaining about sex instead.

If he had something actually worthwhile to be thinking about, he wouldn't care as much about whose dick went where.

To be fair, I can appreciate the frustration. I get it. Imagining some other dude up in my wife isn't a pretty thought. But let's get our priorities straight. Before we start whining about something we can't change, let's fix the things we can. Then we can circle back once we've got our heads screwed on straight.

Why Lifting is Not a Suggestion

5 upvotes · 19 March 2021 · /r/RPChristians

Right. I wouldn't even care except that people complain when life sucks, but can't handle it when they're told to do basic things that will usually make the largest impact. Everyone wants a magic button to let them maximize all their life goals while still being able to maintain all their vices (in this case: laziness or gluttony). Heck, I want that magic button too! But if it exists, the red pill doesn't have it. Until it's found, what we advise here is still the most efficient way to accomplish the goals most men come here to achieve - whether that's figuring how to attract a girl or impacting the world through expanding God's Kingdom.

Backwards sexual dynamic?

5 upvotes · 16 February 2021 · /r/RPChristians

Just a thought here: Is it possible that what you're experiencing with your husband is the same thing that Christ experiences with you? You've got a strong desire for physically reproductive acts. Are you engaging in spiritually reproduction with Christ?

I'm about to write a post to flesh out in greater detail why God doesn't solve the problems of well-intentioned people. Keep an eye out.

Sectarian issues finding relationships?

5 upvotes · 25 January 2021 · /r/RPChristians

You're making no sense.

Be ye not unequally yoked together **with unbelievers**

OP was asking about dating from other denominations of believers, not unbelievers.

Getting your wife back after a separation

5 upvotes · 12 January 2021 · /r/RPChristians

you probably can't understand that a different strategy is needed in comparison to not being separated

It's still going past your head. Strategy for what? If I'm separated from my wife my strategy at winning a game of Risk with my friends will not change.

The problem here is that you're supposed to be playing the "Go therefore and make disciples" game, but instead you're playing the "gotta get back with my wife" game. You're in the wrong game in the first place, and that's the problem I was trying to point out.

and without me making a bunch of blue pill concessions in our marriage

But you did make a bunch of blue pill concessions.

If I've deceived her and manipulated her, how is she winning?

She thinks you're a loser who won't deliver. She asks for 10 things knowing you won't follow through, but if she can get 5 or 6 of them, that's a win. Common negotiation tactic. What did you get in return other than the fact that she now graces you with her divine presence once more? What is *SHE* doing to compensate you for her sin of leaving you in the first place? Oh, nothing? She's back to living her exact same lifestyle and you just conceded to doing more things her way ... and you don't see how that's a win for her? Yeah, you thought you were tricking her ("I'll tell her I'll do 10 things to get her back, but only actually do 5 or 6 of them! hehehe, look how sneaky I am"), but she's playing you the whole time.

If you're suggesting that I need to shoot down everything my wife asks for even if it's reasonable just to assert how alpha I am, that's some terrible advice.

I have a post for people who interpret advice like you do.

https://www.reddit.com/r/RPChristians/comments/ixhw7y/dont_be_autistic/

I wanted her back because it was what I wanted

All I'm reading in all of this is codependency. You've elevated her role in your life so heavily that you will compromise everything. That is an unhealthy dynamic that will ruin you in the long-term unless you can start figuring this out now.

I needed to humble myself and take a good look at what went wrong

And that is the one place you went right.

I haven't compromised my mission to be with my wife.

From what I can tell, **you didn't even have a mission at all until 5 days ago**, if that was your "first shot" at creating one. 13 days ago: **"I don't have much of a mission right now."** You've been an aimless, missionless wanderer.

How can you have the integrity to say "I haven't compromised my mission to be with my wife" when you didn't even have a mission through all of this? I know [/u/rocknrollchuck](#) has been following your OYS for longer - so maybe I'll ask him for input if I'm wrong on this?

So let's hop into your newfound "mission":

My vision is to become an ideal red pill christian man who draws others to Christ, who inspires people to become the best version of themselves, and who loves Christ fully.

My Mission is to become a man who brings glory to God in my marriage, family, career, and relationships by pursuing wisdom, leadership, and love of others. I will accomplish that by sharing the Gospel, as well as by developing my skills in communication, teaching, and fitness, learning about Christ, and developing my sense of humor, love for learning, and concern for the well-being of others.

This was my first shot. Any feedback?

This is vague. When the military gives a troop a mission does the general sit the commander down and say, "Your mission is to kill some bad guys. Now go do it!" No. That's the framework for the mission. The framework for our lives is that there's a spiritual war going on over souls. The enemy wants to keep them from us, it's our job to win then. That's the *framework*.

YOUR mission is how you're going to win them. The general may tell the commander: "I want your troop to blow up that communications array." When they do so: mission accomplished. What will be the "mission accomplished" in your mission/vision? I've shared mine before: 60 discipler-making ministries in 60 countries by the time I'm 60. That's my long-term waypoint. And after that I'm sure I'll pursue an updated mission. But for now, you need something *tangible* to wrap your head around because this vague garbage isn't going to give you any real vision for how you're going to accomplish your mission. You're going to keep spinning your wheels day-in and day-out sucking up to your wife thinking that you're accomplishing your mission because rubbing your nose in her butt hole somehow means "glorifying God in my marriage" to you.

I think this is a great discussion that really gets to the core of what red pill is about. Is red pill a road that you follow even if it's heading off the edge of a cliff? Or is red pill a forest with lots of different paths leading to the same destination?

The red pill is the truth of intergender sexual dynamics. As Rollo would say: it's *descriptive*, not *prescriptive*. But there are certain things that belief compels you toward. You can't legitimately *believe* and internalize the Gospel and not be compelled to *do* something about it - otherwise James 2 wouldn't make sense. You can't *believe* the red pill and still pursue a "happy wife, happy life" routine.

Your post is spoken from the framework of someone with a very, very blue understanding of the world. You lack comprehension of intergender sexual dynamics. You may be able to articulate certain concepts at times, but you fail to understand them, or they have failed to be ingrained into your understanding of your relationship with your wife. As such, this entire post is blue pill to its core.

In the same vein, I could write a post about how men can get their wives to have sex with them by begging, pleading, and guilt-shaming them into it with bible-thumping verse-quoting pressure. And that post would probably get the intended result for lots of people: she'd end up having sex with him. But she'd also despise him for it. She would lose respect and attraction for him. Their marriage would be worse.

This is what your post does for men here. It creates a framework where the man becomes substantially less attractive to his wife and greatly undermines his long-term goals, if he wants a healthy sex life and respectful helper in his mission. The only reason it's redeemable is because, in rare circumstances, you do have to take that hit if you want to have the chance to redeem yourself with the same woman later.

RP Christians and the Black Pill

5 upvotes · 19 December 2020 · /r/RPChristians

The black pill is no better than liberal trash because it pretends that men and women are exactly the same. Men almost exclusively assess a woman's sex appeal by looks, and it mistakenly assumes women are identical to men by also almost exclusively assessing male sex appeal by looks. Men and women are not the same. The sooner you learn that the sooner you can overcome not only idiotic liberal notions, but idiotic black pill notions also.

Even if I find a beautiful Christian woman, would she not be satisfied sexually? Will she always have the nagging feeling that she could do better?

You sound like you're still single, so you're worrying over idiotic hypotheticals rather than getting down to business. Here's a hypothetical for you: *If she's hot and I was still single, she probably COULD do better.* But

hypotheticals aren't real and I've got a good gig going with my wife, so you actually have a chance.

Back to your point: my wife once commented to me that she wasn't physically attracted to me. Ever. Not even when we were dating and I was in my life's peak physical condition. Yet we have a fantastic sex life. She has commented that she knows she couldn't do better. Why? Because I generate tingles through dominance, desire, kino, etc. You've gotta have game. I believe [/u/Deep_Strength](#) has commented before that he's not "classically handsome," yet crushes it in the bedroom. Look at Owen Cook, who's generally short, balding, and (I believe) literally on the autism spectrum, yet is still able to date playmates. The black pill can't account for that.

What is the RP Christian response to the black pill?

Simple: **Looks are the difficulty level you're playing on.** That's all. If you have generally unfavorable genetic traits, but are otherwise physically fit and dress well, your difficulty level is moderate-to-high. If you look like a male model, your difficulty is low. But both can get the exact same results. One just has to try harder than the other. You can still get tingles flowing just the same as any other guy.

I love the line in the politician where Gwyneth Paltrow's character says: "Yes, it's true that I've been having an affair with Tino McCutcheon. Yes, it's also true that I'm spectacular in bed. I work unusually hard for a woman as attractive as I am." Or that tinder meme with a hot girl on one side with the caption "starfish" and the HB6 on the other with the caption "rides like a porn star." The same concepts are true for men. There's a general understanding that when post-optimization physical quality levels are lower, you're going to have to work harder. The black pill is the idiotic notion that you should just give up because it's impossible - and that only comes from idiots who aren't willing to put in the work.

Do pay close attention to "post-optimization" in there, though. You can't be a literal 300lb slob gamer and think you're going to have enough "game" to overcome those deficits. But even the phantom won Christine over with his wretched face in *Love Never Dies* (yeah - fiction, but I couldn't pass up a musical reference).

Don't Be Autistic

5 upvotes · 22 September 2020 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

ONEitis -> rejection -> monk mode -> ONEitis

I like the way you put this. I definitely see how the mental masturbators can easily fall into this cycle, while telling themselves they're red pill because that ONEitis "isn't really ONEitis, I've just found a really great girl who is actually worth my time more than all the others."

putting in the work

A good friend has taught me a lot about handyman work around the house. I've been putting it to good use lately. Built a gigantic playground for my kids. Just cut up my deck and added a new set of stairs over the weekend. Cut down a tree this weekend too. I've now built a tile shower from scratch, done dry walling, built a stuffed animal cage for my girls, plumbing, flooring, and more. I've figured out a lot over the last couple years, and am about to work on remodeling my basement (bathroom, bedroom, home gym, theater room - though I do plan on hiring help for some of this).

In all of this, my buddy has a saying: "You've always been handy. You were just too scared to start doing it."

The word "scared" always threw me off until I realized he was right. I was scared (1) of trying and failing, which really wasn't as big a deal as I thought, but more significantly: (2) that once I started doing it, I'd realize my own competency and have no excuses for not doing it later.

I think a lot of guys are in this second camp. They realize that once they begin and see how capable they are of

living in light of their innate masculinity, they will never be able to go back to their blue pill laziness without a shame looming over them for failing to live up to who they know they are capable of being. It's easier just to stay lazy and pretend you aren't capable of any better - especially when you have a society that labels efforts to "man up" as "toxic" and immoral, meanwhile encouraging you to be lazy, then punishing you for it when you adhere to those expectations.

Looking for Wisdom from Men

5 upvotes · 17 September 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Mission: Composer and Music Teacher. I need a woman to help me fulfill a beautiful life, raise children, have a home.

Try again ;) I recognize that you're new here, so lots of grace on this. As you go through the RPC sidebar, you'll see a lot of content on mission. It might be worth skipping to those posts first, then going back to read the rest, as the direction of your mission is the foundation of everything else.

Spiritual: mature

With the above as your mission, I challenge this statement.

It's just enough distance that it's causing me to weigh the sacrifice. I am 30 and realize I could be seeing all sorts of attractive women. My woman has so much going for her that I have justified the sacrifice.

This is where you complicate things unnecessarily.

If she's worth the sacrifice today, will she be worth the sacrifice in 5 years? 10 years? If no, let her go. If yes, get married and move on with your life. Why screw around with this?

But really, this is where your "serial monogamy" conditioning is setting you back. You believe you have to be in an exclusively committed relationship with her in order to get to a point of marriage. Churchianity suggests that people have to go around acting like they're (pre-)married before you can propose. I can see how these faux-pre-marriages can make some logical sense to some people, but it's far from mandated by Scripture (or even referenced at all).

Back to the point: you're trying too hard to predict the future. You can't. One fundamental principle of life is that women change. You have no idea what she'll be like a decade from now, and no amount of vetting can predict this. What you can predict is who you will be and how you're going to get there - and you can reliably know that hypergamy can work the direction of her change in your favor if you are consistently a valuable man who she longs to follow.

should I take more time as a single man or stay committed to someone I really enjoy? I know it comes down to my own choice

Darn right it does. So what's with the "But I want you all to tell me what my choice should be" nonsense?

Personally, under the circumstances you've given, this is not necessarily someone I would be eager to jump into a marriage with - and perhaps that's for my lack of knowledge of the whole situation. But that's partly why we can't really speak into this situation.

What pillars of RPChristianity might I be missing out on?

Mission. Mission. Mission. Get on that one ;)

Do you have any concerns about how it seems like this view errs on the side of control of your wife over her personal growth and freedom?

5 upvotes · 15 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

authorizes you to control her life

[/u/Praexology](#) is spot on. It has nothing to do with "controlling" the wife. I was literally just talking about this with [u/BornRedy](#) a week or two ago - that you never want to control her. *You do you*, as we often say. If she doesn't want to follow, you keep doing what God has you doing and if she wants to rebel, that's on her. You always invite her to join you in following Christ. You always seek her redemption and sanctification if she's out of line. But at the end of the day, she's her own person.

Ask any mod or EC, including on MRP, about the best way to deal with a nagging, rebellious wife. Not one will tell you to "control her." Every last one of them will say: *Go to the gym. You have better things to do than endure that kind of behavior.* Read between the lines here and you get: *Don't try to control her, only worry about controlling yourself. If she decides that her rebellion is more important to her than having you in her life, that's her choice to make, not yours to force her to do what you say.*

Be the Judge

5 upvotes · 13 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

"Hey, I'm thinking of blank. You have any thoughts?"

OYS - Where Progress is Made (08/12/20)

5 upvotes · 12 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

[u/johnmic07](#) - she hits you like that because she wants to know you're strong enough to take it. Instead of a verbal or emotional fitness test, as are most common, it's a physical one.

I'd suggest spanking is lower risk than general domestic violence, but still not something I'd screw around with without a consent agreement.

I also have a post on actual quotes from abuse victims. That one may be a bit better to help you understand the female psychology on the issue.

How I Communicate Now, Without Words

5 upvotes · 7 July 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Right on. Glad to hear I'm not the only one doing this. Lots of thoughts on this, but it sounds like you've been at it longer. Maybe revive an old post, or write a new one with what you've learned since then? I'd read that in a heartbeat.

Feeling discouraged with many churches' support of the Black Lives Matter movement, including my own.. Are there any truly alt-right/conservative churches left that don't buy into this?

5 upvotes · 1 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Right. Better to word this: *Don't defend churchianity or the congregational structure; but do defend The Church.*

Explaining the Double Standards around Sex

5 upvotes · 14 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I don't think anyone would deny that such a situation is less than ideal, and perhaps even undesirable. But the only alternatives are indefinite celibacy or engaging in the willful, conscious, and ongoing sin of divorce without

biblical grounds (or direct cheating), which is extremely dangerous with passages like Hebrews 10:26-31.

You frequently tend to give way too little credit to a woman's ability to find reasons to do things she doesn't want to do. No woman WANTS to change a baby's diapers or do the dishes or fold laundry - at least not with the consistency required. Yet in most cases, she's capable of doing these tasks with a smile on her face anyway.

Yeah, I get that having sex is on a different level, but there are alternative ways to approach the situation. There was a post on [r/deadbedrooms](#) once, for example, by a LL who gave a list of reasons for why she still had sex with her husband frequently. Many of them boiled down to the idea that even though she didn't enjoy it, she found ways of finding fun in watching someone else be immensely pleased - and that made her happy to see him happy. Now, if you just hate your spouse altogether, that's a different story. But most people are coming from the viewpoint: "I love my spouse, I'm just not sexually attracted." If that's the case, there are still ways of expressing love through sexuality even without your own arousal and not making it a bitter experience.

In short, this is a bad cop-out, pretending it has to be all-or-nothing.

Actual conversations with "abuse" victims.

5 upvotes · 5 June 2020 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

Solid. More to [/u/ciscokid12345](#) - I usually advise my clients to have zero contact with the other party at all unless they've specifically run it through me first. In about 20% of my cases I'm holding back my client from making progress. In 80% it saves their butts. I'll take the 20% hit to avoid losing 80% of the time. People aren't as smart and tactful as they think they are.

I do make exception for some of my extremely competent clients who I've already coached for some time.

What are your views on prenups with Christianity?

5 upvotes · 3 June 2020 · [/r/askRPC](#)

Are you suggesting that staying in a marriage in which you're unhappy is more sinful than divorce? I seriously am not getting where you're trying to go with this. Divorce is sin. Staying married, even in an unhappy situation, is not. Being defiant and spiteful toward your spouse because you cannot divorce him is also sin. A prenup can cover that kind of behavior too.

What are your views on prenups with Christianity?

5 upvotes · 2 June 2020 · [/r/askRPC](#)

I advise all of my clients to have a provision that obligates a wife suspected of adultery to drink from a clay jar filled with holy water mixed with dust from a tabernacle floor.

Seriously, though, I don't ever look to the Mosaic law for dealing with non-ancient-Israelites. I do recommend basic stuff:

- Consequences to infidelity that would affect support or property division.
- Consequences to concealment of asset that would affect property division or claims of separate property.
- Consequences for separating from the marital residence.
- Advance stipulations as to present intentions toward a future custody case (obviously these aren't binding, but they are certainly influential).
- Calculations for how "equal contribution" is to be understood while one spouse works and the other doesn't, especially in the event of divorce.
- Provisions for legal fees to be covered or prohibited, depending on who files for divorce.

- Restricted access to separate property or passively acquired wealth.
- Calculations that identify separate property and allow for the creation of new separate property during the marriage.
- A clear statement that the goal of the prenup is not to pre-negotiate the divorce, but to create intentional disincentives to the divorce process itself.

Most of the things I put in are unique to the situation and requests of the client, though. These are just some common ones.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (05/27/20)

5 upvotes · 28 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I am terrified of going to hell

Have you read [307 - Assurance of Salvation](#) yet?

Assurance of salvation: 5/10 I just don't know

What you're describing is more like a 1 or 2. It sounds like the base knowledge of the Gospel is there, and you may actually be saved, but you lack the capacity to be secure in this. And here's why ...

Mission: First to set my own life into order. Mainly get myself in routine including a healthy sleep, exercise and study schedule. Overcoming my extremely introverted nature by building social connections. Holding down a full time job is also of great importance to become independent. After establishing my life I desire bringing the lost imprisoned by sin to Jesus Christ savior of all.

You're basically saying, "God, I know you want me out making disciples, but I have all these other things I want to do first. Can I put your purposes on hold and still have all the confidence and blessing that those who are actively doing the have, even though I'm not?" Also, you haven't actually referenced anything to do with making disciples. At best, you've said you want to make converts. Huge difference. But let me break this down:

set my own life into order

What is "order" for you? You seem to have this vague notion of what it would look like to "have it all together." That's a woman's way of thinking. Women strive to "have it all together." Men accept where they're at, make the most of it, but keep doing whatever they want, whether they meet some arbitrary standard or not.

More to the point: "into order" means you're doing what God created you to do. This is literally impossible if you're not making disciples. So, you have to start making disciples to accomplish this goal.

healthy sleep, exercise and study schedule

It sounds like you're losing sleep because you're not making disciples, so you have no assurance of salvation and it's keeping you up at night (among other things, I'm sure).

The first step of making disciplers is to be what others should aspire to be. This may involve sleep, exercise, and studying, but the motivation for why you're doing it changes. You're doing it because you want to model for others what a disciplined Christian soldier looks like - not because you think you have to become worthy of some arbitrary standard you've created before you can start discipling people. That's tantamount to pedestaling the disciple the same way men pedestalize women, thinking they have to get themselves in order to be "worthy" of

her. No, you get yourself in order to attract the filthy sinners that they are.

Overcoming my extremely introverted nature by building social connections

Would you be surprised if discipling others helped you break out of your shell? It forces you to build relationships like what you're looking for - you're just doing it for Jesus, not for your own arbitrary purposes.

Holding down a full time job is also of great importance to become independent

Or it's of great importance to support yourself while you make disciples, just like Paul made tents to support himself when he wasn't being funded by those he discipled. Your statement makes it sound like you find "independence" a greater aspiration than making disciples.

I know I'm being obtusely repetitive. But do you get the point? Your mission to make disciples IS what works out everything else. You set your plan, you strategize the best way to accomplish it, then you follow through. All these other things you want for yourself are incidental to that, and are also likely to be fulfilled as you push in this direction.

This is why **mission matters, nothing else**. Get that through your thick skull and all these other things will be worked out on their own. Wait ... does that sound kind of familiar? Oh yeah ...

Matthew 6:33 - "Seek first his kingdom and his righteousness and all these things will be added to you as well." This doesn't mean to "find" his kingdom. He's already talking to those who are earnestly following him and who would become the founders of the early church. It means to seek the best interests of the kingdom - to seek its advancement. You do that, while maintaining your own righteousness in the process, and literally everything else works itself out. I'm just telling you what Jesus says, but hopefully in a direct enough way that you'll get it and be able to move forward.

Who should you listen to on RPChristians?

5 upvotes · 20 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I added a sticky comment, part of which notes that if any women want flair, we'll give it to them. It just won't be an endorsement on this sub - more for gender identification purposes, hence [u/Willow-girl](#) self-identifying as "participation trophy wife" or [u/humectantmenace](#) asking to be titled "Christian Nympho."

I would not be opposed to adding an "RPCWomen Endorsed" flair for women who prove their value to the female community. Someone like [u/g_e_m_anscombe](#) would have been ripe for that type of flair. But it would make more sense to do that after we officially open RPCW, which will also be soon.

Discovered an inappropriate relationship

5 upvotes · 12 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

If I wasn't responsible for this community I would. But if you're going to teach something unbiblical that ultimately advances cultural ideologies of churchianity, I have an obligation to pull things back to a Scriptural foundation. You have made no effort to even try. At best, you're just arrogant and misguided. At worst, you're here to troll.

Discovered an inappropriate relationship

5 upvotes · 11 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Realistically, you can't legally kick her out, even if he owns the place outright. The cops won't enforce trespassing laws on a resident who hasn't left of their own vocation. In many jurisdictions, you can't evict your spouse - you have to be divorced first.

The alternative is, of course, to file for legal separation instead of divorce, then have the court issue a temporary order on a motion to vacate the premises. However, if she has substantially less means to move out than he does, it's probably going to be denied.

The proper response, if you're insistent on living separately, is to move out and take the kids with you, then work out an arrangement for visitation. Many guys are afraid to do this on the premise that it's "uprooting the kids from their home." Yet this is exactly what women do whenever they say, "I'm taking the kids to my mom's/sister's until we can figure this out." The point is: if you don't take the kids with you, it perpetuates the view, especially to the court, that you view her as the primary/default parent and that your role is expendable because you believe it's okay for you to leave with them staying behind and no arrangements worked out ahead of time. That's a dangerous precedent to the court.

Tag: [/u/lololasaurus](#) - All communications are in writing or recorded from now on. This definitely sounds like legit cheating, not just an emotional affair.

Should I give my Dad a copy of NMMNG?

5 upvotes · 27 April 2020 · [/r/askRPC](#)

I agree completely with Deep. That's how I approached things with my dad. I think he ended up reading about 3/4 of it. It didn't stick. Oh well. Don't think giving him a book will be a magical solution to his problems.

You're better off taking something like [/u/Deep_Strength](#)'s book and saying, "I'd really like to do a small group, but churches are shut down right now. You want to do one with me? Someone I know wrote a book that I've been meaning to read, and I'd love to go through it together." Easy. What Christian dad is going to say no to talking about God with his son? Oh ... I guess weak blue pill ones do. Well, hopefully he's not that backwards.

Is compatibility essential (or even useful!) in a marriage? No, not really.

5 upvotes · 26 April 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I advocate for three qualities to look for in a discipleship candidate and spouse:

- Faithful
- Available
- Saved
- Teachable

If you give me those qualities in a person, I can instill any other quality in them.

Is compatibility essential (or even useful!) in a marriage? No, not really.

5 upvotes · 26 April 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Right. Stick around long enough and you'll see countless stories of men whose "good Christian wife" "would NEVER do something like that" ... until he becomes attractive and suddenly she's doing "that" and more. Top post of all time on MRP is a perfect example if this:

https://www.reddit.com/r/marriedredpill/comments/dmpqgv/i_almost_lost_my_marriage_of_32_years_and_turned/

Check my post history for my testimony and rp-imony and you'll see I'm another example of a guy who married a frigid prude who it turns out wasn't actually a frigid prude at all ... it was just me being screwed up.

Is compatibility essential (or even useful!) in a marriage? No, not really.

5 upvotes · 26 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Yes. She can learn. Also, how were you planning on assessing this before marriage? I again refer you to [u/Deep_Strength](#)'s Christian Brad Pitt thought experiment post on the sidebar and also linked in this thread.

... unless you're talking "sexual compatibility" in the sense of gender and sex. I assume that compatibility in the sense of not entering a homosexual relationship is just understood in this sub.

Reposting as text: Advice on how to manage and potentially create a Red Pill women's subreddit for Christian women.

5 upvotes · 26 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Agreed. The short duration of your marriage doesn't seem problematic to me. I'm more interested in how well you are able to connect application of Scripture to your daily life in the contexts applicable to a sub like this - and that you do have experience to share from, whether it's recent or from years ago isn't as big of an issue. Yes, longevity adds credibility, but it's not the only source of credibility.

Was gonna go on mission this year, and now they changed the staff. I don't feel like going

5 upvotes · 14 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I think you missed the point I was making. Think bigger than your immediate concerns and you'll realize how trite they are and that you can mister whether you go or not. So who cares what they do with their group? You do you.

When do you know that they're the one?

5 upvotes · 9 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

There is no "the one" unless God specifically ordains through prophecy a particular bride for you. This is extremely rare. I agree with [/u/reformedpolak](#) - your "one" is whoever you pick to marry. Just don't be an idiot about who you pick, and don't expect that marriage will somehow transform her into your soul mate. Even after marriage, "she's not yours, it's just your turn."

Your question is too much of an effort to defer responsibility for a prospective failed marriage to someone else. If it doesn't end up working out, it's like you want to reserve the right to say that SHE wasn't the one. Take responsibility for your own decisions. If you make a good choice or bad choice, that's on you. Yes, there's going to be risk, and no, you will never be able to account for the seemingly sudden changes that women make after marriage. But that's all got to be factored into your decision to legally and spiritually bind yourself to someone else in the first place.

If she does go off the rails in a way you couldn't foresee, sure, that's on her. But at the same time, as I often tell my clients when they're upset at how contentious their spouse is being: "I didn't marry her. That was you. I'm just trying to help you get out."

Most Christians Do Not Love Women

5 upvotes · 2 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Spot on. But when you ask how men are saved, you neglected to ask how women are saved. Through child-bearing (1 Timothy 2:15). While in one sense, this bolsters a pragmatic aspect of your entire post, in another - the more theological sense - it explains something much deeper that I have been getting on for some time about.

Child-bearing and raising is inherently paralleled throughout all of Scripture to the discipleship process - especially in the New Testament. Jesus references the fruit of a person's seed as the thing by which we would know the saved from the unsaved - their disciples. In discussing the unforgivable sin, Jesus once again takes it back to the concept of spiritual reproduction - specifically rebuking the pharisees for trying to lead people away from Christ (i.e. reproducing their death among those who were moving toward life) as the bad fruit, which is

unforgivable. Yet the good fruit that vouches for the authenticity for our faith is known through the disciples we produce.

In this way, women are a parallel for the mission of the church. The way they, as a man's bride, bear children and raise them is symbolic of the way the Church, Christ's bride, is meant to bear spiritual offspring (evangelism) and raise them through discipling them. And this is the evidence of our salvation. It's quite plain, then, that women's salvation - even their highest honor - is to be the vessels of birth, establishing the practical example of the way the Church should forever understand its mission.

It amazes me, then, that the spiritual parentage concept is so plainly obvious in Scripture, yet the church attempts to "parent" hundreds or even thousands of kids at a time from a singular leader. What father actually parents that many children this way? Actual parenting strategies are abandoned and instead we call classrooms and sermons the "modern" approach to "spiritual parenting." Total hogwash.

I thought I could get over it

5 upvotes · 24 March 2020 · /r/RPChristians

5 times ... 12 times ... 25 times

Why are you so hung up on how many times another guy's willy has been inside of her? If it's one time or 42 times, or even 1,000 times, you need to make up your mind if you're okay with this or not. This is an insanely bizarre detail to share. Also, this is trickle truth, brother. Whatever numbers she gives you: triple it.

This is my first serious relationship

Sounds like you haven't had your first yet. Seriously, are you trolling us?

Is it weird for me to require a virgin or nobody?

5 upvotes · 23 March 2020 · /r/askRPC

It feels like a competition because for these girls **IT IS A COMPETITION**. That's how hypergamy works. They want to know you're better than the last guy. So, they start talking up the last guy with the expectation that you'll try to one-up him. These aren't the wrong girls; they're all girls. Some are just more vocal about it than others. My post history and the sidebar include posts on how to win competition games by not playing them in the first place.

I agree that virgin girls are rare these days. That said, they're certainly out there. What are your Rule 2 stats? If you're under 40, start looking for someone around 20. Chances are much higher she's still a virgin if you're looking younger.

The Philosophy Side of The Bible

5 upvotes · 20 February 2020 · /r/RPChristians

If you were spiritually responsible for a community, you might feel differently when certain bad advice is given. Not to say that the other guy is one, but there is a large group of cult-like KJV-onlyists that can be dangerous. I don't prohibit people from reading the KJV. I just want them informed before developing their translation preferences rather than being influenced in potentially risky ways.

Note that we did not make a debate of it. He made one comment, I made an extremely short reply. This is hardly "in the weeds with what translation is best." If this little tidbit sets you off, you've got to grow some thicker skin, brother ;)

Q&A With an untrusting wife

5 upvotes · 11 February 2020 · /r/RPChristians

<https://deepstrength.wordpress.com/>

<https://loydwalker.com/>

How would a turnaround for the church look like? Making it more RP than Feminist.

5 upvotes · 21 December 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Right. But using levitical law out of its context is unbiblical.

Advice on moving forward with Christian dudes who are bp?

5 upvotes · 17 December 2019 · /r/askRPC

"The Lord disciplines the one he loves" - Hebrews 12:6.

Respond back: "Excellent reference, my friend. I totally agree that we should love our wives the way Christ loves the church. So, what would you say is the proper way for a husband to discipline his wife?"

Wait 10 seconds through either shocked silence or objection after objection.

"Oh, so you think we should just single out one aspect of how Christ loved the church and ignore all the other ways?"

Done. Works every time. Sometimes I still get some objections, but it's put away as soon as I say: "I want to model Christ to my wife in every way Christ is a groom to us, as his bride. If I say I'm only going to be like Christ in the ways that are socially acceptable, but not in the more difficult, controversial ways, am I truly Christ-like?"

[/u/Deep_Strength](#) also had a great reply. Props for making good use of his book.

Encouraging leadership in with non-rp husband

5 upvotes · 31 October 2019 · /r/askRPC

Lots going on here, but I have to hammer this point up-front because it's unbearably often that this happens:

EDIT: Rule 2 as requested

You obviously looked at Rule 2 because you quoted it, but you skipped the "mission" category. That's the single most important thing that affects EVERYTHING you've written here. Everything else is just guess-work without that piece. Nevertheless ...

I do generally agree with (most) of the [RP] ideals, as it pertains to what I personally want in my relationship anyway

Right, because you're a woman designed by God just like every other woman. Your situation here is not unique - you're just frustrated that the power of change most heavily rests on the man's shoulders and you don't have the say or authority.

I can make a very long list of wonderful things about my husband

Great. I can make the same list of Hitler. All this tells me is that you use the positive recognition of his attributes as an excuse to let your hamster keep complaining because you tell yourself: "It's not all hate - I have a fair evaluation of him." Don't couch anything. Tell it like it is and let that be that. Stuff like this makes you lose

credibility, not gain it.

I am grateful for him, I appreciate him, I love him, and I make sure he knows this often.

How much rationalizing did you have to do to write this? Be honest. You're talking divorce and serious frustrations and yet at the same time you're saying you're grateful? That's like when your grandma gives you an ugly sweater for Christmas and you say, "Oh, thank you. I'm so grateful for this wonderful gift" that you wish you could throw in the trash but you know she's going to want to see you wearing it next year. You rationalize, "I'm grateful that she cared enough to give me a gift that she thought I would like," but in reality you're not grateful for what you actually have in front of you.

You're not grateful for your husband. You don't appreciate him - you appreciate some of the things he does for you. Big difference. When you say you love him, what does that mean to you? Because what you're describing doesn't sound like love - it sounds like emotional effort.

Also, [/u/Deep_Strength](#) hit the nail on the head with respect not being in this list.

our relationship is seriously devoid of passion, physical affection, sexual chemistry, and attraction

coupled with:

I'm 5'4" and in the 180s ... He's 5'11" 250s-260s ... he does not lift or exercise. I am also not actively working out.

So you want sex like you see on TV, but you don't want the bodily chemistry of the people you see on TV. You understand how testosterone works, right? It's what fuels our sex drives - men and women alike. Do you know what increases it in a person's body more than anything else you can naturally do? Work out.

I can't force my feelings and he knows this

Yes you can. You can absolutely force feelings. What you can't force is attraction.

I don't enjoy it, he knows I don't enjoy it, and everyone is feeling pretty hopeless

Are you kidding? Hopeless? You're going to use that word? Do you have any hope that if either or both of you got in 6-pack abs shape then maybe your sex drives would be restored? Let me indent your obvious thought process for emphasis:

- **MY HUSBAND AND I ARE MAKING AN ACTIVE CHOICE THAT WE ARE MORE INTERESTED IN OVER-EATING AND AVOIDING THE GYM THAN HAVING A PASSIONATE SEX LIFE**
- **My husband and I are making an active choice that we are more interested in over-eating and avoiding the gym than having a passionate sex life.**
- *My husband and I are making an active choice that we are more interested in over-eating and avoiding the gym than having a passionate sex life.*

I want you to memorize this line and recite it every time you get seconds at dinner. Every time you buy a dessert from the grocery store. Every time you drive by a gym and see their deal of the month. Repeat. Repeat. Repeat.

Right now you're living in passivity. BOTH of you. Not just him. Here's another point that needs emphasis:

- **If passable mediocrity is your goal, you'll never put in the work to get it.**

Everyone wants the best - a 10. That's a fact of life. I'm not talking about SMV - I'm just saying the quality of any result they're looking for in life. People who compromise their desires say, "I would be happy even if I only got a 4. That's better than the 1 or 2 I have now." They make this compromise because they realize getting a 10 would be a heck of a lot of work. They don't want to do that work. They just want better. But they've already decided they don't want to do the work. They're asking for better results without actually having to change anything. As a result, they're never going to bump from a 2 to a 4. They'll stay at 2 forever.

Now, the one who wants a 10 might not be capable of actually putting in enough effort to get a 10. But by making a 10 their target, they put in a butt ton of effort and end up getting an 8. Solid. But the lazy people are motivated for a short while. They have 10 in their sights, 8 is realistically attainable quite soon, but they finally get their 4 and think, "Well, that's better. This is hard work. I'll settle for the 4 I just got." Then they stop. Then they regress because they don't put in the maintenance work. Then they slide back to a 2 and think to themselves, "Well, I already tried putting in a lot of effort and yet we still ended up right back here, so that didn't work. I guess my situation is hopeless." See how foolish this sounds?

Imagine my internet sucks. It keeps losing connection when I'm using it. Videos have to buffer all the time. I can barely even stream music because it takes 2 minutes to load the next song. Now, I'm paying for the absolute lowest speed service, and I know this. But it would take work to pick up the phone and call the internet company to discuss plans to upgrade my service. It would also cost more money. That's a lot of effort. So, instead, I say, "Look how hopeless my situation is. My internet will never get better! I might as well just change internet companies because maybe they'll be better than this garbage I have right now." But if you change companies, you're going to be out a bunch of money because you haven't finished your current contract yet. The other companies are also more expensive than what you have now because they don't even like offering plans that crappy. So, even if you did change companies, you're going to have to pony up some more cash and put in the work to shop around and get something better set up anyway. Or ... you can just put in the time and cash to get a better plan with the company you have now. But by telling yourself, "Things are HOPELESS with this current company" is just absurd.

I think there's some difference in "taste" of what we each want in bed

Yep. He wants a hot girl in bed and you want a hot man in bed. These are extremely different from what you have now. Your tastes are certainly different from what you're each getting right now.

I honestly believe 80% of our problems boil down to the fact I badly need him to lead both me and our family in just about all aspects of our lives (including faith), and that he needs to develop some self respect

Let me venture a guess - projecting a bit from my fatter days. He doesn't respect himself because he doesn't think his life is something worth respecting. Yeah, he's got decent income, but he knows other high-earning people who have better bodies, hotter wives, and more passionate sex lives. He doesn't want to put in the work to get in shape because (1) he loves his laziness and (2) he doesn't believe you'd put in the work to get in shape, and then he'd have done all that work and still come home to the same old same old, so what's the point? He probably even remembers a few times where he did make an effort for like 3 weeks to get in better shape and not much improved, so he tested that theory and it's gone.

But really, your saying this is just deluding yourself. 80% of your problems are him not leading? Try 80% of your problems are that neither of you are in shape, and getting in shape will almost certainly solve the leadership as a byproduct, as he develops more confidence and is more able to process the (apparently appropriate numerical levels of) testosterone he's already got. Just because the numbers are there doesn't mean his body is doing with it what it's supposed to.

I know my part in this is in submission and respect.

Deflecting much? This obviously isn't the real issue. There are easy and obvious answers if that's the problem.

Consider: He never asks you to do anything directly. So, you stop doing anything at all. Period. Is that a submissive attitude? No. Of course not. Why not? Because you know he wants things even if he hasn't said it. You're submitting to his unspoken desires and expectations.

Ask him: "Do you want me to get in better shape and look more physically attractive?" Do you think he would honestly say no? If you know the answer is already yes, then this is simply an unspoken mandate, and you're hamstering away that you don't need to follow it because he never said it out loud. And you don't want him to say it out loud because then you'll have to submit on something you don't actually want to do. Ouch. As a pastor once said, "It's not submission until you disagree."

Point being: you're only "submitting" to those things that you already want to do anyway and not willing to submit in the areas that he's not yet man enough to say out loud - probably because he's got some feminist juju running through his head about never talking to a woman about her weight. And how could he? He's big enough as is that he has no room to talk. So, he's just given up.

I'm out of space. You know what you need to do. Lose 25lbs then update us with an FR.

Emotional self sufficiency

5 upvotes · 23 October 2019 · /r/askRPC

That's a lesson I've tried to word succinctly a number of times to guys who want to rush into marriage and relationships. They get all excited because when they're a 5 they get super pumped when a 6 actually gives them the time of day. It's usually because there's junk that drops her value significantly that guys don't find out about just by looking at her, hence her still being single. But the guy doesn't care in the moment because he's blinded by *feelings of "love"*. He's super pumped to marry this 6, then realize that the sex life he was expecting isn't there. So, he eventually discovers RP and ups his game - he jumps from a 5 to an 8. Now he's pulling 7s with ease and rather disappointed that he married a 6 when a tiny bit of work puts him in the 8-9 range.

If you're going to have to improve anyway, better to do it before you pick who you spend your life with rather than after.

As for a book to read on emotional independence from your wife/women ... I'm going to go off the beaten path and recommend *Practice the Presence of God*, by Brother Lawrence. Get the version with the maxims at the end. It's a 60 minute read. It's the most influential book on my life after the Bible itself. The book focuses on being able to experience God's fullness no matter what your circumstances are in life.

Brother Lawrence references his life doing dishes in a monastery - a job he hated - yet having such great joy because of God's presence in those moments. Substitute "being in the same room with a harpy wife" for "doing the dishes" and the application becomes more obvious.

He was a few hundred years early, but really the book is a Spirit-heavy telling of concepts like amused mastery, developing and maintaining frame, OYS, etc.

Dating apps for Christians?

5 upvotes · 14 October 2019 · /r/RPChristians

You updated with your stats in a comment, but I still want the other Rule 2 information:

- Mission
- Reading
- Finances

- Spiritual Maturity

Those things will tell us a lot of necessary information as to how successful you're going to be with any girl once you get past the initial swipe. Otherwise, I agree with /u/Deep_Strength that it's doable on a dating app, but mostly not worth the time. You're really just trying to skate around the easy way to find someone at that point. My brother did just marry his wife last December, and he's proud to show off how whipped he is to his internet bride. In fairness to him, she's moderately attractive and he's severely obese (but well groomed), so there's that working for him ... granted, she has psychological and health problems that probably also narrowed the dating pool for her.

Also, and I mean this not in a racist way at all, but from what I've read, minorities don't do very well on dating apps unless they're truly top-tier guys. Your build might make that worthwhile, but in order to draw attraction you're really going to have to show it off by pulling up your shirt to flaunt a 6-pack. As soon as you do that, the Christian girls will initially be put-off - not for lack of tingles, but because of social conditioning against arrogance. So, you have to couch it with a joke, like painting a cross on your torso so they can hamster it that you're not cocky, you're just showing off how much you love Jesus to paint it on your body for all to see. That way they're seeing your tingle-producing assets while not judging you for it.

More to the point: the only real value in online dating is to find people who are (1) either not having success IRL, which means they're usually low value - and if they're attractive, it's because they're low-value for hidden reasons that you won't find until it's too late, or (2) very far away, in which case you're stuck dealing with a long distance (not really a) relationship. My suggestion: don't do it unless you're desperate and willing to accept a lower-quality girl. You're better off upping your SMV and initiating in the real world through mission-oriented activities.

F/R Sunday's Argument

5 upvotes · 12 October 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Easy path to nip this in the bud:

1. Stop caring so much.
2. When she screws up this hard, instead of getting mad, just say, "I thought I could trust you to do what you said you'd do. I can't. Now I know. Here's what we're going to do ..." and in this case you finish: "I'm going to stay and cook dinner. You can go to small group and food will be ready when you get back."
3. ... There is no third step. That's really it.

Your wife will fail you. It's inevitable. Expect it. If you know it's coming, you won't care as much when it happens. So, **when she fails you, acknowledge her failure, embrace it, and let her hamstering do your work for you.** You tried to use anger to change how she interacts with you. By telling her she failed you, but not getting upset about it you're both displaying high value and also letting her hamster spin about the whole situation so that she will internally want to do better next time. Which do you think will result in a more positive attitude: her deciding this on her own, or you telling her? Which one will produce more lasting internal transformation: her internally coming to this conclusion or you externally brute-forcing it through anger?

In reality, you screwed up too and you were just shifting the blame on her. If you want to eat, that's your responsibility to get food, not hers. When she offered to cook dinner, she took on that responsibility. When you decided to trust her, that decision was on you. Her failure is on her, your poor judgment of her faithfulness to do what she said is on you. At the end of the day, oh well. She failed. You exercised poor judgment and didn't realize your wife could be flaky like that. AWALT. Deal with it.

Now, you blew this chance already, but an easy move to twist these conversations and turn them in your favor: when you realize how bad you're DEERING and how mad she's getting, just start laughing hysterically. When she gets even more ticked and asks why you're laughing say, "I'm just screwing with you. Did you see how mad you were getting ?? hahaha. Now come on, let's get something to eat."

Hamster goes wild at this EVERY. SINGLE. TIME.

That trick won't work forever, but it's solid gold for a few times. I give it 3-4 uses before it becomes fishy, unless they're super spaced out.

I fell in love with a Muslim girl. What now?

5 upvotes · 11 October 2019 · /r/askRPC

John 1:3 - "Through him all things were made; without him nothing was made that has been made."

No, there are not two gods, there is one triune God. If you deny the divinity of Jesus, you are not a Christian and you're free to date whoever you want. So, that's a simple answer to your question. If you are a Christian, then you may not marry someone of another faith, and therefore it's pretty pointless to date someone of another faith.

Being Supportive on Attitude Issues

5 upvotes · 11 October 2019 · /r/askRPC

the feedback he gets from above may be right only half the time

If a boss provides critical feedback, the boss is always right, even when he's wrong. If he's saying, "You're not drafting those TPS reports the right way," and then you look up the company manual and it turns out you're filing them the right way, what the boss really means is: "I don't care what the manual says, you're not doing it the way I WANT you to do it." It's all a matter of personal preference for most evaluations like this (except when it comes down to the numbers).

I went through the same situation 2 years ago. My boss was coming down hard on me. He didn't even have a reason. He just said he was unhappy with my performance compared to the other attorney in the office. I pulled out numbers - that I was in the office more hours, I was billing more hours, I brought the office more money, my client retention numbers were higher, client satisfaction levels were higher - objectively, I was the better employee. What did it turn out to be? "Well, [other employee] always keeps me informed of everything going on in his cases so I'm always up to date, and I just don't get that from you." I was too autonomous. Despite being objectively a better employee, he had his own personal preference over how things should be done. So, I adjusted my performance to suit his preference and didn't let it get to me because at the end of the day I'm still getting my check. His personal opinions of me don't matter as long as I keep getting that check - that's what his role is in my life. If I need to adjust a few behaviors to suit his preferences to keep getting that check, so be it.

As Paul says, "I don't care if I am judged by you or any other human court. I do not even judge myself. My conscience is clear, but that doesn't make me innocent. It is the Lord who judges me." Have him memorize that verse. From there, it's no longer a matter of managing emotional judgments over him; it's just a matter of adapting behavior to reap the results he's going for.

My point is: most employee evaluation criteria is subjective opinion. At that, his opinion of himself means squat. If his boss's opinion is different from his, his boss is right, even if he thinks he's "right only half the time."

his attitude causes him to take negative feedback way too personally

This is extremely common. I used to struggle with this too. It's ultimately a frame issue. Is he read up on matters

of frame? Amused mastery? DNGAF? If not, I wouldn't give him dynamite right off. But if he is, he needs to work on that. Why does he care so much about what others think of him?

In addition to the above reference, Galatians 1:10 seems to be highly on-point: "Am I now trying to win the approval of human beings, or of God? Or am I trying to please people? If I were still trying to please people, I would not be a servant of Christ."

Now, your question is less about what he needs and more about what you can do - so let's skip there.

As a matter of personal preference, I don't know that I'd ask him about his work day at all. A lot of guys like the idea of coming home and getting work out of their minds. My dad was that way. He was able to enjoy home and family more when nobody was asking him about his job. As soon as someone did ask, a million things started running through his mind that became a distraction and he couldn't get his head reoriented. When a man goes from his office to his home, there should be a psychological shift prompted by the change in location/scenery that you don't want to undermine by blurring those lines too much. If he wants to talk about it, let him talk; if not, find other ways to keep him happy.

The best thing you can do to be supportive is to be the best you that you can be at your role within the household. His day at work sucks? He comes home to find a clean house, children playing nicely in the back yard, dinner on the table, and something fun to do after the kiddos go down (sex, Netflix, board game, etc.).

If you bring work into his home life too much, it's very possible he may feel some form of release by venting to you, but it also means he never gets a true respite from what's going on. Your job is to be an oasis for him. Make things as wonderful at home as possible so it's not like he's going from a stressful job to a slum back to a stressful job. Coming home should be like a 4-hour vacation in these phases of life.

Now, you can't realistically keep the house at vacation-level condition and peace all the time - especially if you're working too (can't remember if you have a job or not). But even if for a few days while he's got his struggles going on, the ambiance and attitude can really make more of a difference than trying to help him find a direct solution to his problems.

Another aspect might be that he's afraid you'll judge him the same way his boss does. By simply asking the question, "How was work?" there is a chain of psychological implications that subconsciously run through a guy's head --> "She wants to know what I did at work" --> "What I do at work matters to her" --> "Why does it matter to her? Probably because it affects her" --> "She wants to be affected in a good way, but I only have bad news right now" --> "She's going to judge me."

Now, he may still tell you simply because he needs to vent or he wants to be compulsively honest or for whatever other reason. But I know when I've had those moments in the past I most certainly was hung up on how my wife would think about me if she knew I wasn't a rock-star at the office every day. And, in fact, my wife did used to be directly UNSupportive when I wasn't performing up to par. So, in those days I'd built a pattern of hiding my poor performance from her. If I wanted to take a day off, rather than letting her know I needed a break, I scheduled them on days she'd be out of town so she didn't know I took time off. I'd leave extra early in the morning, but then sleep an hour or two in my car when I got to my parking lot. I'd exaggerate what I was billing or how much non-billable work I was doing, when in reality I just didn't have the work-flow at the time to bring in a decent paycheck. There were all kinds of stupid things that I did out of fear of my wife's judgment - and it was even worse when I knew I wasn't actually performing up to par.

By not pressing the work issues, you're implicitly letting him know you don't care how well or poor he performs at work - that's his business to figure out and decide what to disclose and not. You're communicating, instead: "You're my husband. I know you're stressed, but I appreciate you and I want to recharge you so you can do a

better job when you go back."

Part of this is also understanding the framework of why you're asking the question in the first place. Are you asking about his workday for his benefit or yours? I'd wager that for most women, it's for their own benefit to open that conversation, not his. "I want to know you. I want to be a part of your life, even when we're apart. It's important to me to feel connected to every aspect of you, including your work life."

Most guys don't get the same relational connection from dumping their work stress on their wife. We compartmentalize our thoughts and emotions, so it's easy to set aside work stresses once we get home ... unless a wife "forces" us to drudge them up by asking about it repeatedly. Sharing that burden with her doesn't feel, to most guys, like he's becoming more connected to his wife. Rather, it's usually the wife who feels emotional fuzzies when her husband is open and honest about his struggles - but he's not getting those same fuzzies. This can become selfish if a wife is opening a box her husband had tucked away, which now reminds him of his frustrations just so she can feel closer to him.

Even if it does cause him to feel closer to her too (as I'm sure there's some degree of that happening also), there are MUCH, MUCH, MUCH better and more effective ways to get him to feel close to you. So, just play a quick side-by-side comparison game in your head in those moments: Which one will make him feel more loved by me?

- Sharing his work struggles or having hot lingerie sex?
- Sharing his work struggles or getting a shoulder massage?
- Sharing his work struggles or being cooked his favorite meal?
- Sharing his work struggles or coming home to a stress-free, clean house?
- Sharing his work struggles or cuddling to a movie and popcorn?
- Sharing his work struggles or playing with the kids over a fun activity I set up for us?

You can see that even though "sharing his work struggles" might develop some level of emotional connectivity for him and could possibly help him ... the latter choice is going to be more effective EVERY. SINGLE. TIME.

So, if your goal is for YOU to feel more connected to him when you feel like work is pulling him away, then by all means, ask your questions about his day. But if your goal is for HIM to feel more loved by you, do things that are more likely to make him feel loved by you. If he wants your advice, let him be the one to ask for it. If he wants to vent, let him decide when and how to do it. Let him lead and initiate on what he wants, and you just keep refueling his positive energy tank in the meantime.

Complete Lifting Reset

5 upvotes · 1 October 2019 · /r/askRPC

For your age, height, weight, and body fat you should NATURALLY be lifting way more than this. Something sounds seriously off here. Most guys with those base demographics could walk into a gym after having never lifted in their lives and be pulling off more than this. I'm very confused here.

What it sounds like is that you probably do have the capacity for higher lifts, but you have a psychological block due to the history of pain. Chiropractors feel great, but they're addictive and do not offer any permanent solutions. As soon as you stop seeing them, the problems will recur - at least until you're pretty built. I used to have lots of pain in my upper and lower back as well, plus my neck. I saw a chiropractor for a while and had no real long-term benefit from it.

Know what did fix me and make all my pain go away? I got buff. Once my bench went from 145 to 225+, all that

pain went away. I'm guessing it's because your body is designed to be muscular. When you don't have muscle, your bones and joints are carrying more load than they should, and not configured properly. When you gain muscle, it forces your body to rest in its proper shape so you're not posturing yourself weird all the time, and it also lets the muscle carry the load of your body around rather than your bones.

Best advice I can give, without being a doctor, is to find non-painful ways to build muscle mass as quickly as possible and hope that the peripheral effect of the muscle you can build will help self-correct the areas where there are pain so you can begin focusing on those areas sooner. But you have to at least start getting your body in a proper shape first.

Duty Sex Sucks, How to Proceed?

5 upvotes · 23 September 2019 · /r/askRPC

As you've already figured out, this is a raw attraction issue. But your question isn't "why is this happening" - it's "what do I do until I get attractive?" So, most of the other answers are somewhat off-topic.

BPP's advice is that a married man should never stop initiating. Athol Kay says in MMSLP that a guy should never turn down a wife's sexual initiation. But everyone agrees it's perfectly appropriate to walk away from bad sex.

Personally, I fully agree with the last bit - walking away from bad sex, but only if you can do it in a non-butthurt way. That requires an immaculate frame and actual OI, rather than the "fake it til you make it" OI that most guys live in perpetually.

As far as the rest, I'm on the other end from BPP and AK. I think it's perfectly appropriate for a married man to go through monk mode for a time. Biblically, this is supposed to happen by mutual consent and only for a short time for prayer (1 Cor. 7). However, "mutual consent" doesn't mean "verbalized consent." If she's not initiating, that's her consent not to have sex; if you're not initiating also, then it's mutual.

I'd suggest a "short time" as a month or two, but it could be shorter or longer. I say that mostly because that's how long it takes to make serious progress with lifting/dieting. A couple weeks alone won't get you very far.

But if she initiates during this time, accept the initiation and be prepared to walk away if you're not into it - unless she pulls the husbandly duty card that most women don't even know exists because they hid it in their trash can so long ago they forgot it was there.

Could someone say anything about the statements this guy is making concerning the validity of the Bible?

5 upvotes · 23 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

And this, my friend, is the only good use of apologetics.

Also, in my small groups I usually end up doing a series on different world belief systems - one a week. When possible, I bring in someone from that belief system to represent their faith and teach us what they believe and why. It is to address this exact situation. I don't want new believers getting led astray. I also want them prepared to witness to such people by knowing what they believe first, so as to facilitate the relationship and gain some insight on where their mental perception is coming from.

Have some fun this weekend. Here's a comic strip for you all.

5 upvotes · 21 September 2019 · /r/askRPC

Expect it. People prefer to stereotype to feed their hate than discern the truth, which takes work and time and might mean they admit they're wrong from time to time.

[ADVICE] My LTR started distancing herself from me for no apparent reason

5 upvotes · 11 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Okay ... here's why the stats matter. I'm not saying this to shame you, but to kick your butt in gear - and because you directly asked for critical feedback.

- Overweight.
- Doesn't lift.
- Doesn't finish books he started.
- Hasn't read RPC sidebar. Says he read Red pill sidebar, but openly admits he hasn't finished books on the sidebar, so something's screwy here.
- Still a student, so no actual income yet
- No quiet times, no consistency in the Word
- Hasn't repented of known sin issues

You're in shambles, brother. You are not the prize yet. The "I am the prize" mentality will get girls horny for you - **but only after you actually are the prize.**

Now that I see your stats, I'm even more confident about my 90% figure on her cheating on you and using you as her emotional tampon. You're safe. She knows she's got you emotionally locked down on her, she's at a distance so she can keep looking at other guys without you knowing, and if she finds a better option she just branch swings - except it's not even branch swinging because you're not actually in a relationship in the first place. You just call it that.

The fact is: you're not attractive ... yet. You'll get there. There is hope for you. But you're too hung up on this girl because you know you're not all that attractive and she's the best option you have ... for now.

But give yourself 2 years of hard lifting, developing your social skills, increasing your network of friends, getting established in your career, etc. You can do much better than her. How do I know? Because you're a 4 and 8s/9s don't date 4s - even as a safety net LDR. So she's probably a 5 or 6. When you're a 7 or 8 you can do better. Why get hung up on what's available to you now when in a couple years you will have so much more open to you - and someone who isn't going to screw around with other guys behind your back or hide things from you?

Also: what's your mission? You still didn't include that one. That's **THE MOST IMPORTANT** part of the Rule 2 stats.

"But Red, you just want to lecture me about making disciples, no matter what I say my mission is."

Darn right I do.

Just got offered a new job, but God is still testing me.

5 upvotes · 11 September 2019 · /r/askRPC

I endorse this.

Getting better "game"

5 upvotes · 10 September 2019 · /r/askRPC

I have read Roosh V ... This doesn't sound genuine at all and I would hate to do it.

... coupled with

Does anyone have good tips on being a better conversationalist and having better "game."

You have an answer, but you don't like the answer, so you're looking for different answers. Game isn't about being genuine. It's about being fun. As you noted, you're not a fun person. If genuine you is not fun, then you have to learn to become fun. Either do that authentically, or practice it until it becomes natural to you.

That said ... the topic of conversation skills does warrant a post sometime soon. Maybe I'll get some time soon.

Bonus points: "I have read Roosh V's book" - and "Anyone know if there are any books out there on this?"

EDIT: second quote pasted wrong

FR: The Spell is Broken

5 upvotes · 9 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Any tips on how you battled this in your head during your transition? After reading a lot about habits it seems you must insert a new routine rather than fall into the old one that leads to PMO.

Right, this is Matthew 12. It's not enough to empty yourself of an unclean spirit, as it will always return - and with others more powerful than itself. That passage hinges on the phrase: "If it finds the house is still empty." So, what do you fill it with?

The Bible only mentions three things that indwell us:

- Matthew 13: God's Word (i.e. from the Father).
- John 17: Jesus (also Colossians 1:27)
- Acts 1:8: the Holy Spirit

And what happens when any of these three indwell us?

- God's Word: Matthew 13 says that we produce a crop 30, 60, or 100 times what is sown. That is, disciples are made.
- Jesus: John 17 is all about Jesus commissioning his followers to be disciple-makers, carrying on the ministry he started and into the nations - most notably: "I pray not only for them, but for those they will disciple" (not exact quote, I've never actually memorized that verse). This is the context of Jesus saying that he would be in us - while we are making disciples.
- Holy Spirit: Acts 1:8 says that when the Holy Spirit comes on us we will become his witnesses.

No matter how you slice it, if we are to rid ourselves of evil, we are to fill ourselves with any (all!) of the persons of God, which always results in disciple-making.

My conclusion: go make disciples. That's how you permanently stop your beating off problem.

Oh, and for good measure: the underlying theological framework of RPC is that spiritual reproduction and physical reproduction are parallel processes and spiritual reproduction is the fulfillment of which physical reproduction is merely a copy or shadow (per Hebrews 8/9). Go figure, then, that ridding yourself of sinful sexual expression would be best accomplished by taking on God which leads to spiritual reproductive expression.

Vision for a Biblical Church

5 upvotes · 4 September 2019 · /r/askRPC

PM me about this. I've already got something like this started with some RPC guys and you're welcome to take a look at what we're doing and draw some ideas from it to work with.

For the more general crowd, here's how I see a biblical congregation operating:

- Christ is the head, as the apostles acknowledged.
- Skeletal budget; no buildings, expensive programs, curriculum, etc.; no mandatory tithes; staff have alternative options for supporting themselves if giving doesn't cover their needs, just as the apostles had, ensuring no compromise of the Gospel or biblical truth in order to secure funds.
- Short-term training model. The goal is not to keep people in your ministry for a lifetime. It's to train them up and send them out to run their own ministry after a few years. This is what Jesus and the apostles did.
- Crowd-sourcing logistics. You use what you already have available to arrange for meetings - homes, coffee shops, etc. The people you train up use their own natural life circumstances to reach the next generation. This is what happened in the early church, which did not rely on a centralized building, but on people allowing use of their homes, cooking from their own food, etc.
- Corporate meetings of everyone in the lineage only to occur when necessary or desired, not ritualistically or routine-based, in the same degree of emphasis or lack thereof that Jesus and the apostles modeled (i.e. permit it when it's in high demand and people won't leave you alone, but always pull away from this model to focus on the few).
- No "all the other churches are doing it" mentality; no prefabricated curriculum or content, though referencing outside material when useful is fine. Stick to the Scriptures, as Jesus and the apostles did.
- All 5 instructional aspects of discipleship incorporated: tell them what, show them how, let them try, send them out, pass it on, taken straight from Jesus' model
- All 3 structural aspects of discipleship incorporated: fun/games/relationship building, life/ministry skills training, personal issues addressed, which Jesus modeled
- Tangible vision/picture for what the congregation will be producing when it is done training up a person, which is communicated up-front, as Jesus did ("Come follow me and I will make you fishers of men")
- Intentional pathway for getting a person from where they're at now to become someone living up to that vision/picture, as Jesus had (his entire discipleship process)

In short, everything must be taken straight from Jesus' model. Additional boundaries can be put in place as helpful tools for cultural purposes (ex. setting up bylaws so you qualify as a 501C(3) if you feel so inclined), but these culturally influenced tools are to be nothing more than tools and must not affect the core vision or alter it in any way.

Miracles, signs, wonders, casting out of demons, etc. are all byproducts of such a ministry, not a thing that we must mandate into a ministry. They are the evidence of the success of the ministry, if that makes sense. So yes, it should be happening, but it shouldn't be forced into the model itself.

Continue to pursue dating or not?

5 upvotes · 28 August 2019 · /r/askRPC

Solid. We may have different views on who asks who, but good stuff all around.

Continue to pursue dating or not?

5 upvotes · 28 August 2019 · /r/askRPC

and also too young to date anyone older

At 20, you've got plenty of options available to you. You're in the perfect age range where if you take good care of your body (which seems to be the case) you should be getting lots of attention from both same-age guys and guys all the way into their 30s. I'm not sure why you'd limit yourself here. If I knew then what I know now and were in a different timeline where I wasn't married with kids, I'd be the 30+ year old guy most attracted to women in their low-20s.

With already low chances with Christian daters, it's very hard to date.

This is a sad reality for many women, especially the spiritually mature ones. Ideally, a Christian woman should always be with a man who is more spiritually mature than her so that she can follow him as he follows Christ. Of course, I don't quite know your actual spiritual maturity, but that could say how wide or narrow your options are.

Because of this paradigm, it's perfectly acceptable for women to chase after men, even though men should be chasing after Christ instead of women.

Best place to start? Ask yourself: what would your ideal man be doing right now?

- Would he be running his own company? Join a networking group for young business owners and pick a small-scale business you could market along the way to justify being in the group. Even if you have no real education or skills, pick something like starting a house cleaning business, crocheting blankets, or whatever.
- Would he be in a band? Hit up local concerts and small-time venues and get to know the guys in the band between sets - especially if they play at a Christian cafe or venue.
- Would he be out making disciples? Look around for a disciple-making community. I don't mean churches congregations. They don't make disciples. I mean the ones really committed to doing what Jesus did. This may take some looking, as these pockets are rarer, but I'd be shocked if there wasn't one in your city somewhere.

Should I start approaching attractive men?

Of course.

then I will be too forward

Here's how this works:

- The beta guys will be thrilled that a (presumably) attractive girl is interested in them.
- The guys who get the orientation of the pursuit and are solid leaders will expect women to come to them.
- The only guys who won't be interested are the old fashioned types who are too spiritually immature to understand the orientation of the pursuit and are too hot-headed to be willing to adjust their cultural impressions that the man should initiate.

In short, the only guys who would be put off by you being "too forward" in approaching them are the types of

guys who you don't want. But being "too forward" you're still going to have to filter out some weak men anyway - but they'll be much easier to tell apart.

weird holding tank that I am in and I know others are too. That it is very hard to date seriously until somewhere around 25 because of the stigma, frustration, and risks dating younger.

That stigma is a product of feminism and you should ignore it. It says that women should "get out there" and "have fun" and "really experience the world" and "learn who you are" before you're willing to *settle down and get married*. This is always code for: *Go have lots of wild, rampant sex, taking advantage of your feminine sexual power while you've got your looks working for you, then get a good provider to supplicate to your every whim a year or two before your looks start fading.*

While it's far from a Christian sub, go read some of the posts on [/r/WhereAreAllTheGoodMen](#). I mean the actual reading bits - top comments, self posts, etc. Not just the memes, pics, etc. They're definitely talking about the secular world, but you'll learn real fast what lies feminism is feeding women, and hopefully you can learn from others' mistakes.

In your particular situation, the lie is that you should wait to get married until you're "ready" because you have to "learn who you are and experience the world" first. Don't fall for that trap. Yes, there are risks to dating younger. But the rewards are much higher and the chances of finding a good guy are INSANELY higher when you look while you're young than when you're 25+. At that point, you've already spent most of your best years and, at least from the perspective of the crude secular sub above, with your highest-value years on the sexual marketplace behind you, you have a lot less to offer a guy, therefore can expect a lot less, and therefore end up with a lot lower quality of men ... ergo the women who keep asking at 28+ r/"Where are all the good men?"

I've prayed a lot but haven't fasted about this.

Fasting can have value, but only if you are doing it for the right reason. Too many fast just because they think it's a good idea or because they want to change God's mind. Biblically, the purpose of fasting is to express the sincerity and extremity of how we feel to our spiritual groom. That's it. If he chooses to change his mind as a result, great, but we don't do it with the expectation that this actually happen, as there are plenty of biblical examples where fasting didn't actually change anything at all.

I wrote a lot more about this here:

https://www.reddit.com/r/RPChristians/comments/blrqw7/share_your_experiences_with_fasting/emr4wi7/. It's a good idea, just make sure it's not with the expectation of results; rather, to build your trust with God because you know he hears you when you go on a hunger strike to show your sincerity.

Where should I look? Or would it be better to put this on the back burner for now?

I tell men to put it on the back-burner until they're in their 30s and well-accomplished in their mission. For women my recommendation is the reverse: begin looking immediately, and don't be afraid to look older. Younger guys are going to be more immature and poorer leaders.

Best way to look for a guy is as I said above: what would your ideal guy be doing this weekend and go there.

A strategy I teach men is cold-approaching. This is more an evangelism strategy for spiritual reproduction, but that's how Christ intends his bride to be. As a woman who knows her ovaries are fading, Christ's bride should realize the clock is ticking on just how many disciples we can produce during our lifetime, and we should be pretty eager to initiate spiritual reproduction often before we become that old guy/gal that the younger crowd just can't identify with - and it's much harder to witness to older people (40+).

In this sense, just as we as Christ's bride are to be eagerly pursuing him with spiritually reproductive passion, so

also should a woman pursue a physical man with sexual passion. Just as we (Christ's bride) may cold-approach people to build Gospel-centered spiritual relationships with, so also should a potential bride be willing to cold-approach a man to build a Gospel-centered physical relationship with.

Easy opener: "I saw you over there and thought, 'I'd love to meet that guy,' so here I am. I'm sywonsmumu. What's your name?"

But what if I get rejected?

It comes with the territory. Your Heavenly Father doesn't reject you. Your spiritual groom, Jesus Christ, will never reject you. The Holy Spirit promises to come on you when you ask. Do you really need much more validation than the supreme being in all the universe? If not, then a guy turning you down shouldn't mean much. If rejection does bother you that much, it says something about the sufficiency of God in your emotional life.

Now, I may be confusing some masculine traits in this, so flesh this out from other red pill women. [u/g_e_m_anscombe](#) might be a good resource for you here. Men are innately meant to seek validation from God, but women are designed to find validation from their husbands - so maybe you're perfectly in your right and God-given design to be concerned about rejection from men, to some limited degree (not to say you are concerned, just speaking hypothetically).

I suppose if you are concerned about rejection, and appropriately so, then maybe the better question to ask is: *How much rejection am I willing to face to find a guy I'm willing to follow?*

You see, rejection is a wonder filtering mechanism. At least from a male perspective, when a girl rejects a guy it helps him filter pretty quickly which girls are worth his time and which aren't. No sense spinning your wheels when it's not likely to work out anyway; so I'd rather a person reject me if they know it's not going to work than waste my time for weeks into a dead-end relationship. This aspect, at least, can work for women too. If/when you face rejection, smile: it means you just checked another guy off your list so you can stop pining over him and move on to the next guy (and as a practical matter, you should have a list of potentials, not just one guy before you start thinking about a backup).

[/u/redpillwonder](#) would also be a good resource - he's done a lot of our writing toward helping women be what the ideal guy is looking for. Maybe he has more tips on finding a worthwhile guy too.

But whatever you do, don't get hung up in the false teaching that you should be out there looking for "Mr. Right" and that there's some guy out there who's perfect for you. There's not. Every guy will have pros and cons. Every married girl will at some point feel like she settled. AWALT. AMALT. Don't hold extremely high standards. Hold biblical standards.

The guy I fell for was often homeless; constantly harassed by the authorities; his feet were dirty; he stunk often; he said things that extremely offended the type of people I would have wanted to impress; people hated him so much they tortured and murdered him. But he was a good man and a godly leader. I couldn't have asked for better. Not high standards, but biblical ones. Not to say attraction is bad - you SHOULD (MUST, even) be attracted for it to work; but you get my point.

[Discussion] Feminism & RedPillWomen

5 upvotes · 27 August 2019 · /r/RedPillWomen

Peach it!

A Man and His Struggle

5 upvotes · 22 August 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Haha. Well played, sir.

Looking for advice, Need help. +Apology.

5 upvotes · 15 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I applaud your humility here brother, especially without sacrificing confidence. Maintain that balance. It will serve you well.

The Kingdom of God is a Party

5 upvotes · 12 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Can you give us an outline of some of his major points throughout the book?

The "Closer to God" Myth

5 upvotes · 3 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

are you saying that women make friends/disciples better by talking with each other

No. I'm saying that this is the natural feminine default strategy and that it is less effective at building healthy relationships than the natural masculine default strategy at building relationships.

Or were you saying that doing is needed by both parties to be most effective?

This one.

Disciple-making is most (only?) effective in longevity (i.e. beyond 2 generations) when authentic relationships are at the core. Note the balance in my posts: I posted first about the importance of building authentic relationships, unlike what the Church tells us, and then I go and criticize the focus on the relationship itself as the end-goal. That's because some people will experience the joy of authentic relationships and stop there. In reality, they must ascend to purposed relationships.

But neither of these authentic or purposed relationships are born on conversation alone. Even among women - and I have asked many - there is a general consensus that their closest friends in life were not the people they had deep conversations with, but the girls they had fun doing things together with - going to the movies, gabbing about things where the content of the conversation didn't actually matter, shopping, etc.

I'd be willing to bet a small fortune that the majority of women who are experiencing great loneliness are trying to build relationships through deep and personal conversation (and likely failing even at that) rather than by living life alongside one another.

That's why I referenced How I Met Your Mother and my wife wanting relationships like that - because they just hung out with each other a lot and it wasn't focused "let me get to know you better time" that comes off as extremely contrived, but it's goofing off about whatever happens to pop on your mind to talk about or to do together.

The Main Event

5 upvotes · 1 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

What you're describing is any boundary-setting conversation, not a main event. There's a huge difference between "I'm cutting off your checkbook" and "This relationship is over."

More Than Marriage: How churchianity has screwed up friendships too

5 upvotes · 1 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

As a matter of frame, capable alphas do what they want and are revered for it, incapable alphas do what they want and people hate them for it, capable betas do what others want and are rewarded for it (but not to the degree

that they worked to get the reward), incapable betas do what others want and don't get rewarded so they become resentful, there is no such thing as a capable omega, incapable omegas have such low self esteem about their social capabilities that they do one of two things: (1) avoid all social interactions so they never have their frame challenged in the first place or never have to serve someone else's frame, or (2) totally give up on their own dignity by embarrassing themselves repeatedly through absurd social antics that they know will never succeed, ironically giving them just enough frame to appear alpha, which they can't maintain so they become beta when their alpha jokes finally work and they don't know what to do, after which their betaness ruins things for them and they're back to omega.

As a matter of sexuality, you're omega if you desperately crave sexual attention from women but can't get an attractive one interested in you, so you settle for bottom tier women or doing ridiculous things until one of them actually works.

Common traits: extremely skinny or obese, video game and porn addiction, low tier jobs, socially awkward, heavy emphasis on their internet persona over their real life.

116 - God is a jerk.

5 upvotes · 25 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

The title is blasphemous

It's not meant to be controversial. It's meant to be a fact.

According to Google, a jerk is "a contemptibly obnoxious person." Presumably the jerk doesn't self-identify that way, so the definition is more about society's judgment of his behaviors. Society certainly shows contempt for God and regularly complains about things he does in the Bible, finding them obnoxious - or worse: cruel, vicious, and spiteful ... all characteristics we commonly associate with jerks.

The reality is that we do have a God who has done cruel, vicious, and spiteful things. By all accounts, with what society means when it uses the word "jerk" - God actually is a jerk.

The issue here is less about how we characterize God and more about why you have bought into the notion society has sold you: *that being a jerk and having jerk-like qualities at times somehow makes you a bad person*. The Bible never said, "God is not a jerk." It does say God is good and not evil and that he doesn't even tempt anyone to evil. That means that qualities that society describes as jerk-like need to be disassociated with their negative connotations as "evil" or "socially unacceptable" or even "morally repugnant" when we read the Bible, and instead try to read just the way we think about God and morality alongside socially unacceptable behaviors.

being a strong alpha man means to always raise others up. Perhaps not so up that they surpass us

Yes, absolutely *so up* that they surpass us. "Truly, truly, I say to you, whoever believes in me will also do the works that I do; and greater works than these will he do" - John 14:12. My proudest moments in making disciples are those when the guy I disciplined goes on to surpass me and do even greater things than I do - and, biblically, all of this works to my account as well as his.

116 - God is a jerk.

5 upvotes · 25 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

As long as that's wiser for your family, do it. Some men are just lazy and will let the bills sit in the mailbox for months. If that's what you'll degrade into, then don't take control just because you feel like the "manly thing to do" is to "take leadership of the finances." Delegate as appropriate. Of course, the better solution is to be the disciplined guy and get the job done right.

Just as playing nice is a tool that can work for you, so can delegating leadership authority. Learn when to play both cards.

Awesome girl that doesn't take care of herself

5 upvotes · 2 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I had the same concern about my wife before I married her. Mind you, I was pretty darn blue pill at the time, so I'm not condoning my thought process in those days. But she was very thin and attractive with horrible eating habits. She never exercised, ate whatever she wanted, and loved snack/junk food days.

Flash forward 14 years since we first met. She's still exactly the same: qualifiers aside, she generally still has horrible eating and exercise habits. And although she is slightly larger, she's still pretty thin overall. We went to a waterpark a couple weekends ago and out of literally hundreds (thousands?) of women 20+ she was easily in the top 5% for waist size. So, at least 11 years into marriage it hasn't manifested as a problem. I wish my genetics were that good to make my body as easy to maintain!

That's not to say this girl will have the same good fortune. She may have hit the genetic lottery, or maybe not. There was a study done at one point that by the age of 40 a person's body shape becomes extremely difficult to change. If you do manage to change it, your body will always want to go back to the shape it was in when you were 40 ... until you get around 70 or so, but that's another mess entirely.

All of that aside - why are you looking so much older? That's a decision you will almost certainly regret a decade into the marriage. My wife is a month and a half older than me and I've already felt that. Not that I would trade her in if God gave me a free pass to do so. She adds too much value to my life right now. But in the majority of cases and for a multitude of reasons, it's better to go younger. I joke now that a prime candidate for a wife is someone who is FAST and EASY:

- Faithful
- Available
- Saved
- Teachable

and

- Elegant
- Alluring
- Submissive
- Young

Those are traits I'd be looking for.

Gravitational Centers - A Case Study on the MRP Journey

5 upvotes · 12 June 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I'm with you. Our state supreme court does have an 18 month docket before they start yelling at the judges for not getting it done.

Argue that she's using supervised visits for the shock value. It's like a woman's n count but in reverse. If she says 10, we believe 20 is more accurate. If she says to the court that your badness scale is "96", the court might believe you're 48, but you may actually be at 3. So, she says you're so bad your visits have to be supervised,

knowing it'll never happen but hoping the fact that she made the request at all will cause the court to believe there is some merit to her feeling that way.

Best solution is just to call it out for what it is as plainly as I just did.

Also ...

I had the kids 70% of the time. I agreed to 50/50 cause I want my kids to see their mom.

I had a client who did this too. I told him not to. We had a GAL recommending he get custody. The psychologist recommended custody. The judge at the pretrial said he'd likely get custody and they all said mom should only get every other weekend. He insisted.

9 months later she filed for a modification - not even a year went by. Court said that because dad knew of all moms problems during the marriage and agreed to shared parenting anyway, he could no longer use that evidence in a modification case.

We still managed to get not one, but two psychologists in our corner (the other one was the opposing party's own expert witness!), the GAL and three school teachers all on our side. Mom only had herself. The judge still ordered shared parenting again, but with a slightly worse schedule for my client. His rationale: *you agreed to shared parenting once, now you're stuck with it. I'm not going to change things on these kids just because she's throwing a fit now. You knew she was like this and that this would happen again - there's nothing new here.*

Don't make the same mistake and assume you can fix it later if it doesn't work out.

Fiance withholding information about rape

5 upvotes · 31 May 2019 · /r/RPChristians

and go to church a congregational meeting every sunday

FTFY. If you see me doing this with guys here more often it's part of a broader theological-linguistic differentiation that I do believe matters. More on that to come.

other girls who were raped ... don't like being touched and are generally not flirty with boys

A lot of this depends on the age it happened and which type of psychological fracture occurs. Girls who were raped at younger ages tend to have a disassociated experience, almost out-of-body-ish, to help them cope, which forms the basis for a borderline personality disorder. Borderline PD is often noted by being irrationally obsessive about relationships and demanding intense emotions from them, and negative emotions are better than no emotions at all. Borderlines are very volatile and are the type who cannot stay out of a relationship for longer than a few weeks at a time. This relational obsession makes them extremely sexual, as they see sexuality as a way of heightening the emotional state of the relationship and keeping their guy on the hook so they won't be abandoned.

The alternative is more common in women raped later on in life, which is what you said you noticed in other women. They have a clearer sense of self when the event happens, so it's harder to disassociate oneself from what's going on. This leads to a more direct trauma that's associated with masculine power over them, causing them to pull back when they see similar triggers in the future.

That's not to say that these patterns are true for everyone, as there are certainly some who break the mold. But this is a fairly common trend that I see in a lot of my cases that involve psychological evaluations.

she also didn't have any qualms doing sexual favors for me once things go heated between us (both of us are christians and she told me she believes in waiting for marriage)...Not sure if there is a link between that

This is characteristic of a borderline. Be cautious. Borderlines present as very normal, yet passionate in the first year or two of a relationship (mostly because NRE keeps their emotional thirst satiated), but their more negative qualities start to show when there is risk that the relationship might end or when the relationship becomes boring, after NRE ends (which is usually after about 2-3 years of dating or 6-24 months after marriage).

Has she ever been diagnosed for any mental health disorders? If she's not willing to get evaluated on her own, you could say you found a really extensive personality test online that's the most in-depth you've ever seen. Then give her one of the free MMPI2 versions floating around online (I can e-mail one if you need it). There's a website that gives slides showing which scales are evaluated to assess Borderline PD (or other PDs for that matter - maybe she's histrionic or something else entirely - or nothing at all). Either way, it's an easy way to get more insight here.

She said that's information that only a husband should have access to

Huge red flag right there. If she's really moved on, then it shouldn't be such a big secret that she has to hide it. I know several girls who have been raped at all different ages and can now talk freely about it because they have found true freedom in Christ from the situation. If it's still a secret, it's still a problem for her. Period.

Also, she's intentionally denying you the ability to vet her for this being a problem. That leads me right back to the MMPI2 as my strongest recommendation. I'm less interested in the details of what happened and more interested in whether or not that manifested into a persistent psychological issue that you'll be dealing with forever. While personality disorders can technically be cured through secular means, it's a minimum of 2 years of intense therapy involving two weekly sessions - one individual and one group - through a method known as dialectic behavioral therapy. Most people deny having a personality disorder in the first place and believe even once diagnosed that it's just a bad diagnosis or that they are perfectly capable of controlling their issues. This is what makes PDs so dangerous: that people with them virtually always refuse to acknowledge them or do anything about them unless ordered by a court. I have seen Jesus cure personality disorders literally overnight (I'm one of them), but you cannot rely on this.

Worry less about the details of what happened and more about the fact that (1) she's withholding information relevant to your ability to assess her marriageability, and (2) she might have a long-term psychological issue that she'll never be willing to have treated.

Also, the fact that you both seem to be shamelessly sexually active with each other is somewhat concerning. On the one hand you seem to want to praise her for being a solid believer, but in the same sentence you're saying that her alleged commitment to Christ didn't matter to her - or even you - once emotions and arousal kicked in. That's playing with fire, brother.

I told her I still consider herself a virgin because it wasn't consensual ... she was damaged goods, I was shocked and told her again otherwise

Beta. Lying. Blue pill. Calling out what I see.

Don't bend over backwards to make her feel better about what happened. Yes, she's damaged goods. You've said it yourself: "I also told her that this means that the past isn't dealt with but rather it is still in the present." Her past has damaged her to the point where she's now using it to damage you. She is broken. Either reject that and move on or embrace it and redeem her.

When we were tainted by sin, we all became damaged goods. "No one is righteous, not even one," Romans 3 says. God didn't coddle us with lies about how it's "not your fault. Adam sinned and you just inherited it. If you had been in Adam's shoes and had control over the situation you never would have been in this mess. You're a good person who just had a bad roll of the dice."

No, Jesus's solution wasn't to lie to us about our status. It was to redeem us. To sanctify us. To reconcile us to God. You need to admit to her: "Yes, you're damaged goods. But just as God can redeem us, he has charged men to redeem the women in their lives, and I'm okay with that" - but only IF you actually want to proceed here. Just no more blue pill garbage about how she's still perfect and lovely and has no problems and so wonderful and idyllic in your mind. Take her off the pedestal.

she can lie effortlessly and has apologized for doing it to me before, to my knowledge this doesn't happen often

Seriously? What type of hamstering did you have to do to write this sentence?

I'm scared brothers is this a red flag?

Yes, but only a huge one.

Anybody else feel like this?

5 upvotes · 16 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

This post is an intriguing byproduct of living in a blue pill culture. "Guys, everyone gets so excited about relationships and dating and marriage. I feel like I should get excited about that too, but I don't. Is something wrong with me? I wish I wasn't this way."

Here you've innately escaped the cultural compulsions, but instead of embracing it for the theological beauty that it is, as [/u/helaughsinhidden](#) pointed out through key biblical passages ... the world has conditioned you to make you think you're the problem. Society would characterize you with a mental health disorder for not wanting the same things everyone else wants. God characterizes you as blessed because you don't desire the things of this world the same way everyone else does.

All of that being said, if I take your attitude a few steps further, it could lead to an impression that you're depressed. Do you have trouble motivating yourself to go to work? Do you isolate yourself from other men? When's the last time you went out to the movies or hiking or bike riding? Depressed people tend to lock themselves up in their houses and avoid these types of things - if you're not doing that, but you still lack desire for these things that the world obsesses over - that's a beautiful thing.

But when you say things like, "I'd like a family," but you can't explain how the thought of having a family excites you, it makes me think that you're still operating in blue pill conditioning. You want what everyone else has. You haven't embraced the red pill yet - that what everyone thinks everyone else has is a lie. Nobody has the family life that gets posted on Facebook or flashed on every TV screen. My guess is that when you say you'd like a family, you still have ideas about what that looks like - even if they're what most people would consider "realistic" ideas - which are rooted in blue pill thinking. I'd dig into that a bit more, if I were you, as this is what might be the tipping point between "I'm different" to "I'm depressed."

If you look at the passages that [/u/helaughsinhidden](#) cited, the reason God grants some people the gift of celibacy - which can easily include a disinterest in viewing women in a sexually exciting way - is to focus on the mission that he gave us.

What's your mission? Let's start there.

Power Prayers

5 upvotes · 15 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Good stuff, brother. I like this. A relevant passage on praying for wisdom: James 1:5 - "If anyone lacks wisdom, let him ask God, who gives generously to all without finding fault, and it will be given to him."

More to the point of praying with confidence - 1 John 5:14-15 - "This is the confidence we have in approaching God: that if we ask anything according to his will, he hears us. And if we know that he hears us—whatever we ask—we know that we have what we asked of him."

The shocking truth: Betas not only live hell in this life, they often go to hell too. Defining the christian alpha.

5 upvotes · 15 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

the relationship is FOR the benefit of the one being disciplined or mentored

Or, as my discipler said, "I'm not discipling you for your own benefit. Sure, you'll benefit from it. But I'm really doing it for the benefit of the people that you'll disciple someday - and the people they'll disciple too." Think big! God's people had a generational mentality for millennia. Somehow we can't see past our own kids.

(F/R) It gets worse, but then better

5 upvotes · 11 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

thinking I was just not rewarding bad behavior, but looking at it to day...buthurt and using this behavior passive aggressively

Withdrawing your time and attention as a means of "not rewarding bad behavior" is not something you do in the moment. If you do it in the midst of bad behavior it comes off as butt-hurt and passive-aggressive, as you've found, otherwise as controlling, manipulative, and callous, as other people have also found. Instead, you maintain frame in the moment, but simply find other things to do with your time later on that don't involve her. If she feels like you're punishing her, you're doing it wrong. Punishment is a display of weakness - as if you must resort to force and fear to get people to follow your lead. Always maintain frame. But if she's acting prissy and testing you left and right, why would you want to be with her in the first place? You won't, so you'll fill your time the next day with other things, like going to the gym.

Married Man Game Part 3: Sexting

5 upvotes · 5 March 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Indeed. Or instead of dropping it you roll with whatever she sends. Instead of nudes or cleavage you get a picture of her rolled up in a parka?

"I can feel the soft fuzz across my face right now as if I were leaning in for a kiss."

"I'd zip it down two inches."

"You grab my hand to stop me, a little nervous and uncomfortable."

"You couldn't stop me even if you were really trying."

"The parka you adorned yourself in was no longer the sign of modesty you meant it."

"It was a challenge."

"An invitation to explore the warmth hiding beneath its insulation."

"I look up to lock your eyes with mine."

"Without looking down, you unzip the next two inches."

"And then two more."

"Anticipation."

Celebrate!

5 upvotes · 4 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Amen!

How do you guys view/approach ghosting?

5 upvotes · 28 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Welcome. Ghosting can mean different things to different people, the main dichotomy being if you just drop off the face of the earth randomly or if you communicate an end and then drop off the face of the earth.

My dad's "cardinal rule" he gave me when I was in college was: "When it's over, it's over. You leave any room for her to worm back in and she'll take it." I found this to be true when I dumped my first girlfriend. She was awful. She acted like it was all cool to be "just friends," but she continually leveraged any time together to try to re-start the relationship, moving in to kiss me, asking to go on dates again, etc. - basically continuing the relationship just without calling it a relationship.

When I was ready to take my dad's wise advice, I communicated plainly: "This is done. We will not be getting back together. I don't want to lead you on." She still tried, so I started turning her down on everything. Then she'd show up to my dorm randomly or message me on the brand-new website that was exclusive to certain people in my university called "Facebook" or AOL Instant Messenger - and I kept hitting that block button.

Some people would call that total shut-down of communication ghosting. Others would say it isn't because I told her in advance that I didn't want to communicate anymore. Take your pick. That's how I'd handle things. But as [u/mado55](#) said, if there are any creepy or unsafe vibes going around, maybe don't even give that warning. I'm sure it sucks being ghosted, but you don't owe her anything and she doesn't owe you anything. Just accept it and move on.

What do you Christians think of MGTOW?

5 upvotes · 27 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

There's a difference between MGTOW and celibacy, as [/u/Deep_Strength](#) and [/u/Hannelore010](#) alluded to.

- Celibacy is a spiritual gift/discipline of a man choosing to remain single and separate from all sexual activity in order to devote himself entirely to God.
- MGTOW is an undefined protest against relational structures currently existing in the sexual marketplace for a variety of reasons.
 - First wave MGTOWs are generally men who were hurt by women, became whiny about it and decided never to get involved again. It was a retaliation effort.
 - Second wave MGTOWs are generally men who couldn't get women in the first place, so they gave up before even trying, joining the band wagon with what the first crowd were doing.
 - While they manosphere hasn't titled them as anything, there are other MGTOWs who actually do chase after sex, they just refuse to get married.
 - There are other MGTOWs who are perfectly fine with both sex and private marriage, as long as it isn't state-enforced.
 - Some MGTOWs are protesting the gender bias in laws; others are protesting the horrendous social treatment of women against men; others aren't protesting anything, but are simply making a decision that they believe is wise
 - There are also countless stories of men who claim to be MGTOW, but then as soon as a hot enough girl shows them interest, they abandon their MGTOW ways and are off into the sunset with the woman they swore they'd never shack up with

I fully endorse celibacy. While I greatly empathize with the MGTOW crowd, I cannot condone the motivation behind their decision. Romans 14:23 is clear enough: "Anything that does not come from faith is sin." 1 Cor. 7 gives a clear enough faith-based reason to stay single. If your rationale is limited to the secular MGTOW rationale, it's not faith-based. If, however, the MGTOW rationale is what caused you to choose the celibate route, then it's perfectly appropriate.

"I saw how awful it is to be a man under today's laws and sexual marketplace and decided I wanted nothing to do with it and that our country needed to change. What was I to do with all of my extra time that I'm not chasing women? I'm going to pursue my mission for God." That's a perfectly appropriate framework within which to be a Christian MGTOW.

For Single Guys - An Intro to the Red Pill, A few pieces of advice, and a Farewell

5 upvotes · 22 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

In all our conversations this is one of the better posts I've seen from you. While there are several things that could use some tweaking, I appreciate what you're trying to do here.

Instead of spending all your time plotting and scheming on how to have sex with women, seek God's Kingdom first. Red Curious objected to me saying this as it's vague.

Let me be clear on this: I'm not saying "seek God's Kingdom first" isn't valuable. I'm only saying that it's not marriage advice. If a guy comes in here on the brink of divorce and that's the best you've got for him, how many of those men do you think will end up divorced and how many will get married? Because I promise they've already heard that advice in the church and the stats are what the stats are.

My objection wasn't to your saying this. I agree with the advice. What I had a problem with was you criticizing the advice on this sub without giving any advice in exchange. It's like saying our health care system in America is screwed up and posting article after article about all its problems, but never actually proposing a better plan. The closest you ever come is saying: "Instead of our current health care system, we should all just focus on having better health insurance." Yes, this is a great goal. But it has no practical value.

Countless men already know that they should be following God and living by the Spirit and seeking His Kingdom. Without clearer instruction, the way most men try to live these ideals still ends up being just as screwed up as if they'd never received the advice in the first place. Many of the blue pill pastors who have ruined the lives of millions of men and women with their horrendous views on marriage firmly believe that they are following your advice. That is why it is objectionable advice. You can't criticize a structure without suggesting a replacement.

That said, I do appreciate many of your suggested replacements that are finally enumerated in this post, although they're clearly not targeted at restoring broken marriages. They're good general principles to live by. But they're also the same as going on a Christian finance website and tell people struggling through severe indebtedness on the verge of bankruptcy that the best way to be a good steward of your wealth is to love God. Yes, it's true. But it has no practical value in the context of their need.

it's not something to study for life, it's something you internalize and go on with

I couldn't agree more! I hope one day that you do internalize it.

How screwed am I? 12 questions from Beta Bucks

5 upvotes · 19 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I really appreciated this. Would you be at all interested in writing up a post on the importance of evaluating RMV in women instead of just SMV?

That is, SMV can be sized up with a single glance. "How bad do I want to bang her?" is pretty much all we ask ourselves before assessing a girl's SMV. But her Relationship Market Value is something often overlooked.

For the secular world, especially the TRP guys (as opposed to MRP), they're not interested in marriage in the first place. The "relationship" only has value to the degree that it gratifies sexuality, and therefore a woman's SMV is all that matters. In the reverse, from your time on [r/redpillwomen](#) I'm sure you'll recall just how much RMV comes up, as they're more interested in locking down their glorious leader than in raw physical attraction. For the Christian, if marriage is going to happen, all of the things you're telling [u/macmeeler](#) are things that need to go into consideration of a woman's potential, and a post on this could really help a guy vet.

Not to get too numerical, but it might even be nice to break it down:

- 2 points for her financial responsibility. 1 based on the debt she brings to the table (relative to your income potential) and 1 based on her ordinary spending habits.
- 1 point for being saved
- 1 point for living out her faith, maintaining boundaries against sin (ex. not sleeping together or having oral in the first week you met), etc.
- 2 points for low n count
- 1 point for mental stability, no personality disorders, no scars from her parents, etc.
- 1 point for being submissive

... you get the idea. I'm just throwing random numbers out there. My guess is, though, that when most guys make such an assessment they're going to find that the "perfect girl" is really nowhere near what they expected, and this will help men start to pick up the cues that you often talk about when you encourage them with ways to vet - and I've always loved your posts on vetting more than anything I would write on the subject.

Just thinking as I type, maybe it's more of a flow chart before you can even get to calculating an SMV first. Like, the first bubble would say "Christian?" and if it's a yes, then you proceed to two more questions that should also be disqualifiers: "Actively living out her faith?" and "Any significant sin issues, or susceptibility to temptation?" Then if those questions are passed, you can get on to evaluating RMV. Anyway ... thoughts?

Ideas to consider for men who follow Jesus...

5 upvotes · 11 February 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Props to [/u/Deep_Strength](#) and [/u/ActualTransition](#) for some well-thought-out answers. Let me make this much simpler:

1. The sole goal and focus of RPC is to get men living the way God wants them living. The majority of that focus is on developing a man's mission (see numerous posts from 100 and 200 series) and establishing him in godliness (300 and 400 series).
2. 1 Cor. 7 says that one of the major things that can distract a man from serving God is marriage. This is especially true when marriages don't reflect God's intentions.
3. One of the primary reasons that marriages become ungodly is an unhealthy sexual dynamic. A cure to sexual dynamic issues is necessary to get these men back on track. That is, sex and relationships are the context, but the Gospel is always the cure, and the mission of Matthew 28:19-20 is the reason why it's worth curing in the first place.

One way or another, sex is something God created. God has a purpose for sexuality, which is directly related to

the mission of Matthew 28:19-20, as I have explained many times here. If people have sexual problems, someone has to be willing to talk about them with biblical answers that are actually helpful. The church has failed. God's mission is our focus, but we must be willing to address all hindrances to our living out that mission. This sub has targeted men whose sexual and relational issues are their biggest hindrance. Saying, "Live by the Holy Spirit" is unhelpful when men can't figure out how to do that because they can't see past their sexual and relational problems.

As has already been noted here, no one is saying, "You should try to get the highest SMV woman you can." That is not RPC's goal. What we do say is, "If you want a high SMV woman to satisfy your sexuality within the confines of marriage so that sex isn't a distraction to you anymore, here's how," or, "If you are already married and sex is a problem holding you back from your mission, here are ways to improve yourself that can be simultaneously beneficial to your mission and your sex life."

All of that being said, what I don't appreciate - and you're lucky I didn't see this post earlier - is people accusing us of believing or teaching something that we don't. This comes up repeatedly here: "You all think blah, blah blah, but the Bible says this instead ..." Most of the time, "blah blah blah" is something that they read on TRP or MRP that they assume we say too, or that they assume just because of the "red pill" name that we must automatically have the same goals and purposes of every other red pill forum.

This is simple and plain ignorance.

Tag: [/u/rocknrollchuck](#)

Finished the 200s, - Question Alpha Positive

5 upvotes · 1 February 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Stoic doesn't mean robotic. It means that you are unphased by negative influences. So, if you were practicing stoicism in ancient Rome and an arrow went through your shoulder in battle, you were fighting before, so you kept fighting. If you're laughing with friends and your wife disrespects you, you keep laughing with your friends, unphased by her comment. Don't go cold. Just continue as you were before the negative or painful experience. Going robotic when you weren't robotic is the opposite of stoicism: it's breaking frame and allowing yourself to be affected by someone else's behaviors.

Ironically, I wrote in that post: "Most guys think this 'robot mode' is the same as 'being stoic' (for example). It's not." What you're saying about yourself and what you learned from this post is the exact opposite of what I actually said in the post ;)

My favorite passage on "alpha positive" or true stoicism is Paul and Silas in Prison, in Acts 16. They've been beaten and jailed ... and what do they do? They're singing songs and praising God. No matter what torture they took, their hearts and attitudes were positive and uplifting to God.

What "clicked" for me? When I started focusing on my mission and realized that the stupid things my wife got upset about didn't matter to God. She matters to me, but my mission matters more. Her job is to help me with my mission, not distract me from it. That's the mental shift that needs to take place.

Too Little, Too Much

5 upvotes · 23 January 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Because no one can vet perfectly and AWA still LT.

My wife is a great example. I thought I vetted carefully. She was hot, stayed in good shape, actively discipling other women, could hold deep theological conversations, memorized new scripture weekly, etc. I got the opinion of other godly people who knew her better than I did and they all affirmed she was great wife material.

Several years after we married and I grew sick of dealing with an entirely different woman from when we were dating, I confronted her about it and she admitted that she had been faking it since we first met in order to get me to marry her. Once she got married she didn't feel like faking it for much longer.

You think you can vet, but no amount of vetting will prepare you for everything.

Too Little, Too Much

5 upvotes · 22 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I'm sure I would have more trouble being detached. That is a serious thing and has serious ramifications.

Ergo the dangers of having "too little" trust. The goal isn't to be detached from your spouse. It's to be attached in a healthy way rather than an unhealthy way - and to know that if you were forcibly detached from your spouse (death, infidelity, divorce, etc.) that you are okay because you have God, other options, internal emotional stability, etc.

What is the Christian RP Advice to a Wife for Getting Her Husband to Change?

5 upvotes · 17 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I wrote a post on this exact subject a while back. Feel free to skim for it in my history.

That said, we divorce lawyers have a saying when a client gripes about their spouse: *You're the one who married him*. We also often say, *I don't have a magic wand*. At some point they need to take ownership of their poor decisions:

- the failure to vet him properly
- the nagging and complaining
- the sexual denial
- the defiance and disrespect

Most people don't recognize their own contributions to their problems. They go to you for advice, hoping you'll give them a magical formula to undo the consequences of all their bad decisions and behaviors. Imagine someone telling you his mom died last year and he wants you to give some advice on how to bring her back. You can't give him what he wants. You can only help him cope with a bad situation.

Now, on a larger scale, the reason these guys go passive is twofold. First: internet sin. It's part of the male struggle since Adam. Get him saved and following Jesus, to start.

Second, society now punishes masculinity in marriage rather than rewarding it. If guys aren't being rewarded for taking on the responsibilities of being men, they're never going to "man up." This root really needs to be resolved at a societal level before application in the home can garner consistent and appreciable results.

A woman can try to condition her man through positive and negative reinforcement, but I haven't met many women who can maintain stoicism consistently enough to align their responses and his behaviors properly in the long run to make this feasible. Plus, it can easily become sin for a woman to employ certain types of negative reinforcement on her husband, as this is often disrespectful and manifests as her leading him.

I prefer my method of negative discipleship, per the post I referenced.

We've done it, guys. "Traditional Masculinity" is now officially deemed "harmful" by the

American Psychological Association. High-five to culture!

5 upvotes · 11 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

True ... but this one can have far greater implications than most of the other stuff I see, particularly in family courts.

Life Lesson: Treachery of women even within the church

5 upvotes · 9 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

After the first divorce, I remarried 4 months later

I hate pop acronyms, but this one actually deserves it: SMH.

in an attempt to 'Set a good example for my children

Because a "good example" to them is teaching them that men should be married and that God didn't really mean all those things in 1 Cor. 7? A more balanced approach needs to be given.

But let's be honest: you remarried because you wanted the validation that you believed only a new wife could give. It wasn't a "fixation on sex." You wanted to prove that you could screw another woman and get marriage right, immediately after seeing your first marriage tanking.

but 4 years into marriage has become a card carrying feminist

And then you discovered that you weren't going to get that validation and success story. Joy.

This intentional change has been revolutionary for me in every way— Physically, Mentally, Spiritually— in spite of the conflict that ensues with every step I take forward.

Uh huh. Sounds Rambo-ish to me.

This one will end in flames eventually too unless she miraculously gets with the program.

Yep, a very Rambo thing to say.

and my mission now is to hopefully keep young guys from repeating history

How is she going to help you with this mission?

Find a woman who WANTS TO BE A WIFE... a homemaker; a mother; a woman that Wants to cook and clean

Yeah, but that's not what I wanted out of my wife. I wanted to do all the cooking. I wanted my wife to be working and remaining financially competitive and hiring out the cleaning or taking charge of maintaining the house myself. Guys want different things. Be cautious of giving advice on false assumptions. Her biblical role is to follow your lead, not to do dishes and vacuum the floor. If you lead her into doing those things, then she should follow; but if you lead her down another path, she should go down the other path instead.

a woman who ... a woman who ... a woman who ...

That all sounds great, but you're also describing a unicorn ... because implicit is that she'll do all these things and also not cheat on you, not divorce you, not blow all your money without telling you, etc. What if I got a woman who did everything on your list, but she cheated on me weekly? Would that be any better? You see, the things

you've listed are nice perks, but they're also peripheral ones. If you're getting worked up over peripheral things, there's a bigger internal problem that you need to work through.

This sounds old-fashioned and archaic, but it's the only way that a marriage will last for the long term.

Again, I could have a marriage that works incredibly well with a woman who doesn't want to cook. I know because I married a woman like that. Or a woman who works rather than being a homemaker - because my wife works and defers a lot of homemaking responsibilities to others.

What you're describing is what you want out of a relationship and concluding that "the only way that a marriage will last for the long term" is if it's a marriage aligned with your goals, purposes, and desires. And for you, you might be exactly right. But for guys who have other missions in life and different plans for how they want to utilize their wife's assistance in that mission ... well, then different lists need to be created about how to vet and what to expect the role balances to be.

Should I ask my ex-wife to meet?

5 upvotes · 13 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians

If you're whole and at peace, you're whole and at peace. No need to go to her.

If you're not whole and at peace, talking to her isn't going to give that to you. Jesus will.

If she's not whole or at peace with the situation, it's her business to come to you if/when she wants to tie off loose ends.

Shame Case Study #1: How To Recognize Shame and Its triggers

5 upvotes · 11 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians

You're over-reaching. Not every comment that you don't agree with is an effort to shame you.

- Sometimes blunt truth is necessary and appropriate.
- Sometimes the person just wants to help, but isn't great at communicating their intentions in online text.
- Sometimes it's a well-warranted rebuke and not an attempt to shame someone.

I haven't gotten to your previous posts on shame yet, but I'm seeing some serious cognitive dissonance here. On the one hand, you seem to be condemning shaming, but on the other, as [/u/Uncommon_Sensed_1234](#) pointed out, you're shaming someone else for posting something you didn't like. So what is it: is shaming wrong for everyone but you, or is this post just massively hypocritical?

Let me step back for a second. Shame is not something anyone else can give you. It's internally decided by the person who either will/won't experience it. If I pee my pants in court, no one can make me ashamed of that. I could flaunt it around as a sign of how confident I am - that I could do something absurd like that and still carry on ... just like Donald Trump saying he could shoot a man in broad daylight and not lose any voters. That doesn't mean it's a good idea to do it - it just shows the degree of confidence a person has within their own frame, and how immune they are to shame.

In the reverse, entirely devoid of any outward influences at all, someone can still experience shame simply from their own internalized perspective of their life and worldview.

When we talk about "shaming" as an active thing one person does to another, it's an intentional effort to cause someone to feel ashamed. It doesn't mean that person has the power to actually make anyone feel ashamed.

People attempt to shame me all the time. As a lawyer, it's part of my job. That doesn't mean they have the power to make me actually experience shame.

Accordingly, if shame is something that you can internally control on your own, rather than blaming someone else for shaming you, work harder at not feeling ashamed on your own. And certainly don't make up a post DEERING against some guy who likely didn't intend to shame you at all. And don't over-reach the extent to which shame actually applies.

Now, what you're probably referring to is not shame at all. It's humiliation. Humility is an internal state of being, much like shame. But humiliation is an external perception about someone. Whether humiliation causes someone to feel humbled or ashamed is up to that individual person. But the effect of external "shaming" is that other people take on a lesser view of the person being "shamed" or "humiliated."

This isn't anything any different from basic frame-mastery anyway. The ordinary responsive techniques apply. Your wife tries to humiliate you during an argument? Fog, negative inquiry, etc. Girl at the bar makes fun of you for being too short? Agree and amplify.

The only time humiliation can really negatively affect you is with people who don't actually know you. People can try to humiliate the president, for example, because few people reading the media posts actually know the president in person - what he's like when he's not publicly broadcasting something. That can have peripheral effects if your public perception actually matters to your life mission - but even then, it's only if you are an important enough figure to have a public perception in the first place.

To that end, I don't see any real discussion on the only viable danger of external shaming/humiliation. I just see you trying to shame someone for giving you blunt constructive feedback.

That being said, I do agree with the commenter that I don't see much biblical reference in your posts. I'm not shaming you by saying that. I'm making an observation to inform you that this reflects poorly on your credibility when you speak. Are you trying to speak from your own authority or from God's? If from God's, then let God speak.

I often write on the three foundations of a person's beliefs: philosophy, science, theology. You seem to use a lot of philosophical thinking. People here are looking for theological conclusions. If the crowd is looking for theology and they get philosophy, you're going to get some push-back. Theology trumps philosophy. Philosophical reasoning should inherently warrant skepticism. Go to Scripture and that skepticism dies down.

Lastly: please fix whatever editor you're using that makes your comment text bigger. It's really annoying and comes off like you think whatever you say should stand out more than what everyone else says.

BF hasn't said I love you...

5 upvotes · 2 November 2018 · /r/RedPillWomen

Infatuation fades

So you do agree with this.

However, it should transition into a deeper companionate love over time.

This is often called pair-bonding, not love.

Dependent familiarity is another way it can manifest - when someone becomes emotionally invested in maintaining a certain degree of stability in the circumstances that are most familiar to them. To that end, most people who experience this are not actually feeling an emotion they would call "love" for their SO; they're experiencing an emotional dependence on the fact that losing something so familiar to them would mean change, which would be difficult, and thus unpleasant. This is also quite a different thing from actual love.

Fair points on the rest :) It's just worth noting that him saying "ILY" to her doesn't actually resolve the "Knowing he loves you is important to feeling secure in the relationship" bit because the words themselves are unreliable, as the actions are the proof. While I agree that it's preferable to have the words also, I do believe the actions *can* stand alone without the words (whether they *should* is a different conversation altogether).

How to date "evenly" as a Christian

5 upvotes · 1 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

No, you're not on the subservient end no matter what. Hypergamy is your out - to just have to be high value enough. Your value to her is one of two things:

1. That she's incredibly attracted to you and wants to gratify that attraction by being around you.
2. The tangible things you have to offer her: money, protection, acts of service, buying gifts, etc.

If 1 doesn't apply, she evaluates 2. If she's still young and capable of pulling guys she's actually attracted to, she will always preference 1 over 2.

If you're high into category 1 to her, you don't need any of category 2 to maintain her. But it works like a scale. If you drop a point in 1, you have to add a point in 2.

As for cooking, cleaning and finances, who does those things for you now? Can't you just outsource those things anyway? You don't really need her to help with those things. They're just a convenience.

Same with the other things. You can pay for consultants who will cost far less and be far more qualified.

Seriously: think of all the money you will spend on a wife in your lifetime. Then think about the cost to outsource what she would do. If you use that as a rubric, I've done the math and the cost of outsourcing is cheaper every time.

What things will she do for you that you can't outsource or where the cost to outsource it would vastly exceed the excess in the cost of marriage. That's where you're really finding your value from her.

[u/osmiumzulu](#) once said that everything can be outsourced except sex (at least for the Christian). So, sex has a clear value for a Christian man in looking for a wife.

The relational connections in life are another thing that cannot be easily outsourced. I have several men I have discipled in life who I would never have been able to connect with on that level if it wasn't for my wife meeting their wives and inviting them for dinner. That can't be outsourced, and it directly helps my mission of disciple-making - just as having sex and birthing kids gives me more disciples to make - even more devoted ones than the strangers I learn to love.

But I can assess those things because I know my mission and her role in it - and in many other ways she has a vital role in my life too. I don't value the things I can outsource as much, and I do often outsource them, or just do it myself.

So, don't give copout answers just to hamster some rationalization for wanting to get married.

Boldly sharing the Gospel - is it unloving?

5 upvotes · 30 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I should also note that by definition, "follow Jesus" assumes you're giving them a mission. Jesus isn't stagnant. He's on the move. He's doing things. If he's going somewhere, he has a purpose for going there.

If a squire is told to follow his knight, or a knight to follow his king, this doesn't mean to literally just follow them around, though that can happen. It's not like Jesus is walking ahead and we're trailing behind, following him. It's more like the fact that the squire adopts the purposes of the knight and helps him with them. The knight adopts the purposes of the king and helps him with them. A wife adopts the purposes of her husband and helps him with them. That's what it means to "follow Jesus" - not merely to trail behind in the same general direction.

So, when we tell someone to "follow Jesus" we have to tell them what Jesus's purposes are that they should be adopting, otherwise we're leaving them to figure that on their own, which is incredibly dangerous. That's why most Gospel presentations that don't include some basic, fundamental vision-casting for the new believer ultimately result in believers who wander aimlessly, plug into a church, sit in a pew, maybe volunteer on the worship team or in the kids' ministry, and think they're fine.

This would be akin to Launcelot telling a potential recruit: "How would you like to live in King Arthur's castle? All you have to do is affirm that He is your King and then try not to get into any trouble while you live there. That's really all you need to know about being a knight. You can figure the rest out as you go."

Then, when he joins the fray and Arthur sends him on his first quest, what's going to happen? Either the guy's going to pee his pants, terrified that he's actually being asked to do something and isn't at all prepared, or he's going to quit and say that he didn't sign up for that.

Even worse would be of Launcelot were being honest about how difficult the life of a knight would be, lest the new recruit get the wrong impression about how fancy and pampered things must be living in the castle.

But in reality, people in the old days - and every story of lore ever told on the topic - wanted to be knights not because of the pampering, but because they wanted to be part of something bigger. They wanted a quest - a mission. They longed for adventure and a role to play in something that actually mattered.

This is why my neighbor, who I referenced in my other comment, ultimately joined the air force. It's why men join sports teams and vie for the championship - not because it's a cush life playing sports, but because the challenge of pursuing a goal that matters to you is very alluring and gives your life a purpose. It's why men join RP forums in the first place: because they're lost and aimless and they need someone to orient their lives toward something that they can strive to achieve - whether that's weight lifting goals, sexual activity milestones, a level of respect from a spouse, etc.

To tell someone, "Join our team, come live in our castle, and be friends with our community" and yet not tell them anything about what that community's purpose and goals are - I'm just not sure what we're accomplishing, and I somewhat agree with my pastor that it begs the question of whether or not the person is actually saved in the first place, if their only impression of the faith is, "Jesus saves you from your sin, so believe in him and try to avoid doing bad things."

That makes it seem like the community itself has no aim or purpose - that it exists merely to survive and keep people as civil with one another as possible. How's that any different from the rest of the secular world? And yet even every secular government has goals and agendas that it recruits people to assist with.

And what's truly terrifying in all of this is the parable of the fig tree. I'll quote it here for easy reference:

"A man had a fig tree planted in his vineyard, and he came seeking fruit on it and found none. 7 And he said to the vinedresser, 'Look, for three years now I have come seeking fruit on this fig tree, and I find none. Cut it down. Why should it use up the ground?' 8 And he answered him, 'Sir, let it alone this year also, until I dig around it and put on manure. 9 Then if it should bear fruit next year, well and good; but if not, you can cut it down.'"

If you already agree that discipleship/evangelism - the mission Jesus calls us to - is what Jesus means by fruit, and we're not imparting that mission to people from the get-go, aren't we setting them up to be cut down? Every newly planted seed knows in its genetic coding that it is growing toward eventually bearing fruit - that's the reproductive imperative in all of God's living creations. But if we fail to impart that coding into the seeds that we're spreading - that we're spreading sterile seeds - how can they grow up to produce good fruit later? We're dooming them to fail.

Even if one wanted to argue that the mission can be given after salvation and not during evangelism, doesn't that still function as a bait-and-switch? We're telling people, "Do this so you can avoid going to hell, and it's a free gift!" but then turning around two weeks later and saying, "Yeah, it was a free gift, but you still have obligations, and if you don't live up to those obligations your heart might get callous and maybe you'll lose your salvation or you just weren't ever really saved to begin with until you start adopting these other things that I didn't tell you about before."

Also, if "following Jesus" is part of the criteria for salvation, and not mere intellectual acknowledgment of the factual events of the Gospel, then how can we ever claim that someone has been saved through our efforts if we have never elaborated what it means to follow Jesus?

To be clear, I'm not advocating for works-based soteriology. Grace through faith is certainly what saves. But if we flesh out what "faith" really means in a biblical context (which I believe I have done in the 400 series), we see the same conclusion that James 2 reaches: that intellectual assent in the absence of any actual reorientation of a person's heart toward living out God's purposes in our own lives begs the quite rhetorical question: "Can such faith save them?"

Ok, I'm done now. Sorry, this is just such a huge topic :p

Losing feelings for my wife

5 upvotes · 26 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I get lots of guys who have brought up this exact issue, including before my RP days. My answer hasn't changed:

"What should I do if I feel like I don't love my wife anymore?"

Now, when a Christian tells me something like this, my typical answer is this: "That's sin. Stop doing that." They get confused and say they're not doing anything. "Okay, then start doing all the things you're supposed to be doing." They get confused again and say they're doing the best they can, but it's somehow "never enough."

Now, at that point I pretend to be confused and say, "I thought you said you didn't love your spouse? But now you're telling me you really have been loving her all along. What's the real story?"

That's when the core of it comes out: "No, I meant that I'm not **IN LOVE** with my wife anymore. I don't **FEEL** the same way I used to."

Phew, I thought they had a much more critical problem. Jesus didn't say, "Whoever has gushy feelings for me is the one who loves me." He said, "Whoever has my commands and obeys them is the one who loves me" (John 14:21).

If your actions are on board, then you are appropriately loving your wife, even if your heart isn't in it. Don't worry, it'll catch up again in time (though the "how" of it is something I don't have to get into just yet).

Goodness ... how awful would it be if I was accused of not loving God every time I had a dry quiet time or I didn't have an emotional moment during worship?

So, when we ask: "What should I do if I don't love my spouse anymore?" that's the same thing as saying, "I don't feel like obeying God. What should I do?" The answer is obvious: obey God anyway. Likewise, with the question

at hand (not to be confused with "obey your wife" - different authoritative roles at play here), the answer is obvious: love your wife anyway.

I'll follow up with the emotional side of it if I have some time later.

On Biblical Justice and Rape

5 upvotes · 9 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I have an answer, but will follow up soon - deadline in 15 minutes and I just procrastinated too long typing that :p

"I think I was just raped"

5 upvotes · 8 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I wrote this post after-the-fact, knowing that it wasn't actually rape. So, rather than mislead a reader and make them think it's rape only to discover otherwise later on, I try to be more up-front with my textual clues about the actual conclusion.

Frame is impossible without abundance

5 upvotes · 6 October 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

The metaphor is decent. That said, abundance makes frame easier, but it isn't essential to have frame. DNGAF and having a mission beyond the marriage are better sources of frame. A guy can have zero abundance, but maintain frame because he's got more important crap to do than worry about whether or not his wife will yell at him for doing it.

It just happens to be that if you replace if we replace "crap" with "girls," abundance fits in as one component of this greater context.

Cut off my best friend/oneitis and now she's blowing up my phone. How should I handle this?

5 upvotes · 1 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Hmm ... (1) Christian - potentially even a mature one, as she's wanting to share her faith; (2) single; (3) hot ... and for good measure: (4) obviously willing to follow you wherever you go, even if the only place you're going is away from her. This girl destroys the "pick 2 of 3" rule. That said, you're pretty insistent that she's not marriageable, and I'll just take you at your word and assume she's got to be a psycho nut job in certain ways.

As Deep said, you've got to take her off the pedestal. You don't want to marry her, but you do want to have sex with her. Great, you've just proven you're a guy. Why would sex with her be so spectacular in the first place? To give an old crude, yet aptly puissant /u/bluepillprofessor quote: "One wet hole is the same as the next."

Let's get to the heart of the issue, though: *What's your frame?*

You feel like you have to respond. That's her frame. She wants an answer. She has emotions that she's waving in your face to make you respond. If you want to respond, fine. Do it. But if you don't want to, why should her emotional reaction to your silence affect you that way? You're not her boyfriend. You don't owe her anything. You have no obligations here.

Your life mission determines the orientation of your frame. You haven't shared what it is. I'll take a stab in the dark and assume it has something to do with evangelism and apologetics, though I'm giving you a lot more credit here than I think your post would indicate. She's providing an opportunity to extend your evangelistic and apologetic influence into a new community through her. That sounds like a golden opportunity served on a silver platter. If you could maintain frame while coaching her through this, that'd be perfect.

But you can't. That's weakness. She knows you have a weakness for her. How does she know? Because she's a

good looking girl. She assumes every guy has a weakness for her. She's probably right. She's baffled because you don't want to talk to her anymore, right? Why do you think that is? "Because girls take that stuff personally." No. Because her world view is shattered when she realizes there's a guy out there who isn't crawling on his hands and knees begging to kiss her feet. Instead of finding it unusual that there's a guy who has shown interest in her, she's confounded at the fact that you're not. Think on that for a while and take her off the pedestal.

What makes you wise here is that you know your boundaries. You recognize that your mission will be compromised if you take her silver-platter offer. Was it rude of you to ghost her? Sure. But there's no verse that says, "Thou shalt not be rude." Jesus was quite rude to the pharisees when they called him out. He was also downright rude to the Syrophoenician woman who pleaded for his help. I'm rude to the telemarketer who calls and I hang up before they finish their sentence. There's nothing wrong with being a little rude.

What are you to do? Ideally, you'd get your internal point of origin straightened out, develop some discipline, and go advance your mission while making it clear to her that you're not interested. But if you can't do that safely, either keep ghosting her or, given that you've already told her you'd call her, be a man of your word: make the call and tell her what's what.

Kavanaugh - the loss of rationality

5 upvotes · 28 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I am a moderate but right leaning. If a democrat has a good idea, I call it good. If a republican has a good idea, I call it good.

By that definition, I'd be a moderate too. But what do I call myself when I find 9 good ideas on the right for every 1 good idea on the left? In short, this is a great way to try to diffuse any debate over your political position by declining to address what ideas you think are good or bad ;)

no one can call out their immature behavior

Well, to be fair, you did. So did several people in the comments below the video you linked. People do all the time. The media just doesn't report on those views; they only report on the views of the women. That's what you're really getting at.

There MUST MUST MUST be some standard of law or procedure that we hold people to in order to convict them of wrongdoing.

There is. For criminal issues it's "proof beyond a reasonable doubt." For most civil issues it's "a preponderance of the evidence."

Do I know 100% that he didn't sexually assault someone? No. But that's not the question here - the question is if they presented a case to show that he did. They didn't.

Innocent until proven guilty. That said, I think one of [u/rollo-tomassi](#)'s posts references a popular blogger who was suggesting that on rape and sexual assault allegations all women should be believed no matter what - because the risk of letting a perpetrator go was worse than the risk of putting an innocent person in jail. It's pretty ridiculous, but that's the nature of modern day feminists.

I know this is a RPChristian forum and possibly political discussions don't belong

It's welcome as long as it focuses on the issues and not a party line. Feminism is a clear issue that is relevant to this subreddit.

HOWEVER we as judges or rulers (if we are to have order) must have a standard to follow and emotion/empathy are not standards.

Let me be clear here: you're citing an outburst that happened which the media covered. There were no negative ramifications. No one was judged. The senator is not going to jail because these women decided to yell at him. The justice candidate didn't lose his position because of this episode. Yes, in the aggregate these types of things definitely sway opinion and affect judgments and policy *on the whole*. But what makes their strategy so dangerously effective is that no one can pin point one incident that caused the tipping point. No one can watch this video and say, "That's the one that got that candidate booted from consideration."

I fear America is falling

America isn't falling because some women yelled at a senator. It's falling because the media portrays these episodes in a way that will influence the next election. CNN has no power to judge the senator or the judicial candidate. What they do have power over is to report on what the real authoritarians do/say in a way that makes sure they don't keep their authority after the next election.

The fact that Trump was elected is something of a miracle in the face of the modern media - but it also shows you just how much of a stirring there is among those who aren't influenced by the media. It takes a massive conviction to go against the grain of cultural pressures like that, and the sheer fact that Trump won even with the media pushing hard democrat makes me wonder how lop-sided things would be if the media switched positions and started leaning even 1/10th to the right as they do to the left. Or more to the point, if the media were less biased in the first place and actually stood in the middle, how much more room would the right have to breathe?

How to Play the Game

5 upvotes · 25 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Great post, brother!

Until she clearly wants commitment from you, don't have interest in commitment with her. How quickly are you willing to give her your commitment?

This is huge for guys who are dating. This is the key to preventing ONEitis and to maintaining a position of dominance that is highly attractive.

I remember when dating my wife I made a comment one day: "I'm so lucky, I bet other guys wonder how I got so lucky to end up with a girl like you." My wife was mortified. It was probably the dumbest thing I have ever said to her - and I thought I was being romantic and giving her some feel-good flattery. Her reply? "That's awful! I don't want people thinking I'd be willing to date some loser." She was open about her hypergamy before either of us even knew that word existed.

That was one of my early red pill lessons: she wanted a guy who was better than her. Too bad I didn't know how to apply it. My solution was to act like I was a step above her - *because that's what would make her happy*. What an awful confusion of alpha traits in a beta frame.

I was giving her my commitment and expecting hers in return. Know what happened? She dumped me. After three days of crying and whining and begging and pleading she took me back. She knew I'd give her anything she wanted - and that set the tone for those first 7-8 years of marriage that I always talk about as being pretty darn awful.

All the techniques for passing girls' tests circulating Red Pill have this concept at their core. Being above the game.

This is pretty much what I was getting at my my "Comparison Game and Positive Dread" post. I like the unique take on that concept here, broadening it to a much wider application.

you want your demeanor to communicate that this approach is you extending to her a chance to prove herself to you, maybe now or maybe over a cup of coffee later

This is spot on! The only point of clarification is that you don't just want to communicate it as your demeanor - you want it to be your actual internalized state of being as well.

And pray, brother. I pray and believe during my interactions all the time.

This isn't just for singles. Even as a married man, when my wife used to yell at me (post-RP), sometimes I picture Jesus sitting right there next to me and we're having a conversation, talking about her in the midst of her fit. To use a somewhat famous Christian joke, it's a lot like [these guys](#) having a conversation about someone frothing at the mouth right in front of him. That's how you develop amused mastery: through prayerfully practicing God's presence.

Absent fathers in Christian communities

5 upvotes · 21 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is sad to hear, brother. Show her what you've got in the next few months. I've had cases where the parties reconcile mid divorce. And if she goes, that's her loss. That said, if you're a cage stager on reformed theology, that's on you for driving her to the liberals ;)

Difficulty accepting my new reality.

5 upvotes · 21 September 2018 · /r/askMRP

They are MY children.

I think you missed the point that [/u/Rian_Stone](#) was making. He wasn't asking if you were raising someone else's kids. He was asking if you take ownership over the fact that they're your kids.

Your post makes it sound like you're their nanny, taking care of her kids until she gets home. Take the reigns back. Your language matters. This will shape your psychology within your marriage.

The Golden Ticket

5 upvotes · 17 September 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Guys have a golden ticket too. It's made of real gold. We just don't get to trade it in for prizes. We rip it up piece by piece and give it to people whenever we want something. If we follow certain stipulations, like excelling in a profession, our ticket becomes more valuable, so we only have to rip apart smaller pieces to get the same stuff as the next guy.

We can also keep our ticket relatively intact, waving it in the air until women start throwing down their gold-colored paper tickets at our feet. Of all the prizes they could have, my real gold is the one they want - the one they'll gladly trade their shiny paper ticket to get.

will there be a difference?

5 upvotes · 13 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Sexual desire is not sinful. Acting on it outside of marriage is. Flirting is not an indication that you want to have sex right then and there. It's merely an indication of attraction. There's nothing wrong with being attracted to

someone or showing someone you're attracted to them. Flirting is just one way of doing that. I don't see anything in the bible that indicates this would be wrong in any way.

Lift, Faggot, Lift

5 upvotes · 11 September 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Amen.

Field Report. I asked my wife to write an erotic fantasy story and she didn't, but something else unfolded instead.

5 upvotes · 5 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Is this harmless fun to put her on display?

I'm a big fan of PDA. Most Christian women are not. In my view, PDA can go a long way toward showing others - especially those in the church - that sex isn't something shameful to be hidden behind locked bedroom doors.

At what point is it causing others to lust?

At the point where you're both reckless about your concern for other people.

Let me be clear: your sinfulness is not decided by someone else's sinfulness. If you can, in good conscience and because of your faith, do any of what you're doing without conviction from the Spirit, then either you're (a) a self-deluded non-Christian, or (b) not sinning. See Romans 14:14, 23 for the operative passages there.

I've lusted after a woman who was wearing full-body winter clothes before. Certainly she was doing nothing sinful in that she was being perfectly modest. My lust was on my own head. If someone wants to lust after you and your wife, that's on their own head. If you're (a) intentionally causing them to lust, or (b) being reckless about behaviors that might cause others to lust, then you can hardly say your behaviors are coming from faith, thus you're in sin. For my purposes, "reckless" is a disregard for the actual implications of your behaviors ("I'd rather not know because then I might have to stop" kind of thing).

Boundaries were set long ago not to involve anyone else, what other boundaries should be considered?

I don't have many, except by personal preference.

Cause for concerned?

That's you living in her frame. Stop worrying about what her story might have been or why she's doing this. You'll get too caught up in your own head.

Ready to get engaged (in light of past PMO)

5 upvotes · 24 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

You've already got some great advice here - shout outs to [/u/helaughsinhidden](#), [/u/Stryker7200](#), and [/u/matrixtospartanatLV](#) for their write-ups! Here are a few things that roll off the top of my head.

FIRST: Your friend is absolutely right. I can't count the number of guys who had "conquered" porn while dating a girl and then found that after marriage they were neck-deep in it once again. I'm yet another one of those examples. What makes me convinced that his concerns over you are valid are the exact reasons you gave for why you think they're invalid: "I've built good habits and defenses ... Time limit on YouTube, no video games, better diet, better sleep hygiene," etc. These are all human effort things. In other words, you're saying that your will-power is higher than most other men. Good for you. It will fail. Your pride in your will power might not let you

fail in the realm of PMO, but the failure will come nonetheless. You're not trusting in Jesus as your cure, you're trusting in yourself ... and I just don't see how that's going to survive when your deep-down blue pill fantasies that I sense still lingering are finally shattered.

To that end, your post has convinced me that you have not conquered your sin; you have merely **poured wax in your ears**.

TWO

Now, with that aside, are you in a good position to get engaged/married? Well, goodness ... you've known this girl for so long and you're pretty darn convinced that you've vetted her quite thoroughly ... I'm not buying it.

My rationale has nothing to do with your porn problem, though I do usually advise to kick it before getting married (which is not a hard stance - just general wisdom). Instead, I'm more concerned with the hints of blue pill ideologies I'm picking up about your attitude toward marriage in the first place.

- Why do you want to marry this woman?
- You seem to have only recently started improving your SMV, so are you sure you'll be content with her 10 years from now when you realize you could be pulling much higher quality?
- What do you think sex during marriage will be like?
- How are you doing at maintaining your physical boundaries in the dating relationship?
- What's your internal emotional state like every time you see her?
- What has she done already to demonstrate her character for being Faithful, Available, and Teachable? I saw in a comment that you've predominantly been in an LDR using mostly video chat to communicate - how does that meet your standards of a woman making herself available to you?
- Are you going to move to where she is or is she going to move to you?
- Why are you speaking to her on Facetime so often?

I get the impression you're emotionally impulsive about the relationship and not thinking long-term. I mean, if she's a total knock-out with a biblical mind about her, then don't lose a good thing. But I'm just very nervous for you.

I can't say for sure whether you're ready or not. Even you can't know that. Only God can, and you're going to have to trust that he's sovereign so that (1) he won't let you marry when you're not ready, or (2) if he does, he'll make it work anyway. In the meantime, kick whatever blue is lingering beneath your skull and rib cage. Those are the real red flags I'm seeing.

Question on priorities.

5 upvotes · 15 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

... I REALLY like this. I'm going to use that in the future. Bravo, good sir!

"Three reasons why Christian parents are raising slutty girls and beta males"

5 upvotes · 14 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is quite an impressive list. Let me add a more conceptual foundation for the notion that we are meant to emulate Christ:

- 1 John 2:6 - "Whoever says he abides in him ought to walk in the same way in which he walked."

- 1 Cor. 11:1 - "Be imitators of me, as I am of Christ."
- 1 Peter 2:21 - "For to this you have been called, because Christ also suffered for you, leaving you an example, so that you might follow in his steps."
- Romans 8:29 - "For those whom he foreknew he also predestined to be conformed to the image of his Son"
- Philippians 2:5 - "Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus."
- Ephesians 5:1-2 - "Therefore be imitators of God, as beloved children."
- John 13:13-17 - "You call me Teacher and Lord, and you are right, for so I am. If I then, your Lord and Teacher, have washed your feet, you also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that you also should do just as I have done to you. Truly, truly, I say to you, a servant is not greater than his master, nor is a messenger greater than the one who sent him. If you know these things, blessed are you if you do them."
- Ephesians 4:24 - "Put on the new self, created after the likeness of God"
- John 14:15 - "If you love me, you will keep my commandments"
- Galatians 3:27 - "For as many of you as were baptized into Christ have put on Christ."

There are many, many more that imply that we are to emulate the example Christ set for us. That said, a common thread of all of these is that we are to emulate the *character* and *priorities* of Christ and not the actual decision-making patterns.

To that end, [u/matrixtospartanatLV](#):

There has to be more. Am I doing it wrong because I got married? Because I had children? Because I have a steady job?

Jesus did NONE of those things.

Jesus married the church. He also refers to us as his children. His job was that of a vocational minister - but he also had a lay job as a carpenter, just as Paul modeled a lay job as a tent maker. Jesus did all of these things.

But I agree that there are some things that we are not meant to emulate. Jesus wore sandals everywhere and not sneakers. Does that mean we must wear sandals and refuse to wear sneakers? Of course not. These are not character and purpose-oriented things. In short, I would differentiate between being Christ's physical image and his spiritual image. All of these passages and more seem to be talking about the spiritual image - that our lives would be oriented the same way as Christ's.

[FR] Duty Sex Doesn't Exist

5 upvotes · 13 August 2018 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

I thought the same thing a year ago.

Is my wife pregnant by another man (I need some advice)

5 upvotes · 7 August 2018 · [/r/askMRP](#)

Cool. Get defensive. You're only proving my point.

Church Discipline

5 upvotes · 30 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

As far as I've always understood it, public discipline per 1 Timothy 5:19-20 only applies to church leaders. All other discipline is to happen in private. For example, a couple years ago my pastor had to discipline a woman for repeatedly and unrepentantly cheating on her husband. The two are still married, but living separate. He still attends our church, but she was asked to leave in private and she has agreed to do so. No announcement was made at church about her leaving. I knew another woman who was being obnoxious toward others in the church and trying to cause trouble. It got bad enough that the pastor asked her in private to leave. After recognizing she was no longer welcome (at least as long as her issues persisted), she did not attempt to come back. There was no public announcement related to her leaving. In both cases, only the people directly involved in the situation were informed of the result and it was left to those people to decide who they wanted to tell and how much was told. After all, public declarations like that affect the victim as well as the perpetrator - and it would not be fair to the victim to make a public announcement of the perpetrator's sin when the stigma, whether deserved or not, will affect the victim's life and relationships.

The reason it's different for leaders in the church is that there is supposed to be a spotlight on them. Paul talks in Philippians about leaving behind people who live after the model he gave them - and he encourages others to follow that model. As such, churchgoers should know who the church leaders are and should actively be seeking to live like those people. If one of those leaders is living sinfully, it should be made clear to all people that they should not be living like that person.

The issue we have today is that many churchgoers don't even know who the "elders" (or deacons or advisory team members, etc.) are in their church (I don't know who they are in my church!), so there's no expectation of modeling on the part of the leaders, which is counter-productive to the mission of disciple-making, which is heavily based on life modeling (as opposed to teaching). So, that throws a wrench into all of this as well, where pastors feel they have a prerogative to keep things hush hush because nobody else was even looking at that person's life as a model in the first place. In reality, this is a pastor's habitual sin for failing repetitively to maintain a culture of disciple-making in his church and he should be the one publicly rebuked for it and letting things get to that point in the first place. But yes, such a sinful culture does make it easier for a pastor to engage in church discipline because he doesn't have to out his friends in front of everybody. But this also fails to encourage elders to live to a higher standard because the risks of failing to do so are much smaller.

TL;DR - Public discipline is only for church leaders; for everyone else it's perfectly appropriate to keep it private. As a practical matter, I'm sure there's room to make it more public if the person keeps coming back after a private excommunication, which then becomes disruptive to the body as a whole, warranting the body as a whole to get involved.

As for unsubmitive wives, you're absolutely right. This is certainly a sin issue, and one that often does not get addressed appropriately in churches.

That said, when it comes to public condemnation, because women shouldn't be positional leaders in the church, it leaves the question as to whether or not women should ever be rebuked publicly. After all, if men want the position of leadership, it makes sense that there is a higher risk and responsibility associated that if they fail in their duty to God, which includes obedience and repentance upon failure.

However, I would make some room for the wives of church leaders because they often operate as *de facto* leaders among women in the church. If a woman is leading a women's ministry, for example, then she is a leader in the church, despite that she may not be paid a salary or be on staff. She still has the modeling influence I referenced above, and that influence is usually targeted at many people, and thus any rebuke should also be before those people who are influenced by her ministry.

That said, we also have to account for the fact that the husband is still ultimately responsible for the leadership of

his home. If an elder's wife is unsubmitive and other women look to her as a model, how do we address this? After all, 1 Timothy 3:4 says, "He must manage his own family well and see that his children obey him, and he must do so in a manner worthy of full respect" (also adding to the debate on physical punishment of wives from another thread). Verse 5 then explains, "For if someone does not know how to manage his own household, how will he care for God's church?"

So, if it is the man's household and he is responsible for managing his wife under control, then if he were to have her reprimanded for unrepentant unsubmitiveness, then should he not also simultaneously resign from his position of leadership in the church? No, most men would much rather hide his wife's sin than accept that conclusion. Or perhaps he is in habitual sin for failing to keep his household under control as its leader, and therefore if she is rebuked he must be rebuked publicly as well.

This leads to the possible conclusion that it's sinful for a man to lead his home in any way other than an RP way.

I'm a Christian. I'm a "jerk." Deal with it.

5 upvotes · 13 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Well-said. Years and years ago, my youth pastor did a talk on different ways people view God, and this seems to fit right in. His three models were:

- A Cosmic Police Officer - someone just waiting to punish you as soon as you do anything bad.
- A Universal Vending Machine - we punch a few buttons to tell him what we want, put in some money/time/whatever, and wait for it to be handed to us.
- A Mystical Force - Like in Star Wars, if we just believe enough, we can manipulate God to do whatever we want.

I like the genie thing too ;)

Book Summaries

5 upvotes · 10 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

No More Mr. Nice Guy

When I Say No I Feel Guilty

Married Man Sex Life Primer

Mindset towards those who are not chaste

5 upvotes · 25 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

There are no "certain circumstances." RP is not a prescribed code of conduct. It is a mindset or orientation of life based on an understanding of how intergender relational dynamics really work. That's all.

If you know the truth and want to marry a non virgin anyway, go do it. The bible doesn't forbid it. RP doesn't forbid it. The only thing RP would forbid is the mindset that you have some obligation to ignore her past indiscretions.

To that end, I'm not even sure why people even use the word "forgive" here? Did she sin against you? No. It's not yours to forgive. Forgiveness has nothing to do with it unless you actually end up marrying her - and even then it's questionable. It's simply a matter of exercising wise discretion.

Women like to use the word forgiveness on this context because it lets them use the bible as a manipulative tool to accomplish their goals. Imagine if instead of "Will you forgive me?" they said what they're really asking: "Will you pretend I never did that?" As long as you understand this is the question you're really addressing, do whatever

you want, acting in wisdom.

Lessons from two divorce cases

5 upvotes · 15 May 2018 · /r/askMRP

It depends on the state you're in. I live in a state that assumes all property acquired during the marriage is joint and marital even if you keep it separate, so there's no helping there. The best way to fool-proof yourself is to get your wife a job earning comparable income to you. Just get filthy rich and pay someone to do all the housework for you. If you want a wife who stays home, that's fine ... but expect to be paying spousal support if it ever ends.

Is Sex Outside of Marriage a Sin? An Official Stance.

5 upvotes · 21 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I explained one example of where it's a sin in the OT. But this line ...

If it aint a sin in the OT, it aint a sin in the NT either.

Dang, brother ... that's pretty ignorant and not consistent with Paul's writings. I also referenced the whole "invent new ways of doing evil" thing, which pretty much affirms that there are new sins that were never mentioned in the OT that are still sin.

Now, you've made a trite philosophical case for your position, but let's see some theological backing to it. Point me to some passages that lead to this conclusion - and I don't mean explaining away passages that are unfavorable to your position. I mean analyzing passages that positively affirm your position.

How to transition into celibacy?

5 upvotes · 14 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Beautiful reply.

If you used to be BP and changed, what made you reconsider feminism?

5 upvotes · 7 March 2018 · /r/RedPillWomen

Travelling in India

I'm really confused by this. I have several clients (I'm a divorce attorney) both male and female who were married in India, including one where we're combating jurisdiction from India to get it in the US. All of these clients on both sides tell me that India law is incredibly feminist and favorable to the woman. Obviously I'm not an attorney in India, so I can't speak to that personally, but what I'm hearing is quite the opposite: that custody and support laws over there are allegedly worse than they are in the US.

Tag: [/u/trexgomez](#) and [/u/yuithegraceful](#) - just for better inside information on this subject

most people would never vote a woman into the US Presidency

I don't think that's true at all. It's more that most people wouldn't vote *that particular woman* into office, given the incredible allegations that had been made against her, some of which were borderline (if not outright) treasonous ... not that I'm a big Trump fan either.

I bought a Laura Doyle book and haven't looked back.

You'll be happier in the long-run. Just make sure you're doing it for the right reasons :)

I now consider myself a moderate.

Which is where I tend to fall.

How about you? What event in your life or the world changed your mind about modern feminism?

The Bible and an 18 month total dead bedroom.

Girl problems

5 upvotes · 6 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

A perfect case of hypergamy at work. You're the BB, her boyfriend is the AF. Of course he's a jerk. Why do you think she's screwing him and not pining over you?

How would one approach this text and hold frame in a beneficial way coming from a Christian perspective?

5 upvotes · 2 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

So ... you've got an ex who knows you're not interested, but wants to get the benefits of your time, attention, and affection anyway. AWALT.

How do you hold frame? Can't tell you. You haven't told us what your frame is yet. What do you want to do? Who do you want to be? What are your priorities right now? Those are the kinds of questions, along with what [u/redpillwonder](#) said that will give us more room to provide helpful feedback.

If you're really not interested in chatting with her because you need time to heal or whatever, just don't respond. You're under no obligation to do so, and it's better not to lead her on if you have no interest.

Rollo Tomassi: How the FI has assimilated modern church culture

5 upvotes · 27 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Let's be clear. There are two good things we can do on earth that we can't do in heaven: (1) make disciples (Matthew 28:19), and (2) reconcile the things of this world to God (2 Cor. 5:18). If those are the only good things we can do here that can't be done in heaven, then they should be the highest priority of the church and all other functions of the church only have value on Earth if they contribute to one of those two purposes.

To that end, there are a great many social justice purposes that the church *should be* engaging in and we should not shame it for doing so.

- James 2 says, "Religion God our Father accepts as pure and faultless is this: to look after orphans and widows in their distress and to keep oneself from being polluted by the world."
- Isaiah 1:17 says, "Learn to do good; seek justice, correct oppression; bring justice to the fatherless, plead the widow's cause."
- Zechariah 7:9-10 says, "Render true judgments, show kindness and mercy to one another, do not oppress the widow, the fatherless, the sojourner, or the poor, and let none of you devise evil against another in your heart."
- Proverbs 31:9 says, "Open your mouth, judge righteously, defend the rights of the poor and needy."
- Jeremiah 22:3 says, "Do justice and righteousness, and deliver from the hand of the oppressor him who has been robbed. And do no wrong or violence to the resident alien, the fatherless and the widow, nor shed innocent blood in this place."

- Jesus says in Matthew 7:12, "Do to others what you would have them do to you."

I intentionally picked verses from different authors rather than repeating from the same book to demonstrate that this is all over Scripture - and I could find even more in Paul's writings. Social justice is a vitally important purpose and function of the church and not one we should ignore or berate the church for being interested in.

The problem isn't that the church is focused on social justice. It's that it has abandoned the mission of disciple-making. Disciple-making focuses on the person; social justice focuses on the cultural needs. When the cultural needs are the primary function, it makes sense that the church will become ingrained with and influenced by culture.

Set the priority straight back to discipleship and you'll notice that the church will be less interested in appeasing *culture* and more interested producing godliness in *people*.

As always, the model of discipleship that Jesus gave us is the answer to the problems of the world and the church. We know the church has lost its way and betas aren't going to set it straight. So, are you going to alpha-up and do something about it or complain on an online forum that you don't like what's happening? ;)

For the record, I live what I preach. I am actively making strides in my church to restore the focus of discipleship and foster an appreciation for biblical masculinity. It has been a long process, but it can be done. In general, it takes 3 years of intentional effort to earn influence with the leadership of a church. You can knock a bit off of that if you happen to build the right connections early on. But if you've been at your church for 3+ years and haven't found your way into a position of influence among the leadership or part of the leadership itself, it's time to get started. If you're already there, start utilizing that influence for God's purposes.

But don't sit idly by just hoping for things to change or looking for a church where someone else already did the work for you. That's lazy and it's beta thinking.

The Feminine Imperative has replaced the Holy Spirit

5 upvotes · 8 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I've actually done a lot of writing on the "No True Scotsman" argument, which only applies if there is no objective definition of a "Scotsman." If Scottish law outlined a clear definition of a Scotsman, then one could use that phrase quite objectively and point to the law that proves it. Someone else could come along and subjectively disagree with that law, but they're still not getting their Scottish citizenship if they don't otherwise qualify under the terms of that law.

God has authority to decide who is a "real Christian" and not. He told us his standard in a written code, the core soteriological principles of which are commonly agreed upon by virtually all branches of the faith (ex. the Nicene Creed). If someone says, "I really do not overly concern myself with issues of salvation," there's good cause to question whether or not she objectively falls within that standard (although I'll refrain from making any judgement on that point, per your request).

Let's assume she's a legit Christian (not to imply she isn't). Let's also assume there's no biblical issue with her being a pastor and that questioning the appropriateness of her theology/biblical interpretation is off the table (again, removing the "no true Scotsman issue from the conversation).

A lot of what she's saying is good. Complacency is deadly. Doubt is a necessary accompaniment to faith. Great. But the women who were moderating Athol Kay's forum also had some good things to say at times. Nevertheless, we see how that went down. The practical harm on a structural level of her being in the position she's in outweighs the good that she might otherwise communicate, even if we assume she was only communicating

authentic, genuine truth - even if it were red pill truth, at that.

To be clear, I recently wrote on the hierarchy of **theology > praxeology > philosophy**. If we remove the theological issues (avoiding the NTS argument), at a praxeological level we still reach the same conclusion as theology: society functions best when God leads men and men lead their wives. This works on a purely praxeological level even without theology *because God designed the world to work that way*.

When we put a wife in a position of spiritual authority over her husband (noting that this pastor's husband attends her church and is not in a higher position of leadership than her), we run afoul of everything the red pill knows to be true, even from a secular vantage point.

When we extrapolate this authority not only over her own husband, but upon an entire congregation as well, it empowers other women in the church to (1) follow in her example of spiritual leadership over her husband, and (2) reinvigorate their feminist tendencies, heightening the BB side of their hypergamous desires on a cultural level within the church. Not only so, but onlookers from outside the church are then given greater justification to amplify hypergamy's BB play on a societal level because "even the church agrees now too."

But I'm not even concerned about that part of it. The world will do what it's going to do. What's more concerning is the impact it has on the men themselves. Despite the cumulative impact these types of women have on the church and society as a whole, and the way this feeds into their dominant position over men, they still want an alpha to screw them. That desire isn't going away, and it's been proven time and again among countless feminists. But they've just convinced men on an institutionalized level that they must be subservient to a woman because she has a position of spiritual authority, which presumably comes from God - and how dare you even think about defying someone appointed by God!

No, the man must beta-up. He must submit to his woman pastor, who proves that it's fine for him to submit to his woman wife, and that he might as well submit to every other woman in society as well ... at least if there's a chance that he wants sex anytime soon.

Of course, if we agree that **women are sexually responsive and not spontaneous**, then any structure that stifles a man's innate authority to initiate with his wife is also going to stifle his sexuality as a whole - because she's simply not going to initiate spontaneously as often as he would.

Let me back up for a second. If women are seen as viable candidates for spiritual leadership and men are being influenced toward a beta mindset by virtue of seeing a woman in authority over them every Sunday morning, it follows that most men will defer to their wives as spiritual leaders by default. It becomes the path of least resistance and the most natural directive, given that the family is subservient to the church and the church is subservient to a woman. So, we have a family with a beta husband, led by the wife on both a pragmatic and spiritual level.

In such a household, where will the man find his authority to initiate sexually with his wife? Perhaps his patience runs dry and his balls are blue enough in more ways than one that he finally makes a move on her. But now she is empowered to deny him. And if she is sexually responsive, what is she responsive to? Certainly nothing he has to offer. After all, he's not offering her anything she couldn't get elsewhere by flashing a smile, or if the man is "lucky enough" ... something more.

In the end, if we allow women to take the lead in the church, men become an interchangeable resource both within the church and outside. He has no value left to contribute. That's not to imply that his leadership is the only value he has to contribute, as the cultural model shows that women can, in fact, be effective leaders. The issue is that desire is dead. His alpha-ness is what he was contributing - and it is something women crave. But in this model, sex would become purely a matter of procreation whenever the wife decides she wants a child. As much as he may slobber over her, she will not be slobbering back.

Of course, I am speaking predominantly philosophically in all of this - suggesting what would logically follow

from one chain of events to the next. But we know that at least the foundation of this rings true even on a praxeological level. We see enough relationships in the church follow this path to know what would certainly result. Theology is, in my view, the only pillar still supporting healthy marriages. Even with that pillar in place, we still see many marriages crumbling to what I'm suggesting. Remove theology from the equation (which is what the secular world wants, including secular RP) and I wonder how quickly and widespread my predictions would become reality.

This is why I believe secular RP is doomed without God - without RPC fortifying the pillar of theology in its appropriate context.

But let me address one more point: that this would kill the faith entirely. I have said on RPC many times before that God intends the physical things of this world to parallel spiritual truths. Physical reproductive acts are paralleled with spiritual reproduction, which is evangelism. Physical child-rearing (i.e. leading in the home) is paralleled with spiritual child-rearing, which is discipleship.

If we train people on a physical level to abandon male headship for female headship, and sexuality in the home is thereby stifled because the wife is not attracted to her beta bucks husband, then the God-given pattern for spiritual reproduction is equally stifled and the compulsion toward evangelism is lost. It's no surprise, then, that this pastor you reference notes: "I really do not overly concern myself with issues of salvation, **especially salvation of other folks**" (note how the article author bolded the wrong section?). What happens after a generation or two with extremely stifled evangelism? The faith dies. Why do you think God set things up the way he did?

And if men are not the ones leading the family in the upbringing of their children, not only do we have the practical impact of these problems propounded on the next generation, but we also lose the model for discipleship that Jesus gave us in favor of female strategies of child-rearing, which have already started to take root even among male thinking simply because the secular culture has pushed that agenda for so long. And what happens if the next generation isn't trained rightly? The faith will die. Why do you think God set things up the way he did?

Of course, I have not even gotten into much of the content of what she teaches ... but these are my thoughts nonetheless.

EDIT: I should note that most of this is based on her statement that she wants to reform the church. I'm simply musing on what would happen if she were successful in that goal.

An anatomy of butthurt and the impact on frame

5 upvotes · 7 February 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

It's only cliché to someone who already knows that move. I often forget that others are gaming women who have had moves put on them before. Nevertheless ... pulling hair during sex is also cliché ... but if it works it works.

TLDR: withdrawing time & attention, the last ditch, roommate, not wife

5 upvotes · 7 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

No ... not supposed to make her hot for him. It's supposed to communicate that her behavior is unacceptable. If she's checked out, why should he continue giving her a free ride?

An anatomy of butthurt and the impact on frame

5 upvotes · 6 February 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

The point of the post isn't to pontificate on the best response to the request, in which case there are certainly many better responses than what is listed here.

The point is to discern what is and is not butthurt.

Wife had abortion without telling me

5 upvotes · 4 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I endorse all of this.

Purity question

5 upvotes · 31 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

My ex set me up with her roommate last weekend.

What the flying spaghetti monster?!? Read up on hypergamy? Don't take dating recommendations from your ex. She does not have your best interests in mind.

The girl I was set up with is not a Christian

2 Cor. 6, yadda yadda. Don't date non-Christians. Period. Next.

I feel like towed the line with making out

I literally just answered this question to someone else yesterday by PM. Here's what I wrote:

This is an issue talked about quite often and the consensus is that there is no consensus. Everyone is different and has their own boundaries. My wife and I dated for over a year before using the word "love." After that, I would kiss her cheek, hand, neck, shoulder, or other innocuous places, and she to me, but they were only pecks. When I was ready to propose, we kissed on the lips for the first time. A month after that we started tongue kissing. A couple months later we started making out while sitting down, then a week later we started making out while laying down. A month after that we started making out with my hand on her belly under her shirt, but never touching her breasts or going below the waist. That was as far as we went, then we were married a couple months later. So, in the 6 months that we were engaged, you can see how physical affection started escalating quite quickly.

Now, that's just my story, and I have no regret about any of that because I actually did marry her. If I had broken up with her, I would classify a lot of what we did as sinful because I was certainly lusting over her in my heart and mind, which is only vindicated if she actually is my wife (in my view, that applies regardless of when the actual covenant is established).

Any advice on how to approach this from a Christ-like frame and position of godly humility and repentance?

You've got to call it off immediately and ghost your ex. You can't get over her while she's still around ... at least not with where your frame appears to be right now. Maybe down the road, but it's going to make both your spiritual and RP journeys much harder.

Wife wants to take Girls Weekend to Tahoe

5 upvotes · 31 January 2018 · /r/askMRP

Look at it this way, if you don't let her go she will use that against you and based on your frame rip you to shreds.

So the solution is to give her frame even more power over his? I agree with the "let her go" sentiment. I don't agree with him funding the trip when she's already drained his resources to meet her standard of living expectations. He needs to cut her off, not keep empowering her.

How should one phrase to a woman that they don't want to have premarital sex, however, you still want to pursue the relationship?

5 upvotes · 29 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I definitely want to avoid shame and guilt, as there is no fear in love

Read the 400 series I'm finally starting to post, and keep up with when the next installments come out, as this is meant to address how to conquer things like shame and guilt.

How does one avoid this shame and guilt that the church has jaded us with in regards to sex and waiting until marriage? Does this have something to do with "mission"?

Being on mission is a large part of it, but there are spiritual foundations that have to be established first before the mission-orientation of your life can do its work. Again, the 400-level content will be addressing this.

To give a tad bit more information, Matthew 12 talks about an evil spirit being cast out and returning with 7 more if it finds the house still empty. Being "on mission," or more accurately: living by the Spirit and His call for your life, is filling your house appropriately so that it is not empty. But getting rid of the evil spirit in the first place must precede this. The answer is the Gospel and will be the focal point of the next 400-series post (Part 3 of the Lens).

I have actually seen the opposite... it seems girls would love to jump in bed with guys in the day and age. I hope I interpreted this correctly.

Most girls, yes. But that's because most girls in the church are not genuine Christians (same for most guys). There are several, though, who do have this completely jaded attitude toward sex because of their overbearing upbringing, which causes them to be sex-avoidant and to be very relieved at the knowledge that they don't have to worry about sex for the near future. My wife was one of them, and still has some semblance of these tendencies.

Thoughts on my family vs. my wife

5 upvotes · 29 January 2018 · /r/askMRP

As [u/steelsharpenssteel](#) said, this is your issue, not any of theirs.

Why do you give a crap about what your family thinks of your wife? DNGAF. "But it's affecting me and my kids because they won't come over." From the story you gave, if you were a rock about all of this, they'd be able to put up with her. The fact that they didn't feel like they could be honest with you for so long is very telling.

Why have you been putting up with your wife's crap for so long? Because you were blind and now you see. Fix it. Lead her or leave her. But take the opportunity to test your leading skills now, otherwise you're going to screw up the next relationship and have to dig yourself out of that hole instead of this one. Figure it out now, then when you're in a good place make the decision.

But for the love of all that is good, don't make major life choices because your mommy thinks you picked the wrong girl. Figure that out for yourself. If it happens by chance to be the same as what appease your parents, fine.

But don't let that be what controls your decision. You control your decisions.

FR: The Spousal Support Scam

5 upvotes · 28 January 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Well, my boss convinces people to go to trial all the time when they really should have settled. That's how he stays rich. So people will do what their lawyer says, for the most part, even when those clients end up spending 6 figures on their case by the end (true story on more than one occasion).

FR: The Spousal Support Scam

5 upvotes · 28 January 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Well, I can only speak to my state here, but we certainly don't have any such official calculator. There is a program available in all states called FinPlan that functions similarly (which is how I determine my % splits), but there is nothing obligating a judge to use it, and many openly reject it.

I had one judge brag about how she was a few months away from term expiration (i.e. been a judge for the maximum time allowable at law) and had never once used a calculator - she always just went with her gut, and had never been reversed on appeal in her career.

So yes, the whims of the judge matter greatly.

Having my mother NOT come out for the birth of our child due to the way my wife treats my mother?

5 upvotes · 24 January 2018 · /r/askMRP

Why do you think she feels like your mom must be the one to bail her out instead of you?

"I work and don't get much/any paternity leave."

Boo hoo. She has the option of saying, "Husband, what's the plan?" Instead, she says, "Husband, go get your mom to figure it out." Why is that?

I have no desire for my wife. I cheated. What is the end-game?

5 upvotes · 22 January 2018 · /r/askMRP

You're right, I have no actual experience in infidelity. But I dare you to find anyone on this sub who would argue otherwise - that one can have better sex under the constraints of marriage.

Advice - Taking the Path to Change/Passion

5 upvotes · 16 January 2018 · /r/askMRP

It sounds like you already know your problems and what you need to do to take the next steps toward resolving the problem: "Me being in her frame, no dread, if I was smacking my career out of the park." I'm sure you could list more if you thought about it.

The thing here is that you've screwed this all up for 20 years. That's a heck of a lot of conditioning and habit-forming to undo.

What's worse is that everything in this post looks at her sexuality and not at your masculinity. So, let me add a few things to your list: DNGAF attitude, abundance mentality, outcome independence, and stoicism.

The more you wander in the realm of, "OMG, my wife won't have sex with me. What should I do?!?" the further you're dragging yourself from your goals. That's an awful place to be. It makes you less attractive to her, so you get less sex; and it makes you all up-tight and frustrated over her sexless audacity, which is just a horrible mental state to live in.

Learn to transcend sex - to live as if you never cared to have sex again in your life. Start there. When you can live there and mean it, then her sexuality will have lost its power over you and you can engage with her however you feel like and if she keeps denying you, you won't care. Which, ironically, is what's going to increase her attraction to you. And if she doesn't respond, you'll already be in the "Whatever, I don't need you; I've got better stuff to do than pine over you" mentality anyway, which is what's going to help you move on with your life.

Holy crap, life is good ! What are some of you thinking ?

5 upvotes · 8 January 2018 · /r/askMRP

Why aren't you working on yourself ? When your car breaks down, what do you do ? You fix it !

That would be great if there was a uniformly agreed upon standard of what a "fixed man" looks like. We all know what a fixed car is like and how it's supposed to operate. That doesn't exist with masculinity. That's why the TRP sidebar identifies the sub with the phrase: "in a culture increasingly lacking a positive identity for men."

So why are some of you so friggin hesitant to read and lift ?

Most guys aren't willing to put in effort toward something without knowing they'll get a return for their effort. They're so used to everything failing that they don't believe "sidebar and lift" actually helps. It sounds like another snake oil salesman promising some get rich quick result with nominal effort.

Also, most of the guys you're referencing aren't even here yet in the first place.

Why do you care what she says ? If your partner disrespects, ignores you, you cheats on you, calls you names and doesn't follow your lead, why do you care ?

Because culture has raised them to believe that they must care.

[/u/BluepillProfessor](#) wrote this up quite nicely on [r/RPChristians](#): "Men are trained from birth to commit idolatry by pedestalizing women. Then at puberty and as teenagers with the horny hormones raging (when every other society in human history worked hard to marry them off) 90% are denied any type of relief and even denied most types of positive interactions with their female peers because they are interested in the "older boys" (aka riding the CC). It doesn't take a genius to figure out how early training combined with unique physical desperation at a uniquely vulnerable time in their life causes men to turn flawed creatures into Goddesses."

Act like you are single.

That's the meal ticket right there.

AWALT, but not all women are going to respond positively to your growth and development.

I'd be cautious here. This comes off as "red pill only works on women who are receptive to red pill." When a man changes women respond. That's pretty much a fact of life. Over time those changes are virtually always positive (subject to initial negative reactions). But they might not be to the degree necessary to meet the man's standards and expectations. To that end ...

The relationship might or might not be salvageable

This isn't an objective reality; it's a subjective conclusion. Either the wife decides this for the man by leaving him or the man decides it for himself by setting a standard and following through. When a guy starts improving, as your post is all about, it's virtually always the latter. As BPP notes in his podcast, a woman can't stand the thought of leaving a guy who is improving without her commanding him to do so. The "what might he have turned out to

be?" question will haunt them forever, so they'll always wait and see. So, once a man starts improving, regardless of how far he is, the decision over whether or not the relationship is salvageable is his to make - and that's a highly subjective decision.

Holy crap my life is good now. I lived in a bad relationship for 10 years.

I'm confused ... is your life good because you escaped your ex? That sounds like some [r/deadbedrooms](#) nonsense. You list the answer, but then you make it sound in your conclusion like leaving your ex was really what saved you. "Get out of bad relationships" is often good advice, but nothing in your post comments on how any of your suggestions have improved your life ... except maybe that it's what gave you the balls to leave?

Becoming a High Value Woman

5 upvotes · 5 January 2018 · [/r/RedPillWomen](#)

Agreed. Contrary to popular opinion, men don't marry for sex. It's true that without sex you're just roommates, so sex is what makes it a marriage. But pretty much everyone agrees that (at least for non Christians) a guy can have a way more exciting sex life by remaining single and hopping from girl to girl.

So, if sex is better when single, the reason for marrying must be elsewhere.

Thoughts on "premarital sex" and polygamy

5 upvotes · 4 January 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Tag: [/u/redpillwonder](#)

It is widely accepted that phenotypical changes occur between couples who share protracted sexual activity. Dr. Robert Zajonc had some pretty influential studies back in the 80s that we talked about in my psychology class in college. He had people match a few dozen photos. Half of them were couples as newlyweds all with similar demographics (age, race/ethnicity, etc.) and the other half were the same couples near their 25 year anniversary. The newlywed photo pairings were predominantly random. The 25-year anniversary photos resulted in a major increase to successfully pairing the married partners.

Now, the theory at the time was that this was simply due to lifestyle habits. If one spouse laughs a lot, the other likely will as well, developing similar mouth creases. Or if they have similar diets, they're going to have similar skin tonality and their features will develop in similar ways according to those diets.

Is it possible that there's a genotypical effect in addition to the phenotypical one? Sure. But the evidence is spotty, at best, and it would require a lot more than a one night stand to have any appreciable impact on the DNA of the woman's eggs to be noticeable - particularly when you compare that to the DNA of the actual father present in the child.

To that end, I work with DNA tests on children all the time. It usually involves women who are in new relationships. For example, if I'm doing a divorce for a woman who was with the same sexual partner (her STBEx husband) for over 20 years and suddenly becomes pregnant with her lover's child (oops!), the DNA test is highly conclusive as to who the father is and the % match between the STBEx husband and the child is not appreciably different from cases where I have done DNA tests involving pregnancy from a one night stand.

In short, although phenotypical adjustments can cause a microevolutionary change within an individual woman, affecting her genetics, I'm simply not persuaded that even 20 years of being with the same sexual partner will have a genotypical impact on the child.

To that end, I will decline to sidebar this without further evidence - but more because it hasn't even passed muster on TRP, which would be the first place you'd expect to find research like this. If TRP approves it and it does end up having more validity to it than what I can find **AND** that there is a fairly conclusive link to our faith in some

way, which I simply don't see yet. I guess I need the explanation spelled out better for how this affects our understanding of Scripture, if true.

Be the Judge

5 upvotes · 19 December 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

This makes sense in some contexts, particularly in a TRP model, but it also makes me wonder from an MRP perspective how AFBB would be such a big concept. Specifically, if the woman can make the rules with her beta (BB) and yet screw Chad on the side (AF), why does Chad having a "high value dick" change anything for her? Women can get sex - even good sex - pretty much whenever they want. The only real question is whether or not screwing Chad is worth whatever else she would be risking (i.e. her beta husband leaving her).

It's not Chad's "high value dick" that's in short supply and high demand - it's unwavering commitment from that high value man that is the unicorn for women. There are plenty of men who can be Chad for a one night stand. But sprinkle commitment into the relationship and either Chad's gone to someone else or Chad becomes a beta.

Be the Judge

5 upvotes · 19 December 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

This works if you have a cudgel. PROTIP, modern man doesn't.

Fair point. In Christianity this works differently, but from a secular perspective you're probably right.

That said, I do know that my wife would be far more devastated from divorce than I would be. The practical aspects are identified in my "Why I'm not afraid of divorce rape" post, which is on the sidebar, and the less mentioned aspect is that it would cause her a great deal of emotional distress and shame and I'd be over it fairly quickly with a "This sucks, but life goes on" attitude - and she knows this (though I refrain from ever explicitly saying it). It's her who won't leave me, not the other way around. I simply won't leave because I don't have to, but there are several grounds in which I would.

argument, consequence, and authority. Explain where in your life you haven't ceded this already?

This probably relates to the distinctions between secular RP and having a Christian faith. There are more eternal consequences and spiritual factors at play that simply don't work or make sense in a secular context, so I'll decline to address them here.

She knows 100% that so long as she can handle your arguments, you will always acquiesce, because you'll never leave her, and never cheat. explain which fancy lawyer words will overcome that ultimate bluff on your part.

To be clear, I don't bluff. More to the point, this caricature about me is based on stereotypes from the Christian label and things I've said out of context. Suffice it to say that I view cheating, for me, as a break of frame and that I have a more flexible standard for divorce (including in the case of a sexually denying spouse) than most people assume when they see the Christian label, although I get there on different grounds than BPP lays out. My flair is simply misleading.

How long into a relationship do you wait to have sex?

5 upvotes · 19 December 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

Personally, I'm a "never before marriage" guy, and my wife and I waited. But for everyone else, ask yourself: *If*

he breaks up with me a week or two after, would I regret having slept with him?

Is This A Good Idea?

5 upvotes · 15 December 2017 · /r/askTRP

How is this even remotely on point here?

Non-covert contracts... just contracts... how to handle?

5 upvotes · 30 November 2017 · /r/askMRP

Assuming by "we are both very religious" you're referring to Christianity, this would be good to post on [r/RPChristians](#). My wife and I are also both very invested in our faith and she has serious hangups from all the anti-sex rhetoric youth and teenagers are given in the church for the first two decades of life. That said, when it comes to dirty talk, an easy way to challenge this is to pressure-flip or employ negative inquiry (I noticed WISNIFG isn't one of the books on your "read" list, yet somehow you skipped over this "prerequisite" and went straight into the 100-level stuff - go back and read it).

Specifically, just ask her, "What's so bad about pillow talk? ... What's so bad about that? ... Why do you believe that's sinful or wrong?" Finish it off with a challenge for her to find you a verse that proves it's sinful. Most people don't understand the freedom Christ is meant to bring, and a rules-oriented life is a lot easier. There's comfort that comes with clear boundaries - and girls are doubly subject to this, given that their only role in a relationship is to follow (whereas Christian men have the dual role of leader in the physical marriage, but follower as part of the bride of Christ, the church). So, even when she's free from rules and boundaries, she naturally wants to place them back on herself. It's easier to live within those confines and accept the guilt and stress that comes with following the rules rather than accepting the reality that no one is trying to control them and they're free to do what they please.

To be clear, this is a lot of what RP is all about. A side-effect of the man becoming OI and developing abundance is that the covert expectations the man once had on his wife are gone. He's setting her free, saying, "You do whatever you want. I'm just going to be awesome. If you want to be awesome with me, climb aboard ... but we're doing it my way." You're not forcing her to do anything any more than Jesus forces us to follow his rules. He simply says, "I'm Jesus. I'm awesome. If you want to follow me, great. If not, go do your own thing - no one's stopping you." Just as the consequence of rejecting Jesus to do your own thing is an eternity separated from Jesus ... so also is the consequence of your wife rejecting you to do her own thing - she can live forever separate from you, and you just go keep being awesome.

I know you're nowhere near there and probably not even moving in that direction, but if you're coming from a religious background, it's vital to realize that your job is not to control or manipulate her into doing what you want her to do; it's for you to do what you want to do and she can do whatever she wants ... and in the process, somewhere along the way, you doing you will make you more attractive so she's more likely to want to do you too. Because spiritual marriage and physical marriage are paralleled in Scripture, the best way to get her to experience the spiritual freedom (i.e. internally from feelings of guilt, shame, etc.) to open up in the bedroom is to emphasize the freedom she has in your marriage. As [/u/justpickanyusername](#) noted, I'm guessing she's not likely to leave you if you stop trying to control her and release your expectations on her. So, getting rid of your covert contracts is going to be key - because that's how she'll learn that God doesn't put any covert contracts on her either, despite the fact that many, many, many church women do assume there are implicit expectations put on them by God that aren't outlined in Scripture - things that bloopers have been teaching them all their lives that simply aren't biblical, they're just things that sounded good to put in a sermon at the time.

As for your contracts: they *actually are covert*. Sure, you had one isolated example of her overtly telling you, "If you do this, then I'll do that." But you have the covert expectation that she will follow through on what she says.

You covertly expect her not to change her mind. You covertly expect her mood to remain reasonably consistent over a span of five minutes. You covertly expect her to think and talk rationally. Now, she might follow through on those things. But she also might not. And you assume that if you act a right, certain way, then all of these expectations you have on her will be met ... *and therefore* her overt statement will be made into an actuality. In her mind, she's really thinking, "You had me revved up 15 minutes ago, but as I started eating I'm just not feeling it anymore ... maybe I can get something out of it so it's not all a waste ... oh, he just did the dishes, but now I'm really tired, having just laid in bed and zoned out to my phone for a while, so I'm really not feeling it at all ... maybe I can just ignore him and he'll give up."

You stopped escalating and started letting her de-escalate. Women are like gravity - their arousal always trends downward and it takes an active influence to prop it back up again.

But here's the biggest mistake you made: she said "Do the dishes and I'll do you" - but for some reason you assumed by nature that you have to be the first one to fulfill your end of the bargain. Screw that. I'm a lawyer. You know how often I advise my clients to fulfill their end of a deal first and just take the other side's word that they're good for it? Never. That's idiotic.

Now, from her perspective, if you get her to fulfill her end of the deal first, even if it is based on some overt contract that you'll do the dishes afterward (which means you're in her frame, by the way, so you're better off just abandoning deals like this in the first place unless you're the one offering them to her). If nothing else, at least you've given her something to look forward to. She realizes she's getting something out of it and is at least a little invested in that outcome. But once you actually do the dishes, she's no longer getting anything out of having sex with you (noting that women don't tend to crave orgasms until after they're already revved up, so when she's cold she doesn't care that she might get off too). This is one of the many reasons why choreplay is an awful, awful, awful sexual strategy. If she already got what she wants, why should she care about making the sex good for you - or even having sex at all in the first place? If she wants nothing from you, she'll give nothing to you to get it. She might not be stopping you from taking from her (i.e. starfish, non-responsiveness, etc.), but she's not going to make the effort herself.

Dark Triad - Narcissism

5 upvotes · 18 November 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

If it helps, the DSM-V defines a narcissist as someone who meets 5 of the following 9 traits:

A grandiose logic of self-importance: This isn't simply thinking you're more valuable than everyone else around you. It means you literally think everyone in your sphere of influence would fall apart if you left them to themselves. You believe people depend on you more than they actually do.

A fixation with fantasies of infinite success, control, brilliance, beauty, or idyllic love: This is the guy who thinks he's going to make millions from the novel he's conceptualized in his head but has never actually started writing; or the homeless man who thinks he has the idea that could revolutionize politics and bring world peace if only he could get into office; or even the blue-pill guy who thinks he's the most romantic guy in the world and every girl would be lucky to have him as a husband because he's so nice and affectionate and different from all the other guys.

A credence that he or she is extraordinary and exceptional and can only be understood by, or should connect with, other extraordinary or important people or institutions: These are the celebrities who only marry other celebrities; the CEOs who don't make eye contact with poor people ... it's also (and more accurately) the common people who think they're so hot/smart/funny/etc. that they *should be hanging out with celebrities* because in their mind they're on that level and no one else gets it, they just can't seem to break through the system that's rigged against them.

A desire for unwarranted admiration: Nuff said.

A sense of entitlement: Not in the typical, "I earned it" manner - but the notion that the world should revolve around you just because you exist. It's literally the attitude of my 5 year old son.

Interpersonally oppressive behavior: A compulsion to ridicule other people, usually in harsh or crass ways; it's often directed toward the weak as easy targets, but the deeper narcissists take this attitude toward their superiors in self-destructive fashion as a means of affirming their own sense of superiority against common sense.

No form of empathy: simply put, you don't give a crap what other people think. My boss recently cited an academic journal that concluded that the narcissist's brain responses and an analysis of behaviors, responses, and comparison testing shows an emotional maturity level consistent with that of an 11-year-old boy.

Resentment of others or a conviction that others are resentful of him or her: This goes beyond the typical, "I don't like that guy" attitude. It's more global, applying to virtually everyone the narcissist comes in contact with (many psychologists hypothesize that a narcissist is incapable of genuine love because of this, but none can agree on how to define love in the first place, so that aspect of the conversation rarely goes much further). No matter who the narcissist is around, the mental focus is on how that person is failing to meet the narcissist's needs, or otherwise how the other person is screwed up for harboring a (non-existent) grudge (because the narcissist thinks other peoples moods and attitudes are always about him)

A display of egotistical and conceited behaviors or attitudes: we've all seen this.

The American Psychiatric Association also notes that narcissists are defined as having substantial impairment in two of the following four qualities:

- **Individuality** - the narcissist's sense of self is defined by what he assumes everyone else is thinking about him, thus lacks a core identity of his own
- **Self-direction** - narcissists usually have no substance behind their delusional perceptions (if they did, they would be thinking rightly, thus wouldn't be narcissists); so, their grandiose ideas about who they are or what they have to offer society never actually amount to anything
- **Empathy** - no concern for the needs or feelings of others
- **Closeness** - inability to pair-bond, develop deep, personal relationships, or foster intimacy with a spouse/SO on an emotional level

With all of that in mind, actually having a narcissistic personality disorder is incredibly destructive. It does make great sexual strategy (they usually have the hottest spouses with insanely crazy sex lives), but it will cripple a man's MAP and prevent him from being able to make any appreciable progress in his mission, as his self-import will consider realistic goals and progress too small and unworthy of his time and effort. He will only pursue that which is generally unattainable - and then blame everyone else when he can't meet his own expectations.

Narcissists have the worst hamsters of all the personality disorders.

That said, as noted in your post, in order for a person to be truly successful in life they must adopt lesser degrees of several narcissistic features - not enough to tick the checkbox on the psychologist's scorecard, but certainly enough to push a person in the right direction. All successful people in life have narcissistic undertones embedded in their personalities.

Narcissistic tendencies don't have value for their own sake. Rather, their success comes from three primary factors: (1) when these traits are appropriately internalized at healthy (or at least "not dangerous") levels weak people recognize they can't compete and back out of the way, reducing competition from people who legitimately

might have stood a chance if they kept playing the game (when at unhealthy levels, the persona is so extreme that even the weak see through it and aren't afraid most of the time); (2) narcissism fosters dominance, which triggers a person's ability to manage and overcome the competition that does stay in the game; and (3) in order to maintain the "marginal narcissist's" sense of self, he becomes a master at charm, which garners incredible levels of popularity and makes people want to be around him.

Preempting the DV charge.

5 upvotes · 14 November 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

As they say, MRP can't fix a marriage

Well, it can fix a marriage, but that's an ancillary benefit if by chance it happens, not the focus.

Wife complains that she feels like I am "leaving her behind".

5 upvotes · 13 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

And she outright refuses to tell me what she's thinking in the moment because she "might regret it".

Check out the 206 post. It addresses why it's important to insist on nipping these things in the bud. First, by letting her refuse to address the issue right then and there, you're operating in her frame by giving her the power to decide when you talk about important issues. Second, by letting her hamster out for even longer, she becomes more and more convinced of the sincerity of her issues, even when they're entirely misguided in the first place. By addressing this up-front you're not only cutting off the problem before it escalates in her mind, but you're also getting to the truth of the matter, rather than having to NI [negative inquiry] your way through several layers of hamstering after she's done and ready. Start the conversation on your terms, not hers.

the problem I'm having, from what I understand, is keeping her in my frame

Because you're still letting her dictate the terms of the relationship, like when it's okay to talk to her about certain things and not.

She is genuinely hurt that I am making positive changes in my life "without her"

This is the golden goose right here:

- "Sure thing, I'll include you in everything. I'm heading to the gym tonight, why don't you come along"
- "I'm going to fix those boards on the deck, want to help me?"
- "I'd like to invite the Smiths over for dinner next week, you mind helping with the cooking?"

Now, she really means she wants to be involved in the decision-making process. But that's only because she's used to taking the lead on all of these things and she's fighting for a return to normalcy. Her push-back is actually a good thing.

But if you can reframe her objection into something where she can feel included as your helper, and she's actually willing to join in on your improvement by improving herself alongside you ... well, why not?

I seriously found a gem with her guys ... we are VERY different in many ways

She's not a gem or else you wouldn't be here. This type of ONEitis is what's keeping you in her frame. ONEitis is probably the single most important issue that kills a man's frame. If you believe she's unique among women, then

the rules do not apply to her. You're always going to come up with some excuse for why she's not falling into your frame and you'll never internalize your own frame. This turns into a series of victim pukes about how a perfect little angel is somehow a vicious monster, "But's just this one area - everything else is perfect." Don't believe the lie. Even if you have someone in the top 1%, she has the same base operating system working beneath the flashy exterior and outward displays.

As for being "VERY different in many ways" - if you were referencing how you and she are very different, welcome to the club. My wife and I are about as complete opposites as possible. But if you mean your situation is different from what other married couples go through, think again. 1 Cor. 10:13 says otherwise.

I have "changed" for the better about 50 times since we've been together (9 years), and it lasts days to weeks at most

This is why I had ruiz post his blurb on addiction as 202. You're stuck in the perpetual inspiration/motivation cycle without ever escaping into transformation. You're not letting the Gospel change you internally, so your external behaviors keep relapsing.

This will be addressed in 400-level content. Sorry to all who I keep saying this to: I really do plan to get there, I've just been busier than planned, which keeps me from putting up as much content as I'd like.

I really went through some dark stuff and have done things to her I'd rather not say

We can't do much to help without knowing what's going on, but suffice it to say that the answer is usually OYS and move on. Confess your faults, put it out in the open rather than dancing around the issue. Let her choose how to respond to it. If she chooses to forgive you and move on, don't let her take that back. God doesn't look kindly on those who only pretend to be gracious and forgiving; it's got to be genuine and you can hold her to that.

If she eventually admits that she lied and she never really forgave you, then you've got a bigger problem on your hands that might mean escalating to a main event.

She is already well aware of alot of RP principles ... I have always felt a need to explain things or clarify to her

Dang ... that sucks. Huge, yet irreversible mistake. This is why RP often says: *Women don't want to have you explain the rules of the game to them; they just want you to play the game and to show them that you understand how to win.*

i'd welcome any advice that comes my way.

I get the impression you haven't adopted a mission outside the marriage yet - one that you can both venture toward together. Go read (or re-read) 108 on the lifepath of a relationship. You're showing clear signs of swinging back and forth between the upper-left and lower-right quadrants with a lot of regression happening to deal with the negative implications of your forward progress. Get your mission and plow forward to get the relationship working again.

Hypergamy for the Married Man

5 upvotes · 9 November 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

This conversation shows a severe ignorance of Christianity based on modern day stereotypes. I think you're listening to what blue pill pastors say rather than what the Bible actually says. In the same way you reject much of what blue pill scientists say about intergender relational dynamics on the grounds that they're not looking at the

actual facts and they're getting their information from bad sources (i.e. asking women rather than observing their behaviors), so also do RP aware Christians reject what pastors say about intergender relational dynamics when they're not looking at the actual facts and preaching their own subjective ideologies rather than what the Bible actually says.

[/u/_degenerate_](#): Doctrine that denounces evolution

That's not part of biblical doctrine. I can't find a state based on Christianity as a whole, but 78% of white mainline protestants believe in evolution as either a natural process or a process guided by God (44% of black protestants). Looking at white Catholics even, that number is 68% (as [/u/BluepillProfessor](#) alluded to). Among the unaffiliated Christians, it's 76%. Personally, I do believe God utilized evolutionary processes as a means of creating the world, and the Bible doesn't say anything that contradicts "a praxeology focused on the effects of evolutionary biology." Even to the degree that I may at some point end up differing as to the source of a particular impulse among humans, I don't deny those impulses and their existence.

You can't "not care" and "care with a religious fervor" simultaneously.

A primary theme throughout the Bible is to reject any care for what other humans think of you or what happens to your relationships. "If I were still trying to please man, I would not be a servant of Christ" (Galatians 1:10). "Man," there, is in the general and includes my wife. "From now on, let those who have wives live as though they had none" (1 Cor. 7:29) - meaning our lives should be centered around our mission without regard for our spouses as some emotional center.

One also can't have abundance mentality when the choice is always limited to "the one" by virtue of faith.

The Bible doesn't preach anything about "the one" or having a soulmate. That's a myth created by Calvinists who like to circle jerk about God having one predetermined path for everyone. But because that path is unknowable, even if there was such thing as a soulmate, you'd never know if you found her, making the whole concept moot in the first place.

As noted in [this comment on this thread](#), "I've even told my wife to her face (not that I recommend this) that if she died or left me I would not be crushed, as it would make it easier to pursue my mission without dragging her along."

a permanent union of "one man, one woman."

The Bible never preached "one man, one woman." In truth, most cultures through Bible times specifically permitted polygamy, including Israel, and the only time the Bible references a man only having one wife is for a deacon in the church (1 timothy 3:12). Given that this command is not extended elsewhere, the presumption (as many Christians agree) is that if a man can afford to support multiple wives and lives in a society where polygamy is not illegal, then he's free to go for it.

Now, here's the thing - TRP hates it when the media looks at all the noob haters, singles them out and says, "Look how awful everyone associated with that group is!" And every month or two TRP has to put up a post saying, "If you are here because of our CNN coverage, we're not really like that; don't just us all by the few bad eggs we have here."

I'm going to say the same thing about Christianity. Sure, there are a lot of bad eggs. But unlike most secular forums, our faith is not defined by what pastors preach on Sunday mornings. It's defined by what the Bible says. So, if you find something in Scripture that's contrary to RP praxeology, let me know - I'd love to see it and

discuss that on RPC (and I'm not denying that there may be some conflicts). But don't express ignorance by speaking from stereotypes as if they define our faith.

Wife addicted to weaponized sex; impending divorce

5 upvotes · 6 November 2017 · /r/askMRP

6 weeks was the longest I think

Hah! Try 18 months ... then after that reading up on RP and realizing I had to set all of my resentment, frustration and anger aside if I wanted to become attractive again. That was not an easy pill to swallow - probably the hardest of all the RP lessons I had to accept. But it works.

Wife addicted to weaponized sex; impending divorce

5 upvotes · 6 November 2017 · /r/askMRP

she went ice queen over sth, shut down the sex, I withdrew and got busy

When I read this from most guys, I get the image that he tries to initiate, she says no, and he says something fairly innocuous (or nothing at all) and just leaves. Maybe this is you, maybe it's not, but it falls under the other kind of butthurt.

- Butthurt 1: Aggressive - Guy gets emotionally aggravated at the rejection and picks a fight.
- Butthurt 2: Passive-Aggressive - Guy represses his emotional aggravation at the rejection and withdraws.

In both cases her actions have sparked an emotional response, which proves to her that she has the ability to control you. She can't control which type of butthurt you'll express, but she knows she can get to you all the same - and that's all that matters for her to keep her power.

The solution is that you *literally have to stop caring*. It cannot be just an act. At first it will be an act, but *fake it til you make it*. If you express any emotional response to her rejection she's going to see it as a sign of weakness and keep pushing that button whenever it advantages her to do so.

At the same time, when you punish your wife (whether by being emotionally aggressive or emotionally repressive) when either one of you initiates sex, you're conditioning her to see sexual initiation as a danger zone where she is likely to feel emotional pain of one form or another. So, she'll do what she can to avoid that initiation in the first place in order to stay safe. That's why you probably get the "I'm tired" or "I have a headache" line approximately 5-10 minutes before she heads off to bed - just in time to cut you off from trying something before she walks into the room where sex happens (and shame on you if you let her go on thinking that the bedroom is the only room where sex happens).

The only real way to avoid being butthurt is literally to act like nothing happened and continue offering to let her live alongside your awesome life. She says no? "Cool, another night. Want to drink some wine and do a puzzle then?" I used to be super emotionally repressive against my wife (i.e. passive-aggressive butthurt) when she would deny me or show "duty sex" signs. Result? Even after discovering RP and trying to initiate, at first she would shrivel up into a ball and cry about how I must be so mad at her for saying no. Is that how I want her reacting when I try to have sex with her? No, so I'd respond, "If I were mad at you, would I do this ...?" and then I'd make out with her for 30 seconds, feel her up a bit, then walk away.

Eventually every denial was met with that kind of attitude. **I showed her that her denial had no impact on my emotional state.** Guess what happened? She stopped trying to manipulate me with denials. When she realized I was happy and fine without getting sex from her and that she couldn't get to me - even with her balled-up feelz

(i.e. guilt-tripping me into compliance), she started trying different approaches to getting her way ... but sexual denial reduced significantly as one of those methods.

My Revelation of Manhood

5 upvotes · 3 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Great to hear your story and see some serious progress! For many of us, "a few times a week" is a world of difference from where we once were.

I have committed myself to changing, for myself, but also primarily for God

This is a beautiful line - one that we would all do well to remember. Any time it's *for her* or *for sex*, that's what makes our world fall apart.

going to pick up woodworking

This is totally awesome. One of the guys I disciplined years ago took up woodworking as his primary hobby a few years ago. It's amazing how much he enjoys it, while also it being something where he can make some useful things for around the house or cash from selling his projects. Props to you for having a productive hobby!

My hobby is (no surprise) *writing*. I've just never made much of an effort to submit my books to literary agents, so I've never really gotten anything published yet, thus no personal return. I either need to find something more productive to enjoy as a hobby or actually buckle down, finish some hard revisions, and start querying agents!

Having a hard time with this reality.

5 upvotes · 24 October 2017 · /r/askMRP

I don't think this situation can be fully understood without delving into the spiritual aspect of things (i.e. more on your mother's religious views), but that would inherently require some talk of "right/wrong" and I'll avoid that here.

Suffice it to say that humans have a base impulse to do certain things. Sometimes it's to eat. Other times it's to drink water. Other times it's to have sex with a random stranger. Other times it's to have sex with your own spouse. One of the things that makes humans unique among virtually all other animals is that we have the ability to deny these base instincts/impulses.

Similar to what /u/ReddJive said, "AWALT" means that the base impulse is there. But again, humans can choose to act against those impulses. Some women are highly self-controlled and will be faithful until death. Others will not be. That self-control can come from religious influences, it can come from fear of consequences, it can come from psychological barriers, or from societal conditioning. Whatever the source, it's there.

The thing is, you never know which woman is the high-self-controlled woman from the one who only pretends to have a lot of self-control. On TRP, most men are trying to get in a girl's pants on the first date or two. As a result, they're finding women with low self-control. It makes sense, then, that they just assume all women will *actually cheat* because their primary interactions are with women who don't have the self-control to resist cheating.

On MRP you're probably going to find a different narrative. We're around women (our wives) who have probably demonstrated significant self-control over long periods of time. So, although we acknowledge that they have the impulse to cheat, for many of us we have additional security that our wives will exercise self-control against that impulse. That security comes from personal experience and observation with her.

That said, I can also recite example after example after example of women who had the outward experience to the rest of the world of being upright, faithful, self-controlled women - even those who had high positions of status in the church and were faithfully teaching people about the Bible every week ... and some of these women

cheat. The point here is that there will always be some doubt about whether a particular woman actually has the requisite self-control to withhold cheating or not, and if so whether or not she will exercise it. Within that gray area, you're going to have to make an assumption.

To that end, it comes down to a matter of utility. Which one is more useful: (a) assuming she might cheat? or (b) assuming she will never cheat on you? If you assume she won't cheat, you're setting yourself up for failure. There are pretty much no benefits to this assumption (or very few/nominal ones), but great risk. In the alternative, assuming that she *might be the cheating type* encourages you to be a better man, to take caution in the relationship, etc., while it has virtually no negative repercussions. Between the two, it makes more sense to follow the useful assumption over the useless one - even if the assumption ends up being wrong at the end of the day. After all, if you become a better man in order to keep your wife attracted to you to help her exercise that type of self-control to keep her from cheating, even if she wasn't going to cheat in the first place do you really think she's going to be ticked at you for this?

How does this advice change for dating?

5 upvotes · 18 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I see that this sub is aimed at marriage. Im very, very single.

No fret at all. Here's the thing: RP is sexual strategy. The Bible says we shouldn't be having sex outside of marriage. So, there are only two circumstances where a Christian should be applying RP as a sexual strategy:

- When already married
- When looking to build a foundation for an eventual marriage

In your case, the latter function applies to you. So, RP will apply more toward who you should be now in order to prepare yourself and your eventual spouse for a long, satisfying, sex-filled marriage.

With that in mind, RPC delves beyond rote sexual strategy into addressing biblical masculinity as a whole, which applies even to singles who do not intend to marry.

skeletons in my closet. I have no idea how to be a good enough person or have the dedication to not succumb to sin.

You can't just will-power your way into sinlessness. Period. Only Jesus saves from sin. Only once you're actually "saved" can Jesus begin chipping away at your life problems. It doesn't matter what your skeletons are. "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just and will forgive us our sins and purify us from **ALL** unrighteousness" (1 John 1:9). Sure, you're still going to fail. But are you sinning intentionally or because you lack the self-control necessary to stay on the straight and narrow?

Good news: RPC is probably the only place in the Christian universe (at least as far as I know) where you're actually going to learn effective strategies for biblical self-control. More on that in the 400-series, but for now things like "STFU" and stoicism and just generally becoming a man will seriously help with this. Also, see the 202 post on conquering addiction.

i have no problem being honest about my faults

That's good. You're not going to get very far here if you're faking.

I have validation issues that obviously have to be addressed as well.

Validation usually comes from caring too much about what other people think about you. [/u/macmeeler](#) just put up a great post yesterday on the topic of helping to sift through whose opinions matter and whose you can chuck out the window. The most important verse reference on point is Galatians 1:10 - if you live to get the approval of people, you'll never be capable of walking with Christ.

How do i "date well" without being steam rolled by some good girl church girl who expects a BP beta bucks?

I'll make a post on this in the next couple days. Long story short, physical marriage between men and women parallels spiritual marriage with Christ. The same parallel applies to pre-marriage relationships. The Bible doesn't say much about this from a physical perspective, but it does have a lot to say about the pre-salvation process: *Evangelism*. Go learn how Jesus draws his bride to himself and do likewise. More on that to come.

Also, i am hoping some of have been in my shoes in terms of my position with religion.

I know countless people who have lived where you're at. Your presence is welcome and you are not alone!

Any wisdom at all would be great. I struggle with myself on a daily basis now and its only getting darker.

Not to parrot the obvious, but start by lifting. It sounds like you're not overweight or anything, which is good - but are you actually *built* or just "not out of shape"? What's your bench, squat, deadlift, etc.? Read 101 and 203 on the sidebar.

Do you have a mission in life - preferably one from God, where you can invite a woman to live alongside you as your helper? Read 108.

Do you have the proper frame of mind to understand how the feminist imperative has permeated the church and the strength to stand against it and the wisdom to cultivate desire through your strength rather than supplication? Read 102, 103, 107.

Are you a skilled leader who people follow, or are you desperately clinging onto the few people who are okay with associating with you? Read 204, 205.

Are you living like Jesus lived and learning to grow in your faith from that of a spiritual child to one who eats meat and labors for the Kingdom? Read the 300 series.

I'm writing these things for a reason ;)

Another threat is coming

5 upvotes · 11 October 2017 · [/r/askMRP](#)

Since [/u/matrixtospartanatLV](#) summoned me ...

Is this pattern of her wanting out of the marriage during or close to ovulation normal?

Yes, it means that she wants to screw someone but can't bear the thought of screwing you, so she wants out.

Thoughts on best approach?

Start recording one normal, peaceful conversation every 1-2 days. If she ever files for divorce and alleges acts of violence to get a protection order, you play those recordings and say, "Does this sound like the voice of someone

who's terrified of me?" If you have the diligence for it, more recordings is always better.

More to your pattern, despite what you say your pattern of action shows that you've made her your emotional center. You need to find a mission in life outside the marriage. Women were designed to be helpers and arm candy. That's what they want more than anything. They don't want to be the precious stone Indiana Jones is searching for - they want to be the girl adventuring alongside him, helping him find it. Make her your stone and you've just lost your marriage. Find another stone and invite her on the adventure and you're giving her an opportunity to fulfill her internal imperative, which is the only way she can be satisfied in the marriage.

Once you have a mission, start getting in shape to fulfill that mission. That starts with physical shape (also: doing physical things a la OYS). Then it's emotional shape (master stoicism and frame), and finally: mental shape (keep up the reading).

After a month or two of making headway with the physical, mental, and emotional trifecta, you should start to demonstrate leadership toward fulfilling your mission. That mission can't be marriage-centered. That never works. If your mission is "make a lot of money, have a great house, raise good kids, etc." then you're not going to make much headway. Those are the things all women want inherently anyway (i.e. provision, beta comforts). That just comes off as being a beta-appeaser. Sure, you can have those things too, but you have to show her that you have higher interests than hers, and that you're capable of pursuing them.

Then invite her to help. Once you've mastered the trifecta and have made progress on the mission, she should (ideally) be hooked on your mission and want to join you in it. This is where true relational intimacy will happen for her - not from getting her needs and comforts satisfied, but by living your life on a mission alongside you. That's what she craves. Would Indiana Jones' girl have been happier if immediately after they met he quit his journey to buy a house and settle down as a professor? No, the adventure is what caused her to go crazy over him. That's what solidified the bonding.

I want to keep the marriage intact.

Above is how.

Sleeping Naked

5 upvotes · 5 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

If human...harsh man

Haha, yeah. The rule used to be that they had to stay in their own beds all night. My wife started caving and letting them sleep in our room if they came in before I went to bed, but she knew I didn't approve of them being in the bed. So, it turned into: "If you want a bed, go to your own. Otherwise, you get the floor."

Sleeping Naked

5 upvotes · 5 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Haha, that'd be too much like work.

The Challenge of A Hot Wife

5 upvotes · 2 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

hot Christian woman marry guys for their "potential" only to find herself disappointed his lack of ambition in realizing it

So, so true. That, or they marry him for alleged spiritual maturity because of positional leadership titles (pastor,

elder, etc.) thinking that'll make him a great husband, only to find the opposite.

"somehow I convinced her to marry a scrub like me!" as if it were something to brag about

They're bragging about how humble they are. I hate it when guys do this. Also, when I was dating my wife (granted, a decade ago), I once made a comment like this and she immediately shut that up, saying it would be embarrassing to her if other people perceived her as dating beneath her. Girls don't like it when their guys say things like it, and guys look like wusses when they do it.

Having a top tier SMV wife means that not only Chad, but Chadzilla, is your competition.

So true. It rings true for being a top-tier guy too, though ;)

mate guarding ... you legitimize the threat as credible in her eyes

This is wise.

cucked

That's the word that got your post removed initially, fyi.

Overall, great post. Thanks for sharing this! I'm married to what I'd call an 8.5. I've definitely seen a lot of this happen at different times in our marriage. When you say, "error if we assume that just by virtue of her faith such a Christian wife is immune" - I completely agree. I've seen this happen too many times in my job (one even went lesbian for a time, after her husband cheated on her with a little boy - church drama at its worst!). But couple that with a borderline sexually repressive psychosis from the anti-sexuality agenda some Christians are raised in ... and that's pretty much a guarantee she's not gonna cheat ;p Fortunately, I've made some solid progress over the years. Still working at that one, though.

Bitchy mood

5 upvotes · 30 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

The withdrawal of attention is better applied in a grand-scheme sort of way. You withdraw by scheduling other activities. On a particular day, you don't go into silence mode and just ignore her. That comes off as being butt-hurt. You're better off holding fame and having a good time in the midst of her bad mood. That's actually the best way to pull someone out of their funk anyway.

To be clear, you have to figure out your goal: (1) do you want to have fun tonight? Or (2) do you want to make it obvious you're trying to teach her a lesson?

Why are they so defensive?

5 upvotes · 12 September 2017 · /r/askTRP

Women are highly sensitive to "fakers." They like the illusion that their man is "the real deal." The notion that a man could practice some techniques from a book to get into a woman's pants is offensive to her (therefore making her defensive, per your question) because it threatens her ability to find "Mr. Perfect." She'll never know if she's dating a true Chad or a chump who knows how to look like Chad until she's emotionally invested in the relationship.

[/u/BluepillProfessor](#) just made a post about this [here](#), specifically describing how men are made, not born - and that women instinctively reject this and want to find "naturals," while simultaneously faking it themselves. Your answer is described there in more detail.

Picking the right attorney

5 upvotes · 8 September 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

a client doesn't actually know their own case's weaknesses

Very true. When I'm interviewing the client, I never ask it directly that way. Instead, I ask: "What are the things you think your spouse is going to say about you to get ahead?" 99% of the time the guy can rattle off a million things his wife is going to say about him - but he never would have identified those things as weaknesses directly because in his mind they're not true, so they're not actual weaknesses. But everyone knows what their wife will complain about and what she's likely to lie about.

It depends

Indeed - and I always play out each scenario for them. "If this, then that ... but if this instead, then that instead ..." etc. That way they know what all the options are and we can start figuring out how to frame the case in a way that best suits his goals. For custody stuff, though, 90% of the time the discovery is worthless. As you note, that's more for financials, which is really where I shine.

flat fee

It is doable in divorce law as long as you do it by stages of the process. I tested it out once and it went something like this:

- To do all the initial filings, open the case, set up a case plan, and get through the first pretrial, it will be \$w.
- To conduct discovery, possibly do a deposition, handle all the other hearings up to trial, set up a balance sheet, run support calcs, etc. it will be \$x.
- To engage in settlement conversations at any phase of the process, it will cost \$y.
- To go through trial, it will cost \$z.

I don't quote appeals costs until just before trial because I need to know where the current is rolling to figure out what arguments we'd likely have to make. But, the one case where I did do this flat fee scenario it worked out quite well. I ended up charging a total of \$30,000-ish for the entire case, my client got what he wanted. For one phase I went over budget (i.e. I spent more time than I was paid for) and for the other two I was under budget, altogether getting paid about \$1,500 more than if I were to have charged hourly. The client was happy because he didn't have to bear the risk of it being more and he knows I'm motivated to work efficiently rather than just chatting him up during client meetings to get a few extra dollars.

50/50 v. OYS/Value

5 upvotes · 8 September 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Yeah, beds are a sensitive subject for most women. The *marriage bed* is a sacred symbol to them. In my BP days, when I was just starting to make changes, I had a lot of resentment against her for the sexlessness of our marriage, so I would sleep in the basement instead. This infuriated her. Now, biblically, sex is *the actual defining factor of a marriage*. So, it didn't make sense to me that sleeping in the same bed was more important to her a symbol of *the marriage* than having sex was. Instead, I took the attitude (without ever verbalizing it), "I'm not recognizing your symbol until you recognize mine." It certainly didn't work (I didn't have the frame for it at the time).

Nowadays I just tell her I'll sleep wherever I want. If I'm in the basement, it might be because I want to withdraw my presence in response to something she's done. Or maybe I just like clonking out to Netflix once in a while. If

she wants to feel warm and fuzzy when I do sleep in our bedroom, great - I'm happy she can feel that way. If she wants to get all butthurt because I felt like sleeping in the basement, that's her business. I no longer give decision-making weight to her ideology of the *marriage bed* as some sacred thing, which means I'm also not tying my sexuality with her to it either, covert contracts be broken. The trick was getting her to realize this shift, as I had for far too long ingrained a clear pattern that sleeping in the basement = "He's mad at me."

Can RPChristians use real dread?

5 upvotes · 5 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Sorry for the auto-mod there.

just as we are instructed to take the admonition to cut off your hand and pluck out your eye

I actually do think he meant this passage literally, but he's saying it to prove a point. It's always said, "It's better to do this than to burn" - a point you well make about 1 Cor. 7:9. In short, he's saying, "If you could save yourself by cutting off your hand, you should do it." I think he means that literally - but then he concludes with the requirement to be perfect, thus saying, "But you can't save yourself by doing that" and in the following chapters concludes that he is actually the only way to salvation.

As to that 1 Cor. 7:9 point, though - absolutely brilliant. I've noticed that the Greek was missing the "with passion" part, but hadn't thought about it being double entendre.

Dread levels

Agreed on all counts. That said, in some of my past comments on spinning plates for Christians, I do believe 7 and 8 can be hit safely without causing serious spiritual problems - but only if the guy is spiritually mature enough that he's not controlled by temptation. I start conversations with hot girls all the time. But this falls within a few boundaries:

- I know I'm not going to succumb to temptation.
- I have a clear cut-off point (usually it's before getting a number, though that didn't stop the girl at the Greek drive through from offering it)
- Because the guy I want to be is friendly and likable and not afraid to talk to strangers or high-value people (after all, that's how I get ahead in my career), so by extension that means I have to be approaching other high value people, and for men women are usually higher value than other men, with regard to our own perception
- Because minor conversations help maintain an abundance mentality when done in moderation

Dread Level 22

Haha

Hi Gals, Here are some really cute ~60's Vintage videos. Here are a couple.

5 upvotes · 31 August 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

Death note is great (slightly disappointed with the new netflix movie, though) ... but I think she was talking to the other commenter.

Fiance is away for 3 years, need advice

5 upvotes · 30 August 2017 · /r/askMRP

The break up talks have been because I hate the distance, no mention of the other larger issues

Does she know you're not happy with the sex? If the answer is yes, then she's associating that with every single other thing you complain about as well, whether you bring up sex at the time or not. In her mind, if she improved the sex you wouldn't be complaining about the distance - it'd be worth it to you. So, in her mind it's still an ultimatum even if you're not self-aware enough to realize that's what you're doing. I put it that way because that's really your agenda too. If you were getting amazing hot sex out of her, my guess is you'd be having a lot less breakup talks about "the distance."

Maybe we have grown apart

This is cultural conditioning on how the world wants you to view relationships. I'd love to hear a solid explanation of the "grow closer" or "grow apart" model of understanding relationships that makes sense. Relationships are a lot simpler than this emotional voodoo would have you believe. There are inputs and outputs, on switches and off switches. Unless she has a mental health problem, there are no complicated relationships - there are only complicated people who defy logic within a relationship.

idea of the man she wants me to be to present to her family and social media, and I don't fit the mold

That's a good thought. Run with it. 99.9% of single women are less interested in who they're marrying than they are in the concept of being married. They love the idea of being a wife more than they love the guy who, by relational definition, makes them a wife. This is why so many people end up divorced.

She looks at what other couples have, and they have completely different lives that don't apply to our situation

Some light reading on the comparison game/trap.

I don't get why she doesn't want to break up when I feel so unimportant to her

You're free support. Imagine you owned a shoe store. You get a crush on one of the regulars, so you start giving her shoes for free. She has so many of your shoes that you see her just tossing them on the street after wearing them only once or twice. Then you one day say, "I don't get why she won't just quit shopping here. She would obviously like the shoes at another store better, as my shoes are clearly unimportant to her."

When you give away your attention and affection for free, she doesn't value it - but why not keep getting it? After all, it's better to get mediocre attention for free than better attention and have to pay for it *when you're not living in abundance*. When she improves her life circumstance and has some abundance to live off of, then she'll leave your cheap crappy shoes and go somewhere else and start paying - and she might even try to keep you on the hook to get the occasional crummy pair again, when she's in a bind or in need of a quick fix.

Your solution? You can change the rules and start demanding payment before giving her more shoes. But if this is done all at once she'll say, "Screw that" and leave.

You can start thinning your shelves. Keep some of the better shoes to yourself and only give her the ones you know probably wouldn't sell anyway (i.e. only give her affection when it's easy and convenient and low-cost for you to do so). Withdraw your attention/affection gradually so you're not rewarding her for bad behavior and you have more time to invest on improving yourself.

A third option, and my preferred method is to custom tailor a whole new line of shoes that's far superior to what the other shoe stores are selling. Display them prominently in the windows so other women walking by take notice and begin window shopping. When she tries to take those shoes for free, you say, "No, that's a special line.

I don't just give those away. You can take some of these old scraps like you've been doing, but since I'm not making those anymore they won't be around much longer [i.e. ease into it]." She'll probably take a few more freebies and ignore the high-quality line you're now producing for a while. But in time she's going to want it. She's going to butter up to you to try to get it for free and you're going to stand firm. Eventually she's going to realize, "Crap, I can't get free shoes anywhere anymore. So, do I pay a fair price for shoes elsewhere or do I pay a fair price with the guy who's been good to me and now has better shoes than the other stores are offering?" Her answer doesn't matter because if she's out the door, you've already got back orders and your product is sold out for months.

To be clear, I'm not suggesting attraction can be negotiated. No matter how hard you try, you can't convince her that the crummy shoes you've been giving away are really high-quality ones she should be pining over. I'm also not suggesting you should barter for sex - even overtly. Trying to barter for sex will only cause it to feel like a duty and not genuine desire. In that scenario, she's manipulating you with sex to get what she wants. What I am suggesting is that there is a relational dynamic where women will do just about anything to get what they want - and if you become what they want or have what they want, then she'll do anything for you. But if you give away what she wants from you for free, you make it cheap and worthless and she won't want it because it (you) have no value to her.

Fiance is away for 3 years, need advice

5 upvotes · 30 August 2017 · /r/askMRP

she has had oneitis for me ... I was happy leaving her for the last girl, and she sucked me back in.

I'm pretty sure you've got oneitis for her. Otherwise no amount of "sucking" could get you back in if you were really ready to move on.

~~She is loyal~~ I'm the highest value man she can get right now.

FTFY

Are there some obvious questions I can ask myself / her to help me get more clarity on the situation?

Asking her questions is pointless. She doesn't understand the situation. All you'll get is her perception of what she wants, which will be a regurgitation of what her social conditioning has told her she should want, then she'll butter you up long enough to placate you once more and repeat the cycle.

There's only one question that matters here and it's one you need to ask yourself: *What do you want to do?* It's literally that easy.

She is currently too busy to give me much attention, and I understand

What is it you think you understand here? That's a serious question that needs to be answered.

I don't think she would cheat or leave me

... because she hasn't found a higher value man who she can "suck" in (yet).

Her libido doesn't exist.

If that's an important issue to you and you're not married yet, why are you still with her? I'm guessing the answer is because she "sucks" you back in - putting on the high-libido facade for just long enough to placate you. Don't be an idiot. Either that or her emotions are simply too powerful for you. "But guys, she was crying!" My kids cry

all the time too. "I don't care, go to your room."

I've been reading and studying a lot.

Not enough. If you'd read NMMNG (literally the first book on sidebar) you'd have the answers to all of these things.

since I bought the ring last year

The ring doesn't mean you're married. It means that at one point you wanted to marry her. If that's not still the case, the ring means nothing - it is no longer a symbol of commitment and she must legally return it (it's a conditional gift where she has not fulfilled the condition).

I love her, but ...

No, you experience what social conditioning has told you is love. Stop that.

I don't know if I will find one as loyal

If the jester sat on the king's throne and kicked the king off to his bedroom everyday and the jester proceeded to rule the country - who is loyal to who here? She's certainly not loyal to you. She just hasn't cheated on you (yet). Maybe she never will cheat on you - but that's not loyalty. Loyalty is about more than just sex. Finding that one in a million girl who won't cheat on you (yet) isn't some major gold-mine. You're sacrificing a lot for a false ideology.

I'm dating two MGTOW.

5 upvotes · 30 August 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

/u/pinkipadcase - this is key. RP guys tend to ream girls for the "It just happened" or "It just so happens" rationalization. It has become cliché. It doesn't "just so happen" that you get along with both of them - you responded to their invitation, you engaged with them, you made an effort to get along with them, and now that effort has given you options. This isn't an accident that "just happened." Don't be one of those women. You seem to have a good head on you :) Try to erase "just happens/ed" from your vocabulary.

Filed today.

5 upvotes · 29 August 2017 · /r/askMRP

That's nice propaganda, but try telling that to her lawyer and you'll get a good laugh. The divorce is on **EDIT: her the law's** [that was an idiotic typo] terms and you owe her what the judge says you owe her. That doesn't mean you're powerless in the process, but you're going to lose big if you go in with the mentality you're proposing.

Your wife is a whore and you should divorce her

5 upvotes · 24 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Expect? No. Hope? Yes. I usually take the mantra: *Hope for the best, expect the worst*. The question at hand, though, is not one of desire, hope or expectation. It is one of appropriate response in the wake of any unmet vow. But we're also probably really off topic at this point anyway :p

Your wife is a whore and you should divorce her

5 upvotes · 24 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I'd refer someone to the book of Hosea. God told Hosea to marry a prostitute. She cheated on him constantly. Her pimp starts sending her back to all her old clients even after the wedding, so Hosea has to buy her off the

pimp. Then she keeps going back of her own accord and he has to rope her back in.

The book exists to show ancient Israel how God felt when his people were constantly leaving him for false gods and worldly pleasures. Other passages clarify the nature of how God deals with these people. In some circumstances he drops them like a rock. Other times he remains faithful to them and draws them back to himself.

with a "whore wife" its not about sex. thats the part you are not seeing.

What's it about then?

Your wife is a whore and you should divorce her

5 upvotes · 24 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

What do they say about assumptions?

Why I'm not afraid of divorce rape - and how to get yourself there too.

5 upvotes · 15 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Too many questions for a full answer, which is why these things usually go through a 2-3 hour long initial consult (we charge \$200 for this).

But here are the following assumptions I'm making:

- No health care cost [I know, an idiotic assumption, but roll with it]
- No child care costs
- Marriage duration of over 15 years
- Kids are under 14
- Your K1 income is subject to self-employment tax (combined income for you is \$460k)
- Court imputes her to 40hrs/wk = \$80k
- Income disparity negates the parenting time offset, so no child support deviation (this doesn't actually hurt you; it just shifts money from spousal support to child support, which actually advantages you)
- Your ownership interest in the company is entirely marital and from active appreciation
- She files head of household, you file single

With all of that in mind:

- Running a quick tax calculation, \$10k/mo in spousal support and \$621.62/mo in child support creates a 58/42 split. Depending on your county, this could go up or down to a 60/40 or 55/45, so this is somewhere in the middle.
 - If I run the same numbers with no child support, the \$10k/mo spousal support would create a 60/40 split, which most judges would accept (this is closer to a state-wide norm; it's my county that uniquely pushes for a 55/45 or 50/50).
- All assets would be split 50/50, including your interest in the company.

The Courts in my state will take the following justifications for this type of conclusion:

- The statutes specifically state that there shall be a presumption of equal contribution to the marriage, even if that equal contribution is not financial in nature. As a result, contribution to the care of the home, raising kids, etc. is deemed to be equal for so long as you remain together, even if you don't believe it's equal.
- If you ever believe she is not contributing equally, it is your responsibility to file for divorce or legal separation in order to prevent getting taken advantage of. If you fail to do this, the presumption of equal contribution stands, as your continuation in the marriage is an implicit communication to your wife that she may rely on the equal contribution law.

This type of rationale would make more sense to me if my state permitted post-nuptial agreements. Then, if an income disparity started to creep up or was on the horizon, the parties could agree after marriage how to address it rather than forcing a husband to get divorced to protect his prospect of finances. Unfortunately, that's not the law yet. So, the legal separation, but continue living together route is the next best thing.

Thank you from a SF Bay Area Christian

5 upvotes · 12 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

"that was descriptive of the apostolic times, but not prescriptive for church today"

I never understood that argument. Paul references Adam and Eve for his reasoning for why he gives the prescription he does. In doing so, he's saying two things: (1) This is how God designed it, and (2) Even as culture has changed over the last 4,000 years (from Adam to Paul), this truth has remained consistent and should still be applied today. Somehow we have the gall to say, "Yeah, but we're 2,000 years later now ... Paul agreed to a 4,000 year structure, but if it was 6,000+ he would have changed his mind."

the cognitive dissonance is hard to reconcile.

It shouldn't be hard at all. He is personally a Christian. His church is an institution. As a result, in his personal life he follows what the Bible says. When he steps into an institutionalized role, cultural concerns take over because institutions must function within culture.

Stop treating the church like an institution and treat it like a fellowship of individuals with a common purpose and you'll see more consistency. But this means giving up control over success. Institutions function very well in western society. After all, it's western society's model for success. Interestingly, if you look at the Christian Church in other countries that don't follow a capitalistic model of government, you'll find that churches are more fellowship-driven and not as institutionalized - especially where the government persecutes the church, because there's no incentive for the church to appease culture if it is guaranteed to fail.

many women that are in their 30s that are having a difficult time finding a good spouse for themselves

That's because alpha is what gets you in the door, but the church preaches beta.

Therefore, given the dating marketplace, there is a lot more demand than there is supply. I don't see it getting any better in the near future.

The good news for men is that we don't need to find a pre-made mature, godly woman. We really just need to find *a Christian woman* and lead her into godliness. We become responsible for her growth (1 Cor. 11:3). In reverse, a woman doesn't have the God-given role/authority to find *any man* and lead him into Christ-likeness. This option exists, but it's working against the grain of God's intended design. So, a truly godly Christian woman is in a tough spot because finding someone who is more spiritually mature than her who can lead her will be very difficult. This is true anywhere, not just the SF Bay area.

the women not feminine enough or the men are too weak to clearly communicate attraction because of the social stigma around sexual desire

Bingo.

reprimanded Jack for his "un-Christian-like" behavior

And where is her reprimand for reciprocating?

Should he have kissed her? No, probably not on a first date. Is it sin? No, it's not. Is it unwise? Probably. The church wrongly assumes that all "unwise" decisions are sinful. It's not wise to eat a bag of doritos (unless you're literally starving to death). Other than personal gratification, there's no "pro" to put on the list of pros and cons. But are we to go around shaming every Christian who eats a bag of doritos?

Likewise, kissing is not sin. If they weren't lusting in the kiss, there's nothing wrong with it - and even then the lust is only inappropriate if they never marry. It's unwise because it might lead to lusting or other things if there's no self-control. But being unwise isn't being in sin.

From the discussion that I've read so far on this subreddit, I've been able to gain a frame work and vocabulary to properly process and organize my thoughts around the experiences.

Glad we can help :)

CMV: Can anyone break my fall? I feel like on my current trajectory I'm gonna end up redpill.

5 upvotes · 12 August 2017 · /r/ExRedPill

I feel like I've been lied to on a massive level, about how interests and personality are more important than looks. And I believed it, until I started going on dates about four years ago.

Here's the deal: you're dealing with two different scales and trying to treat them as one. There is a physical/sexual attraction scale, then there is an entirely separate romance/comfort scale. When people say "interests and personality are more important than looks" they mean that they're *more important when trying to foster romance and comfort*, which are staples in developing long term relationships.

MARKETING AGENDA

One thing that TRP has successfully figured out (among its many failures) is that the media, hollywood, and politics have an agenda on this point - and that agenda is to convince people that romance and comfort are the most important thing ... bonus points if they can get you to believe that romance and comfort will foster physical attraction too (it does not). Why do they promote this idea? Because it makes them money and gives them power. It's how Disney made it big - the overly-romantic themes it has to all of its movies is idealized everywhere. Of course, it's for kids, so they don't highlight the implications that this romanticization has a person's sex life. The wedding itself is when "happily ever after" starts, not the wedding night. The goal isn't to have a healthy, happy long-term marriage - it's just to get married in the first place and to retain those romantic feelings.

But, for most men, sex is what keeps those feelings alive. This isn't RP make-believe - it's biologically and psychologically proven fact that having sex with someone releases chemicals in your brain that cause you to feel close and connected to your partner. There's actually a separate natural drug in our bodies (can't remember the name off-hand) that gives a similar connectivity-high when experiencing romance and comfort in a relationship. Although both genders experience each of these, for most men the first is their primary form of feeling connected; for most women, the second is how they primarily feel connected.

So, for men romance is often a secondary means of fostering connection with another person - we enjoy it, but

it's not as vital to our bio-chemical makeup as the natural drugs released in our body after sex. For women, sex has an important connectivity component, but their bio-chemical makeup prefers connectivity through romance and comfort. As RP praxeology would note, the feminist agenda doesn't like these biological distinctions between men and women, preferring to make us all equal in all ways, and therefore tries to over-sexualize women (the "empowered" or "dominant" woman in the bedroom) while simultaneously desexualizing men to become sappy romantics who think that personality is everything.

TV IS NOT REALITY

The problem is that people who focus on interests, personality, etc. usually can't get the physical relationships they want. Even if you can find a wife who has extremely fuzzy romantic feelings for you and her heart jumps every time you walk in the room - she may never actually want to have sex with you. The TV trope of some guy doing a really sappy romantic thing, then his girl jumping her body all over him is simply a fantasy. I'm a divorce attorney, so I see the ins-and-outs of relationships all the time.

The only circumstance where this ever works is when the physically attractive traits are present, but the romance/comfort traits are lacking - at which point the sappy gesture frees the woman to stop thinking of how uncomfortable she is in the relationship to start focusing on her already-existent physical desire. And with most actors/actresses - of course that physical desire is going to be there!

But what happens when that physical attraction isn't already there and you make a grand, romantic gesture? This is the case in at least 75% of marriages (I'm being conservative; it's probably closer to 90%). If the wife's romance meter has been running low, she's going to perk up and be a lot happier for the next few days ... but her mind won't jump immediately to: "I want to have sex with him." That's the lie culture tells you through TV, movies, marriage counseling, etc. Why? As I first said: they don't realize that physical desire and romance/comfort are two entirely separate, independent scales. Oh, and for the record, if you're really good at keeping her romance meter high - that grand gesture will get a smile and that's about it.

FINDING BALANCE

Interests, personality, etc. are good at building relationships. Looks and alpha traits are good at cultivating physical desire. To get a relationship started, you're probably going to need some more of those alpha traits. To keep the relationship going, you need some more of those beta traits.

The real problem is that people instinctively understand this, so once guys have the relationship locked down in marriage, they shift to predominantly beta traits to keep the relationship going ... which works for longevity, but ends up giving them a dead bedroom.

RP people saw this and over-glorified the sexual aspect of the relationship because they'd been missing it for so long that it's all they ever thought about. Result? Everything is about alpha, alpha, alpha. They stopped caring about longevity because they weren't happy in their longevity. Sexlessness made them wish they weren't stuck in longevity. As a result, rather than fixing the sex issue and maintaining the longevity, they started to see longevity as a risk not worth taking. This further polarizes their views on stifling beta traits and going pure alpha (until you get to MRP, of course).

I think RP has been around since the early 2000s, so maybe 15 years. Mark my words: in another 15 years, when the generation that started it all realizes they've just wasted their lives without any longevity in their relationships, they will be regretting it and TRP will die in favor of places like MRP ([r/marriedredpill](#)), which promotes an incorporation of more beta traits. They still over-glorify the sexual aspect of marriage, but they do set boundaries on how hard to push to get it, if a person intends to keep their marriage intact. Then there's places like [r/RPChristians](#), which doesn't over-glorify either aspect. It simply accepts the truths about how the world functions (which are mostly found in the Bible because God created the things RP is discovering) and utilizes those truths for our own personal betterment - not as a manipulation tactic to find fulfillment in an aspect of our lives we've been idolizing (Christianity condemns idolizing anything other than God - including things like sex

and romance, which are healthy, yet peripheral desires to our overall purpose in life).

If all you want is a companion in life and sex isn't important to you, then the advice you're getting from the world is great advice. That said, you still probably need some nominal traits that cultivate a baseline physical desire to get in the door in the first place - whether it's looks, leadership skills, etc. doesn't really matter ... unless you're searching online, in which case people judge you by your picture because it's the fastest assessment tool they have and with 1,000s of profiles to sort through, they don't have time to read everything on your page. They only read the profiles of people whose pic makes them interested in knowing more.

If all you want is sex and you don't care about marriage or hanging on to any one girl, then RP will get your goals accomplished (albeit in a crude, immoral way - whereas [r/RPChristians](#) allows for those moralizing conversations). Of course, they probably need to have *some semblance* of beta traits if they want a girl to be interested long enough to actually get back to his place. A guy who's a total jerk all the time is just going to come off as a jerk. At that point, he's not playing game, he's playing numbers. If all-beta guys had the gall to play the numbers game too, they'd probably be just as successful as the all-alpha guys.

The healthier option is to find a balance :)

How to get my wife into RPW?

5 upvotes · 11 August 2017 · [/r/RedPillWomen](#)

Where did you get that she's happy?

I guess I made that assumption when you said:

- "happier!" *Implying she is already happy, you just want to increase it.*
- "to the claim I'm 'trying to fix her' - I'm not" *Implying that she doesn't need fixing.*
- "make her happier and more satisfied" *Implying she's already happy and satisfied, but your eager for her to have more abundance in these things (I would be too!)*

As to the "fixing her" thing - your original post did explain a lot of problems that you perceive she has (RP says they're really your problems - she is a reflection of you; as the man, you're responsible for the way she acts around you), making it seem like you were asking about the book to utilize it as a tool to "fix" these problems in her. If it's really just about her happiness and satisfaction and has nothing to do with helping her to conform to your expectations, then that whole paragraph should be removed ;)

Would you be happy if you were controlling and nagging? Isn't it the point of RPW that these behaviors lead to unhappiness?

Those behaviors mitigate happiness, but don't destroy it. A woman can be perfectly happy as a bossy nag. Some women actually find a lot of satisfaction in this. But when they do that, they're trading *one type of happiness* for another. She's giving up her interest in sexual happiness, relational fulfillment, etc. in exchange for happiness through power. This is something RPW would probably do well to discuss more often. Might as well tag a mod on this: [/u/LuckyLittleStar](#).

That happiness through power has limits, just as all forms of happiness do. Different types of happiness have different types of limits. I can find happiness by watching a really good movie. But there's a really, really low limit on how much happiness I can derive from that. My wife can find happiness from getting me to buy her something, but there's a low limit on that one event. She can derive greater happiness from controlling and nagging me into becoming the kind of guy who buys her stuff all the time - but that's going to have a negative impact on my ability to feed into her other drives for happiness through relational intimacy, sexual attraction, etc.

and it may even cause many men to end up cheating on their wives, thereby stealing away their happiness in a peripheral area (rather than it simply going unfulfilled).

In my experience, most women (probably men too) tend to ignore aspects of their lives where: (1) they haven't experienced happiness in a while, if ever; (2) achieving happiness requires too much effort; or (3) there is no compelling need and it's not a natural priority. A few examples:

- (1) My wife has never really experienced happiness playing video games. So, she won't play video games, even with our children who love them and want to engage with her on that level.
- (2) For a long time, achieving happiness through sex took a lot of effort during periods when she wasn't attracted to me, so she just ignored her sexuality.
- (3) My wife has no compelling need to go rock climbing. She's done it before and has had lots of fun, and it's worth the effort to her. But it's not a compelling need, so other things take higher priority.

There are probably more things that could be added to this list, but those 3 are a good start.

If someone you love is sick, you try and find them a cure.

This is a valid point. But in this case you're both sick. The MRP cure is to fix the man, which (if done right) will most likely cure her too - it will lead her to become all the things talked about in *The Surrendered Wife* without her actually reading the book. The book is just a shortcut you want her to take. I get it - I wish I could have a shortcut too. But if she reads something like that and stops testing me (when tests are rare enough as is), how am I going to earn her respect? She's going to give it because a book told her to, not because I have earned it in her eyes. So, her behavior will conform, but her desire will not.

Behavior modification does not fix marriages. Attraction modification does. Interestingly, the behaviors that MRP expects a man to modify are things that not only increase the wife's attraction to the man, but also things that will naturally increase a man's attraction to her. Increased testosterone and removing porn as an outlet = higher attraction to wanting sex with your wife. Having a mission outside the home and not making your wife your emotional center = you're not inoculated with constant doses of her, so you appreciate the time you have with her better. Passing tests and setting boundaries = she starts developing the qualities you like to see in a woman.

Here's perfect timing for you. A few weeks ago I read a post/comment that [/u/RedPillWonder](#) wrote on this sub to my wife (didn't mention anything RP, just said it was an article I found online that I thought she'd appreciate while thinking about how to raise our daughters) and it covered a lot of stuff about submissiveness, beauty, respect, making wise choices, etc. Basically, the same thing as you finding an innocuous way to have your wife read *The Surrendered Wife*.

Cue present: I sent my wife a flirty text message. She gets all self-conscious and while writing this comment to you my wife texts, "I keep thinking about that article you read me though and am second guessing myself." Instead of taking it as an action plan to improve herself, or my actual intent of using it as a framework for parenting our daughters, she took it as a measure against her - that she's not up to par. What I meant for one thing, she took another way and it didn't work out. I'm now wishing I had never read her that article and just simply led her into how I want her to parent our kids - and into developing those traits herself ... and I should do this directly, not getting a book or article/comment/post to do it for me.

Custody theories that could ruin you ... and the merits of shared parental rights

5 upvotes · 3 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Yeah, that's not what that means at all. Obviously weeknights are massively important, including the overnight (even though they're sleeping), which I included directly in my post.

My point was: why bother fighting for time that you know you're not going to be with them anyway? For example, I had a case where the kids were involved in 3 basketball teams in high school. With all expectation, they would not be quitting any of these teams and they'd be 18 by the time they were out. The practice schedule to make all teams work involved evenings being booked for MWF from after school until 8:30pm.

Dad enrolled the kids in these teams as an effort to keep the kids away from mom because she had MW parenting time per temporary orders at the time. The kids decided they liked the teams and would stick with them. I persuaded the GAL to recommend, in response, that mom get TR instead, since dad was the one who enrolled the kids in the activities in the first place, so the schedule should be on his time. Result? My client got to see the kids every MWF from after school until 8:30 at practices and games, and also got TR all evening and overnight. So, basically, she had the kids every day, even on her husband's days, even though she was only actually allocated an equal time schedule.

Similarly, I've had many cases where I've represented fathers and they got one weekday overnight as their only parenting time. So, we pop in the order that no activities shall be scheduled on Father's overnight. We also got an order that said Dad could pick extracurricular activities for the kids every spring and fall (Mom got summer and winter). As a result of the extracurricular activity schedule, Dad picks things that had practices on three of Mom's nights. Result? Dad sees the kid 4 weeknights and gets the kids every other weekend, and this applies for most of the school year, even though he was only ordered 1 weeknight. Of course, summer parenting time is different, so Mom didn't have the ability to manipulate the schedule this way, and (for the most part) schools don't have winter extracurriculars (fall and spring activities overlap through winter), so she had a double-loss without realizing it. This was a better result for him than fighting endlessly for 50/50 time, where he actually would have ended up with less time with the kids despite the technical first-look impression of the plan as it stands ... and he saved tens of thousands of dollars in the process by settling on these grounds. He was elated.

Divorce Incorporated

5 upvotes · 2 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Things are definitely different in my state/city than what [/u/wescowell](#) described, but I can echo about 90% of what he said.

Or is it that the laws are designed to be more fair, but the judges executing the law are still biased?

Here's the thing: custody laws in almost every state involve an immense amount of judicial discretion. So, while the laws themselves might be more fair than before, "judicial discretion" overrides almost everything. I do a lot of appellate work too, and the general rule of thumb is that the person trying to overrule the trial court always loses in the absence of clear, unmistakable abuse of discretion.

For example, I once had a magistrate say (on the record) to my client: "Did you just roll your eyes at me? Do you really think I'm going to do anything to help you when you give me that kind of attitude?" Sure enough, that case was reversed on appeal. But most judges/magistrates are smart enough to know how to word their opinions to pass an appeal, even though the real foundation of an opinion might be their own personal biases.

Those biases can sometimes work in a father's favor if the mother is putting her in a tough spot, but it's a bias nonetheless. In fact, I just got a decision in yesterday where the judge said (exact quote): "Mother is the better parent. Her parenting style is far superior to Father's. For all practical purposes, [name] is, essentially, an absent Father and has been relatively uninvolved in the child's life since birth ... Father has shown no signs of being able to handle the stresses of parenting and has shown no history of success in parenting because he hasn't even tried until now ... Father's attitude toward the child is, essentially, to let him do whatever he wants in the hopes that

just keeping him happy will somehow fix his behavioral problems. Father is fooling himself." Despite all of this, the court still gave custody to the dad. Why? Because Mom was moving out of state and the judge has a predisposition toward the view that "children should never be forced to relocate out of state." So, despite all of the evidence that the judge acknowledged in his decision, he exercised his discretion to go against the weight of that evidence in order to keep the child local. Here's the real kicker, though - the fact that he said all of that essentially defeats our ability to appeal because we no longer have the ability to argue: "The judge failed to consider ___ and ___ and ___." He addressed it point blank, gave us every benefit of the doubt, and still went the other way - and that looks really good to an appellate court when they're reviewing the decision, making it a very difficult case to try to appeal.

That is the power of judicial discretion. Now imagine if you get an older judge (i.e. age 55+, as most of them are) who grew up with the old-school thinking and worships women. As noted in my previous comment, this is much rarer in large cities, like where I practice, or places like Chicago. But as soon as you go out of the larger cities (I also practice in 10 surrounding counties), it's a whole different ball game. So, I think [/u/wescowell](#)'s experience is based on the fact that he's practicing in a large metropolitan area, as he even acknowledged.

a well-crafted prenup gives you the best of both worlds. I suppose I would invite [u/red-curious](#) to participate.

I will echo [/u/wescowell](#) in that every prenup I've ever seen drafted by another attorney has been garbage and has not helped the person trying to claim it. Most often, one party wasn't represented by an attorney in its negotiation, in which case my home court system will throw those out 100% of the time. If each party isn't represented when it's signed, you just bought some very expensive toilet paper.

The other big mistake I see going around invalidating prenups is the inclusion of unconscionable provisions without adequate disclosure.

- Disclosure: Most attorneys are smart enough to put a general disclosure page as to current assets and income valuation, but fail to add something that says, "The parties anticipate that Husband will also accrue ___ and will attain raises and may earn as much as ___ in the future, and intend this agreement to remain binding under all such circumstances." Without this type of thing in there, the court will often say that any substantial increases in the value of property (especially from active contribution, which most attorneys also fail to address - this is very different from passive contribution and must be spelled out in detail) was not anticipated to the degree actually accrued, and therefore the parties didn't know what rights they were signing away when they executed the document, therefore it's not binding as to those assets that had increased in value (except to the value that existed at the time of signing).
- Unconscionable: I laugh every time I see a prenup that says, "Under no circumstances shall husband ever pay spousal support to wife." This is *sooooo* common, and yet it's instant malpractice. No judge will enforce that. Instead, it's better to write something like, "The parties understand that husband may receive substantial increases to his income. In light of such anticipation, the parties agree that husband shall retain the first \$500,000 annually, pre-tax, free from any support calculations, and that any computation, accounting, or income/expense calculation shall only apply to income in excess of such amount." At the time the pre-nup is signed, if husband is earning \$150,000/yr he's never going to hit that mark, so you're essentially putting in a "no spousal support" clause (my state did away with the term "alimony"), but you're doing it in a way that prescribes a calculation and makes it clear that the wife knows what she's signing away, as she should rationally be able to anticipate whether or not her husband is likely ever to earn in excess of \$500,000 and know that it won't happen.

Things a prenup won't account for are child support (cannot be permanently waived under any circumstances), custody/parental rights matters, and financial misconduct.

the manosphere has been railing against Marriage 2.0 for a while now. Have men stood up enough so that the laws, and therefore society, changing to a Marriage 3.0 framework now? Or is it more like 2.1?

The way I look at it is, to be blunt ... before the 1920s men had it as good as white plantation owners being taken to court by one of their slaves in the 1820s (okay, maybe not that extreme, but you get the imagery). Marriage 1.0 was *DEFINITELY* not fair to women. I don't care how hard-core you are into men's-rights activism ... no one can justify what those laws were in light of a shifting cultural framework. It made sense at the time because there was a cultural incentive toward things like sexual fidelity, leader-helper roles in the home, provision for spouses, and simply presenting one's marriage as a happy marriage.

When TV was invented, relationship drama became all the rage. It was funny because it took all the things that people actually experienced behind closed doors that they tried to hide and made it public - made a joke out of it. People started talking about those things and it became normalized - "marriages have problems" was the go-to understanding, whereas there was more of a drive before then to present one's marriage as happy and better than everyone else's. Now we have shows like Jerry Springer, where relational dysfunction is actually encouraged for profiteering.

When relational problems started being normalized and people accepted that not every marriage was as happy as it seemed on the surface, laws started changing to let people out of what they were not bold enough to admit publicly was a bad situation. But this went too far to the point of, in maintaining the previous parallel, reverse-discrimination. Racial minorities for a long time were getting major college scholarships, job preference treatment, etc. Despite media coverage, there were serious advantages to being a racial minority, if you had your act together even remotely. The same thing happened with divorce laws toward women - they went too far the other way.

As [/u/wescowell](#) noted, many of those laws have since been adjusted to find a safer balance, but by giving the massive degree of judicial discretion to trial courts that they do, the laws themselves are hollow. In smaller counties, most judges know that the parties can't afford to appeal, so they just ignore the law entirely. In larger counties, the judges are more fair because they've seen it all and just don't give a crap anymore. That said, they will still take the view: "I can do whatever I want. The statute only tells me how I have to word my decision to avoid getting reversed on appeal - it doesn't tell me what my decision has to be." As a result, I've seen two different judges take the exact same set of facts and make two entirely opposite rulings - yet both of them could rationalize their conclusions with the statute.

The thing is, the statutes don't prescribe what the decision should be under different factual patterns. They simply say, "When deciding custody, the court must consider these things ..." It doesn't say what weight they should give to each item, how that item should factor into a conclusion, and there's often a catch-all for "any other relevant factor not on the list" where the judge can just start making up stuff, and as long as he can point to a place in the record where someone mentioned it, he can use that as a key factor in doing whatever he wants and get away with it.

Does this happen all the time? No. But it's certainly not uncommon. I'd give it a Marriage 2.4 title.

Divorce Incorporated

5 upvotes · 2 August 2017 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

Sure. Here are some stats for you:

- 85% of all children with behavioral disorders come from fatherless homes (per CDC)
- 90% of all homeless/runaway children are from fatherless homes (Census Bureau)
- 71% of all high school dropouts are children from fatherless homes (National Principals Association)

- 75% of all adolescents in chemical abuse centers come from fatherless homes (Rainbows for all God's Children)
- 63% of youth suicides are from fatherless homes (Census Bureau)
- 80% of rapists diagnosed with displaced anger come from fatherless homes (Criminal Justice & Behavior, Vo. 14, p. 403-26)
- 85% of all youths in prisons grew up in fatherless homes (GA and TX Dept. of Corrections stats)

Children from fatherless homes are:

- 5x more likely to commit suicide
- 32x more likely to run away
- 20x more likely to have behavioral disorders
- 14x more likely to commit rape
- 9x more likely to drop out of high school
- 10x more likely to abuse chemical substances
- 20x more likely to end up in prison

... than children where they have an active, present father-figure in their lives.

Now, I get that "fatherless" means no father at all, as opposed to "mom gets custody, dad's still present as a non-custodial parent." So, when it comes to custody-based stats, here are a few from the Pew Research Center:

- **Median household income** - F: \$40,000, M: \$26,000
- **Average Age** - F: ~40, M: ~34
- **Education** - Interestingly, F/M are almost equally likely to have a college degree (17/18), women are more likely to have started, but not finished college (32/40), but men are more likely to have graduated high school (32/26) - remembering that these are stats only for single fathers v. single mothers
- **At or Below Poverty** - F: 24%, M: 43%

Courts seem to favour women because they don't want to deal with the complaining and fallout.

Nah, judges don't care about that crap. The Court favors women because most judges are older people who have been around since before equal-rights laws for fathers were passed, so they're used to an older system of doing things where custody was presumed to mothers. Also, the fact that dads have to prove fatherhood and mothers don't leaves a distinct impression in many judges. Perhaps the biggest factor, though, is that most judges are beta SJWs, so they're used to pandering to women and they think women will respect them more for it - and this plays true for female judges as well.

My county actually has 5 domestic judges, 4 of whom are women. Interestingly, if you go into smaller counties, the judges are almost exclusively men. Those smaller counties are **FAR FAR FAR** more likely to hand custody over to a mom than my big-county female judges. Why? Because women judges don't have anything to prove - they are already the epitome of female power. They can do whatever the heck they want and the feminists will

support them for it because they're powerful women. The men, however, are so used to sucking up to women that they can't get it out of their systems.

More fun stats: In a neighboring county, a statistical analysis was done on a male judge's most recent 60 custody cases:

- Shared parenting was requested by one or both parties in 45 of the cases (75%), but was only granted twice.
- Custody was granted to the woman in 51/60 cases (85%).
- Of the 15% of cases where dad got custody, 8/9 were because the mother had severe substance abuse or violence problems, the remaining 1 was due to extreme mental health issues and medical disability.
- Although it wasn't part of the study, that same judge also rejected an **AGREEMENT BY ALL PARTIES** that Father get custody. The Father, Mother, and the children's Guardian ad Litem all testified under oath on a fully-signed agreement at a final hearing that Mother was incapable of parenting the children and Father had to be the custodial parent, and that Father was stable and capable ... and the judge ripped up the agreement and gave custody to the mother anyway.

What percent of men are Alpha?

5 upvotes · 27 July 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

I love statistics, so it's intriguing. But I'd be very curious how they're defining alpha and beta and what sample populations they're using. I get the impression that this survey was probably done in some place like LA or NYC, whereas if you took the same survey in TX, OH, or GA you'd get insanely different results. I can say quite definitively that most alpha men in my home area (using an RP definition, not a generic one) are politically and philosophically conservative, and this perception seems to hold up well with implications I see from TRP/MRP all over the place. So, I'm very shocked that these results would come back so skewed the other way, when this is not typical of RP-alpha thinking.

Use red pill to get out of a dead bedroom

5 upvotes · 25 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I know too many marriages where this is the story, including mine for the longest time. As I've told other people before, my wife's extremely conservative parents, who kept her in a legalistic Christian bubble, would only ever tell her two things about sex: "It's bad until you're married, and it hurts a lot all the time" (her mom must have had physical problems). Because she wasn't married for 23 years, her brain filtered out the "until you're married" part and just focused on "it's bad." For 23 years all she knew was, "Sex is bad and it hurts." That took a lot to overcome.

My DB started turning around when I gave up on trying to have a healthy sex life. I stopped initiating and just started doing whatever I wanted, including running/lifting. I lost about 40lbs, stopped the choreplay, and just did what I thought needed to be done, and if I thought things were in good shape, even if she didn't, I relaxed anyway.

Becoming my own man that wasn't dependent on her to tell me what to do gave her a base attraction to me that she hadn't had since we were dating. She still struggles with the "dirtiness" of sex every now and then. She intellectually knows it's permissible, but there's a remnant of what her parents instilled that makes it hard for her to go beyond certain boundaries, though we're slowly pushing them.

The biggest factor in overcoming that mental block for my wife was teaching her the process of disciple-making. When she finally realized that physical reproduction is meant to parallel spiritual reproduction, and she sees in the Bible how desperately God wants us to be spiritually reproducing with him, and with all different techniques ...

somehow something started to click where she realized, [to be crass] "If God wants us to be 'slutty' with spiritual reproduction, maybe it's okay to be a little slutty with physical reproduction too."

What was it for your wife that overcame the "mental block"? I've heard very few success stories in the Christian realm. I started [r/RPChristians](#) and I'm sure the people there, as well as others I know IRL would love to hear new ideas on what has worked for others.

4 Rules for a good conversation

5 upvotes · 24 July 2017 · [/r/TheRedPill](#)

Early on, when I was first learning networking, I found the conversation stack immensely helpful. It goes something like this ...

Imagine a nameplate

"Hi, I'm ruizbujc. What's your name?"

That name plate is on a house

"What part of town do you live in?"

Through the window you see some papers and bills on a desk.

"What do you do for a living? How do you like doing that?"

Some kids run out the front door

"Do you have close family nearby or are you here just for work? What's your family like?"

One of the kids is holding a tennis racquet

"So, what do you do for fun? I like doing this. You ever try that?"

The kid throws the racquet at a car in the driveway

"Do you like to travel? What places have you been?"

Someone in the car turns the lights on.

"Hey, you mentioned _____. What are your thoughts on that?" [light = ideas, concepts, beliefs, etc.]

Although I don't need to use the stack anymore, the imagery gives incredibly easy cues to new conversationalists about how to move from one subject to the next in appropriately ascending order. That ascending order, of course, is overridden by context. If she tells you her name and it reminds you of a place you've been, be like, "Oh, Savannah, like the city in Georgia. Great place, you ever go there?"

The basic stack (there are expanded versions) helped me dominate networking events in my career. I owe most of my early success in building an initial law practice to the stack.

Part 1 - Signs your wife might have a personality disorder

5 upvotes · 13 July 2017 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

I fully agree with everything you said, except I do believe there is merit to the medical model - *especially when*

divorce and custody decisions are based predominantly on this model.

From what I've read, "ditch and replace" is a commonplace suggestion. Being that this sub is predominantly for "married red pill" people, and the fact that they're constantly coached: "you have to keep 'ditch and replace' as a viable option," there has to be an understanding of the legal implications of what that might mean.

To that end, if a guy is stuck in a 20-year marriage with someone who has a legitimate "medical model" personality disorder, he has two options: (1) ditch and replace, risking the fury of the courts; or (2) understand their spouse's situation so they can make informed rather than ignorant decisions about things like frame, game, etc. that will improve their circumstances without the risks associated with divorce. To be clear, mental health issues in divorce don't only impact custody determinations (usually in favor of the non-disabled spouse); they have a reverse effect on finances: if a spouse is deemed to be mentally ill, the mentally healthy spouse will usually have *increased obligations* for the support of that spouse and the children. Because that determination is made by a medical model (usually by forensic psychologists who spend half or less of their practice actually treating), it seems incredibly valuable to me to look at things from a medical model standpoint, particularly insofar as the actual diagnosis itself matters.

That said, when it comes to developing stable relationships, you're spot on: context is key. But I don't want people to use context as the same type of escape you mistakenly think I'm endorsing: "Oh, that explains why she's that way. I guess I can empathize with her now." His frustrations may alleviate as they gradually turn to pity or guilt (if he is the contributing context), but when I have had clients make this realization throughout the course of their own therapy process, their usual response is not to adjust their frame to account for the additional information; it is to make concessions, usually to mitigate their own contribution (i.e. paying the guilt debt) or to throw a bone (i.e. advance moral self-righteousness by compensating pity where pity is due).

Your duck example is a good one to explain context as to an isolated incident, but you have to remember that most of the people I see aren't being diagnosed because of a one-off event. They have built a patterned lifestyle of this. Oftentimes they have caused an SO to feel trapped because they know how to hide their mental health baggage while in the marketplace, then as the marriage settles in and long-term security is developed (usually through divorce law protections increasing with the duration of the marriage) they relax and the craziness becomes more evident, impacting numerous areas of the marriage (to be fair, men do this too, but in very different ways). When people build a lifetime of pattern, understanding the context that helped develop that can be useful, but (and I acknowledge that this is my out-of-profession opinion) it is more valuable to know how to function within those patterns without losing frame to develop a new pattern of productive interactions rather than failed ones. Yes, the context can assist in this, but understanding the patterns themselves has been more vital in my personal interactions with trying to negotiate with these people.

Lastly, as to your 4-step pattern of "diagnose - contextualize - blame - destroy," I may have given this sub too much credit if you think RP guys are likely to take that route. I assume it as a given that most people here are moving away from that flawed way of thinking, not still trapped in it.

Either way, good post and thanks for presenting the other side of the issue!

Red Pill Advice for a 17 year-old?

5 upvotes · 10 July 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

Well, under ideal circumstances her first relationship should be her last one. My wife was only my second girlfriend, and I was her first boyfriend. As [/u/RedPillWonder](#) mentioned, vetting is pretty much the single most important thing you can do.

In our situation, we avoided dating altogether until we had a secure understanding of what we were looking for in another person. Some people assume you have to date around to figure this out, but I simply don't see that as a necessity. It's a valid option, but wise people can figure out who they are and what they want without living

through mistake after mistake to get there.

Sorry to hear about your psychotic relationship. I think that's another testament to vetting properly :p

Red Pill Advice for a 17 year-old?

5 upvotes · 10 July 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

This is absolutely wonderful advice. /u/blue lumi would do well to seriously consider everything you've said. Every new item you mentioned made me think, "Man, I'm glad I have an awesome wife who was like that when she was 17!"

Assuming from your flair, it might be great to post something like this as a general thread on a new sub I've started: [r/RPChristians](#) - not only for any female subscribers, but for men to see that there actually are godly women out there who are wise and internally radiant (whereas most of the RP world is overall degrading).

Dealing with the stressed wife.

5 upvotes · 7 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Yes, as /u/Chinchilla_the_Hun noted, I mentioned this as a 3-day exercise, not a permanent structure for the marriage. When a captain hires a new first officer, he needs to show the first officer how he wants things done. Only after that does he withdraw and let the first officer work unsupervised - because the trust is developed. If the first officer just plows in and starts doing things his own way, it can cause problems in other areas of the ship that depend on the systems the first officer would be responsible for.

The biological step-mother.

5 upvotes · 7 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

That's the illusion. You're really not doing a ton of extra stuff ... maybe a few extra things in the beginning because you don't yet know how to own your own life (i.e. you forget what needs to be done and everything you forget is on you).

All you're really doing is shifting responsibility for which of you comes up with the list of things that need to be done each day. Even when you delegate back to her the exact things she was doing everyday already she will end up doing them without stress even though her daily activities have not changed.

Why? Because thinking about what needed to be done is what gave her stress. It trapped her in the comparison game against an impossible standard. Women love checking boxes off lists (it gives them a sense of accomplishment) ... they just can't handle making the list.

The biological step-mother.

5 upvotes · 7 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Being a divorce/custody attorney really doesn't give me any super-power of discerning RP/BP guys from each other. To be perfectly honest, until a couple months ago because of how I interact in my professional life I assumed I was an alpha guy. After reading NMMNG I realized just a few weeks ago that in my marriage I was waaaaay more BP than I thought.

Interestingly, my wife asked me what I was reading the other day (WISNIFG) and I answered, "Just a book on how to be more assertive and a family leader." Her response was, "You of all people don't need to be more assertive, and you're a great leader." So, I opened up the first chapter of NMMNG for her, read the list of 11 traits of the "Nice Guy Syndrome" and she acknowledged, "I guess you do do a lot of that."

So, as of a few months ago I was a BP guy trying to become RP for a wife who already thought I was alpha. Interestingly, we had a DB marriage for the last 6 or 7 years (an entire year and a half with no sex at all, mostly because I was too bitter to initiate). This proves to me that a wife is attracted to actual alpha, not her perception

of alpha. So, even though I had my wife convinced I was RP, she subconsciously was not attracted because I was actually BP in disguise. Now that I'm actually growing in my RP-ness, she's getting tingles again.

Sorry, that's a long answer to your question: I didn't even know I myself was BP, so no, I didn't see RP/BP distinctions in my clients until I discovered TRP/MRP a couple weeks ago (before that I took a Bible-based approach, distinguishing authoritative v. passive men, which is very similar, but not quite the same).

What do you do if you hold a door for a woman and she don't say "thank you"?

5 upvotes · 3 July 2017 · /r/askTRP

In her eyes, it's like if I wipe my butt after taking a dump. I show off the toilet paper to my wife and rather than saying, "Thank you for making sure your butt was clean," she's disgusted with me that I'd wave that around. If you try to say anything, you're waving your internal/emotional pile of crap for that girl to see. If it helps, I'm 99.999% sure my wife would not want to have sex with me after that; I'm guessing the girl at the door wouldn't want to have sex with you after that either.

To be clearer: people don't say "thank you" for what they believe should be the standard. They thank you for going above and beyond. Our feminist culture has made it the standard that men must serve women in certain culturally mandated ways, including holding the door open. If you want her appreciation, you have to hand her a mint with your subservience. While you're at it, you can go ahead and bow down a few times and kiss her feet too. I'm pretty sure she'd thank you somewhere in there.

Seriously, though: if you're going to hold the door open for people, do it because that's the kind of guy you want to be, not because you crave appreciation. OI OI OI OI. If you haven't yet, read NMMNG - he talks about this mentality all the time, and you're on the wrong end of a few of his lessons. For example:

- You've made a covert contract: "I do this for you, you're supposed to thank me."
- You "give to get"
- You're looking to women for validation of your self-image as a "nice guy" who holds the door for them (notice how quickly you dismiss any appreciation for men saying 'thank you,' as if it's unimportant compared to the 'thank you' of women)
- You're caretaking (just on a mass level rather than an individual one)

Those are concepts off the top of my head that are addressed in NMMNG that you've violated. Go read that book and focus on how to become OI/DNGAF. Do things because you want to do it, not because you need something in return.

5 Love Langues v./and (?) NMMNG

5 upvotes · 29 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

Makes sense. I lived the 5LL life for a while too and never got anywhere with it.

I concluded that 5LL cultivates contentment, but not attraction or desire.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (08/25/25)

4 upvotes · 27 August 2025 · /r/RPChristians

****Info****: I'm now 40 years old, been married for 17 of those years. 4 kids ages 8-13.

****Read****: All the sidebar stuff recommended by MRP and obviously what I wrote.

****Lifts****: Had some injuries, but picked it back up again this summer. 5 rep sets (lbs): 275 squat / 300 deadlift / 165 overhead / 205 bent over row / 255 bench press

****Mission****: Make disciples of all nations / ****Vision****: 60 disciple making ministries in 60 countries by age 60

****Physical****: I pigged out with my kids this summer. Super fun, great bonding. Not good for my gut. Adding lifting back in a few months ago really helped, but it's going to take some heavy cutting to get back to where I want to be.

****Mental/Emotional****: Job's been insanely lucrative, but also means insanely stressful. Way more work this past year than I'm used to. I'd still rather less pay to get some of my time/energy back. Aging into my 40s is noticeable. I also find myself getting angrier and more passive-aggressive than I remember being in the past. Need to get that under control.

****Spiritual****: Doing great here. I'm in the Word. Prayer isn't consistent, but more than I used to. My mind is focused on enough productive things that temptation toward active sins is pretty much non-existent, although passive sins are probably fair-game for self-assessing. I'm connecting well with my current congregation (been here for 2 years) and feeling a lot of respect from the leadership, unlike my last congregation, so that's a huge plus. Overall, things are going well.

****Professional****: Crushing it - just need more of a break, which I think I have about 2 weeks "chill" for now before my next surge.

****Marriage****: I've been a bit of a passive-aggressive pussy about stupid stuff. It gets to my wife. I've let myself fall into a "victim mentality" at times of ignoring her when she says/does things I don't like, and then when she tries to "fix it," I'm intentionally avoidant because I'd rather be upset at her than let her "make it up to me." I'm just being an idiot in these moments, but it gets to her and is overall just dumb on my part. Need to fix that. Otherwise, things are going pretty well. Had some really good times lately.

Praise God for this community

4 upvotes · 10 September 2022 · /r/RPChristians

I'll second Deep's book. While TRM definitely has a lot of interesting and useful things to ponder in it, there's a lot of secular/unbiblical information too, so you have to approach it with great caution, as you would any non-Christian book.

That said, when you read those books, the goal isn't to "reconcile" them through a "biblical lens," nor do you want to put a "red pill lens" over the Bible. It's just the Bible. We've emphasized that on this sub a number of times. The fact that God's way happens to align with what the secular world observes when they investigate God's created reality is just common-sense logic: people are happier and have better marriages/relationships when they live according to biblical (or in secular terminology: "traditional") principles that stand in opposition to modern progressive norms on marriage, gender, sexuality, etc.

Reading Rollo Tomassi is like reading a college textbook book. It's well-researched and contains lots of very accurate and correct information, while still also containing lots of conclusions and theories that are contrary to what the Bible teaches. Yeah, you may find value in reading that textbook ... but you're going to find much greater value out of reading the Bible.

If there's any "lens" issue you want to address, it's not that you want to wear a certain lens when you approach TRM or the Bible ... it's that you want to become conscious of the lenses you're already wearing and remove them so you can read the Bible with a clear mind without preconceived notions that have been ingrained in your mind by our culture since you were an infant.

No, it's not okay.

4 upvotes · 26 July 2022 · /r/RPChristians

Agreed!

Plan, Act, and Wait on the Lord (PAW)

4 upvotes · 22 June 2021 · /r/RPChristians

I just responded to someone on the discord who private messaged me about the exact topic of "waiting on the Lord." Didn't realize you had a post on it. Here was my reply:

Yeah, it's certainly in the Bible. But it's not emphasized the way it gets emphasized today.

Most of that emphasis stems from a recently popularized book: *The Ruthless Elimination of Hurry*, by John Mark Comer. I've known lots of people to read it and it's created something of a fad among pastors.

Comer gets his popularity from being discipled by a guy named Dallas Willard, who I'll acknowledge as one of the greats of our time. His book *The Divine Conspiracy* was restoratively revolutionary, and I've heard great things about his other works. Comer has some good stuff too, but this was one area where he seems to have gone awry - at least in how people have interpreted him (I'll give room for the fact that he didn't mean things the way people are taking it).

Comer's *Ruthless Elimination of Hurry* essentially tells pastors to stop filling their calendars and to accept that God will work in his own timing, and by being busy we may miss what God's trying to tell us because we do things by our own power instead. I've heard of (and personally attended at least 4 different congregation services) countless congregations whose pastors have adopted this theology philosophy. It's an excuse for pastors to start telling people "no" (and teaching their congregants to do the same), which isn't a bad thing, but it's applied in a way that still emphasizes sluggish pursuits over missional priority. That is, instead of saying, "Sorry Bob, but I can't talk about predestination with you over lunch because I'm discipling Davy," they say, "Sorry Bob, but I can't meet with you because I don't want to add anything else to my schedule right now" ... except that these pastors are still lazy and refuse to admit "because I don't want to," so they still come up with other lame excuses rather than owning the fact that they're taking control over their schedule, then tell themselves, "Thanks John Mark Comer!"

The concept of "waiting on the Lord," to my knowledge, is only mentioned rarely in Scripture in as many words, but does have significant roots through a number of stories. (a) Abraham had to wait on God to give him Isaac way into old age and even decades after God first prophesied Isaac's birth; (b) Israel had to wait on God in the desert, wandering around for 40 years for what should have been a couple weeks of a journey; (c) Jesus waited on the Lord before beginning his public ministry, telling people his time hadn't come yet ... and so on.

These examples throughout Scripture don't paint a portrait of people who are without a mission just twiddling their thumbs. They're usually highly active people who are going, going, going without break - and even in God's refusal to act in culmination on what they were awaiting, they continue in diligent faithfulness.

"Waiting on the Lord" isn't a call to "do nothing until God acts." It's like asking your boss for a promotion and he says, "I'm not ready yet." Do you twiddle your thumbs and stop all work until he's ready to promote you? Or if you have a conflict with your co-worker and your boss says, "I'll deal with it," but you don't see him dealing with it in your timing. Do you just screw around on your phone until the situation is handled? No. You keep working. You keep fulfilling your job duties diligently while you're waiting.

The key question I'd ask anyone who is waiting on the Lord: What are you waiting for? If it's something God already gave them or told them through Scripture, then the waiting was over 2,000 years ago - the answer is already given. I hear time and time again, "I'm waiting on the Lord to tell me what his will is for my life." That's about the dumbest line I hear with any frequency. God already said in Scripture what he wants you doing with your life: "Love God, Love Others, Make Disciples." Done. So, don't wait on things that have already been answered, and always be dutiful while waiting.

Tag: [/u/TheChristianAlpha](#) - even though you weren't the one I wrote this to, given our conversation today it might be helpful.

Announcement: Red Pill Christians will now exclusively be a male only space

4 upvotes · 25 March 2021 · /r/RPChristians

Yes. At least, for now we have no plans on changing this.

Why Lifting is Not a Suggestion

4 upvotes · 19 March 2021 · /r/RPChristians

It's more important to be attractive than it is to be lifting.

Are you suggesting guys aren't allowed to set their own goals? In general, I agree with you. But there is merit to both lifting and staying lean - preferably in balance.

The reality is that power lifters tend to have too much fat on them and generic "just be attractive" guys aren't as attractive without the muscle as they think they are.

Why God Doesn't Love You.

4 upvotes · 17 February 2021 · /r/RPChristians

Glad to hear it, brother. You were one of four people I had in mind while writing this.

Getting your wife back after a separation

4 upvotes · 12 January 2021 · /r/RPChristians

A better idea is to seek the Lord, and get His thoughts and ways on how to proceed.

This is where I think his confusion is. I think he mistakenly believes that because God hates divorce, *prioritizing the reconciliation of his marriage IS prioritizing God's will in his life*. Maybe I'm giving him too much credit here, because that argument (however wrong it is at its core) at least has the appearance of cogency, and therefore I can empathize with OP being misguided in this direction. But if he can recognize, as [/u/Deep_Strength](#) said, that his marriage being fixed is *a byproduct* of living for Christ and not the pathway, then he'd be in a much better position.

do you have that same attitude and actions toward the Lord and His Kingdom?

And there's the rub. Most people will never have that "breakdown" moment in their relationship with God because they are overly-secure. They read "I will never leave you nor forsake you" and say, "Well, I never have to worry about that with God because of this passage." But then they read things like, "The one who didn't produce more minas was thrown out where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth" and think, I must just be misunderstanding the passage because Jesus couldn't possibly have meant that. Or, "The tree that fails to produce good fruit will be cut down and thrown into the fire" evokes the response, "Yeah, I'm misunderstanding that one too. I bet Jesus really meant that trees with bad fruit get cut down - not ones that fail to produce good fruit. Heh. Heh. You misspoke, Jesus, right?" And "any branch that does not produce good fruit will be cut off from the vine, but the one that does produce fruit he will prune so that it becomes more fruitful" - "Yeah, that was a joke too, Jesus. Right?"

Oh, and let's not forget: "If anyone does not *hate* his mother and father, brothers and sisters, **WIFE AND CHILDREN** - yes, even his own life, he cannot be my disciple." Yeah, Jesus definitely didn't mean that one because we were totally meant to do everything we can to shower our wife and children with love and affection at all times to keep them from leaving us.

I'm reading a book right now titled: "When to Walk Away," in which the author (a pastor) acknowledges early on

something to the effect: "I didn't realize how black and white it is in Scripture and how abundant the examples are of godly men allowing people to walk away for the sake of remaining steadfast in their mission - Jesus being the one to do this the most." He comments that the reason for this confusion he had is: "For so long I'd focused on Jesus' teachings, but when I began to look not only at what he said, but also at what he did - how he lived and behaved toward people - a whole new world opened up to me about what it meant to be like Christ." I'm tempted to declare it mandatory reading for anyone who wants to do online ministry ;) ... even though there are still some blue moments.

I understand the "buy some time" principle, but this post has a "follow this format" vibe to it, and although you mention everybody and every situation is different, it still is portrayed as general advice to follow, and it's not good.

This is critical - it's why I bothered to take the time I did to respond. That and the fact that OP has been around long enough that others might think his advice here is somehow valuable or representative of the community - which seemed to be the case, given the comments that were up when I saw this.

It doesn't have to be the roughest version of "It's my way or the highway" vs "I'll do anything to get you back, baby"

Right - that was his autistic response to me. "RC doesn't like my way, so he must want me to do the exact opposite extreme, which is absurd." What's absurd is thinking in extremes like this in the first place.

Getting your wife back after a separation

4 upvotes · 12 January 2021 · /r/RPChristians

I might do that. Since RP, I've had at least 11 couples I've counseled reconcile after coming to my office to file for divorce - and that's out of 13 who attempted it (note: I'm not counting those with whom I had no guidance/influence who just retained me for a time). Pretty good rates there. A heck of a lot better than marriage counseling rates, anyway.

The best summary advice I can give in a situation like this is what [/u/bluepillprofessor](#) has noted: "When a woman wants a divorce, the best thing you can do is keep improving yourself and ramp up your dread game. Women can't bear the thought of wondering *what could have been* if she'd stayed with a man who's on the path to improvement - especially when she sees after he's back on the market how desirable he is to so many younger, hotter, and more submissive women than her."

I have observed this phenomenon countless times. Wife divorces Husband. Husband starts dating multiple women who are drastic improvements, eventually marrying one. Even in the cases where Wife also remarries, I've never seen her get over the fact that Husband has a new woman, unless the new woman is less attractive than her. Instead, her new marriage is wrought with strife against the new guy because she wishes he'd live up to what her ex *became* after they separated. Subtext (and in a few cases: overt-communication) shows that these women wish they'd never left the guy and want him back.

In the 11+ cases where the parties reconciled (I'll add the qualifier: *permanently*; I've had some where they reconciled briefly but still divorced a year later), this is what happened every time. The wife eventually realized that she wasn't going to get better than him on the sexual marketplace, so she relents.

The two where the reconciliation failed were:

- 1 - lots of blue pill "I'll change for you" promises, but the man ultimately was not willing to improve.
- 2 - the other one involved a wife who was an alcoholic and promised to give it up, but failed, so husband ended up leaving her anyway.

FR: DiscipleHaus, My Vision and My Mission

4 upvotes · 11 January 2021 · /r/RPChristians

I ironically just posted [this video](#) in the discord. The context is Andrew whining about "What if we fail Jesus? We don't know what we're doing." Peter answers:

We'll probably both do it wrong. It's like fishing. Remember what Dad taught us?

Andrew: Dad didn't teach us anything. We just sat there.

Peter: And watched. And then it was our turn and we made our own mistakes.

So, challenge point: was [/u/redirecteds](#) showing this guy first: "Hey, watch me do it, then I'm going to ask you to do it"? Or was he taking the ~~pastor~~ congregation leader approach of: "I'll tell you what to do, then expect you to figure out how to go do it all by yourself?"

Granted, what I'm reading here is still a step above that because he's at least there to observe it. He's making sure the guy follows through, then debriefing him afterward. So in the process Jesus gives:

1. Tell them what
2. Show them how
3. Let them try
4. Send them out
5. Pass it on

... ~~pastors~~ congregation leaders skip from 1 to 4 then stop, but Rfs added 3 in the mix (and if I know him, with the expectation that 5 will come down the road). The only thing missing in the story is 2 - but it's a beautiful thing to watch all the same, because so few people even get that opportunity to try something in front of a more experienced member of the body. And I expect that while this one example may catch some men's attention, this isn't just in the realm of cat calling, but would also be applied to showing him how to read the Word, pray, share his faith, etc. - and then observing as he tries each of these things. And then it will move on into equipping him with tools that Rfs has found useful in his growth, obedience, and mission that go beyond just these basic, foundational components.

Solid post, brother. I'm looking forward to seeing this continue to play out and being a part of it in the coming months.

Matchmaker, matchmaker, make me a match

4 upvotes · 18 December 2020 · /r/RPChristians

is it possible to have someone else successfully do preliminary vetting for us?

Ish, sure. Nobody here denies that there are benefits to online dating services. But for all the benefits, you'll never overcome the primary flaw: the people who use them are mainly people who need to. Put more clearly: higher quality people who have no problem finding matches without the help of online dating won't be found in online dating.

There are some exceptions, of course. But they're rare. I spent a chunk of time on Tinder and various other (mostly Christian) dating sites about 8-9 months ago in research for a post I eventually canned (I found it too hard to gather the type of information I was looking for and didn't want to write a post on half-valid research). The

bird's eye view was to get a picture of the current online dating market and to see if things like [/r/WhereAreAllTheGoodMen](#) applied to the Christian sphere also. Suffice it to say: there's a reason online dating has the stigma among sexually successful people that it does.

A match-making service seems like a cheat code

If by "cheat code" you mean, "Here - I gathered all the people that nobody else wanted. Take your pick, they're desperate because they can't find someone else," then sure. There's a reason it looks like all the good girls are taken. There's a reason we suggest: find them young, train them right.

I encourage the use of dating networks - but not for the expectation of finding a wife. It's useful in the sense that if you had a magic button that with extremely low-effort would drastically open up your social circle and degree of female attention ... why wouldn't you use it? All that extra social connectivity, even if it doesn't end in marriage, can be leveraged to expand your social network for the dual purpose of both advancing your discipler-making mission and possibly exposing you to someone you would find marriageable material someday.

So, go meet someone you "match" with online and let it not work out, but still hang with her and her friends every now and then, and maybe her roommate's best friend ends up being a catch - someone you wouldn't have met if you hadn't used the cheap and easy resources at your fingertips. Yeah, there's value in doing things the hard way (much greater value, at that!) but that doesn't mean you should be a fool and reject the low hanging fruit just because it's easy.

The Basics of Female Frame

4 upvotes · 12 November 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I actually started to type that out and realized it was 3:30am and the post was already really long. So, I deleted what I started and figured I'd save that for a subsequent post. If this one was "Basics of Frame" the next post will be something akin to "Building Frame" and should address those issues.

The First Among

4 upvotes · 22 September 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I love this. It's very mature to take this perspective. I love Dawson Trotman's quote in [Born to Reproduce](www.discipleshiplibrary.com) when he's talking about interviewing prospective missionaries: "I found that most people were willing to cross an ocean, adapt to a new culture, and learn a new language - but they hadn't even won their first at home."

Start local. In his talk The Need of the Hour (same site) he talks about how you can't reach the world until you reach your country; and you can't reach your country until you reach your city - and that until you're street, and that until your neighbor.

Don't Be Autistic

4 upvotes · 22 September 2020 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

If it helps, re-reading is key. I remember in the first week after I discovered RP reading the top 50 posts at the time, NMMNG, WISNIFG, and most of MMSLP. That was way too much information for 1 week, so I went back and re-read many of these in a better pace. Much, much more useful doing it that way.

A picture of a relationally solid church community

4 upvotes · 11 August 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

BOTTOM-LINE

Now, as you can tell, I'm being exceptionally hard on you. Your congregation actually seems like a fantastic

place. As long as it's not run by some psycho like Steven Anderson (obviously I don't know all the theological beliefs and if they're biblically sound), it's a place I'm sure I'd prefer to attend over other options.

My point here is not to prove you wrong about your congregation. It's not to denigrate your congregation. It's simply to get you to take off the rosy-colored glasses you're wearing when you look at your congregation so that you can work to improve it. [/u/rocknrollchuck](#) has shared the old joke before: "If you ever find a perfect congregation, don't join it because it won't be perfect anymore." You may think right now that you're a realist with some limited expression of the flaws, the same way a guy with serious ONEitis will pretend he's a realist because he can admit that the object of his ONEitis has certain habits that he can get past. But the fact is he still has ONEitis and that, in itself, is dangerous and prevents him from being able to have a healthy relationship with her.

In the same way, I am suggesting you may have a ONEitis for your congregation that may prevent you from having a healthy relationship with it. This congregational ONEitis is typical of churchianity culture - where people love their congregations even more than Christ himself, idolizing all sorts of aspects about them.

The reality is that the way you have glorified your congregation - I could glorify mine the same way. And honestly too! I could talk about the relational satisfaction. The way it preaches headship. The fact that nobody in the entire congregation has gotten divorced since it started (also a true statement). The amount of new converts who say "the prayer" every week. The people being discipled by the leadership - and especially the ones I know concretely who are being discipled by myself and who are out making more disciples as well. I could hear countless challenges like the ones you've heard from this community and defend them eloquently with actual, hard facts that would perfectly address every concern anyone might possibly raise about my congregation.

I could do all of that. But I don't. Because I know it's not perfect. I see numerous areas of unbiblical expression that require improvement. Refinement. Sharpening. Training. I am not a drone who goes with the program because I'm so impressed by it. I am the one who goes with what I see is biblical and work alongside the leaders of my congregation as co-partners in the Gospel to see disciples made of all nations, allowing them to correct me where I am wrong, and they allowing me to speak into their weaknesses where they are struggling or even failing.

I'm excited about what your congregation has going for it! But they're not here. YOU are here. I'm less interested in what they do and more interested in what YOU are going to do moving forward - and whether or not your ONEitis for your congregation is going to be a hindrance to getting it done. Loving your congregation is a great thing, but never stop trying to improve it either. Because Jesus is on the move. As [/u/deep_strength](#) often says, and I have been saying for years as well: our faith is not a destination that can be achieved; it's a direction we're following as Christ goes.

What's the next step your congregation needs to take to become more Christ-like in how it approaches the mission to make disciples of all nations? That's a step you should be discerning and helping them accomplish. And it's a step you must be living first in order to get them on board.

Speaking of which: who are the guys you're discipling today? How are they doing? What do their lives look like? Are they discipling anyone else yet? If your congregation is so impressive at making disciples - why aren't you doing it? Or maybe you are - and if that's the case, what are you learning about how to make disciples that your congregation could benefit from? It should be a synergistic relationship - one body, many parts - rather than a centralized hierarchy (except to the degree that Christ is the head, not any particular "lead pastor" or "elder board").

Decoding towards a better world?

4 upvotes · 7 August 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Can you point out some of the books that you have in mind?

Given my constant opposition to scientific apologetics, I'd prefer not. That's like asking a Satanist if he knows any good books on how to love God.

If this knowledge could be made accesible to everybody

It is. It's called the internet. There are dozens of websites dedicated to this exact purpose. I'll cave and give you three of them: Answers in Genesis, The Gospel Coalition, and CARM.

I want to make it accesible to those who are currently e.g. tempted by finding truth only in what "we" call the hard sciences and where there is currently no place for the word without discrediting people and this shies many away from even touching it.

This is why God values faith over knowledge. Recognize this and a lot of what you're driving toward starts to fall apart.

bring scientists into the frame of the bible, based on a purely rational approach

The *purely rational approach* that ignores faith and focuses exclusively on what can be scientifically knowable IS LITERALLY entering their frame. It's not a different approach. It's like me saying, "My wife won't have sex with me, so let me think of things from her perspective and give her everything she says she wants and maybe that will make her start seeing things my way." That's the blue pill approach that never works. You can't make a scientist acknowledge faith by feeding his demands for knowledge.

To be clear, it's all a hoax anyway. Science itself doesn't require the *absolute proof* for most of what it teaches that it does of Christianity or any religious system. There are TONS of scientific theories that have only circumstantial inferences that imply certain conclusions. And the standards applied to virtually every historical text are 10x more satisfied in the biblical account - yet when it comes to religion, the MO is to require a much, much higher standard than they require of their other non-Christian peers. This is why you'll never convince themselves - because they don't intend to play ball in the first place, even if you try. Avoid persuasion and focus more on demonstrating the value of faith.

Saw a post asking about porn addiction the other day. Here is a really great video that's helped me a lot already.

4 upvotes · 27 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Right. If you found value out of it, explain what value you found out of it.

The reality is that we can't vet every video link that comes through here. Some people have tried to post really nasty and heretical content. Others post videos that are 3+ hours long. We're not watching all that to figure out which ones are legit and which ones aren't. So, if you want the video up, you have to do the vetting for us by explaining the content of the video in your post so that we can see if there are any red flags.

As I often tell people, there are two requirements for posting links (and I bump posts regularly for violating this):

1. You have to have an explanation of the content that will be found if someone clicks on the link, and it must be thorough enough that someone can engage in the conversation completely without actually clicking on the link.
2. The link has to be an afterthought to the post, not the centerpiece. If it seems that the whole point of the post is to get someone to click on the link, it'll be removed.

The idea is that we want content on this sub to be within this sub. There is SOOOO much bad content out in the

world that we simply don't trust much of it. This sub is not meant to become a hub to reference other outside content. It's meant to be a community of men who sharpen each other. Links to outside content steal that away and encourage a mass-production model of the faith, which is much of what I preach against. I'm less interested in what some rando on YouTube thinks about a subject and more interested in what YOU think about it and what YOU are going to do about it. That's what matters on this sub - because we're a sub not merely of learning, but of doing. If you say content on a link has changed your life in some way, then write a post on how your life was changed by it and include, as an afterthought, "By the way, here's the link that started this for me."

Tag: [/u/rocknrollchuck](#) [/u/Deep_Strength](#)

Anyone familiar with Tony Dungy's stuff?

4 upvotes · 24 July 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

This.

Make it easy for your spouse

4 upvotes · 14 July 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I remember an excellent post you wrote that went into great detail about this. You gave the 30,000 feet and the street view that explained how the process usually unfolds, and it's not always how many men expect it to go.

Hmm ... I'm not sure I remember that one.

I'll note one of the main thoughts in my head when writing the post was how many men will think or say "My wife is supposed to do or be "abc" and it's true, but their own actions are making it that much more difficult for her.

I remember a conversation where a couple in my previous congregation were sharing about their marriage. The wife said that they were fighting and she just wanted her husband to hug her and tell her everything would be alright. The husband responded, "Nobody wants to hug a porcupine." She said that was a big eye-opener moment for her.

The funny thing is: it "opened her eyes" to the fact that Jesus hugged us as porcupines, so what an awful thing for her husband to say to her because he wasn't being like Christ. She should be able to act like a snotty, spiteful harpy and he should somehow be falling over himself to give her that hug ... rather than the more obvious conclusion: *If you stopped acting like a porcupine and made it easy for him to want to hug you, maybe you'd actually get that hug.*

Staying humble and RPC

4 upvotes · 9 July 2020 · [/r/askRPC](#)

The key is realizing that being humble is not thinking less of yourself. Rather, it's thinking more of others.

I don't even think it's that, though there is certainly value in appreciating others' needs and potential above our own, as I do with every man I disciple. I always ask God that when I invest in a man, they go on to do greater things than I do - and some have done exactly that! I'm encouraged by this, and not upset that they have surpassed me.

More to [/u/NoFaithInThisSub](#), in this conversation, I love in Numbers 12:3, which was written by Moses and says, "Now Moses was a very humble man, more humble than anyone else on the face of the earth."

This is the same man who threw stone tablets in anger at Israel's idolatry, whose face literally shone with the glory of God, who was the only man at that point in known history to see God and live, and who led an entire nation - and who also cared about his public image enough to disobey God by tapping on a rock because he was too embarrassed to talk to it. Yet in all of this he's still the most humble man in the whole world.

None of this implied he was thinking of others more. What it does tell us is that he had strong convictions, but did not overstate them. He knew exactly who he was before God and man - and this is evident in his conversation with God at the burning bush.

In this, I can say in all due humility: "I am probably the best racquetball player you've ever met." This is not a boast, as if I'm trying to overstate my skills. It's accurate. And for me to, instead, pretend that my neighbor is better would be probabilistically dishonest. Yet for me to play racquetball with my wife in a way that makes the game fun for her rather than completely creaming her ... that's part of humility. It embraces who I am, while still recognizing who she is in context, and giving deference to her in the situation rather than show-boating in a way that would aggravate her.

Phil's Victorious Humility

Yet at the same time, one of the guys I used to play with was Phil. He was the best I'd ever seen. A guy joined our tournament and was trash-talking everyone all the way up. The trash-talker had a nasty attitude, but he literally shut out every single competitor all the way to the finals. 15-0 every game. Nobody scored a single point against him.

Phil makes it to the championship too, though most of his games were 15-12 or 15-11.

Then the two are pitted against each other in the championship game. Phil just smiles and reaches to shake his hand before starting. The guy refused and made some comment about how "I'm going to destroy you. You're pathetic and I don't shake hands with trash. Everyone at this YMCA is pathetic and I'm here to prove it."

That guy served first. Phil returned it with a kill shot to the corner. He never served again. Phil shut him out 15-0 both games. He smiled at the man, offered him his hand again and simply said, "I appreciate that you played a fair game." The guy simply walked off and didn't even bother to take his 2nd place trophy/reward.

In this, Phil never lost his humility the entire time. It was a big lesson for me at the time - that someone could be GREAT, and yet simultaneously humble without undervaluing his own status. He didn't say, "You're right, you'll probably beat me," which Phil knew would be a lie. He didn't give the other guy a chance either. He literally gave it his all, even knowing that the guy couldn't actually play at Phil's level, despite being better than all the other competitors. So, even without reservation or consideration for the other guy's feelings, Phil was able to live accurately in light of who he was relative to that man, while still remaining meek, gentle, humble, kind, etc.

My point is: humility is embracing who you are before God and man and living in light of that toward the "greater good" - and if you are in Christ, that greater good is your own desire, even over the self-serving good that your flesh may initially prefer. Elevating yourself beyond reality is boastful and arrogant, but deflating your self-perception beyond reality is also unhelpful and prohibitive of the confidence necessary to make a difference in God's Kingdom. Devaluing others has the same effect, whereas elevating your perception of others causes you to see the world through false lenses, again hindering your ability to minister. Instead, I must know exactly who I am and who my neighbor is in order to decide how to act appropriately.

- In my wife's case, the greater good is served by having a fun game together (though it has been far too long since we've had that chance).
- In Phil's case, the greater good was served by displaying his dominance in the court in order to be a vehicle for God's judgment against the proud. There would have been no good served by validating his opponent's arrogance.

Reformed? Or Arminian?

4 upvotes · 3 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Nah. From what I recall, reformed says that some things are predestined and others are on free will. That's not the same as saying both are always on simultaneously.

Feeling discouraged with many churches' support of the Black Lives Matter movement, including my own.. Are there any truly alt-right/conservative churches left that don't buy into this?

4 upvotes · 2 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

That's not a viable long-term solution, though. What you're suggesting is either:

- (1) that the entire police force be disbanded and we devolve into anarchy because "you can quit being an officer" if the hostility against the police grows far enough and private security is a better-paying gig anyway. That's the natural end-conclusion without some protection for officers; or
- (2) that because we HAVE to have a police force, SOME people should be forced into a low-paying, thankless job that is hated by countless people in the nation and just deal with it.

Imagine (a) the types of people who are going to sign up willingly for that second camp, and (b) who those people will become after they've lived in those conditions for some time.

But more to the point: there's no actual evidence that "systemic racism" by the police is actually occurring. What we do see is that the incidents of violence by police officers against unarmed African Americans is drastically under-proportionate to the number of violence by black people committed against police officers. One study showed that in 2015 a police officer was 18.5 times more likely to be killed by a black male than an unarmed black male was to be killed by a police officer. The incidents of unarmed black people being killed by police officers has also dropped every year since then, down to only 10 cases in 2019, whereas 48 police officers were murdered in 2019. In 2015, black people made up only 6% of the population, yet were responsible for 52% of murders.

Yes, we can make up excuses for why it's justifiable for black people to have a disproportionately higher quantity of murders due to their "history of oppression" (which no doubt does exist) - but that doesn't change the fact that police are acting relative to the crime rates. To that end, I read one statistic that actually showed the reverse: that if we look at unarmed white deaths by police officers relative to crimes committed by white people and compare that to unarmed black deaths by police officers relative to crimes committed by black people, you will see that black people are actually killed less often than white people relative to the amount of crime each of them are committing. Now, I have no idea if that study was assessing all crimes or only violent crimes where the officers were at greater risk - but the fact that black people commit more than half of the murders in the country yet make up (at current) only 13% of the population tells me that the targeting isn't based on the color of one's skin, but based on the crime rates and the risks posed to the police officers by different cultural groups.

Feeling discouraged with many churches' support of the Black Lives Matter movement, including my own.. Are there any truly alt-right/conservative churches left that don't buy into this?

4 upvotes · 1 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

This is my view. Simply put: we're part of a heavenly Kingdom, not an earthly one. We are here as part of a spiritual military force, rather than a physical one. With physical military forces, it's often a running joke in movies that some people get stuck stationed in a research base in the arctic, right? There are crappy assignments. But they're usually also important assignments, whether we want to admit it or not.

Can you imagine the researchers stationed in the arctic revolting and insisting that all stations should be equal,

and therefore those stationed in Hawaii should be recalled because they have it too good, and those stationed in the arctic should be recalled because they have it too bad, and we should all have equal positions in some mediocrity, like Kansas? That's lunacy and would completely undermine the point of the mission each party is stationed at.

God is the potter, we're the clay. Some are designed for noble and others humble purposes, and others to be destroyed altogether, right?

In this, I don't believe there is any room for a biblically oriented black person to be complaining about his lot in life. Does God not promise that those who are given little and are faithful with little will be given much in the age to come? Doesn't he promise that the lowly will be glorified?

Jesus could have come in the height of Israel's glory, if he wanted. There was a time when they were a super-power throughout the world. Instead, he comes in a time when Israel was in exile, subject to Rome, and broadly persecuted. The hate against Israel by Rome isn't as clear from Scripture because the apostles weren't prone to whining about their earthly situation, but most secular history around the time documents this well - and it escalated to the point that within the lifetime of the apostles there was a war between the Jews and Rome that resulted in mass slaughter and the destruction of the temple in 70AD. That's the people and time-frame that Jesus decided to come in.

If black people want to make a claim of oppression, that's fine - but Jesus himself came as one who lived within oppression and did not demand equality, but instead demanded that his people pursue a spiritual Kingdom that would be better than the physical ones that were oppressing them.

Biblically oriented black Christians should understand this and realize: *Yeah, I'm the unlucky one who got stationed in the arctic. It sucks, especially when I know the guy who was stationed in Hawaii. But this is a temporary placement, so I'm going to carry out my mission in the place I've been given, and look forward to the reward I was promised for my diligent service.*

Does that mean you can't vote the way you want, or that you can't voice your concerns? Of course not. If we have certain political freedoms, we have every right to use them - and we should. But using our freedom to promote concepts of guilt, shame, condemnation, hate, violence, anger, and overall political unrest ... that just seems completely contrary to the model Jesus gave us.

Anyone else frustrated with their church leadership re: COVID?

4 upvotes · 1 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Yeah, you're changing the framework with this comment. My framework: *Don't do anything that will cause someone else to sin by violating their own conscience/convictions.* Your framework: *Don't do anything that could be potentially harmful to someone else.* Switch back to my framework and you'll see the conversation is much simpler and doesn't leave nearly as much room for that slippery slope. Of course, we do have to leave room for those who are mature to educate those who are immature on what their conscience and convictions are. So, if someone says it's sin to get a boner when you're not married, it would be sin for us to do something to cause him to get a boner, but it would not be sin if we taught him that it's actually okay to get a boner, and then he got one because of something we said/did.

How to know if I'm (F) dealing with a narcissist or with someone who has narcissistic traits (who is a bit arrogant & entitled)?

4 upvotes · 24 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I deal with psychological diagnoses of NPD in my career ALL. THE. TIME. It's the number 1 source of business for me. Most people find us by googling, "Divorcing a narcissist."

narcissist ... or narcissistic traits

According to the DSM-V

1a - **Identity**: Excessive reference to others for self-definition and self-esteem regulation [i.e. "Do you see how much better I am than they are?"]; exaggerated self-appraisal may be inflated or deflated, or vacillate between extremes [i.e. "I'm the most respected/hated person in my entire office"]; emotional regulation mirrors fluctuations in self-esteem

OR

1b - **Self-direction**: Goal-setting is based on gaining approval from others; personal standards are unreasonably high in order to see oneself as exceptional, or too low based on a sense of entitlement; often unaware of own motivations

AND

2a - **Empathy**: Impaired ability to recognize or identify with the feelings and needs of others; excessively attuned to reactions of others, but only if perceived as relevant to self; over- or underestimate of own effect on others. [This is generally interpreted to mean that they are INCAPABLE of discerning these things, not that they do discern it, but just don't care, which is more an antisocial trait.]

OR

2b - **Intimacy**: Relationships largely superficial and exist to serve self-esteem regulation; mutuality constrained by little genuine interest in others' experiences and predominance of a need for personal gain

3 **Antagonism**: Specifically as characterized by:

- **Grandiosity**: Feelings of entitlement, either overt or covert; self-centeredness; firmly holding to the belief that one is better than others; condescending toward others, and
- **Attention seeking**: Excessive attempts to attract and be the focus of attention of others; admiration seeking.

4 The impairments in 1a/1b and the individual's personality trait expression are relatively stable across time and consistent across situations [meaning they're that way all the time, not just in certain contexts].

5 The impairments in 2a/2b and the individual's personality trait expression are not better understood as normative for the individual's developmental stage or socio-cultural environment.

6 The impairments in 2a/2b and the individual's personality trait expression are not solely due to the direct physiological effects of a substance (e.g., a drug of abuse, medication) or a general medical condition (e.g., severe head trauma).

Now, realistically, I could take any person off the street, get to know them, and come up with examples of how they have met each one of these standards. Everyone will meet these standards at some point in time. That's why item 4 is so important - it's that they do these things constantly without ever dropping the attitude no matter what context or situation they're in. For example, if they show up to church and know how to adjust their behavior to fit in better than they do at home alone with you, it shows they're conscious enough of their own expression that it's not a personality disorder - it's general machiavellianism (which is not a disorder diagnosed in the DSM). The true narcissist doesn't realize there is anything wrong with any of these behaviors in the first place; they think it's perfectly appropriate for them to act this way, so they will not adjust their expression for different contexts or at different stages of life.

Funny story, my wife accused me of having NPD just a few months ago. She cited some of the same criteria you did. So, we both took an MMPI-2 (the primary test used by forensic psychologists to assess and diagnose

personality disorders). Turns out I'm free of personality disorders or any real anomalies at all (I did have a few scales that were out of the ordinary, but nothing exciting).

What you're describing to me is someone who has an inflated ego and is somewhat high-maintenance. But it doesn't strike me as narcissism - not even the traits. Of course, I don't see their actual expression, so it's hard to say for sure. For example:

A sense of superiority: meaning objectively thinking they are superior to a lot of their peers

Is he:

- Boasting 5-7 times a day about how he's better than someone at something? Or is he trash-talking people 5-7 times a day for being idiots and incompetent? If so, it might be one of the narcissistic traits.
- When situations come up that he's better than someone else, he presses the point harder than is warranted, or if someone else fails, he's harder on their failure than he should be. Then it's probably not a narcissistic expression, as these are contextual and he's merely exaggerating an otherwise appropriate response.

If you really want to, I can e-mail you a copy of the MMPI-2 and you can have him and you take it. I'll tell you what your scores mean and if his scores actually trigger the narcissistic criteria. It's about a 45-60 minute test.

RPC Chat - Episode 4: Christian Dead Bedrooms

4 upvotes · 18 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

So dread is really just a consequence of the wife not following her calling where the husband is

Not really. It's a man's response to his wife being sexually defiant/rebellious. In some sense, we can say her "calling" by God or by her husband includes not to deprive one another (1 Cor. 7), so technically the verse fits. But the language wouldn't resonate with most people.

A wife could easily say, "I'm following my calling. I'm evangelizing, making disciples, and taking care of the kids and house and supporting my husband. I just don't want to have sex with him." In this sense, she believes her calling is complete, but their sexuality is still at issue.

As such, it's more accurate (at least in terms of modern linguistics) to say that dread is what a man employs to restore his wife's sexual interest in him.

Where I had got concerned is if a man revels in her dread, recognizing that she is in distress, and taking joy in it.

That's not dread. That's sadism. Dread is the process of increasing one's own attractiveness to your spouse. The difference from general self-improvement is that it employs additional concepts of preselection that general self-improvement does not consider.

Specifically, preselection says that if you put two identical twin men in a room together, one has women hanging all over him and the other is all by himself, which will the woman find more attractive? Obviously the one with other women hanging all over him. This study has been repeated not only by the red pill community, but by other psychologists ad nauseam, usually with pictures of the same man photoshopped in two different scenarios with the woman asked to identify which man is more attractive. The conclusion is always the same: women are attracted to men who other women find attractive.

This derives from the hive mentality of women. But more specifically, it relates to the fact of the logical subconscious conclusion: "If women find that man attractive, but not the other guy, there must be a reason, and I

will trust the conclusions made by these other women rather than my own eyes."

From a marriage perspective, it's a little different. Your wife already knows you, so she's not approaching her perception of you based on what strangers think because she trusts her own experience first. This is why the first 7-ish levels of dread are about changing the man into something better. Initially, those changes are often overcome by the historical-impression problem - that people tend to view you the way they've always known you, giving little credit to any changes you're actually making. Yet when you get to the mid-late stages of dread where other women are actively showing interest in you, the wife starts to think: "I see that he's been changing, but didn't think much of it. Now that other people are starting to take notice, maybe there's more to these changes than I realized." Notice that this isn't about making her jealous - it's about opening her eyes to the fact that you've changed and are suddenly more attractive. She only notices this when other women notice it because women trust other women when it comes to finding a man attractive.

In this, I'm reminded of the reverse scenario where Dave Chapelle once commented: "Too many guys get mad when another dude stares at his wife's breasts. Why would you get mad at that? That's the greatest compliment I can receive. I don't want to be married to a woman who isn't turning heads. But when another guy stares at my wife's chest, it makes me feel good to know that I have what he wants." (Obviously not an exact quote; concepts from memory.)

Original red pill says to create dread by making her jealous if I'm remembering that right and that is not Jesus like at all.

This is wrong. You are either remembering this incorrectly or you were getting your information from a non-endorsed contributor.

Sanctification is the job of the Holy Spirit, not the husband

By this logic, no one would ever be allowed to rebuke anyone because that would be considered "unloving" and it's not our responsibility to work toward their sanctification, right? [/u/Deep_Strength](#) is spot on with this. The Spirit does the heart-changing work; the husband is the vehicle through whom it happens.

Regarding your podcast I have a few concerns ...

Yeah, there are always going to be complainers. At some point someone's going to complain that we're not baptizing people. Then someone else will complain that we're not having communion. Someone else will complain that we're not sharing the Gospel in every single episode.

The things you're referencing are all personal preference issues. They're not bad ideas. I may even take some of these comments to heart in how we approach future episodes. But unless you can show me a verse that says, "Thou shalt quote at least 2 Bible verses within the first 10 minutes of every group gathering," I have to assume that this is just preference.

Curious: do you hold your pastor to that same standard? Because I have yet to meet a pastor who consistently makes Scripture the foundation of what they're preaching these days, much less actually quoting it. Most often, we get an ear full of their personal opinions on how people should live, followed by a passage they found which they think supports their position. They're usually using the verse right more often than not ... but the "not" is often enough that it's clear they're preaching from an eisegetical standpoint rather than actual exegetical interpretation. In our situation, most of the Scriptural foundation is on the sub here, whereas the conversations are auxiliary - they're not meant to be repetitive of the Scripturally grounded content here on the sub, but conversation inspired by that content.

Also, notice that when Paul was writing his letters, he often went very long stretches without quoting any Scripture at all. And yet we saw fit to deem his writings Scripture, despite his lack of biblical references in

certain sections. What he was doing was speaking to issues rather than exegeting from a passage.

Issue speaking is, admittedly, significantly more difficult than direct exegesis. It requires having done the exegesis ahead of time so that one can speak competently without having to waste the time of doing the entire study in front of everyone before actually speaking on the subject.

That said, when we get to live pod-cast episodes (which will be forthcoming), I'd be happy for people to ask questions about where the Bible supports what we're saying - because it does.

Tag: [/u/OsmiumZulu](#)

OYS - Where Progress is Made (06/10/20)

4 upvotes · 10 June 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Contact [u/r_horizon](#). He's helping with some of those things also, but his ambition for what he'd like to accomplish with all of this might require assistance on some stuff like that, which I'm otherwise incompetent to handle. I know [/u/annaerials](#) has also been assisting with some of this stuff and just last night added a lot to the YouTube stuff, which was fantastic. The team of people helping with this kind of stuff is small right now, but could easily have room for growth as we keep putting out more content.

Need some dating advice...

4 upvotes · 10 June 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

[/u/redwall92](#) is saying that you're DEERing to us about your scrawny physique before we even brought it up as an issue. Pre-emptive DEERing is worse than regular DEERing. If you know this is a problem, at least own it and accept the criticism when it comes. It's not a big deal, just remember for the future ;)

How to create sexual tension/make conversations man-to-woman as a Christian?

4 upvotes · 3 June 2020 · [/r/askRPC](#)

How to create sexual tension ...?

and ...

Reading : first 5-6 posts on RPC sidebar

You're asking the question too early here, brother. I appreciate wanting to skip ahead to what you think are the fun parts, but you have to lay the foundation first.

[60DOD] Week 8, Social Life

4 upvotes · 3 June 2020 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

It's gotta be a priority.

Exactly. The "when you move someplace new" is me right now.

Introduction and OYS #1

4 upvotes · 20 May 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

At first I thought you wrote it, haha.

Who should you listen to on RPChristians?

4 upvotes · 20 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Imminently. I just have to write the announcement post. I will not be a huge content creator there, myself, but I'll participate from time to time.

Does Man Really Findeth A Wife?

4 upvotes · 20 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

You should check the whole sidebar. It's all recommended reading, not just the ones that get specifically named.

Is marriage worth it?

4 upvotes · 19 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Don't have kids, use a prenup. Do both of those and you'll be fine.

Alternatively, only marry a woman who earns as much as you or more. That's the other easy way to avoid divorce rape.

How do I approach my husband about this issue?

4 upvotes · 18 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Don't be afraid to tell him how you feel

Followed by quoting:

they may be won over **WITHOUT** words by the behavior of their wives

Huh?

Why an Adulterous Nation Seeks After a Sign

4 upvotes · 13 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Well said, friend. I'm surprised you didn't delve into the adultery angle a bit more, which would have connected the dots a bit more clearly. As /u/DeChef2 noted, looking for a sign doesn't make you an adulterer; but people who already are adulterers are the ones who will ask for one.

In this case, the Pharisees had abandoned God - their first spouse - for legalistic practices and "rules taught by men," along with their lust for the power that came with their position. They were looking for the Messiah, but didn't want to give up their lovers any more than the adulterous Gomer did for Hosea. So, they demanded more and more proof that would never satisfy them as yet another excuse for not having to give up their love-affair with legalism, which gave them power and control in the Jewish culture at the time.

Now look in modern times. CHRISTianity has been replaced with CHURCHianity. The structures that give pastors power and a voice among the people are now replacing the significance of the role of Christ among his own bride. Instead of looking to the way Jesus made disciples, and following our groom as he instructed, churchianity is hung up on Sunday services, programs, service projects, outreach events, etc. We have abandoned the way of Christ for these other idols.

Lots more to say ... too low on time. Good conversation, either way.

Why an Adulterous Nation Seeks After a Sign

4 upvotes · 13 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

This guy gets it!

Starting, Developing, and Evolving Hobbies

4 upvotes · 6 May 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I love this post, brother. Very well done. In no particular order, some of my hobbies include ...

(1) Reading/Writing (including reddit)

- I chat with other writers
- I use it to advance my mission
- It's a fun, creative outlet (especially when I write fiction)

(2) Lifting/Running

- I usually do it with other people, making it socially engaging
- It's a fantastic time to parent my children and have deeper, more stimulating conversations
- It provides internal confidence and physical stimulation, as well as just makes you feel good about yourself

(3) Recreational Swimming (seasonally)

- I love just taking my kids to the pool. Lots of fun screwing around.
- It's another great way to meet people.
- It also has some value in staying in shape, depending on how hard we play.

(4) Logic Puzzles + Movie/TV/Audio Book

- Whenever possible, I enjoy multi-tasking to logic puzzles. My current favorites are **Griddlers (aka Nonograms)**, for which I'm currently ranked 175th in the world by points (i.e. difficulty of puzzles solved, not quantity).
- When I was in college, I was infatuated with minesweeper and was, at the time 3rd in the world for fastest time on expert setting.
- These are simple tasks that, while intellectually stimulating, can easily be done without losing focus on other visual/audible things, making it a great multi-tasking form of enjoyment.

(5) Distance Biking (seasonally)

- It's fantastic physical exercise.
- It's peaceful and relaxing, providing lots of time to either think or converse with my children (I always have two of them in the trailer with me).

I have a number of other small things I engage in with less frequency - back-burner hobbies, if you will. These are things that I could take up again and readily enjoy if I find myself lacking in things to do.

- Racquetball. I used to play on a professional level and with professionals (though not actually as a professional). I've never been beaten by anyone under the age of 40, including among the professionals. It's been a great tool for connecting with other people - especially new people, expanding my social circle. That said, since moving last year, I'm now 30+ minutes from the closest courts, so this one got put on the sideline for now.

- My wife and I are pseudo-competitive with jigsaw puzzles. We've talked about joining official competitions (rather than amateur ones we do with family/friends) to test how we'd rank against other competitive puzzlers. We are collectively undefeatable among those we know personally. My wife and I tested against each other once, using the same puzzle on a computer (i.e. not actual puzzle) and she managed to beat me by 14 seconds on a 30+ minute effort, so we're generally pretty evenly matched, which makes it more fun.
- I used to do a lot of singing/song-writing, leading worship for churches, and generally enjoy playing the guitar and recording music.
- I always note cooking as one of my hobbies, but I don't extend it beyond occasional experimentation yet. I do research, from time to time, different types of ingredients and how they work together or affect the palate (the "learning to cook without a book" idea).
- I love watching musicals (preferably live), but they're sparse enough it's hard to convert it into a dedicated hobby. At best, there are about 5 decent ones a year, which is less than one every other month - unless you go to NYC and watch them on Broadway (which I did last year and am doing again next year).

You get the idea.

Roosh V on Jessie Lee Peterson

4 upvotes · 4 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Remember how many scientists made fascinating discoveries in the 70s because they went on LSD and it caused them to set aside their preconceived notions and come to very real conclusions about how to proceed with their work?

No / Bad Sex - Always His Fault?

4 upvotes · 28 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Frame issue, much? This validates my comment in this thread about your lack of frame. Chill out. He's just pointing out the obvious. If you're not charting your progress on significant matters, why should we assume you're actually making good progress? There's a reason these things are REQUIRED by the sidebar for these types of posts. Lots of what you're discussing is addressed by the exact literature he referenced.

More to the point: putting words in his mouth that he didn't say, then calling him "beta" and an "internalized-white-knight" will not be tolerated here. I have no hesitation banning someone whose ego is so out of control that they have to go around calling anyone who challenges them "beta" or "white knights." Suck it up or get out.

BiblicalGenderRoles.com

4 upvotes · 28 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I've seen some of their stuff. I'm not a fan. I'd probably agree with [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) - there's probably some value in reading alternative viewpoints, even if they're wrong, because you're probably already reading a ton of wrong viewpoints on the other side anyway. Better to balance yourself out if the truth is somewhere in the middle.

It's like saying you're a political moderate, but refusing to watch any news source other than CNN. You claim you can see how liberal it is, and therefore think you're fine. But then you start watching Fox News, which is equally biased and full of holes to the same degree as CNN. Do you reject it because you know some of the content is bad? No. Because realizing WHERE the disagreements actually are gives you a better ability to figure out for yourself what's actually true and not.

- The point of reading articles like these isn't to figure out what's true. It's to figure out which issues aren't settled so you can research it for yourself.

The same goes to what you read here too. If your faith is based on what other people tell you about God rather than your own independent ingestion of Scripture, you're a fool. Stop relying so much on articles and keep going back to Scripture.

Another way to think of this: if 0-5 is camp 1 and 5-10 is camp 2 and 5 is actually true, if you're only reading resources from camp 1 and they're all in the 0-1 range and you want to be a 5, you're going to object to some things they say and tell yourself, "I'm clever enough to see through their lies!" But because you only ever see information in the 0-1 range, you'll probably end up being a 2 or 3 and believing you're in camp 2 for being that way. Yes, you're better than the 0-1 sources, but you're still drinking some of the cool-aid. Even if you start reading some 5 resources, you, as a logical person, are going to assume that everyone gets something wrong, so you won't be persuaded 100% exactly to 5 - maybe you'll become a 3 or 4. But balance your 0-1 reading with some 9-10 reading and you'll see just how wrong both sides are, but by recognizing both extremes rather than trying to personally assess out of your own ignorance of what camp 2 says, you'll always end up leaning in favor of the majority of content you read and wind up in camp 1.

Now, on the actual social and spiritual climate we're in, I'd wager 5 isn't actually what's true ... it's probably closer to 6, 7, or even 8. We're just so used to seeing 0-1 from so many congregations that 5 can feel like we've gone far enough, and we assume the "middle" is actually true. But I don't see God being a "God of the middle." He takes strong stands on important issues. Just not always the same stance on the same issues that some people pretend.

Am I in the right place?

4 upvotes · 28 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

If mega churches didn't have a constant barrage of new faces each week, I'd agree with you, to some extent. But since when is the easier path the best path? I have had no problem turning around my image with others. I'm not sure why that would be so objectionable.

Is there anything that we can do to help him?

4 upvotes · 27 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

What's with all the "LTR, breaks up with her after two months" and "LTR for another few months." Do you not know what LTR stands for?

He insists ... so we have no choice

Well, apparently his frame is strong enough to drag you into it. So he might have something more figured out than you do.

Here's the deal. I've had incredible success with persuading guys of the things I write about here - discipleship, hypergamy, fitness tests. All of it. I can include at least 4 pastors in that list, 2 of whom I would call "fully red pillled" (not even purple). If you want to help this guy, here are a few pointers.

1. Figure yourself out first. I can persuade pastors to what I do because they see that I, as a lay person, do a better job at their job without a title or a soapbox than they're doing. You have to be what they want. Are you there yet? Because it doesn't sound like you're the kind of guy he wishes he were. Focus on yourself, not him. That's the first step toward persuading others.
2. Surpass ignorance rather than being enamored by it. You say he's "wise when it comes to pointing to scripture." This is the starting point of many men I work with. The reality is, he's not wise at all. You've explained how he's actually quite foolish. What you mean is that he knows what the Bible says, but is clueless on what it means or how to apply it. You need to understand the Bible better than him, which it sounds like

isn't hard. But right now, you're persuaded by him that you think he knows more than he does. Have you **read 302 yet**? What's the last book of the Bible you followed this process with all the way to completion?

3. Ask questions. Let people figure things out for themselves whenever you have the chance to. I wish internet forums were conducive to this. If he's at least fluent with what the Bible says, ask him questions about how Jesus did things. Was he impulsive? Was he so excited about marrying the church that he jumped right into it after a couple months, or did he take years discipling her and modeling life for her first before becoming one with her? But don't be an idiot and ask these questions as a challenge. Hence ...
4. Pull a Nathan. Ask him to teach you something that you're dying to know. Make it a topic relevant to his situation that's going to force him to realize how dumb he's being (if he's actually being dumb - I really don't know enough about his situation). When Nathan wanted David to understand a flaw that he wouldn't admit to naturally, Nathan concocted a story to get David angry at the villain in the story, only to reveal that David himself did exactly what the villain did. Now, you go get him to teach you about how Jesus modeled relationships for us, and ask lots of questions that (1) if his teachings are wrong, bring suspicion on why they're wrong without directly challenging him; or (2) if they're right, show him how he's not living by the own standard he's teaching to you.

There's more, but this should get you started. Really, though, worry more about yourself. It's not your responsibility to save him from his own mistakes if you're not any better off yet. You have to have what he wants, and right now you don't.

Reposting as text: Advice on how to manage and potentially create a Red Pill women's subreddit for Christian women.

4 upvotes · 25 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I don't think johnmic07 is being fully honest with his representation of the deuterocanonical/apocryphal books.

most Catholics haven't read them

This can be said of the other 66 books too. My previous congregation was 68% ex-Catholic. Virtually all of them, after becoming Protestant, were shocked at the fact that those who weren't previously in a Catholic church actually read their Bibles. They said that they were never (or rarely) encouraged to do so, or that if they were, they were told to do it for "relational" quality and not to understand it because only the priests were allowed to interpret Scripture for them. This is also consistent with a lot of ex-Catholics have reported on places like **r/TrueChristian**, and it's also consistent with my time attending a Catholic congregation.

they don't really teach anything controversial

This is also incredibly false. Catholics do use these books to draw certain defining doctrines from. Purgatory is a great example. It's curiously absent from the primary 66 books. You can only find things that kind of seem like they reference purgatory if you're intentionally eisegesis it into the passage, but which have other more obvious meanings that don't require forcing an outside concept onto the passage. Instead, purgatory comes primarily from the Maccabees references to people praying for the purification of the dead.

The only reason they aren't included in the protestant/Jewish old testament is because they have not yet found complete original versions written in Hebrew. Only translations in Greek and fragments in Hebrew. Not because there's anything in them that contradicts something significant in the rest of the Bible.

Again, this is a completely false statement. The primary reason for Protestant rejection is **BECAUSE** of its inconsistency with the rest of the books. It would force playing theological gymnastics to create consistency.

While I'm not the biggest fan of CARM, they list at least a few of the things that I'd put on my list:

<https://carm.org/reasons-why-apocrypha-does-not-belong-bible>

All of that being said, while I 100% reject the notion that they are theologically inspired, they may still be useful for historical value. We use historical texts from other belief systems to figure out what happened in the past all the time. Even secular histories will use the Bible as a source of information for historical analysis, while rejecting the theological matters addressed in it.

I have no problem if someone reads the deuterocanonical books - and I've even done so myself. It's fascinating and worth the read. But it's not something I'd put theological stock into.

I say this not to upset any Catholics, who otherwise have reasonable defenses to some of the things I've said. Rather, I would simply prefer that if the Catholic argument for their inclusion is presented, that the opposing view is presented as well - especially when that opposing view is as grossly misrepresented as has been done here.

Genuinely curious about your philosophies. Not looking to debate just want to listen.

4 upvotes · 25 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

According to your comments on the [r/TrueChristian](#) sub, you're making countless false conclusory statements without any fair representation of anything said in this thread at all. This is hardly "trying to understand it." Goodbye.

Someday is a dangerous word

4 upvotes · 16 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I like this. It's a perfect call toward something I often advise guys: **Set very clear goals and deadlines for yourself.** If you leave it vague, it won't get done.

While I certainly don't endorse everything he says, Coach Red Pill (not to be confused with [u/RedPillCoach](#)) on YouTube does have a fantastic video on this point, which I encourage a lot of guys to watch and follow through with outlining their own life goals. I have a spreadsheet I keep on my desktop for this as well:

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

Godliness is sexy (companion post)

4 upvotes · 14 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Haha, you missed the point.

Thoughts?

4 upvotes · 4 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

When I was in college I had the same prerequisite. There were girls who were hot and into me who offered to "convert" to Christianity for me. But I knew it would never be a genuine conversion if they were doing it *for me*. It sounds like you found the same thing: her conversion clearly wasn't genuine.

From a spiritual angle, it doesn't matter if "she will go back to being a hoe." Biblically, all non-Christians can do is sin. A "break from Christianity" means she's going back to being a non-Christian with the hope that Jesus will still take her back sometime before she dies, but only after she's had all her fun. That's playing games with Jesus, not authentic faith. If she really believed what the Bible says, she'd know that the lifestyle she wants to return to is like dipping her hand in acid. Nobody does that unless they're so mentally distorted (such as being on acid) that they literally cannot cognitively understand what they're doing. The simpler conclusion is that she doesn't actually believe her choices are anywhere as dangerous and destructive as they are. How can that be if she's been given a new heart and her eyes have been opened by the Spirit? Oh, it can't. So that must not have happened yet.

figure out an exit strategy

"Sorry, I don't date non-Christians." There, I figured it out for you.

how to dread an ENTP

Dread is best applied in marriage and LTRs. 6 months is hardly an LTR. You should still be in the NRE phase. No need for dread then. Not that it hurts to implement it anyway. It's just overkill. Better just being a high value man than worrying about her.

On Testosterone

4 upvotes · 3 April 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Right. My first reaction at the pic was to assume it was two current shots. Turns out it was supposed to be a before/after. Who knew?

I have no problem with those who want to use steroids. But I'll stick with my protein shakes.

You have any thoughts on creatine? I've toyed with the idea of using it once the gyms open up again. I've heard stellar reports from some. But I also know 2 guys with a masters in exercise science who say the gains go away as soon as you stop taking it, so it's artificial improvement. Worth it or no? I figure you'd be the one to know.

LTR no longer Christian. Next her?

4 upvotes · 3 April 2020 · /r/askTRP

Short answer: yeah, her numbers are higher than she admitted, and you're better off moving on. As [/u/osmiumzulu](#) often refrains: "If it's not a hell yes, it's a hell no!"

Lots more to say, given your core starting point, but I usually try to avoid religious talk on the secular forums. Post this on RPChristians and we can discuss further.

What Does the Future Hold for Us as Christians? Should We Be Considering House Churches at This Point?

4 upvotes · 3 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

These are fantastic things to think about, brother! Given my recent affirmation in my leanings toward preterism, I'm not as persuaded that anything is a sign of prophecy yet to be fulfilled. Rather, I would take all of these prophecies as having already been substantially fulfilled in the first century. But that doesn't mean we can't recognize the spiritual imperative that such difficult times creates and the possibility that things will get worse before they get better.

What would you do if all of a sudden you couldn't go to church anymore - permanently? Would you give up?

I'd praise Jesus that God saw fit to tear down one useful structure in order to remind us of the more foundational concepts of what it means to be the church, and let us rebuild who we are meant to be in a more authentic context to what the apostles would have experienced in many countries, such as Rome.

Obviously I wouldn't give up. I'd keep doing exactly what I'm doing now. I just wouldn't have the benefit of someone else finding all the Christians for me. I'd have to step up my own social networking game. This would also be beneficial in that I'd more likely be seeking out non-Christians because the pool of Christians needing discipleship would be scattered, making it harder to find Christians, making it easier to focus on the lost. That's a beautiful thing, not a bad thing!

How would you connect with other Christians?

The same way I do now. My connection with other believers was NEVER dependent on the congregational structure. And I hope nobody else's is too. When we become too dependent on structures, we lose our dependence on Jesus.

Would you still share your faith knowing you could be killed for doing so?

Of course. This question, though, is usually more targeted at proclamational evangelists because they're the only ones truly threatened by these types of mandates. Their entire strategy of evangelism goes down the tubes if they can't preach on street corners, hand out tracts, or knock on doors. The relational people will still be building relationships with non-Christians, and given that the Gospel is most likely to be received when trust is established, that trust will also most protect the believer. Nothing has to change about that particular strategy.

What if the authorities were to come into your house and search it, taking every Bible you own?

Can't remove them from online. There will always be access to underground Bibles. The better answer here, though, is that now is an even better time than ever to focus on Scripture memory.

What if digital versions of the Bible such as YouVersion and the BibleGateway website were no longer available on the web?

Unlikely. Pirated versions will always be available. But again, Scripture memory is my key.

All of that said, I don't think freedom of religion is under permanent risk right now. Freedom in how we express it is certainly at risk. But not the right to believe and share one's own views with others. 30 years from now my opinion might change, and perhaps it's good to have that conversation 30 years ahead. But it's not immediately on my mind :p

OYS - Where Progress is Made (04/01/20)

4 upvotes · 2 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Been there, done that, brother. Your position with your wife/kids is incredibly common. It's probably the most common dynamic in households with young kids. In fact, it's so common that I'm probably going to write up a full post on it instead of replying here. Look for that very soon - I wrote half of it while starting a reply to you anyway, so it shouldn't be much longer, but I do have to get some work done.

Most Christians Do Not Love Women

4 upvotes · 1 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I was just going to remove the troll's comment in the first place, but it's worth keeping it up just for this comment.

FR: Teaching a 16yo kid to Lift.

4 upvotes · 24 March 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Now you know what I'm talking about when I say my mission is to "make disciples." This is exactly what it looks like. Life modeling. Welcome to my world, brother! Linking this on [r/RPChristians](#) for others to see how simple it is compared to the way some people try to over-complicate it.

Whose game are you winning?

4 upvotes · 11 March 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Right, but to some degree there's truth in the old saying that "if you're not doing what you want, you're doing

what someone else wants." The only alphas without a mission at all are pure anarchists who don't want anything at all - they just want to burn down what everyone else wants ... which in itself becomes a mission.

The Philosophy Side of The Bible

4 upvotes · 19 February 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I would certainly take issue with the characterization of the KJV here. But yes, it's better to read any generally accepted version than none at all.

How would a turnaround for the church look like? Making it more RP than Feminist.

4 upvotes · 22 December 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Because context matters. Jesus says: "If your eye causes you to sin, gouge it out." Would it be biblical or unbiblical for every man on earth who has ever watched porn to blind himself? Or for every woman who ever gossiped to cut her tongue off? Unbiblical, of course. That would be a wrong interpretation of that verse. The context must be considered before we make stupid choices based on uninformed interpretations.

Regarding OT law, we are never to follow it blindly at face value. That ignores its context and role in a pre-Gospel world. The new testament is abundantly clear that the gentiles (i.e. everyone who wasn't a jew) had no obligation under old testament law. In fact, even Paul who was certainly a jew - and so much so that he called himself a Hebrew of Hebrews - said that because of Christ he was no longer under the law.

So, when a pastor like Steven Anderson tries to quote old testament law as if we should be following it today, he's removing it from its context and promoting an unbiblical interpretation.

Now, many principles of old testament law are still valid. But it's like committing a crime in New York then arguing to the jury to acquit you because Japanese law would permit your actions, when you're neither Japanese nor living in Japan. Sure, Japan probably has a lot of similarities to the laws the New York courts apply. But you have to cite New York law, not a parallel point in Japanese law to make your case.

Non-believing spouse

4 upvotes · 12 November 2019 · /r/askRPC

What do I do with her?

"Let those with wives live as though they had none." ~1 Cor. 7:29

I know the Bible tells me to pray for her but in all these years she never was genuinely interested in meeting my needs. How long is long enough?

Long enough until she leaves.

She is escaping her motherly duties with work

You own 2/3 of the company. You're her boss. If you need to, "buy her out" (whatever that means when you're married) and replace her with an employee. Or just give her a workload that's consistent with her ability to work at home. If you think you're already doing that, then just deal with the fact that you've got a lazy wife who doesn't want to do the housework and either manage it yourself or get attractive enough that she feels the need to keep up. But at the end of the day - keep going back to 1 Cor. 7:29.

By the way: if you didn't have a wife right now, would you be getting in better shape in the hope of attracting hot girls? If so, why are you doing any different right now? Live a motivated life, not a placated one.

Confession & Repentance?

4 upvotes · 4 November 2019 · /r/askRPC

I spilled my guts and she just kinda looked at me blankly

Because she's thinking: "Why are you telling me this? Are you looking for my approval and validation? Do you want me to be your mommy?"

I've been thinking about writing a post on this exact topic. Perhaps now is the time.

Covert contract with God

4 upvotes · 27 October 2019 · /r/askRPC

Solving sin is a byproduct of faith in Christ, not a prerequisite to it. The whole point of the Gospel is that you don't have to worry about sin anymore because God gives you more important things to do. When you start doing them you stop caring about clinging to your sin the way you used to. Right now you're holding back because of your investment in your sin, but after Christ the luster of it all just fades and you don't really care anymore ... the same way a blue pill guy stops seeing the luster in marriage when he discovers the red pill. The truth sets you free from all that fraudulent garbage that seemed to be a dominant, extremely powerful and controlling force over your life before.

And of course you don't want to make that change right now - because you see it as a loss of your fun without a gain or exchange. It's like a drug addict who knows his life will be so much better if he goes to AA and cleans up, but while still addicted he thinks it's all just going to be one big buzz kill for some "greater good" that they really see as mediocrity. Then after they finally do clean up for good, they look back on those days and can't figure out how they were so dumb as to think that was somehow better.

How to communicate self-improvement to a potential partner?

4 upvotes · 23 October 2019 · /r/askRPC

I'm not fully religious yet

Good. Don't be. Religiosity is what ushered in the transition from Christianity to churchianity.

RedPilled 3 weeks, redpill aware 3 months

I probably need to do a post on this, but what you said makes no sense. The Red Pill is truth. Once you're aware of the truth and accept it as truth, you're red pill. The only way I can interpret this phrase to make sense is to say that you became aware of the existence of the red pill 3 months ago, but didn't start reading content and agreeing to the truth of it until 3 weeks ago.

What I'm really guessing you mean, though, is that you started applying behaviors that you think are "red pill behaviors" about 3 weeks ago, like lifting, developing frame, etc. This is a wrong framework for understanding things.

met interesting girls. One who likes me is religious ... she requires a man to be religious

As well she should. This isn't "her issue," as if this is a problem with her. Biblically, it's foolish and unscriptural to be with a non-believer (unless you became a believer post-marriage). Of course, that doesn't actually stop most girls, which is why she's showing interest in you in the first place, despite your spiritual ambiguity. This is another reason why I believe God has men in authority rather than women. While there have certainly been situations where men have abandoned their faith for women, it is significantly less often when you see the reverse. A quick

look on any dating app and you'll see in droves the number of women who profess "Christian" or "God comes first" on their profiles, who also have countless children out of wedlock, boozing it up, using drugs, etc.

I want to make sure that I'm approaching this in a full redpill manner

Then why are you bringing it up at all? The "full red pill manner" is *acta non verba*. I swear, people today are so screwed up with this "communication is the life blood of relationships" nonsense. Get that out of your head. Take a vow of silence for 30 days, learning to communicate solely through action (and not sign language or charades) and I guarantee your attractiveness will be much better for it.

At this stage of my life journey

I don't care about the nuance of what you actually said and how it should be interpreted. She will hear: "Oh, so he intends to stop improving in these areas at other stages in his life."

I have some weaknesses that may be relevant to your selection of a partner

i.e. "I recognize that you're the one in the position of social dominance because you get to select who you marry, and I'm just lucky to have the chance to be selected by you."

I understand that it's not ideal manners, but it's important for me to focus my efforts on XYZ first because it impacts me more in ABC ways.

i.e. "It really matters that you agree with me because I'm hung up on what you think, so I'm going to defend my position and explain to you my rationalization for exactly why I'm doing things this way, after which you will agree with me and I will feel much better once I have your approval."

If it is more pleasing to your ears

"... because my life mission is to make you happy, my dear."

I will try my best not to use swear words around you

"... because I recognize how important it is to conform my behaviors to your liking."

I do not want to misrepresent myself here, so my usage of swear words will still maintain regularity outside of our conversations

"Don't worry, I'm still going to pretend to be alpha to everyone else - but for you, I'll be as beta as you want me to be."

If it is critically important for you

"... yes, FOR YOU - because doing things FOR YOU is everything I live for"

I may make these changes in the distant future

"... FOR YOU I will make permanent changes to my life. Not for God. Not for my own well-being. I'll do it FOR YOU."

because I do see merit in how it relates to exemplary manners and character

"See how great I can rationalize pussifying myself at your feet as really a choice for me instead? Don't worry, honey. Any time you want me to change something about myself, as long as you can give me a rationalization that my hamster can get behind, I'll make the change because I can convince myself I'm doing it for me."

but I would need the space and time to make these changes of my own accord without any undue pressure

"... because I'm a pussy who isn't disciplined enough to make significant life changes without substantial space and time, and especially not under pressure. And if you are trying to pressure me at all, my desire to do it FOR YOU will be so strong that I won't be able to do it for myself because I cannot see myself apart from my desire to do things FOR YOU. But if you can stop pressuring me, then it'll be a lot easier for me to convince myself that what I'm doing FOR YOU is really for myself."

I'd love to hear your thoughts on my priorities and terms on this.

"... because I'm happy to change my priorities and terms if you think I should."

Seriously, it's crap like this that makes me see why the MRP guys throw around words like "faggot" and "autist" so much. Are you trolling us? Or do you really think this way?

As [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) said: acta non verba. Let that be your mantra.

Is my marriage salvageable?

4 upvotes · 23 October 2019 · [/r/askMRP](#)

You've already gotten a lot of good advice here:

- Stay plan is the go plan
- Recognizing incongruency in your statements
- OYS

You get the idea. Here's why none of that is going to work for you, though: you're still so stinkin' blue pill'd that your goal is to save your marriage, or in the alternative: to find happiness in life through another woman instead. This goes beyond the advice to avoid validation-seeking. This is at the very core of who you are as a man.

What's your purpose in life? What's your mission? If you have nothing to live for outside the home, then the home becomes your mission. If the home is your mission - the thing you're pursuing in life - then nobody in the home can follow you because you're chasing after them all the time. You end up looking like a dog spinning in circles trying to catch its own tail.

I'm also confused about the whole "We are only together because of our kids and religious beliefs." You claim 'religious belief' as a reason you can't get a divorce, yet wouldn't those same 'religious beliefs' also preclude cheating on your spouse, which you clearly did - and with even noting: "I didn't feel guilty." I'm not moralizing here, but just showing some serious cognitive dissonance in your own head that you've got to work through. In my view, this is really the most screwed up part about your story - not that you cheated, but that you hamster your way through idiotic rationalizations like this that are totally inconsistent with your own behaviors. Either you're going to follow your spiritual beliefs or you're going to abandon them. Choose. But don't be a luke warm kind of guy. If you choose the former, [/r/RPChristians](#) might be able to help you get your head back on straight with all this, without losing your faith in the process.

How to handle Labor / birth

4 upvotes · 17 October 2019 · /r/askRPC

Yikes! Lots of "beta up" advice here. Seriously, the whole labor and delivery thing isn't as big a deal as your wife will make it out to be. Seriously, you'd be surprised at how many cases I get where the guy doesn't even go to the hospital at all with his wife, or will just visit her and his kid for a couple hours at a time.

[u/osmiumzulu](#) is right. Don't make a big production of it all. It's definitely not the time to be a jerk, but there's no point sublimating yourself either. It's just as much your baby as hers. Help her out as she needs, but you still do you.

In MMSLP, Athol Kay talks about the difference between a fitness test and an actual need for help. Labor and delivery doesn't change all that. It just significantly raises the probability that she needs actual help. Adjust your evaluation of the dynamic accordingly.

How to Hide Your Porn

4 upvotes · 6 October 2019 · /r/askRPC

The RPC way is to stop using porn. Why make excuses? You slip up, just repent and move on.

The advice here isn't to hide anything from your spouse. It's to avoid the internal pressure toward compulsory disclosure. Too many guys assume that there's some biblical command: "Thou shalt tell thine wife all secrets and sins of your life." That command doesn't exist.

If you can get past the internal compulsion toward disclosure, then you can decide logically if you want to tell her or not. When you're 100% in control over your own decisions and not feeling compelled or under pressure, then you can decide for yourself if you want to tell her and what your motive might be for doing so. If you feel like it, do it; if you don't, don't.

The key here is that you're making your own judgment calls and not letting cultural imperatives make you feel like you have to do it. As long as you're acting of your own volition and not external pressure, you're good to do as you please. But most guys will realize that once the pressure is gone, the wiser choice is usually not to say anything.

Help! Stunned by wife

4 upvotes · 20 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Comments like this (including part 2) are why you're endorsed. Incredible work here.

What it means to be humble.

4 upvotes · 17 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

(My definition) Humility is thinking of yourself less. Humility is not thinking of yourself as less.

I've often heard it worded: "Humility is not thinking less of yourself, but thinking of yourself less often." Either way, this is a nice catch-phrase, but it's not the conclusion I reached when doing a word study on the topic in Scripture.

My definition: **Living in light of an accurate perception of who you are before God and man.**

If I told someone, "I'm probably the best racquetball player you've ever met," I can say this with perfect humility. Why? Because it's almost certainly true. I'm not puffing myself up beyond reality. I was the racquetball champion at my university and I've never lost a game to anyone under the age of 40 (those old guys are good, though!). I've regularly beaten professional players. Does it make me less humble to acknowledge these facts about my life? No.

The "less often" definition is a matter of frequency. It doesn't fit on the spectrum of proud - - - humble. It's on

the spectrum of self-absorbed - - - - selfless. Selfish people can be humble and proud people can be selfless. In this sense, I get the impression that your post is more about a selfless person rather than a humble person.

With that in mind, I agree with the rest of your post.

If we're too concerned with ourselves, and our interests, how can we be making disciples?

Right. By definition, we are meant not for our own purposes, but for Christ's purposes for us. Christ's purpose was to the nations through disciple-making, not for us to internalize our faith (at which point it is likely not saving faith at all). Also, this phrase is preceded by the compulsion to be "one in Spirit and in purpose." That purpose is, of course, the mission of the Church which is to make disciples. So spot on there!

Be like Christ

This is the fundamental concept of discipleship. And for those who don't know how to be like Christ, we emulate others who do - "Follow me, as I follow Christ" (1 Cor. 11:1). It also encompasses the "walk as Jesus walked" concept and not merely "don't do the things Jesus said not to do" that gets preached.

Jesus knew He was God, but He didn't cling to it, or hold it up as something He might lose, or put it on a pedestal

Right, and this gets back to the core of a biblical definition of humility when you take it in the context of the passage - that God sent Jesus in the form of a man. Knowing his humanity before God, he accepted and embraced his role without complaining or bragging about his divinity. He knew that he was a man to God and God to men and fully embraced this by the way he led people, yet submitted to God. This is true humility - knowing who you are before God and man and living in that knowledge.

we should not put ourselves on a pedestal, (like you see people doing in the secular RP) but rather be humble, and be willing to serve

I'm not sure how you connected this thought from that particular section of the passage you quoted, but your thinking goes back to the self-absorbed/selfless scale here rather than the pride/humility scale.

To give a different example, I can say with perfect humility: "I probably have more success with my disciple-making than anyone else on this sub." It doesn't have to be a boast about my skill - though even Scripture says there is room for boasting of those we disciple or of our understanding and knowledge of God. Rather, I can say this in humility because I believe it is accurate and it sets the stage for my authority to speak on the matter of discipleship. If, instead I picked a random guy who has never made a disciple in his life and I said, "He may be better at disciple-making than me," I would not be humble - I would be a liar and would undermine my ability to make progress in Christ's mission over all of us.

I mean, it's not like I'm claiming to be the most humble person in the entire world - as that would clearly be prideful, right? Oh wait ... that's right, Moses made that claim about himself in Numbers 12:3! Was Moses lying about his humility because he was boasting about it, and therefore could not have actually been humble? Or was he still humble when he said this because it was an accurate statement about himself?

Just some thoughts :) Props for the post! I love the book of Philippians.

[FR] Wife goes off the rails, did I 90% pass my fitness test?

4 upvotes · 17 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

When one thing doesn't go her way, the whole world is on fire and burning around her and she normally

wants everyone to die in the flames with her to feel her "pain" or "frustration".

I addressed this in detail here:

https://www.reddit.com/r/RPChristians/comments/d3s1o7/fr_unstoppable_emotional_inertia/

[/u/rocknrollchuck](#) already addressed the relevant stuff here. You're rewarding a lot of bad behavior, thinking it's the "nice guy" thing to do. You're rationalizing it as the "RP" thing to do because you're maintaining positivity in the face of her negativity. But your words betray you because it's pretty obvious from the way you write that you're using these things to try to manipulate her through gift-giving, acts of service, or all those other 5 covert contract languages.

A trick that works wonders: she's slamming things on the table asking you to answer for what she perceives as your mistakes. You pick up your 11mo and start flapping his mouth open and closed with your fingers to make it look like he's talking. "Mommy, why are you so angry? I love you mommy. Don't be mad. Are you going to slam me down too? Come here so I can spit up on you."

The thing with positivity is that it has to be your own. You tried to give her your positivity. "Here's a latte for you." "Let me get the bottle ready for you." "Maybe I should go get the baby for her." For her. For her. For her. Stop that. Don't do things *for her*. That's weak and women see through it every time. **You. Do. You.**

- If you want to get the baby because you don't want him crying alone? Go get the baby. But don't do it because you're afraid she'll be mad if you don't.
- If you want to get a bottle ready for the baby because you're a responsible adult who takes care of his kids, then do it. But not because you're afraid of how she'll react if you don't help her out.
- If you want to buy her a latte because she's been good to you and deserves a reward, then do it. But not because you feel like you have to placate her anger and it might cheer her up a bit.

I went out to the mall the other day to buy my wife some "care package" stuff. I got her cookie-dough lip balm and some face cream from a local cosmetics store at our mall. I also bought her a "stress relief" and "bluberry maple pancakes" scented candles. I also got her a bag of taffy and chocolates. All of this was about \$40. She's been working hard and deserved a treat.

On my way out of the mall she calls me up furious that I'm not home yet. Did I give her the care package to cheer her up and prove that I was really doing a good thing for her so she shouldn't be mad? You'd better believe I did **NOT!** I don't reward bad behavior. Instead, I played a practical joke on her and all the kids laughed. She pretended to be frustrated, but eventually caved and started laughing too, even though she was the butt of the joke. I didn't play a practical joke to cheer her up - if anything, I appropriately expected her to feel even more upset by being picked on. But I knew that whatever was going on in her, my positivity would override it - especially once I got the kids to be positive with me. She felt the fun in the room and joined in, despite nobody doing anything to her or for her to cheer her up or make her life better.

She then went back to work in our home office in a good mood. She was back in a context where I wanted to reward her hard work. But I still didn't give the treats to her right then - I set them up in the driver's seat of her car so she'd find them when she got up in the morning to take the kids to school/daycare; a time when she's in the midst of doing things helpful to me and likely mildly stressed out, so as to communicate: "You're doing good work right now," rather than rewarding past service, her past bad attitude, contemplating prospective service, etc. It was a fun surprise for her. It didn't come with a grin on my face demanding validation or praise in return. I wasn't even there when she got it - and that was intentional. It let her know that, yes, my time at the mall was for her benefit and therefore she should have felt dumb for getting mad at me over it - but also reminded her that I could have given these to her the night before, but didn't, further affirming that she won't be rewarded after bad behavior.

And I just got back from a client meeting that cut me off before I finished, so I can't remember where I was going with this. Enjoy as far as I got.

That Girl at Work

4 upvotes · 5 September 2019 · /r/askRPC

When you have sufficient abundance, this stuff won't matter. Right now you're probably thinking, "This is awesome! There's another girl in the world who would be all over me!" When you've had 25+ girls act that way toward you within a year (i.e. about one every other week) you stop caring. You don't need the validation. You know you're the prize and your thoughts become: "Geeze, another one? What are these girls so desperate for?"

You see, this is how attractive girls are all the time. They have so many guys eyeing them that it's no longer cool. It's creepy. Unless he's one of the top guys who's ever eye-banged her, and then it's fantastic.

I've lived there at different points in my RP journey. I've also had moments like right now where I'm falling behind and it stops. Gotta get those lifts up, bro. What are you doing putting an 11-rep max on your stats? 1 rep max (ORM) or 5 rep sets - that's what matters. Get your ORM up to 250, minimum. You taking protein shakes yet? Do it. I went 7 years without lifting (i.e. since college) and got my ORM up from 135 to 275 in 6 months with nothing but protein shakes and the SL5x5. You've been hanging around for at least a month. There's no excuses not to be at least 10lbs up on your bench a week for the next 2 months - and I find it hard to believe you started at 65lbs.

I've had enough conversations with you to know you know a good bit of theory. You're developing a frame and learning how to pass tests. Good for you. But your base stats are your lowest hanging fruit. Figure that out in the next 3 months and that's where your biggest improvements will come from. Take a before picture of yourself today, and take a video of yourself benching your ORM. 3 months from now I want you to show both of the before/after sets to someone at your gym (yeah, that means you gotta work on your social game to meet someone at your gym first) to hold you accountable. Go.

On Frame: Punishing Your Wife

4 upvotes · 27 August 2019 · /r/askRPC

Good word, brother. This is the type of content that belongs on the main sub. As is occasionally brought up on RPC and MRP, the concept of withdrawing attention is not *in the moment* as a punishment, but after the fact as an internal expression of how much time you want to spend with someone who treats you poorly. We don't let someone else's actions dictate our behaviors, even (especially?) if we think we're doing it to prove a point of our authority or individuality against them.

Ok, I'll bite: To confess my cheating or not?

4 upvotes · 27 August 2019 · /r/askRPC

She is under the impression she's married to a certain person, someone who is faithful and has kept their vows. If that's not true, you are lying to her every day you let her think that.

Does this not ignore the possibility of Christ's transforming work? Maybe a year ago he was that person. But today, if he is truly changed by Christ and is not that person anymore, is he really lying about who he is today? This position seems to undermine "the old has gone, the new has come."

[32F] "I'm a beautiful, successful single mother who's struggled BIG TIME to find a good man, and I'm losing hope."

4 upvotes · 20 August 2019 · /r/WhereAreAllTheGoodMen

You didn't underline the best part: "Everyone looks at me as a success story, a strong woman who's [sic] life is so together. I am painfully lonely and losing hope."

This is what feminism does to you so-called "strong women." God luck with that. I love women. Feminism doesn't love women; it loves power. Never confuse the two.

Looking for advice, Need help. +Apology.

4 upvotes · 15 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I'll open the door if you want to explain your rationale. No threat of banning if it's in this thread, as long as you're explaining yourself and not trying to convince everyone else on this forum to hold the view. I'm interested in how you arrived at this conclusion.

The more I think about it, the more genius that God's creation of man and woman becomes

4 upvotes · 12 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Right, exactly as it was with Adam and God in the garden before sin.

RP Christians for Women - Cultivating Gratitude / The Power of Fasting

4 upvotes · 6 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Solid advice. You've included good counsel for the women here on an issue that intersects both relational and spiritual development.

For those who haven't given up carbonated beverages already, do it. With limited exception, I stopped making any regular use of them back in college. The same goes for alcohol - which is about a once every couple weeks thing. I'm a little more flexible with things like gatorade, but even that is uncommon.

I will note: when I've done a study on fasting in the past, I found that it's less about us getting anything from God or growing or developing in our spiritual journey or any other self-building purpose. It's one of the few areas of our faith that is truly meant to be expressive toward God. It's about showing our Father how truly sincere we are, the same way a mob might go on a hunger strike and chain themselves to a tree. The goal here isn't necessarily to change God's mind, but to express our spirit. Ever see someone do something that makes no sense and seems kind of foolish, and you ask him why he's doing it and he simply answers, "Because I must"? That's kind of what fasting is like - and meant to be.

In this sense, it's one of the few places where emotionalism truly has a place. As much as I preach against it, my fight against emotionalism isn't to say that all emotions in our faith are wrong - rather, making those emotions a primary pursuit is what's dangerous. Fasting just to fast is worthless. Fasting for the peripheral benefits is also worthless on a spiritual level. Fasting to feel good about yourself is also worthless. But fasting because something is gravely important to us - so much so that we feel compelled to express that importance - can be a truly powerful way to demonstrate the sincerity of our faith. If that sincerity happens to have an impact, all the better.

To that end, fasting is a perfectly appropriate way for a woman to express to her husband how important the issue is. It's submissive. It doesn't lord her wants and wishes over him. It doesn't insist that he comply with her requests or even join her in the fast, as you say. It is something she does on her own without flaunting it that reminds her regularly that a matter is important. And if her husband takes notice, he will see through her submissiveness and fasting how truly important the issue is and be able to make an informed decision. That type of information does not come when a wife makes request after request to her husband and he has no way of knowing which ones are truly important to her from the ones that are passing thoughts. And just as our Father may still decide not to comply with the results of our fast (as was the case with David fasting for the life of his son), at least a wife will know that she has expressed herself fully and in a respectful manner that did not pressure her husband, but informed him through sincerity without withholding anything from her - only from herself. And the man should do this for Christ as well - even to the point of modeling this form of submissive expression for her to follow.

I've written more about this here:

https://www.reddit.com/r/RPChristians/comments/blrqw7/share_your_experiences_with_fasting/emr4wi7/

The "Closer to God" Myth

4 upvotes · 3 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Right on. If it helps add clarity ...

Christ came to fulfill the law, not to replace it

This can only make sense in completion if we understand the old testament as the symbolic roadmap to understanding the new testament. The old testament laws are "gone" in the sense that the physical requirements of the law are fulfilled and no longer apply - but the spiritual truth behind them still applies. And this is true not only for the law, but all of God's doings of the old testament, from Adam to Malachi.

So, I'm not so inclined to tell another believer: "Thou shalt not steal, so get your filthy paws off that candy bar!" and more inclined to say, "God wants you to develop the type of character that knows how to earn a fair wage to provide for yourself so that you'll never be worried about stealing in the first place."

This is the difference between following the letter of the law and developing the character the law was designed to instill in us. The law tells us what that character looks like, but the Holy Spirit is the one who actually gives us the character. So while the law can emulate what good character should look like, only the Holy Spirit can actually give us good character. The emulation is the road map/tangible expression - the real thing is the spiritual work. This is true everywhere in Scripture and not just the law and commandments - the things of the Old Testament are, as Hebrews puts it, "copies" and "shadows" of the "heavenly things."

The "Closer to God" Myth

4 upvotes · 3 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Notice that I didn't say we should ignore the relational aspect. Only that it's not the over-glorified mega-priority #1 that churchianity makes it out to be.

In reality, I can't produce children without my wife and she can't produce children without me. There has to be an intimate sexual relationship to get there. We have to have an intimate relationship with Christ in order to produce spiritual offspring, and we have to be on the same page relationally in order to raise them effectively. They do go hand in hand.

But the point of the relationship is to produce disciples, just as Malachi 2:15 says the point of marriage is to produce offspring. Churchianity gets it backwards - they try to get a stronger relationship all the time and try to use obedience as a tool to get it. Look at the [r/TrueChristian](#) post and you'll see countless comments making this exact mistake.

That's a woman's way of thinking, not Christ's intent for us. Women use sex to get relationship and commitment. Churchianity uses spiritual reproduction as a way to feel closer to God. Yes, it can have that impact - and maybe that's okay. Maybe I'm the one who's wrong because we are the *bride of Christ* and not the groom, and therefore it's okay to want to use Jesus to get our feels. But something tells me we're to aspire to more - that the ultimate goal is Christ's mission regardless of our feels, and if the feels come along the way and inspire us, all the better. A wife should be with her husband whether she feels it or not, but it's better when she does. Right?

Household Finances

4 upvotes · 29 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

"Are you asking me?" I replied that I was telling her what I intended to do

Yes, because every woman loves hearing, "I don't ask you for permission woman, I tell you!" Your frame presents like a splintered board. It's flimsy, but you're hoping no one will try to break it because it'll cut them if they try to punch through.

Better response: "Yes, mommy. May I please have permission to spend our dollars on a new toy?" Then laugh it off.

I said grace and then fed the 10mo so my wife could down her food. The disrespect kept escalating.

So you decide to serve her needs like a good beta and somehow she ends up disrespecting you?!? Who knew!

I can't have sex with a man I can't trust

Well, at least **one guy on MRP would agree with her.**

The reality is that she trusts men who she's attracted to. Women are emotional and make decisions based on gut impulses rather than intellectual wisdom. If her emotions feel right toward a man, she trusts him because she trusts her own emotions. If she finds a man attractive, her emotions feel right toward him. But her brain rationalizes this through other hurdles because her gut knows that no one will give her any credit if she explained the truth. Instead, she rationalizes her non-attraction to you through ways that normal people would call "untrustworthy behavior," like not telling her where you're going or how long you'll be gone. For an attractive man, she wouldn't care. You think she would. She wouldn't. Why? Because she'd trust him. She doesn't need to know where a trustworthy man has been for the last 6 hours. See how that works? The trust issue has nothing to do with how long you're gone without telling her.

scheduled for a call that evening with a buddy of mine who's also a financial counselor

Good, so you're on the ball with that move. Cancel the call.

To hear my wife saying out loud that she desired to be ... it turns out, she honestly wants to be them

Uh huh. Women were created for these things, but they're also tainted by sin to have urges against them.

Here's the real problem: you're letting her words mean too much to you. Yes, it was a nice little shot of validation in the moment, but the fact is that she's not going to suddenly start becoming any of those things - at least not for longer than a week or two.

No, we did not have sex after that phone call, but there was a sense of unity and focus on fixing our marriage

Uh huh ... because apparently "fixing our marriage" doesn't involve having sex after a phone call. It involves the incredible emotional intimacy that you both felt in that moment, just as long as sex doesn't have to be part of it. You're caving into the feminist notion that good marriages are built on emotional connectivity to the other person, and I'm guessing that you still believe that if you can resolve all the emotional problems that the sex will be worked out as a byproduct, right?

"If we can keep connecting on this intimate of a level like that, then eventually she'll feel comfortable enough around me to want to have sex again." It's a lie. Don't believe it.

Good marriages are not built on emotional connectivity. They're not founded on trust or communication or any of those things. A good marriage has attraction as its most fundamental quality.

Would you marry an uggo? Would she marry a fat slob? No. But what about the 400lb ugly girl who you would trust with your life and who is really good at conversation? Would you marry her? If you were married to her,

would you be excited to stay married or would you be eyeing other women?

Likewise, look at every 300lb video game geek who works at a grocery store with a hot cashier. They talk like they're besties. But is she going to marry him? No. Why not? She trusts him. They have great conversation. She feels emotionally validated by the things he says to her. But she's not attracted to him. And if she did find herself married to him, you'd better believe she's looking at other men.

Attraction is the most important quality that binds together a good marriage. Don't buy into the lie that emotional intimacy and open communication are a substitute. It's easy to believe that right now because those two things just happened in your marriage and your *emotions* tell you things are getting better, but you've already said that none of these things made her vagina any wetter. Focus on what she does, not what she says. She did not have sex. Even if she *SAYS* she will want to have sex if she feels more emotionally connected, you now have proof that great emotional connectivity did not result in great sex.

quick tag

If you tag more than 3 people reddit doesn't send any notifications at all.

How do I prevent myself from acquiescing to the girl I'm dating

4 upvotes · 22 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I'll lead when I believe it's important, but picking out a flavor of ice cream is not something I want to be aggressive about

Right, this makes logical sense. But women follow the mindset: "If he's not a good leader over small things, he won't be a good leader over big things." It follows Jesus' advice: "Whoever can be trusted with very little can also be trusted with much" (Luke 16:10). While you think you'll "step up to the plate" when bigger things come around, the reality is that you're communicating you aren't a good leader on the details.

I just moved houses on Saturday. We spent yesterday unpacking. My wife wanted to take over and start deciding where things go on the walls, where to put furniture, etc. It was stressing her out, but as a woman she thinks that's her default job: to decorate the house. Frankly, I don't care whether the white painting gets hung on this wall or that. But I made clear decisions anyway because:

- It's my house and I'm ultimately responsible. I will not be relegated to a "man cave" in the basement.
- Giving her carte blanche over all that minute garbage makes her feel like it's her house and she's responsible.
- My making decisions takes the stress off her and puts it on me - but since I don't really care, there is no actual stress, so neither of us get stressed by that part.
- Being clear and decisive about small things matters to her when she's deciding if I can be trusted over bigger things.

she decided that she couldn't handle a dating relationship while her mom while her mom is likely going to die soon

I.e. "Normally I want a guy who can comfort me through stuff like this, but I really just want out, so I'm going to take the excuse while it's here."

However I can't help but feel like people, especially those I'm dating, would interpret my generally more targeted display of more "alpha" passion and mission as not being aggressive enough and trying to be a people pleaser.

Right, because you've already admitted that you're not generally a decisive person. You're only decisive on things you actually care about. Everyone has that - even women. You have to learn to be decisive about the things that she cares about. And women care about everything. My wife ordered the wrong sub for me on moving day for lunch. She felt so bad started to get really upset about it. It's a sub. I don't care. But for her that small little thing was a huge deal. Which ice cream you like might be a massive ordeal in her mind. It doesn't make logical sense. It makes emotional sense. Figure that out and accept it as the reality of how women work.

it makes me think these women have had less than an ideal level of respect for me

Right, because women respect a man who is decisive *and* wise. Just being blindly decisive won't help much, though blind decisiveness is still better than indecisiveness.

emotionally tough nuts to crack, I'm a very open person

So you vomit your feels on them, using them as your personal therapist, and then they're disgusted by you. And you're surprised?

Or perhaps your openness is more positive of all the things you're hopeful about - your life dreams and all that. And she hears about everything you intend down the road, then looks at where you are and isn't impressed by the progress.

I really can't say without knowing what type of "open book" you are, but generally speaking, being an open book decreases respect. You're trying to fabricate an emotional connection because sharing is how you feel an emotional connection, but women don't get their *feels* by receiving what you share; they get it by sharing what they're feeling with you. You need to do less telling and more asking. Learn the art of drawing emotions out of women through engaging questions and not interesting conversation pieces about yourself or anything else.

How do I maintain my more selectively opinionated and passionate personality which is where I connect with how God made me personally, while also being "alpha" and maintaining a sense that I'm very much in control

Let me rephrase: "How do I be *selectively alpha* only over a few things, but have everyone still think I'm alpha?" Hopefully that rewording makes the answer more obvious.

both of these women were the kind to be less open, more introverted and slower paced

I seriously doubt that.

Their lack of emotional and physical intimacy is troublesome. I don't want my type to be women who take a long time to open up

That's not your "type." It's your output from the input you're giving. Women are generally very easy to understand. They just lie to you about themselves so they seem complicated. That's why you can't trust all those "research studies" that base their information on questionnaires. Or many of them simply don't understand how their own "selves" work, which makes it seem confusing because she doesn't know what she wants.

Learn what makes women tick and you'll be able to predict with incredible accuracy how they will respond when you act a certain way. This is all on the sidebar both here and on the other RP subs. Get to reading.

Their lack of emotional and physical intimacy is troublesome

They don't lack these things. You lack the ability to draw it out of them. Many women do not just throw these

things at the first guy they meet. They test you. If you prove yourself, then you get these things from them in return.

They only dated one or two people and married them

That's not easy mode. That's insecurity causing them to settle for the first thing rather than strive for the best thing.

very happy and fulfilling relationships by their own account

Yes, "by their own account." Very few people are willing to share their marriage struggles - especially blue pill guys. They wrap their entire self-worth into the success of their marriage. They then must persuade themselves that they are happily married because an unhappy marriage would make them feel worthless and a fool. But because they're so wrapped up in what other people think of them over their own frame/views/opinions, the only way for them to be happy about their own marriage is to get other people to validate them in their marriage. How do they do that? By telling you how great and happy they are in their marriage. Many of these people feel an incredible cognitive dissonance between their surface-level belief that they're happy and the repressed resentment they feel toward their spouse, which comes out in a variety of ways. The most common are pornography, food, and video games. They don't realize it, but these vices are the tangible evidence of their marital dissatisfaction, functioning as a coping mechanism so their conscious brain doesn't have to accept the reality that they're truly unhappy. As a result, they try to target their unhappiness to specific things. Instead of being generally unhappy, they say, "We'd have a perfect marriage if it wasn't for this one thing that we're dealing with." That one thing is almost always tied to sex or respect lacking in some way.

How do I flip the script I've been playing out and have girls going crazy over me (but not needy and insane)?

Lift, sidebar.

[30F] "My fiancé wants to call off the wedding because he found out I slept around when I was younger."

4 upvotes · 17 July 2019 · /r/WhereAreAllTheGoodMen

There's a mod button called "ignore reports" that prevents the reports from showing up anymore. Enjoy.

Question regarding men being the ruler of the family

4 upvotes · 15 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

So we're not reinventing the wheel, /u/Deep_Strength did a full post on this very question almost exactly 1 year ago today (3 days over):

https://www.reddit.com/r/RPChristians/comments/8ye7p1/biblical_textual_analysis_of_why_adam_had/

While his conclusion is based on textual evidence from Genesis, the same conclusion can also be reached from a modeling perspective as well. Genesis 1 says we're made in God's image. Jesus says he lives in the model God gives him. The entire new testament says we are to model the example Christ set for us, reflecting his image to the world. Ephesians says that the relationship between Christ and the church is a model for human marriages as well.

The model we see is that Christ is head over his church. This is not a product of the fall. This is not a broken system that will be restored in heaven when the church is considered equal with Christ (it isn't!) or even that the church gets to be head over Christ (it won't!). It was always true that Christ would be head over the church. As such, it's always true that a groom is head over his bride - and this structure transcends the fall.

The part of Genesis 3 that you quoted as the curse isn't the headship orientation, but the desire orientation. This is most obvious from Genesis 4 when it says the exact same thing in regard to sin:

- 3:16 - "Your desire will be for your husband, and he will rule over you"
- 4:7 - "it [sin] desires to have you, but you must rule over it"

The phrasing in the Hebrew is almost identical between those two verses with only the subject and object being changed (you/sin and your husband/you). Adam had already been given dominion over all things. But sin's desire to have us is a product of the fall, just as a woman's desire to control her husband is the curse of the fall.

It's also my personal belief that the "curse" isn't so much an alteration of reality (except in the case of the serpent) as it is a statement of the natural consequences of sin - and the particular type of sin committed, at that. But that's a longer conversation.

As for submissiveness, a lot of this depends on your definition of "submissive." Paul preached that we should submit to our governing authorities (Romans 13), but wrote this during the reign of Nero who was ordering Christians to be killed. Was he saying that Christians should have been killing each other per Nero's decrees? Obviously not. In the same way, it's hard to interpret submissiveness as "obey every command," as many people take it.

Biblically, submissiveness seems to be not a behavior, but a character trait.

- Someone can give \$1,000 to charity and not be generous. A woman can obey her husband and not be submissive.
- A guy can refuse a legitimate beggar's request and still be generous, just as a wife can refuse her husband's request and still be submissive.

I get frustrated when guys seem to take an attitude that submissive means "she must obey me always at all times, blindly and without question, whether she likes it or not." Many rulers over the ages have accomplished this from their subjects without submissiveness in the biblical sense. They submit, but are not themselves submissive.

Submissiveness is more about the softness of her heart toward you and a respect for your leadership and authority. As much as I'd love to say it's tied to her ability to follow a man's mission, it's not. Paul did not follow the mission of Caesar Nero when he suggested submitting to his authority. But when he was imprisoned (even wrongly!) and had the opportunity to leave, he didn't. He remained in jail and his submissiveness won over the jailor to Christ (affirming the 1 Peter 3 advice), thereby advancing PAUL'S MISSION (which is the mission of Christ). He respected the authority the jailor had over his freedom and did not fight against it in a head-to-head collision, just as a wife constantly butting heads with her husband is not submissive. In fact, the apostles and Jesus constantly attempted to evade capture from the authorities, yet even Jesus submitted to torture and execution once caught, just as Paul remained in jail when he had the chance to be freed.

- As an aside, let me be clear: this is part of why I believe Jesus had to be tortured and not merely crucified. Jesus could have submitted only to the crucifixion and still saved humanity, as the sacrifice was sufficient. His torture was not necessary to the Gospel. But it was necessary to set an example for us and show his submissiveness to the authorities. No one can say, "Jesus's submissiveness doesn't count because he had to be on the cross to fulfill God's purpose for him in salvation," because the lashes he received (which he could have spared himself with a word) doesn't fit into this model.

- Jesus's words to Pilate also reveal a lot about his view of submissiveness. He did not obey Pilate merely because Pilate had the force of power over him, as Jesus plainly says Pilate had no power of his own. Instead, Jesus says Pilate only held his position because God placed him there. As a result, Jesus respected Pilate's authority and willingly entered into great harm because of his trust in God's leadership and the purposes God had for the situation and the people God put in place to carry out those purposes. This softness toward the situation (rather than angry defiance) is what is extremely noteworthy about Jesus' entire torture and crucifixion scene and demonstrates the type of submissiveness of heart that women should maintain even toward abusive husbands.
 - Side note on that: I do not condone physical abuse in a marriage. However, physical abuse is not given as a reason for divorce in the Bible. The model of Jesus is that he submitted even to an abusive authority he hadn't chosen - how much more a woman to an authority over her who she did choose and agree to marry. 1 Peter 3's advice is that this submissiveness is the best strategy for winning over an unbelieving husband, just as Paul evidenced with the jailor that his submissiveness is what won that jailor over. That doesn't mean safeguards shouldn't be put in place; but Paul's attitude toward the jailor was one of compassion and love for his authority, just as Jesus spoke on the cross: "Lord, forgive them for they know not what they do" as he was literally in the process of being murdered by them.

In light of all of this, we see readily that Jesus and the apostles had an attitude of submissiveness toward their governing authorities, but didn't necessarily obey every single command and often even attempted to evade getting caught for their non-conforming behaviors. If you've got a crappy mission that doesn't involve making disciples and a wife is on board with the great commission, then I imagine this is the dichotomy you can expect in your marriage. If you've got the great mission of disciple-making, then I can't imagine a reason why both submissiveness and obedience couldn't go hand-in-hand.

In the same way, submissiveness for a wife is not a measure of her adherence to her husband's authority, but the degree of respect and trust she has for him personally and the extent to which she will do anything and everything for him, even if she believes he is wrong, just as I was willing to move across the country at the encouragement of the guy who disciplined me in college to whom I was submissive. I did it not because he had authority to order me to do so, but because I loved and respected him so much that I would have followed virtually any leadership decision he offered. And although I at times believed he may have been wrong, I knew him well enough to know that if there was a genuine dispute on a matter, he probably knew better than I did, so I trusted his word over my own understanding - and on most of those disputes I discovered years later that he was the right one after all.

I'm rambling and have written this in about 8 different waves as I keep getting distracted at work, so maybe it's not all that coherent and I'm too low on time to edit it. My main point is that submissiveness is a character trait just like humility, patience, anger, kindness, etc., and it cannot be measured by behavior, but by demeanor. So, when you say that men are to lead and women are to be submissive before the fall, this is not merely a "rule-maker/rule-obeyer" dynamic; rather, the leadership of men is a character trait that inspires others to behave differently than they otherwise would, and the submissiveness of women is a character trait that inspires them to respond to others differently than they otherwise would.

The "rule-maker/rule-obeyer" dynamic is certainly present in Scripture as well, and was also intended by God before the fall. But the character traits of leadership and submissiveness were present in Adam/Eve before the fall by virtue of their being sinless and the sin itself was the breaking of these qualities.

Jekyll and Hyde

4 upvotes · 2 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Unfortunately, that's all the questioner gave me, and there's no real mechanism for asking for clarification to the original question-asker.

I can only assume he's talking about how men in his church perceive their wives as having drastic mood swings without understanding why they're having those mood swings. Their allusion to hormones tells me they're blaming it on PMS or something like that rather than taking responsibility for being unattractive drunk captains. But that's just guess-work.

They have appropriately noticed a phenomenon happening consistently among several marriages, but blame it on something they can't control in order to avoid doing anything to fix it through the things they can control. But their question as to how Scripture handles female interactions with men is certainly a valid one - I just wouldn't go in with the presumption that Scripture agrees with them that women are designed by God to have a Jekyll/Hyde dynamic to their personalities.

Tips on denominations & finding men's groups?

4 upvotes · 29 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

More important than finding the right denomination is finding the right guy to disciple you. Is there anyone in your life who makes you think: "That guy's got his stuff together. He's strong, confident, godly, and making a difference for eternity. I want my life to be like his someday"?

If you do have that guy in your life right now, go ask him to disciple you. If he won't, follow him around anyway. Learn from him passively. When you're ready, start discipling other men and living a mission on your own. In the meantime, chill with the guys here and raise up some local guys to be on the same mission with you. It's a life-long journey and you're not going to find a permanent resting home from most of today's congregations - certainly not after only a few months of looking around.

Let me simply say that the Catholics, Orthodox, and Protestants (all denominations) are screwed up in some ways, but also have strengths that the others don't have. Rather than committing to one particular line of theology, learn what they all have to say. Pray diligently with godly counsel and discern from Scripture for yourself who's got what right. Don't take someone's word for it just because they're from your denomination of choice. Let the Bible dominate. Every denomination will say they're the most biblical, but ALL of them also compromise their credibility somewhere to make their core beliefs coherent with the rest of their theological framework.

Always be less interested in theological technicalities than you are in the character of the people you're living alongside. Unless the Gospel is compromised, I'd take a group of faithful, available, and teachable believers who have a lot of bad theology over the stagnant intellectuals any day. Any day.

Red Pill Church site?

4 upvotes · 20 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

There is no such thing as a non red pill church. There is Christ. Christ is truth. The red pill is about understanding truth and applying it in our lives and relationships. The singular Church is Christ's church - his kingdom.

There are a lot of babies in that kingdom who think they're mature and know the truth. They're wrong.

But I suspect you're really asking, "Is there a congregation in my area whose teachings are consistent with what is taught on RPC?" I have no clue. I don't live there ;)

A testimonial epiphany...

4 upvotes · 8 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I'm glad for you, brother.

It sounds like you've been studying for a while, but haven't been applying for long. "I am my own judge" (or the RPC/1 Cor. 4:3-4 twist) is found in NMMNG and WISNIFG, which should have been the first two books you read.

My guess is that the results you're seeing right now are actually a necessary step in the wrong direction.

For the first time, your wife is noticing a change. She likes it. She's rewarding you. "Good little boy. You're finally making the changes I've been telling you to make for years. Let me give you a treat."

This isn't a bad thing. It comes with some great sex - and good sex is still good sex. But many men see this initial improvement wane for a time before the long-term demonstration of frame brings it back with improvement.

Keep up the good work. I hope I'm wrong and that you're already on the final and long-term upswing. But enjoy it all the same either way.

How do I receive the fruits of the spirit? And dealing with resent towards women

4 upvotes · 31 May 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I would love to help in the spiritual mission of bringing others to Christ in the future, but the problem is I don't even fully believe all the stuff

I know it's going to sound weird, but ... so? Paul says this weird thing in Philippians 1:15-18 - "It is true that some preach Christ out of envy and rivalry ... out of selfish ambition, not sincerely, supposing that they can stir up trouble for me while I am in chains. **But what does it matter? The important thing is that in every way, whether from false motives or true, Christ is preached. And because of this I rejoice.**"

I'd rather you believe and preach - but if preaching Christ is all we get, I can rejoice alongside you for that as well. That said, my guess is that as you preach Christ your faith will be more and more established as well.

I'd believe in the Christian God under a certain set of circumstances

Yes, because I will only believe that molecules exist if they'll dance in circles with party hats in such density that they spell out "molecules exist" in the sky. I don't get to set the terms on how truth presents itself. Either molecules exist or they don't. Either God exists or he doesn't. Molecules don't bend to my will to prove themselves. Neither does God.

then those circumstances came to pass

And then there's grace - so much undeserved favor here. It's truly beautiful.

I only believe that intellectually. I've come to the conclusion that I have no faith

In the parable of the sower, this is the seed that springs up on dry ground, but has no roots. There is no depth or substance to it, so it soon withers away, as evidenced by your following sentences.

any repentance is only intellectual and not from a feeling of true sorrow

What makes you think repentance has to come from an emotional place? Don't succumb to the emotionalism that has invaded mainstream churchianity. You don't need some weeping tears moment. You need a resolute conviction to do and be better. That's why they call it "conviction" of the Holy Spirit, not "pangs of emotional regret of the Spirit."

I lack faith, and faith is a fruit of the spirit

Interestingly, it's not. *Faithfulness* is part of the fruit of the Spirit (also note that it's one singular fruit of the Spirit, not many fruits of the Spirit). Faith doesn't make sense if it's not in the context of faithfulness.

Faithfulness is about what your beliefs prompt you to do. While it may lead to the same conclusion for you right

now, it's a different framework for perceiving things that might help.

If someone threatened to kill you and your family, do you *believe* him? If you do, you're going to do something about it. If not, you're going to ignore his threat and end up dead.

How do I receive the gift of faith, to truly believe in Christianity, because I do not believe it is something I can intellectually convince myself to do.

First, find someone to disciple you. You're dry ground right now. Someone needs to till you to soften your heart so you can become good soil, able to receive God's Word.

Second, start living as if the Bible is true. "But that's legalism!" everyone screams. Yeah, and deal with it. God was legalistic through humanity's infancy - even to the point of establishing the very definition of legalism as his covenant with Moses and the generations that followed. Legalism is often a necessary starting point before people can mature enough to grasp the spiritual meat beyond the milk of legalism.

If it helps, my kids don't have a clue why I tell them to go to bed each night. They hate going to bed. I explain it countless different ways and they still don't get it. I remember being like that as a kid too. Then, after I matured, I started to understand the value of sleep and giving our bodies the ability to replenish themselves. I didn't go to bed simply because my parents told me to, but because I appreciated the value in it. Legalism leads to authenticity much the same way. That's also why there's really no good rejection of Pascal's wager.

Does it just come down to reading the Bible and praying more? Because admittedly, I hardly do any of those things.

No, it comes from *faithfulness* - living as if the Bible is true. Of course, you have to pray and read your Bible to know what truths to be living in the first place.

Imagine a guy coming onto a red pill forum and refusing to read any sidebar material or posts from veterans and then saying, "How can I be red pill?" You have to read the content to grasp the concepts. But this works on another level too: because men are not red pill who act a certain way, but who understand the truth and let that guide their actions. In the same way, one isn't a Christian simply because of how he behaves, but because he understands the truth and lets that guide his actions.

I have resentment towards women now

Sure, and I resent dogs. Their smell is disgusting and their pet dander makes my eyes itchy and nose runny/sneezy. They're wet and slobbery and always want to cuddle up to you when you want nothing to do with them, or they'll run away when you actually try to get their attention. Dogs are the worst. But they're still just dogs. A dog's gonna do what a dog's gonna do. And a lot of people love them anyway, so I'm over it. If someone keeps a dog in their house, oh well. That's their decision. It's not like I'm going to hate their dog. I'll just stay away, personally.

I saw that most girls saw me as a tool to use for their own social advancement, and not a real person

Yeah, just as you see most girls as an object for your own sexual gratification, and not a real person.

Don't lie. We all do it. That's not to say we try to objectify women intentionally, but it's inherent that when I see a hot girl on the street I'm more interested in how she looks to me and what I'd do with her body than in the types of conversations we might have if we were to start chatting.

Women use men. Men use women. This is the nature of the universe, my friend. Blue pill men are the only ones who allegedly care for women simply for who they are. But remember that the whole point of the blue pill is that they're lying to themselves and don't even realize it. A red pill man embraces the fact that he wants to use a

woman for her body, just as she wants to use him for her social status - and we're okay with that.

That doesn't mean that's the only basis for any connection. Other ways of relating can be simultaneously true too. I do enjoy teasing my wife and having conversations about life, the Bible, etc. with her. The fact that I want to use her body for my sexual pleasure or that she wants to use me to improve her social stature doesn't somehow diminish the value of the other dynamics at play. It's a blue pill lie that says it must be all-or-nothing. To that end, maintaining this resentment toward women is still very much a blue pill reaction. It's like the red pill got lodged in your throat and you're angry because you can't actually swallow and digest it, but you can't spit it up either.

I swear, not lifting must be a sin

4 upvotes · 11 May 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Totally wrong, brother. Jesus didn't walk everywhere. He rode a donkey from outside Jerusalem to inside Jerusalem one time. That was like ... you know, at least 100 less calories he burned over his lifetime than if he were to have walked it.

Rachel Held Evans, Influential "Christian" Feminist Egalitarian, Dead at 37

4 upvotes · 6 May 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Good on you - not sure why you got downvoted for ending a fruitless debate.

But let me add one more note: when Satan will be vanquished, it will be terrifying and tragic for all the fallen angels who supported him and his cause. Does this mean Christians should not rejoice in this?

That's not to say this woman was the devil - the point is simply that if there's an extreme example where rejoicing in the fall of an enemy of God, then there's a line somewhere over which it's okay to rejoice in these things. Where is that line?

From there, I don't buy the whole "she had kids, therefore this must be viewed as a tragedy and not a win for God's Kingdom" argument. Sure, from her kids' perspective, this is a grave loss. But her kids aren't the center of the universe. We're not meant to view all things in the world through their eyes. This is a highly liberal and emotionalist approach to the situation. In reality, we are to view things through God's eyes.

Didn't God know the day she would die? Did he not have the ability to spare her if it would have pleased him to do so? And yet he didn't. Does God not love her children every bit as much as he loved her and every one of us? Perhaps God rejoices because her children are less likely to be led astray - I don't know. All I'm saying is that we can't use her kids as pawns to guilt people into having a particular emotional reaction.

We must view the situation through God's eyes and no one else's.

Tag: [/u/OsmiumZulu](#)

How to take women's votes away to save them and society.

4 upvotes · 2 May 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I can't speak for every user here, but as the creator of this sub I can tell you that my personal view is this:

- we live in a fallen world, which means fallen governmental structures. Even old testament Israel was broken during the time of the prophets.
- when God sent Jesus, it wasn't to fix political structures, but to create a new spiritual kingdom altogether. Jesus acknowledged that the political structure that put Pilate in a position of governmental authority to kill the Son of God ... was still given its authority by God himself. Jesus consistently declined to give focus in his ministry to revamping politics.
- the apostles had significant influence throughout the world, but never recorded any urge to fix broken political

structures. They did urge submission to governing authorities.

- historically, when the church did start pushing for political power, it became very corrupt and compromised the gospel.
- all of these things happened in a time when individual votes didn't exist or matter and there was no broad freedom of speech.
- I personally believe as a matter of philosophy and not theology that the US would have a more godly political outcome if female suffrage were repealed and that there is nothing wrong with exercising one's vote and freedom of speech to that end. But I'm not mad or angry about the female right to vote either - fallen men will make fallen decisions too. It's a fact of life that I doubt will change in my lifetime, unworthy of wasting time and effort when we could instead focus on sanctifying women through godly marriages and make use of the vote we know they're going to get anyway.
- I also believe that as believers we have an obligation to use the authority God has granted us to reconcile the world to his ways, not just people. This includes politics. But that doesn't mean all people must have the same political philosophies, as God has never endorsed a human led political structure in the first place.

At the end of the day, political decisions will never solve spiritual problems. I'm more interested in the spiritual problems and living out solutions. While politics can be important, it's more a hobby than a life mission.

God uses dread, and it works.

4 upvotes · 30 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

That's not how dread works. The concept of dread is about shifting the balance of power and attraction in a relationship. Most women know that they could find another guy to have sex with at the drop of a hat. This makes them feel empowered in the relationship because they don't need you for sexual fulfillment, but blue pill men do feel like they need their wives.

When a man employs the various levels of dread (not just creating space) he is demonstrating to his wife that he's the attractive one - that he could get another girl at the drop of a hat, if he wanted. It's not that he does; rather, it's that she knows her husband is a man other women want. This is what increases attraction - not the jealousy or the space a man creates when he walks away.

When a man gets to the level where he does start creating space as a consequence to her poor behavior, she isn't attracted because he's gone and "absence makes the heart grow fonder" (a useful, yet misguided trope) - she's attracted because she knows he could get another girl (which is why the first several levels precede this) and the distance (1) creates an opportunity for him to meet someone else, but more importantly, (2) expresses that he doesn't need his wife, further establishing him as the valuable one in the relationship. He is the prize, not her. This shift in power restores the biblical framework of the man as the leader, rather than the default structure that society gives, which in today's sexual marketplace assumes that the woman is the one who is more sexually desirable to the world.

Now to your main point, God does not employ dread. Dread is an attempt to understand what God does. God precedes the philosophy, not the other way around. To put it another way, if it weren't for God, we wouldn't know what dread was in the first place. Dread is a secular word used to describe one context in which women develop attraction for men, and that male-female dynamic is parallel in Scripture to the way a spiritual bride is attracted to her spiritual groom. So yes, in a sense, we could say that God uses dread; but it would be more accurate to say that God just is - that he's not intentionally employing any strategy or dread concepts - and that when we employ dread, (1) we are simply trying to make ourselves more like God in the way we are attractive,

and (2) we should be seeking to incorporate these things into our very being so that it's not a "strategy," but just part of our inherent way of life, just as it is inherent for God to be attractive.

It's probably worth a post of its own - maybe even an addition to the 100-level content, but I'll try to put up something in the next week on this subject.

Women Feeling Threatened by Hyper-Sexualized Social Media

4 upvotes · 30 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

As chuck said, this sub is open for both men and women, but the imbalance you noticed exists as a matter of the balance of our user-base. I'd love for women to post more about godly femininity here, just as men post about biblical masculinity. While RPW can be a good general place, it is still ultimately a secular sub. Perhaps an RPCW sometime down the road, if the interest is there?

Dates and Drama

4 upvotes · 23 April 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I think [/u/red-sfpplus](#) once used the analogy of a steam engine - pressure keeps building. You can either release the emotional pressure in a way that works for you and powers the ship, or you can let it blow up all on its own and create a giant mess. I'll choose the first option.

Anybody else feel like this?

4 upvotes · 16 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Good reply. You brought up the exact passages I intended to!

I've read almost all of the sidebar and there's still a couple things I have questions on

4 upvotes · 15 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

as long as ... he will ...

[/u/Willow-girl](#) is right - this is a covert contract. The point is that you're using your mission as the context to meet girls, not that you stop meeting girls and hope one just falls in your lap.

So does this mean we no longer go out and do things like approaching women in grocery stores and malls?

There's nothing that says you can or can't. If you want to, do it. If you don't, don't. The difference is that the people you find in the grocery store or mall are not likely going to be wife material. The people who are willing to follow your mission, if your mission is a godly one that involves disciple-making, have a much higher probability of being wife material.

Do we stick to only women in church since we aren't supposed to date unbelievers

Most women in the "church" (by the modern use of that word) aren't believers either. No, don't stick with "church" women. Whenever and wherever you meet women, bring Christ into the relationship, raise them up, get them making disciples, and see what happens. Don't limit yourself to congregational gatherings that often have nothing to do with the biblical church.

do we approach in places like Sunday morning service?

That's certainly a viable option. After all, someone else has done the hard work of gathering people together who are at least willing to say Jesus' name. You might as well take advantage of their efforts, if you can.

I guess I'm just confused as what it looks like when God puts a woman in your life.

This is spelled out pretty clearly in the "finding a girl you can't keep yourself from banging" posts on the sidebar. The process is simple:

- Meet a girl.
- Invite her to do something that helps you advance your mission.
- If she responds positively, keep inviting her along.
- If sexual chemistry develops, be clear and overt in communicating about it and setting boundaries.
- If you decide she's wife material and the chemistry is still there, propose.

In the midst of all of this, if you want to go on "dates," like taking her out to dinner, going to the movies, etc. then go for it - just remember to balance in mission-oriented activity so you're actively vetting for her following ability too.

how will this effect my future relationships with christian women

To the degree that you let it.

At worst, it precludes you as a marriage candidate from some of the most spiritually uptight (or possibly even mature) women, but even then they'll still often move past it if you're attractive enough.

It seems like something that would drive most high quality women away once they find out

That depends on what you mean by "quality." If you mean "quality" in the way the world tends to view that word, just the opposite. The "quality" women will often be more attracted to a guy who has a successful sexual history (granted, one girl doesn't necessarily prove much here). But regarding spiritual quality, yeah, some of them might be turned away. Oh well. You goofed. There are consequences. Don't try to undo them - try to redeem them.

Breaking the Nice-Guy: Take Ownership, Ask For Help

4 upvotes · 12 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

The thing is: no woman even knows what it means to "have it all together." It's a nebulous phrase, making it an impossible standard to live up to.

Married Man Game Part 3: Sexting

4 upvotes · 5 March 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Nice.

Married Man Game Part 3: Sexting

4 upvotes · 5 March 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Haha, I'll assume that's a good thing.

Rushing to buy a House!?

4 upvotes · 4 March 2019 · /r/RedPillWomen

Solid. My thoughts exactly. That commute is horrendous.

Impressing with food!

4 upvotes · 4 March 2019 · /r/RedPillWomen

Stick with staples, but up your game with it. If you make a chicken, top it with a butter-parmasean sauce, for example. Or if you do spaghetti, make the sauce or garlic bread from scratch. A personal favorite of mine is home-made tacos, make the shells yourself, and garnish them with cilantro over the top. It looks fantastic, but really doesn't take much effort - and who doesn't like a taco?

RPC: a place to stay (or at least return to)

4 upvotes · 4 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

This is a much needed word. A sterner environment is better suited to test men's frame here so they're ready for practicing in the real world.

Analysis- was this dread?

4 upvotes · 28 February 2019 · /r/askMRP

You were insecure about something. It upset you. You say you didn't give any signs of being off, but she noticed anyway. Nevertheless, she responded to your sexual advances.

Was that dread? No.

Was that a wife who happened to be DTF despite the fact that she thought you were being a covert baby? Yes.

I'm trying to analyze her psychology

Darn right you're way into her frame. Understanding female psychology on the whole has value. Trying to understand a particular person's psychology without training, testing, and clinical analysis is absurd. We can't tell you her personal psyche because we don't know her and we're only getting small snippets you tell us.

Maybe she watched some porn without telling you and was revved up when you got home. Maybe she was with another guy the night before and needed some sperm to convince you the child is yours if she happened to be pregnant. Maybe she happened to be attracted to you at that moment. Maybe she was afraid that turning you down would upset you even more.

Maybe, maybe, maybe. We just can't know. Stop worrying about it. You had some great sex. Enjoy it. Do it again tonight. Dread is not an intentional strategy you try to use to trick a wife into having sex with you. It's a state of being. As you found out, you can't fake it because she'll smell the phony all over you.

Should I Date An Unbeliever if I Can Lead That Person to Christ?

4 upvotes · 6 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I think I agree. I'll just caution that in addition to general abundance, another aspect of plate theory is preselection. However, hanging out with nonchristian girls all in a way that others perceive as romantic contexts, even if you're not intentionally escalating, will lower your SMV in a manner that scales with the spiritual maturity of the women onlookers.

Generally, preselection assumes that lots of female attention enhances a guy's SMV, right? What if he's only hanging out with ugly girls? Well, that actually drops his SMV. It shows that only low quality women are interested in him, so girls who perceive themselves as higher quality than the girls he's around will think of him as lesser in SMV and hypergamy will reject him.

Now for Christian girls, the degree of spiritual maturity still matters. The more mature she is, the more it matters to her - not necessarily for raw sexual attraction, but in contemplating a man's potential RMV, and mature Christian women will not date a guy less spiritually mature than them. They might want to have sex with him, but

they won't date him toward marriage.

So, if a guy has a lot of even low effort nonchristian plates, he is cutting off his candidacy from the top tier of spirituality mature women, making the alleged unicorn run away from him. That's fine, but it means he is locked into my approach instead: raise up a godly woman rather than find one ready made. That is, he will have to seriously lower his standards on the spiritual maturity of the girls he's willing to date because the more mature ones won't date him in the first place.

Tag: [u/rocknrollchuck](#)

Stop apologizing so much

4 upvotes · 14 January 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

This is similar to my boss's approach to apologies - that they're only valid if you:

1. Acknowledge what you did and that you understand you shouldn't have done it.
2. Acknowledge how it affected the other person.
3. Communicate what actions you intend to take to ensure it doesn't happen again.
4. Ask for forgiveness, putting the ball in the other person's court at that point.

I'm not saying this is the best way to approach things, but it's interesting that your random points that might "couple together" are 3 of the 4 in his series.

I disagree with your bereavement conclusion, but I'll leave it as a matter of personal preference and not get into it.

Validation and Interdependency

4 upvotes · 11 January 2019 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

What else can we do?

My solution is always generational disciple-making. For the secular crowd, this would translate to mentoring. We could broadcast it before millions on a daily basis - even new millions every day and not the same ones - and maybe some would pay attention, others would think about it, a few of those would take it seriously, some in that group would apply it, and you'd get to a very small handful who would make it an intentional part of their life and mission. Mass-marketing is not an effective strategy for changing a culture. It's also not the strategy employed by liberals, whose dogma includes such things as taking over the educators, controlling the practice of psychology, etc. Why? Because teachers and psychologists in the secular world fulfill a very similar role in people's lives as ...

Discipleship, on the other hand, is effective. It's the method Jesus modeled that brought one man to being the largest religion on the planet for most of human history. It functions on multiplication rather than addition. If I can impart what I know in 2 other guys, and I send them out and we all impart what they know to 2 other guys, then we've got 9 guys, and then we all get 2 more, then we've got 27, and it just goes on from there. It's also more secure because you can lead the flow of vision and information rather than hoping someone is self-motivated enough to care, internalize, apply, etc. Also, it gives people who do internalize and want to apply the information an opportunity to have someone to ask questions, get advice, and seek counsel when they're trying to put into practice what other men might otherwise give up on if they hit a roadblock and they're all alone.

Instagram and Sex Robots - How Technology is Changing Male/Female Interactions...

4 upvotes · 9 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

This is certainly an interesting write-up. I like it. Here are a few things that came to mind while reading:

females have always had to survive in history by interacting with the group

Rather than a psycho-historical perspective on the feminine social matrix, I prefer what the Bible says. Men were created with a mission. They look at what needs to be done. Women were created to be helpers. They look at other people who may need help. While God may have put the desire to be with a woman in man, biblically, it is always secondary to his mission. For women, their interaction with others IS the exact reason for their creation, which is why they're drawn to social interaction. "It is not good for man to be alone," but he can do it - he doesn't *need* women, especially in a post-Gospel world, Paul being the prime example. Women, on the other hand, were created expressly for interpersonal interaction, which is why even in the post-Gospel world Paul encourages the young widows to remarry, despite his general advice in 1 Cor. 7 to remain in whatever position you are.

they are competing with false versions of other women

A nice addition to my [107 post on the comparison game](#).

The state after marriage says, do whatever you want and you still get half of this man's resources for a decade or more. If you have kids? basically 2 decades.

This is an alarmist way of putting it. The only resources split are those acquired during the marriage. If a man is dumb enough not to maintain records of what he had going into the marriage, that's his own idiocy. Most states in the US will not impose indefinite spousal support until you've been married for 25+ years - and even then my dad divorced after 26 and only had to pay for 7 years. And child support is not half your assets or income. It's usually closer to 20%. For example, guy in my state who earns \$100k, assuming the wife is at minimum wage, may have to pay around \$20k/yr in child support, less if the wife makes more. And the reverse does apply if the woman is the heavier earner. At least in my state, the law used to be anti-male (divorce 2.0), and then they retracted some things and now it's anti-high-earners (divorce 1.5), which still has a disparate impact on men because most men are higher earners, but they argue that it's still gender neutral because if the woman earns more then she is subject to the same obligations - and I have seen this reverse scenario play out in court many times as well. So, the law is not against men ... it just happens to be that most higher-earners are men (and not because of the mythical wage gap), so men bear the brunt of that law more often.

It literally cost the cystic fibrosis guy 4 million and raising another man's children for decades.

Let's be clear on this: the 4m pounds came from his internet business and not child support. That's something he would have had to pay even if they never had kids. The kids had nothing to do with that bit.

As for the kids, I calculate his total post-divorce to be around \$300,000 between child support and school tuition, plus whatever he voluntarily paid during his parenting time. As for pre-divorce, in those days the cost to raise a child was around \$11k annually, which is \$33k for 3 kids, over an average of 9 years per kid = another \$300,000. So, altogether he's out \$600k for these kids. Accounting for the \$250k payback, he's out \$350k. But even at that, he settled this case rather than taking it to trial. Could he have gotten the full \$600k or more? Possibly. Who knows - certainly not him, because he settled. He agreed to take this instead of fighting for a better share.

Why would he do that? Well, because he still loves the kids and wants a relationship with them (even though 2 aren't speaking to him right now - but that will almost certainly die down). Also, there's a high probability that if he had known, he would have adopted children anyway, and thus ended up raising another man's kids anyway - just under less nefarious terms. Or there could be any other number of reasons that rationalize the dollars ... things that made sense in his situation to make him feel right and whole with that settlement that we don't get to

consider when we see that "he only got \$250,000!" as is the typical reaction to something like this.

My assumption is that we are talking about higher level men who are able to get women

That's the thing though: my personal experience in interacting with these high level men tells me quite the opposite. They're more likely to pay for prostitutes, sex toys, and high-end pornography than the lower or middle class people I represent. High-end men tend to monetize everything. So, if they want sex, they will pay money to get it rather than go through the relational hassles. Money makes sense to them. Trying to win in the SMP doesn't - because that takes effort, even for a man of high status, whereas money takes none. Sure, they are "able to get women," but even a multi-millionaire still has to work for her attention and attraction. Not so with porn or a prostitute ... or a sex doll.

what about the incels who are in the bottom 20% - something like this allows them to pay their way into a woman who looks like a 10 without all the problems reality brings

You've got this backwards. The incels would probably use these, but they would still be seeking relationships with real women rather than exchanging them for sex robots. The robots would be a mere way to placate sexual desire, but their blue pill fantasies would still compel them to look for validation from women. A sex robot cannot give that, and thus they will continually be unsatisfied and disappointed and still longing for female attention.

You appropriately give good references to [u/Rollo-Tomassi](#)'s content on point, but another thing he talks about is validational sex, which is what most betas are really seeking. A true alpha could use a sex robot and be just fine - because he doesn't need that validation. He knows he can get it when he wants it, so sex is just about his own enjoyment at that point. If he feels like doing it with a doll, he'll do it with a doll. If he feels like bagging an actual woman, he'll go out and get her and take her home for the night or a quickie in a closet or whatever. The robot is satisfying to him because it gives him exactly what he wants: sexual gratification. The robot will never be satisfying to the beta because it cannot give them what they want: validation.

I do believe that technology has been able to provide women what they want most - loads of attention

But again: this is artificial attention. They don't know if the person behind the screen is really what his profile picture shows. The fantasizes - and women are just as good at living in fantasy worlds as men - but in the back of her head she knows it might not be real. Women are the true validation-seekers, and rightfully so in light of their biblical purpose for creation. Paul as much as says that men should look to God for their validation and women should look to men. That's why it's so off-base for me to see a beta mindset in a Christian man: because men should not be looking for validation from other men or women - only from God. But for the woman this is different. That validation is part of her created design. But artificial validation will only go so far because hypergamy will compel her toward the AF and the BB. She can't get either of those from a man online who clicks the like button. It inflates her self-esteem, but does nothing to satisfy her actual needs. That guy on the internet isn't going to pay her mortgage. He isn't going to screw her brains out while she's ovulating - and she might not want him to either, if she knew who he really was.

While attention may be something women strongly crave, I don't think it's accurate to say that's what they want most. What they want most is the attention of a high-value man. And they cannot assess a man's value if their interactions only remain online - which is actually an indicator of low value, if he is not willing to step out in the real world to meet her, or doesn't have the resources to make that a viable option. But the artificial validation does placate women until they can find that man in real life, just as the sex doll doesn't give the beta what he really needs, but it does placate his sexuality until he finds someone who he mistakenly believes will give him that validation.

Follow the Red Pill but Do Not Sin...

4 upvotes · 8 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

The red pill is not something you follow. It is something you understand. It is not prescriptive; it's descriptive. The red pill doesn't tell you to sin because it doesn't tell you to do anything. Red pill people will tell you what to do, assuming you have the same goals they do ... but ultimately each man's goals are his own, ergo the sidebar posts [u/rocknrollchuck](#) linked to.

I will say that all Christians should share the same goal of disciple-making, so there is broad latitude with regard to advice because we do have a common purpose. The secular world doesn't have a dogmatic commonality of purpose, but biology and herd mentality gives a practical commonality toward maximizing sexuality.

is a sin to hook up?

4 upvotes · 26 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is the answer.

Responsibilities and Privileges

4 upvotes · 19 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians

As I'm not married, would love a older married man's feedback here since I'm sure there are things I'm missing.

What's missing here is how this affects the privileges/responsibilities dynamic. You're adding more responsibilities - that a man must be strong spiritually, physically, mentally, emotionally, and socially. But where do the privileges come back in? You seem to assume passively that if the man is strong in all of these areas, people will just throw privileges at him, including his wife. Does that just magically happen? What privileges will she throw at him - respect for his decisions, great sex, a nice meal?

Problem - Why should the church prioritize this above other initiatives?

With respect for the philosophical foundation of your answer to the question, it's very weak and unpersuasive. You essentially say that healthy marriages are more important to God than people dying of starvation because "God cares about healthy and whole people." What about the health of the people dying of starvation?

I do agree that the problem of intergender relational dynamics in the church should be a high priority - one of the top even. But my rationale is much simpler: because God values the great commission. Marriages were designed to be a physical representation of what that commission is to look like on a spiritual level. You have a husband (God/Jesus) who indwells within his wife (us/church), which produces offspring (new believers). Malachi 2:15 says that the whole purpose for creating marriage was "to produce godly offspring." The Bible seems clear enough that the church's primary mission is to "make disciples of all nations." If marriage is the primary physical representation of that process, the best way the enemy can destroy the church's mission is to destroy marriages. If the church restores a healthy view of marriage and physical reproduction, then people will better understand their spiritual marriage to Christ and the spiritual reproduction he wants them to engage in. That's why the church should focus on reorienting the privileges/responsibilities dynamic in the home.

Opportunity - What is the opportunity here?

I'm not sure what you mean by this. I assume you're suggesting benefits of solving the previously identified problem. If that's the case, you're missing the biggest one: *the fulfillment of God's plan for this earth, as expressed in the great commission.*

All of the things you mentioned will already be the case in heaven anyway. In heaven, all people will be biblically grounded, all men will be strong, and all people will be happy in the community. Sure, it's feel-good for us to

have a little taste of that on earth, but I care more about the big-picture. Focus on the game, not the play or the player. If you want to win the game, we have to go bigger.

What's the best way to apply this given the constraints of your church? Does it mean preaching a sermon from the pulpit, initiating a church-wide guided Bible study in your mid-week group, or starting a men's group?

Personally, I believe none of those will be effective. One-on-one discipleship is about the only way we can effectively do today what Jesus did back then.

Invite others to give feedback here and get them to buy in and evangelize your project for you.

Now that's good leader thinking :)

Recommendation - Provide a recommendation based off of the potential solutions.

I don't understand why this line is here or what it means.

Lead and Implement the plan - See what is possible to realistically do. Even if leadership doesn't sign off now, you've planted the seed. Continue the conversation with that seed in mind. Maybe start a men's group that's unaffiliated with your church.

I've tried all different ways of approaching this. Anymore, I don't care if my church doesn't agree with what I'm doing. I do it anyway. If they find anything unbiblical in my approach, they can confront me about it. It hasn't happened yet. While the lead pastor clearly doesn't care to back up what I'm doing, he can't find any reason to shut me down - and what I'm doing is growing. Our associate pastor is on board now too. We're moving in a good direction. So, I'd ignore the whole "unaffiliated" thing and just do whatever you want until they intentionally shut you down or ask you to disaffiliate yourself.

Love this sub (+ question about meeting an ex)

4 upvotes · 17 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I don't see any stats. Rule 2 applies here.

Of lesser importance: you've got dread all wrong. The goal isn't to make your wife jealous. It's to be attractive enough that jealousy would be warranted.

I once made the mistake of telling my wife when another girl hit on me. I assumed it would instill dread. Wrong. It just came off as tooting my own horn. Did it make her jealous? Probably. Did it make her want to have sex with me any more than before? No. Because tooting your own horn makes you less attractive.

Similarly, your intention isn't aimed at making you more attractive. It's aimed at jealousy for jealousy's own sake. You're trying to rub her nose in the fact that you're spending time with other women. That will depreciate her feelings toward you, not appreciate them.

Possibly the most troubling part of your whole post:

I asked my wife if she would be okay

Frame, brother. Frame. Do you ask her for permission to go potty too?

Look, if you do go meet with your exes, just go do it. You don't need her permission. You don't need to tell her what you're doing. Just go do it. It's still a pretty dumb idea on a number of other fronts already addressed elsewhere in the comments.

But let me emphasize: even if you do go off on this ridiculous scheme, absolutely **DO NOT** try bragging to her about it or use it as leverage to make her jealous.

As I've said many times before, dread is not about jealousy for its own sake. It's a way to leverage preselection in a marriage context. The reason the first several levels of dread are about self-improvement is because your wife believes she knows you fully and completely. You have to start changing. Without that change, her attraction won't change either. Once you do start changing, she will continue in this assumption - but the upper levels of dread, when you start to get organic attention from other women (not fabricating it, as you suggest), will open her eyes to the fact that maybe there's more to your changes than she was noticing at first. It gives her a new appreciation for the man you're becoming by the fact that other women appreciate it. That is, she's going to have one of two reactions when she sees another girl interested in you: (1) "Hah, that's because they don't know him like I do; if they did, they wouldn't be interested either," or (2) "Hmm ... why are they interested? Girls never used to be interested in him before? What am I missing?" and then she gets interested too, as she follows that trail.

Jealousy can certainly work against you. That's why dread is set up the way it is. I'm convinced the term "dread" was used solely as a way to take an otherwise obvious concept and make it sound edgy. Don't let the edginess of the word fool you into thinking it's something it's not.

What does RPChristians think about this marriage video from Larry J. Russell

4 upvotes · 6 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians

To add to what /u/Deep_Strength said, there's a false dichotomy being set up here: God v. your spouse, followed by a "you can't serve two masters" mindset. In reality, your devotion is wholly and only to God. Your wife is to follow you in that devotion. Her needs are met by virtue of the fact that a man following God will be taking care of his home, relating with his family, putting food on the table, etc.

After all, if you're to disciple another believer on how to be a good husband and lead his family, how can you do that without modeling?

The problem I see here is that so many pastors confuse teaching with discipleship. From the 208 post, they skip straight from "Tell them what" to "Pass it on" without ever going through "Show them how, let them try, and send them out" first. If that's the case, then it's easy to neglect your family in favor of teaching - because that's an either/or.

But discipleship is impossible without modeling. You have to live your life the way you want other people to live theirs so that they can look to you. As Paul says in Philippians 3:17, "Join one another in following my example, brothers, and take note of those who live according to the pattern we gave you."

Funny enough, that verse is literally two after Paul says, "Anyone who is mature should take such a view of things. And if on some point you think differently, that too God will make clear to you."

In short, the problem is solved if someone is actually making disciples the way Jesus designed. If they're going off doing their own version of disciple-making instead of what Jesus showed us (i.e. 99% of the mainstream church), then yeah, abandoning your family in favor of ministry duties is a very real problem.

How common is this really?

4 upvotes · 14 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

pounded many of his friends, and then was marrying some soyboy pastor

Because the best these pastors can get is either the girl no one else wanted or someone else's leftovers. Because they aren't attracted to the first, they rationalize the second by coming up with biblical excuses for why men

should want to invest their lives into these types of women - "Single mothers need your help. We're supposed to forgive and forget others' past mistakes." You get the idea.

is it just a matter of becoming a high SMV/RMV man, watching every red flag, and screening any woman i am vaguely interested in?

No. It's also about training up a girl to become what you want her to be - to become marriage material. What you're laying out is a recipe for finding a unicorn. You'll find quickly that statistics will work so far against you that you might as well give up. Somewhere along the way you have to shift gears to take responsibility for leading your woman and not just trying to find someone ready-made.

surely there are women who reject this way of thinking/doing things

Of course there are. Just like there are countless guys who reject pornography and acknowledge that it's sin and commit to not watching it ... then screw up periodically and do it anyway. Even the best-intentioned people screw up when temptation grows stronger.

Maybe the last of NAWALT needs shattering and sweeping out of my mind.

Correct. I view AWALT as a spectrum, not a switch. Some women are 100% AWALT in that they're literally riding the CC, branch swinging, and acting like the poster child for hypergamy every single day. Others might be 80% ... others 50%. No one will ever be 0%. That tendency will always be there. But some women are better at controlling and restraining their innate desires and coding than others.

And to be clear, it's a function of temptation too. A woman can easily be NAWALT if there is never any temptation to be like that. Put her in an all-girl school in the arctic and see if she starts riding the CC. It's not going to happen because the option just isn't there. Add an all-boy school right next door, but fill it only with omega boys who are totally undesirable and the temptation will be there, but so low that I doubt it will ever be a problem. But drop her in the middle of a bar full of 6-packs and biceps that are swarming her and all of a sudden she goes from 3% to 60% - she gets a little drunk and maybe 70% until enough additional temptations creep in - and then you know at some point, under the right circumstances, she'll be AWALT too.

1 area i still need to work on is not cave into emotional blackmail

I'm not sure what you mean. How would it be blackmail - like she's going to out you for some emotional reaction you had if you don't do what she says? I think you mean emotional manipulation in general.

An easy way to address this is simply to say it out loud in the middle of the moment: "I understand that you're emotionally worked up right now, but I will not allow your emotions to manipulate me." It's not the best way to maintain frame, but it's an easy way to get in the right mindset and clarify some boundaries for future conversations. I wouldn't do this more than 2-3 times, but it's certainly useful in the beginning.

BF hasn't said I love you...

4 upvotes · 2 November 2018 · /r/RedPillWomen

I never understood the "what if he/she doesn't say ILY back?" concept. Does love always have to strike at the exact simultaneous time in every relationship? Can't one person decide they love someone and then a few months later the other person decides too? Why is that such an evil or nerve-wrecking thing?

Also, saying "I love you" doesn't actually mean anything. I know countless men who use the phrase and mean nothing by it other than a reflection of their present emotional state. But if "love" is purely an emotional thing, then 15 minutes after he says he loves you he might not love you anymore ... and then an hour after that he might love you again. Emotions are flippant, so an emotional declaration means pretty much nothing. So, if you're

concerned that "he hasn't said it because he doesn't **FEEL** it" - that's because I'm sure sometimes he feels it and sometimes he doesn't. At the very least, I can say with definitive certainty that in 100% of relationships that feeling will fade - usually 6-24 months after the wedding. So, at best, you're asking for just a temporary emotional boost in yourself from him.

Other men will use the phrase as a form of emotional manipulation to heighten your infatuation with them so that they have more power and control in the relationship. An extreme example is BWS - no matter how much he beats her, as long as he keeps refraining afterward, "I love you," she keeps going back for more. Certainly you're not asking for that kind of intention from him, even if to a lesser degree.

So, when you say you "love" him, what exactly do you mean? Love is not an emotion. If I feel giddy feelings toward my wife, but beat her, cheat on her, and yell at her for not vacuuming the house every day and she's in tears all the time - but I feel giddy toward her in the midst of doing all of this, do I really love her?

It's also not just a simple phrase to utter. I could tell someone I love them and totally not mean it. That doesn't do anyone any good.

Love is better understood as an orientation of a person's behaviors and priorities. How does he treat you? If he has options on how to spend his time, where do you rank on the list? Those are better indicators of whether or not a man loves you. If he says, "I love you," that doesn't prove anything. It is merely a statement of intent. His actual behaviors are what matter.

To that end, look at what he does, not what he says. This is a core tenet of any branch of red pill thinking. And if you see it in his behaviors, why does he need to say it? Especially when saying it is superficial and might come from a different intention than his behaviors might otherwise indicate. All you're doing is asking to be manipulated - either through intentional withholding or intentional misuse of the phrase, and even if he is sincere about his intentions it doesn't mean that his actions will line up or that he means anything more than his flippant emotions have been feeling lately.

EDIT: I mixed up says/does in the last paragraph and fixed it.

Can't get physically strong: Advise needed

4 upvotes · 24 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Not sure why you'd think that'd be unpopular. It's the correct response.

IVF medications

4 upvotes · 17 October 2018 · /r/askMRP

You have better things to do with your time than to boss her around. If and when she's ready to follow you in doing stuff besides sleeping, she will. If not, she won't and you do your own thing. If she's legit screwed up from pregnancy and meds, this attitude saves you a lot of trouble and butthurt. If it's not legit and she's just not interested, do you think forcing her out of bed to do your bidding is going to be more helpful?

On Biblical Justice and Rape

4 upvotes · 10 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

2/2

To summarize the above:

- All of the OT law and old covenant are now obsolete (Hebrews 8, notably 8:13).
- The commands are not about creating a dividing line between good and evil, but about pointing us to a positive, proactive character of godliness.

- God's method of revelation and communication with man is no longer predominantly external (as most people still treat it), but internal through the Holy Spirit within us.

This is where I get back to the part about Paul replacing the external legal standard of morality with an internal spiritual one. This is where your question really gets answered, using the context of all of the above. Paul gives a 2-part standard for moral issues in a Spirit-driven framework.

1. "I know and am persuaded in the Lord Jesus that nothing is unclean in itself, but it is unclean for anyone who thinks it unclean." Romans 14:14
2. "Whatever does not proceed from faith is sin." Romans 14:23

The first verse basically declares that nothing is inherently sinful. I usually use watching child pornography as an easy example. Everyone agrees this is sin, right? What if you're an FBI examiner watching it to find clues that lead to the arrest of the perpetrator. Still sin? Trick question. If he wasn't a Christian, yes it's still sin (Hebrews 11:6). What if he is a Christian? Still a trick question: we need to know his motives. Was he doing it to glorify God through working diligently as God desires of him? Probably not sin then. Was he doing it to advance his career without any mindfulness to glorify God in what he does? Probably still sin.

In this way, the second part deems everything we do that isn't prompted by our faith as sinful. As a result, I believe that "not sinning" is the exception to the rule, rather than the inverse, which most people innately assume: "I'm a good person, except the times that I sin." Sin is not something we do when we're not being good; in our flesh sin is our default state and good is what we do when we are not sinning.

In light of the above, the standard I apply for all moral issues: **Does it proceed from faith?** That is the "good, clear answer" you're looking for.

Conclusion

Now I want to be clear: I'm not saying we all make up our own standards. We don't decide what we want to do and rationalize our faith to support it. Rather, the Spirit compels us toward a mission and if our behaviors are not oriented toward the fulfillment of that mission (i.e. because of our faith), then all such things are sin - even something as innocent as helping an old lady cross the street or giving money to the poor. See 1 Cor. 13:1-3 or Isaiah 64:6.

Accordingly, the orientation of our hearts toward or away from God's purposes (i.e. our faith) is what draws the line between "sin" and "not sin."

Common Objections

So, when I present this most people say, "Cool, so as long as I don't feel guilty when I look at porn, it's perfectly fine to do it, right?" That would certainly be possible in framework that only contemplates Romans 14:14. But that's why Paul gave us Romans 14:23 as the reverse buffer. When you look at porn, are you doing it because something about your faith compels you to do it? If the answer is no, then it's still sin, even though it's not an inherently sinful activity.

"What if I just want to chill out to Netflix for an evening? Do I always have to be acting out of faith all the time, non-stop for it to be sin? Is TV always sin because I can't watch it from faith?" This question always comes up because Americans love their TV.

Yes, if you're watching TV just to kill time and to gratify your own desire to veg out, it's probably sin. Why?

Because it's not proceeding from faith. 1 Cor. 10:31 is a little more explicit and even lists eating and drinking - common life necessities - as things that we must always do to God's glory, and it would clearly be sin if we were doing it for any reason other than to glorify God because that verse commands that "whatever you do, do it all for the glory of God." So again, the primary question is: *why are you doing it?* Motive matters.

In the reverse, though, there are countless ways to redeem these activities - not in that we're trying to justify our actions by pretending our motives are different than they are, but by actually changing our motives. As Brother Lawrence said, "Our sanctification did not depend upon changing our works, but in doing that for God's sake, which we commonly do for our own."

So, I used to be addicted to TV. I'm glad that addiction is over. But I still watch TV. My purpose in doing so is now less about watching a show simply because I enjoy it. It's because I have a friend at the gym or a neighbor or a co-worker - all people I'm trying to share Christ with - who have mentioned these shows and I'm trying to build a commonality with them, and having familiarity with something they get excited about is immensely useful in developing that relationship.

The fact that I enjoy the TV shows I watch does not negate the fact that if I could not use that time to advance God's purposes in this way, I wouldn't be watching the show in the first place. In my mind, "I really like that show and want to watch it" is not enough of a reason for me to invest the time to watch that show. My focus is on my mission: make disciples. To do that, I have to find strategic ways of building relationships with others that will earn me a place of influence in their lives that can be leveraged for Christ.

To continue with the TV example, I love going to my wife's work parties. There are so many shallow and superficial people there. The topics of conversation always start with things like the weather, something going on in the office, a popular thing in the news, etc. - innocuous things that most people don't actually get passionate about.

Enter me: "So, what types of things do you do for fun?" They always list impressive things, like running or playing an instrument or researching the NASDAQ - and some even deny that they ever do anything fun at all, only working all the time. "Fun? Free time? What's that?" is a very common answer. I know better.

No matter what their answer is, I follow up with: "You watch any good shows lately?" About 95% of the time (there are rare times when people legitimately don't watch any TV) they'll give me a couple things they've seen recently. If I've seen it or heard enough about it to hold a conversation on the topic ("That's a great show. What do you think will happen to Jack after that last episode?") - invariably, a spark lights up in their eye. They get a more crooked and intense smile than their previous superficial expressions. They're invested in the conversation, which I can now steer whichever way I want.

That includes 4 times that I've been able to share the Gospel with people as a result of these conversations (out of about 6 or so of my wife's work parties I've attended), and 3 of these couples having visited our church afterward - and that's just with my wife's work parties, and it's far more common to have these conversations and results with people I'm already in-context to chat with. I promise you that couldn't have happened if we just talked about the weather. It happened because I'm intentional about how I use my free-time, orienting it toward engaging in things that I know will be useful for building relationships with non-believers.

1 Cor. 9:20-23 - "To the Jews I became like a Jew, to win the Jews. To those under the law I became like one under the law (though I myself am not under the law), so as to win those under the law. To those not having the law I became like one not having the law (though I am not free from God's law but am under Christ's law), so as to win those not having the law. **[To those who love watching TV, I became like one who loves watching TV, to win those who love watching TV. To middle-class suburbians, I became like a middle-class suburban, to win middle-class suburbians.]** To the weak I became weak, to win the weak. I have become all things to all people so that by all possible means I might save some. I do all this for the sake of the Gospel, that I may share in its blessings."

See how that works? That's the line between good and evil: *Does it proceed from faith or not?* The law doesn't dictate this. The Holy Spirit compelling me toward a mission and to act from faith to God's glory does.

Tag: [/u/lololasaurus](#) [/u/neytax](#) [/u/BobbyMckee](#)

On Biblical Justice and Rape

4 upvotes · 9 October 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Eek ... the Bible doesn't actually make that distinction. I've heard this argument more times than I can count, and it always falls flat in my mind. It's another one of those products of cultural Christianity that makes me shudder every time I hear someone mention it - which is a lot.

For the sake of argument, let's assume that Hebrews 8 went on to say: "There are 3 types of laws: moral, civil and ceremonial. When the old covenant was made obsolete, it only affected the civil and ceremonial laws, but the moral laws are still over you." I'm pretty sure that's not in there, but let's suppose it is. How do we, even with this assumption, go about categorizing which laws are moral, civil, and ceremonial? There would have to be yet another verse - or an entire book - making the categorization with each reference.

Consider: is the commandment not to bear false testimony against your neighbor a civil law about court proceedings or a moral issue about lying? One will argue that it's clearly talking about presenting a case to a judge (civil), while another might say that it's in the 10 commandments, so it must be moral. But who says the 10 commandments are all moral laws? There's no standard. Instead, when we do this we're making up a law for ourselves - deciding on our own which laws can be done away with and which can't. This is the exact same standard that is applied to justify homosexuality - "That wasn't a moral law, it was only a civil one, so that law went away" - and then when the new testament comes around, "Oh, Paul was still speaking to the Jewish people in that passage, who were under the law still."

Leviticus 19 is another great example:

- 3 Respect father/mother and honor Sabbath - moral or civil? Let's assume moral
- 4 Idols - Moral
- 5-8 Offering, "sacrifice it in such a way" - ceremonial
- 9-10 Don't glean fields, leave for the poor - civil welfare or moral generosity? I'll go with civil here
- 11 Steal, lie, deceive - moral
- 12 Swear falsely - moral
- 13 Defraud, rob, hold back wages - civil, I presume?
- 14 Mock the handicapped - moral or civil? Let's say moral
- 15 Judge fairly - civil
- 16 Slander - moral or civil? Let's say moral
- 17 Don't hate in your heart - moral
- 18 No revenge or grudge; love neighbor as self - moral
- 19 No cross-breeding, cross-seeding, cross-weaving - civil? I hardly see why. Moral? But most people disagree. We'll go with ceremonial?
- 20 Sex with a slave - civil

- 21-22 Forgiveness for sex with a slave - ceremonial
- 23-25 Wait before eating fruit of a new tree - civil?
- 26 Bloody meat, divination, omens - meant might be civil, but the other two moral? maybe civil?
- 27 Sideburns - let's assume that's civil, otherwise a lot of guys would have to get a new hair cut. Goodness, I can't even grow sideburns if I wanted to!
- 28 Tattoos - again, we'll assume this is civil
- 29 Don't let your daughter be a prostitute - sounds moral, but the justification is a civil "greater good" one; we'll go with moral
- 30 Sabbath - moral or civil? we'll call it moral
- 31 Mediums, spiritists - moral with a civil justification? we'll go with moral anyway
- 32 Stand up for and respect the elderly - moral
- 33-34 Treat foreigners well - civil, but maybe moral? let's say civil
- 35-36 No dishonest measurements - civil, presumably, but honesty can be called a moral issue too. I'll say civil

Phew ... that's a lot of laws and virtually no distinction or categorization. They're all spliced together. What are we to make of that? Not just the fact that some of them are highly debatable, of course.

What I make of this is that the tripartate-law advocates would suggest:

- "We are bound to follow Leviticus 19:3, 4, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, the first part of 26, 29, 30, 31, and 32 ... but because Jesus died, now we can ignore Leviticus 19:5-8, 9-10, 13, 15, 19, 20, 21-22, 23-25, the last two parts of 26, 27, 28, 33-34, and 35-36"

See how ridiculous that sounds? Do you think when Moses wrote Leviticus 19 he was distinguishing between these 3? Or do you think God just gave him a law and we all are the ones who decided to splice apart these laws and commands years later? And if the distinction mattered to God, why didn't he put it in the Bible so that we would better understand the Gospel?

Tag: [/u/lololasaurus](#) [/u/neytax](#) [/u/BobbyMcKee](#)

Looking for a Relationship Tip

4 upvotes · 8 October 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I think a common concept went in one ear and out the other: comfort v. fitness tests. Fitness tests are "you this" and "you that." They're accusatory, trying to see how alpha you are in your response. Comfort tests are "I feel this" and "I'm experiencing that." They're more directed at her own internal emotional state.

Notice the difference in how they could be worded in the examples you gave:

- "We don't talk enough" v. "You don't make enough time to talk with me."
- "I want to hear more about your day" v. "You never tell me anything about your day."
- "I want to spend more time with you" v. "You don't spend enough time with me."
- "Do you miss me?" v. "You don't miss me enough."

The responses you're giving are fitness test responses, not comfort test responses. Go read up on comfort tests. That reminds me - there really isn't much sidebar content here for comfort tests. [u/rocknrollchuck](#), [u/osmiumzulu](#), or [/u/Deep_Strength](#) - our married mods: you have any interest in writing up a post on differentiating comfort and fitness tests and how to respond to each differently?

In the meantime, there are several ways to increase your "comfort game":

- Start responding to comfort tests with comfort test tools, not fitness test tools.
- Focus on her feelings through an expression of yourself toward her - your strength and provision, rather than her shortcomings or your behaviors. Example:
 - **YOU-BAD:** "You shouldn't feel lonely." "You should know that I care about you." "Don't doubt me." (implied: "You shouldn't ...") "You're over-reacting." "You need to accept that this is who I am." "You could try doing x, y, or z, to solve how you're feeling." "Maybe if you would do x, y, or z, I would respond the way you want."
 - **I-BAD:** "I've got a lot going on right now." "That's just who I am." "I do make plenty of time for you." "I do x, y, and z - don't you see that?"
 - **GOOD:** "I don't want you to feel lonely." "I care about you." "You can trust me." "I understand how you're feeling." "I really enjoy spending time with you."
- Re-read 104 and amp up the personalization component of how you compliment her.
- Remember that she's less interested in having *more of you* and more interested in having *more of the way you make her feel*. You don't need to be more physically present to keep funneling those feelings toward her.

What does living out Matthew 6:33 look like?

4 upvotes · 5 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

The first thing is to look at what the verse is actually saying: "Seek first **his kingdom and his righteousness**." It doesn't say, "Pray a lot, read your bible a lot, and hang out with other Christians a lot." Those are all great things. They're foundational to your ability to advance God's Kingdom. But most people stop there. They interpret this verse as: *Try to love God a lot and all these things will be given to you as well*.

Second, how does the verse end? "As well." That's significant. It means God gives you his Kingdom and his righteousness first, then you get these other things. But it's not the order that's significant - it's the the fact that "as well" implies that God also gives us his Kingdom and his righteousness. Are you taking ownership over the Kingdom? If God gave you a Kingdom are you going to say, "Cool, I'm just going to live in it and hope all works out well"? No, you have to manage it and help it grow. You have a responsibility with that, just as the workers in the parable of the minas/talents.

So how do you live out Matthew 6:33? The same answer I always give: make disciples. Advance God's Kingdom. Make God's Kingdom your top priority - as this is the path to righteousness anyway - and that will be the path on which God provides everything else.

Perceived Threats?

4 upvotes · 2 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I'm not sure I agree about how you represent Jesus's response to aggression. The pharisees often mocked or challenged him and he responded by humiliating them - showing them that he was smarter and beyond all the little games they tried to play. That's why they'd occasionally storm off talking about how they could kill him.

Either we have to incorporate this behavior as a way of expressing love, or we have to admit that Jesus didn't always give a loving response to those who were antagonistic to him.

Cuddles are required

4 upvotes · 29 September 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

That's not a bad thing ;)

Better Beta Divorce Strategy

4 upvotes · 27 September 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

This has traditionally been my view, though I once got berated by a few ECs for arguing that there are appropriate contexts for DEERing, like in the courtroom. They insisted that DEERing was always wrong no matter the context and that no real man ever does it. All I could do was laugh.

She liked me the whole time!

4 upvotes · 22 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I'm so sorry ...

Has she hit a wall or is she really saving herself?

4 upvotes · 21 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

how do I tell if shes sincere about her faith and that's her reason for waiting, or if it's a cover for having hit the wall like what I was referring to?

The ultimate answer is, as /u/RedPillWonder said, the evidence of her fruit (see Matthew 7). I differ with RPW in that I don't think Jesus was referencing the fruit of the Spirit (which Paul hadn't written yet) or general good works (which Jesus dispels in the immediate next few verses), but the disciples flowing from one's life - when the Gospel grows up in us, the fruit is that seed-bearing part of us that drops from our branches into new soil so that it can also grow up. That is: evangelism and discipleship is the fruit.

Apart from that, a secondary (yet less secure) way is simply to ask her when she became saved. If she identifies a date before college, don't trust her. Either (1) she isn't actually saved and she's confused about what it means to be saved, or (2) she was genuinely saved back then, but she's willing to engage in deep sin issues even with the Holy Spirit influencing her conscience. If it was 2, is it possible that she repented between college and now? Sure. But there are too many variables to know with any certainty, so you're in a high-risk zone. Also curious is whether or not she has had the opportunity to be with the same caliber of guy that she slept with back in college. You say she has a high SMV, and that may be, but has she really been putting herself out there enough for those types of guys to be hitting on her? Because it'll happen at some point. If being married to Christ didn't stop her, you'd better believe being married to you won't stop her either.

To that end, I'd prefer if option 1 was actually the case. Even though it means she isn't a genuine Christian (just a self-deceived faux/self-identifying one), at least there's room for God to change her down the line. Don't date her, but share the Gospel with her. Lead her to Christ - and move yourself further along that path at the same time :)

Do you fast?

4 upvotes · 19 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I don't think that's how it works.

"I spoke to a lawyer on Wednesday"

4 upvotes · 18 September 2018 · /r/askMRP

So, you've thought about divorce, you've talked to lawyers, you've started a plan for the divorce process ... and

then you get ticked off and threaten her when she says she did the same thing. What the heck, dude?

Also, you whine about being 3 months without sex. But nothing in your post indicates you trying to initiate with her. Are you employing kino throughout the day? When you see her twirling her hair while oggling you, do you flirt back? Are you practicing overcoming ASD and LMR with her? It sounds to me like you just want excuses to get divorced, not to solve the actual problem. If that's the case, just do it already. Get divorced. Don't whine here about her talking to a lawyer if you're not even trying to solve the problem in the first place. Make a decision and execute, but stop living in limbo. Either screw her in bed or screw her in court. Just do something.

Also, yeah, you screwed up. You broke frame. She was oggling the new guy you were becoming, and then you convinced her it was all just a farce. It takes months or years to convince someone you've changed. It takes one mistake to convince them you really haven't. Back to work.

[FR] "Lost" Frame for the First Time in a Long Time.

4 upvotes · 11 September 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

This is great ... if a man actually is the prize. By now I've seen enough losers recite, "I'm the prize" and have it blow up in their faces because they're not. They're still fat, lazy, and pathetic. Not to impute this to OP, but this sub needs to be more cautious about the people they give this advice to. I understand that the mentality alone, apart from actually, can have benefits, like developing confidence and frame ... but it's got to be accompanied with so much more. I see so many men with the "I'm the prize" attitude who end up divorced with no girls lining up for him while she's off with the hot doctor. You actually have to be the prize too. It's not enough just to say it or believe it.

Church has nominated a female Deacon

4 upvotes · 2 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I'm more curious: what is a deacon in your church.

Suppose I call my wife by the title "assistant to the regional manager" because of all the housework she does. She meets Dwight Schrute one day, and they discuss what it actually means to be "assistant to the regional manager." How do you think that conversation would play out? Is this woman's position more akin to my wife's in the story or to Dwight's?

Another example: I've known many people with the title of "pastor" who don't fulfill the biblical role of a pastor. I've also known many people without any title who fulfill the role of a pastor. Is it better for a woman to be one of these people over another? If a woman is serving in the church in the same capacity as a deacon but doesn't have the title, is that more scripturally acceptable than if she had the title of deacon but the role of deacon in your church wasn't necessarily what God meant by that position anyway?

There's a lot to iron out here before jumping the gun with any conclusions.

All that said, if your church during elections gives an opportunity to ask questions or express concerns about a pending issue, why would it be at all inappropriate to do just that?

I'm still single ... just married.

4 upvotes · 28 August 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Sure. My mission is discipleship. To further this, I invited my wife to co-lead a small group with me. She declined and listed a bunch of other things she wanted us to be doing instead.

Rather than forcing her, I got together with my pastor and we're now working toward developing a discipleship ministry through our church on a much larger scale. My wife was initially uninvolved.

I speak to my wife about this, giving her updates periodically - (1) because it's something that's important to me

and I enjoy talking about it, and (2) because that type of exposure shows her where my heart's at: my mission.

Historically, whenever I've done this, at some point my wife starts to catch on that I'm more interested in this other stuff than I am in her. She gets jealous of my mission and initially competes with it for my attention, which leads to a flurry of fitness tests, which eventually turns into seduction when she sees I don't cave. After that, she realizes that what I'm doing outside the relationship is bigger than either of us, so she finally decides to join along and offers to help, and suddenly we're pursuing the same mission together again.

This improves all of our interactions. She respects the fact that I'm leading us into something that actually matters and not just improving our own lives for our own sake, and marvels at the competency I display at what I'm doing, giving her the tingles. She feels more "in step" with me, giving her fuzzy feelings. She sees the positive impact it has on our children when (1) we demonstrate to them that they're not the center of our world (which is crucial for successful parenting), and (2) that they see the value in pursuing a larger mission outside the home as well. All in all, there are no downsides and I get to do what I want to do - what matters most to me in life. As a result, the sex has never been better.

Potentially Getting Engaged. Asking for Guidance.

4 upvotes · 27 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I don't like the medical consequences/risks of breast enlargement.

I was just using that as an extreme example. I'm not saying you should do it. But her reaction to that type of request would be very telling about the extent of her submissiveness.

Interestingly, after years of being 100% anti-boob-jobs, my wife initiated sex yesterday and afterward brought up the idea that she might want to have one done. ... ?!?!?! I have no idea where that came from, as I've certainly never proposed it. But she apparently is displeased with the sag that happens after having 4 kids. I don't know what I think yet, but I'm confident she'll do whatever I tell her. If I tell her, "Yeah, you should do it," she'll do it, no questions asked, no bad attitude about it. If I say no, she won't. That's the type of submissiveness you need to be looking for.

That is absolutely true. Can anything be done about this?

Yes. Read, lift, STFU. Red pill yourself. Pair-bonding is a valid psychological phenomenon that only affects people with blue pill tendencies.

I know the "honeymoon phase" has to end at some point, but I'm not sure when or what that feels like.

When: usually 6-24 months after the wedding day (for most people).

What: buyer's remorse. It's that feeling you get when you just spent every last dime you own buying a house and incurring all kinds of baggage/debt to do so and now you're stuck with it and you're wondering whether or not you made the right call, then starting to see how wonderful all the other houses on the market are, which now that you've gotten a couple raises you could have actually afforded ... if you hadn't bought this house already. That's what it feels like.

I was really into her until recently. Could this be because of the sex too?

Possible, but unlikely. It sounds more like commitment anxiety.

Not being allowed to have sex sucks. I don't want to either be celibate or guilty for 10 more years. Also I would like to start having children in the next 3-5 years. Other than that? Cooking, cleaning, etc will be nice

to not have to do all the time.

All excellent reasons. The fact that you're most sexually primed in your late-teens/early-20s and might not have sex during the peak of your life is ... frustrating. I got married at 23 and still felt that way. Of course, the horrid sexuality of the first 8 years of my marriage didn't help either. Having kids at a young age was also very important to me. I wanted to have all my kids be 18 by the time I turned 50. After 4 kids, I failed my goal by 6 months. Close enough.

But what I'm seeing in your responses, which is concerning, is that your reasons for marriage have nothing to do with the advancement of your mission and they're all frame-issues. You're being controlled by your sexuality, your ideologies on how many children you want and when you want them, and what you think her services around the home will be like. Be prepared for all of these expectations to fail you in marriage. Do you still want to marry her even if doing so wouldn't get you any of those things, or not the way you want them?

I don't even know how to begin changing this.

I know [/u/Deep_Strength](#) will have a chapter on social scripting in his upcoming book. I'm going to have a smaller section within the larger concept of frame in my book (though his will be released much sooner than mine). Be on the lookout for these and ways to combat social scripting. You can research it on your own too, of course.

"Three reasons why Christian parents are raising slutty girls and beta males"

4 upvotes · 14 August 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

More to [u/matrixtospartanatLV](#) ...

If we are going to change the way Christianity is taught then we need to be speaking to the guys that are actually teaching the congregation.

This is certainly helpful, but note that it's not what Jesus did. He didn't go to the pharisees and say, "You've already got the ears of the people, so I'm going to target my ministry toward you so you can start teaching them rightly." No, he started from the ground up and worked against the interests of the pre-established teachers. He became the teacher of the people.

In the same way, I believe the best model isn't to go to the pastors, who likely will never change their views. They believe that it would be disadvantageous for them to do so. Instead, those of us who recognize the advantage of teaching actual Truth must become the teachers to the people. This happens through personal discipleship that evolves into small groups, which in cumulation begins to change the culture of the people to a point where the leaders have no choice but to adapt to the new culture.

I think this is what you're getting at with your last paragraph, which is closest to the model of culture-change that Jesus established for us. The top-down approach falters every time a new leader is replaced because the people themselves are never being indoctrinated. That approach assumes that people are dummies who will eat up whatever the leadership feeds them. So, if you can successfully change a leader and he teaches his congregation rightly, what happens when his successes get him called away to lead another broken church and the new guy doesn't live up to par? Well, that dummy congregation is going to eat up whatever the new guy teaches and you can just never keep up. But if the culture of the people themselves changes, it doesn't matter if Bob and his wife move away, or the Jonses stop showing up ... a few personnel changes will not disrupt the environment as a whole once you've taught people to think for themselves and to look to the Bible for answers rather than a Sunday morning sermon. This is the ground-up approach and why it is stable and why Christianity has survived for centuries ... until seminaries (among other things) began perverting it into something that no longer resembles the house that Jesus built.

[FR] Duty Sex Doesn't Exist

4 upvotes · 13 August 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Didn't mean to dodge the question and I think I edited my response before you sent this. In short, there's no way for me to compare your sex with mine, but I'd say it's certainly possible they're on par. I just don't know for sure without being in your shoes.

:brohug: back

Anyone here feel bad for being too hard on themselves re: chastity?

4 upvotes · 8 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Props for staying chaste. Get involved in a church. Period. You have no excuse for that one. Don't pursue nonchristians. Seriously, don't screw with that mess.

Those things aside, there's no problem with casting a wide net to fish for IOIs. You'll catch some bad fish and have to throw them back to the sea for some other fisherman to pick them up. But you can't catch the good fish either if you're not throwing out your net at all.

How do you learn to truly let go of someone?

4 upvotes · 8 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is an interesting comment and I like it. That said, I'd still caution OP against pursuing his ONEitis, as it puts him squarely in someone else's frame. He's being manipulated by an intangible emotional draw and not in control of his own faculties as a man, and this is dangerous. To that end, I wouldn't support the notion of, "You really love this other girl, so go get her, Tiger!" Not to say that's what you're telling him, but I wanted to clarify that point anyway so that the line was more pronounced.

Sex Addicted v. Sex Starved [MRP Draft]

4 upvotes · 7 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Let me be clear: Rollo's statement here doesn't suggest a conclusion. It merely states a fact. That fact is accurate in itself.

I agree that the Christian marriage is not about control, but you have to remember the frame of reference: that most men here are coming from relationships where they have been controlled by their wives. This post is about releasing them from that control, not about encouraging them to become controlling.

I also didn't say that a man must downplay his wife's interests. In most situations our interests are aligned. But there are times when there is a stark contrast between the two, like my wife wanting me to spend half a million dollars on a new house, when this would be unwise stewardship of our finances. I don't downplay her request, but there are some requests that are objectively irrational in the first 10 seconds of being presented, so I don't have to sit there and contemplate her input for 3 days before giving the obvious conclusion: No. Are you really suggesting I should just succumb to my wife's desires because you/she would be "extremely hurt" if I didn't prioritize her happiness over my own?

And to be clear, I don't think you account for the fact that I have positive desires for my wife's well-being, just as I do for my kids. I act on those desires. I don't ever want to go to Chuck-E-Cheese. Ever. Period. I hate that place. But I know my kids love it and it makes me happy to see them running around, playing games, and eating pizza. So we go. Not because my kids demanded it of me or emotionally pressured me into it, but because I proactively - without them bringing it up - know that it would be fun for them. In the same way, it makes me happy to do things for my wife. But not when she tries to use emotional pressure games to coerce me. If I succumb to her will against my own interests due to manipulation, pressure, or control, I'm going to have a bad attitude about it and it ruins it for my wife. But if she trusts me to be good to her, then I am good to her and it

makes me happy to do that, even if it's thing that I wouldn't naturally do of my own accord. The issue isn't downplaying a wife's interests - it's a wife submitting her interests to her husband rather than trying to take control of them herself, and then the husband being responsible with those interests in his own sound discretion.

Starting a RPC men's group

4 upvotes · 30 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I'll update later, but I'm joining an established men's group and tonight will be my first night there. I'm told by the current host/leader of the group that he wants me to take over the leadership to discuss "biblical masculinity and marriage issues for men."

In short, I'm being given a group on a silver platter to start this process with. I'll let you know how the first night goes soon.

Relationship started Secular/RP and now I'm wanting to reset it in the way Christ designed. Is it possible?

4 upvotes · 30 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Why continue in a relationship with a woman you're not excited to be with? Some guys spend months or years in dead-end relationships *trying to make it work*. Contrary to popular opinion, relationships *should not* be hard to maintain. People do this out of a sense of loyalty and commitment, which are good, but they're applying it in a very blue-pill way in a pre-marriage context. Loyalty and commitment are reserved for your spouse - and even then in a different way than the rest of the world typically pushes those terms.

At the end of the day, if you're a high quality man, there's no reason to continue in a relationship you're not fully excited about. To do so is to allow ONEitis and pair bonding to control your otherwise wise discretion.

Advanced MRP Course by the Coach

4 upvotes · 19 July 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I'm excited for this series. Make sure to post updates here too as you go along.

Wish I didn't say anything at all...

4 upvotes · 19 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

First off, OYS. You goofed. Oh well. Admit it. Own it. Move on.

Second, unless the Holy Spirit is the one convicting you to have said something (in which case James 4 applies), you didn't sin. So, nothing to worry about there. You did your job. Move on.

Third, there's a trichotomy at play here: the bad choice, the "not the bad choice" choice, and the choice God wanted you to make. When you say you wish you hadn't said anything at all, you're saying, "I made the bad choice, but I should have made the 'not the bad choice' choice." But as a technical matter, neither of those options are the choice God would have wanted you to make.

So, then: *What did God want you to do in this situation?* I have no idea. I don't think you do either.

Quite frankly, even a passive, "I'll pray for you," can be condescending and reaffirming of the passivity of men in Christianity. That line is no better than clicking the "like" button on Facebook. As a practical matter, we know that prayer has value and can be influential in a situation. But you don't need to tell him you're going to pray for him in order actually to do it. So, when the question is what you should have *said to him* or not, the implication is that we're concerned with how he would receive whatever you would have said. Receiving an "I'll pray for you" rarely means anything to anyone other than close friends who know you'll actually follow through and who believe it will actually help. Don't click the "Christian 'LIKE' button" on this guy just because he has an abnormal mass.

What is something of value that you could have communicated to him instead?

- *Look, I'm just a common worker here. I'm not your doctor or anything, but I know this has got to feel like a pretty crappy day for you. Nobody likes being stuck here. I don't even like it - and I'm not even a patient! But I do feel like God has me here for a reason, and today you might be that reason. Would you mind if I prayed over you before we go any further?*

And then pray over him right then and there. Sure, it's embarrassing as many nurses and doctors will walk by. You may even get some dirty looks or someone telling you you'll lose your job over it. Be tactful in where/when/how you do it to minimize some of the risks. But if you feel the Spirit tugging on your heart like that, don't wuss out. Just do it.

I've had this exact conversation a handful of times with the homeless guys outside the court. It always goes well and I get to know them, building a relationship with the people that everyone else walks past. One guy I even offered to buy Chipotle (he was sitting right outside one) and he said, "Nah, man. What you just gave me - that was all the food I need." I asked him what I gave him and he said, "Hope. A reason to believe that there is a God and he's got more in store for me than this."

Since then, one of the guys I disciplined at my church has co-planted a church downtown for this guy and a number of other homeless people in my city. It's a beautiful thing. But it starts with being confident and assertive, never backing down when the Spirit gives you direction.

How to deal with anger against feminism and the downfall of modern society?

4 upvotes · 17 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is key. As I often say: *The way to stop sinning isn't to try to stop sinning; it's to do what God told us to do.* Is the same concept as trying to stop thinking about a pink elephant. If you try to stop you will fail. If you think about something else you will succeed. The same concept applies to wasteful things we do with our time.

100 Series - Theory and Understanding [Compilation]

4 upvotes · 3 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

You're free to use any of it. No need to provide credit. Feel free to treat it as your own content, if you like.

100 Series - Theory and Understanding [Compilation]

4 upvotes · 3 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Unfortunately, the church today is too feminized to be willing to teach any of this. They will give lip service to the technicalities of theology, but in practice will live out the exact opposite and condemn any man who wants to be a biblical man.

What parts of "Game" should a RP Christian utilize? Which ones should we not utilize?

4 upvotes · 20 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

There's nothing wrong with making "sex" the end goal of game ... if you're married. Many men here are married, at which point I'd say that most aspects of game are perfectly appropriate. Of course, per my "Defining 'the red pill' for Christians" post (on the sidebar), this shouldn't be one's highest goal.

If I had time, I'd go into the distinction between an immediate purpose and an underlying premise, where the underlying premise of all we do should be God's glory, despite the fact that the immediate purpose might be something else. So, when I feed my kids, my immediate goal is to make sure they don't starve to death, but I also have an underlying premise of glorifying God and reflecting his image in how he cares for us by virtue of how I care for my children. But that's enough on that for now. My point is simply that a man can have an immediate purpose of enhancing his sexuality while maintaining an appropriate underlying purpose of glorifying God.

That said, as you note, if you're not married there has to be a different focus. Gaming a woman to get her into bed isn't biblical until she's your wife (unless you're making her your wife through that act). But I'm not sure much else really differs from a biblical perspective. 1 Cor. 7 says the reason to get married is when two people "burn with passion" for one another. That obviously refers to an intense sexual attraction. How's that sexual attraction going to develop if your focus in the relationship is purely platonic until marriage?

Or to be clearer: by fostering sexual attraction between you and other women, you're creating a condition where you'll be mutually "burning with passion" with someone else, thereby creating the condition when Paul would say, "Fine, go ahead and get married - but don't say I didn't warn you." To that end, if your goal is to get married and have lots of great sex, then sexual game is your fastest ticket to getting your goal met. From there it's just a matter of making sure you're not sinning.

But from another angle, in my view that seems like you're cheating the system. "Paul says it's better to stay single, unless we're about to sexually sin with someone else ... so I'll cheat the system by putting myself in positions where I'm likely to have that burning desire so then I'm not going against Paul's recommendation when I get married." That attitude just doesn't make sense to me.

And for the record, as /u/Whitified as said a number of times - if you're truly red pill (Christian or non), you'll understand that marriage should not be a goal you're actively pursuing. It makes zero sense for either a biblical or a secular standpoint in today's culture. The fact that marriage seems to be an active pursuit for most men is very troubling. If you're a non-Christian, just have sex outside of marriage and you're good to go, there's no reason to bring legal entanglements into things (obviously I'm speaking from their perspective - not that I'm actually encouraging non-Christians to sin more). If you're a diligent believer, you would heed Paul's advice and devote yourself wholly to God, not being distracted by the cares and concerns of a wife.

So, it still makes more sense to me that the Christian should not employ any "game" or sexual strategy before marriage - that he should simply pursue God, full-out. This requires being the best man you can be, which includes all the self-improvement and awareness concepts that RP has to offer. Your goal in doing this is the underlying premise of God's glory, and your immediate aim is your mission - not making yourself attractive to women. Being attractive and having women fawn all over you is a passive side-effect of doing this which will (in my estimation 99.9% of the time) result in a situation where you're in a "burning passion" anyway, so you'll still end up getting married - but you'll have done it with the proper orientation of your life that will set a precedent of seeking God and not your wife. She will know she's coming alongside you on a mission, not getting a guy who's head over heels for her.

Is there anything we as young men we can do to slowly dispel a Jezebel spirit with RP principles?

4 upvotes · 29 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Good reply.

You're apparently the type of guy that attracts "Strong, independent Womyn. TM " I would stop and consider why that is.

Well, he said the answer, you've just got to look for it. He uses phrases like "I withdrew" and "I avoid" and "I have always been calm and relaxed" and "I have self doubts" and "I don't really know how to guide myself."

OP sounds to me like an insecure introvert without a mission in life. I was there once too, so I get it. But when you're not actively engaging with others and following up on those relationships, it makes sense that you're only going to engage with those who are bold and active enough to engage with you. Those tend to be the strong-willed, caution-to-the-wind types of people. So, those are the kinds of girls who show interest. If OP wants to find a woman who isn't like this - who is more meek, mild-tempered, submissive, etc. - then he's probably going to have to be the one to take the initiative (not that I recommend actively finding a spouse anyway, per my other

posts).

marriage prep: confront her with my past sexual sins?

4 upvotes · 28 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

There's a practical answer here and a biblical answer. The practical answer is what you're seeing a lot of so far: don't bring it up. This makes sense in worldly wisdom. If you were with a secular crowd, I'd agree 100%.

[/u/rocknrollchuck](#) seems to take more of a blended view: don't bring it up, but make sure to follow biblical principles about not lying if she asks you about it, at which point you should OYS and not hide it.

I'll present a third option: Romans 14. Some people eat meat, some don't. Some people "consider one day more sacred than another" and others don't. The penultimate verse is 14, "But if anyone regards something as unclean, then for that person it is unclean."

To that I ask: *what's the Spirit telling you?* For some men they might be able to withhold the information for the rest of their lives and it not violate their convictions from the Spirit. What is the Spirit convicting you about? If your heart tells you to disclose the information, you must disclose the information, whether it makes practical sense under worldly wisdom or not. **Do not violate your conscience.** Your conscience can either defend or condemn you (Romans 2:15). To that end, if your conscience is telling you one thing and any man here persuades you to do another, he is in violation of Romans 14.

Simply put, there is no hard-line biblical rule about this issue. Accordingly, per Romans 14:1, it falls into the class of "disputable matters." If anyone condemns you for doing what you believe the Spirit is leading you to do, 14:10 says, "You, then, why do you judge your brother? Or why do you treat them with contempt? For we will all stand before God's judgment seat." Do what is right before God, not what your brothers say.

To that end, I offer no opinion on which way you should go - only that you should pray about the answer and take whichever path maintains the integrity of your conscience and desire. If your conscience and desire are both aligned to withhold the information, then withhold it. But if your conscience tells you one thing and your desire another, go with your conscience.

Since men are the prize in a marriage, is a dowry a blue pill idea? I'm curious to know since dowry's are in the Bible, was that an example of the cultural shift towards hypergamy?

4 upvotes · 18 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

You're thinking of a bride price/reverse dowry.

RP Biblical Compendium Favorites

4 upvotes · 22 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Summary of Biblical RP in 2 Verses

David to Michal: "It was before the LORD, who chose me rather than your father or anyone from his house when he appointed me ruler over the LORD's people Israel--I will celebrate before the LORD. I will become even more undignified than this, and I will be humiliated in my own eyes. But by these slave girls you spoke of, I will be held in honor" (2 Samuel 6:22).

1. He passes a compliance test.
2. He demonstrates raw alpha.
3. He implements hard dread.
4. We see his authority from God.

5. He agrees and amplifies.
6. He spits in the face of humiliation.
7. He maintains an amused mastery perspective.
8. His mission came first, which was the underlying reason for his indiscretionary jubilation in the first place.

I'm not sure of another passage that can be more RP than this.

God Punishes Beta Men

4 upvotes · 5 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is a solid reminder. But it's more than "God punishes beta men." It's: *God punished all people throughout all of time throughout the whole world because of one man's male betaness.* That's how much God hates the beta attitude. He put a reminder throughout history that men should never forget to leave their homes. Why do you think it took 5,900+ years before the patriarchy desolved and feminism started taking root as the new foundation for society?

Also take a look at the role of faith over the last 2,000 throughout the world and compare its prominence with society with when the patriarchy fell. Over 2,000+ years since Jesus was born and somehow within a decade or so of each other, faith falls and feminism ascends.

I used to make the mistake of believing that it was easier to find a spiritually mature woman than a spiritually mature man because there were **more women in the church**, which I assumed meant that women were more drawn to Christ and Christian ideals than men, and more ready to submit their lives to it. Of course, the manosphere knows the truth: the church hasn't changed women toward increased spiritual maturity; women have changed the church toward decreased spiritual maturity.

Instead of fulfilling the mission God put us here for, we're having small groups to talk about our *feelings*. Virtually every small group I've been a part of (except the ones I lead, of course) ends up getting derailed en masse (i.e. virtually every week) from a conversation about how to grow in our ability to carry out a mission for Christ and turns into group therapy where people are encouraged to share some deep struggle that is affecting *their feelings* so that we can pray over each other and have our *feelings* fixed ... as if God put us here to boost our morale. He promised we'd suffer, be persecuted, and that some of us would die for His mission.

How can we reconcile that with the church's modern prioritization on feelings? Because one man decided to be a beta and let his wife take charge of a spiritual decision ... and men have ever since been following in his footsteps.

Edit: I may return later to comment on the linked article. Did you mean to link to a specific comment that seems unrelated or to the article proper?

FR: The Spousal Support Scam

4 upvotes · 1 February 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Incredibly rare. They do happen, but there has to be some fraud that took place. Two comparison cases:

- I had one where the wife was pro se (i.e. no attorney) and dad's attorney bullied her into taking a bad deal that abandoned all spousal support. She got a small bit extra in the way of property division that nowhere near made up for the loss in spousal support over time. The court denied her subsequent request for support because pro se litigants are held to the same legal standard as if they themselves are an attorney competent and proficient in the area of law at hand.

- I had another case where the wife agreed to forego spousal support on the grounds that her husband was earning approximately the same amount as her through his self-employment business. Just under a year later they were back in court over a child support contempt, his financial records were requested, and it was discovered that in the original divorce he did not provide a complete record of his income and that he was actually earning about double what he had reported to the court. We then filed a motion to amend the original judgment, which was granted, and he was ordered to pay spousal support at an appropriate rate under law, back payment for every month from the date of original judgment forward, and interest on the back payment at the federally applicable rate. The court also hammered him on the child support award, accepting my client's suggestion of his income (which was far higher than we could actually prove) on the grounds that neither party had hard evidence to prove an actual number and the court didn't trust him, so they went with her allegation instead.

Long story short: don't commit fraud and you'll probably be fine.

Facebook

4 upvotes · 1 February 2018 · /r/askMRP

My wife knows I have a somewhat prominent main reddit account. She also knows I have a "secret reddit account" (this one). Every now and then she whines and complains about me not giving her full access to all of my accounts.

Along the lines of what /u/GargantuaBlarg29 said, there are two ways to handle this. My gut reaction is to take the hard-nose approach and say, "You don't tell me what to do. I'll keep secrets if I want." But that's not going to get me anywhere.

Instead I replied, "But if I let you see my 'secret account' then you'd probably harass all the girls I'm hooking up with ... and how am I going to get laid if that happens?"

Her response was, of course, to defend our sexual relationship and how good she thinks it is. I think it's good too. But she doesn't need to know that, so it's a nice little double-whammy, while also lightening the mood.

How to use TRP to grow "rich"?

4 upvotes · 1 February 2018 · /r/askTRP

TRP is here to open your eyes. It is not here to give you a purpose or help you find meaning in life. For that, there are places like [r/RPChristians](#).

What you're really struggling with is the difference between learning and applying. Consider ...

Adam and Bob are walking down the street having a friendly conversation. Adam tells Bob, I have something to show you, follow me. So, the two men round a corner and cross a few blocks before coming to a lot. Bob's jaw drops. Before him is the most impressive mountain of bricks he had ever seen. "I've never seen so many bricks," Bob tells Adam. Adam smirks and says, "I know, right?" The two marvel for a moment before Adam asks Bob, "So, do you have any bricks?" Bob motions for Adam to follow along.

The two men walk a few blocks down the street to another lot, where Bob lived. Adam runs a lap around the house but doesn't see Bob's pile. "Where is it?" Adam asks. "Where's your pile of bricks?" Bob shrugged, "Well, I don't have a pile of bricks. But my house is made out of bricks."

Are you accumulating a pile or are you building a house? What are you doing with all these bricks you're amassing for yourself from all this reading?

How should one phrase to a woman that they don't want to have premarital sex, however, you still want to pursue the relationship?

4 upvotes · 29 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Be direct, clear, and tactful. If you rely on innuendo, she might not get it, or even if she understands the innuendo she might think that because you're not talking straight it's not a serious issue to you.

If you want to lay a clear boundary to the relationship, set the context, set the parameter, allow room for feedback, don't budge into a realm you're not willing to budge.

Hey babe, I have something I want to talk about for the next several minutes. We haven't had sex yet, but I've certainly been tempted to try. I know everything in society tells us to give into that temptation and that there's nothing wrong with it. That said, remaining faithful to God is more important to me than a night of fun and intense pleasure. I want to have that night with you someday, but I have a very firm, unwavering boundary that I will not have sex with anyone until I'm married. Is that something you can be okay with?

If she says yes, great. Short conversation. If she says no, you need to cut her loose. The harder part is actually following through with the boundary.

FR: The Spousal Support Scam

4 upvotes · 28 January 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I typically get better results for male clients out of female judges. /shrug

Argument - critique requested

4 upvotes · 28 January 2018 · /r/askMRP

This is the answer right here.

she isn't the judge

I'm pretty sure I made a whole post on this.

either she admits she isn't a good wife to you (she won't) or she will shut up

Meh, in my experience, they actually end up hamstringing themselves out instead of either of these. They'll rattle off a long list of ways that they "contribute" and assume that you should be bowing at her feet for doing all of this. In the face of the facts, this list is usually objectively irrational, but no need to DEER.

The real issue is that when most men get this list they're too afraid to say what they're really thinking: "You left sex off your list. Until it's on, I don't give a crap whatever other contributions you think you're making." Tact in the exact wording can help, of course. But the paralyzing fear of being called sexist or accused of reducing her to "a piece of meat" is too much for some guys.

I remember the first time I went there. It was liberating. Wife responds, "You only want me for my body!" You could take the easy AA there, but I find it far more effective to NI that sucker all the way. It usually reveals that she's insecure about whether she has anything of substance to offer you. Once she's in that vulnerable place, THAT'S when you AA to the comfort test: "Of course you do. In fact, let's go prove it right now. We'll make it so good you'll never doubt yourself again."

Now, in reality she wants to know that she has worth to you beyond just sex. No falling for that trap, even if it is in the context of a legit comfort test, otherwise OP will hear those things pop up on that list every time and she'll refrain, "But you told me you did value these things about me!" as her excuse for being allowed to leave sex off the list. This is no different than last time ... AA or NI into an AA. Done.

I believe this is true "frame" rooted in the Fear of the Lord.

4 upvotes · 28 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is a simpler summation of the conclusion of 404 in a narrower context. Well said. And yes, this level of abundance and amused mastery in the "legitimately full" circle can be maintained perpetually :)

How to Handle a Veiled Threat of Domestic Abuse?

4 upvotes · 25 January 2018 · /r/askMRP

[r/RPChristians](#) might be a good place for some of this. That said, BPP is directly on point: your overall negativity and anger is what's screwing things up here. None of this indicates even a remote hint of amused mastery, strong frame, OYS, abundance mentality, or any skillfulness with fogging, AA, NI, etc.

As soon as she starts nagging you, AA her. If that doesn't get her to back down, fog and NI for the next dozen or two exchanges, then AA when you finally get to the bottom of the issue.

"I told her ____" ... I don't even care what's in the blank, if you're saying this phrase thinking you're putting her in her place, you've already failed. You used this phrase 4 times in a relatively short post.

Now, how would you guys have handled that?

First time she tries to screw with me over petty stuff, pat her on the head and say, "Aw, that's cute that you think I'm your little pet." Next time I just respond, "Woof, woof." A few times after that, "Hey, you seem like you're pretty up tight. Maybe if I put something up where it's tight it can help you unwind a little." This is all your initial AA and C/F. This keeps the mood light-hearted, even if she does get a little flustered that you're not taking her seriously.

That's actually a good thing. Genuine tension is easily confused with sexual tension if you're setting a context of sexuality around the tension. This is a nice double-whammy because sexuality releases tension of all kinds. So you're increasing your sexuality, while simultaneously thwarting the other garbage she's throwing your way.

If you're not skilled at AA or she's too self-aware to be distracted by AA, just fog and NI all day. "You're right, I didn't do the dishes last night. Why is that a bad thing?" Then, "You're right, I could have worded myself better. But what's wrong with being blunt every now and then?" After enough NI, you'll only ever get 3 possible conclusions, and one of these will always result:

- She decides not to deal with it and just walks away, and you let her, then go about your day business as usual, including gaming her like nothing happened.
- She realizes that her frustrations with you aren't because you did anything "bad" or "wrong" - it's that you're simply not meeting her personal preferences, at which point you do your final NI: "Why is it wrong for me to pursue my personal preferences instead of your personal preferences?" Never answer your own NI, by the way, and don't deliver the questions as attacks, sarcastic remarks, or even ask them as if they're rhetorical. They are genuine questions that you want to force her hamster to spin on. 9 times out of 10 her hamster can't run that fast and ends up just fizzling out.
- A deeper issue is revealed that's at the core of her frustrations that converts the s-test into a comfort test, demonstrating that all of her nagging and nit-picking wasn't really about those things themselves, but about something deeper. Then, when she's pondering on that issue it's like time is suspended and the ball is just floating above home plate waiting for you to knock it out of the park. AA is your bat. "You're right, it's not what you're doing. I've been so upset about how mean my mom was to me the other day, and I've just been feeling like nobody loves me anymore." *Hey, honey, it's okay. <hug, rub her back. Hand on cheek and look her in the eye>. You know I love you.* [And if you're a chicken who just wants to pass the comfort test that you converted her s-test into, you can just stop there. Otherwise ...] *Besides, being mean and loving someone aren't mutually exclusive <put your forehead on hers and look mischievous into her eyes> ... and I'm willing to go*

upstairs and prove it right now.

How could I have handled it better?

STFU. The easiest order of learning progression should look something like this:

- **STFU first:** Learn to let her rant with you saying nothing. Don't be an idiot about it, but you do have to remain silent even while it's uncomfortable. Pop Quiz: she says, "So, where were you last night? Were you with some girl? Are you cheating on me?" How do you respond? If your gut reaction is to give me an answer to the question, you haven't mastered the art of STFU yet. If instead you think to yourself: *I don't have to respond if I don't want to, but I do have some ideas ...* then you're ready to move on.
- **FOGGING/STFU:** When in these conversations are happening, start agreeing with her, but do no more. *I can see how it looks like I'm cheating on you* - then STOP. "Well, are you?" Option 1: no response at all, other than maybe a smirk and a shrug (why waste free dread?). Option 2: *I understand why you feel the need to ask me that* - then STOP. You don't answer to her. Are you cheating? Given your faith, probably not. But you have no obligation to tell her that, especially not when she's trying to force you to do so on her terms. When she's in your frame, give her whatever comforts you deem appropriate, but when she's trying to make her frame dominant over you, the best thing you can do is just let her hamster spin and refuse to engage on her terms.
- **FOGGING/BR:** Once you've mastered that, and you no longer care what she thinks about you, and you're fine if she thinks you're cheating on her or whatever - now you start asserting yourself with broken record. She nags you about the dishes: "Why aren't they done yet?" You already told her you'd do them after the game. What do you do? *I understand that you're frustrated, but I stand by what I said. I'll get them done after the game.* She responds, "But I have a friend coming over in 5 minutes and I don't want her seeing our dirty sink!" *I understand your frustration. I'll get them done after the game.* You might be tempted to explain something else, like: "You can blame it on me if she's offended at our dirty sink" or "You shouldn't care so much about what your friend thinks about our sink" ... but don't. Just agree and re-assert yourself.
- **FOGGING/NI:** As described above, when she's getting all sassy or flustered, just say, *I understand that you feel that way, but why is ____ bad/wrong?* Ask this repeatedly until you get to one of those three conclusions: (1) she gives up and leaves, (2) she faces the reality that her personal preferences aren't more important than yours, or (3) the core of the issue (if one exists) is revealed and you either pass it as a comfort test or hit an AA home run (which is AA on easy mode because there's lots of silence for you to pause and think of the perfect response).
- **AA:** Once you've done that enough times, you'll start to get a good feel for AA responses and this just becomes your go-to.

AMUSED MASTERY fits in with all of this as well. It's an overarching mentality you maintain throughout the process to keep you from getting butt-hurt. If you have kids, this will come incredibly naturally to you.

For example, my 2-year-old daughter is hyper-emotional. There are times she'll be screaming and yelling about not wanting to go to bed and my wife just can't deal with it. So, I step in and my daughter gets right in my face and start screaming even louder, just inches away. Do I engage? No, I blow in her face. It ticks her off even more, so I do it again and just laugh. It's funny to me to see how mad it makes her when I blow in her face while she's screaming. Then I do it a third time, following it up with a tickle. Now she's laughing with me. After the tickle she does a little "hmp!" and crinkles her nose, so I pick up her arm and bite it and pretend to eat it like I'm a monster. Suddenly she forget she's mad as we play a little game and I threaten to eat her leg right off, then I chase her into her bed, which she knows is "base."

Or my 4-year old daughter whines all the time. It's ridiculous. So, sometimes I just start fogging and start whining right alongside her, usually in a similar, yet exaggerated tone: *Yeah, mommy. We're hungry. Get us food. We're thirsty. Get us something to drink.* My daughter gets mad that I'm mocking her, but she also finds it kind of funny and is soon distracted and realizes that whining isn't going to get her what she wants.

In each of these examples, how many times did I say: "I told her ____" (ex. go to bed/stop whining)? *Never*. How many times did I verbally assert my authority over them? *Never*. How many times did they ultimately do exactly what I wanted them to do? *Every time*.

My wife is the same way. I kid you not, next time your wife is sitting next to you on the couch complaining about something you did or nagging you ... blow in her face. See what she does. Then bite her arm and see what happens. Then start mimicking her voice exaggeratedly and laugh. 100% without fail she winds up in my frame rather than fighting to get me in hers, and she's laughing right alongside me.

If there's a serious issue to address, I bring it up - but I do so on my terms and when I'm ready. It might be 10 minutes later or 3 days later, but at some point I say in my own timing: "Hey, I remember you saying something about _____. Here's what we're going to do on that issue." You preempt the comfort test by letting her know that you hear what she's saying, even if you don't acknowledge her at the time, but you also show that you're on the ball and can be trusted to lead. It's a win-win.

EDIT: To be clear, obviously there are other ways to ingest all this stuff and people figure it all out in different orders all the time. But if you're as new to all of this as I suspect you are, use this as a template to get you started. Keep reading the sidebar and lifting and all that as well, which is where the real progress will come from.

FR: Crawling back to RP after some struggles, wife kicks me while I am down.

4 upvotes · 25 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I think you're forgetting Hezekiah 3:17 - "Share with the wife of your youth all the secrets of your heart, that you may delight in her all the days of your life."

Seriously, though ... transparency and vulnerability are good things, but there is a limit. When our sins affect someone else negatively, I do believe we have an obligation to confess to them to the degree that such confession can rectify the problem. But we must also remember Psalm 51:4 - "Against you only have I sinned."

No matter the struggle, here's how I conceptualize this:

- If the sin doesn't affect her or your relationship with her in any way, you have no duty to confess. Only do so if you think she could help you, bearing in mind that "accountability partners" rarely ever actually solve sin issues and it's usually counter-productive to make your wife your accountability partner.
- If it negatively affects her directly or the relationship in anyway:
 - Confess the sin itself
 - If her behavior contributes to your sin (ex. as a trigger), let her know her role in the situation; if her behavior in this context is also sinful, call it out for what it is
 - Let her know the conditions in which your sinfulness is likely to recur
 - Take responsibility for the sin itself and how it affects her and the relationship; don't blame her behavior, just let her know that her behavior is a trigger
 - Because she is now aware of your situation and her influence and the impact it has on her and the relationship, and that this is an ongoing issue, your obligation in confession is done and does not need to be repeated with each recurrence of the sinful conduct.
- If your ongoing sinfulness changes in some way so that it has a new or different impact on her or the

relationship, remind her of the issue, let her know of the new information you have on how it's affecting the relationship, and leave it at that

- If your ongoing sinfulness doesn't negatively impact her or the relationship, or if any negative impact has already been confessed to her, then at that point it's an issue between you and God

To give an example, here's how this played out during the days I struggled with pornography - especially during the first chunk of the 18 month period of pure denial. I'll keep the same bullet-point format for easy reference.

- I knew my pornography struggle was affecting our relationship.
- [Condition met]
 - "I've been struggling with watching porn and masturbating to it."
 - "It's no secret that we have a pretty awful sex life. You've sinned with how sexually denying you are. I've sinned with how I have responded to that."
 - "I cannot go without sex for more than a couple days before I'm tempted to find an alternative outlet. Any time we go 48 hours without sex, there's a good chance I'm going to be tempted and fall into sin."
 - "I'm not saying this to blame you for my sin. I'm just letting you know where I'm at spiritually. It's still my sin. It's my responsibility. But you do have the ability to help me with this, although I won't force you."
 - "I'm not going to keep bringing this up every time I fail. That would only be hurtful. But I do want you to know it's an ongoing issue so that you are not disillusioned by my silence." [The first time I had this conversation she insisted on me re-confessing ever time and I actually did agree (stupidly, I might add). After a few confessions it was obvious that wasn't helping, so I stopped, which led her into a disillusioned state that because I stopped confessing I had also stopped looking at porn. That's why the "I'm not going to keep bringing this up" part is so important. The second time I had this conversation is when I made clear to her that I would not be confessing any further, but that didn't mean the problem had gone away. I insisted that I had no spiritual obligation to confess to her every time and she was unable to find any passage that would compel such confession on a husband's part to his wife.]
- At one point I realized that my ongoing struggle with pornography was creating a greater bitterness and hatred for my wife than what I was previously aware and was also causing me to see other women in real life differently, so I re-confessed the sin this way: "As you should already know, I have been struggling with pornography for some time. Your behaviors haven't changed, neither have mine. Again, that's no excuse for my own sinfulness, and you're welcome to get mad at me, but remember the plank and the speck before you speak. Although I've already confessed all of this to you, it's starting to affect me in different ways and I thought you should be aware of those changes. Specifically, I find myself frequently resenting you and wanting to avoid you constantly. I also find myself fantasizing about other women and plotting in my mind how to cheat on you without getting caught. I have never acted on these thoughts, but the temptation is certainly escalating and because my attitude toward you affects our relationship, this needed to be said."
- After that iteration of the conversation, there was never anything new, so I never brought it up again. Her behavior didn't change either.

Once I reached that point, I finally came to the realization that, as David concluded, my sin was now between God and me alone. My obligation to my wife was satisfied. Once it was purely an issue between God and me, that's when I felt like I could finally work it out. If it was an issue between God and me and my wife, then her behavior would have been too big of a factor for me to ignore. I wouldn't have been able to focus on myself. So, between God and me, we resolved the issue and the sin is gone - and the ongoing 400-level content (specifically

The Lens Illustration) is the means by which I overcame this issue, along with many, many, many other issues I was struggling through.

So, those are my thoughts on confession of sin. If it's not a sin issue, that's just purely a matter of exercising wisdom and discretion: will telling her improve things or make them worse? That's it.

EDIT: To be clear, there is no book of "Hezekiah" - that was a joke.

Can someone explain this sub's view of "premarital sex" please?

4 upvotes · 23 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

It sounds like you already understand the right conclusion, but just need to know how to get there. A proper understanding of *porneia* does reveal this, but I'll take it you're not satisfied there. The concept of two people becoming one flesh is the next easy model to look to - that this is something God reserves for marriage in Genesis, thus practicing it outside of marriage would defy the order of creation.

Personally, although those alone are sufficient, I find the most powerful explanation in the model Christ gives to the world. Specifically, the Church is his bride. Sex is a reproductive act where a man meets with his bride to create new life. Evangelism is the spiritual parallel.

Premarital sex, then, would be akin to God trying to generate spiritual life by uniting himself with a non-believer. It just doesn't make sense. 1 Cor. 6 and 2 Cor. 6 both make it clear that God is not to be united with an unbeliever - that light should not become one with darkness.

Going even beyond that passage, Jesus says in Matthew 7 that a bad tree *cannot bear good fruit*. So, if God is engaging in procreative acts with non-believers, no good fruit could come from it - only bad fruit. But because a good tree *cannot bear bad fruit*, that would imply that God is not "good." Accordingly, we can see that God does not engage in spiritually reproductive acts with non-believers.

Now, spiritual contraception does exist too, but these virtually always fall in the category of "sin," which we know God cannot do. So, that leaves the conclusion that by the model Christ sets premarital sex is sin without exception.

Thoughts on "premarital sex" and polygamy

4 upvotes · 4 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

To be clear, as I said elsewhere, this is not a hard theological view I hold that I would endorse to anyone else. I was just listing a framework that accounts for the very basic facts and was asking for input. Don't act like I was trying to use this as a teaching for all to follow. My original post should make this clear.

Even so, I don't think you realize the degree of interpretive measure you're taking in all of this. Although I personally oppose polygamy on grounds of wisdom (Solomon being my prime example - but I still see no command in that story), I don't see the same clarity you do in God's opposition to it. Instead, I see in 2 Samuel 12 God telling David, "I gave you all of Saul's wives and concubine, and if you wanted more I would have given you more."

I'm trying to figure out how much of what we believe is actually scripturally mandated as compared with human views that we simply believe are what God would have said if he did decide to address the issue. The latter is a dangerous path to tread.

Be the Judge

4 upvotes · 19 December 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Some good things here ... and so so so much wrong too. I'll leave it at that.

Advice to get over a breakup ?

4 upvotes · 18 December 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I'm sorry to hear this, brother. I went through the exact same thing back in college, but didn't have the benefit of being RP aware at the time. I was misplaced in thinking I was some kind of super-Christian (I was actually a non-Christian) and she initially had all the outward signs of being a Christian, but after deciding I was the guy she wanted to marry, she got scared of losing her "crazy, fun college years," so she started cheating on my several times a week (mostly because I was too self-righteous to have sex with her before marriage - which was a good choice, but from a wrong motive). After about 9 months of being together I finally became a genuine Christian, realized that our relationship wasn't anything godly, and broke up with her.

That being said, I'll start by fully endorsing the response by [/u/RedPillWonder](#) and suggesting you read up on [/u/OsmiumZulu](#)'s guide to finding a Christian wife.

Second, props for making the wise choice of committing your life to pursuing Christ! Don't let this be a phase. Let it be your identity. I've finally started the 400-level content, which will dive deeply into this.

So what now? ... what's the RP Christian way to handle this?

Ideally, just ignore girls for a while and start learning and growing in your faith. Go monk mode. If you want a quality girl, you have to be a quality man. It sounds like you're just taking your faith seriously for the first time, which means you've probably got a long way to go.

Find someone to disciple you! One year of being disciplined can catalyze the same degree of spiritual growth that would take most other people a couple decades or more to figure out on their own.

Get on a mission. Biblically, women are meant to be helpers. God said, "I will create a helper suitable for him." If you don't have a mission, what's your wife going to help you do? Finding a mission that's more important to you than finding a wife is going to be (1) what attracts a Christian woman to you, and (2) what makes her feel whole in her relationship with you. The divorce rate for couples that have an active lifestyle of evangelism and discipleship (the mission God prescribes to us) is under 2%. Why? Because if both people are doing what God designed them to do, they will be incredibly satisfied in life.

Develop a frame. This should go without saying here, but your frame is you. It's your identity. It's that core truth that shapes how you perceive everything in life - and it should be unshakable. Without a frame, when you do find another girl, you'll end up buckling to your affections. Decide who you want to be based on who God says you are, then start exploring what life looks like to be that.

Ghost her. I hate saying this, but my dad taught me this as his cardinal rule of dating and I can't help but agree: *When you end it, end it and never look back or you will always get sucked back in.* Seinfeld had a long-standing joke on the series over how often Elaine would get back together with Putty (one of the main guys she saw throughout a couple seasons of the show). There was even a whole episode devoted to the idea that a break-up doesn't stick in one-go ... it has to be eased into over time. Don't let that be you. When I left the girl I referenced above, I made the mistake of hanging out with her a couple other times. In my mind I was trying to prove that I could transcend the stigma about being friends after dating. I was obviously wrong, saw what direction things were moving, and ultimately had to put a hard stop to all contact. I chalk this up to fleeing from temptation, not letting it have any part of your life. If she was a source of temptation while you were dating, she'll continue to be a source of temptation afterward - and don't let that in.

I hope this helps.

It's hard to lead if you don't have preferences

4 upvotes · 29 November 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Leaders thrive in chaos

This right here ... such an underrated aspect of leadership. If there is no chaos, there's no need for a leader - things just naturally unfold as they should. More to this point, though ...

Going in and demanding to have every one suddenly revolve around you may in fact be a strategy to display your value, but it's also a good way to show how much of a prick you are.

Sometimes it's okay to be a prick, but on the whole, leading when there isn't chaos and things are naturally unfolding in an orderly manner comes off as weak. It makes you seem like a control freak, which most people associate with mental instability, not the solid oak-like qualities men should embody.

As John Maxwell notes, leadership is influence. Not position. Not power. Not a platform. Influence. So, trying to look like the man in charge just for the sake of it isn't a display of leadership; it's often a display of insecurity. It shows that a person doesn't understand leadership and doesn't know how to influence people without leveraging position, power, platforms, etc. as the backbone for how he gets things done.

To that end, with military experience in-hand, I'm sure you can attest to the difference between your COs who led purely out of position as compared to those who had earned influence in their subordinate's lives.

She's not your's it's just your turn

4 upvotes · 17 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I know MRP suggests not letting your first officer/mate in on what is going on ... But this is worldly advice. The Bible has given the Christian husband rights over his wife and it is his responsibility to find a Christian girl who wants the same and understands her role in a marriage.

To be clear, there is merit to the notion of leading with your actions, not your words. But more to the point, secular RP has no basis for authority over the woman. In fact, quite the opposite: *it is an absolute IMPERATIVE for them to keep things quiet* because women have all the power in most first world societies. So, if they tried to exercise verbal authority, it would be obvious as coming out their butts. Instead, they are forced to make her *want* to submit to his authority.

As Christians, we come from a slightly different place. If the wife is biblically grounded, she will understand the compelling authority of Scripture in her life. Although I typically advise against men using the old, "Submit! The Bible tells you to!" argument (which is a really bad one), there is actually some room for us to have the direct, verbal conversation with our wives about biblical submissiveness without ruining the plan - because it's a concept that she must ultimately embrace or otherwise reject aspects of her faith, which compromises her internal integrity.

All of that said, I defy you to find a verse that says, "A husband must be completely open with his wife and tell her everything." That's not in the Bible. I agree that there are some things where we have a moral obligation to disclose them, but I'm doubtful RP principles is one of them. I know a lot of things about philosophy, sociology, etc. that my wife wouldn't care to hear even if I tried to tell her. Awareness of theory of intergender relational dynamics isn't any different. If she asks and you lie - that, of course, is a different matter.

What is the value of femininity?

4 upvotes · 13 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

After a long day fighting the world most men go home to a masculine, controlling, judgemental, sex denying harpy. These men are worn down over the years.

Indeed - one of the values of femininity to the man is not only in femininity for its own sake, but in avoiding the negative repercussions of being with someone who is non-feminine.

What is the value of femininity?

4 upvotes · 13 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

This is a great question! Here are some things to chew on:

FIRST - The question assumes that God organized masculinity and femininity for our benefit. Although all things do work together for our good (Romans 8:28), God has higher purposes (Isaiah 55:8). In this particular situation, God's higher purpose is that through marriage he is trying to establish a parallel for how the Christ-church relationship would operate. So, he created men and women uniquely in order to demonstrate the role that we, as Christ's bride, are meant to fulfill in relationship with him, while also giving men the opportunity to display the type of masculinity that Christ employs with us. Establishing this parallel is God's first and primary purpose in creating the genders differently, so even if there is no value added to the man from his wife being feminine it still makes sense that she should be feminine all the same - in order that the parallel would be further established and understood and that our marriages would properly reflect Christ to the world, not only in our individual representation of his character, but in how we function together as a unit.

SECOND - From the very beginning God said, "It is not good for man to be alone" (Genesis 2:18). God has put an internal compulsion in the heart of most (read: 99.9%) men to want to have a wife - and this occurred in Eden before sin entered the world, so we know it is part of His original design for the sexes. God then created *woman* from Adam's rib for the purpose of completing him - that a part of him (literally his rib) was missing and he could not be whole without being one with her (through sex).

Now, again with my first point: this is all a parallel to demonstrate to us how God desires to be in relationship with us and how the unity between Christ and his bride is something that forms a more perfect whole. It explains why the church is meant to long for Christ as a wife longs for her husband - and also how God, although being self-content without us, chose to give us an irreplaceable role to play in his plans. Ecclesiastes 3:11 references this when it points out that "God has set eternity in the human heart; yet no one can fathom what God has done from beginning to end." That is, we were created with a longing that only an eternal God could fill, and nothing on earth is going to fill that.

More to the point here, though: God created men to need a feminine woman to help point us toward that eternal longing that we otherwise try to suppress (see Romans 1:18 et seq.). So, we want a feminine woman simply because God made us desire it and long for someone like that.

THIRD - If a woman is not feminine, it's extremely hard for the man to fulfill his role in the marriage. When the marriage roles are broken, attraction between the couple suffers (see 102-103 on the sidebar). So, if a man's wife is not feminine, either he will lose attraction to her, or even if he does not, because of her lack of femininity she takes a more masculine role in the relationship, scaling back her husband's masculinity, causing her to lose attraction to him, and this then hinders the relationship from the other side. Once again, broken marriage roles also impacts our ability to reflect God to the world, which is an essential function of the church and being a Christian in the first place.

FOURTH - It should come as no surprise, but children without a clear mother and father figure tend to suffer significantly. Despite what popular agenda tries to say, children that are raised without a feminine presence in the home (even male children) tend to be imbalanced. Because Malachi 2:15 says that the whole point of marriage in

the first place is "to produce godly offspring," the impact of our lifestyle choices on our children should matter significantly to us. So, if the guy is determined to be masculine, then the wife should be determined to be feminine. When they choose to swap roles, see the first 3 points for why that doesn't tend to work.

FIFTH - When referring to traditionally feminine roles (i.e. housekeeping, cooking, laundry, nursing children, etc.), the captain/first-officer/ship example keeps coming to mind. If the captain is stuck swabbing the deck and cleaning the cabins all the time, he has no capacity left to chart a course and steer the ship where it needs to go; he can't look out for icebergs or storms coming up; he can't inspect for where maintenance and repairs need to occur; etc. In short, running a family is not a one-person job - especially when kids are involved. Just look up some stats on kids raised by single parents as compared with those who have both a mother and father figure present. So, if the man is to have the capacity to do what he needs to do in steering the ship, it is of great value to him to have someone else who can manage the day to day operations. That's why CEOs appoint managers and supervisors. That's not to say that the wife (or the "feminine woman" in general) must do all of these things by herself; rather, it means that there is value to him to delegate the responsibility for the care and attention of these things to her. She may want to hire the neighbor boy to mow the yard instead of doing it herself; or maybe she contracts out a bathroom remodel or hires a nanny or housekeeper or sends the kids to daycare so she can work. She should still run many of these directives past her husband, but it is helpful for him if she does the legwork he has delegated to her, develops a sound plan, and solicits his approval (or otherwise tweaks/adjustments to her proposal) before carrying it out. This is efficiency in the home.

SIXTH - Femininity is incredibly attractive. Guy or girl - it doesn't matter. Repeated psychological studies have shown that people have stronger positive emotional brain reactions to seeing a feminine woman than they do to seeing a man or a masculine woman. Because of this, the household is judged by the appearance and character of the wife before anyone cares to react to the husband. So, if the family is to make a good impression on outsiders (as the Bible compels us to do, per 1 peter 2:12, 2 cor. 8:21, 1 timothy 3:7, and Romans 15:1-2), the femininity of the wife is the most appealing place to start. It makes other women think, "I wish I could be just like her!" and it makes other men think, "I wish I had what they have!"

SEVENTH - There are some things that masculinity simply cannot do effectively. For a man to maintain his direction and mission in life, he must sacrifice certain qualities and traits about himself to get the job done. Inviting femininity into the home allows someone to fill in the gaps where he has forfeited his ability to do so - and this benefits the man by not having to try to work beyond his ordinary bounds.

EIGHTH - It's just pleasant to be around a feminine woman.

Edit: See also [this comment](#) on a tangentially related post over on [r/TrueChristian](#) about the benefits of femininity and biblical submissiveness. I think [/u/redpillwonder](#) linked to that thread on RPC a while ago, and it was an interesting read.

New to RP, Keep seeking approval?

4 upvotes · 8 November 2017 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I still want someone to tell me I am doing a good thing

God designed us to seek approval and validation. Before the fall, we were understood to found our approval and validation from Him alone. After the fall, our relationship with God was severed and we only truly understood physical relationships on earth among people. Result? We now crave validation from other people instead of from God.

The problem is that only God's validation can truly satisfy us. Galatians 1:10 says, "Am I now trying to win the approval of human beings, or of God? Or am I trying to please people? If I were still trying to please people, I

would not be a servant of Christ."

The Gospel is the answer. Because Jesus died and rose again, if you are in Christ you have a reconciled relationship with God (2 Cor. 5:19), and thus are able to receive his validation.

How do you get it? Read anything I've ever written on having a mission - specifically as to adopting the mission of disciple-making. In Matthew 25 Jesus tells a parable where the master validates his subjects: "Well done, good and faithful servant!" What did they do to receive this validation? They multiplied what they were given. You received your faith as a gift of grace from God - that is your talent/mina. If you fail to multiply it, you will be like the guy who hid his mina and was cast into darkness "where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth" (v30; a descriptor also used by Matthew in 13:42 to describe hell).

If you do multiply, you will receive the validation you so desperately seek - and this is a validation I experience daily as I continue to meet with and disciple men.

I keep wanting to ask her "do you like the new me?"

For the love of all that is good - **DO NOT DO THIS**. I wanted to do this really bad. I actually did at one point. It's such a huge display of low value that you actually get the opposite of the validation you're looking for. She might verbally praise you at first, but a flurry of fitness tests will soon follow in an effort to put you back in your place, proving that her words were hollow. It's the female *crabs in a bucket* mentality - if you start improving, she has to as well, so she'll verbally come off as supportive yet with her actions try to undermine your improvements so she can retain the power in the relationship, and also proving to you that she really doesn't care for your improvements the way you want her to.

If she already demonstrates this based on her actions, let that be enough. That's how women actually speak most of the time anyway - and so should you. Acta non verba.

Also, I fully endorse /u/OsmiumZulu's comments on rebranding - very well put. Meditate and pray on that.

[For Singles] Getting Laid Like a Christian (part 2)

4 upvotes · 3 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Wow. <Adds to the sidebar>

I got near the end and thought, "There's only one thing that I'd add to this," and then you said that too.

found this on facebook

4 upvotes · 31 October 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

Well ... yeah, she needs the TV to give her those feels because he's obviously not giving it to her. Despite feeling relaxed and pampered, she's probably not feeling romantic compulsion or sexual tension.

fast results, little ones--but wow

4 upvotes · 22 October 2017 · /r/askMRP

That and new guys (myself included at one point) often misread early signs due to confirmation bias. They want to believe that what they're doing is working, so it's easy to interpret events in that light rather than realizing that she provably never would have cared much to help out a bit more in the first place. It's not that a new tactic is changing how she interacts with them - it's that they're just finally tapping into something that has been there all along that they've just been too chicken to test.

Get past those pre-existent inclinations into new territory and that's where the true difficulty begins.

Nice guy married to someone who feels love from random acts of service, help me out here.

4 upvotes · 20 October 2017 · /r/askMRP

5LL

I couldn't agree more. One of my first posts on here was about that book. Covert contracts galore. It does have value, but more in how to game. But even then, you have to figure that part out for yourself because he doesn't tell you how to use the 5 tools for that purpose.

Question I always had about Christianity (but every pastor/priest is too bluepilled to answer)

4 upvotes · 19 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Disrespectful, rude, trolling, etc. comments will be removed. Genuine discussion is always permitted. I know this isn't a PPD sub, but I also don't shy away from healthy discourse that engages in *why* we believe what we believe. I don't like the notion of being a mindless drone that just believes what I'm told and am not willing to engage with someone who has a legitimate challenge to my way of thinking.

If it becomes overwhelming, I may adjust how things get moderated and be more strict, but right now there's virtually no discussion on the viability of RP views, so we haven't hit my threshold yet.

Either way, thanks for notifying me of this. I wouldn't have found out otherwise, given how far nested this conversation is - and on such an old thread.

What is going on in the head of Christians that give BP marriage advice?

4 upvotes · 18 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Women are more likely to develop an emotional connection to God that can be used for the church's advantage (for good or bad - it works both ways). As a result, the church has a vested interest in keeping women in the seats to maintain a position of power. This has been going on since just after the days of Theodosius I. Although the origin of this fem-centric preaching was a grab for power, because it went on for so long modern pastors simply follow suit and assume that pedestalizing women is a "noble" thing to do and consistent with how the church has always done things (nevermind the fact that we don't see this attitude anywhere in Scripture).

Now, Jesus is held as a shining beacon of self-sacrifice and we're all told to aspire to that same level of self-sacrifice. So, if a man leads his family, great - he does well. But if a man fails to lead his family and his wife steps up and does so, the church tells him that's even better because he's being a servant to his wife, self-sacrificing like Jesus did in order to maintain her happiness.

How do they hamster away the Scriptural incongruence? The church turns a blind eye and just assumes that all households are naturally run with men as the leaders. If women just happen to always get their way, it's not because the woman is leading the family; it's because the man is leading in a way that "loves and serves" his wife - by sacrificing the decisions he would have made in favor of the ones that serve her interests. This is then glorified as being "Christ-like" just like Jesus sacrificed himself for his bride.

What they miss is that Jesus never self-sacrificed just for the sake of it. He always had a greater purpose - and his self-sacrifice always led to his glorification. When a man self-sacrifices just for the sake of it or without enhancing his glory, he is breaking the pattern that Jesus laid out for us. Yes, men do need to engage in sacrificial love. But those sacrifices should always be there to further our own God-given agenda in life and enhance our glory as the head of the household. This is what the church misses.

Remember: *God doesn't sacrifice his agenda to make the church as happy and comfortable as possible. That's not the kind of self-sacrifice Jesus engaged in. Jesus' sacrifice was specifically to further his own plan - one that he established as the leader of the relationship.*

Deconditioning the wife who is disgusted at your touch - 10 Levels of Kino

4 upvotes · 13 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I will say, this entire post boils down to: "Gradually ease her into it in low-pressure environments until she's comfortable or even enjoys it." That's it.

The problem is if you say just that and nothing more people make all kinds of idiotic assumptions about what "ease her into it" means, so they end up screwing it up and saying, "Well, that didn't work." Then when they're complaining that 2 weeks of "easing into it" was worthless and you say, "No, this really takes months," they complain, "Well, why didn't you tell me that the first time? Why would it take that long? What would you do for all that time?"

But when you answer those questions up-front to avoid these failures and complaints, everyone who's already half way competent makes the opposite complaint: "Why would you say all that? Isn't this kind of obvious?"

Deconditioning the wife who is disgusted at your touch - 10 Levels of Kino

4 upvotes · 13 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

The fact that you blame yourself for her lack of attraction is to me wrong, tragic and a form of self torture

Isn't that the whole point of RP, though? How often do men come here asking for help and we refrain: "It's your fault. Take responsibility. OYS. Man up and be attractive"?

I'm not sure how it's torture for me to acknowledge that being physically obese, emotionally weak, and mentally passive were serious contributing factors to my wife's lack of attraction to me. What woman would be attracted to that? Very few, I'm sure. To suggest otherwise is to defy the very heart of RP and go back to the beta mentality that "you should just be yourself and find that special someone who likes you just the way you are - even if you are lazy, fat and boring."

It's not torture for me to acknowledge the facts about how I have contributed to the flawed relational dynamic I have with my wife. It's just being real. We call it out for what it is here on MRP all the time - drunk captains, beta men, "faggots," or whatever the situation of the day is. How often does any flaired individual (yourself included) suggest we should blame women for their lack of attraction to their fat, slob, beta husbands?

I personally think marriage should be entirely abandoned as a concept.

From a civil/governmental perspective I agree with you entirely - and I'm not sure why anyone outside of a religious institution would ever want to marry. That being said ... this is **marriedredpill**. To quote the "Guidelines and FAQ," which is literally the first link of sidebar material:

Isn't TRP against marriage?

Our goal is to help newly unplugging men trapped in loveless, unhappy, low-sex marriages. By becoming stronger and more assertive men, they can bring a lot of happiness to their marriage and LTRs. We encourage men to grow in those areas before reaching the point to "next that bitch".

I believe my posts and comments here are perfectly aligned with this goal.

Clever girl, I wasn't paying attention

4 upvotes · 6 October 2017 · /r/askMRP

Women mistakenly assume (1) that looks are the only thing that makes a man sexually attractive to them, and (2) that increasing beta comfort traits in a man won't impact his looks and won't affect her sexual feelings toward

him. To them, adding beta to an attractive man is a means of fixing his weaknesses without negating his strengths. In reality, they don't understand what makes certain men sexually attractive to them, and culture tells them it's all looks and nothing else. They also don't realize how adding beta affects everything else.

Pre-marital sex, experience, and reality

4 upvotes · 6 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Thanks for sharing your story! One thing that stood out to me:

I want to sleep with her, and the holy spirit is telling me to look at marriage not like it's a technicality, but a union.

This is so often missed. Western church culture represses sexuality to such a degree that the "wait until you're married" part often goes unnoticed (i.e. people remain repressed even after marriage) or it causes marriage to be viewed, as you say, like it's a technicality - that marriage's only real purpose is to get sex. In reality, Malachi 2:15 tells us, "And why did the Lord God make them one, with a portion of His Spirit in their union? To produce godly offspring." In light of Romans 9 (the whole "not the children by blood, but by the promise" thing), it occurs to me that the purpose of marriage is to work together on the common mission to produce spiritual generations for God's Kingdom - and as with all parent-children relationships, to raise those future generations to have a healthy understanding of both spiritual and physical reproduction as well.

Thanks for sharing :)

Bitchy mood

4 upvotes · 30 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

That was an edit you made after I replied. Long story short, do you want to do things on her list? Do it. If you don't, don't. I feel like a lot of guys on MRP waltz around thinking the best way to be RP is to defy women whenever possible. Screw that. If what they want to do is what you want to do, why do you have to defy yourself just to prove a point? That's idiotic. As in my original comment: you shouldn't be out to prove a point or teach a lesson. Just do what you want to do. It's that simple. Don't make things more complicated than they need to be.

A few questions about overt and subvert communication, and when to use which...

4 upvotes · 15 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

Here's what you're missing:

- "Women say they want the truth" is what they always legitimately want at a conscious level. No matter what the situation, they always want their questions answered and things explained to them. This is how they control their world - because knowledge is the cornerstone of power and manipulation (although she'll never admit that her thirst for knowledge is really a power play).
- "But they never want full disclosure" - this is a subconscious inclination that affects their attraction. They don't consciously realize that they want the mystery behind the man to remain just that: a mystery. The more mystery, the more she can rationalize and hamster out about the guy and fantasize, etc. This makes her excited and tingly. But she'll deny it to her dying day because the feminist imperative tells her she needs to be empowered - to have all the answers, even if it takes away the mystery and magic in the relationship.

So, if she asks you that question, you have several options on how to respond:

- OYS: Give the straight answer, own it, and move on.
- Self disclosure -> fogging/negative inquiry -> AA: Tell her the truth and if she tries to judge you negatively

for it, get to the bottom of why she thinks it's such a big deal - then AA when she finally reveals the core issue: "You're a wasteful scumbag who can't manage money!" "Darn right I am, but I can manage you!"

- Mystify -> AA: "Oh, I put it to good use," and refuse to go further than that. She keeps asking and you say, "You're getting feisty ... makes me want to put you to good use too!"

And there are many others.

Question I always had about Christianity (but every pastor/priest is too bluepillled to answer)

4 upvotes · 11 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I meant to reference that verse in my main response on this thread, but ran out of room and had to edit it out.

"Women will be saved through childbearing" is a reference to discipleship. Jesus says, "By their fruit you will recognize them," when figuring out how to discern who is in Christ and not. The fruit is the reproductive offspring of a tree (which originated as another tree's fruit at one point too). This view is consistent with every other passage where Jesus talks about plants/fruit.

So, there is a great weight on our ability to generate offspring - that's the very essence of how we can have assurance of our salvation. Although evangelism/discipleship are not necessary for salvation itself (which comes through faith), they are inherently present in every genuinely saved person in some capacity. After all, Jesus simultaneously says, "Any tree that does not bear good fruit will be cut down and thrown into the fire." Note that he does not say "bears bad fruit" - it's a failure to bear good fruit. So, no fruit at all = hell (with some need for clarification on semantics that I won't get into here).

If we understand the "fruit" to be the "child" that a tree bears, it now makes much more sense how "women will be saved through childbearing." They have the unique position of modeling for Christians everywhere - both men and women alike - what spiritual childbearing should look like by virtue of their own physical childbearing. This is an honor men do not share in a physical sense. Instead, we must look to the female aspects of childbearing and childrearing to understand how we, as the bride of Christ, are to function in the evangelism/discipleship processes.

Both you and OP (tag: [/u/Whitified](#)) might find [this article](#) very interesting. It notes that if a wife was barren, talmudic Jewish writings permitted (maybe even compelled) the man to divorce her, and also emphasizes that the ancient Jews understood the obligation of reproduction as an imperative only for the man, although the woman is the vehicle by which this would happen. This somewhat parallels with: "One man plants, another waters, but it is God who makes it grow." That is, we are the vehicle (soil/tree) God uses for spiritual reproduction, but the ultimate responsibility for our bearing fruit is with Christ, not his bride (us, the Church). That said, if I am a barren bride, particularly if I'm a harpy, denying bride to Christ, and that is why I am barren ... that leads to some rough implications that many pastors and theologians would rather ignore. It's easier to take a dishonest look at these passages and explain them away, as with easy-believism. Again, Matthew 7 is directly on point here with its "fail to bear good fruit" as opposed to "bear bad fruit."

50/50 v. OYS/Value

4 upvotes · 8 September 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Interesting. Usually I'm the one getting accused of and berated for valuing the marriage as an ideal over the man.

None of this is to imply "tyrannical ownership" and I'm not sure how you read tyranny in any of this. My wife is happier with this arrangement than treating our marriage like a business or joint venture (with few exceptions, of course). That puts too much pressure and investment on her.

Take it or leave it, my view is that Jesus models the perfect marriage for us. He doesn't model a 50/50 enterprise or joint venture or even a captain/first officer of a ship relationship. He models a benevolent dictatorship (as

opposed to a tyrannical one). Better than a ship is the metaphor of a king over his kingdom with a queen at his side. But like Arthur, we aspire to use our ultimate authority to advance our kingdom, not abuse it lest we be overthrown (divorce rape).

Jesus' people understand that EVERYTHING is His and we are only stewards acting under his authority for the good of his glory. If I don't model this in my marriage I cannot reflect Christ to the world or help connect my wife to Christ. Instead, she would operate on covert contracts (in the Christian works we call this legalism), thinking God owes her something.

What is selfishness?

4 upvotes · 31 August 2017 · /r/askTRP

And the closest thing I have to an empire is my country

If you're married with kids, it's your family. If you're still single, you're in empire-building mode (i.e. establishing your career, social status, residence, etc.), so you're better off focusing on self-improvement until other people's lives depend on you. And even then, if you don't focus on keeping yourself strong and you're all about self-sacrificing for your family, you won't be strong enough to be someone they can depend on. Don't be weak. Marcus Aurelius had to be strong himself before his country could depend on him.

I'm dating two MGTOW.

4 upvotes · 30 August 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

Nice guys can smell it out. They're also the most jaded/wounded guys on the market, but they're committed to their niceness. If you want a nice guy, great, but don't later complain that they're not willing to be a real man for you.

The way they sniff it out is your body language, posture, facial expression, hair style, clothing choice, voice inflection, etc. Men and women alike - our past baggage affects how we interact with people today. These subconscious cues are instrumental in the decisions we make. We rationalize it at a conscious level in different ways by saying things like, "I prefer women who act such and such a way or who wear these types of clothes, etc." (or in the reverse for men), but those attitudes, behaviors, clothing styles, etc. are all a product of our conditioning. So, they're really saying, "I like people who have been conditioned to express themselves this way." Chances are that people who express similar external features have similar internalized baggage about their past, oftentimes the nature of that baggage even being similar.

There are exceptions, of course. But on the whole guys (or at least moderately perceptive men) can subconsciously and immediately tell which girls come from a wealthy upbringing, which ones have been sexually abused in the past, which ones are artsy, etc. all from a first-glance impression.

What triggers women to do random shit tests in an LTR?

4 upvotes · 30 August 2017 · /r/askTRP

We have been together for a few months now; should I even be worried about those tests? Will this continue for the rest of our life?

Tests are her way of remembering how attractive you are. The more you're tested, and the more you pass, the more tingly she gets. She likes knowing you're a strong man, so she (sometimes subconsciously) does things to evoke a reminder because she wants to feel hot for you.

This will continue your whole life, but will taper off when you're not attractive to her anymore. When she knows you're weak and worthless, she won't need to test your strength and resolve very often. She'll just walk all over

you.

Seems I handle them OK, but still feels uneasy.

It feels uneasy because you have a weak frame. You're bluffing your way through it and afterward thinking, "Phew, I made it out alive." Yes, you handled it "OK" but still lots of room for improvement as your frame strengthens.

Dread-game may be the most important aspect of a Redpill LTR or marriage.

4 upvotes · 29 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Yes, I wear mine selectively, but have had it off for the better part of the last 4 years. Biblically there is a basis for women to wear a symbol of submissiveness to their husbands (see 1 Cor. 11 I think, on head coverings), but no like requirement for men to wear a symbol of commitment. At my wedding (before I lost my alpha) I instructed the officiator not to bring up the rings in his message and to talk about Malachi 2:15 instead, which says God's purpose for marriage is to have sex and make babies.

Filed today.

4 upvotes · 29 August 2017 · /r/askMRP

And make me rich in the process!

Seriously, though ... fighting for the sake of fighting doesn't help anyone but the attorneys. Go in with a clear strategy beforehand and you can usually get better than the courts would give you and cut your legal fees to 1/4 of what they would be if you played the jerk card, making her want to litigate against you. Save the jerk card for how you pick up the next girl.

How long should I wait to be "official"?

4 upvotes · 28 August 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

As /u/mauibaya said, you're probably already in a relationship - as long as the exclusivity is an overt agreement.

That said, if it wasn't an overt agreement and it was more of a passive statement that he's not currently with anyone else or looking, you need to remember that he hasn't agreed to stop looking. If that's the case, you're not in a relationship. Whether he'd word it this way or not, you may just be a plate that he's spinning to see what happens in the event you do move closer together ... but he might pick up another plate down the road and not feel any remorse because he hasn't committed overtly to you not to do so.

how long is a reasonable amount of time to wait before I can expect a relationship?

As long as it takes to get in the same city. I'm a firm believer that LDRs are not real relationships. I say this as someone who spent the first year of my "relationship" with my wife over 1,000 miles apart. We talked on the phone and by video chat all the time. We shared stories and had an emotional investment. We had overtly agreed to exclusivity. There were emotions both ways.

But it was a one-sided arrangement. Although I cared about the relational connection, I was gaining absolutely no insight on physicality, and seeing each other every 3 months during that year simply didn't reveal much (granted, as Christians we both agreed not to have sex until marriage, so I'm talking about physical responsiveness in different ways than just rote sex). In essence, she got to vet me for everything she wanted to see in the relationship and I gave all of that information while remaining blind to whether or not she met the criteria that I needed in the form of physical intimacy.

Result? After we married, we had a very, very long time of sexual frustration and disappointment. We had talked about sex and having a physical relationship in our long-distance conversations, but what she said was very, very

different from how things played out in action. What made it worse was that she honestly believed what she said. On a theoretical level, as long as it remained an intellectual exercise, she was all about having a great, healthy sex life in marriage. But as soon as we were in the same city together, I started picking up signs that she was extremely low-libido and physically non-responsive, which was incredibly inconsistent with all of our conversations the previous year (again, conversations she genuinely meant and believed, even though her body didn't end up responding the same way her mind thought it would). I was dumb enough to buy into her excuse: "It's just because we're not married; I don't want to be tempted to go too far. I promise [yes, she made an overt promise] that as soon as we're married I'm going to be jumping all over you and I'll be so horny and insatiable you won't know what to do with me." That never happened. Marriage actually decreased what little physical interest she had beforehand.

My point is, it's not fair for you to be able to vet the man on the relational aspects and him not to be able to vet you on the physical aspects - and even if you think what you're saying with your mouth will line up with your words, and even if you have a few short-term in-person experiences to look at, none of that can really be relied on. If he's willing to do it, great - just make sure you're not unintentionally duping him to the point where your biochemistry doesn't respond the way you consciously think it will right now, while you're at a distance and getting a few short bursts of physical contact. I've seen this LDR stuff fail again and again and again well beyond my own experience.

The good news is that it can be redeemed. I totally love my wife and don't regret marrying her. I do, however, now realize that our LDR days were not an actual relationship. It was a time of emotional coddling and information gathering, to put it crudely. When I started seeing how we interacted when in person on a daily, consistent basis - that's when the relationship began.

For more reading, Rollo did a decent post on this:

<https://therationalmale.com/2011/09/20/letting-go-of-invisible-friend/>

FR Just filled for divorce

4 upvotes · 26 August 2017 · /r/askMRP

Beautifully said.

Let me add to OP that the single most important thing you can do up front to prepare for the battle ahead is to map out your negotiation high and low up front. Consider the following categories:

- bank accounts
- vehicles
- retirement
- real estate
- investments
- business interests
- credit cards
- medical bills
- student loans
- mortgages
- vehicle loans
- custody
- parenting time
- school placement
- child support

- spousal support
- medical needs/expenses for kids
- extracurricular activities for kids
- dependency deductions
- pets

First circle the ones most important to you or just reorganize the list in honest priority. If the kids aren't as important as your retirement don't lie to yourself because you think you're supposed to put them on to. If they are on top, out them there. But I'm constantly amazed at how child support is a higher priority for guys than time with the kids. Nevertheless, custody and parenting time are so important for girls that this type of attitude gives huge leverage. All I'm saying is to be honest with yourself.

Second, with that prioritization write out your realistic best case scenario. Don't give yourself 100% of the retirement unless it's all separate property or you're giving up something else in exchange - but don't sell yourself short either. That's for the next step.

Third, do the same thing again, except identifying your absolute bottom line - three minimum you would accept to settle the case.

Give that to your attorney up front, tweak it as you go, but maintain a strong sense of the legal cost you will incur to (1) get between these goal posts, and (2) to move your result up once in the goal posts.

Following this strategy is the difference between my \$10,000 legal fee cases and my \$100,000+ legal fee cases. I give it to all my clients and those who have a clear vision for their priorities always save buttloads on legal fees. The ones who have no clear goal or think they have to win on every issue end up spending a small fortune.

Your wife is a whore and you should divorce her

4 upvotes · 24 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

That makes more sense. To that I'd defer to 2 Timothy 2:12-13 - "If we deny him, he also will deny us; if we are faithless, he remains faithful."

So, if she is merely faithless to the marriage vow (i.e. by constant denying sex, for example) then we should follow in Jesus's example (Paul is actually quoting Jesus from Matthew 10:33). But if she actively disowns that vow (i.e. cheating or trying to divorce you, etc.) then we're free to disown her right back. I don't get the impression Jesus would be happy about this second option as many men would be at the freedom to start anew, but we're all still human.

RPW, please don't have this mindset when you get older

4 upvotes · 24 August 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

This would make sense if every 40+ woman was (1) wise, (2) has valuable experience, or (3) has a good heart. Those women do exist. But they are not the majority of society by any stretch.

Ok ASKMRP, riddle me THIS!!!

4 upvotes · 17 August 2017 · /r/askMRP

I still think monk mode can work in an LTR/marriage - and I know it was beneficial to me. The key is confidence and attitude, and to own it. There was one point where my wife questioned me on why I'm not even trying anymore, fairly early in the process, thinking I was mad at her. I said, "I'm taking some time to figure myself out." She seemed to be processing what that meant. I didn't explain. Instead, I just pulled her in and said, "Besides, if I was all upset right now, would I do this?" and then made out with her for about 30 seconds. "Now go get some sleep. I'll let you know when I'm ready." She didn't bother me about it again.

When I came out of monk mode after finding RP toward the end and implementing some things, it was a drastic improvement from the garbage sex life we had before. I am fully confident that if I had kept trying to "initiate, initiate, initiate" during this time, the improvements in me would have come off as so gradual in the bedroom that she wouldn't have enjoyed the full experience of the change - especially the lifting. Her mental process each time would have looked something like this:

"sex with a fat guy ... sex with a little less fat guy ... a little less ... a little less ... can't tell if he's still fat or not, but I only remember him being fat, so it still feels like he's fat ... better shape ... better shape ... he kinda looks good, but it's really not all that different from the last time ... more in shape ... more in shape ... he looks really good, but this isn't at all as exciting as I had hoped."

By withholding on the initiating, I went from 75lbs obese one time we had sex to the very next time having huge pecs and my abs were showing. That stark contrast was jarring to her in a very good way. She physically saw my body change gradually over time, but she experienced it all at once in the bedroom.

But I do agree that monk mode for a married man looks different. It's pretty much only an intentional celibacy thing and for a short time. You still lead, OYS, lift, engage with your wife, etc. You do not go off to your room to meditate, withdraw emotionally or physically, ignore responsibilities, etc. That'd be idiotic.

Why ask?

4 upvotes · 17 August 2017 · /r/askMRP

Amused mastery is not simply for your wife. Consider those people as practice for strengthening your frame. While keeping your ego in check, rise above those types of comments and laugh it off. After all, **that's what they want you to do** - that's the whole reason they're mocking you that way.

That said, if you want a place that will share hard truths, while giving a little more respect, feel free to post on [r/RPChristians](#). Even if you're not a Christian, you can still get some good RP advice with a different atmosphere until your frame is strong enough to come back here.

Take my word for it - I've been ridiculed plenty enough, and could call out half a dozen people on that. But I'm thankful these people gave me an opportunity to practice rising above it with my attitude, while keeping the validity of my thought processes in check.

Why I'm not afraid of divorce rape - and how to get yourself there too.

4 upvotes · 15 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

You have to remember that child support is not you paying 100% of the expenses for the children; it's usually based on a % of income. So, the statutes in my state have a table that says if the joint marital income is \$X/yr then \$Y of that should be allocated for the children. If you make 80% of the combined marital income, you pay 80% of that number and she presumptively will pay the other 20%. The figures in the table in my state were based on research done in the 80s and have not been adjusted since (for inflation, for example), so they're actually very low numbers compared to the actual present-day cost of raising a child (but that doesn't stop dads from complaining).

When I get dads who are paying all the child related expenses and then get slapped with a child support award, I always remind them that when the court does this, they're expense-shifting. There is no shame in enforcing this. So, stop buying their clothes, back to school stuff, etc. Unless it's separately ordered as a division (i.e. medical expenses, and sometimes extracurricular expenses), she's now responsible for all of that. If she doesn't want to pay it, you say, "Then deviate child support and I'll start covering that stuff again." Put the pressure on her to accept the reality of what she wanted. Sure, most dad's object: "But that's not fair to the kids because she just won't get them new clothes, etc.; she'll keep the money for herself." Fine, then let that happen for a while and when the court sees that the kids haven't gotten new clothes in a year and the stuff they're wearing is falling apart

or too small (yes, this happens), then they switch gears on who should be parenting the children primarily.

As for getting custody, I passively addressed it above, but in my jurisdiction she has to have at least 2 of those things I mentioned in the custody/PT sections working against her. If she has nothing wrong with her, you're not getting sole custody. That's just how it is. I'm actually going to step out to meet with a client right now where mom was making all kinds of allegations against dad that didn't pan out, she's ticked that it didn't pan out, and the court is saying, "If there's nothing wrong with dad, he gets equal parenting rights." That concept goes both ways. Custody is less about who the better parent is and more about whether or not one parent is a total flop. If neither parent fails, then it's shared parenting.

Why your wife should work at a real job

4 upvotes · 15 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

there is one particularly insidious christian ideal (not so much biblical, but christian nonetheless) that I think absolutely needs debunking, and that is that a woman's place is in the home

I don't think I know any legit Christians who would hold this as part of their faith. There are many who will acknowledge it as personal preference, but this is not a "Christian ideal" in any sense of that phrase.

That amounts to roughly \$160/week, and \$8,320 per year.

In my area, the standard rate is about \$250/wk per child (less if they're in school). I have 4 kids ages 5 and under = ~\$1,000/wk = \$4,000/mo. Starting in two weeks one of them will be in Kindergarten, so I'll save \$100/wk on him = \$900/wk = \$3,600/mo.

maid service ... we pay \$80/week. Which is \$4,000/year

We pay \$100 every 2 weeks = \$2,600/yr

I don't really ask my wife to cook

I do all the cooking. My wife maybe cooks dinner 2-3x per month and about 80% of our dinners are at home.

So if my wife chose to stay home and work rather than get a real job, she would be worth to me about \$18,000 per year (\$8,000 + \$4,000 + \$6,000).

Some people have additional peripheral considerations. My law firm, for example, doesn't have a decent health insurance policy (it's a 3-atty, 2-staff op). So, if we do health insurance through my job, that's \$1,275 in monthly premiums + \$6,000 deductible per person. Through my wife's job (large accounting firm) we pay \$500/mo in premiums and have no deductible (\$20 co-pay/visit). This is a *massive* savings to keep her at work.

But work also has parking costs for her, additional gas (in a 30-minute commute this adds up), etc. Also, you forgot to tax-effect her income. Assuming you're in a 30%-ish bracket, if her salary is \$26,000, her take-home would be about the \$18,000 you'd need.

The sting of divorce rape, if things do turn sour, is massively reduced.

In my case, it's completely gone. My wife earns about \$110k and I'm a bit above that, but we're close enough to a standard 55/45 split that the court wouldn't grant a spousal support award from me to her. I've also set myself up to the point where I'd be guaranteed 50/50 custody/parenting time rights with the kids, which with equal income negates child support in my state. In short, I would suffer 0 consequences from a divorce. Of course, I'm also a divorce attorney and have made friends with all the judges, magistrates, clerks, bailiffs, etc., so I've got that

working for me too.

Rather than being at home, she's in the presence of other men during the day. While this might sound like a recipe for cheating, I actually think it's just the opposite.

It does go both ways. My wife has had men at her work hit on her and it gave her bubbly feelings inside. She promptly tells me about it and we resolve the issue, but most men don't have that kind of honesty with their wives. If my wife wasn't Christian, she almost assuredly would have cheated on me a couple times. She still might surprise me someday, as the saying goes ("AWALT"), but it hasn't happened yet. But you're right, housewives (better term than SAHM, which I think is somewhat emasculating and affects the father-child relationship long-term) also have opportunity, so neither one is more advantageous than the other in this area, in my view.

Kids should be with their mom rather than with a sitter. I disagree with this.

Indeed. I disagree with your rationale, though. First off, this is, again, not a "pervasive christian ideal." This has nothing to do with Christianity - and Christianity would actually 100% deny the concept of women having the primary responsibility over the children. The father is the head of the household. That includes children too.

Second, this type of mentality promotes the notion that wives should get default custody because it inflates the role of the mother with children.

Third, the studies you referenced are non-repeatable. Other studies have been reported to show the exact opposite results - that children who start out at daycare have already adapted to the social aspects of school and the student-teacher environment, giving them an advantage over the other children.

Developmentally children benefit more from fresh breast milk than refrigerated breast milk. They do, but that benefit is minimal.

After a typical maternity leave, this is correct. For the first 3 months it really is significantly different, though. But again, most jobs will give this time off for maternity leave. My wife gets 6 months leave with 100% pay (she's on leave right now, actually).

In closing, your wife should have a job.

Depending on family goals and priorities, I completely agree and advise all couples to this end. Perhaps the most important factor that you left out: *You never know when something will happen to you, and if your wife is not there as a backup plan, having no education or experience, then the family is in deep waters without a paddle.* That said, I do acknowledge that some people have different priorities. As [/u/BluePillProfessor](#) would say, most women really just want to be a guy's arm candy and men would love them to be ready and available at all times for sex. So, her staying at home can be very conducive to this, as the stressors of having a job change her psychology a good bit ... not beyond control, but enough that it makes the man's job harder to keep her sexually interested. Plus, she's a higher value woman, so she knows she has more options, which makes it harder for the man to keep his value up to par until they're in their mid-upper 30s. As a rule of thumb, I consider it a 1::2 ratio of income. If a woman can earn \$60,000k/yr a man has to earn about \$120k/yr to match the income-impact of each of their overall value. To that end, my wife's income level increases her value on the marketplace more than my income increases my value on the marketplace, so I have to compensate in other areas, such as being more physically fit, OYS, DHV in other areas of life through leadership, fringe benefits, etc.

it motivates me at work to earn more money. Specifically, a lot more than her. As a man, I instinctively recognize the need to be the main breadwinner, and seeing my wife's income creep up is like a fire under my ass.

Per my last section, you're better off increasing your value in other ways. If your incomes are approximately equal, you'll negate pretty much any and all potential concerns for divorce. When you no longer fear divorce, dread increases, which actually raises your value to her in an effort to keep you. Of course, she simultaneously needs you less, which is why increasing your value in other areas is essential. In short, yes, you should want to earn more overall, but I wouldn't make it a high priority to have an imbalance in your incomes - this will actually hurt you.

Key point here: **Stop hating on Christians because of your misconceptions! That's ignorant and childish.**

Tag: [/u/JDRoedell](#) - because some of this is relevant to the comment where you summoned me.

108 - Life-Path of a Relationship

4 upvotes · 14 August 2017 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Heh, this is the cliff notes. I normally take 4 weeks to cover this content, 2.5 hours per week. A marriage counselor friend of mine actually uses this as the baseline for all of her clients and has turned it into more of a 10 week process, because she filters some stuff from her degree into this framework.

Fasting and Hard Nosed Prayer

4 upvotes · 12 August 2017 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

You should be willing to pray when you don't even feel like it.

This is well said. I often tell people: *Love is about what you do, not how you feel. You say you love God? Show it, even if you don't feel it.*

I fasted for 40 days even though I worked an active job.

Dang, dude - that's hard core. My max was 7, and that was while I was in XC in high school, running 10-20 miles/day. I about died for the first 3 days ... then by day 4 I didn't even notice it anymore.

I got myself to a point where I realized I don't need anything but God.

This is where I was. Then, around a year ago I got the clear command: "Now that you don't need your wife, I want you to go get her."

Homework assignment: do a 36-hour fast.

Heh, just came off of one yesterday (48hr).

Excellent post. I wish I could give this two upvotes :)

It is working..

4 upvotes · 27 July 2017 · [/r/askMRP](#)

my sex drive is up the roof

I think this is an under-appreciated aspect of RPing. Many men in DB marriages consciously repress their sexuality. They know they want sex, but they forget what it's like to have the hard urge - especially with the physical, emotional, an intellectual strength to act on that urge to gratification. They have changed the urge for

sex to resentment about sex.

RPing takes that conscious repression and says, "Stop being an idiot - it's okay to feel that urge and let your strength take over sometimes" - just not in a rapey kind of way. As a result, regardless of whether the woman is actually responding to the changes in the man, he's going to get more sex and more satisfying sex simply because he's going for it, when in days past he would have sat in a corner and stewed about it instead. I don't know what % of RP success is attributable to this factor, but it's more than 0, thus worth being reminded every now and then.

Well here we go / victim puke I guess

4 upvotes · 26 July 2017 · /r/askMRP

I'll ditto this.

Princeton's new 'men's engagement manager' to combat aggressive masculinity on campus

4 upvotes · 26 July 2017 · /r/RedPillWives

Just ... wow ...

I cried in front of a potential plate. She fucked me everyday for the next week.

4 upvotes · 25 July 2017 · /r/askTRP

I follow [/u/cholomite](#)'s law - *Tingles without fuzzies won't last; fuzzies without tingles are worthless*. You've got to present a beta side every now and then or the LTR will certainly fail. You just have to make sure you're in control over how this is expressed, not her making demands. Most TRP people won't bring this up because TRP isn't all that interested in fostering LTRs; MRP is more designed for that.

As for your particular situation, if you care to ignore the religious angle, [I wrote a post about what you're describing](#). The gist is that each gender has a role and there are two ways in which these roles play into attraction: (1) seeing someone of the opposite gender who is likely to be really good at their role, and (2) seeing a quality in a potential mate that they will let you fulfill your role.

For women, one of their roles is caring and nurturing. She will not stay long with a guy who will never let her express her caring or nurturing side. But you gave her an opportunity to console you with a quick, "I'm sorry, it's okay." This is attractive as long as it stays on your terms and does not give any indication to her that the problem giving rise to the situation will interfere with your ability to fulfill your role as a man (i.e. mostly alpha stuff).

EDIT: Also, how does your title reconcile with: "I left ... I didn't message her till a week later"? It sounds to me like there was no sex for the entire week after you said that, whereas your title says, "everyday for the next week." What gives?

Half assed mrp?

4 upvotes · 24 July 2017 · /r/askMRP

I am +- a 7 SMV and she is a 4.5

I get the impression you're going just based off of looks and nothing more. You might be accurate about her SMV because women's SMV is based 90% or more on looks, for most men.

Let's be generous and say your looks are actually an 8. Factor in ...

- "Therapy" = baggage = lose a point

- "Relapsed for a month" = can't follow through with goals = lose a point
- "stress ... stress ... stress" = buckles to pressure = lose a point
- "chores are done by me or her mum" = mommy has to help ... and it's not even your mom? = lose a point
- "resentment ... lasts for a week" = butt-hurt/weak frame = lose a point
- "mostly starfishing when 'it' happens" = not commanding her in the bedroom and caving to bad sex instead of walking away/weak frame = lose 3 points

Okay, the math obviously isn't going to work if we subtract. Let's assume all matters are 0, but you get +2 or 3 points for being in pretty good shape (I'll take your word for that). In that case, it's her 4.5 against your 2 or 3. If you've got a decent job that's better than hers, maybe you're a 3 or 4, but still less.

Now, out on the marketplace you might actually look like a 7. You have to remember that SMV is not an objective number floating above your head. It's how people perceive you. You've given her a lot of reason to believe that you're a very low-value man. So, she perceives you as lower value than her ... approximately a 3. You perceive her as a 4.5, and she probably sees herself that way also.

If you were to go out and find someone new, they don't know all your failed fitness tests, inability to command the bedroom, emotional/mental health baggage, etc. They get your appearance and immediate interactions. So, you pass 2 or 3 quick tests on a first date and you're immediately back up to a 7 ...

... until you start an LTR with them and because you haven't grown out of your weak frame yet, you repeat all the other mistakes and they discover that what they thought was a 7 was really a 3 or 4. So, even if you can up your game to get a 6 or 7 into an LTR, if you don't fix yourself first, you're just wasting your time.

Solution? Use your current girl as practice. Sure, it'll take some time, but start overcoming these problems and get better at passing tests. Then, after you're legit RP and where you need to be, either she's going to see your increased value or you're positioned for your next relationship to be far more successful.

First impressions are hard to break. Long-term impressions from consistency and predictability are even harder to break. That's why "MRP is TRP on hard mode." If you can win on hard mode, you'll destroy the competition on easy mode, if you really do end up getting stuck back there.

SO is bitchy and disrespectful too often, should I leave?

4 upvotes · 24 July 2017 · /r/askMRP

Those are all things that give your frame strength. They aren't the shape of your frame. The shape of your frame is determined by your expectations. For example, a guy who has a massive paycheck has a strong frame; but if he doesn't spend that paycheck to improve his life circumstances, it's pretty uncomfortable inside that frame. Consider ...

Weak, Uninviting Frame - Overweight, addicted to video games and porn, no friends, socially jaded so he demands to get his way all the time, makes unreasonable requests, is extremely lewd, has a crap job and lives in a crap apartment.

Strong, Uninviting Frame - Physically fit, great job, strong confidence, large social circle, but lives with his parents, bosses people around all the time, and is consistently emotionally distant.

Weak, Inviting Frame - Most beta marriages ... Great listener, provides material comforts, even if it means living above his means, helps his SO whenever she needs it, will go out of his way to please her, in an argument he's usually the one to apologize and give in

Strong, Inviting Frame - He doesn't need his SO, but he loves having her around. He has lots of friends, a great

job, is physically fit, and knows how to say no to his SO. He commands respect wherever he goes. People like to be around him because he's just and fair, he's witty, he's generous, and people just like to be around him because his awesomeness radiates from within and makes them want to be a little more awesome too.

Wherever you are on the weak/strong - un/inviting matrix, there are also the particulars about your frame. For example, before discovering RP I had a moderate-strength frame. It wasn't weak, but it wasn't strong. That said, even where I was strong, I had accounted for my wife's wishes and desires in the decisions I had made more than I should have. As such, I wouldn't back down from things when I made a decision, no matter how much she whined ... but my decisions usually tended more toward her favor than I would have liked. This made us both upset because I wasn't experiencing life the way I wanted and she was still getting shut-down without seeing me experience the internally radiant alpha glory. So, passing tests meant squat when I still wasn't happy with the result I had chosen.

The thing is: I was the idiot who chose to set the line in a bad spot and then build a bunker there.

A good example: She would make suggestions on how to fix up the house. I disagreed, but came up with my own ideas that incorporated many of her ideas, even ones I didn't like. Why? Because I thought I was honoring her. We'd then set that plan in motion, despite her frustrations of not getting her way. Then, when it was done, we had a house that neither of us really wanted. It was a symbol of unholy compromise - that both sides were losers, not a balance between winners.

So, at some point I said, "Screw it. You're right, our oven handle is falling off and the dishwasher is leaking all the time. We do need to get new appliances." She goes through a couple stores and picks out these super expensive ones with all the bells and whistles. That would have been a colossal waste of money. I had a budget of \$1,500 on the two appliances combined, she was looking at that much for *each of them* (i.e. \$3,000 total). Old me would have tried to compromise: "Okay, I'll meet you in the middle at \$2,250, but I'm going no further." I'd then hold that line and not budge no matter how much she whined and gave me dirty eyes. At the end of the day, I'd be upset for over-spending so we can have a couple extra knobs we never turn and buttons we never push.

Now, when this situation happened (literally just yesterday) I left her at home, took the kids with me, picked out a pair of appliances within my budget, texted her pictures, saying, "These are what I'm getting. take a quick look and let me know if there's anything glaring that I forgot about." She texted back saying the oven wasn't a convection oven - she was right, that was pretty darn important and I forgot to check if it had that feature. I picked out a new one and sent the pic, she said it seemed fine, but obviously wanted more bells and whistles. I bought the one I picked out anyway. Afterward, she's breathing easy because she has new appliances that actually work and are significant improvements from what we had before, and she didn't have to go through the stress of picking them out or trying to convince me into buying them. They're not exactly what she wanted, but she respects the fact that I made a decision, set a boundary, and didn't cave to her.

So, an example of re-doing your frame:

- My old frame was defined by compromise and had a \$2,250 boundary.
- My new frame was defined by me and had a \$1,500 boundary.

Despite the fact that the result was further away from the \$3,000 boundary my wife was proposing, she was actually much happier with me setting a clear boundary and getting the job done. As my frame develops in strength and she learns to respect it, I will soon be able to delegate tasks to her on my terms. For example, I could send her to the store and say, "Go buy a new oven and dishwasher, but don't go over \$1,500" and she'd do it. Six months ago, if I tried that she would have come home with \$3,000 spent and lots of excuses why it was a great idea.

Now, you need to decide whether or not you're living the life you actually want to live and with the boundaries you actually want. Account for her desires less and less. As much as I hate to say it, one of the biggest parts of

unplugging for me was accepting the fact that women don't know what they want and they have no clue what will make them happy. Even if you cater to them and give them everything they say, they will still not be happy. Period. So, if they don't know what makes them happy, and me catering to them makes me unhappy, then the only rational option is for me to do what I want to do and let her come along for the ride. If she's happy, great. If she's not, it's not like I have any better ideas in the first place.

The one caveat is that we do know what makes women unhappy. If you cheat on them, they will be unhappy. If you beat them, they will be unhappy. If you pick your nose and scratch your crotch next to them in public, that will make them unhappy. If you are consistently emotionally distant, they will be unhappy. So, if you want a woman to rest inside your frame, make sure you're not decorating your frame with things that will make them unhappy.

Is Red Pill truly congruent with Holiness?

4 upvotes · 15 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Haha, great points and fully agreed, except to the extent that TRP promotes spinning plates, premarital sex, and a pump and dump mentality, which I do believe are firmly opposed by scripture, with a few exceptions.

Red Pill Advice for a 17 year-old?

4 upvotes · 10 July 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

Is any of this really RP advice?

A lot of guys there are shy, smart, and just want a wife.

This sounds like you're saying, "Go find where all the blue pill guys hang out and I'm sure you'll find someone who will drool over you." If I had to guess, /u/blue lumi is asking for comparable RPW advice to what guys get on TRP because she wants an RP perspective, not to be told, "Ignore RP and go fund yourself a nice blue pill guy."

I appreciate the logic in your post if she just wants to find any boyfriend at all, but I don't suspect this is the case.

Welcome to Red Pill Christians

4 upvotes · 9 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

It is never explicitly taught like that; rather it is a social stigma. It begins when children's ministries, youth groups, and singles groups get blasted with "sex before marriage is a sin." Then they get blasted with all kinds of shame and guilt tactics to manipulate them away from sex. Although they didn't intend it that way, teenagers almost always interpret it that way regardless (especially the girls). They linger in this "sex is bad for me right now" mentality for so long that when "right now" switches to "I'm married" their brains can't rewire themselves without massive effort. A few good (yet extremely rare) sermons just doesn't cut it. My wife was one of these people and I have counseled numerous couples and discipled many, many men who had marital sex problems because of this.

Then there's the confusion between lust and healthy sexual desire that gets pounded on married men too ... Then the married women think they can't talk about sex openly because it might make a man lust. So they start being overly modest in their apparel, which then makes other people think all "good Christians" must set really high, over the top standards as well, and things just snowball into an unspoken cultural stigma.

Try asking someone at your church openly, "How's your sex life?" and see how they respond. 9 times out of ten the man will give a quick answer and brush it aside to hush the issue rather than engaging in the conversation, 10/10 for women ... they might even report you to the pastor or an elder. Hang out at a restaurant with those same guys, though, and the guys are just fine because they compartmentalize and don't associate the restaurant culture with the church stigma.

I can't speak to Catholicism though. Never been catholic. I just know that in the many small groups I've led, when

I try to talk about biblical sex either everyone clams up or I get reported to someone, including in men-only groups.

Critique my wife's ultimate shit test

4 upvotes · 9 July 2017 · /r/askMRP

As NMMNG says, the beta's answer to everything is: "Try being even more beta! Maybe that will work."

Most people here idolize being alpha, so they make the same mistake: "Try being even more alpha! That's how to fix the problem!"

What I've learned most in the last 24 hours is that this sub is not about fixing/saving marriages; it is about putting a guy in a spot where he'll bounce back with a great sex life after a failed marriage ... and if you happen to save your marriage along the way instead, that's great. As a result, the fuzzies side of things gets extremely downplayed in favor of the "more alpha!" mantra.

The biological step-mother.

4 upvotes · 6 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Thanks :) It's my first non-question post here, so I'm glad I can finally contribute back with things I've learned.

WISNIFG for wife & kids?

4 upvotes · 3 July 2017 · /r/askMRP

I'm about half way through this book right now. I had the exact same thought. That said, there are two things that make me think it is a bad idea to share this book with your wife. I have no objection to sharing it with your son.

FIRST - There is a 99% chance that she will internalize every strategy, example, practice exercise, etc. in the context of her relationship with you. Even if you have a great relationship, she's going to think about ways that she can start practicing this stuff against you. The end result is that you're helping her build a stronger frame rather than letting her rest in the comfort and safety of your frame.

SECOND - MRP theory is based on the premise that LTRs/marriages are not equal - that the man is meant to be the head of the household and his wife is meant to support him as a Captain and a first mate combo functions. WISNIFG talks about marriages as co-equal relationships, which will give her the impression that she shouldn't be looking to you as the head of the house - that she has a right to step up her authority in the home. This could cause you some trouble and make it a lot harder to be the alpha.

SON - For your son, this is all a different story. You should actively be trying to teach him independence and this book is a great way to do just that. In addition, he's not likely to employ these methods against you because you are still a support system that he does not want to put in jeopardy. The book itself even cautions not to try certain things with your boss because you have to be wise when you exercise assertiveness and not, and getting yourself fired won't help much. Likewise, your son won't want you to cut him off if he's too rebellious with his assertiveness.

Dating questions while reconnecting with my faith

3 upvotes · 27 May 2026 · /r/askRPC

The red pill means embracing the understanding of how the world really is. It does not mean embracing a prescription of behaviors. While the world appropriately recognizes that certain behaviors are good at producing certain results, the reality is that those behaviors also have consequences which even the most "red pill'd of men" will tell you to respect. For example, if you're lusting after a minor child, we're all going to agree: "Yeah, don't act on that or you'll go to jail." Consequences matter.

As a Christian, we just add one more consequence to the list that non-Christian red pill men don't embrace: the

impact of sin on this life and the one to come. When Jesus said in Matthew 10:28, "Do not fear those who kill the body but cannot kill the soul. Rather fear him who can destroy both soul and body in hell" - he's sharing consequences that secular-RP advice doesn't acknowledge but we do. Ecclesiastes is a book all about what is meaningless in life and he ends it by sharing what does have meaning (i.e. the "meaning of life") in 12:13-14 - "The end of the matter; all has been heard. ****Fear God and keep his commands, for this is the whole duty of man.**** For God will bring every deed into judgment, with every secret thing, whether good or evil."

Recognizing that the red pill is descriptive of the world, not prescriptions of how men must behave let's get back to your questions ...

1. The barrier is exactly that place in your physical contact where you slip into sin. That's going to be different for each person, but when you fall into lust or into tempting her to lust, you've crossed the line.
2. Everyone experiences sexual attraction. That's not sin. God designed us that way. It becomes sin when it shifts from "she's hot" to "I would if I could." If your thought is, "I want to bang her, and the only thing stopping me is the fact that I'm a loser she'd never say yes to, but otherwise I would," then you're probably over the line. If it's, "I want to bang her, but even if I could I wouldn't because we're not married, so I'll refrain and control my thoughts further," then you're probably fine.
3. I'm not sure why you think fun/vetting are exclusive. Do both. There are a host of fictional characters to look at as great examples of people who do this. If you're a sci-fi guy, Doctor Who is fantastic at being fun/energetic and making people want to follow him wherever he goes, but you find out that much of his adventurous spirit is grounded in the reality that he uses that excitement to disarm people and learn a lot about them when they don't know he's really analyzing them through it all. If you're an anime guy, Lelouch from **Code Geass** is another clumsy, dramatic character who is secretly using his soft-fun side to analyze everyone he comes in contact with. Or if you're into cop-dramas, Patrick Jane from **The Mentalist** does this really well, constantly poking fun jokes at people and having fun messing with their minds, only to find out that's just how he disarms people to learn more about them than they'd be honest with if he asked them directly. Point being: do both.

Asking 100 Women Out - Catholic Edition: Girl #1

3 upvotes · 27 August 2025 · /r/RPChristians

Super fun read. I always love field reports. I'm glad you're taking a level head between developing confidence through practicing your approach and developing your social skills, while also not doing it from a standpoint of leading people on or screwing with people's feelings just because you "can." Looking forward to more of these.

Submissive Christian wife

3 upvotes · 16 August 2025 · /r/RPChristians

This is a male-only sub, so you probably won't find many women's opinions. I'm not really present enough to care to enforce that rule right now, though, so you lucked out. There's another RPCWomen sub out there, if you want to check that out.

Regardless, for a legit answer, it's probably best to understand what the Bible means by submission in the first place.

- The word for "submit" is **hypotasso** - it is a military term referencing subjugating oneself under another's authority.

- A different word is used for "obey": **hupakouo** - it references an active behavioral conformity to instruction.

While submission should be a driving force behind our behavior and influence our decisions (and therefore does have a behavioral component) it's more about the attitude than it is the conduct itself. The example I typically

give is Paul telling us to submit (*hypotasso*) to our governing authorities in Romans. Yet the same guy was constantly defying his government. Strict obedience would have obligated him to turn his brothers and sisters in Christ to be slaughtered by Nero, but he did not obey. Instead, when he was caught, he accepted the consequences - and in Acts 16 we see him and Silas in prison with the opportunity to escape and they choose to stay anyway. That's submission. They recognized their government was their authority and accepted it and chose to work within the system instead of trying to defy it.

With a man, your obligation isn't to "never talk" or "just obey everything he says" or anything like that. It's to respect him and accept the consequences of your actions. What that means is that if you behave in a way that causes him to get angry, accept that he's angry, let him be angry, don't fight back or accuse him of hurting you with his anger, but embrace: "I chose to behave in a way that gave you this reaction, and I will bear the consequence of that choice without trying to change your reaction."

The default effort is to try to explain away his anger. "You shouldn't be angry at me because x, y, z reasons, so I was in the right for saying what I did, and you shouldn't be upset with me" ... is super unhelpful. Remember: 1 Peter 3 says that even if your husband were an unbeliever or disobedient to God, you're still obligated to submit - this means that even if he's wrong and sinful, your attitude and behavior toward him is a biblical constant in what it expects of you.

But I also read you saying, "I can't help it. It just slips out of me. I can't control my emotions." Okay, fine. You're not a submissive person. It might ruin the relationship, and you'll have to accept that consequence if he ends up choosing not to marry you because of it.

Of course, the Bible doesn't expect you to automatically master any trait all at once. Self-control is a fruit of the spirit. So is patience. Does anyone ever say, "As soon as you become a Christian you automatically master the skill of being patient overnight because of the Holy Spirit in you"? Obviously not. Everyone agrees that patience is something God builds in us over time with practice. Self-control, being in the same list, is the same - along with love, joy, peace, etc. They're all things we work at.

It seems like you have the heart-desire to be submissive but your self-control sucks. So work on it. I'm not going to suggest ways to do that because they're a dime-a-dozen and you can just hop on AI and get a list of 100 ways in 2 seconds how you can practice growing in self-control. Have at it.

Question about dating as a single Christian man who's looking for a Christian Woman in 2022

3 upvotes · 13 October 2022 · /r/RPChristians

However, I'd like to mention that this is predominantly in the West. In East Asia, Africa and Eastern Europe, women don't prioritize a men's looks or rather, natural physical features as much as Western European and American women do.

I totally get that. It's not a genetic trait. It's a product of the culture.

If you move to East Asia, Africa, or Eastern Europe, let's revisit this conversation. Otherwise, it's irrelevant to you.

Your argument reads like the girl who has a dozen one night stands in a month and wants to get an abortion. When someone confronts her about the immorality of abortion she says, "What about women who have been raped? See, abortion should be allowed!" That has nothing to do with the conversation because she wasn't raped. It's a deflection tactic.

Question about dating as a single Christian man who's looking for a Christian Woman in 2022

3 upvotes · 9 October 2022 · /r/RPChristians

while women might not care about looks as much as guys do

You've actually got that backwards. Research shows that women actually have higher standards than men when it comes to physical appearance. Prime example is when OKCupid did a research study on how men rate women and vice versa. When they analyzed the data from the men, they saw a pretty typical bell curve with most women being "average" and lesser were below/above average and very few were far below/above average. For women, the data was extremely skewed. They reported that 80% of men were "below average." That means that the top 20% of men included both average and above-average guys. Which means if you want to be "above average" in a woman's eyes, you really have to be in the top 5-10% of men for looks.

attractive, Christian, and FAST that are single? Again, Idk if Christian = Godly

Christian = saved (i.e. the S in FAST). Godly = spiritually mature. At least, that's how I'm using the terms in this conversation.

To what extent is a wife allowed to withhold sex and affection if she doesn't feel supported emotionally?

3 upvotes · 10 September 2022 · /r/RPChristians

Welcome to the club. Your story tracks with mine pretty closely (including the 4 kids and "I'll never want to have sex with you" stuff) ... up until the point of cheating. I found MRP and eventually started this sub shortly before I got to that point. Feel free to check out my testimony/RP-imony in my post history for more.

You definitely had some big mistakes there. But what are you doing NOW in the wake of all that? How are you living for Christ TODAY?

To what extent is a wife allowed to withhold sex and affection if she doesn't feel supported emotionally?

3 upvotes · 10 September 2022 · /r/RPChristians

I gather that you're reformed

Eh, I wouldn't say that. Curious where you got that from, though.

nearly all of the counselors I sought out either 1) acknowledged the problem but wouldn't rebuke her, 2) blamed me or told me to lower my expectations. Of course, when I went to them on my own and confessed my regrettable episode of sin to them, they didn't waste any time removing me from any formal ministry involvement, meeting with me to express their concern, and assigning me a weekly counselor

Funny how that works. Try to guess how many times I've heard that exact same story. While it's not a situation I have personally experienced, I have been privy to it with others so many times that I have a great empathy for those who have endured it.

acknowledge that I committed the worse sin (though I have seen how toxic that 'who was the worse sinner' mindset is when trying to restore a marriage)

By the way you're talking, I'm going to guess she was sexually denying and you delved into porn. If I'm anywhere in the ballpark, I wouldn't jump to the conclusion that you are the "worse sinner." I have a post on this: https://www.reddit.com/r/RPChristians/comments/drpl1x/the_truth_about_porn/. Before you read, let me emphasize that the post does NOT justify porn use. The key prefatory line is: "As long as churchianity keeps

blaming porn for more than its actual role in marriages falling apart, there will be no motive or reason for its leaders to look for alternative, more biblical cures for broken marriages and sex lives."

Sane, healthy human beings can't live in such toxicity forever. She didn't want a husband, I've come to realize.

As a product of my career (divorce attorney focusing on cases involving psychological issues), I am uniquely aware of the default mental conflicts between husbands and wives, whether there's an actual disorder or not. These are aspects of our sinful nature that almost always tie back to the curse in Genesis, but have modern implications that, while stemming from Genesis, aren't things one would naturally predict from the Bible alone, unless you spend an incredible time meditating on all the ways the curses can play out in a marital dynamic, and most people haven't given it the years necessary to get there. Understanding psychology (specifically matrimonial psychology) and then introducing what we know from the Bible about our unique gendered-sinful-natures is a "shortcut." Most pastors and even counselors/social workers are not fluent enough in *both* (usually only one or the other) to put that together ... ergo your situation.

You're right that you can't live in such toxicity forever. Praise God "forever" will be in heaven and not the mess we deal with here.

I'm so sorry to hear about your situation, brother. If there's a way I can be an encouragement to you as you try to follow Christ in the wake of these struggles, let me know.

Smash The Overton Window

3 upvotes · 29 July 2022 · /r/RPChristians

Glad to see you back. Solid post. Lots of things to process.

- While generally a useful tool, the Overton Window image makes it look like the window is in the dead-center of the two opposing extremes, whereas modern political climate shows otherwise. If 0 are the "unthinkable republicans" and 10 is the "unthinkable democrats," the Overton Window would be between 6-8, not 4-6 ... EXCEPT FOR ...
- It's important to remember that the "Overton Window" is location-specific. The cultural centers are exactly as you described, but there are large swaths of the (decentralized) population outside the major cities where the Overton Window would lean far in the other direction. The main issue is that the major cities are the only ones with resources to justify substantial investment in media, which is then projected. While it has, for the most part, failed to persuade the majority of the decentralized populous, it is still the only message being projected because of a lack of competition from the underfunded rural towns. This leaves a blah mix of social niceties being adopted because of media norms (things like "happy wife, happy life" or "dads are deadbeats, kids need their moms more") while still being able to reject political policy changes (things like abortion, legalization of homosexual marriage, etc.).
- I've never understood people who complain about the consequences of democracy, but still embrace it. Sure, there have been some terrible dictators/monarchs, and I'd rather live under a liberal president than a murderous tyrant, but it's also important to realize that there have been some great monarchs/dictators throughout history as well AND that this is all a false dichotomy. It's not "American democracy v murderous tyrant - take your pick." As much as I hate to admit, over the last years I've been more and more persuaded toward a corporate anarchy (i.e. no "federal" structure) with localized organization (maybe state-level, definitely at least city-level).
- I'll call BS on your "1800's where literacy rates were up" line. I've done the research on this one a few times and the data always comes back the same: *illiteracy* has gone down consistently from the 1800s through the present. One example source: https://nces.ed.gov/naal/lit_history.asp. That said, the overall point is still

agreed.

- Quite ironically, "radical thought" is what seemingly all-at-once transitioned us from the dark ages to the renaissance, then from that to the reformation, then into the "age of reason," then again to the scientific revolution, and again to the "enlightenment" era - and eventually the "modern era" and post-modernism. Even though "radical thought" has had the impact of liberalism over time, I assume you're suggesting it is the best weapon for undoing the harm of liberalism?

Overall, our disagreement on "disciple the nations" notwithstanding, solid post and I'm in full agreement with the conclusions. Great call to action.

Parenting

3 upvotes · 14 June 2022 · /r/RPChristians

I like this post and it's a worthy topic. Here are some thoughts:

Modeling Does Work

I think you dismiss this too quickly. Let's take a look at your excuses.

We are all doomed to be imperfect

If that's the case, then all techniques will be imperfect and are to be equally embraced or thrown out with modeling.

Even if we were, perfection doesn't necessarily inspire patterning behavior

I don't see how this connects. Your argument is why modeling won't work, not why being perfect won't work. There's a difference between **BEING** a great example and **MODELING** a great example. A dad who *is* a great example to his kids, but makes no effort to expose his children to his lifestyle or show them how to live it alongside him is not modeling. He may *be* a great guy, but it doesn't mean squat if he isn't actively *modeling* it in a way that his kids can receive and follow. This is the difference between being a passively-"good" parent and disciplining your children.

We are all wired differently

I agree that there will be different personality styles, ranges of interest, etc. that will deviate from person to person. But are you really going to try to argue that men can only have one or two Myers-Briggs personality types, and that if you're interested in Broadway musicals you can't be a real/godly man? (as I write this from a hotel on Broadway about to leave for a musical). One of the reasons I ham up my love of musicals with RP guys is to emphasize that one can have a great marriage, bear spiritual fruit, have a good sex life, and - yes - even raise wonderful children while having interests that deviate from typical "masculinity" things, like football and poker. Do my kids need to share these interests? Nope. If my son turns out to love watching football, I will cringe inside, but fully support that. If he has other interests he can still be "masculine" by all biblical contexts and have all the things in life God designed for him.

There is a natural inclination for a son to rebel against his father to a certain degree

There's also a natural inclination for children to become their parents. Rebellion against a father-figure usually happens when the father figure is total trash or absent, giving no respect. But the cliché that "the apple doesn't fall far from the tree" is more common in the long-term than a lifetime of rebellion. Short-term rebellion, we're on the same page. In those teenage years, sons will always go off the rails for a bit. But they'll circle back in the vast

majority of cases.

In short, I'm not persuaded that actual, active modeling (i.e. discipling your children) is anything short of the absolute most effective approach to parenting. I challenge anyone who disagrees with me to come spend a week with me and my kids (ages 5, 7, 8, and 10). I believe what you're arguing against is passive-existing as a "good person," which is not modeling.

Discipling your children is and always will be the best way to go.

Responding to the Rest

Now, for the advice you're giving ...

Reject passivity

I agree 100%, but I think the verse you cite is off-base. While Romans 12:1-2 is solid in its own context, that has nothing to do with rejecting passivity, though I understand that you may be defining passivity as conformance with the world. But a guy could also (and in these parts often does) reject conformity to the world while still being quite ungodly. And there are many men who are "godly" in the sense of their rejection of worldly immoralities, but who are still passive in how they express or apply them.

I'd suggest passages like Ephesians 5:16 and Colossians 4:5, which compel us to make the most of every opportunity. Or Matthew 6:33 which says we should "seek first His Kingdom and His righteousness" rather than passively avoiding bad things in life. Or there's the great commission (Matthew 28:19-20), or Colossians 3's attributes of love (all action words are ascribed to "love is," whereas all the "love is not" words are emotions we passively experience), and so on.

The key here is that rejecting passivity isn't merely about avoiding conformity to the world. It also means adopting PROACTIVE things God intends for us to do. Most people go through life doing whatever is easiest or feels good, but when something "bad" comes up they think, "Ah ha! That's the thing God told me not to do, so I'm not gonna do it," then pat themselves on the back for being so "godly." In the meantime, they walked by countless people who need the Gospel and made zero effort to connect with them, and they haven't discipled a single person in the last decade ... but because they read their Bible in their own private home for a few minutes it's all good?

Accept responsibility

Again, I 100% agree, but 1 Cor. 16:13 doesn't seem to say anything about responsibility. Other good virtues, sure. But responsibility? Not in there. I'd look more at passages like:

- Galatians 6:5 - For each will have to bear his own load.
- 1 Timothy 5:8 - But if anyone does not provide for his relatives, and especially for the members of his household, he has denied the faith and is worse than an unbeliever.
- 1 Corinthians 3:8 - He who plants and he who waters are one, and each will receive his wages according to his labor.
- And if you really want to go parental: Proverbs 22:6 - Train up a child in the way he should go and when he is old he will not depart from it.

These are all passages on embracing and utilizing responsibility *if we want to achieve a desired end*. And that's just the thing: **responsibility does not exist in a vacuum**. Some people like to say that just by being a man

means you have responsibility. No. You have responsibility parallel with the outcomes you want to receive in life and the lives of others who you rope into your framework and mission along the way.

Leads courageously

Again, solid premise, but the verse doesn't speak to courage. It speaks to being godly. But something like Joshua 1:9 or Deuteronomy 31:6 would make more sense, which speak more to courage itself - and specifically to leaders of God's people. Who of God's people are you leading? If you're ONLY leading your family, you're a coward and have no ability to life-model for your family how they ought to make disciples outside the home if you're not doing it in your own life. It's easy to say, "I'm courageous because I said 'no' to my wife, and that was scary!" *Ooooooh*. Good for you. Now go do something outside the home that actually takes balls.

Expects the greater reward

I'll embrace this one as-written.

What would you add to that?

There are, of course, other attributes of biblical masculinity that you're leaving off. I'll defer to other commenters for a longer list. I understand that's a bigger topic in itself, so I'm limiting my assessment here just to the things you actually wrote about - not the ones you didn't. [/u/Deep_Strength](#) usually has good thoughts on this subject already anyway.

A code of conduct

I'm not a fan of this approach. More rules seems to result in more rebellion. I get that it's cool to have a "code" - like Barney from *How I Met Your Mother* having the "Bro Code" that talks about ways men *should* act, or Dexter having his "code" of only killing evil people that his father instilled in him. There is some value to these in niche situations. But on the whole, adding more rules is contrary to the message of Christ. He came to bring freedom from the constraints of the law, not to add to it. Why should we parent differently from Christ? Instead of giving us a new "code" to replace the OT law, he gave us his Spirit. That Spirit is now what guides us. A father can also instill his spirit to his son, just the same way that Elijah gave a "double portion" of his spirit to Elisha when he knew Elijah was about to pass (2 Kings 2). This is a MUCH better approach than creating a "code" of additional rules you think men must follow. At some point your son will think (and rightfully so): "That's a silly rule to have as part of the 'code.' I don't want to do that one," and then he'll question the whole thing, and when he realizes how arbitrary you've been with how you raised him, that will be his grounds for rebelling against you. Don't give him a code. Give him your spirit.

Ceremonies

I've heard this concept before. John Eldridge was a big advocate for ceremonies and "rites of passage" in a boy's life. I haven't made up my mind on them yet. I don't know how useful "ceremony" has ever been in God's Kingdom (in fact: I know it has killed much of God's earthly kingdom, the Church), but I do see some value for them on an individual level. This concept more comes from the chivalrous "knighthood" days (so I'm not surprised your book on knight hood mentions it). I think if people want to have it, go for it. You won't do your son harm, unless you orient his life around the ceremony (achieving it, or something more ongoing), which would be destructive.

Instead, "rites of passage" are more useful. These are situations when a boy has to experience something new in order to usher into a new phase of life. For me, these always come with clear conversations: the sex talk before the schools started talking about it, for one. Another is when my son started staying home alone for short times, and the conversations revolving around that. Another was when his sister was getting bullied in school, and conversations we had about his role in helping to protect her, which was something he wasn't age-appropriate to do when he was, say, 5 and she was 3. These types of new life phases are things that require unique attention. If you want to use a ceremony, your call. I'm fine with a clear conversation and check-in process on how things go with the topic-at-hand as we go along.

I know it looks like I tore your post apart, but I really did enjoy the read and am glad you brought up the topic. Good work, brother.

Getting Out of Woods and On Mission

3 upvotes · 10 May 2022 · /r/RPChristians

John 15 says: "Every branch that does bear fruit he prunes, that it may bear more fruit" but "Every branch in me that does not bear fruit ... is thrown away like a branch and withers; and the branches are gathered, thrown into the fire, and burned."

If you want your baggage dealt with (i.e. pruned), including your porn and masturbation issues, **mission IS your answer**, not the thing you do *after* you're pruned. You cannot be pruned until after you start bearing fruit. He has to see fruit before he starts pruning. Anything before that is just Matthew 12's trading one evil for another. You can stop your old destructive patterns, but others will inevitably take their place. Adopting the mission to bear fruit for God's Kingdom (i.e. reproduce your faith the same way fruit reproduces more trees when planted in nearby soil) is your answer. Don't get that backwards.

Stop Pointing the Finger

3 upvotes · 28 February 2022 · /r/RPChristians

Right, this reminds me of /u/RedPillWonder's post:

https://www.reddit.com/r/RPChristians/comments/hd1v5a/worthy_of_love_earned_respect_and_other_biblical/

God's commands are not conditional

By virtue of being your husband, you are to respect and reverence him.

By you being his wife, he is to love you regardless of your actions.

You are to submit to your husband even if he's not a good leader or Captain.

Pointing the finger treats God's commands as conditional.

Abstinence till marriage (Advice/Discussion)

3 upvotes · 25 February 2022 · /r/RPChristians

I'm also reminded of Titus 1:12-13 - "One of the Cretans, a prophet of their own, said, 'Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, lazy gluttons.' This testimony is true. Therefore rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith, not devoting themselves to Jewish myths and the commands of people who turn away from the truth."

The "Jewish myths" were from the ritualized culture the Jewish Christians, like Paul, were being called out of. Just as Judaism lost its way and abandoned Yahweh for their own rules and myths, so also has modern Christianity abandoned Jesus for its own myths.

This could be legit myths, like "Happy wife, happy life," or entire paradigms, like the import of building up the church their own congregational unit over advancing the actual name of Jesus. It could be ministry models, like the "Come, because ..." model in contrast with Jesus' "Go, therefore ..." model.

One way or another, when people get tied up in these unbiblical myths, we're called to "rebuke them sharply" to jar them out of that silliness.

You already know I think you go overboard on this - but for anyone else reading, there's another passage on-point.

Mission

3 upvotes · 23 February 2022 · /r/RPChristians

Solid post. The only tweak I'd make is:

Don't get hung up on the details ... **AS LONG AS your method is based on how you see Jesus doing it in the Bible.**

That's the one detail that matters. My method of discipler-making is going to differ from Francis Chan's, which is actually even different from the guy who disciplined me. The key in these differences is that we're all looking at how Jesus did things and using that as our model.

I knew another guy who decided he would look at secular mentoring models and base his discipleship strategy off of what has worked in the rest of the world. He failed miserably. He could teach people generic principles, but he never found spiritual generations flowing from his life, even when he attempted to teach mission and spiritual concepts. You can't take Jesus' content and package it in secular methods and expect it to work. Fascinatingly, though, you CAN take secular content and package it in Jesus' methods and it DOES still work. I actually know several massively-successful consultants who made a fortune selling Jesus-discipleship-methodology to secular company execs.

Solid post. Just remember that the one "detail" that matters is really more of a framework: *It HAS to be based on how Jesus did it*, not whatever cool ideas you come up with yourself.

Stop Blaming Your Kids

3 upvotes · 24 November 2021 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Better for avoiding losing custody down the road too. I can't count the number of cases I've seen where the allegation comes up, "So and so still sleeps in the same bed with the kids," and the court basically says, "That's gotta stop now or you lose all overnights."

Worst case I've seen is one I have right now: Dad (45-ish) still sleeps in the same bed with his billboard/magazine-model daughter (16). My client (Mom) insists it's not sexual, but she's still creeped out by it. I'm not so sure she's right.

what do you think

3 upvotes · 7 August 2021 · /r/RPChristians

This is exactly what I was going to say.

In defense of the top moderator of Christian Marriage (who wrote a long essay earlier today rebuking this subreddit)

3 upvotes · 7 August 2021 · /r/askRPC

Agreed entirely. Well said, brother. I miss chatting with you.

Why does RPC hate feminism?

3 upvotes · 13 April 2021 · /r/askRPC

There's a difference between hating something and believing it is unbiblical or morally corrupt. I can love people who are non-Christians and morally corrupt - and I have great relationships with many such people. So to be clear: we don't hate feminists; but we do disagree with their philosophies and believe they are unbiblical.

That doesn't mean we think that *every single thing* feminists say are false or that we disagree with *every single point* they're trying to make. Even the devil makes good points - but he does it in harmful and destructive ways. Likewise, feminists have some good points and identified some serious problems, but come to lots of wrong conclusions about how to fix them.

I believe the Bible has better answers, and the Bible is incompatible with most of their views:

- Feminists are pro-choice, believing a woman has the prerogative to choose whether or not to kill the baby inside her. The Bible says that we are created by God and he is the only one who should decide who lives and dies and that we should not take another's life in our own hands outside of his orders.
- Feminists believe that women should have the right to rule over men in marriages. The Bible acknowledges this desire even as early as Genesis 3, but also makes clear that God has established that men should be the leaders in the home.
- Feminists believe that women should be empowered to do everything that men do. The Bible tells us that God created men and women differently for unique purposes that are both valuable, and that while women may be *capable* of doing *many* things that God has assigned to men it was not his intent that they do so.
- Feminists believe that women do not need men in their lives and can be fulfilled and self-sufficient without a man. The Bible tells us that God created women to help men, not to be independent of them. Yes, women can be fruitful and independent, but that capability is not part of God's design, and even if a woman *can* bear fruit for the Kingdom independently, the Bible suggests that she do so in the context of the Church, not apart from the Church, and that the Church should be led by men, and therefore her efforts should be in help and support of the men within the Church.
- Feminists believe women should be able to be pastors and leaders and teachers, including over men. The Bible says that women are not to have authority over men or teach men.

The list goes on. Do we hate people who believe false things? No, although there are certainly some spiteful people in any red pill group that you should watch out for. But there's certainly value in calling out false teaching when we see it - and there's even room for zealous anger when those within the Church are perpetuating ungodliness, just as Jesus became zealous when he saw those in the temple courts doing so.

In this, I wouldn't condemn everyone for having righteous zeal against the false teachings of feminism - especially when it's being taught among those who identify as Christians. Rather, the vitriol against such things only becomes a problem when it extends beyond the scope of what Christ himself expressed in his life as a model to us.

Why Lifting is Not a Suggestion

3 upvotes · 19 March 2021 · /r/RPChristians

Are you suggesting credentials don't matter? A guy who's never lifted should be teaching on lifting? Someone who's never read the Bible should be okay to teach theology? Someone who's never prayed is somehow good to lead a community in prayer?

2 Timothy 2:2 - "And the things you have heard me say in the presence of many witnesses entrust to reliable people who will also be qualified to teach others."

People have to be reliable and qualified in their field to assume teaching positions.

Hebrews 5:12 - "In fact, though by this time you ought to be teachers, you need someone to teach you the elementary truths of God's word all over again. You need milk, not solid food!"

The reality is that not everyone is qualified to teach, even though all ought to be moving in that direction.

I.O.A. -- The Illusion Of Action

3 upvotes · 9 March 2021 · /r/TheRedPill

Mental masturbation fits in here too. Lots of guys think that reading about how to pick up women or studying game somehow *is, in fact, action* when it is not. Don't fall into that trap either. Learning something doesn't mean you know how to apply it.

Does anyone suffer from chronic pain due to lifting injuries?

3 upvotes · 8 March 2021 · /r/askRPC

I've had a consistent lower back pain for years - especially bad since late-August. It sucks. Somedays it's hardcore (like yesterday) and others it's just a dull ache. I find that when I'm cutting and my weight is down, and I'm also continuing to lift, it hurts less. When during COVID my weight went back up and I wasn't lifting, it hurt more.

I don't know all the details of what you're specifically dealing with, but my guess is that "no weights at all" is not a doctor's prescription, and that there are ways to strengthen your muscles without trying to max out all the time. Best method for lifting through it is to start with the largest weight you can do with manageable pain and just do high reps there. If your injuries/issues are not muscular, then I'm confident you'll find that increasing your muscular strength will go a long way in reducing the pain - especially in things like arthritis or joint injuries. It takes the burden off of the skeletal and fluid-based issues and shifts it to your increased muscle size and capacity.

Granted, I'm also not a doctor, so look to what others say who may be more qualified here.

Has anyone run a "Red Pill" type course for men at their church?

3 upvotes · 2 March 2021 · /r/RPChristians

Amen on that. Love the analogy. To OP: join the discord and it'll be easier to engage back and forth about what you're trying to do.

How I Overcame Porn Permanently

3 upvotes · 3 February 2021 · /r/RPChristians

Did Jesus call his disciples to follow him, or did he wait for them to ask to follow him? Always look to what Jesus did for your model for discipler-making.

Children before marriage

3 upvotes · 26 January 2021 · /r/RPChristians

I was a virgin at the time I married my wife lawfully before the state and God. My position changed after I married based on a study of scripture. There are several posts early in this subs history addressing the issue thoroughly, but I don't have time to hash it out again. I'd encourage you to do some digging.

Anything You Can Do I Can Do Better.

3 upvotes · 22 January 2021 · /r/RPChristians

I'll give you credit that looks are not everything. As I occasionally say: looks decide the difficulty of the mode you're playing on. But why play on hard-mode when you don't have to? Just because you're too lazy to hit the gym every now and then?

That kind of attitude actually shows that you're weaker in the other areas than you think you are. If you can't show drive and commitment to take care of your body, which is easy, why should any woman - especially a high-value attractive one - assume you'll do any better taking care of your mind and spirit?

And no, "mind" doesn't mean how smart you are. I know lots of crazy high IQ people in my circles who have lazy minds that aren't suitable for leading a woman or keeping her attracted, much less leading God's Kingdom. The fact that you understand quantum physics and can speak 7 languages and code in all the major programming styles isn't attractive. The "mental" component is more about your charm, charisma, confidence, social dominance, etc. Those are things that are 10x easier to generate when you're physically fit - and some people can't generate them at all when they're not physically fit.

More significantly: in our appearance-driven society, is there any question that people are more willing to listen to a physically attractive person than the average Joe? That includes sharing the Gospel with people and discipling them. If they have to get to know you before they can develop that respect from your intellect and spiritual maturity, you're stabbing yourself in the foot because most people won't give you the time of day to get to know you in the first place if you don't present as someone they want to be. While it's not true of every single person on the planet, this does hold true with countless people - well over 50%, I'd suggest. Why cut off over 50% of the population like that just because you're too lazy to hit the gym to earn their attention and respect?

There are so many more reasons I could give. Go read "Lifting is not a Suggestion" on the sidebar. In the meantime:

And to her surprise, even with her full body weight I won.

Meditate on why it's significant that she was "surprised" by this and how different things would be if people didn't assume you were weak and scrawny because of your physical appearance.

How to vet for virgin woman quickly without wasting time?

3 upvotes · 20 January 2021 · /r/RPChristians

Look at the number of down-votes you've gotten on this comment and let that mean something to you.

Getting your wife back after a separation

3 upvotes · 13 January 2021 · /r/RPChristians

Explain that difference.

Marriage is a disaster and I'm not sure where to go...

3 upvotes · 12 January 2021 · /r/RPChristians

I'm 90% sure he isn't blue pill

Is he fluent with concepts of fitness tests, hypergamy, etc.? Or are you using "red pill" and "blue pill" interchangeably with other concepts such as "alpha/beta" or "liberal/conservative"?

SERIOUSLY considering leaving Christianity help! [Short]

3 upvotes · 12 January 2021 · /r/RPChristians

"The Sermon on The Mount" in which there are five times Jesus takes a teaching of the law and then amplifies it

Except that he doesn't. He's just referencing concepts that *already existed* in the OT. He was emphasizing that the

pharisees were picking and choosing from OT law what to follow and not, and that there were many concepts easy to ignore, yet when broken make you equally a law breaker.

As for the rest of the post, others have addressed the main points well enough. I'm more curious at the fact that this trite point is what makes you want to leave the faith. "I'd rather go to hell than teach my children to be willing to take up their cross and suffer like Christ" is a bizarre conclusion to reach.

Lactation and intimacy

3 upvotes · 4 January 2021 · /r/RPChristians

If she's not producing enough, you're certainly welcome to try, but I don't think you'll get any out, so I'm not sure how much it will actually help to supplement what she's lacking.

Idolatry, The Marriage of the State

3 upvotes · 31 December 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I agree with [/u/husky-viper](#) in that I like where your head is at, but you're trying so hard to write like you're a KJV translator or philosopher that it's hard to find anything actionable in this. I can get pretty academic at times myself, so in posts where I find myself doing this, I add a "Conclusions" or "Application" section that gives the bottom-line reason the post should matter - and that, then gives the interpretive metric to go back and understand the beauty and depth in everything else that was said beforehand.

That said, I don't know that I can agree with your views on marriage. I think from a OT perspective, you're spot on. But in a post-Gospel world where we now are citizens of a spiritual kingdom rather than a physical one, the impetus toward physical marriage is gone and replaced by our spiritual union with Christ - even as the compulsion toward physical child-rearing is over and replaced by the spiritual child-rearing imperative called discipleship. In this, I agree with Paul in 1 Cor. 7 or Jesus in Matthew 19 that it's better not to marry if you can avoid it.

To be clear: marriage is still great. But the benefits of marriage that you reference are now things we have direct access to by our union with the Spirit through the cross. We don't *NEED* marriage to get those benefits anymore. As such, marriage is now primarily a tool for getting help toward a man's spiritual mission and legitimizing sex.

In this sense, I don't hold that "marriage is good for me because it brings me closer to God" applies to a post-Gospel people. I believe from Scripture it is a distraction from God, not a compulsion toward him. But it is one that serves a valuable function all the same, and therefore is still redeemable, especially in recognition that most men would proceed in sexual sin without it.

Is the podcast in podcast form?

3 upvotes · 29 December 2020 · /r/askRPC

[u/redirectedfs](#) also mentioned recently that he may put things up on Apple music.

Merry Christmas - I've put together my "Tricks of the Trade for a Fun Frame" list as your present - good ideas for fun during the holidays

3 upvotes · 26 December 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Who rinses beer cans? And why is this thing I've never heard of even worth getting upset over in the first place? Funny. Agreed though. Tamales are great.

Merry Christmas - I've put together my "Tricks of the Trade for a Fun Frame" list as your present - good ideas for fun during the holidays

3 upvotes · 25 December 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

My guess is you stopped because after the wedding you gradually became unattractive and instead of tickling being a fun way to tease her, it was unwanted touching. Same behaviors will always be interpreted differently when done by an attractive man and an unattractive man. At least, that's part of why I remember pulling away from it :p

What is Dominance?

3 upvotes · 18 December 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Not bad. Another perspective to frame this is that women momentarily enjoy external behavior, but long-term thrive on what's internal to their man. That's why fitness tests exist, right? She wants to know if you're an outwardly showy phony or the real deal.

In this, a guy isn't actually dominant in the relationship until he shifts from "faking it" to actually "making it." Internalization.

But there are still "dominance moves" that don't make much sense to me - as if dominance doesn't exist until a guy proves it. I can do pretty much anything I want in the bedroom - and she won't stop me. She prefers it. But something like slapping her butt or choking her doesn't increase my pleasure and I don't have to do these things to know and experience the total power of being in control - so what motive do I have to do them?

I know some women like to be choked out or spanked - so maybe *to them*, as in my second sentence, outward expressions of dominance also has a unique momentary value even apart from the benefits of long-term internal manifestation of it? Thoughts?

(M22) Interested in a Muslim girl - Advice?

3 upvotes · 16 December 2020 · /r/RPChristians

This is a ridiculous conversation.

23 year old woman desperately looking for help.

3 upvotes · 9 December 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I'm not in a position to suss out the exact line right now - or even confident that an exact line is possible to create, though I'd wager the bar is lower in God's eyes than we'd prefer to make it. But when OP says this:

We made an oath between ourselves, with God, saying we would be together forever (and all the other pretty things)

I'd be pretty confident that's above the bar.

A Word to New Users

3 upvotes · 5 December 2020 · /r/RPChristians

everyone sticks to the main sub, even for basic questions

It's probably worth mentioning that RPC proper has lots of passive lurkers. I think some people are deterred from [r/askRPC](#) because it has a smaller subscriber base, therefore they don't think they'll get the full gamut of answers. The reality is that anyone worth listening to is among the subscriber base there (among others who aren't worth hearing out too, of course).

So, I continue to encourage people to use askRPC rather than RPC proper for most questions, unless the question comes in the form of a field report or is on a topic that is broadly applicable and useful for everyone in the community. In the meantime, we'll continue to take down weak stuff.

The Basics of Female Frame

3 upvotes · 13 November 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Not ask questions completely unrelated to the topic of the thread. Start your own post and give details.

What to do about GF?

3 upvotes · 13 November 2020 · /r/askRPC

What's your actual question? I actually have one for you.

- My brother is dating a girl who isn't a Christian. She doesn't have the qualities he wants in a wife. She's materialistic and vain. He wants someone who will prioritize family over career and she isn't all that interested. They sound like a horrible match, but he does seem to have some degree of emotions for her.

I can't figure out what he should do. Do you have any advice for him?

The Basics of Female Frame

3 upvotes · 12 November 2020 · /r/RPChristians

The law doesn't prohibit people from being alcoholics. We do not owe a duty to the government to avoid alcohol. Does that mean I'm advising people, "Therefore, go get drunk as often as possible and become alcoholics because the law doesn't prohibit it"? That's a somewhat ridiculous interpretation of the facts.

But as [/u/husky-viper](#) already noted: I did address the issue in the post itself. Just gotta keep your eyes open ;)

Simple Question, How Do I Know If I am Truly Red Pilled?

3 upvotes · 23 October 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Looks like someone read my [Are you Truly Red Pilled? post](#).

I endorse this. "The Red Pill" is ultimately "truth," as Rollo puts it. I'd narrow it to "truth about intergender sexual dynamics." $2+2=4$ is truth, but not a "red pill truth."

In theory, one is "red pill" if they know the truth. But many people live in a cognitive dissonance between what they know to be true and what they're actually willing to do, then act completely baffled when they're not getting the life they want. The reason is that they don't actually believe what they say is true - they just acknowledge it with their lips to fit in, and have persuaded themselves that because they *talk about it a lot*, somehow they actually believe the things they're saying.

But if you really believed the key to a great sex life involved STFU, sidebar, and lift and yet you're not getting the results you want, there are only three possible reasons:

1. The red pill is wrong.
2. You're just getting started.
3. Your belief is intellectual-only, but you harbor so many secret doubts that you won't commit.

Lifting is a great example of this. I know a LOT of guys who preach the importance of lifting. Yet their physical strength is mediocre, at best. How do we reconcile this? After all, they do lift regularly - and have been for a few YEARS now! Conclusion: They recognize that lifting is important, but don't fully understand why, so they compromise their routine rather than constantly pushing limits.

It took me 6 months to go from benching 135 to 275. I know some who have been at it for years and only up to 185 - can't even do two plates yet! Does that make me better than them? In some ways yes, in others no. But what it DOES mean is that I actually *believe* in the purpose of lifting, whereas some of these people treat it like a checkbox game. This is why tracking progress is so important.

Are you guys ok with premarital sex?

3 upvotes · 15 October 2020 · /r/RPChristians

marry them all. Gonna love that child support bill

Unless you're legally separated, there's no basis at law for child support between married individuals.

it IS fornication, and the man should be married to the woman immediately after ... And if he chooses to bring them into my life, then I'm going to have faith that he is allowing me to have them.

Come on, dude. You know better than this. Everyone in Israel knew the law that if you deflowered a virgin, you were obligated to propose. Nobody has that understanding today. Are you legit proposing to all these women?

I ask God to remove any women from my life that he doesn't want me to sleep with. And if he chooses to bring them into my life

"I aSk GoD tO rEmOvE aLl PoRn FrOm My LiFe He DoEsN't WaNt Me To WaTcH." See how dumb that sounds? Replace porn with "people he doesn't want me to kill" or "faces I don't feel like punching," etc. This is idiocy.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (10/14/20)

3 upvotes · 15 October 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Still no progress here. It's hard to make time for reading when I'm not in a deerstand.

Everyone makes time for the things they love or that are important to them. This isn't a "no time" issue. It's a "not as high a priority to me as other things" issue.

MISSION:

You danced around associated concepts, but never actually used the phrase "make disciples." Back to Scripture to figure out why God created you.

PHYSICAL: 2

Sorry to hear about the injury. I have a recurring problem creeping up in my lower back repeatedly. Mind sharing your/OtA's PT for that?

I think the biggest thing that I'm wrestling with at the moment is the black pill, which we've had some pretty good conversations about in the discord

I'd entertain that conversation someday.

I am destined to remain single due to my lack of attractive qualities (genetics, poor frame, constant injuries)

Excuses. No DEERing, brother. You can't control your genetics, but you can certainly overcome them. A poor frame is 100% in your control. You can adjust your workout routine to minimize injuries.

the costs of a dating relationship/marriage do not justify the benefits. I'm not terribly upset or demoralized by this anymore

Glad to see you've figured this out.

According to her, nearly everyone I work with sings my praises, even people in projects where I have NO CLUE what is going on. I want to endeavor to be the person she believes me to be; I know I can do better!

Great job, bro. Accept the compliments rather than filtering them through a self-defeatist attitude. You definitely don't seem like you believe you're the prize. And maybe you're not. But this is the start of your frame development.

Bible: 7

Why are you merging quiet time and Bible study into one group? They're not the same. It sounds like your QT might be 7, but your actual study is 0. That's okay - just make sure to split these out. The reading plan has nothing to do with actual study, though.

Prayer: 6 I missed a couple of days this past weekend

So? I mean, it's great to pray everyday. But some days you'll study, others you'll memorize, and others you'll pray. Don't get hung up on the idea that all of these have to be 10 all the time, or even that missing a day drops you a point or two. It's not legalism. It's general health.

Fellowship: 10 This will be ranked lower next OYS. I am staying in my house until I get my COVID test results back

You still have discord. Fellowship is more effective in-person, but equally viable online. No excuses here.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (10/14/20)

3 upvotes · 15 October 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Holy cow, your mission is all over the place. That's the first thing to get on track: what do you actually want to do with your life? Despite listing something like a dozen different mini-missions (really: short-term goals), you never once mentioned making disciples, and the vague reference to the great commission seemed focused more on sharing the Gospel than discipleship.

Here's the thing: the sidebar has an entire pathway to get you off your butt and where you need to be. Let me summarize it for you:

1. Lift
2. Start mastering the 7 basics (300 series), taking a month or two to really become competent at each, and ...

... that's it for now. That right there is the next 6 months of progress for you. When you can walk in and realize that

Bible study: 1/10 Didn't read this week.

makes no sense at all because just reading the Bible isn't even remotely close to studying it - and when you can get your quiet time/devotional (i.e. "reading") number up to an 8-10, and then after that your Scripture memory up to 8-10, and then after that your Bible study number up to 8-10 (sequentially, not simultaneously, and some may fall down to a 4-6 after you move on, and that's okay too) ... when you've done all that, you'll really start to see some major changes in your life and the

Assurance of salvation: 1/10

figure will skyrocket too, especially once you start working on your ...

Mission: ~~Set my own life on track~~ Make disciples

Life is not hard. The Bible gives us a clear roadmap. I know, I know ...

knowing what you should do and actually being able to do it are different things altogether. I lack degrees of self-control needed to keep going the right way. It honestly feels like a vampire is sucking me dry everyday

If there were a medicine to cure your depression that was somewhat painful and you didn't want to take it, and it would take multiple doses a day 7 days a week for several weeks, would you do it anyway?

- If the answer is no, then you're really only here to complain and there's nothing we can do to help you.
- If the answer is yes, then take the cure.

It's called the sidebar. The 7 basics. Developing and living on your mission. Practicing these things and working toward internalizing them have a proven track record for dealing with this type of emotional dysphoria. I mean, if your issues are physical in nature because you literally lack the chemicals in your body to permit emotional regulation, then go get some meds. But if that's not the case, start taking the pill. The red one. You know, the one found in the Bible.

Priestly ministry to men

3 upvotes · 12 October 2020 · /r/RPChristians

It was actually around 2%, but still much better than virtually all other averages. I believe the study also ignored divorces that occurred prior to salvation.

Don't Be Autistic

3 upvotes · 21 September 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Well said.

Looking for Wisdom from Men

3 upvotes · 17 September 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I know I want to be with her, I'm looking for ways to work through demons.

This sounds very much like you're preparing an "it's not you, it's me speech," but just don't want to deliver it.

The Art of Asking Questions

3 upvotes · 19 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Karen, I'm so sorry to hear about all you're dealing with. Thanks for sharing all that. Does anyone else have similar struggles? Maybe we can learn from each other.

Alternatively:

Karen, that really sucks. I'm kind of curious about what the Bible has to say about stuff like this. What were we supposed to be talking about today? I bet God had us talking about this subject for a reason, and it might end up giving you an indirect solution to your problem.

Or ...

Karen, it's too bad this situation is still going on. Last week we suggested doing blank. Have you done that yet? No? That's frustrating. How about you do that this week instead and give us an update next week. I don't think we can really help you much further until you start applying the things we talk about.

Which one (or others) you go with depends on the character of the relationship you have with her. I use "Karen" as an example because it's pretty rare I have this problem with a guy, and if I do find one, it's easiest just to tell him point blank: "Bob, thanks for sharing. Let's let some other guys weigh in."

"Spiritual Growth" - such an awkward phrase.

3 upvotes · 16 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Do you think that personal sanctification in the form of the fruit of the spirit or Christ-likeness in one's own life can also fall into the category of "producing fruit?"

- **Fruit of the Spirit:** No. To say as much would mean that when Jesus is preaching on "fruit" we would have to imply extra dialogue by Jesus: "Oh, and by 'fruit' I mean something this guy Paul will teach you a couple dozen years from now, so just remember these words because you'll be able to interpret them then, but right now just expect to be confused." I can't imagine Jesus would do that. If Jesus had preached on "fruit of the Spirit" I would be more persuaded by this argument. Also, many aspects of the "fruit of the Spirit" are things that can be faked. Matthew 7 (the primary "by their fruit you will recognize them" passage) makes clear that things which can be faked aren't a reliable metric for knowing who is genuine from those to whom Jesus will say, "I never knew you; away from me you evildoer."
- **Christ-likeness:** Yes, in the sense that Jesus' primary function in his earthly ministry before his death was to evangelize and disciple.

Note the parable of the sower, where Jesus explains that the seed planted in the soil is the Gospel and when it grows the plant/tree is produced. This growth/tree is not the fruit - it's the tree. The character issues we instill in people as foundations of the faith are, to continue the metaphor, akin to the roots of the tree (or if we use the family-structure parallel instead of plants, it's the 'spiritual milk' - the underlying nourishment everyone needs at start); and the "spiritual meat" that we consume after the foundational things are the tree itself. The fruit of a tree is when these roots and the shoot of the tree absorb nourishment from the soil, the light, the water/fertilizer, etc. and produce something seed-bearing which can generate life in others - either through consumption by the tree's owner (God) for his enjoyment, or by falling into nearby soil, which, if the soil is healthy, results in reproduction.

"Therefore, if anyone cleanses himself from what is dishonorable, he will be a vessel for honorable use, set apart as holy, useful to the master of the house, ready for every good work."

Beautiful reference!

Yes, this is the ultimate value of the "avoid sin" mantra churchianity pushes. They stop there. It is enough, in their eyes, if one ceases sinning as much as possible as this life can afford. Yet they fail to recognize James' saying: "Anyone who knows the good he ought to do and does not do it sins." That good includes the fulfillment of the Great Commission. If "not making disciples" is a sin, then "avoid sinning" also means "Avoid not making disciples."

But even without this "workaround" explanation to get there, the passage you reference is clear enough: the point of sin-avoidance isn't for its own sake, but because it improves our usefulness. This is the John 15 concept that Jesus cuts off the fruitless branch, but prunes the one who bears fruit so that it can become more fruitful.

we're more effective fruit-bearers externally when we're more Christ-like internally.

Amen to that!

Of course, we have to account for the balance of churchianity's teaching and how we counter-weight this. There was a recent post complaining about why we don't talk about how husbands ought to love their wives 95% of the time, like churchianity does. The reason is, of course, because churchianity already addresses that so thoroughly. There's no balance. We have to focus on the things churchianity won't teach in order for guys to find balance - not because we disagree with the obligation of a husband to love his wife, but because most guys hear that enough from their congregations already that it's not their more pressing need, which is all the things churchianity isn't telling them. Likewise, while it's valuable to "avoid sin" and "serve those in need" and all that other stuff, I don't write about it as much - not because I don't think we should, but because there's already enough of that content out there and it doesn't need to be refrained here as well ...

... unless there is some unique take on the matter that churchianity has missed, such as the sanctification-orientation of loving one's wife, or the missional purpose for why we avoid sin in the first place.

Thanks for the comment, brother. It's helped me to process some of my thoughts on this matter better.

"Spiritual Growth" - such an awkward phrase.

3 upvotes · 15 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Well said. I believe I agree with all of this. Definitely worth further thought and exploration. As noted elsewhere, I really don't have any problem with the term "spiritual growth." This is one of those situations where I'm posting more of a thought process with the expectation that people in the community, like you, give some push-back where it's due. Thanks for that.

"Spiritual Growth" - such an awkward phrase.

3 upvotes · 15 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

This makes me smile just reading it :) Literally nothing gives me greater joy than to see people living out their faith - especially for those who I've had a hand in, as I hope the one(s) who brought you to Christ can experience the same.

What else should I call the growth I've experienced ... ?

So, on the podcast I've referenced that sometimes I post things that I know aren't quite fully developed thoughts, just to read the comments of people who challenge me and help refine my view. This is one of those examples. I know there's nothing technically wrong with the phrase "spiritually mature" - but the phrase also comes with a lot of unhealthy baggage. I'm exploring here whether or not there's a way to separate the negative baggage without losing the convenience.

the past year or so since accepting Christ as my savior

I love to see the fire you have while so young in your faith! I'd tell you to never let that die out, but everyone does, at least for a time. More significant is learning how to keep rekindling it.

But I'm not producing fruit yet and I'm not sure what that really looks like.

I have an upcoming post on this - or, rather: series of posts. Keep an eye out.

Do you have any concerns about how it seems like this view errs on the side of control of your wife over her personal growth and freedom?

3 upvotes · 15 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

And this brings us around to the fact that you haven't shared or referenced a single scripture to buttress your points here. You can go to the sidebar and see numerous scripture references for the things we encourage men to do.

You seem to be basing your argument on feelings and "fairness" (at least as you define or apply it, not God's standard), rather than scripture.

Nail, meet head.

So much good stuff in this comment.

No, your congregation does not preach "biblical headship"

3 upvotes · 13 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I see the remedy for this to be an equal if not greater emphasis on Men loving their wives, as Men being in authority over their wives.

What you're saying sounds great in theory, but fails in practice. This is EXACTLY how feminism crept into churchianity in the first place. Pastors read the Bible, but wanted to appease women, so instead of preaching on these matters equally, they address headship/submission maybe 2% "love your wife" 98%. In all that talk, they began to confuse Scriptural interpretation with their own personal application of doing whatever makes her happy.

Jesus models a different paradigm altogether. Happiness isn't even a present factor. "Loving his bride" includes provision, support, and encouragement - but there is 10x more about leading her in something that matters to him, and sanctifying her so she's qualified and equipped to do it. That's why we talk so much here about mission and leadership - because THAT IS how we love our wives like Christ loves the Church.

Catering to her emotional state accomplishes nothing for eternity and proves a futile waste of time if it becomes the focus. The man's mission in Christ is not merely for his or Christ's sake, but also has the passive benefit to his wife of giving her life some value to eternity as well.

she was repeatedly told (by church and christians) to respect and never question her husband, so she missed many red flags

Right. That's why the red pill communities use the phrase: "trust, but verify." Blind trust is idiocy and breeds cynicism. Trust that is verified is wise and breeds confidence. If she had followed this simple red pill concept rather than listening to churchianity, I bet she'd have seen these issues much sooner.

and endured abuse for a while ... I would say that abuse is prevalent in many forms still today in marriages, whether it be physical, mental, emotional or spiritual abuse

Check out my post on *Actual Quotes From "Abuse" Victims* and see why I'm skeptical of her actually being "abused" without more details. I haven't heard her story, but unless I see the pictures of her black eyes, I'm doubtful. What women report as abuse is often a ridiculous reinterpretation of the facts designed to make her sympathetic. Yes, there are real cases. But in my experiencing handling "abuse" cases (yes, that's literally my day job), you're not going to convince me that actual abuse situations are more common than false allegations. Of course, many of the false-accusers genuinely believe they were abused, which is part of the problem.

in my view it is easy for many redpill christian ideas, or really any system which places the husband in

authority over the wife, to be twisted or abused by abusive husbands

Completely agreed. Which is why 99% of what we write on this forum is about making men better men, and why we also push the notion that a man should never verse-quote his way into authority over his wife. First, the secular laws won't back him up when push comes to shove. Second, it's not an effective strategy and is in stark contrast to how Jesus modeled headship for us.

In this, I challenge you to find one situation where any mod or endorsed contributor has encouraged a man to quote verses to his wife about her needing to submit to him, or where he has ever been encouraged to abuse his authority, or where we have proposed any strategy of influencing one's wife other than through the foundation of being the type of man she *WANTS* to follow. You won't find one because we don't endorse people who give such garbage advice.

and also contributes to a silencing of victims of marital abuse

In my experience, there does need to be a silencing of alleged victims - not in total, but just toning the volume down. The fact that victims of abuse are so vocal and that the issue is so popular to talk about today is what has contributed to the inflation and absurd expansion of things people call "abuse" that is hardly anything close.

All genuine abuse victims should have an appropriate forum for finding safety and relief. If it's physical abuse, that should come in the form of shelters and domestic violence charges and protection orders. If it's mental/verbal/emotional abuse, it should be through counseling/training on coping strategies, developing a stronger frame, and 1 Peter 3 concepts. But the way people over-emphasize and over-empathize with every alleged abuse victim today has absurdly increased the number of false allegations that either (1) land men in jail or with protective orders and affect their parenting rights because the courts want to play it safe, or (2) get dismissed, but still end up costing the guy thousands of dollars in legal fees to defend against a bogus allegation. Seriously, I'd be shocked if even 1 out of ever 4 claims of abuse had any factual basis to them at all - and I say this as an attorney who deals with this as my primary practice area at law.

For example, the wives submit to their husbands verse is used to encourage a wife to have sex with a husband, and maybe it is seen that the husband can have sex with his wife whenever he chooses even if the wife doesn't show consent.

But biblically that's true. Now, you won't find any mod or endorsed contributor encouraging a guy to commit marital rape. We're always very clear: if she denies you, go do something else. Don't force her. But that doesn't change the fact that her denial is sin and unbiblical.

More to the point: women are welcome here, but it's not for them. [r/RPCWomen](#) is for the women. So to say that anything we write is "to encourage a wife to" do anything at all is inaccurate. Instead, most men who come here are such pussies that they don't even know how to initiate sex with their wives in the first place. They've been denied so many times that they truly believe it's the wife's prerogative to set the standards for their sex life. Even if they pretend to be the leader in every other area, they're still deferring to their wife's leadership in the bedroom. Many men need to be empowered by knowing that this is sin on her part and that he needs to become the type of man who would make her want to repent of that sin. And when he realizes that he has a God-given right to have sex with his wife, maybe he'll be bold enough actually to initiate with her once in a while. And if she gives a hard no, the advice is always to back down and hit the gym.

I am just a young bloke, not in a relationship but got interested in exploring this topic

I get it. You sound like you're pretty new around here and are still pretty heavily influenced by feminist ideologies. I don't expect you to agree with everything you read here. But do know that we (or at least I) have a reason for everything that's said here.

[u/weakandsensitive](#) once explained that most guys are so beta that it's not enough to teach them how to live in a healthy balance. They have to become a jerk for a while, living on the other side of the line, before they can even understand what that balance looks like to be the oak.

Or as I re-word it for more sensitive folks: if on a scale of 1-10 a 5 is ideal, if you've spent the last decade living as a 1, preaching a 5 will only ever get the person to move to 2 or 3; but if you push a 10 for a while and he embraces it for a time, it's much easier afterward to tone him back to a 5.

This is how it was when I was being spiritually trained. My discipler saw lots of people who were 1s and decided to train them to be balanced Christians. He pushed and prodded, giving us ridiculously high expectations for Christian living, pressuring that we should be sharing the Gospel with non-believers every single day, alongside daily prayer, Scripture memory, Bible study, fellowship, quiet times, and much, much more. In my senior year he finally dropped the bomb on all of us: "You don't actually have to do all those things every day. Biblically, if you have a quiet time one day and memorize a verse another, that's perfectly acceptable too. You're not meant to be legalistic about all of these things. But when you started you were so immature that I had to train you to become actual freaks so that when you leave this place you live in balanced commitment to Christ rather than falling back into spiritual apathy, as so many do."

Admittedly, I'm still a bit of a freak - and I've embraced that. It's become part of my frame - my internal point of origin. But the same concept applies in how we train men here. They need to be taught how to be the insensitive jerk so that when they're ready for balance and to become the oak, they are actually able to do so. If you take a bloop and try to turn him into the oak from the get-go, he may hit it for a time, but he'll virtually always backpedal. So, we have to figure out actual effective strategies to get men where they need to be, otherwise we'll never be anything more than "churchianity-lite."

some of the movement towards a more egalitarian system of marriage is in fact inspired by the noble desire to prevent men from abusing women

Right - a perfectly noble goal that has been resolved ever so poorly through all the wrong methods that don't actually work.

our modern definition of abuse is wider and more accurate than in times past.

Yikes! Take that back, brother. Haha. Seriously? You've got to be trolling now. I'll give you that laws hundreds/thousands of years ago permitted more harm than would be biblical, but the laws have swung sooooo far the other way that you'll never persuade me "my wife hit me with a baseball bat, I raised up my hands to block her and broke my arms, then I called the cops on her, but they arrested me and took me to jail and I now have a DV conviction on my record" is a more accurate definition of abuse than what we see historically. Yes, that's a legit case. [u/bluepillprofessor](#) has shared many others like it too.

Tag: [/u/rocknrollchuck](#)

No, your congregation does not preach "biblical headship"

3 upvotes · 13 August 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I ultimately made my husband agree

That's not an agreement, haha.

In other words, are my actions loud enough for this topic to not be brought up again, or should I voice my changed views to my husband?

For men, I'm generally a fan of *acta non verba*. For women - especially if the husband is still blue pill (which yours is, if he is still living under this prior "agreement") - this changes and you'd probably be better off communicating it directly, because he won't figure it out on his own just through your actions.

You could try passive acknowledgment by asking his opinion a lot and concluding, "Sounds good. You're the boss" ... but even that likely wouldn't do it.

Where's the Victory?

3 upvotes · 12 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

(Cross-posted from [r/TrueChristian](#))

Thanks for actually posting it here rather than redirecting to TC, otherwise I would have taken it down ;)

God doesn't immediately take away the full weight, he gives us just enough to handle with the help of the Holy Spirit.

So here's another lifting reality I've come to embrace: **Being strong doesn't mean heavy weights are less heavy; it means your capacity for heaviness has gone up.**

I remember when I was struggling to bench 225lbs. I'd push and push and push and barely get it up! Then I got stronger and stronger and stronger. By the time I finally hit my goal of 300lbs as a ORM, I assumed lower weights should feel a lot easier. But you know what? 225lbs still felt like 225lbs. But increasing my bench from 225 to 300 didn't make 225 feel like 150. It was still doggone heavy. I just managed to increase how much heaviness I could take.

Let's put it this way: on a scale of 1-10, benching 225 early on felt like an 8. Doable, but quite hard. As I got stronger, I expected 225 to feel more like a 5/10. It didn't. Instead, I realized that 10 changed to 11, then 12, and so on.

Heavy weights remained equally heavy. But my capacity to handle greater and greater weights is what increased. Lifting 225lbs is still lifting 225lbs. The only difference when you're stronger is that you go into the lift *knowing* you can do it, rather than seeing it as a challenge and wondering if you can actually put it up or not.

Too many people enter spiritual endeavors expecting that as they mature difficulties and temptation will decrease. The frequency may. But the difficulty when in the moment does not. Instead, as you grow stronger in your spirit, conviction, and discipline, you find that you have dealt with so much harder temptation that even though old temptations are still equally present and equally tempting as before, you *know* you've handled worse, so you *know* you can push through, not having that skepticism of "can I or can't I?"

I feel stuck

3 upvotes · 12 August 2020 · /r/askRPC

Solid.

Update: Looking for guidance

3 upvotes · 11 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

If a woman married someone she was not sexually attracted to it would make sense why she would not want to have sex with him no matter what he does.

This is the whole point of the red pill, though. Even these marriages are salvageable. While there's some split on the issue (I know [/u/deep_strength](#) has debated it with another blogger), I'm in the camp that even in the

circumstance when there was ZERO sexual attraction going into the marriage, *at least SOME* can be developed through what the red pill teaches. You may never go from 0 to 10, but you can certainly get from 2 to 7 without much effort. I may even go so far as to say the 0 to 10 scenario is possible, depending on the reasons for the non-attraction in the first place.

What I was saying is that a man pedestalizing his wife and doing everything he can to please her and make her happy is the *wrong* answer and will cause more harm than good. It will solve some of the *relational* aspects of the marriage, but not the sexual ones.

To be clearer, in the red pill we recognize the different strategies necessary to maintain a healthy *relationship* from a healthy *sex life*. Most of churchianity and marriage counseling blends these together, assuming that they overlap. They don't. A woman can be sexually attracted to a man she despises (battered woman's syndrome being an obvious extreme example) or completely adore a man as marriage-material who she has zero sexual interest in. In this, the red pill notes that relationships are the woman's domain and sex is the man's domain. Or, to put it another way, there's a maxim:

- Women are the gatekeepers of sex; men are the gatekeepers of commitment (i.e. the "relationship" part).

Generally, most men want sex from women, most women want relational feels and commitment from a man. Marriage counseling, at its absolute finest, addresses the relational aspects by damaging the sexual aspects. It helps women get what they want from a man, and the man, not realizing its negative impact on their long-term sexuality, gets the immediate relief of the relational problems dying down, so both walk away happy. They may even have sex for a week or two afterward, most likely because she wants to *reward him* (i.e. putting herself in the dominant position) for working through the marriage counseling with her. But in the end, while he has been better trained to suit her relational needs, she almost never becomes better suited to meet his sexual needs.

In their effort to serve their husband and their family they don't have time to think about sex.

I think you missed what you were writing. Her husband wants sex. Yet you say she's exerting an "effort to serve [her] husband." Hmm ... By folding the laundry? By decorating the house? By doing the dishes? Most men don't care about these things.

Women justify their lifestyle as "service to my husband" because the husband gets to enjoy the benefit of it, but the reality is that they're serving themselves. Women have MUCH higher standards on housework than men do. The moment they surpass the man's standards and begin working toward their own, they are no longer serving him, but themselves. But in reality, if you ask any man even within his own standards: *Would you prefer your wife to vacuum the floor or have hot sex with you?* what do you think his answer is going to be? In this, women prioritize the things they want to do for their husbands over the things their husbands would actually prefer.

So, when you say that you've "known countless women who are exhausted. In their effort to serve their husband and their family they don't have time to think about sex" - the answer is a simple one: make sex with your husband your first priority in how you expend your energy and then work on the housework after that. If that means that after having sex with your husband, doing the dishes, folding the laundry, and caring for the kids these "countless women are still exhausted. In their effort to serve their husband and their family they don't have time to think about vacuuming the floor" ... well, heck ... I don't know what guy would pressure her over the floor in that circumstance.

They along with their husbands go to work, but their responsibilities include child care, cooking, and cleaning, while their husbands takes out the trash once in a while and occasionally does maintenance around the house.

Right, and that's the husband's failing for not leading his ship. He passively defaults to her. This is part of the red pill strategy: get the man back to leading. One of my first posts in the red pill subs was on [dealing with the](#)

stressed out wife. I know more now than I did then, but the principle still applies. The issue isn't that the man isn't helping out enough. It's that she feels responsible instead of him. That responsibility is a drain on her, even if it is the exact same amount of work as when he's responsible and she's just checking off boxes on the to-do list he gives her.

if their husbands took a bit of initiative and helped out around the house once in a while

No. He doesn't help her. She helps him. He needs to take ownership of the home rather than deferring it to her. The perception dynamic of him running the house with her as his helper massively changes the stress-load from her being responsible for running the house and him "helping out" every now and then.

It doesn't matter how masculine he is or how much he works out, if he doesn't pick up after himself, he's ugly.

But if he doesn't, he's not "masculine." Masculinity inherently involves a man taking ownership over his domain - his entire sphere of influence. This isn't just his body, but his social life, his physical property, his relationships, etc.

Now this changes if the man is the sole breadwinner and the wife stays home. Obviously housework should then fall on the woman.

And here's the catch: *that's not how it actually works.* My parents are a great example. My mom never had a full-time job while they were married, and never even worked part-time since having kids. Yet she was CONSTANTLY on my dad's rear for "not helping more around the house." This is the default state of most marriages, even single-earner households. It doesn't matter if it's literally her job or not. The wife will always complain, wanting more help. The only solution that has any lasting impact is the biblical one: where the man is the head of the household - not just responsible for his career/financial provision, but all aspects of the family unit (including parenting!) - and in this she becomes his helper rather than her wanting his help.

But for a thriving relationship where neither party feels taken advantage of, there should be an equal division of labor.

That's not biblical. The goal of marriage isn't for "neither party to feel taken advantage of." The goal is to make disciples. I had to address this with my wife recently. 99% of women see the goal of marriage as their own happiness (or, if they're being dishonest with themselves, raising "successful" children, however that's defined). If we divide the work into different camps - financial provision, raising the kids, housework, and making disciples - if both parents are equally involved in raising the kids and working equal hours, but the man is the only one doing what God actually wants husbands and wives to be doing, that burden rests on his shoulders and not hers. If she has to take care of more housework so he can get the Gospel out to new people or raise up new laborers for the Kingdom, that matters too.

I have yet to see a marriage where the wife does more to disciple others than the man. Instead, I see women investing in dead-end congregational programs more than their husbands - like serving in children's ministry, singing on the worship team, becoming a door-greeter, joining a planning committee, etc. With the men I disciple, they're actively making disciples through sharing the Gospel and spiritually parenting the spiritually young. That takes time and work, and if she has to do some extra housework so he can do what God actually put husbands and wives here to do, so be it. If she's sharing the load by discipling other women, great! I just hardly ever see that.

But even in the absence of a disciple-making man, there's still nothing that biblically says, "Thou shalt divide the labor within your family unit equally." If a husband leads the family into an unequal division of labor, he can do

that. That's his prerogative. He will just answer to God for how he led. It's not for the wife to make him answer to her for failure to live up to his expectations.

As a woman, I don't need to be treated as a princess

This is hamstering. You don't *need* it, but you *want* it. Yet when a man tries to give it to you, you will enjoy it, yet seemingly inexplicably find him less attractive. At the end of the day, every woman has the princess fantasy, yet most will pretend to be "realists" by saying they don't have that fantasy. Props to you if you can legitimately break it. But entitlement runs DEEP in modern culture on both sides. Eventually the "I just expect my partner to ... whatever" attitude IS ITSELF part of that entitlement. Once married, the wife doesn't have the right to enforce her expectations over her husband, nor can she biblically use it as grounds to deny sex. [/u/redpillwonder](#) did a [fantastic write-up on this](#) for [r/PCWomen](#), which I recommend reading.

The entitlement is frankly just creepy

Agreed. Nice Guys truly are. And you're right: they're often more manipulative and nasty people than the alphas who are often labeled jerks. This is all covered in NMMNG.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (08/05/20)

3 upvotes · 7 August 2020 · [/r/PCChristians](#)

Guess I'll surrender, right? What does that even mean?

I've long held that this is horrible advice. Would you be surprised if I told you that phrase is never actually in Scripture? It's the same fallacy as "let go and let God." It leads people to passive inaction, assuming God will just take over. It's a cop-out. Don't buy into it.

We aren't meant to **surrender** to God. We're ON THE SAME TEAM!!! We are his soldiers. We fight for him, not surrender to him.

Are you *TRULY* Red Pill?

3 upvotes · 5 August 2020 · [/r/PCChristians](#)

I address much of what you're saying [in this post](#). The short conclusion is that as long as you're living the spiritual reality, you don't have an obligation toward the tangible expression. For anyone already making disciples and evangelizing, you don't *need* to have the roadmap of physical relationships because you're already at the destination.

Should I continue to just wait?

Yes. It would be pretty blue pill to be pursuing relationships you don't care for simply because you feel compelled to be in a relationship.

Where would you categorize me? Would you call me blue pill?

If you're living out of your own frame and it's obvious that the world takes notice, and your lifestyle is prompted by what you know to be true about life, the spiritual world, intergender sexual dynamics, etc. - then you are in the "Christian" and red pill camps, even if you don't pursue long term relationships. For that matter, most secular TRPers push against LTRs in the first place.

If anything I am more like a celibate monk. Is there anything wrong with being a monk?

No. Monk mode is a normal phase for a red pilld man who is still growing and developing into his own frame and mission.

The Origins of the Ekklesia ("Church")

3 upvotes · 2 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

How do we know the teachings of Jesus and the Apostles ?

Through Scripture.

How do we know which of the multiple interpretations out there are correct ?

Through faith. What you're asking, which many others do as well, most likely stems from the atheist disposition toward us. They demand absolute proof. Christians are so used to flailing around trying to give it to them that we have that same mentality within our own framework: *We must pretend that we have absolute proof of what a passage means, or else our whole faith is a sham!*

But that's just the thing: faith doesn't require absolute proof. God judges each according to what we have been given. There is room for disputable issues. The room for disputable issues is far, far greater than most would care to admit because there is massive freedom in Christ. His yoke is easy and his burden is light, yet people expect that his yoke is perfection and his burden is the weight of our failure to live up to it. In reality, the yoke is what bound the oxen together and allowed the driver to steer it - tilling soil by the plow so the seed could be planted.

This is why Paul gave us Romans 14 to address disputable issues:

- 14:14 - Check your heart.
- 14:23 - See if it comes from faith.

I break "comes from faith" down into two components (though there may be more): (1) our faith is expressed through Scripture, thus we have to have a Scriptural basis for our framework of living; and (2) the underlying imperative of our faith is to build God's Kingdom, so if it doesn't contribute to that goal in some way, then it's not a product of faith.

Whatever interpretation you want to go with on any disputable issue, as long as the above is satisfied, it doesn't really matter who's right or wrong. Why do we care if someone pretends they can become sinless before heaven? Why does it matter if someone person insists the spiritual gifts are dead? What's the big deal if the cracker and juice literally transform into Christ's blood or not (or, if you're me: if the entire thing is a sham in the first place)?

Virtually all of these disputable issues are theological technicalities. Yes, they affect the Christian's life. But a cessationist has the same faith as the one who still believes in the gifts - they will just express it in different ways. The one who believes in gifts will say the cessationist is using them without knowing it, by excelling in things like teaching or pastoring or showing generosity, mercy, and hospitality. The one who rejects modern existence of the gifts will say the one who claims to use them is really just acting on his own skills or calling on God's power rather than utilizing their own authority. The result is practically the same, despite the theological framework we use to get there.

Pick any debated concept among the faith that separates the denominations and I'll show you the same result: **IT DOESN'T MATTER.** The practical expression of the one who is faithful on either side of the debate will still be substantially aligned with the image of Christ, despite one having more of an expression of a nose rather than an ear or a hand or a foot. And in this, why get upset that not everyone is mustache hair on the body of Christ? Mustache hair is about as useless to the body as the people who argue over these things without making disciples,

so that's what they might as well be!

How do we sort out weed from wheat ?

The weeds are the non-believers and the wheat are the faithful. This is the only distinction that does substantially matter: those who preach the Gospel of Christ from those who don't. And even this has more room for flexibility than many would be willing to admit.

what proves that your church is right ?

Nothing. First off, don't even call it a church if you claim to agree with my post. It is a congregation. The Ekklesia is not divided into *your* church and *his* church. There is The Church and that's it.

From there, how do we know whether one teaching within Christ's Ekklesia is right or another? We don't. We pick a side consistent with our convictions (Romans 14:14) and live it out according to our faith and desire to be faithful (Romans 14:23), trusting that if our God is sovereign, it's up to him to decide how to judge the path we chose - and more likely than not, he had a hand in our choosing it. And yes, he may cause people to choose different sides on different issues because maybe a hand needs to understand one reality about God while a foot needs to understand another - and while they seem in conflict to us, maybe they're not to God, which is why he left room for both views in the first place.

The Origins of the Ekklesia ("Church")

3 upvotes · 2 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

This requires hours of continuous study on our part and many long conversations with more mature believers.

I don't know that I agree. In [this comment](#) I referenced [/u/1timothy47's](#) post, which goes further in depth on the subject, but essentially runs the conclusion that based on (for his namesake) 1 Timothy 4:7, we have an obligation to train ourselves to be godly. I do believe much of the responsibility for our spiritual growth is on our own heads. We can't sit back and assume we must learn from someone "more godly" when we have direct access to the Scriptures the same as they do. Is it preferred? Of course. But as his post says: having someone more godly in our lives is a luxury, the lack of which is not an excuse for failure to grow into a discipler-maker of our own examination of Scripture with the Spirit.

But you're right - the classic Sunday service context is not the most likely place to find this luxury. It is, however, the best place to find those to whom you can be that luxury in their lives. Take responsibility for your own growth or someone else's, but don't make someone else responsible for you or those who God gave you. That's a reliable framework to operate in.

Episode 10 - No Frame, No Game Part 2

3 upvotes · 30 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

inappropriate and will undoubtedly lead to stumbling for men (and possibly women)

I don't agree - or even if I do, to no greater a degree than Amish boys beating off to pictures of a woman showing her ankles. Look, everyone can be triggered by something. It's not our obligation to remove every possible trigger that anyone could ever be tempted by. If that were the case, we might as well just leave the planet because some women might start masturbating just because they happened to oversee [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) smiling.

To add some clarity on the situation, we actually dealt with this behind the scenes and the original was much,

much worse. The original video actually showed two nude people having sex (from an angle that no private parts were visible). I opposed the clip and was unanimously out-voted that there was no need to change it. I pulled rank and made them take it down anyway. I insisted they find an alternative that still alluded to romantic passion, but otherwise kept the woman clothed and did not involve actually having sex. The scene chosen fulfilled those requirements. If this 1-second clip is really that problematic for a guy, he should already know his tolerance is so low he has no business being in the internet in the first place.

I do like [/u/annaerials](#) comment on what you said, though:

I don't think it's any more intense than commercials on TV, and truly I think any perverse thought is probably quickly snuffed out by 4 burley guys chatting.

And from [/u/thechristianalpha](#):

We shouldn't take it down. We can't placate to everybody. If we compare that tiny clip to song of Solomon then the clip seems tame in comparison. It sounds like those people just haven't read the whole Bible ... When a newbie Christian reads Song of Solomon for the first time... The Bible talks about boobs???

Fun story: I actually pseudo-discipled a guy who used to get paranoid that he could only wear sweat clothes every day, but his boss made him wear jeans, and he was afraid that wearing jeans would make women lust after him.

He also commented that he believed it was universally sinful for women to wear high heels or leggings or yoga pants or jeans or ... pretty much anything other than sweat pants/shirts because a guy could possibly lust after her if she wore anything else.

You remind me of this guy.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (07/29/20)

3 upvotes · 30 July 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

2/2

- 13 The angel sounding his trumpet likely occurred in heaven as a command from the angels to initiate the next phase of God's plan.
- 14 The "four angels who are bound at the great river Euphrates" were Antiochus, Agrippa II, Sohemus and Malchus, who were kings within the Roman empire who helped Titus during the siege by sending him supplies and additional soldiers.
- 14 The "bound at the Euphrates" notion is because two of the kings, Sohemus and Malchus, ruled kingdoms on opposite sides of the Euphrates.
- 15 Titus could have called on their aid sooner for other purposes, but knew he would need their help in this particular siege. They were called for aid in ultimately bringing about the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple with the intent of killing 1/3 of the people. Remember that the Roman army were characterized as locusts/beasts and the Jews in the city were the only humanized ones.
- 16 These 4 kings from v 14 contributed 20,000 men, according to Josephus, which is two myriads (i.e. 10,000 soldiers each myriad). The actual Greek reads clearly: "dismyriades myriadon," which translates literally: *two ten thousands, ten thousands*. Some like to interpret a multiplicative element into this, but it could have been restated for emphasis on the fact of the ten thousands. Alternatively, the concept of a myriad myriads could simply be hyperbolic of an uncountable amount, like when we say "a million bazillion." Jeremiah 46:23 notes

the uncountable nature of an army of locusts.

- 17 The iron in the breastplates could have been manipulated to make these colors, or it could be reflective from the sun/sky. Alternatively, it could be symbolic of the red fire, blue smoke, and sulfur from the destruction within the abyss that would soon consume Jerusalem.
- 17 Just as some horse armor had human faces, others had lion faces.
- 17 Josephus reports that during the wars, including against the Jewish zealots, Rome often used firebrands, which would have accounted for the smoke and sulfur as well. While it's not specifically referenced in the siege with Jerusalem, during the 5 months it's highly improbable that they didn't use the same tactics they were using in other sieges during the war.
- 18 If Rome is referred to as locusts and the Jews as humanity/mankind, the third who died were those held up in Jerusalem at the end of the siege. The firebrands launched into the city likely caused this.
- 18 Josephus estimates that 3 million Jews were trapped in the city. He also estimates that 1.1 million were killed during the siege - which explains John's vision that 1/3 of the people he saw in his vision were killed.
- 19 As above, the mouths were the catapults shooting firebrands and the tails were the spears with a shaft like a serpent (akin to Moses' staff turning into a snake).
- 20 Despite popular beliefs among Christianity that like to glorify the Jews as faithfully devoted to their Scripture, they were actually full of lots of idol worship. The *Midrashic Lamentations* attribute the destruction of the temple both times (first by Babylon and second by Rome) to the Jews turning to idol worship, as reported in this verse. It could also be a reference to the Jews' idolatry of the old covenant and their Scriptures in the wake of Christ's death, refusing to acknowledge the Gospel of Jesus, and the gold, silver, bronze, stone, and wood that were used to construct various aspects of the temple - their ultimate idol.
- 21 Referring to similar corruption among the Jewish people, likely exacerbated in the wake of their entire culture and religious system being destroyed. It wasn't for several years before Rome permitted Jewish councils to meet and have any influence again, creating a very dark time for Judaism after the war.

Hopefully you enjoyed my summary preterist commentary on Revelation 9 ;) Someday I want to create a pseudo-concise summary of all eschatological passages like this, as the websites I see are books upon books of information to examine and it'd be easier to have a quick cheat-sheet like this to reference for simple questions.

Tag: [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) [/u/thechristianalpha](#)

Help. // Porn sucks

3 upvotes · 15 July 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I'm glad you found this helpful. The one thing I'll add:

I'm still convinced it is, just due to his past use

I don't take the "once an addict, always an addict" view. I believe Jesus can fully cure someone from addiction. That doesn't mean the person will never commit that sin ever again. It does mean that the addictive compulsion is completely gone.

For example, I have a friend who was an alcoholic. He'd had multiple DUIs and totaled at least 3 cars due to alcohol abuse. It lasted into his late 30s (so not just a college fad). He came to Christ and prayed over the issue repeatedly. Eventually God led him out of it.

Since then, he notes the compulsion is completely gone. It doesn't matter if he's with friends who are drinking, if he steps in a bar, walks up the alcohol aisle at the grocery store - the compulsion is just not there. He had one or two times since then that he did get drunk, but they were far from "relapses." Rather, they were conscious choices/mistakes and did not restore his compulsion afterward. The next day he was equally free from any addicted compulsion as he was before the incident.

The same thing is true for pornography. I haven't read all your comments here, but from what another user told me, if he's really only using porn once every several months, it gives the impression that the controlling compulsion is gone. Yes, he's still going to get horny every now and then, just like a food addict will experience legitimate hunger distinct from addictive gluttony. And that horniness can lead to sin without becoming addiction, just as it can with other guys who have fallen into the porn trap without addictive impulses.

So be cautious about the "once an addict, always an addict" mentality. This leaves no room for God's transforming power and, instead, attempts to maintain a controlling hold over him, always causing him to have to live against the standard of his past. Thanks God we're not judged by our past in this way by God! How much less should we judge each other on such terms.

Make it easy for your spouse

3 upvotes · 14 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Could you explain further how you arrived at the conclusion that sanctifying our wives is optional?

Simple: I can't control her. Working toward her sanctification is mandatory. The sanctification itself is not. Many women will reject their husbands and continue in sin and defiance regardless of how hard their husbands try. The result is what's optional, not the imperative toward it.

I see how husbands need to get their own relationship with God in order first before bringing up something our wives are struggling with

I brought this up in the two videos we recorded last night on frame, which will be posted in the coming weeks. Suffice it to say that the order of building your frame and utilizing it should go something like:

1. Strengthen your own frame. Learn how to take punishment without it affecting your mood - that you are genuinely happy even while people are trying to bring you down. This is not a "fake it" kind of "prove to them they're not getting to you" thing. It is actual, internal, authentic, heart-felt peace and joy within yourself no matter the circumstances. Think of Acts 16 when Paul and Silas are beaten and thrown into prison, yet the same day they're singing hymns to God in their cell. That's strength of frame. It is not offensive or attacking others' frame - it is just building your own.
2. After that, your next goal is to improve your frame. Make it a place that others want to live. Show how great life can be if people would only come alongside you rather than oppose you. This means having a positive attitude, a work-ethic that makes others envious, a household that others wish they could live in, a faith that others long to have for themselves, etc.
3. Invite others into your frame. The previous part should not include actual invitation - it involves natural, organic lure. Acta non verba. In this final phase, now you're actively telling other people to set their own frame aside and live with you. You're giving them the benefit of all you've done with your own life. When Jesus tells the parable of the shrewd manager, he concludes that we ought to use worldly wealth to win friends for the sake of the Gospel and that this is wise. The manager used his position of power and influence to build a relationship with someone that could help him down the road. Similarly, invite others to benefit from your awesome life so that you may win them over for Christ - and this first of all being your wife.

For example, I would like my wife to do personal devotions by herself again and this seems like something I need to encourage as a loving husband trying to follow Eph 5:25-27. For now, I am just concentrating on first making sure I do my own and have been reading a devotional book with my wife most nights.

I'd stay away from devotional books. For the most part, they're going to reinforce blue pill churchianity. This will do her and your marriage more harm than good. If you do want to do one, do your research. I have recommended one in the past, but admittedly never actually picked it up. Doing so now.

https://www.reddit.com/r/RPChristians/comments/cqld69/warnings_for_a_people_not_listening_to_god/

RPC Podcast Episode 7: The Importance of OYS

3 upvotes · 10 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Agreed. It took a while to record it because we wanted both chuck and dross to be in for that conversation. It's not always easy working with everyone's schedules. Any topics you'd like to see addressed?

What do I need to learn from here since I came from the og TRP?

3 upvotes · 21 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

the whataboutism of not choosing a bad pastor is a bit broad and a bit unnecessary

I wasn't addressing the topic of choosing a pastor. I was noting the reality that many people here are in congregations with weak pastors who enforce blue pill ideologies on the men in their congregations. This is the large majority of congregations today. For many people, finding a congregation with a "good pastor" is simply not even an option - either because the options are so limited or because they're in an urban area where everyone is so liberal and feminized that only bad options abound. My point wasn't about picking a good pastor; it was about the implication in your comment that people should be serving their congregation in its own context rather than sanctifying and transforming it for Christ by discipling others within the congregation (the only effective way to accomplish the task).

"sanctify the present moment" is a phrase used by my counselor

That's fair. Just make sure the advice you're taking to heart is primarily grounded in Scripture and not just something that sounds Christian-y. While it's certainly not unbiblical, if it's not a concept taught in Scripture, "not unbiblical" can often be a distraction from the "biblical."

Some of us are poor evangelizers. I always have been. Explaining and defending the Faith is not my strongest suit.

Making disciples is not about evangelizing (which precedes discipleship) or "explaining and defending the faith." It is about spiritually parenting those who are spiritually younger than us. Do you have kids or want kids? The processes of raising children and discipling someone are virtually identical.

Now, if you don't have kids, it's easy to say, "I'm not ready to have kids either." Many people say this. But the reality is that "you'll never be ready," as many often reply - and rightfully so. Yet when you do have kids, you figure it out. How? Because you had a parent to learn from - in both what they did right and what they did wrong, and also because you have peers to help you, and because you have a brain that learns as you experiment and try new things. When it comes to discipleship, Jesus gave us a perfect model so that no one can say, "I don't know how." All you have to do is look to how Jesus discipled his 12 - and especially Peter, James, and John - and you will have the perfect model ready to go so you have even less work figuring out how to parent a spiritual child than you would parenting a physical child.

Romans 12:4-11 explains that there are different types of service

Well, it really talks about different gifts, but I don't want to push that point. In passages like this, I stand by my comment above: these are all the different contexts in which we make disciples. I fully embrace that your context for discipling people will be different from mine. You're going to meet different types of people with different interests, different skill sets, and different things to contribute to God's Kingdom. That doesn't excuse the mission to make disciples. It only alters the pool of people you'll disciple and some of the topics that you'll address while discipling them.

I also get the impression that Catholic Christians aren't welcome here.

They're certainly welcome here. I've had plenty of conversations with Catholics. I will note, though, that there's a large number of Protestants who despise Catholicism and this place encourages men to be vocal about their passions, which leads to misplaced vocalism on things like Catholic-bashing. It's not super-common, but it does happen from time to time. Just note whether it's coming from a rando or a mod/EC and that will say a lot.

That said, what's not welcome is a "well, that's what my parish teaches, so I'm going to believe it regardless of whatever you say the Bible actually says" attitude. I'm not saying this is your attitude, but it is the attitude I have seen from a few of the Catholics who have come this way.

I hold to the totem pole of knowledge hierarchy:

- Philosophy is on the bottom, which seeks to solve problems and answer questions through the use of logic and reason. It tells us what *should* be true if the universe is logical.
- Science is in the middle, above philosophy, which seeks to solve problems and answer questions through the use of observation and experimentation. It tells us what is *observably* true.
- Theology is on the top, above both of these, which seeks to ascertain truth through the use and application of divine revelation, which is primarily from Scripture. It tells us what is actually true.

So, if a statement like "sanctify the present moment" comes up, I have to ask where on the totem pole it comes from and whether it's something we want to be teaching others. The phrase doesn't appear in Scripture, so one would have to make a Scriptural case for the concept - which might be doable, and if that's the case then do it. Otherwise, it seems to lack any observation and testing with regard to its usefulness, making it a personal philosophy, which is the lowest form of insight and often changes from person to person.

For example, one person's philosophy on finding a date may be: "Opposite attract," so he looks for a woman who is different from himself. Another says, "No, birds of a feather flock together," and then looks for someone the same as him. Another's philosophy is to reject both and ignore similarities/differences as a viable rubric. None are correct and forcing one method on another might actually lead someone to emphasize things that would make it less likely that he find a woman who meets his own standards and preferences. So, sharing your own philosophy may be fine in some cases, but distracting and unhelpful in others.

But where it becomes dangerous is when a personal philosophy is couched in words that make it look like a theological conclusion. Then people start falling for all kinds of cult-like teachings, as that's how most cults begin. A charismatic leader develops his own vision for life apart from Scripture, but words it in a way that makes everyone believe it's a godly, biblical, spiritually compelling thing to do. That's scary!

Anyway, I'm rambling at this point. I hold no ill-will against you. I'm just putting out an explanation for why the "sanctify the present moment" phrase struck me the wrong way. The real thrust of my original comment was because you encouraged him to develop his mission, but seemed to leave "make disciples" out of it, which is, at best, incomplete advice, and, at worst, harmful and destructive. That's the part I'd really want you to process

further.

What do I need to learn from here since I came from the og TRP?

3 upvotes · 20 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I'm glad you honed in on this phrase, as it's crucial. But let me challenge things in a slightly different direction. Jesus is clear that all believers are to "make disciples of all nations." The ministry you serve in is not a fulfillment of your obligation to Christ; it's your fulfillment of your obligation to your congregation. And if you're committed to your congregation, then you should appreciate and value that obligation. But it shouldn't trump what Jesus has asked of you, me, OP, and everyone else: to make disciples.

If you'd like to think of it this way, Jesus is the groom and the people known as the Church are collectively Jesus's singular spouse. Our congregations are the temporary home Jesus has given us until our permanent place has been established. Serving your congregation has great value. But is the bride's obligation to take care of the house or to carry out what her husband asks of her? Often-times the two overlap. Jesus has asked us to build up the Church - and this is a good thing (though I'd wager he means more in terms of building up the people rather than making the programs run more cohesively). But even more important than any of the "extra" things we do to serve our congregations is the singular mission to make disciples, which is Jesus's top priority for us and the mission congregations are failing to carry out, making it all the more essential to take on the responsibility at a grass-roots level.

I love this quote by Dawson Trotman - my favorite preacher/speaker:

If I were the minister of a church and had deacons or elders to pass the plate and choir members to sing, I would say, 'thank God for your help. We need you. Praise the Lord for these extra things that you do,' but I would keep pressing home the big job—"Be fruitful and multiply." All these other things are incidental to the supreme task of winning a man or woman to Jesus Christ and then helping him or her to go on.

At times, I try to be a bit more generous. I try to give people an opportunity to use their preferred area of "ministry" as a context for making disciples. So, if your area of "ministry" is to handle the protection detail at your congregation, that's great. Disciple those who are protecting the congregation alongside you. Let that be your context. But don't let it be a replacement for the big job.

On the other hand, what if someone reads your comment and decides he's going to join or start up a protection team in his congregation, and he ends up protecting a pastor who's leading people astray with all kinds of blue pill nonsense or even prosperity preaching or other atrocities that are actually doing more harm than good? Do you get a free pass because you're "serving the church"? Of course not. That's no different than being a Nazi and claiming, "I was just trying to help my authorities and I thought they were doing right. I was ignorant of all the harm we were causing." That's not to say your congregation is such a place, but this advice could lead to some people taking a self-satisfied attitude toward activities that actually support what's harming God's Kingdom! Yikes!!

Anyway, I know you mean well, but I challenge you to stay biblical with your focus. "sanctify the present moment" sounds super spiritual, but I'm not aware of that phrase in Scripture anywhere, so where did it come from? Most likely a sermon or book where some guy wanted to sound holy by making up a phrase people could quote him over. I recommend sticking to Scripture. When we do that, the answer becomes clear that our mission/calling/whatever you want to call it is to make disciples. Everything else is just context.

I hope this helps, brother.

RPC Chat - Episode 4: Christian Dead Bedrooms

3 upvotes · 18 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Matthew 7:12

I assume you mean, "Would you want your wife to use dread on you?" To that, I would love nothing more than for my wife to become more attractive to me and others :D

For the rest, I'm not sure how you're trying to connect these concepts to dread. At best, you might be arguing that dread is somehow in conflict with loving your wife. I get the impression you don't understand dread.

- Level 1: "Learn to recognize and start passing fitness tests" (i.e. not be a pushover to your wife). You can't love her if you can't lead her because God designed husbands to lead their wives as their expression of love. If a guy is letting his wife boss him around, that's the opposite of loving her.
- Level 2: "Develop an action plan to improve the major areas of your life. Develop the physical, spiritual, psychological, financial and personal areas of your life." Are you suggesting that improving yourself is unloving to a wife?
- Level 3: "Begin to build a life apart from your wife. Join a club. Take up a cause, discipline, or calling. Get busy." Is it unloving to have friends and hobbies outside the home?
- Level 4: "Begin conditioning your availability to your wife with her treatment of you. You are busy now. You don't have time for a sexually disinterested, annoying, or angry wife." This is nothing more than God did to Israel or Jesus to his people. Isaiah 59:2 comes to mind - "But your iniquities have separated you from your God; your sins have hidden his face from you so that he will not hear." There are also numerous passages about God turning away from those who behave poorly toward him. Are we to suggest it's unloving to create and enforce boundaries when people cross them and that the only loving thing to do is be kind all the time no matter how bad someone treats you? Obviously not.
- Level 5: "Upgrade your clothes and start dressing 'up' more of the time." Nothing unloving about dressing nicer.
- Level 6: "Begin to study pickup artistry. Before you do anything stupid, use your newfound knowledge about the stages of seduction and pickup artistry on your wife." So now it's unloving to try to attract your wife?

Most men never need to employ dread beyond these levels. But I could add to this list even for higher levels. But it's worth emphasizing that the levels of dread are things you increase only until you get the results you want in regard to the improved relationship you have with your wife.

Dread Level 10, for example, is where you have the "have sex with me or I'm gone" conversation with your wife. One would have to be an idiot to assume that all men should aspire to have this conversation with their wives, or that it's a constant state of life to have this conversation daily. Obviously the proper interpretation is that once you get the result you want, you back down and hover where you need to in order to maintain the results you're looking for.

It also seems like you assume the point of "dread" is to make your wife jealous. This is total lunacy that most new guys simply don't understand. That attitude will backfire EVERY. SINGLE. TIME. The goal isn't to make her jealous; it's to show her that you're attractive - first by actually becoming attractive, and then, if necessary, by utilizing post-marital preselection to your advantage in the way she sees other people acknowledging your attractiveness to help her acknowledge it as well.

[/u/Deep_Strength](#)

Are women really "saved through child-bearing"? Yes.

3 upvotes · 18 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I have no clue where you got that from.

RPC Video Chat

3 upvotes · 17 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

[u/r_horizon](#) has taken point on this for now. I'd suggest contacting him to see if there are ways you can help out so he doesn't, in time, run the risk of burning out on it.

Are women really "saved through child-bearing"? Yes.

3 upvotes · 17 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Right. I agree with everything except your last paragraph. It's true at times for some people, but not necessarily universally.

It's more accurate to say that perfect human marriage as God designed with completely parallel our relationship with Christ, even in the face of humanity's individual sinfulness.

Explaining the Double Standards around Sex

3 upvotes · 15 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

That's what lube is for. And I agree - men have some pretty awful attributes too. It's not just women. The difference is that men are held accountable for these openly and everyday.

Explaining the Double Standards around Sex

3 upvotes · 14 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I think you're missing the point of what I was saying. These normally annoying or disgusting chores can become actually enjoyable with the right attitude going in. It's not "close your eyes and think of England" or "putting up with it." I legit enjoy doing the dishes or changing diapers at times when I'm in the right frame. I don't enjoy it because I magically convince myself that dirty diapers or dishes somehow became anything other than disgusting, but because I know how to amuse myself while shopping things I wouldn't normally care to do.

But perhaps this is part of the solipsism of women that they'd be incapable of this.

Regardless, to your point, yes, a guy will certainly feel like that's a buzz kill, but it's still better than the alternatives. While it's an awful practice, the fact that date rape drugs exist in the first place is pretty clear evidence that some guys, at least, are cool with sex even with a completely disinterested woman.

Actual conversations with "abuse" victims.

3 upvotes · 12 June 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

In most cases I've referenced, there's no evidence the person felt coerced at the time. It was regret after the fact, once divorce proceedings started, that caused them to recharacterize everything. Stop trying to white knight by pretending these cases are more credible than they are. I'm not taking these from some random third party. These are from my own cases that have mostly been tested in court.

Actual conversations with "abuse" victims.

3 upvotes · 11 June 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

This is true in most states. My mom did that to my dad. There's also an attorney I know who charges \$1,000 just for an initial consult because he's so unethical that everyone wants to rule him out for the opposition while not hiring him themselves either. As a result, he earns \$250,000 a year on initial consults alone, 90% of these people

never hiring him.

The strategy does backfire occasionally because if you get caught doing that the judges will consider it a sign of bad faith and dishonest tactics and will hold that against you when assessing your credibility as a witness later on.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (06/10/20)

3 upvotes · 10 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

have you guys thought about doing a livestream on YT?

Absolutely. I read at one point that you have to have 1k+ subscribers to qualify to do those. So, until we have that, it's not an option. We do intend to start having guest speakers come on fairly soon. I have some other fun ideas in the works.

Need some dating advice...

3 upvotes · 10 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

This is a weird conversation. The answer should be quite obvious here: *Decreasing abundance doesn't increase abundance mentality*. Dumping a girl won't actually increase abundance or abundance mentality; it is a byproduct of what someone who already has an abundance mentality is willing to do if a woman turns out not to be a good candidate.

Abundance mentality comes from a variety of other factors:

- A shotgun, rather than sniper approach
- Becoming the prize and knowing it
- Receiving IOIs

Basically, anything that persuades you that more girls are into you will increase your abundance mentality and anything that actually causes more girls to be into you will increase your abundance. While the two are correlated, they are not identical.

Decreasing the number of girls interested in you might make you feel good about yourself, but it is only an expression of an abundance mentality. At best, it vindicates a man's feelings of abundance IF AND ONLY IF he already has someone else lined up to take the old girl's place. But I don't see a ground for it increasing abundance.

All that being said, I don't agree with DeChef in his view that the only reason to dump a girl is because you don't expect it to lead to marriage - especially if your views toward marriage aren't necessarily oriented properly.

I believe I've told one of my stories on here that addresses one such example. Extremely shortened version, limiting it just to the relevant parts:

- I was interested in a hot girl in college, got lots of IOIs back; we started informally dating
- Guy I was discipling became interested in same girl
- Even though I had every reason to believe I would marry this girl, I let her go anyway, placing my investment in him as a disciple over my prospect in her as a wife.
- They're now married and probably making as many or more disciples than I am, being full-time staff with a campus ministry and even heading up the national "sexual health" division of the Navigators.

In the end, he is singularly the most fruitful disciple I have ever made. Hands down. I have never regretted the

choice for a minute. But it was a great example of turning down a girl who I did believe was marriage material - for the sake of my mission (allusion to /u/johnmic07's comment there).

RPCC Episode 3: The State of Marriage

3 upvotes · 9 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Fast talking isn't generally a problem. Most people's brains can process at 500 words per minute, whereas the average person talks at about 150 words per minute. I've read research studies that show people remember more from people who speak faster than slower, theorizing that they are filling the extra brain capacity, leaving less room for distraction and engaging the listener.

Actual conversations with "abuse" victims.

3 upvotes · 7 June 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

WISNIFG Bill of Assertive Rights #4 - "You have the right to change your mind."

Society thinks that once you make a statement, you're locked into that statement for the rest of your life. Changing your mind isn't an option. Do you know how many political leaders could have gotten out of a jam if they'd simply said, "Yeah, I did say that back then. I changed my mind because I'm smarter now." Done.

My wife used to pull this crap on me. "But you said ... !" "So? I changed my mind." Done. No need to try to rationalize a reconciliation between your past statements/conduct with your current decisions.

Actual Conversations With "Abuse" Victims

3 upvotes · 5 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I actually had 7.

[60DOD] Week 8, Social Life [MRP]

3 upvotes · 5 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Intentionally leading someone on, sure. Per Romans 14, you can't biblically and rationally do that in a place coming from faith. But as long as you're acting in faith, you can't take personal responsibility for how others decide to feel about you. Too many guys feel like they owe an obligation toward other people on stuff like this. I'd lump it in the category of things churchianity teaches that aren't actually in Scripture anywhere, except for indirect connections that are never applied consistently on other topics the same way.

RPC Video Chat

3 upvotes · 4 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Good idea. I'm really going to look into having someone else be responsible for video processing and uploading. Personally, I simply don't have the time and capacity to keep doing that every week. But I'll keep this in mind for whoever takes over. And if nobody takes over, I'm not sure exactly how long we'll keep this up! You'll notice very fast that video editing is not my strong suit.

But I'm definitely encouraged that a few more conversations in, Dross decided to turn his video on and OZ put up a picture of himself, so there's at least some better user recognition there.

What are your views on prenups with Christianity?

3 upvotes · 2 June 2020 · /r/askRPC

From a secular viewpoint that prioritizes feelings over godliness, what you're saying makes perfect sense.

How should Christian men seeking to marry respond to women guilty of fornication claiming

that males using porn is the same thing?

3 upvotes · 1 June 2020 · /r/askRPC

Matthew 5:28 says a man is guilty of adultery in his heart if he lusts inappropriately. It DOESN'T say that all the other negative impacts of fornication are also imputed to him. So, watching porn and riding the CC are like apples and oranges. They're simply not the same and should not be placed on the same level.

Now, if a girl actually researches the effects of pornography and fornication and how they are distinct from one another, and concludes, "I've slept around, so I'll take a guy who sleeps around, but not one who watches porn," then go for it. But to equate porn with actual fornication is not appropriate.

Response to "Why Men Hate Going to Church"

3 upvotes · 26 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

You're seriously going to mince words on that? "He used a dog as a metaphor to represent a woman." That better?

Who should you listen to on RPChristians?

3 upvotes · 20 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Haha. I'll think on it, but I don't want to encourage too much fundamentalism. If liberal theology is one extreme, fundamentalism is the other. The truth is much closer to fundamentalism, but fundamentalists generally have very, very wrong interpretations about the way the OT is to be understood and applied, which is made clear by the NT quite directly.

Who should you listen to on RPChristians?

3 upvotes · 20 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I've thought about giving you a "hardcore fundamentalist" flair from time to time. Not sure if that would work for you or against you, so I've refrained.

Discovered an inappropriate relationship

3 upvotes · 12 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

You're missing the point. I didn't say it was a good idea. I'm simply challenging your contention that *feeeeeeeeling* a certain way toward someone is somehow sinful. That's the same logic that makes guys constantly beat their heads over a wall every time they get a hard-on.

How is one to navigate as a biblical masculine man in a female-dominated workspace

3 upvotes · 4 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

For discipleship specifically, *The Lost Art of Discipleship*, by LeRoy Eims (referenced on the sidebar) and my book (also referenced on the sidebar) are the two I point people toward up-front. There are many other good ones, but those are great primers. The others out there tend to be tangential and less on-topic, or they muddle their definition of discipleship to veer away from what Jesus actually did.

Roosh V on Jessie Lee Peterson

3 upvotes · 4 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Yes

Is working out THAT important to find a potential spouse.

3 upvotes · 1 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Lots of comments here - but no one has hit on this yet. Look at the arena you're working with.

- Adam is obese. He's a 1/10. Let's say his entire immediate social network of people he might brush shoulders with involves 10,000 women in a given year. Maybe he has 100 women who would give him the time of day ... out of ten thousand. He doesn't know which those 100 are. Good luck, Adam.
- Bob has a male-model body with chiseled abs. He's a 9.5/10 - not just physically, but on the whole in how women evaluate him. In his 10k network, 9,500 women would gladly give him the time of day, many of them begging for it. He doesn't have to figure out who they are because he can pick pretty much anyone and statistics are on his side ... even plenty of the married ones.
- Carl is no male-model, but he has visible abs and his shirts form-fit around his pecs and biceps. He's an 8/10. He maintains an average routine at the gym. In his 10k network, 6,000 women would gladly give him the time of day, many of them begging for it. He may face some rejection, but it won't be hard at all to figure out which women are interested and which aren't.
- Dave is identical to Carl in every way.

Now, all 3 men want a high-quality woman who would be a good helper. All three recognize that she doesn't have to be perfect, but does have to be willing to follow his lead, not have any serious psychological issues, and it would be better the more spiritually mature she is. Very basic criteria, right?

Which man do you think is going to have the easiest time finding such a woman? Which one is most likely to find a girl extremely well-suited to his goals and who checks all the boxes and is ultimately teachable and malleable enough to grow in the direction he guides her?

Now ... everyone agrees that'd be Bob, right? But then consider the 4+ hours a day, 7 days a week Bob has to spend at the gym compared to Carl, who only has time for 90 minutes 4 times a week. Is the probability increase between Bob and Carl worth the added effort?

Now ... go one step further: Bob and Carl are both married. They both have fantastic wives who are attractive. They both managed to marry a solid 9. In fact, they're identical twin sisters. Good for you, Bob and Carl. Adam is dating a 3, but she's not too sure about him.

Carl's SMV is lower than his wife's and she knows it. She sees Bob around the corner and thinks, "Why couldn't I have married him instead? I'm every bit as pretty and competent as my sister." So, she loses sexual attraction for Carl. They still have regular sex, but it's not great and he can sense the lack of enthusiasm in her. Why did you marry up, Carl? Didn't you know this is how hypergamy would play out? So, Carl discovers the red pill and realizes that the SMV dynamic in his marriage is out of balance. He has a choice to make: (a) put up with his mediocre sex life because his wife is great in other areas, (b) leave his wife to find a better unicorn, or (c) put in the extra hours improving himself that Bob did and get the sex life he wants with his wife and hope she actually responds as he expects (which is, admittedly, probable, but far from a guarantee).

Dave married a 7. His bedroom is thriving, and he's got all the other non-sexual perks in his wife that Bob and Carl have as well. Sure, his wife may not be as "hot," but he doesn't have to deal with **the challenges of having a hot wife** either. As he leads the way, she's inspired by his continued growth and improvement, and even though it doesn't necessarily change his overarching SMV, she feels some pressure to keep up and ultimately grows from a 7 to a 7.5 ... and possibly more. He's a pretty happy guy.

Tag: [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) - props for the way old post, but it's one I'd never forgotten.

Is working out THAT important to find a potential spouse.

3 upvotes · 1 May 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I'll ditto all of this, but especially emphasize your first point, as it's pure gold - and a concept that I haven't iterated on here in a long while. You just need to change one word:

It may be possible for you to be fat and still ~~attract~~ *persuade* a good looking Christian woman with beta game.

She's not attracted. It's an intellectual game at that point. As others have said and is commonly known: women are told to marry for spiritual maturity, not looks. They aren't attracted to such guys, but beta game can intellectually convince a woman that a particular unattractive guy meets the qualifications the girl's pastor told her to seek.

About to file for divorce

3 upvotes · 29 April 2020 · /r/askMRP

Just seeing this. You're correct here - Jesus was internally validated, not externally. He did not pine over whether or not some guy would follow him. He had abundance, knowing if he kept doing his thing, people would join him. He even commented at one point that if nobody else would do it, "the rocks would cry out." Yeah, he did specifically call people to follow him, and that's fine too. But the imperative was not merely to "go spread the word." It was to "make disciples." In short, he's saying, "The way you just saw me live my life with you, go make that your way of life too."

It is churchianity that has screwed this up and re-interpreted the phrase "make disciples" out of its obvious meaning and replaced it with "tell everyone what you believe and make them believe it."

In practice, Jesus' model looks a lot more like what /u/HornsOfApathy did [in the post I referenced here](#) than the whole "stand on a street corner and shove the Bible down everyone's throats" garbage. Some principles I see in his post:

- He was just doing what he wanted to do and another guy wanted what he had.
- He enjoyed teaching the guy and it enhanced his own life and sense of fulfillment seeing his frame project into this kid.
- Watching the results of his efforts gave him an internal sense of satisfaction - enough to write a post about it - but with the obvious flip: if the kid hadn't followed, there's no indication he would have been butthurt about it.

I usually enjoy what Horns writes, but I haven't followed him closely enough to know if he has kids. Kids are literally a physical piece of yourself externalized into the world. I love the idea of projecting myself into the world - not because someone told me to, but because it's fun creating a kingdom for myself - even as I am part of my father's kingdom, as he was of his father's. That's how patriarchy works.

But the reality is that I don't want any more than the 4 physical little goblins running around my house that I already have. So, instead of projecting my physical self, I make spiritual children - and not in the "shout it from the mountaintops" method, but with the "I'm awesome, anyone who wants to come along is welcome" approach that Horns took. Wouldn't it be great if this approach led to so many people wanted to follow that we literally had to pick and choose which ones get to learn from us and which ones have to play second-fiddle? That's what Jesus had when he went on the mountainside and called his 12.

Tag: /u/coachdad8 - I appreciate your zeal, but in this case it seems to have been misplaced. There are good things being said on both sides. What happened to "take what works and leave the rest"? I'm not sure why anyone needs to start insulting and measuring dicks this way. It just comes off as a loss of frame ... unless it's funny. I'm always up for a good laugh.

Are there some worship songs you enjoy?

3 upvotes · 28 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

[u/ChadDownUnder](#) hooked me on Keith Green for a while. Yeah, he's old, but check some of these lyrics:

Well, you speak of grace and my love so sweet
How you thrive on milk, but reject my meat.
And I can't help weeping at how it will be
If you keep on ignoring my words.
Well, you pray to prosper and succeed
But your flesh is something I just can't feed ...
I want hearts of fire, not your prayers of ice.
And I'm coming quickly to give back to you
According to what you have done.
(To Obey is Better Than Sacrifice)

The world has gone crazy but soon maybe
A lot more are gonna know
For maybe they don't understand it
Or maybe they just haven't heard it
Or maybe we're not doin' all we can
Living up to His Holy Word
'Cause phonies have come and wrong's been done
Even killing in Jesus' name
And if you've been burned, here's what I've learned
The Lord's not the one to blame
(How Can They Live Without Jesus?)

His plan of battle, you know it
He fooled them all
They led him off to prison to die
But as He entered Hades Hall
He broke those hellish chains with a cry
Just listen to those demons screaming
See Him bruise the serpent's head
The prisoners of hell He's redeeming, oh!
All the power of death is dead
(The Victor)

Do you see? Do you see?
All the people sinking down?
Don't you care? Don't you care?
Are you gonna let them drown?
How can you be so numb?
Not to care if they come!
You close your eyes and pretend the job's done ...
Oh, can't you see it's such sin?
'Cause he brings people to your door
And you turn them away
As you smile and say:
"God bless you, be at peace!"
And all Heaven just weeps
'Cause Jesus came to your door
You've left Him out on the streets
(Asleep in the Light)

I've been out fighting the war today
The war inside of my head
I thought that I killed my enemy
Yes, I thought that my ego was dead
But it's still stubbornly living
In the kingdom of my thoughts
In the state - in the state of mind
I've been out struggling with everyone
In the arena all day
Views I defend, they don't matter much
Because they would debate either way
Where's the root of my problem?
Why does everyone oppose every side - every side that I take?
(War Games)

Jesus commands us to go

But we go the other way
So he carries the burden alone
While his children are busy at play
Feeling so called to stay ...
Jesus commands us to go
It should be the exception if we stay
It's no wonder we're moving so slow
When his church refuses to obey
Feeling so called to stay
(*Jesus Commands Us to Go*)

Oh Lord, there's just so much to be done
Oh Lord, so many souls to be won
Oh Lord, this world is falling apart
Dying for love from a broken heart
Here am I, send me
Though there's really not that much I can do
What I have seems so small
But I want to give it all to you
Oh Lord, you said the harvest was great
But Lord, looks like the workers are late
It's getting hard to understand
How they ignore your great command
Here am I, send me
(*Here Am I, Send Me*)

You're just not going to find Christian music like this in congregations anymore.

Teacher reflections on behaviour management

3 upvotes · 27 April 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

If I were writing to a group of trained psychologists, then yes, I would have worded this differently. The same behaviors can be classified as either punishment or negative reinforcement, depending on the context of how they're being used. I don't think that distinction is particularly relevant here, as parenting involves both getting kids to stop bad behaviors and start good behaviors.

The long-term study I referenced was focused primarily on looking at the overall success of children who were raised with different types of positive/negative treatment in the home. It did not specify any distinction in the

adult subject as to whether they were averse to bad behaviors and/or prone to good. Nobody look at a person in those terms. We look at the whole of a person, recognizing that, to some degree, everyone is going to have some balance of unproductive and productive behaviors.

If you want to run a long-term test to determine whether "punishment without negative reinforcement" or "negative reinforcement without punishment" or neither/both changes the outcome, let me know when you're done. I'd be interested at the results. Until then, I'm working with what I know.

If it makes a difference, most academics actually split "punishment"/"reinforcement" frameworks into two separate categories: utilitarian and retributive.

Utilitarian

You're speaking from a utilitarian perspective, viewing the nature of the action purely in the context of manipulating an end result with an individual person. Utilitarian views are generally extremely flexible and do not require the maintenance of strong boundaries because the response to someone's actions should be tailored to what will produce the intended result with the individual. Often times this means ignoring one's own boundaries when enforcing them would serve no purpose, or offering different degrees of positive/negative response that may seem disproportionate to the established system of boundary enforcement because the unique situation implies that such exaggerated/diminished response is more likely to cause the other person to modify their behaviors the way you want them to.

- Example 1: I set a boundary that any kid who isn't in bed in 5 minutes will lose TV the next day. My 4, 6, and 8 year old are all in bed in 5 minutes. My 2 year old, while understanding me, was not in bed. A utilitarian will excuse the child because, while understanding the action/consequence dynamic, she doesn't have the capacity to connect it to her own behaviors or future consequence. So, taking away TV tomorrow would serve no purpose *for her* because she won't remember or understand why it was taken away. Therefore, the boundary should not be enforced. Instead, the utilitarian might employ some other measure that *will* have the impact of teaching the child to go to bed when she's supposed to, like a spanking *in the moment*.

Because the goal for the utilitarian is to conform an individual's behaviors, many people who operate within a utilitarian framework are less interested in actually punishing anyone and more interested in "talking it out" with the expectation that doing so will help them understand and make wiser decisions in the future.

Examples of utilitarianism in the modern legal context: (1) Giving women a pussy pass for prostitution, as Canada does, on the view that they're just trying to survive and therefore their violation of the law is forgivable and punishing them wouldn't actually help them become better people, while still incarcerating the men who pay them. (2) Sentencing violent aggressors to anger management rather than jail time, on the theory that they will become better citizens and incarceration won't be a motivator. (3) Letting juveniles have a clear record once they turn 18 (except for some types of offenses) in the hope that having a clean slate will assist them in becoming successful adults without their negative past to hold them back. (4) The sentencing gap between crack/powder cocaine, crack being punished over 10x more harshly, even though there is negligible difference between the substances; the rationale being that the crack cocaine community has massively higher statistical rates of gun violence, murder, money laundering, etc. that wants to be targeted through more severe sentencing, especially when they can't catch criminals in the crack cocaine industry on those other charges.

Retributive

Retributive models operate on a dual system of direct and indirect goals. The direct goal is to create and enforce an operative framework for its own sake. "This is how I want things, so this is how it will be." Anyone who violates the framework is punished not because you want them to be better or improve, but because you said you would, so you will. Another way to say it is that within your authoritative framework they *DESERVE* to be

punished. It doesn't matter that the punishment won't actually help conform the person's behaviors because there are larger issues that can be compromised if we start adjusting the boundaries for each individual person or situation.

- Example: In the example above, the 2 year old would lose TV the following day instead of getting a spanking in the moment. Why? Because that's what you said the response would be, so you follow through with what you said. It doesn't matter that the child doesn't understand, and therefore can't learn from the punishment. It does matter that the other kids will see that you're consistent in holding your boundaries, and eventually the younger child will learn that too.

Where utilitarian models focus on conforming an individual to the authority's expectations, the retributive models focus on conforming the community by using the individual as an example to others and establishing such clear consistency in the authority's own operation that (1) there becomes no point testing the authority's boundaries because the result is always the same, (2) the authority doesn't have to spend so much time coming up with uniquely tailored responses to others' actions because anyone in the system already knows what the response will be.

Examples of retributivism in the modern legal context: (1) The establishment and mandated enforcement of sentencing guidelines in most states for virtually every type of offense. (2) Parking/traffic tickets, littering fines, and other "per se" violations of law. (3) No tolerance policies on issues of (proven/admitted) domestic violence or gun-related crimes or school bullying, which policies often mandate the way the sentencing guidelines are applied. (4) Certain types of judicial discretion, such as one judge ALWAYS giving the maximum possible sentence for certain types of crimes he finds particularly distasteful.

Balancing

Neither is perfect in itself. Most people balance these, though I certainly lean more retributive. On the whole, the retributive model is better for a family unit (rather than any one individual child) and establishes a clearer and stronger frame for the head of the household (me). Of course, the draw-back of the retributive model is that some people are willing to accept the consequences to get the benefit of the action. Celebrities don't care if they get a parking ticket because the clear and foreknown enforcement of a \$25 fine means very little to them. My son has told me on occasion, "Okay, I'd rather lose TV tomorrow than do what you're telling me to do today." At that point, my boundary HAS to adjust to some degree in order to maintain its strength/integrity, so I'm going to up the consequence of violating it.

Similarly utilitarianism risks manipulation. Subjects ultimately believe that if they jump through enough hoops that the authority gives them, proving that they've been rehabilitated, then the authority will get off their back and they can go back to doing what they wanted to in the first place. It ultimately diminishes respect for the authority, who is seen as soft, and often does not produce lasting effects in the long-term.

The Point

Back to reinforcement/punishment - all of these models leave room for rewarding good behavior. Nobody is saying that's a bad thing. But it's also somewhat infuriating when criminals get government stimulus checks to help them get back on their feet, ultimately subsidizing many of them in their return to bad drug habits, or to live off the government as long as possible before even looking for a way to support themselves. This is rewarding bad behavior, hoping that the "positive reinforcement" toward a productive lifestyle will result in positive changes. It doesn't. Rather, more people are motivated by the mentality: "I just got out of prison. I'm not going back!" Yes, some people don't care because it's become a way of life for them. But again: it's not just about that person. It's about showing other people who DO care that the boundary will be enforced, so they'd better stay in line too.

To that end, one would have to be a fool to take a purely "positive reinforcement" approach, to the exclusion of negative reinforcement or even punishment. If you want to splice hairs over negative reinforcement/punishment

with your own kids, go for it - but make sure that when you do so you're thinking of it from a broader framework of balancing utilitarian goals with retributive consistency.

From there, I don't care so much about the distinction between, "If you color on the wall, you get spanked" and "If you don't clean the wall when I told you to, you get spanked." But I'm not going to reward someone for not coloring on the wall - there's no room for positive reinforcement for people to do the minimum that's expected of them anyway. Yet if they clean the wall, even when I don't ask, then I'll certainly reward that good behavior. Or if they're consistently obeying me when I ask, without complaining, that deserves a reward.

Any Christian women who participate here that this idea appeals to, I would love to hear your advice!

3 upvotes · 26 April 2020 · /r/RedPillWomen

One would think. The majority of church culture in most first world countries shows a much wider chasm between biblical views on marriage and relationships and what is actually taught by the mainstream church, which has predominantly caved to cultural appeasement and political correctness.

Dalrock used to write on this a lot. We also address this on [r/RPChristians](#), of course.

Can you SEE it?

3 upvotes · 22 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I was in the same spot, brother. I understand the frustration. My wife was 100% on board with making disciples when we married. After we married she admitted she lied and really didn't care about that - she was just saying it to get me to marry her. I spent 7-8 years in obese beta bux land, having relatively little hope before figuring myself out. She's turned the corner. You present a strong lead and the chances she'll follow go way up. And if not, you'll be more effective at carrying out your mission anyway - so win, win.

Find Something to Lift around the House

3 upvotes · 20 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

No one had a problem because not as many people here are as sensitive and judgmental as you seem to be. That's okay. I encourage you to stick with it and strengthen your emotional stability. This seems a better option than running away from views that rub you the wrong way. Try to understand how others think rather than hating on them for not thinking like you. Even if you still end up disagreeing with them, you'll be far more capable of loving them. No need to be so bitter over a silly internet conversation.

Find Something to Lift around the House

3 upvotes · 20 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Just noticed your user name. This conversation makes a lot more sense now.

Bottom line: you have this rainbows and butterflies view of Jesus that churchianity has shoved down your throat for as long as you've been attending services. I get it. We all came from there at one point. If you read the bible with a mind to challenge whether what you were taught was actually true (as the Bereans did in Acts 17) you're going to find a lot of inconsistencies and that most "pastors" don't know as much as they pretend. As much as you think OP's comment was sin, many of us would view your position as sinful as well.

Asking what Jesus WOULD do often creates conclusions based on our own ideologies of the Jesus that we want to believe in. Asking what he ACTUALLY DID do shows us the real Jesus. This, of course, requires intimate fluency with the bible which takes substantial time. I strongly encourage you to study more and condemn people less.

Can't stop disrespecting women.

3 upvotes · 17 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

You read NMMNG yet? It's a foundational book. He talks a good bit about how to build a backbone, but without being a ridiculous caricature who craps all over the world.

What are your thoughts on tattoos?

3 upvotes · 16 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Deep: do you want to do an official full write-up on your directional response to "is this/that sin?" questions and we can just put it on the sidebar so you don't need to keep copy/pasting over and over, and you can just direct people to the sidebar instead?

Also, if you agree to do this, I'd recommend going over [ruiz's take on this too](#), as it's the response I subscribe to and seems to work hand-in-hand with a lot of what you write on the subject.

Alternatively, I can just put ruiz's post on our sidebar ... but I'd prefer to keep sidebar content in-house whenever possible.

Other input from [/u/rocknrollchuck](#) [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) [/u/RedPillWonder?](#)

Bible Study with Wife?

3 upvotes · 14 April 2020 · /r/askRPC

I strongly encourage you NOT to use a study, but to go straight into Scripture. Read the 300-series posts on quiet times and Bible study to get a picture for how to study Scripture on your own. Pick a book and go at it. I recommend Philippians to start with. It's short, but has a lot of depth to it. I memorized the book and haven't found a single aspect of daily life that isn't addressed by something in that book. I've done the same things with other more popular books, like James and Romans, but haven't found the same fruit as Philippians on a pragmatic level (though they certainly hold significant theological insight).

Godliness isn't sexy

3 upvotes · 14 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Solid post, brother. You need to cross-post more of your stuff here. The only thing I'll note, which has been alluded to in less clear terms by a couple people: what you really mean is "godliness" in the way churchianity defines the word. True godliness does, of course, inherently encompass a variety of attractive traits, including the significance of maintaining one's physical appearance (at least to a degree - one doesn't necessarily need to be a male model to be godly, but one does at least have to conquer basic obesity and have a modicum of pragmatically valuable strength).

Regardless, I'm glad to hear from you on this. I'm going to put up a companion post to address one thing from the comments: the assumption that feminists push that men are more visual than women (and therefore more shallow) when it comes to sexual arousal.

Living Out of Yourself

3 upvotes · 8 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Agreed. We will still sin. But when you say this:

So saying 'Do what you want' can be a dangerous thing to say to many christians who are not constantly being transformed by the renewing of their minds, as that is a crucial first step

I agree in theory, but perhaps not in practice. First, I'd question if a person who refuses to allow God to change them is even a Christian in the first place. And if they are non-Christians, it's pointless telling them not to sin

because everything they do is sin anyway - even the things that seem good.

More specifically, I think this view still inappropriately looks at sin as extrinsic behaviors rather than an internal state of the heart that prompts the behaviors. A buddy of mine wrote a post on [r/TrueChristian](https://www.reddit.com/r/TrueChristian/comments/f8vuke/is_this_a_sin_is_that_a_sin_not_the_right/) not to long ago: https://www.reddit.com/r/TrueChristian/comments/f8vuke/is_this_a_sin_is_that_a_sin_not_the_right/. In it, he explains that no behavior is inherently sinful; rather, it's the orientation of our heart and the motive of our faith that determines if our behavior is "sin" or "not sin." He uses an example I've often copied before: "Is it sin to watch child porn?" Most people will say yes. But what if you're an FBI investigator who watches it to find clues to catch the perpetrator - and he does this because he knows God has called him to protect those children and he is acting in faith to God by taking all reasonable means to fulfill that goal? Obviously this is not sin anymore. So even something as "inherently wrong" as watching child porn isn't actually "inherently wrong" at all.

So, when I tell someone: "Do what you want," that might cause them to do things that others would view as sinful, but it doesn't necessarily mean it will be sinful. That said, I do also agree on a pragmatic level that we're all way more sinful than we realize and even a lot of the "good" things that people call "non-sinful" that we do are probably still sin anyway. Like watching TV. If someone asked on reddit, "Is watching TV a sin?" They'd get laughed at and everyone would say, "No." But the reality is that it CAN be sinful, and probably ACTUALLY IS sinful far more often than we might realize - perhaps even over 95% of the time it's sin. Why? Because the people watching TV are doing so as some form of procrastination of other things God would have them be doing, or perhaps they're doing it for some reason other than being prompted by their faith to do it. Yet ruiz, in that post, also uses this as one of the exact examples of how one CAN (and he does) watch TV from a place completely prompted by faith. It's a beautiful read, if you haven't gotten to it yet.

Back to the point: my real goal with saying this wasn't to guide people away from sin. It was to show them how sinful their hearts are so that instead of faking holiness they can seek actual holiness. Someone who behaves righteously by ignoring their heart's evil desires still has a heart that desires evil. I'd rather people focus on a lifestyle that fixes the heart so it doesn't desire evil anymore, over modifying behaviors. Although, I think to your point, this often happens as part of the maturity process and perhaps the spiritually young still need a little bit of legalism and behavior modification just to get started on the path, just like kids do, as [/u/redwall92](#) referenced in his comment about the parallels between this mind-set and parenting.

On Testosterone

3 upvotes · 4 April 2020 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

Three years ago I wouldn't know what the heck any of those words meant. Thanks for the added info!

Have you swallowed the Red Chewable Tablet?

3 upvotes · 3 April 2020 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

Haha. I'm definitely wordy, but that's no excuse for someone else to be lazy. If a guy doesn't want to read a lot of words, just don't read them. Pretty simple.

LTR no longer Christian. Next her?

3 upvotes · 3 April 2020 · [/r/askTRP](#)

I don't see it yet. About to head to bed. askRPC might actually be the preferred place, as you'll need to put in all the Rule 2 information if you're posting on RPChristians proper. I'll check for it in the morning.

Most Christians Do Not Love Women

3 upvotes · 1 April 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I agree with [/u/RedPillWonder](#), but in light of your comment let me take things a step further.

Your interpretation that women are most in God's image when they are married is also the way I would take what

I think you're asking. A woman without a husband is like a man without Christ, or Christ without the Father. She is as incomplete as a person as Adam was without God.

But as RPW is saying, the reverse doesn't play out quite the same. Christ without mankind is still perfectly fine. There is no circumstance to imagine God without Christ, but this is the exact point of the parallel God is establishing: that we are fallen and trying to return to our ability to reflect God's image - triune as it may be. So, while God is triune, he gave men, women, and children to represent triune structures as well - and Jesus, in the way he interacts with humanity is a mediator, bridging the gap between God's triune being and our triune structures here on earth, linking the two through his own relationship with the Church.

But again, if the Christ-church relationship is our given model (as we don't see the same imperative for men and women to interact the way God and Jesus do), then a man's need for a woman is as essential as Jesus's need for the Church (i.e. based on desire, not need), whereas a woman's need for a man (i.e. husband) is as essential as the Church's need for Christ (i.e. based on need, and hopefully also desire).

But all of this is still glorious not only for the Father and men, but also for the woman. After all, while it is still evident throughout Scripture that the Holy Spirit is referenced in the masculine as a person (as God, as a whole, while presumably ungendered (Jesus' physical body excepted), chose to identify himself in the masculine) ... we also see many wife/mother-like traits ascribed to the Spirit. The way I see this triune structure of God is that:

- The Father is the head
- Jesus is the Son of God whose obligation was to obey his Father
- The Spirit is the functional will of God put into action in the world

In this sense, in as much as the Holy Spirit is God's primary means of influencing the world for his glory, so also is the significance and glory of the wife's role with her husband in marriage. And this is made even more obvious when we consider the third relational context of Christ and the Church - that Christ, while not needing the Church, has chosen to glorify the Church by sending it to be his primary vehicle through which his will would be accomplished.

This is a fantastically beautiful thing for women! And it's interesting to me that no one bats an eye when seeing the way the Spirit enacts the will of the Father on earth, or that everyone loves and adores the way the Church is meant to serve Christ on earth to carry on her will - yet because of feminism, as soon as we argue that wives should rejoice at being the primary vehicle through which a husband's will is effected in his world (i.e. sphere of influence), everyone groans instead, rolling their eyes while commenting, "Oh, so she's just supposed to be his work-mule while he sits back and does nothing." How bad does one's theology of the role of Jesus with the Church or the Father with Christ have to be to reach such a backwards conclusion!?

How ego-centric has the Church become (as [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) notes is characteristic of women - and the Church by extension) that we over-emphasize our own role in the work Jesus set out for us, ignoring the infinitely more drastic, yet often unseen ways that Jesus is at work in the world alongside and over the Church!

Like I say, all of this should be as beautiful to women as the Spirit is to the Father or as the Church is to Christ. It is not to their shame, but to display her splendor, even while the husband and Christ are glorified by it.

And since RPW couldn't tag him and I have one extra tag left: [/u/Deep_Strength](#)

If a man were able to change the bible would that prove they are the 2nd coming of Jesus?

3 upvotes · 29 March 2020 · [/r/askRPC](#)

I've been fascinated by this type of stuff for a while. But don't get too hung up on it either. For context, I do a lot of writing in my spare time, including a fantasy series where quantum entanglement is the underlying premise for the way a relic works that the main character finds, allowing him to see things from the other end of the universe.

I worked alongside a physicist to help me figure out how other relics in subsequent books (I'm part way through book 3) would function if realistically possible, given known concepts of physics and quantum mechanics.

All that to say, I track with everything you're saying and knew it before you wrote it. Props for the shared interest.

But the Bible is not the ink on the page. It is defined by the original writings of the original manuscripts as originally intended by the original authors. If I wanted, I could steal the earliest known manuscripts, use some high-tech lasers to shave off ink particles and replace them, then return the manuscript. We don't necessarily need quantum mechanics to do that (though, admittedly, there's always risk to the documents to do this). But the reality is that this would just be falsifying the manuscript, not actually changing Scripture. It's tampering with evidence.

I'm a lawyer. So let's imagine I'm representing a guy whose wife is accusing him of physical abuse. She CGI's a video from her phone to make it look like he hit her. Now, he had shown the video to dozens of witnesses before she does this, and even to the judge at a prior hearing before the final trial. The new video comes out and the judge sees the difference and the witnesses all testify, "Yeah, that video has been doctored. The original video was nothing like that." Further, the wife testifies on the stand, "Yes, I changed the video, and therefore it is now obvious under my changed video that he hit me." How's that going to play out in court?

Changing the ink on the page doesn't prove any more than adding CGI to a video. Moreover, if a person then admitted to changing the ink on the page to "prove" their divinity, that very admission acknowledges the non-divinity of the act. Why not just go back in time and actually change the historical events, if you're truly divine? Surely God has that kind of power.

So no. Changing ink on a page would not prove anything about one's divinity. It only proves one's ability to change ink on a page.

But what you're really asking is: how can we trust the translations we have? How do we know someone hasn't already modified Scripture to cause us to believe things the original authors never intended?

The answer is, of course: you can't know. But God has never valued knowledge highly. In fact, much of Scripture is written to de-emphasize the value of knowledge. This was very difficult for me as I used to take such great pride in the fact that I knew more than virtually everyone else around me. At some point I had to set that aside and recognize that God prizes faith over knowledge. I'm now okay with that.

Also, this whole setup doesn't do squat to address the Holy Spirit in all of this. It's not merely that "God wouldn't allow that to happen" - it's that the Holy Spirit is in us and proves through the fruit of existing Scripture its authenticity. But at the end of the day, it still comes down to a simple question: do you believe the Bible, as we know it (at least insofar as the earliest existing manuscripts represent it) is true and that you will allow that truth to radically change the way you live, or do you believe that the chance of its modification on substantive issues is high enough that the whole thing needs to be scrapped and there's no basis for faith at all? No one can decide that for you, nor can we logically persuade you, nor should we, if we are to approach ministry as Paul did in 1 Cor. 2. You've got to figure that out for yourself.

An MRP Mod makes a disciple

3 upvotes · 24 March 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Above and beyond, my friend. Well done.

I encourage my American friends to be fully stocked, supplied, and able to effectively work from home by Sunday, 3/22, though EOD tomorrow would be ideal.

3 upvotes · 20 March 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

You forgot home gym equipment. Can't let yourself go just because the gyms are closed.

Coronavirus Mega Thread

3 upvotes · 17 March 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Wait for it to drop a bit more first. There are lower days yet to come.

Whose game are you winning?

3 upvotes · 17 March 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Right. Most people are also getting divorced, eh?

A mission that can be completed in a year is a short-term goal. It reinforces a "Next-Thing-itis" mentality because once that year is up, what's the next thing you're going to invest time in?

Missions that could take a lifetime other than pure money-making:

- Become a best selling author on the NYTimes list
- Write a show that gets produced on Broadway (one of my second-tier "missions")
- Start a non-profit that will cure world hunger
- Create a cure for cancer
- Own your own professional sports team
- Make it into the Guinness book of world records
- Another example I gave someone recently: become the best-selling yodeler of all time
- Mine: Making spiritual disciples of all nations (a long-term goal as a waypoint for this is to reach 60 countries by age 60)

You can see how some of these are legit, while others are somewhat goofy or laughable. Others are realistically unattainable. The actual destination, for women, is less significant than the journey - as long as the destination is something that will require a man to display his masculinity to accomplish it. You don't see Indiana Jones losing the girl because he didn't actually get to take the Ark home at the end of the movie.

All of these require consistent dedication, self-improvement, passion (so you don't fizzle out), leadership skills, social networking to get a team of people supporting you, etc. Most of them also require you to be generally attractive, as it's extremely hard to be successful if you're an unattractive person.

When you summarize all of this together, you realize that being mission-oriented, even toward a stupid mission, has the passive byproduct of causing you to become more attractive overall, so it's a double-hitter. 1. The mission itself is attractive because women love supporting something bigger than themselves. 2. Pursuing the mission diligently as your top priority causes you to develop skills that are inherently attractive to women. Win-win.

For more reading, I have a post titled "**Mission Matters, Nothing Else,**", which goes more into detail on how having a solid mission affects all of the other fundamental issues discussed on the various red pill forums.

is love between women and men real?

3 upvotes · 12 March 2020 · /r/askRPC

Men love idealistically. Women love opportunistically. As others here have noted, there are pros and cons to each.

- Idealistic love is virtually unconditional, optimistic, and develops deep loyalty. On the other hand, it's also blind, irrational, and fosters subservience and inequality, as the other is placed on a pedestal.
- Opportunistic love is pragmatic, predictable, and easy to foster. On the other hand, it also comes off as cold, selfish, and insincere, if misunderstood.

As [/u/Rifleshoot](#) said, our love toward God can often come off as opportunistic. If God said, "I don't care how much you serve me, I'm still sending you to hell. I am not lying. This is not a test. You will never change my mind." ... how would that affect how you live your life? Would you still follow him and be a Christian? For most people, the answer would be no. If they're going to be tortured for eternity, might as well have fun while you can, right?

Hebrews 11:6 acknowledges the foundational nature of the relationship between our faith and expectation of reward from God: "And without faith it is impossible to please God, because anyone who comes to him must believe that he exists and that he rewards those who earnestly seek him." How easy would it be for us to cut off those last 9 verses and pretend they don't exist?

The closest I've seen otherwise is Brother Lawrence, who wrote, "I have endeavoured to act only for Him; whatever becomes of me, whether I be lost or saved, I will always continue to act purely for the love of GOD." He transcended the traditional aspect of opportunistic love that one would expect of a bride (of Christ) into the more masculine notions of an idealistic love toward God. This is not the norm. Obviously it sounds like a nice ideology to say that we should all love God this way (which is the very definition of "idealistic"), but it's also not pragmatic because we know that nobody would ever be saved if that's the type of commitment we were drawn into. Perhaps as one becomes immensely mature, that transition can happen - but at least up front, even Jesus used the promise of heaven and the threat of hell as a motivator to inspire his followers.

Communication Doesn't Work....or Maybe...

3 upvotes · 4 March 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Excellent post, brother. This is truly good stuff. I find myself on the other end of the conversation when people tell me: "You've said what I've been thinking for some time, but didn't know how to put into words."

I started to type a longer reply, but it eventually evolved into a post of its own, as I continued to process some things ([here](#) - though I imagine the direction I take things might not be of particular interest to you).

One thing that I didn't address in that post is the similarity I see between "feel, think, do, communicate" and the Myers-Briggs typology, which I've researched quite a bit.

- I/E - The introvert/extrovert spectrum addresses how you receive information from the world - internalizing what you observe from the sideline, or interacting with it. This is just you experiencing it and how you prefer to do so.
- N/S - The intuitive/sensor dynamic is about how your brain processes the information you receive from the world. Do you see what you've experienced in terms of details or conceptual patterns, for example?
- T/F - The thinker/feeler dichotomy is about how you act on what you've processed. Some people will, upon processing the information they've received from the world, make decisions on what to do with that information based on what feels right to them, whereas others will do whatever is most logical.
- J/F - The judger/perceiver spectrum is perhaps the one point where the 4 start to differ. This is less to do with

how you communicate your decisions and everything to do with the framework within which we implement them. Judgers, for example, will stick to rules, planning, and procedure, whereas perceivers will generally tweak the structures to their own preferences and operate on pragmatic reality over technicalities.

I'm not sure how relevant that is to you, but I thought it an interesting comparison worth sharing.

What about BDSM and Roleplay?

3 upvotes · 2 March 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Matthew 18:6 is the most common reference for that point. With passages like that available (not to mention 1 Cor. 8, Romans 14, and so on), it's pretty well undisputed and commonly known to all that a Christian shouldn't do something that will cause someone else to stumble. There's no value in trying to dispute such well-established issues simply because the particular verse chosen might not have been the best one (rather, we often use the first one to come to our minds when we write these posts).

Q&A on Sexual "Brainwashing"

3 upvotes · 20 February 2020 · /r/RPChristians

It would be nice if I could say stuff like that in a Q&A ministry and be done with it. But in this particular situation the guy is asking, "WHY can't I crap where I eat?" Answering, "Don't crap where you eat" does nothing to answer the question. Plus, his question was a bit more nuanced.

Q&A on Sexual "Brainwashing"

3 upvotes · 19 February 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Agreed. I think I noted as much ;) I just used Jacob and Rachel as a fairly extreme example of presumably waiting 14 years just to have sex with one girl.

The Philosophy Side of The Bible

3 upvotes · 19 February 2020 · /r/RPChristians

A number of them - usually ESV for generic reading, Young's Literal or an interlineal Bible for study.

Many Christians believe that the Christian red pill ideas promote an anti-Christian perspective on marriage. What's your response? What would you say to someone who says that the Christian red pill ideas are too process/result oriented?

3 upvotes · 19 February 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Solid.

Q&A With an untrusting wife

3 upvotes · 11 February 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Most q&a on got questions is private conversation and not publicly published. This is one of those. Sometimes they notify me a year later that they're publishing one of my answers, but that'd be a while off for something like this.

Are all missions related to becoming a Pastor or Missionary? Or can it be anything?

3 upvotes · 27 January 2020 · /r/askRPC

I would argue that the exercise of one's spiritual gifts aren't the mission itself; rather, they are the context that creates the pathway for how the mission will be fulfilled.

That is, the mission is the same for us all: "Go and make disciples of all nations." Some will insert their life

context into that mission: "I'm a plumber, so I'm going to make disciples of those who need plumbing work done, or fix the plumbing of those I disciple."

But if one is gifted at ...

- teaching, then he will say: "I will make disciples among those I teach."
- hospitality, then he will say: "I will disciple those who I invite into my home."
- mercy, then he will say: "I will disciple those whose aid I bring."
- evangelism, then he will say: "I will disciple those I bring to faith."

Alternatively, the gift may create not only the context, but the directive as well:

- The teacher will emphasize teaching in his discipler-making relationships.
- The hospitable will utilize their invitation to advance the relationship with those they disciple.
- The merciful will show those they disciple how to care for those in need.
- The evangelist will model for their disciples how to share the Gospel.

The spiritual gifts are in no way a limitation on one's obligations in the discipler-making relationships they maintain (as if one could argue: "I'm gifted at teaching, so I don't need to be hospitable to those I disciple"), but they do add a unique flavor to the relationship that builds up each part of the body of Christ rather than trying to force everyone to be a jack-of-all trades (what I could reasonably term stem-cell Christians).

Just some things to think about :)

Tag: [/u/agoodcrayon](#)

A Series of FRs

3 upvotes · 12 January 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Yes. Bob is their father. He's a solid believer, very present, active at the gym (even at 60+) ... but does struggle with some OCD issues.

The dichotomy you notice is extremely common. I see it in my cases all the time. Even in my own family, I have a man child brother who lives in my dad's upstairs staying up to 6am every night drinking and playing video games. It's usually the younger sibling who had these issues, as is the case with Debbie and Fiona. Many people guess it's because the older sibling gets more parental attention, being the first for everything, followed by the younger sibling wanting to set themselves apart from the older by being a very different person.

Empirical evidence to support RP in general?

3 upvotes · 12 January 2020 · [/r/askRPC](#)

Census Bureau has good stuff. The FBI public statistics also helps a lot when it comes to anything criminal as well. Domestic violence stats, for example, come to mind, demonstrating significant variances from public perceptions of men and women (ex. overall, women are more physically violent toward men than men are toward women).

[/u/Deep_Strength](#) also cites a lot of good material in his book, which is worth a look.

Tag: [/u/SingularityOne198](#)

David and Michal

3 upvotes · 12 January 2020 · /r/askRPC

Never try to look at Scripture "from a RP perspective." Don't eisegete your own ideas into the text - especially when trying, as this post intends to do, to force some reconciliation.

Michal saw David dancing in front of other women in his underwear. Why is it hard to understand why she would be upset by this? She's embarrassed at her husband's indiscretion. Are you married? How would your wife feel if you hired a housekeeper and danced around the house in your underwear while they were trying to clean your living room?

By getting into dread, you're over-thinking things. Dread is a tool, not a mechanism for interpreting every relational dynamic. To a hammer, everything looks like a nail. To a man holding a hammer, he can choose to put it down and pick up a screwdriver.

How to Live Life without Women (MGTOW until the Lord Provides)?

3 upvotes · 12 January 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I know that it is in my best interest to forget women and turn my heart towards God, but once I accept this frame of mind, what will life be like for me?

99.9% chance that once you accept this, life will be like ... everyone else's, but more fulfilling. You're still going to end up married, you're still going to struggle through the same life hurdles everyone else does. But instead of being controlled by your wife, you'll be driven toward more important things and able to enjoy your wife.

My personal goal in life is to have a multitude of children with a submissive woman I love.

You can't control whether or not your wife is submissive, so knock that out of your "goal" list. You can make that a dream or an ideal, but goals should be things that YOU can achieve.

Also, this isn't a mission. What's your mission? If that is your mission, it's a crappy one that is ultimately holding you back from both women and doing anything of value for the Kingdom.

I am bad with women

Most likely because you're worried about being good with women.

my biggest fear is that I will remain a virgin forever and live a life I am unhappy with in pursuit of His purpose.

Translation: "I don't believe God can or will satisfy me if I fully commit myself to him, so I get hung up on other things that I think are more capable of satisfying me than God."

I pray that God provides me what I desire

As the Psalm says: "Delight yourself in the Lord and he will give you the desires of your heart." People seem to think this means that God will give you whatever you want once you make him your top priority. In reality, the verse can be better interpreted as God saying to you: "Make me your highest desire and I'll give myself to you."

For those of you who have lived life as a Christian for some time and have shared the same fears as me, how have you overcome them

Yes.

and what are some things I can do now to live according to God's word?

Read the 300 series and start practicing the 7 basics, including evangelism - and when you've brought someone to Christ, keep following up to help them grow (i.e. disciple them).

When will I know it's time to marry, lose my virginity, and raise children?

Per 1 Cor. 7 - When you're so inflamed with lust mutually with a woman that you'd otherwise end up sinning by having sex outside of marriage.

MGTOW until the Lord Provides

Get this "God will find me a wife" business out of your head.

How would a turnaround for the church look like? Making it more RP than Feminist.

3 upvotes · 22 December 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Acts 15

Romans 6:14

Romans 7:1-6

Galatians 2:19

Galatians 3:10-14

Galatians 3:23-24

Ephesians 2:14-15

Hebrews 7:18-19

Hebrews 8 (especially 13)

Those are the ones that come to mind off the top of my head. Jesus saying, "It is finished" (in conjunction with him saying that the law would not pass away "until all is accomplished") would be another example. Paul, as a Jew, saying he is not under the law is also telling (1 Cor. 9:20). In Galatians 5, Paul becomes so enraged at the Jewish believers trying to force Gentiles to follow the law that he says he wishes they would emasculate themselves (Galatians 5:12).

I'm sure I could come up with many more, but these examples should more than suffice and I don't have the time while away on holiday to too much more in-depth. Suffice it to say that the law

How would a turnaround for the church look like? Making it more RP than Feminist.

3 upvotes · 21 December 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Are you Jewish?

How would a turnaround for the church look like? Making it more RP than Feminist.

3 upvotes · 21 December 2019 · /r/RPChristians

When was the last time you sacrificed an animal?

How would a turnaround for the church look like? Making it more RP than Feminist.

3 upvotes · 21 December 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Calling for the execution of homosexuals, or to put them in concentration camps. That's the main one that comes

to mind.

So what ***can*** you negotiate?

3 upvotes · 17 December 2019 · /r/askRPC

You can negotiate compliance. That's about it. Anything internal has to be there on its own. Often-times, even if the desire is there, negotiating compliance doesn't make the desire come with it. For example: I've had situations where I wanted to perform a task at work. Then my boss would come and tell me I had to do that task. Instead of thinking, "That's great, I wanted to do that anyway!" the mandatory compliance took the fun out of it, so my desire to do the task suddenly felt like an obligation - even though I still had the desire for it too. It sucked.

The same thing is true in any other number of areas. Thinking small? Serving my neighbors when a pastor then starts pressuring the congregation on service. Thinking big? Giving to the homeless when the government starts raising taxes to fund social welfare.

The government can negotiate my compliance through executive force (military, police, etc.). My congregation leader can negotiate compliance through access to influence (i.e. if I want to have influence in the congregation, I have to play ball with him, lest he shut me out). My boss can negotiate compliance through economic pressure.

None of them can negotiate how I feel about something or what I think - and often times trying to negotiate any of this into me destroys any natural desire I might otherwise have, or at least precludes me from being able to experience and express my desire in the process.

GotQuestions.org says "God pursues us". What's is RPC's response?

3 upvotes · 17 December 2019 · /r/askRPC

I'm a writer for gotquestions and they've published many of my pieces among their articles. They get a lot of stuff right and a lot wrong. I've already written a lot about this quite a bit on the RPC sidebar regarding the "orientation of the pursuit." Look up that term and you should find it.

To summarize: I did a study twice (partly to make sure I wasn't mistaken; mostly because I lost my results from the first time) on the number of times the words pursue/pursues/come after/seek/etc. are used in Scripture. I found:

1. There are certainly examples where God pursues his people.
2. For every one example of God pursuing us, there are 22 examples of us being compelled to pursue God.

This is most obvious in the context of Jesus (our groom) and his "followers." He always invited people to follow him. Churchianity and gotquestions assumes that "invitation" is the same thing as "pursuit." It is not. After the invitation, Jesus went on doing his thing. He did not chase people down to convince them to follow. He gave them an offer then started walking. Many people turned away. He did not chase them down. Many people asked for some time to do other things. He denied them. Jesus drew clear lines on who could and could not follow him - he didn't chase down or pursue those who were on the "could not" side of the line. He kept on with his mission.

Don't ever confuse initiation and pursuit. Men initiate. Husbands initiate. Jesus, as groom to the church initiates. Women, wives, brides follow and pursue. As the church, we are in this position toward Christ. As husbands, we are in Christ's position toward our wives.

Own Your Shit Weekly - December 10, 2019

3 upvotes · 12 December 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

You're an idiot. I've had cases where we subpoenaed video footage from gas stations, restaurants, grocery stores, etc. You going to avoid all those too?

I had one case where the other party got info from a friend of a friend of a friend. Another where it came through contacting the contractor working on a party's house. GAL wants to do a random screen you're not prepared for? You're done.

Can you get away with it? Sure. It's possible. But you're a fool if you're banking on that.

Three Strategies to Maintaining Good Nutrition Over Christmas and New Year's

3 upvotes · 10 December 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Solid advice. I usually fast the day before or limit my calorie intake to those binge-worthy events and eat nothing else that day.

Another thing that helps is simply to remind myself that I'm there to build Kingdom-advancing relationships (whether it's family, friends, co-workers, strangers, etc.) and, therefore, I focus primarily on the conversation rather than the festivities themselves. If alcohol is involved, rather than bingeing, keep one glass in your hand and sip it for hours. Can I handle more? Absolutely - I have yet to find a quantity that could get me drunk (yes, it's a medical condition). But that's not the point - most alcohol is packed with calories (ergo the term "beer belly").

So, like the man said: drink lots of water, try to avoid pop, juice, alcohol, etc. That alone will likely save several hundred calories.

Men are the prize

3 upvotes · 6 December 2019 · /r/askRPC

Is Jesus not our prize? Does God not say in Genesis 15:1 - "I am your very great reward"?

Like [u/deep_strength](#) said (though I take a slightly different spin), the secular concept is a shallow mockery of the deeper theological truth of the role between a husband and wife as modeled through God's relationship with his people and Christ's relationship with his bride, the Church. Their concept is true - but they're only seeing 10% of the whole picture.

In the reverse, Jesus says that if we won't praise God, the stones would cry out. So, are we really to argue that a bride is the prize a man earns?

In your view, when we all go to heaven, what's the prize that Paul speaks of when he says to run the race as one who aims to win the prize for which we were called heavenward? He already says in Philippians 1 that he's called heavenward to be with Jesus. Would that not, then, make him our prize that we're running to win?

Or do you believe your reward in heaven is not Jesus himself, but some great mansion and pearly gates?

And if this is the dynamic between Christ and the church, why should it be any different between a husband and his bride?

Should Christian men & women only accept Christian counsel

3 upvotes · 12 November 2019 · /r/askRPC

a book I got her to read

This is where you first went wrong, my friend.

thinking she finally is changing

Don't worry. You'll swallow the pill eventually. Right now you're letting the taste of it linger in your mouth, hoping it's not true.

Should Christian men & women only accept Christian counsel?

That depends on the topic. As [/u/conk2000](#) says, there are countless things worth getting advice from non-Christians from. A non-Christian taught me how to practice law. He was darn good at it, and now I am too.

Similarly, there are lots of Christians who give very bad advice. Much of RPC harps on all the bad advice given by churchianity.

What I can say definitively, though, is that biblical advice will never fail you (which isn't the same as "Christian advice"). It's up to you and the Holy Spirit to discern which advice is biblical and which is man-made philosophy inspired by a verse here or there. There is no such guarantee from secular advice, though seculars often discover good advice (as is the case with secular RP) by observing the way God created the world in the first place.

Other than that, I agree with [/u/Willow-girl](#) and [/u/Rifleshoot](#) - if you're trying to go about some weird way to get your wife on board with your way of thinking, this is not going to work because you can't negotiate attraction or logic her way into being more interested in you.

I believe it was [u/weakandsensitive](#) who once commented: "If an attractive man gives a girl a teddy bear, it's sweet and endearing. If an unattractive man does it, it's creepy." I've seen this true over and over again in my own life and those I've observed. The exact same behaviors elicit two very different responses. You're not yet on the right side of that line. Keep working and you will be.

Service and Mission

3 upvotes · 12 November 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I agree with you that many men are looking for ways to deflect responsibility. I also agree that this post could very well dissuade them from serving in opportunities when they should be serving.

However, I'm also persuaded that most forms of service performed by congregations are not at all what God intended in the first place. I have served on numerous service teams and engaged in ministries serving the homeless, victims of human trafficking, orphans, children with no money for lunches at school, etc. - some through congregations and others directly with faith-based non-profit entities. What I've found is that most people who claim to do these acts of "service" for the community:

- Don't actually care about the people they're serving.
- Don't care about the quality of the work put in.
- Do not intend to use the service as an opportunity to build a relationship with someone outside of their socioeconomic demographic.
- Have no intention (or even training) on how to translate the service opportunity for eternal Kingdom-building gain other than inviting the person to church (which I don't take as Kingdom-building; only congregation building).
- Are primarily doing it because their friends will be there or a pastor asked for help.
- And most importantly: Do it primarily to check off a box in their head of things they're "supposed to" do, or because it makes them feel good about themselves.

While a person's attitude toward service is not the sole criterion for salvation, I do believe the disposition of the hearts of the people I have co-labored alongside in the past is consistent with those to whom Christ says, "I never knew you." Now, he might "know" them on other grounds - but not because of their service, which is more indicative of a broken relationship.

If people are given opportunities to be placated in their spiritual development by believing they are more mature or better people than they actually are, they are hindered from becoming the type of people God actually intends them to be. This is where much of churchianity goes wrong. It substitutes placating behaviors that most pastors mean-well about, but which actually INCREASES the degree of excuse-making for why people don't need to go out sharing the Gospel, making disciples, etc.

In reality, service is a subset within disciple-making as a characteristic/trait that is to be modeled for those you disciple to learn after. When practiced in a vacuum, it gives people the mentality, "I don't need to share the Gospel or make disciples because I raked my neighbor's leaves/helped at a soup kitchen/gave a homeless guy a meal/etc. and that's the good thing God wanted me to do this week."

However, when you go in with the mindset: "My job is to share the Gospel and disciple those who believe," then the addendum is always inherent in the process: "And that means training these people how to be like Christ in every way, including the way he served those in need who asked."

But I do believe the "who ask" part is necessary. Even James says, **"You do not have because you do not ask, and when you ask you ask with wrong motives."** I believe this verse alone emphasizes and summarizes the point of my post and the example that Jesus gave - and still gives. Every instance we see of him serving was toward someone who asked and who, while perhaps may have had poor motives at first, were so in need that they genuinely required his help and were overflowing with drive for him as a result of the service he gave them.

The one exception is when Jesus washed the disciples feet - and that's a different story that serves a unique purpose, especially connected to the last supper, communion, being among his closest disciples, etc. But I don't have the time to get into that right now :p

I think the point you make is a good one and I'd be eager for you to post it (and I my reply) to the thread itself so that others can see the value in challenging views that are presented, especially when there's a Scriptural foundation (which is perhaps the one thing lacking from your reply). As with Paul in Acts 17, I do not want anyone taking my word for anything just because "Red-Curious said it, so it must be true" or "Paul said it, so it must be true." I want everyone searching the Scriptures and challenging what I say with reasonable and biblical questions as to the accuracy of what I derive from Scripture. This is how I learn and how our community is built stronger.

The Truth About Porn

3 upvotes · 6 November 2019 · /r/RPChristians

use porn to satisfy his BDSM kink

So he had this kink already and porn was simply an outlet for it.

He really needed to find a wife who shared his preferences rather than marrying 'vanilla' chicks and using porn!

What I'm reading is that the mismatched sexual preferences are what caused the imbalance here, not necessarily the porn use in itself.

Eventually I went outside the relationship to get my needs met

So the porn is apparently what ruined the marriage, not this, right?

I'm teasing, and assume it's safe to do so because you seem over it. But in all of this, I'd go back to my original point in most of this post: is his use of porn what caused any of these problems or was it an outlet for him to curb desires that he already had and which were never reasonably going to be fulfilled in the relationship anyway? In

most situations, it's the latter.

Perhaps a better way to word it: if he had gone off porn during the marriage, would the sexual chemistry issues that led to his dissatisfaction and your affairs have still been present? Would they have been exacerbated by the fact that he had no outlet at all for his BDSM fetish? Or do you think his sexual preferences would have changed if he'd gone off porn so that everything could have worked out?

The Truth About Porn

3 upvotes · 5 November 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Haha. That's about what I'd expect from the crowd these days.

On creeps and romantics and obedience to God

3 upvotes · 4 November 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I think you're missing the underlying point /u/Deep_Strength is making. You're only looking at the immediately proximate cause and not the interconnectivity of these issues.

A man does the dishes at his wife's request. She doesn't think, "How dare he! I'm leaving him." Instead she thinks (subconsciously): "Why does he succumb to everything I say all the time? It's so unattractive. I'm not attracted to him anymore. I'm leaving." Yes, this mentality does happen a lot.

The goal for Christian husbands whose wives deny them should not be sex but their wife's repentance

3 upvotes · 1 November 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Is God immune to our efforts to disappoint him (intentional or unintentional)?

Yes. Disappointment implies an expectation that wasn't met. God knows exactly who we are and we always live up to exactly what he expects of us.

Do you as a father want to be immune to your wife's or kid's efforts to disappoint you?

Yes. If I expect my wife to be AWALT, nothing disappoints me from her. If I expect my kids to be kids, I'm not disappointed when they make kid mistakes.

Does this immunity come at a cost? Specifically .. if I'm immune to the hurtful stuff, then am I immune to the pleasant stuff?

Not at all. You take the same pleasure in them you would either way. You're not "pleasantly surprised" when they do right - it's part of your enjoyment of them in the first place.

It's probably useful here to distinguish between enjoyment of a person and enjoyment of a situation. My disposition toward a person is static (pending actual character changes). If my wife burns dinner, I don't enjoy her any less. If she cooks my favorite meal, I don't enjoy her any more. She is still herself. I enjoy the whole of who she is. But if dinner is burned, I may not enjoy the situation - I like food that is edible and I don't like wasting money on food to go in the trash, etc.

When my kids won't listen, I don't think less of them - they're kids, and I know that's who they are and part of being a kid (within reason). But I am still disappointed in the situation because I like peace and quiet and when my instructions are carried out. The fact that they're expressing their child-likeness in this moment doesn't make them lesser; it's inevitable that they will disobey me from time to time, so the whole of who they are is unchanged, but their choice in the moment creates a disappointing situation.

The gap here between us and God is that God cannot get disappointed because he already knows the result of every situation. We, on the other hand, have the capacity for broken expectations because we have no guarantee that our expectations will always be accurate. As a result, we often set our expectations too high.

But in the case of our children, we are still able to adjust for this to some degree. If I want my kids in bed by 8, I don't send them to bed at 7:50, knowing I could get through their entire night-time routines in 10 minutes if they were perfect. I expect that as kids they will not listen immediately, so I start the bed-time process at 7:30, knowing that after 20 minutes worth of delays, they'll still get to bed when I want them to.

That is my expectation. If it turns out to be 8:15 before they're done and in bed, now my expectation has been broken - even with me already accounting for what I believe is a reasonable expectation of delayed obedience. That's disappointing when it happens.

What word do you use with your kids, wife, etc that communicates disappointment on a relational level?

That depends on what you're trying to communicate. My relationship with them is unaltered by their behavior. I'm still their father. I still love them. I don't think any less of them when they behave as a wife and kids do, even if their behavior goes outside my expectations. So, I don't use any word to communicate disappointment/displeasure/whatever "on a relational level" or toward them personally.

Instead, it's a matter of situational communication and boundaries. "You're supposed to be in bed. You're not listening. I'm going to spank you if you don't listen soon." I state my expectation, their behavior, then the resulting consequence for the gap.

If it's something more character-driven than a single behavior, which is usually evidenced by a pattern of behavior, the communication stays the same: "I expect you to <blank>. You have consistently shown poor judgment/behavior/character/etc. in this area. Until you get yourself back on track, I'm going to have to <blank>." It's not a condemnation of the person, but of the situation.

If it helps, imagine the situation like you're the hulk. "You punch Hulk. Hulk no like being punched. Hulk punch you." Hulk isn't disappointed in the person who punched him. It's the situation that causes him to be affected and respond.

Killing the Blue

3 upvotes · 29 October 2019 · /r/RPChristians

zero scripture

This post was written for MRP. I cross-posted it here, as I do with most of my MRP posts.

"If she doesn't like it, she can leave."? Come on, that is not the attitude Jesus or Paul on the topic of marriage

This is precisely their attitude. Those who follow Christ are part of his bride. He often sets clear boundaries and says, "If you don't abide by this boundary, you cannot be my disciple." This is true for the rich young ruler, it was true for the man who wanted to bury his father, or the one who wanted to say goodbye to his family, etc.

Similarly, Paul notes in 1 Cor. 7 - "Let those with wives live as though they had none." That is, a guy is to pursue his mission for Christ to the same degree as if he were single (taking account for the context of the passage). If one's spouse refuses to follow along and chooses to leave instead, that same passage says to let them go (presumably after following the Matthew 18 process for calling them to repentance first, after which point they are deemed an unbeliever if they don't repent).

Moreover, depending on your particular theology, if you're of a branch that allows for salvation to be lost, this would be another example of Christ telling his bride: "Here are my boundaries. If you aren't okay with that, you're welcome to leave." Christ never leaves us or forsakes us, but 2 Timothy 2 (at least in this line of theology) does make it pretty clear that we may voluntarily walk away from him to the degree that "if we disown him, he will disown us."

"Attraction is the life-blood of marriage." That, I would argue, is rather unbiblical.

It's only unbiblical if the Bible actually does state something else as the life blood of marriage. In reality, we're using colloquial terms here, so it's a matter of personal conclusion. To that end, you're welcome to disagree. But I have found through my profession that marriages with constant attraction often last indefinitely, whereas those without attraction either end in divorce or perpetual unhappiness.

If I want to get more theological, while I wouldn't call it the life-giving force of marriage, I could say that making disciples is the technical function of marriage, without which it is pointless. But that's separate and apart from what I was trying to convey.

Obviously that platitude would mean something like "don't needlessly be a dick to her about that mole on her back" rather than "If she likes smoking, you should encourage her to smoke more."

This is not true. Many of the women on dating websites and social media platforms who ask for a guy who will "love me, including my flaws" will then identify character issues and not a weird mole. This tells me that the prevailing understanding of the phrase is character-driven, not a reference to minor physical defects. I'm extremely confident that if you investigate this you'll find the same conclusion.

I think people like you do this because you want a strong frame and not to look like a bitch.

You couldn't be farther from the truth, brother. It's all about audience. Admittedly, I usually write "[MRP Draft]" on posts to the MRP crowd, and I neglected to do that this time. Often-times I will write a separate draft for RPC that includes the Scriptural foundation for what I write, but I'm in the middle of taking over a law firm and changing office locations right now, so I'm too low on time to do that. Suffice it to say, I could back up most of what I say through a clear theological framework.

I also can't believe you defended choosing not to love your own wife at times.

I'd be curious what I said that caused you to reach this conclusion. The closest is my section on "unconditional" love. But the fact is that God/Jesus does place conditions on the expression of his love. If he didn't, the Gospel wouldn't be necessary because the condition of faith in Christ would be non-existent and everyone would be saved simply for existing due to the unconditional nature of God's love.

But if you research the Scriptures, you're going to find countless examples of conditions placed on the expression of God's love toward his people or Christ's love toward those who would come after him. When the condition is not met, the expression of love for those people is withheld.

In actuality, this in itself is also an expression of love. By setting clear boundaries and enforcing them, while this may seem "unloving" or as a "withholding of love" from any traditional colloquial use of those terms, Jesus is actually compelling us to be better. The unloving thing to do would be to enable us in our laziness and flaws by continuing to shower us with blessings and grace (i.e. "expressions of God's love toward us" in the colloquial sense). But nobody speaks about love in this way today. So, it's easier to suggest that people should make their love conditional, just as it's clear through Scripture that while God's general love for all of humanity is unconditional, the expression of God's love to us in the form of salvation and other grace given to believers is certainly conditional and that such grace is not given when God's people defy those conditions - hence most of

Israel's subjugation to their enemies and eventual captivity in Babylon.

Killing the Blue

3 upvotes · 28 October 2019 · /r/RPChristians

The bible, brother. That's the best book for interpreting that and every other verse. Study Jesus's life inside and out so you can always answer what Jesus did in a particular situation.

Killing the Blue

3 upvotes · 28 October 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Well, I'm the founder of RPC, so I'd say that what I wrote in this post is pretty consistent with what RPC would say on the topic ;)

On a biblical level, I always tell people to look to the example of Jesus and when/why he sacrificed. He never once sacrificed simply for our happiness - it was always oriented toward his glory and to fulfill a larger purpose. While he certainly expressed his love for us through his death, the Bible is also clear beyond question that Jesus's primary purpose through the cross was God's glorification and the impact was, per Philippians 2, that he be exalted above all others as well. If Jesus's highest purpose in leading us was merely our happiness, we wouldn't see the countless passages of him turning people away, giving very harsh standards for following him, condemning those who professed a desire to follow him, etc. Modern notions of "servant leadership" are entirely inconsistent with the character of Jesus, being taught solely on what Jesus said without reference to what he did.

Killing the Blue

3 upvotes · 28 October 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Almost everything a wife does can be done by the husband, friends, family or even complete strangers who you influence to follow you and support your mission.

I liked the way /u/OsmiumZulu put it once: "Sex is the only thing you can't biblically outsource in your marriage." As such, it's critically important. Even child-bearing, as you referenced, can be outsourced through surrogate mothers who receive your DNA, and most Christians don't necessarily have a problem with this.

Good thoughts all around.

How to communicate self-improvement to a potential partner?

3 upvotes · 23 October 2019 · /r/askRPC

Is she actually strict about sexuality or is she that way with you?

It's a fitness test that he hasn't realized yet. It's like all those dating profiles that say, "I don't do hookups, so don't even bother." Yet the very next sentence says, "I'm pregnant and the dad's not in the picture anymore, and you'd better be okay with that."

/r/WhereAreAllTheGoodMen seemed somewhat exaggerated of the sexual marketplace until I actually created a tinder profile to research what it's really like and ... dang, if it all ain't true. In 15 minutes of swiping there are dozens of examples (yes, more than 1 a minute) that are exactly like this. I didn't realize how much the dating market had changed, as I was married before online dating blew up, but it's now more than ever that I realize how critical it is for guys to be red pill'd to know how to navigate the shark infested waters.

Is my marriage salvageable?

3 upvotes · 23 October 2019 · /r/askMRP

The books ARE the sidebar. How can you read the sidebar if you don't have the books? You mean you read the names of the books that you're supposed to read on the sidebar and then saying, "I've read the sidebar"? Are you kidding me?

44 year old single Barbie, mother of 4 kids and 2 MORE ON THE WAY. Not here for games or sending nudes. Looking for a real man who respects her life decisions and her kids.

3 upvotes · 23 October 2019 · /r/WhereAreAllTheGoodMen

I am an easygoing person until you piss me off

Isn't that the exact definition of someone who is NOT easy-going?

Catholic

Uh huh ... she apparently signed up for the "no contraception" bit, but decided she didn't like the "no sex outside of marriage" part? It's shocking how common this is.

I'm convinced this is an ASD mechanism. Girls don't want to believe they're as depraved as they are, so they tag a spiritual affiliation to their name to feel like a good person. "It's okay, I go to church, so I must be moral." Then when they screw up, they default to, "Hey, God is gracious and forgiving. I'm broken, but praise Jesus that he'll keep forgiving me!"

Too bad Jesus isn't a psychological coping mechanism, or else their plan would actually do more than oil that hamster wheel.

Boundaries and Boundary Enforcement

3 upvotes · 18 October 2019 · /r/askRPC

I had boundaries ... I of course did nothing ... she just brought her social binge drinking out in the open, and I began to occasionally join

Hmm ... you needed her more than she needed you and look what happens: you're following her around instead of her following you. See how that works. It's [u/Rollo-Tomassi](#)'s cardinal rule of relationships. The one in power is the one who needs the other the less. Memorize and lean on that.

I told her if we were going to stay together, shut down all contact or I'm out

Classic mate-guarding. Horrible idea. It's a display of low value.

How do I reset boundaries now?

By switching the power dynamic. This is done in one of two ways: (1) you become more valuable than her; or (2) she becomes less valuable than you.

For so long as she's in her own frame, her willingness to follow your boundaries is based entirely on her perception. She's unlikely to perceive her value as dropping - women get way too much affirmation today for that to be a realistic option. This is especially true when she already has orbiters. That option is also mostly out of a man's control, short of tactful negging.

The better option is to keep improving yourself to the point where you're the best guy she could get. The problem is that you've got your history working against you. Even if you do improve, when other girls start to notice you,

her initial reaction will not be to salivate, but to scoff and think, "If only they knew what I know!" That's a necessary intermediary.

Once she's at this intermediary point, that's when you can start setting boundaries back. In doing so, it's not just to coerce her compliance (which is still predominantly in her frame, if you're hung up on whether or not she acts a certain way); rather, your goal is to cause her to make repeated decisions on whether to choose you or herself. If she believes she's more valuable, she'll probably choose herself the first numerous times, and you're going to do your own thing without her - not in a cold-shoulder kind of way, but in a missional, "I'm a busy man with important things to do and I will not let you sabotage me" kind of way.

She's going to start thinking about branch-swinging more, getting more and more validation from whatever orbiters she's got, and may even seek more. This is a byproduct of your past mistakes. If you hadn't screwed up for so long, she might skip this phase. But this is the point where she puts herself back out on the SMV (with plausible deniability, of course) and gets a reality check. Either she's hot-stuff and gets the validation she was looking for and is bolstered against your boundaries and her lack of need for you (maintaining her position in the power dynamic, possibly leading to a branch swing), or she's going to realize that she's older than she was when she was last in the dating market and will start asking [/r/WhereAreAllTheGoodMen](#) ? She probably won't drop her perception of her own self-worth in response (women almost never do), but it will at least let her know that you have more options than she does and therefore acknowledge that maybe you do have something to offer her that she isn't going to get from another guy - at least not anyone she could pin down for marriage.

This is what lays the groundwork for the main event, after which she may be more inclined to start following your boundaries - because life would suck for her if she left you or you left her. She'd be stuck being used by a bunch of Chads for one-night stands with no one actually willing to take care of her.

Yes, this means her affection for you and willingness to follow you is opportunistic. Accept it and move on.

Past this, once she's in your frame she understands reality the way you do. This means that if you imply you're hot stuff among women, then to her you'll be hot stuff among women. If you believe she's attractive, but couldn't do any better than you, she'll take that as fact too - and be grateful to have you. Domestic violence abusers are an interesting example of this - through physical force they get their wife in their frame and she becomes so hung up on how he thinks and views things all the time that she believes whatever lie he's peddling, even though he may objectively be a low value man. I'm not condoning this practice; I'm only showing this psychological phenomenon in an extreme context that shows just how powerful being in someone else's frame can be.

When she's in your frame, she'll follow your boundaries. Before she's in your frame, she'll only follow your boundaries if she believes she has no other choice, or if she has another self-interested reason for doing so.

6 years into a LTR, but now something is going on with me - Constructive criticism and discussion will be appreciated

3 upvotes · 18 October 2019 · [/r/askRPC](#)

She is submissive, caring, loving, taking care of me and having me as her priority in most of her choices in life

Except the choice of where to live/work, apparently. Also, it's easy to be "submissive, caring, loving," etc. when the other person isn't actually there 90% of the time. You only have to be these things 10% of the time. My wife was the EXACT same way you described when we were in our LTR for 1 year - and then we got together and suddenly everything started changing and she wasn't at all what I thought she was when we were in the LTR.

She a year and a half older than me

10 years into marriage when you can get hotter, younger girls who are more submissive and helpful to your

mission, you're going to regret this.

We pretty much never have fights

Yeah, because you're not around each other enough to step on each other's toes.

I proposed to her while in a trip in Rome (I just wanted it to be memorable)

i.e. "I still buy into the Disney fantasy about all this."

she has also a boyfriend (2 years now) and knows about my LTR, but still it looks like she wouldn't mind if I would GO for it

Pretty normal. This is hypergamy and branch swinging in the works.

For the last three days or so, I am trying to find the reason why I fell for this

Are you kidding? You started flirting with another girl, then you start becoming attracted to her more than your fiancé. And you're wondering why? That in itself is your answer. You will become attracted to attractive women who show interest in you. Heck, you'll become attracted to attractive women who DON'T show interest in you. It's part of life.

Any philosophical and in-depth psychological responses/ideas will be even more appreciated, cause those two realms are my personal favorite go-to for finding answers.

This is a problem for you. Don't fuel esoteric thinking. Focus on practical reality. Your situation is not unique and doesn't require a PhD in philosophy or psychology to understand. You like two girls. For one, you're an emotional tampon with a high commitment, but you're not really attracted to her anymore. For the other, you're highly attracted, but it would mean starting from scratch and not knowing if it'll work out. Don't philosophize over this. Pick. Take action. But don't sit on your thumbs hoping that plugging your butt-hole is somehow going to increase pressure to your brain to give you an ah-ha moment.

Which girl is going to be more helpful in making disciples? If you want some philosophy to think about - contemplate the purpose of marriage. "Why did the Lord God make them one, with a portion of His Spirit in their union? To produce godly offspring" (Malachi 2:15). Godly offspring = disciples (which can also be physical children). If a woman isn't helping you make disciples, the relationship is pointless.

Developing charm?

3 upvotes · 15 October 2019 · /r/RPChristians

More to [/u/mrpmonk](#) - again, while not "red pill" (as virtually no comedian is), my favorite clean comics are Jim Gaffigan and Jerry Seinfeld. John Crist is a Christian comedian who I'd put in the b-tier category, but is good for a clean show. Jeff Dunham is also b-tier, but still relatively clean. I'd keep Dane Cook and Dimitri Martin on that clean list too.

Dave Chappell is definitely not clean. His latest Netflix special was hilarious ... but also possibly the most inappropriate routine I've seen yet.

Developing charm?

3 upvotes · 14 October 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I wrote a post on [SMV and long hanging fruit](#). If my break-down is even remotely close, 1/10 of your SMV is dedicated not to charm alone, but "charm, personality, charisma, wit, etc." My guess is that you already have at

least 1/2 a point there, as most guys do. It's one of the few things that guys are at least given the green-light by culture to utilize in the sexual marketplace. The other 1/2 point that you may not have is the seductive aspect of how you utilize your personality/charm/charisma/wit.

From your post history, though, I'm guessing the problem isn't charm, but frame. You clearly don't have an abundance mentality. Your posts also show that you over-think things. You also don't seem to have hobbies of your own. Personally, I don't take "watching sports" as a hobby unless you are actually going to the games frequently. Watching the Sixers on your couch is no different to a girl than watching the latest Netflix release on your couch. No-abundance and over-thinking leads to a lack of confidence, which leads to a poor frame.

I made a comment recently to [/u/skimthedross](#) about how Rambo gets used a lot as a "what not to do with your frame" kind of thing, but there isn't as much proposed on what TO DO with your frame. I suggested Jim Carey - especially from *The Mask* when he's got the mask on.

- Highly sexual (constant kino, flirting, etc.)
- People can be shooting bullets at him and he just laughs (amused mastery)
- He overcomes hostility by exaggerating what the other person says/does (A&A)
- Has no problem noticing other girls, even in front of the one he's interested in (dread)
- He initiates with anyone and everyone, but on his terms (leadership, frame)

I could keep going, but you get the idea. It's not a perfect example, as there are certainly some blue parts to the mask too, but it at least shows enough good examples of what these concepts look like in practice to be worth the attention.

Whatever the case, you need to find someone with real life examples to look at and model. As [/u/redwall92](#) said, you can't get this from Reddit, so a movie reference is the best I can give you. Jeremy Jordan's role in *The Last Five Years* is another good example of a guy who, while holding blue pill ideologies and being a validation-seeker, expresses many red pill qualities throughout the movie that are worth a watch. I believe I referenced "The Schmueel Song" as the best example I've seen on film of pulling a woman into your frame and amused mastery.

Long story short, your problem isn't lack of charm. It's lack of frame. To get there ...

- Start with getting a decent mission going and create a plan for what you want to have accomplished in the next 1, 3, and 5 years. Make sure it involves disciple-making.
- Then begin initiating with women often, using your mission as the context for an invitation. "I'm trying to build a ministry for God's Kingdom. Here's something I'm doing. You mind helping me out?"
- You will face a lot of rejection - but **this rejection should INCREASE your confidence, not decrease it**. If you develop confidence through successes, your confidence only lasts while you are successful. If you develop it by immunizing yourself against failure, the confidence can never be broken.
- Once you have confidence in the face of rejection, you can start having fun with rejection. It becomes amusing (yes, this is part of amused mastery). There was an episode of Brooklyn 99 a season or two ago where this hot girl shows up at a crime scene. They all note that she's so far out of their league that it was certain to result in rejection. So, instead of taking it seriously, they made a joke of asking her out. Sure enough, the dorky guy who initiated got accepted. Yeah, this is fiction, but there's some truth there. Having fun in the face of rejection is attractive.
- When you learn to have fun in life, and bad things happening to you (like rejection) can't break your fun attitude, you will have frame.

- When you have a fun frame (and not merely a strong one), you will inherently be witty and charming.

But you have to start with step 1 to get there. You can't skip straight to having a fun frame. It won't work. And you must ACTUALLY become immunized to rejection, not just faking it. So, go get rejected a lot.

Going to the same church as your ex

3 upvotes · 14 October 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I'm just not able to get the same spiritual connection on my own doing my own devotions

You're focused too much on spiritual *feelings* here. Note: there are no such thing as *spiritual* feelings. There are only feelings. This is part of the emotionalist agenda that churchianity pushes nowadays. If you're attending a congregation to get an emotional boost, you're doing it for the wrong reasons.

Congregations are a tool. You use a tool. You don't go to your tool box to get gushy feelings. Figure out what that tool is designed to do and use it for that purpose rather than for the purpose of boosting your feelings.

I feel like going to her church and seeing her would give off the vibe ...

Gonna cut you off right there. That's 100% living in her frame. Who cares what she thinks? She's not your girl. And even if she was: **who cares what she thinks?**

if I do run into her would simply acknowledging her then walking away be the best option?

Heck no. Make preselection work for you here.

How to overcome awkward self consciousness?

3 upvotes · 11 October 2019 · /r/askRPC

Haha, this is great.

Seriously, though: eye contact is the source of so much awkwardness for beta men. There's some truth when you say: "Weaklings will cower in fear, look away, and quickly move." Eye contact alone is the first way to demonstrate frame to a woman - and it can be done without even asking them out or showing any actual sign of interest.

99% of the time, when a girl notices a guy looking at her, he turns his eyes away immediately to diffuse the awkward eye contact ... because it's *weird* when you both look at each other, as it presumes some connectivity and an invitation. It shifts from two separate people to two connected people and now the silence goes from expected to awkward, as if one of you should say something. It's a frame issue because the guy feeling pressured to look away does so out of fear of what she might think of him if he kept looking.

So, I've stopped looking away when I see someone I'd prefer to keep looking at. What if she looks right back at me? I keep looking - right at her eyes. It's seriously not as awkward or creepy as society makes this out to be (unless you're unattractive, of course, in which case it's always going to feel creepy even if it's just a glance). If she's at a distance, I wave or smile, and she always does so right back, even if she has no clue who I am. If she's nearby, I'll say hi and introduce myself. No, I'm not cheating on my wife. I'm not banging them in my head. I'm not already plotting to find a hotel room. I'm just being friendly while appreciating beauty when I see it.

This is more to /u/Rifleshoot

I'm torn between two women

3 upvotes · 11 October 2019 · /r/askRPC

Solid.

I'm torn between two women

3 upvotes · 11 October 2019 · /r/askRPC

Best reply here. Well said, and so succinctly.

[FR] Comfort Test About Finances and More

3 upvotes · 8 October 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Don't do it. Too many problems arise.

[FR] Comfort Test About Finances and More

3 upvotes · 8 October 2019 · /r/RPChristians

My wife's an accountant and is horrible with finances. She even overtly says: "If I see money in the account, I'm going to spend it." I wouldn't trust it just because of the job.

Difference between congruence-test and genuine need for help or a task

3 upvotes · 7 October 2019 · /r/askRPC

I agree with /u/OsmiumZulu whole-heartedly. Have you read MMSLP yet? It's on our sidebar and he has a section specifically dedicated to this topic.

Main sub being banned soon.

3 upvotes · 2 October 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Very well, actually. You just gotta know how to do it.

How to win a girl back after rejection?

3 upvotes · 1 October 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Right on - and most significantly to /u/NoKoala4: if you want to enjoy your sex-life after marriage, you're going to have to lose the weight eventually. If you get married while overweight and then lose the weight, you'll realize you could have done MUCH better than her and most likely regret having married her. If you lose the weight first, you'll have a broader base of women to choose from and likely won't even be interested in this girl in the first place.

Either way, the best girl you can get while you're obese is likely less of a catch than the girls at the bottom of your standards when you're fit. This always spells disaster because one or the other of you will regret the marriage down the road. I've seen the whole, "I don't know what I was thinking. I wish we'd never married" conversation way too many times.

Forbearance and Meekness vs Standing up for Oneself

3 upvotes · 24 September 2019 · /r/askRPC

meekness and standing up for myself

/u/OsmiumZulu addressed this better [in this post](#), but let me finally weigh in on the topic, as I'm not sure I have officially done yet.

The beattitudes are not commands. It does not say, "Thou shalt be poor in spirit, and when you obey this command yours is the kingdom of heaven." No, they are statements of temporal existence. Are we expected to be

poor in spirit at all times? What about the spirit of power 2 Timothy 1:7 talks about? But sometimes we will be poor in spirit - and when we are, our influence in the kingdom of heaven (i.e. God's Church on earth) grows.

Same thing with mourning. If the beattitudes are commands to maintain these dispositions at all times, should we just mourn all the time? That interpretation makes no sense. But when we do mourn, we know we have a Comforter.

(I've used A.M. here with pretty negative results from her family.)

First, this displays a misunderstanding of AM, which is not merely a behavioral tactic like AA, but a mental state of being.

Second, you're not trying to seduce her family, so AM isn't going to work the same way. AM is meant to maintain your internal peace without losing your fun-loving frame. If you try to force a certain behavioral motif out of an AM mentality, it comes off as contrived, at worst, or cocky-funny, at best.

"She usually hits me with an open hand."

This sounds like an effort to be cocky-funny.

I probably err on the side of tactlessness in my general life

Which would be the opposite of the point of the 48 laws of power. You read those yet? The entire thing is about how to be socially tactful.

I struggle with venomous words. (Never towards her family or in front of them.)

You probably don't realize how easily parents can sniff out a fake. They give women a run for their money on this - and even worse is when one of those parents is a mother-in-law. Not only can they sniff out a fake, but they are intentionally looking for it at all times.

At this point I don't really care what they say

This is the right approach.

but it will have fallout on my relationship and my fiance will get really weird

Yeah, my wife did that too. I have the mother of in-law stories. AI-LALT?

This all stopped after my wife started following my lead. When she realized that I was of greater value to her than her parents (which is a difficult threshold to cross before marriage), and this took a long time, she finally saw her mother for the crazy she is and started seeing me more clearly for the better kind of crazy I am.

Can you give examples or advice on how to broach this?

Around your in-laws, maintain a fun, humorous frame without the cocky part. The 48 laws of power seem incredibly valuable here. Especially 12, 14, 17, 21, 38, 41 (re: your fiance's likely view of her father - be your own man, not his replacement), and 46.

Regarding 17 - my dad used to say that the best thing he ever did was to get his in-laws to fear him. I thought that was grossly inappropriate and "unchristian." Then when I had even worse in-laws than he had, I realized again that a healthy fear is good for a relationship. My MIL now has a healthy fear of me and it keeps her antics at bay when I'm around. Instead of her putting me down, she now tries to butter me up when we're around each other.

When you're around your wife, don't accuse them. Laugh at their antics. Ask ridiculous questions like, "Was your mom joking when she made that violence comment? Haha, I couldn't tell if she was being serious or not, but it reminded me of ..." and tell a story that fits.

I know Jesus says turn the other cheek

Here's the thing, though. Jesus "turned the other cheek" to the Pharisees, but only because he knew that in doing so he was winning influence with the people against them. His humility and servitude was not blind - it was strategic and advanced a greater purpose.

So yes, let your in-laws berate you, but also let your wife see what's going on and the way you willingly take their abuse - while still recognizing it's abuse. Jesus didn't say, "Turn the other cheek and act like they kissed you," he says, "And let them strike the other also." This makes them look cruel and you a hero for taking it willingly.

Indonesia to outlaw sex outside marriage

3 upvotes · 20 September 2019 · /r/askRPC

A perfect chance to note that people can have disagreements on things like theonomy ... yet I lose no respect for you at all. The way some Christians war with each other ... if they just understood the concept of living in their own frame, all the madness would die down. The war among denominations is a direct byproduct of the blue pill.

Help! Stunned by wife

3 upvotes · 20 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

So you figured out that your special little snowflake and your incredibly unique situation is ... well, let's just say welcome to the club. AWALT. She's not special. You're angry about it.

Of course, you say "after taking the red pill," yet you clearly hadn't taken the red pill - because if you had, you'd have already known all of this intuitively without needing to snoop to figure out the truth about her. AWALT. You thought you had a unicorn. You don't. You thought she was the unique girl who legitimately had no libido. You were wrong. You thought she was loyal to you. She wasn't. Again, welcome to the club.

Look, like many men here, I've been exactly where you've been. I went huge gaps without sex too. I thought my wife legitimately was asexual also. You at least see she has a sexual side, which gives you hope to get on the right side of that line. I didn't have that hope when I started my journey and guys on MRP were actually telling me my wife was an "outlier" and a "lost cause" and that "even the red pill can't save a situation like yours" - that's how asexual my wife seemed. Of course, they all had too little faith in their own teachings, because within a few short months my wife was already back on with the program in ways I hadn't contemplated possible given our incredibly dead bedroom leading up to that.

What I see here is a blue guy who thinks he can sprinkle some red behaviors in his life to get his wife sexually interested in him. This is the very definition of a covert contract - and I'd hardly call it even purple. You obviously don't believe the true nature of women or understand hypergamy. Back to reading the sidebar.

Apart from this, you've got some outstanding advice here - /u/lololasaurus and /u/macmeeler are spot on point. Read and reread their comments.

[FR] Wife goes off the rails, did I 90% pass my fitness test?

3 upvotes · 18 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I think /u/rocknrollchuck would agree that the line you quoted is really meant for new guys who don't know how to handle themselves in conflict yet. Stepping out in the midst of active conflict is generally frowned upon among the RP vets, though considered acceptable as a form of STFU if you need some time to gather your own thoughts and psych up your frame game.

Better strategies would be AA, AM, or overall just coming at the conversation with your own unwavering happiness.

In addition to my last post on this, I did it again with my wife today. She comes into the kitchen stomping her feet, "Are you kidding me?" she asks in anger at the mess the kids had made. She starts throwing things into the sink, making loud noises, etc., expecting me to come clean it all for her. I didn't feel like it, so I kept going about my business (in this case: folding laundry while watching a show). After she was pretty much done cleaning up the mess and I finished my stuff, I walk over for a drink. She's still huffy and obviously trying to show it to get my sympathy. Instead, I told her a story of what was going on at my office. She quickly forgot that she was mad and went back to her usual self, smiling and talking as if nothing had happened.

Now, if I'd told her: "I know you're upset, but the way you're acting is unacceptable. I'm going to fold laundry for a bit, and if you want to talk after I'm done, you need to approach me with respect," how do you think she's going to respond to that? It comes on very, very strong and sets harsher boundaries than most situations warrant. I don't want her to be off-put by my boundaries; I want her to enjoy living inside of them.

The positivity approach is more likely to draw her in, whereas the step-away approach has value if you are incapable of maintaining a positive, fun frame in the face of her negativity. For the reasons stated herein, it's clear that OP approached the situation with a relatively weak frame - and that's okay, so it means that he needs to step aside from time to time to figure out how to keep his frame in order. But as he develops himself, that tactic should be used less and less in favor of maintaining frame, rather than being a stiff board.

Where and how to meet religious women?

3 upvotes · 17 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Locked - this question belongs on askRPC. You also didn't give us any of the Rule 2 stats. What's your mission? Also, there's a LOT of content on this exact question on the sidebar - what makes your question unique that isn't already answered there?

Repost on askRPC with all of this information provided.

Self-conscious about things I cannot change immediately.

3 upvotes · 9 September 2019 · /r/askRPC

Women will generally self select themselves out of your life if they don't like something about you

Right. Polarization, per *Models*. Rejection in this fashion is not a bad thing; it's a time-saver.

You wouldn't want to be with someone who changes their opinions on a whim like that.

Eh ... AWALT. Most girls are going to change their opinions pretty readily for an attractive guy. It's not surprising that they'll change them to go against the grain of a guy they're not attracted to. The issue is more of finding out if you're in the majority with regard to how women assess attractive qualities. Most women aren't going to care about a few stretch marks if they're tied to a 6-pack today. So, if she's in the minority, then so be it - he just shouldn't let it get to him. But if he's in the majority for what women find unattractive, then it's not just her taste that's the problem there.

Personal Finance and Peace

3 upvotes · 5 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I love your attitude toward your husband. Well done. A few thoughts:

Tithing

I'm all for generosity and charity. My wife and I probably allocate well over 10% of our budget toward Kingdom-advancing purposes. But that doesn't mean 10% goes to a local congregation, as many people suggest. The concept of a local congregation didn't even exist in Scripture, yet these congregations have taken claim to the tithe. In the early church, giving went to the missionaries like Peter and Paul who were traveling around for the sake of the Gospel, as well as to local needs - the widows and orphans, the brothers who were impoverished or disabled, etc. It was a sharing with one another, not a 10% straight to the pastor. Yes, there are examples of people doing this, but nothing close to a mandate, and it was mostly in the initial explosion of new converts when nobody really knew what was going on and they were just trusting the apostles to figure it all out.

A few years back I was at a congregation where the preacher talked on this subject and he said: "You know, financially speaking, our body is doing fine. We really don't need your tithe. How about instead of 10% you give us 5%. Take your other 5% and donate it to your own ministry. You don't have the money to buy pizza for your neighbor? Now you do. Share Christ with him. Your apartment is too small to invite people over? There's an extra \$200 a month to get a bigger place to host people you can share the Gospel with."

Another useful tidbit on tithing - the guy who discipled me once commented: "Generosity is great, but strategic generosity is better." He then shared his own personal conviction (not a biblical mandate) that he only gives: (1) where there is an actual need, and (2) where non-Christians are not already going to meet that need. The local city homeless shelter is a great place to serve and volunteer. We even planted a congregation there. But our financial support goes not to the shelter itself; rather, it goes to the ministry planted there, and to the needs of the people within that ministry. Secular sources will keep the shelter alive. Spiritual sources will keep the people alive.

Paycheck to Paycheck

I'm iffy on Dave Ramsey stuff. A lot of it isn't updated for changes in the market and investing strategies in recent years - and by the time he publishes one book after another, the publishing process itself takes long enough that some of the advice becomes moot. Ramsey is for the financially illiterate, but the financially savvy can do much, much better ignoring him.

I also agree on the credit card thing. Most credit cards will net you better points than paying cash or with debit cards. That's free money you're losing out on. I just cashed in \$1,500 worth of points accumulated over the last year. That's a huge bonus to have for having used a credit card instead of cash. Know how much interest I paid on that credit card over that same year? \$0. Because I pay it off every single month.

Only one income

This is wise. That's essentially what we do.

Rich Budgets

I'm literally working a case right now where the guy earns \$500,000/yr and is living paycheck to paycheck. He assumes he's so rich that he doesn't need to pay attention. As I'm combing his bank statements he's got \$600 at a rooftop steakhouse in NYC, another \$350 at a bar in NJ. It's crazy.

I like the comparison to financial fasting. Well said.

That Girl at Work

3 upvotes · 5 September 2019 · /r/askRPC

Yeah, but not the Andy Stanley rule. Someone sent a limo to pick him up from the airport once for a conference he was supposed to speak at. It was a woman driver. He sent the driver back to get a new driver, missed his speaking spot and screwed everyone at the conference. He then lauded this story as the "right choice" to make. I look at it as him applying a ridiculous legalistic standard that he created ("rules taught by men") to the detriment of hundreds of others who had gone significantly out of their way and taken time off work to attend this conference to hear him speak. Total disrespect.

The Pence rule is nice as long as it's reasonably applied.

That Girl at Work

3 upvotes · 5 September 2019 · /r/askRPC

Right, no need to invite temptation. Flee from it instead. That said, if OP had not admitted to his susceptibility to temptation here, entertaining a conversation here or there could build abundance by confirming the IOIs. After all, what some guys perceive as IOIs are really nothing and they're just mentally masturbating over a situation. But this only goes for guys who aren't actually tempted to act on anything in the first place.

That Girl at Work

3 upvotes · 5 September 2019 · /r/askRPC

"That's not what I mean, and you know it." Changed topic.

As /u/OsmiumZulu said ... "provide unlimited sense of security for your wife at all costs." Why would you respond like that?

My wife and I were chatting once. She made a similar comment. I reply: "Let's just say I'll keep my eye out for someone on board for a threesome." Years ago, she'd have been down my throat for making such a lewd, "sinful" comment. Now she laughs at it and says, "Wait ... you're not serious, right?" I tell her, *We'll figure out if I'm serious when I find the right girl.*

Instead of reassuring her through all this, I'm making it clear that I am a highly sexual person, and I deliver the lines with such a confident frame that she assumes I'm joking because our faith would imply so, but she really can't tell for sure.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (09/04/19)

3 upvotes · 4 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Pascal's Wager

So many people knock the wager as some heresy, claiming it doesn't lead to "true salvation" because it creates a fear-based acceptance rather than the love we're meant to have for Christ.

The fact is, Jesus defined love by our obedience toward him, not our emotions toward him. And Jesus himself preached hellfire and brimstone as a motivator to get people to repent. Who am I to argue with his tactics? But liberals think they're better than Jesus and that their way is more "pure." *Sigh*

What do you think about courtship?

3 upvotes · 3 September 2019 · /r/askRPC

The problem with "courtship" is that it's not often clearly defined. I have heard the following used to describe "courtship" at different youth groups in my time:

- "Courtship is when you get to know someone by spending time with them only in group settings until you're sure you want to marry them, at which point you propose."
- "It's basically just being friends until you're ready to propose."
- "Courtship is pretty much the same thing as dating, but where you set the goals and boundaries very clearly up-front."

- "It's when you make your romantic interests for a woman known to her family and they arrange for you to spend time together and get to know the family until they can decide whether or not the two of you are a good match."

These are just ones I've heard - and I'm not even listing them all. Sure, there's some overlap here. But they're clearly giving different versions of events. So, it would be very relevant to know what *you* mean when you ask about this subject, as that very heavily affects how we answer.

Whatever your definition, the goal of courtship is to keep couples from becoming sexually active by placing extremely high boundaries on their ability to be alone with one another. This, in essence, presumes that every couple engaging in courtship is spiritually immature to a degree that they lack any appreciable self-control over their passion. While it's a fair assumption to make, it's also a self-fulfilling prophecy about the state of teenagers, because courtship in itself is one of those things which stunts a person's spiritual maturity in a number of ways.

But even without going down that road, it's important to note that "courtship" as a concept is found nowhere in Scripture. It's a human philosophy made to address the problem of youths getting sexually active before marriage. The Bible **DOES** have a lot to say about pre-marriage relationships, and what I see the Bible saying doesn't overlap well with a courtship model.

To be clear: the Bible doesn't talk so much about pre-marriage relationships between humans; rather, it talks a great deal about the pre-marriage relationship Christ had with his bride and how he brought his bride to his bedchamber. If you want to know what your pre-marriage relationship should look like (note that you can call it dating, courtship, or whatever other title you want to make up), the best way to approach it is to follow the model Jesus gave. How did he draw people to himself? How does he continue to bring more people into the Church, his bride? The same process used to cause someone to become Jesus' bride (i.e. evangelism) should outline the same process you should use to cause someone else to become your bride.

From there, it's just a matter of making sure you actually understand biblical evangelism and not philosophical evangelism, which is what churchianity preaches nowadays.

I believe I have found my mission

3 upvotes · 2 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I agree with /u/NoFaithInThisSub - this is only tangentially related to disciple-making (i.e. God's mission for you), and doesn't seem big enough. It's also so vague that you could do virtually anything over the next 40 years of your life, look back, and rationalize that you accomplished this mission.

Your mission must always incorporate the great commission. I used to make exception for this. Not anymore. Biblically, I don't see a way around this.

From there, you need a clearer vision for how you're going to accomplish the goal of making disciples of all nations. On that end, re-read the mission posts at the end of the 200 series. From there, consider:

- You're at God's Judgment Seat someday. He says, "You want to get into my Kingdom. Tell me, what have you done with your life to contribute to the kingdom that you say you're so invested in being a part of?"
- You answer: "Well, I inspired a lot of people."
- God: "Inspired them to what?"
- You: "Well, I lived my life as an example, so I suppose I inspired them to take after my example."
- God: "And what did you do as an example to them?"

- You: "I tried to strive for Jesus."
- God: "What does that mean to you?"
- You: "Well, it means that I tried not to sin and to go to church and read my Bible and generally just improve myself all the time."
- God: "And how does you doing any of those things help me today now that the world is passed away?"

This is the conversation you need to be having with God in your prayers. Ask him to have that conversation with you today rather than after it's already too late to go back and do anything about your conclusions from that conversation.

For further reading: Luke 13:6-9, Matthew 7, the parable of the minas/talents, Matthew 13's parable of the sower, Matthew 28:19-20; Acts 1:8 (and appropriate context), etc. You'll get a pretty good idea of how important the concept of spiritual reproduction is to God and why that needs to be a more clear part of your mission.

For reference, my mission is as follows:

- I will glorify God by making disciples of all nations through spiritual generations of discipler-makers living and reproducing among the lost.

My vision, which is my "what I want to have accomplished by the time I'm 80" goal, is:

- I intend to build disciple-making ministries in 60 different countries by the time I'm 60.

From there, I have to ask myself:

- What needs to happen by the time I'm 70 to make that a reality?
- What needs to happen by the time I'm 60 to make my 70-year-old goal a reality?

...

- What needs to happen today so I can make my 6-month goal feasible?

Continue to pursue dating or not?

3 upvotes · 29 August 2019 · /r/askRPC

Not an excerpt. I was referring to Jesus, of course. Though I'm a man, I'm still among the bride of Christ. I can't imagine if Jesus were to have married (which he would have been within his right to do), that his lifestyle would have been particularly different. After all, we know Peter was married, and yet we see him living the same life with Jesus anyway. It just puts a different lens on the ideal husband - and yet we don't deal with Christ exclusively in his poverty, but now also share in his glory. So there's that too ;) But his disciples had to follow him and trust in his future glory before they actually saw that glory as we do now.

Own Your Shit Weekly - August 27, 2019

3 upvotes · 28 August 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Yikes. I didn't realize it was a thing either until a couple years into practice I had to hire outside counsel in another state. My mentor suggested only working with an attorney who did his own appellate work.

I determined after that to do all my own appellate work. Holy crap, does it make a difference in how you approach trial. I've also handled appeals from other attorneys doing the trial and ... let's just say if they don't do appeals they don't know how to set the case up for a win on appeal.

My dad's practice (criminal law) is mostly appellate work now. We've both been able to squeeze out some wins from non-appeal-attorney trials, but it's significantly harder.

If you have a biased or idiot judge, your odds of winning are still the same, but 90% of your strategy should be setting up for the appeal rather than trying to educate the fool on the bench. You can usually figure this out about 2/3 the way into your case.

[FR] A Changing Dynamic

3 upvotes · 28 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Solid report, brother.

Regarding teaching - once you're far enough along, minimal prep time is required. This is especially true if you utilize intentional question-asking to guide the conversation where you want it to go rather than lecturing, which is generally an ineffective way of getting through to people.

More to the point: I would never want to lose opportunity to gain influence within a congregation; but if it's a bad time for opportunity, simply reschedule: "I want be free to run a class right now, but my schedule opens up on this date. Would that work?"

Other people already touched on the other stuff, so I'll just leave it at that. Very encouraging report.

First argument in a while

3 upvotes · 27 August 2019 · /r/askRPC

Correction, this is the first time I lost frame in the past few weeks

Correction: this is the first time you realized you lost frame. I lose frame every day. Most other people never notice it because it's internal to myself (per my last OYS). Frame is not merely an outward projection, but also an internal point of origin.

I have thrown in sexual innuendos to her tantrums before but it usually ends with her whining saying I am not taking her seriously.

This right here is the definition of being in her frame. Are you acting to get a result from her (in her frame) or doing what you want to do because she doesn't get to you and you like to have fun, regardless of her reaction (in your own frame)?

In my wife's case however this does not diffuse the scenario, it just ends up with her ...

You care too much how she reacts. So she reacts the exact opposite way you want. Laugh it off and move on.

When I first discovered the red pill I treated it as a way to get my wife on board. It was an interpersonal relationship reconditioning strategy. Boy was I wrong. That is the very definition of being hung up in her frame - because my goals were still pinned on her, even if I had an independent mission. Even my separate mission from her was in-part designed to get her back on board.

Ironically, it wasn't until I could disassociate from all concern for her thoughts, behaviors, interactions, etc. and be my own man that I was actually able to start getting the results I wanted. The first way, all of the red pill feels like work. This latter way, it's just fun because you do whatever you want and enjoy life and the red pill "strategies" that get taught are literally just a byproduct of having a frame freed from outside influences.

And in this, we recognize very quickly how well our frame measures up to Christ - because when we stop being molded by external expectations, our behaviors stop conforming to those expectations and we learn what our own

decisions and behaviors look like, and we see readily that we are not the men we thought we were. We were only playing the part that others expected of us - and those expectations were often more Christ-like than we actually were, but we couldn't see our own sin and non-Christ-likeness because our behaviors had conformed without our heart being transformed.

By stepping out of everyone else's frame and not caring about what your wife thinks or how she'll react or laughing at her when she tells you you're not taking her seriously - that's when you realize just how much a sinner you are and when you can start figuring out how to be Christ-like in the first place rather than merely modifying your behavior to Christ-likeness.

[Discussion] Feminism & RedPillWomen

3 upvotes · 27 August 2019 · /r/RedPillWomen

That's pretty much the [r/RPChristians](#) take on "churchianity." Every movement follows a process, including both feminism and the church:

1. Someone starts with an important vision.
2. People flock to the vision and growth happens.
3. Organization must occur to keep the fringe edges of growth aligned with the original vision. This is where the church was meant to stop.
4. Institutionalization happens, whereby associating with the brand becomes more important than knowing what that brand's original vision actually was, or contributing to that vision.
5. Death occurs, or a new visionary steps up.

In the case of feminism, they just keep adding new visionaries, wave after wave. It's not the same thing anymore. Neither is the church.

Rethinking about MGTOW as a Christian

3 upvotes · 26 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Per my more substantive comment in this thread, the method of gathering statistics on the subject is riddled with so many flaws that even the "hard stats" you're looking for are inherently unreliable. The "explicit proof" that anyone claims to have is always based on self-reporting, which is highly subjective in nature and the examination criteria rarely ever accounts for this with direct observation. That's why in his videos [/u/redpillcoach](#) talks about Gottman's method, which took self-reporting out of the mix and focused on actual observation to make determinations about marriage and relationships. Unfortunately, no one is going to commit domestic violence when they're aware there's a camera watching them.

Source: In addition to being a divorce attorney, I have a degree in statistical methodology.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (08/21/19)

3 upvotes · 21 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

PHYSICAL - Consistently back at the gym after 2 months of cardio-only. Lifts are going back up, so that's a plus. Diet is back on track. I'm dressing nicer - mostly at work, but also at home. Income is projected to have a nice boost in a few months. Sex is good, albeit frequency is a bit down.

MENTAL/EMOTIONAL - I broke frame this morning.

I was up until 3am last night (2 hours later than normal) trying to configure my home office in a way that my desktop would actually work. There was too much electrical interference to get the wireless mouse to work

without jumping with the computer behind the desk, so I eventually moved it to be on top of our very large L-shaped desk.

My wife didn't like that. She had arranged the desk exactly the way she wanted it for her work use. So, this morning she acts all bratty about the computer taking up her desk space. To her credit, despite her attitude she did at least try to sound reasonable, saying things like: "I recognize it's not just my desk, but we need to figure out how to share the desk space in a positive way that meets both of our needs." Translation: *I know you're only using about 4% of the desk space and I'm using the other 96%, but this is unacceptable and you're going to have to put your computer somewhere else and just find a way to make it work.*

For about 10 seconds I wanted to argue with her about it. For another 5 seconds I wanted to look for an alternate solution that accommodates her request. For those 15 seconds, I broke frame.

I remained STFU during those 15 seconds, then simply told her no. This was the only configuration that worked and I wasn't interested in looking for alternative solutions at the time.

The fact that I broke frame had nothing to do with how I interacted with her. It was internal to me - that temptation to return back to my old ways of arguing or acquiescing. It's a uniquely rare feeling anymore.

SPIRITUAL - Still solid. Lots of time in the Word, learning new things, building new relationships with other believers and non-Christians alike. Expanding my ministry influence. Good things are on the horizon, and some are already here.

Faking and Making

3 upvotes · 21 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Sometimes people fake things not because of anyone else's frame, but because they want to become what they're faking at. My son fakes being a super hero all the time. He doesn't do this to impress everyone, as if we actually believe he's a super hero. He does it because he wishes he were actually a super hero.

As we practice this art, we have the capacity to develop a proficiency toward our desired end. Nobody else has to be involved if you don't want them to be.

I'm reminded of something CS Lewis once said:

Do not waste time bothering whether you 'love' your neighbor; act as if you did. As soon as we do this we find one of the great secrets. When you are behaving as if you loved someone, you will presently come to love him.

I believe this holds true in a wider variety of contexts. Perhaps a more common cliché is: "Dress for the job you want." You don't actually have the job you want yet. But if you dress like you do, it sends psychological signals through your brain that train you to make progress in achieving your goals. This is significant and doesn't involve being in anyone else's frame other than your own goals.

Faking and Making

3 upvotes · 20 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

2 Corinthians 5:17 - "If anyone is in Christ he is a new creation. The old has gone, the new has come."

If we really are a new person in Christ's image, then our flesh is the "other" and therefore following the desires of the flesh is living in someone else's frame than our own. My identity is not found in my flesh, but in my spirit which is one with Christ.

The compulsions of my spirit are identical to Christ's not because Jesus said so, but because of who he has made me. It is my original internal desire, not resistant obedience to his external commands.

As I often say, God is scarcely in the business of telling us his plans for our lives and is more interested in transforming us into the kind of people who don't need to ask in the first place.

Looking for advice, Need help. +Apology.

3 upvotes · 16 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Let's be clear: don't work on a better argument to rationalize what you want to believe. Work on figuring out what the Bible actually says. Exegesis, not eisegesis.

If you conclude without preconceived notions or bias that God legitimately embraces premarital sex as a valid act for men, then that's one thing. But using the Bible to justify your own desires is not cool. Just keep that in mind.

Looking for advice, Need help. +Apology.

3 upvotes · 15 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Most women will lie about this question in order to impress the man and make him like her more. Even the week before our wedding, going through our last days of marriage counseling, my wife was saying things like "once a day, maybe every other day." It wasn't long before we were in a dead bedroom anyway. Don't trust what she says when asking her those questions. Of course, if she gives a garbage answer that's against her own interests, I suppose that's reliable :p

OYS - Where Progress is Made (08/14/19)

3 upvotes · 15 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

PHYSICAL

After taking 2 months 90% off related to the moving process, I'm back at lifting and dieting. It feels GOOD and painful at the same time. I had forgotten how sore muscles could get when they're not constantly strained every day. Diet has been going real good too. I've limited myself to under 800 calories the last 2 days and 1300 today, despite burning over 1,000 each day. Of course, this is only the tip of the ice berg after having gained back 9lbs of the 22 I had lost in my previous cut.

Sexually, I've got some ideas on a few things I want to try, props to /u/thechristianalpha - but because my wife occasionally reads my reddit (though she won't admit it), I'd rather not share them publicly just yet.

MENTAL/EMOTIONAL

I decided I'm at a juncture with my kids where it's becoming increasingly important for them to know that I understand them and care about them. We just moved, so my two youngest daughters in daycare have to make a whole new set of friends, my son is going into a new school, and my other daughter is starting school for the first time. Big changes for them, and I can tell it's affecting them, even though they've otherwise fit in with the other kids in the neighborhood extremely well.

So, I figured a good question that would communicate to my kids that I care about their thoughts and feelings would be: *If there was anything you could change about Daddy, what would it be?* Seemed like a good OYS question - where am I failing my kids? At least from their perspective. Not that I'm going to change (though I might, if I agree with them), but it at least lets them know that I'm interested enough to ask.

- My oldest (son, 7) said: "Sometimes when I say something you don't hear me all the way, and then you ask me what I said and I think you know what I said because I thought you were listening, so I don't want to repeat myself, but you keep asking me, and I think you're just joking, so I get really mad because you're joking so much, but it's really not a joke. I wish you would just hear what I said the first time." Haha. That was totally weird, but a valid point - and one worth working on.
- My second (daughter, 5) said: "Nothing! I like you just the way you are :D :D :D ... oh wait. There *iiiiis* ONE

thing. STOP RUNNING YOUR HANDS THROUGH MY HAIR!!!" I told her: *You know you like it when I do that.*

- My third (daughter, 4) said: *Yeah, I wish you would give me more candy.*
- My youngest (daughter, 2) said: "I don't want this water." Apparently she wanted milk.

I also asked my third today how she was doing at her new school and if she made many new friends. She said, "Well, one girl. But she leaves at nap time every day, so we don't get to play much." I asked her about other friends, but she couldn't think of any and said, "I'm just shy." So, we had a really good conversation about how to overcome shyness, but she concluded: "I think I just want to keep being shy." So, I pivoted and talked about ways she could keep being shy (for now) and still make lots of new friends. I also referred her to my wife (a heavy introvert with good social skills) to get some extra "inside information" on how it's done.

SPIRITUAL

Things are going fantastic right now. Too much to type right here and now, but suffice it to say I'm meeting with a ~~pastor~~ congregation leader tomorrow morning and am expecting very good things to come out of the conversation that should really propel my mission 3 years ahead of schedule.

Separate from that angle, I'm also planning on asking him to disciple me so I can reverse-disciple him, thereby mutually benefiting each other in a way that advances God's Kingdom from a variety of angles.

The Kingdom of God is a Party

3 upvotes · 12 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Yeah, I'm all for bonding over fun rather than negativity and burdens. But it still has to be leading somewhere. If a party turns out to be an effective strategy to get people in the door, what do you do with them once you're there? If this congregation truly found long term success with their model as a groundbreaking missiological practice, why is nobody talking about their model today? Except for you ... based on a book written in the 90s ;)

I'm partially teasing, but the point is that Jesus's model of discipleship is the only model I'm aware of that has consistently proved successful for the past 2,000 years and is still discussed and practiced openly today. The issue we have now is that so much other irrelevant content has flooded in, spawned by the deceptive need to mass market the church since Theodosius I forced everyone to become Christian ... that good missiology has been lost in the sea of human philosophies about missiology. As a result, the definition of discipleship changed drastically from what Jesus meant in borrowing the term from Jewish culture (tweaking its spirit) to some general concept of being good little boys and girls.

Look at the outcome of Jesus's model of discipleship compared to the outcome of churchianity's model and tell me if they in any way are being as or more effective.

I have followed Jesus's model (as best I see it in Scripture) and am seeing similar results - guys who compared to the product of churchianity look like super apostles, like [u/TheChristianAlpha](#), my friends Buck and Chad, a former Pastor Brad I discipled, my recent pastor Dan I discipled, and a handful of others I've worked with over the years - all of whom are still reproducing their lives in others to this day. I say this not to brag, but to shame the mainstream church in the way it hopes to find these people by preaching to the masses until one such guy rears its head (i.e. hunting for a unicorn), whereas I can, through the Spirit, produce such a guy every year - and the next year they're producing even more.

And I'm off topic now. Suffice it to say, if our goal is to produce pew sitters, that's what we'll get. But my goal is to produce super apostles. That means living up to the rigorous standard first, then building other guys up relentlessly as well. Churchianity wants to build up its brand - the institution of the church - more than its people. I'm not okay with that.

Tag: **u/chaddownunder** - because although I don't disciple him directly, we have enough contact that he's becoming another one of these guys.

Denominations Question from Newcomers and Those Seeking to Return to the Church

3 upvotes · 11 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I actually know a Nazarene pastor who has planted several churches. He says he won't plant a church until he has all 5 roles filled. It's quite interesting how he approaches it.

RP Christians for Women - Cultivating Gratitude / The Power of Fasting

3 upvotes · 6 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Isn't it?

There's certainly a lot of value that can be gained from fasting beyond the biblical purposes, which I think is what you're describing. But the Bible does portray a pretty clear outline of what fasting is intended for in a spiritual sense.

I wrote more about this here:

https://www.reddit.com/r/RPChristians/comments/blrqw7/share_your_experiences_with_fasting/emr4wi/

I was labeled a misogynist because I said that I preferred someone who was conscious about modesty

3 upvotes · 3 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Nail on the head. Especially that first sentence. I just riled up a bunch of people on TC for saying that there is a higher pursuit in life than feeling closer to God. Screw the mob - but preach truth all the same.

That said, I'm not as inclined to push the modesty agenda because the way most Christians talk about modesty today is exaggerated and assumes a woman can't do anything whatsoever to spark the sexual interest of a man ... and that's just off.

My experience having a break up with my first christian girlfriend

3 upvotes · 2 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I got used to wake up and lay down thinking about my girlfriend, I felt blessed all the time, nothing could make me sad

Most guys think the 400 series doesn't apply to them until they have a problem. This is right here why the good times are the best time to be reminded of **the empty/full dynamic** - because you were *illegitimately full*.

I also tolerated her mother, which told her to break up with me

Hah! Try having a mother-in-law who drove to a lake and threatened to jump off the bridge and commit suicide in order to convince her daughter not to marry you.

I should take my distance from those kind of people.

Right, which can mean setting clear boundaries and not backing down on your frame when she tries to crumble it.

The best way to do this is to call out her garbage as part of a joke. She says something snide. You laugh loudly and say, "That's hysterical. I thought you meant that in the mean way." She did, and you just blew it off with a smile. Now she knows you're going to call her on her garbage and everyone else in the room knows there was no

other way to interpret it other than the mean way, yet you're cool because you're not being mean back.

I think the right thing to do is just stay away from a girl until you have the guts to handle her.

Sage advice, brother.

it's almost impossible to have abundance without missionary dating.

No missionary dating. Missionary to dating is fine though. I think [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) has a post along these lines from a long while back. The general premise is that you share the Gospel with plenty of women, not limiting your outreach to guys only, and expect that if you don't come across a ready-made girl you're going to end up creating one.

I'm still clueless how I will make God the center of my every action but I will pray every moment for this outcome

This is a common misconception. I love my kids, but when I tell them to clean their room I get upset when they hang all over me wanting to spend more time with me.

God did this to Moses in Exodus 14:15 - "Then the LORD said to Moses, 'Why are you crying out to me? Tell the Israelites to move on.'" Basically, "Stop spending time with me and start doing what I told you to do."

Christian culture over-glorifies our relationship with God to the point that we think getting "closer to God" is the most important thing. The result is that we end up like clingy kids that hang all over our parent's neck because it makes us feel good to be near them, but we never actually clean our room, which just makes them angry at us instead.

Then we get all confused, wondering: "How can I be focusing on God so much and yet still feel so distant and my life feel so screwed up?" Duh.

The Main Event

3 upvotes · 1 August 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

They're actually the same definition of frame. You just don't have a taste for what a nonchristian's frame looks like. That's okay, neither do I. But their frame, as distasteful as it may be to a mature Christian, is uniquely potent at evoking the sexuality of the average women.

More Than Marriage: How churchianity has screwed up friendships too

3 upvotes · 1 August 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I haven't seen it, so I can't say.

As for mastermind groups, this sounds eerily close to the way CS Lewis describes the trinity - that the relationship between the Father and Son was so strong that their connectivity created a tangible, sentient entity that we call the Holy Spirit. It sounds like he was possibly imputing his "Inklings" mastermind philosophy on his understanding of the trinity, which is somewhat eisegetical (except he acknowledged that he's not interpreting Scripture in doing so), but is still overall a worthwhile notion to consider.

I do know that Paul talks about the Church having one spirit and one purpose. A "mastermind" sounds like the spirit of a community of people that takes on an identity of its own. I like this idea, but it's also a stone's throw away from institutionalization, where the communal identity itself becomes more important than the mission of the community, thereby changing the identity of the spirit of the community away from one of vision to one of institutionalized growth. I'm not okay with that.

What I'm talking about, though, is far more base and simplistic than any of this. My post here was actually

heavily inspired by [u/ruizbujc](#)'s post on [r/TrueChristian](#) about **building healthier relationships**.

In that post, ruiz breaks down different categories of friendships and recognizes that people can be actual, authentic and deeply connected friends even without a "mastermind" hive community spirit/purpose behind them, but that the epitome of friendship is when this common goal is added to an otherwise authentic friendship.

So, in light of the Aristotelian tripartate view of friendship categories, ruiz would say (as do I) that friendships of virtue don't exist in the absence of friendships of pleasure - that friendships of pleasure are the stepping stone to get to virtue, and you can't get there without it. At best, you are business partners at that point, and it would be a bastardization of the world to call each other friends if you don't have that deep enjoyment of each other's company that extends beyond the vision at hand.

It is my view that discipleship cannot exist without actual friendship occurring as part of the process - that something will always be lost and the "virtue" or "purpose" that builds the foundation of the relationship will fade away if there is no connectivity to leave a lasting impression.

I have lived both types. I have known numerous men who have tried to disciple me without the relational component, as have I tried to disciple many men without it. They see me as a great teacher, just as I saw some of those other guys who were over me. But eventually the relationship faded, we forgot about each other, and I had no internal compulsion to keep living up to the ideals they tried to teach me because I had no great and personal loyalty to them.

Justin, however, was the type of guy who actually built a relationship with me that went beyond mere content and purpose. We played sports together, talked about shared interests, watched TV shows/movies together, etc. I knew I could trust him because I saw who he was and not just the content he had to offer. He knew I was a worthwhile investment because he saw how I lived and not just how I nodded at the next great lesson. In fact, his most recent post on his discipleship blog (www.justingravitt.com) lists this relational aspect as the first foundational component of discipleship relationships - and he posts all of his articles on reddit over at [/r/disciplemaking](#) under the username [u/1Timothy47](#). It's worth a look.

I hope that adds some clarity.

Joshua Harris, author of "I Kissed Dating Goodbye" is getting divorced and has fallen away from the faith

3 upvotes · 30 July 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

[/u/Hannelore010](#) hit the main points. I read it when I was dating my wife. I disagreed with a vast majority of things he said. It's mostly his own personal philosophies on dating, inspired by anti-sexual church culture, rather than actually exegeting any Scripture on point.

I used to talk a lot around here about the hierarchy of Philosophy < Praxeology/Science < Theology. He writes from the lowest tier of those (philosophy), as do most "Christian" and "biblical" authors. Instead of exegeting Scripture, they eisegete it - looking for passages to affirm their own views rather than figuring out what is actually being said.

The reality is that the Bible speaks relatively little of the pre-marriage process on a physical level. Guys found girls they liked, paid a pretty penny to the girl's dad, and she became his wife. It was more of a desire and exchange model than courting or dating. Courting was merely a philosophical reaction to the over-sexualized nature of mainstream secular dating.

What both camps fail to realize is that just as the process of living out a godly marriage is parallel in Scripture to Christ's relationship with the church, so also is the pre-marriage process parallel to the process we go through before entering into a relationship with Christ as his bride. That process is called evangelism. And yes, the Bible has a lot to say on that topic. So, we can learn everything about how Christ draws his bride to himself and use that as our model for drawing a bride to us as well. This is not hidden in Scripture at all - most people are just too

blind to recognize the parallels God was creating between physical and spiritual things, despite reading countless parables, the epistles talking about it, and even Hebrews 8-10 referencing the earthly things as "copies" and "shadows" of the truer heavenly things. Because of this, virtually every "Christian" or "biblical" book on dating in the mainstream will fall flat.

Should I, a single man, go monk mode until improving or try to find a wife during a slump?

3 upvotes · 30 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

MISSION: DISCIPLESHIP

Way too much focus in your life on apologetics. I think you're misunderstanding the place and value of apologetics. Worry less about convincing people to Christ through wise and persuasive arguments. This will not work in the long term.

And where's the Great Commission in all of this? Are you going on to disciple the people you share apologetic arguments with? I don't see any of that in your mission.

MISSION: MARRIAGE

Why is finding a wife part of your mission? This bit is truly concerning to me. I noticed the "finding the girl you can't keep yourself from banging" posts weren't on your read list. Add them.

If you're chasing after women, they're not chasing after you, and you're not chasing after God. You can't have two masters. Right now you're trying to split your attention between finding a girl and developing your intellectual superiority over atheists. Neither of these are healthy pursuits and they're ultimately going to get you nowhere in eternity.

Moreover, once you're dead, what will your life have amounted to? Who's going to carry in your influence after you're gone? Maybe you hope that one of the guys you persuaded to follow Jesus won't be persuaded to stop following Jesus and that perhaps he'll go on to do great things for God's Kingdom. But how do you know? Certainly if he goes on it won't have been because of you - it will have been because of whoever taught him how to keep going on, and he'll be carrying on their ministry legacy rather than yours. Lots to say on this, but I'm low on time. Simple point: I'm guessing you're already living 1 Cor. 7:33 and you're not even married yet. Stop figuring out how you can please women to get more dates and focus on other things. This is all in my "finding the girl ..." posts.

1. Yes, you can be attractive to women even with an injury. This is purely a frame issue. I've known midgets who could pick up girls without a problem - 8s and 9s even - because they have solid frame.
2. Looks and salary are the same. You can look now, but if you know things will get better later, why bother searching when you know you can do better later? A good reason would be to practice game, even if you don't intend to follow through. This would mean nixing online dating and just master the art of approaching women in real life - not for the purpose of setting up dates, but to improve your ability to interact with women in the first place. The more likely reason, though, is that you're just bored and lonely because you have a crappy mission and no real friends, so you think getting a girlfriend will solve all your emotional problems. In this situation, you're going to find someone who is beneath your maximum capacity, then you're going to have to decide if you're willing to settle for her or dump her once you're back in peak condition and able to pull from a higher tier of women.
3. Yes, it's perfectly appropriate and beneficial to attend on campus ministries. I personally recommend the Navigators, if they have one on your campus. Most of them accept alumni. This is a great way to enhance

your social influence, find people to disciple, and meet younger women. Going to a ~~church~~ congregation for a couple weeks won't do much for helping you meet new girls unless you're already phenomenal at your cold-approach game. It usually takes a couple months to start building connections with everyone you'd want to chat up.

4. Stop viewing marriage as a goal to pursue. Get on board with the mission to make disciples. Focus less on intellectual superiority (I know, your PhD program bolsters this aspect about you) and more on your spiritual ambitions. Don't worry about persuading people to make a decision for Christ in a singular moment, but on training them to follow him for an entire lifetime - apologetics as a primary goal is incompatible with this purpose due to its incredibly narrow scope. Develop a stronger frame that doesn't care about how often you get rejected or whether or not girls will find you attractive with an injury.

More Than Marriage: How churchianity has screwed up friendships too

3 upvotes · 30 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Good stuff. But why can't Aristotle's categories overlap in the same relationship?

I'm not advocating for friendships of pleasure. I'm saying a friendship can't be effective at its purpose (making disciples) if it lacks pleasure. I've seen and lived through countless examples of "friendships of purpose" that don't have a pleasure or even utility component to them, and they all ultimately fail.

But unless you are going to jail for the sake of the gospel

I actually had Acts 16 in mind when I wrote that bit.

Household Finances

3 upvotes · 29 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I intend to stick with those commitments, even if it's just a smokescreen

Right. This is part of not going Rambo. A guy shouldn't read RP material and become alpha overnight. Even if he internalizes it quickly, he must still pretend to be beta until he gradually eases his way through the transition. [/u/bluepillprofessor](#) discusses this at great length in his video blog and book. Since you're still early on, don't skip those.

I couldn't spend money the way I wanted, even though I am the sole breadwinner

That was the exact trigger that led to my parents' divorce. Props for realizing this in advance.

I'm not at the top of her list, not even close. My paycheck is.

Catch up on the sidebar and you'll realize:

- Men love women because men love women.
- Women love men because of what men can do for them.

She will never love you the way you want to be loved. Even if you become the most attractive man in the world, she will not love you for who you are. She will love you for the fact that she can show off to all her girl friends how great of a guy she got ... among other things.

This is a reality of life that is to be embraced, not something to fight against. Don't be mad about it any more than

you'd be mad at a worm for lacking the generosity to share his dirt-meal with you. No, women are not worms. But women are women, and there are boundaries over what they are mentally and emotionally capable of, just as there are boundaries over men. Women can be great at emulating authentic, masculine love, but it will only ever be to the same degree that a parrot emulates the words "I love you." It has no clue what those words actually mean; it just knows that saying them produces a good reaction and gets him a cracker.

I'm prepared to open my own bank account, move all cash out of our joint accounts, and remove her access to our family budget.

Right, because continuing with counseling is what's going to keep you from going Rambo. I can't wait to read the update after this. It'll be like the fourth of July.

I'm hoping some of you guys can shoot me some wisdom

Yes, it's a bad idea. It's going Rambo.

What's really going on here is that you got in a fight over finances and now it seems like finances are the most important thing in your marriage. You view them as the most important thing to her. You're willing to blow up your marriage over it, so it seems like the most important thing to you. But then you're going to calm down and realize there are other more important things and it won't be such a big deal.

The best way to handle the situation is to phase yourself in gradually. Start by asking your wife to see a copy of the spreadsheet she maintains to manage your budget because you want to get a snapshot of how things have been going lately - a very plain and innocuous request. You'll find she probably doesn't have a spreadsheet, which will make her feel like she's not doing her job properly without you actually saying it. So, you reply, "No worries. Can you give me an overview of our average net surplus/deficit over the last 6 months? I want to make sure we're planning for long-term savings." She's probably going to have no idea and give you a BS number about how much she usually sees in the account at random times when she checks on it. After a few more questions like that you end the conversation and thank her for the information she was able to provide and that it helps you wrap your head around some of the long-term goals you have, like retirement, vacation-planning, etc. If she asks you what those goals are, stay amorphous. "I haven't decided anything concrete in my head. I needed some information before I could figure out what reasonable goals are in the first place."

About 2 weeks later you start trickling in some information about your long-term goals. "I'm thinking I want to retire by the age of 60 instead of 70. What would it take to do that?" She's going to have no clue. You're going to end up seeing a financial planner. You'll be the one to set up that meeting. You're going to ask her lots of questions about your financial status before meeting with him so that you know how to run the conversation. You're going to tell her, "Just so you know, they're going to try to sell us all kinds of thing that I don't want to buy. I'd rather handle the talking so you don't have to deal with the pressure of telling him no. And if we think it's a good idea, you and I can talk about it afterward and just call him back. Don't worry, we can still consider all the options he gives us, I just don't want to be pressured into making the decisions in front of him, so let me handle the conversation." Most girls hate that kind of pressure anyway, so she'll acquiesce.

After the financial planning meeting you come up with a long-term plan using some of the information the adviser gave you, and then tell your wife that the conversation really motivated you and now you want to be more hands-on with the finances and budgeting.

You get the idea from there. But see how gradual that process is, and how it puts the pivot points on external sources so it doesn't look like you're just turning into a control freak? This is how you slide into things rather than going Rambo.

But you better be really stinkin' good with handling the money once you take over, otherwise it's a bad idea to take over the finances in the first place. Be better than she was. Period.

116 - God is a jerk.

3 upvotes · 25 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

He just cares more about people than they care about themselves.

Right. A jerk is someone who ignores other people's thoughts and feelings and imposes their own wants and desires on a situation instead. Because God knows better for us than we know ourselves, he does this as well. It comes off to people as being a jerk. The only people who don't describe God as a jerk are Christians who feel compelled to rationalize God's behaviors with their own moralistic philosophies, which is an unnecessary (even spiritually harmful) task, per my conversation with Dan_M7.

Husband had an affair - seeking feedback

3 upvotes · 23 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

alpha males are tough to crack

From your descriptions of him, it sounds to me like your husband is not alpha. He seems like a dominant beta. I know I planned a post on it at one point, but can't remember if I ever wrote it, on the topic of how dominance/submissiveness is not synonymous with the alpha/beta dynamic. There can be dominant betas and submissive alphas. Military guys are great examples of submissive alphas. Most of them have very alpha mindsets, yet will behave quite submissively within their chain of command. In the reverse, countless wife-beaters are highly dominant, but have extremely beta mentalities about their lives with blue pill ideologies that are at the core of their rage.

As /u/TheChristianAlpha commented, your husband is almost certainly validation-seeking, which is a very beta, blue-pill mind-frame. But his sexual resentment toward you (as you alluded to in another comment) causes him to treat you with a dominant tone - not because he's a dominant person, but because something in him is emotionally hardened against you.

I just haven't been with someone who is humble enough to change, keep frame, and be the leader he needs to be.

A defining trait of blue-pill betas is that they live in constant reaction to those around them. They don't have their own sense of self. The way you describe him, this seems pretty accurate as to him specifically as well. While his reactions may not take the form of complying with your requests, the fact is that his lack of humility, inability to maintain his own frame, and poor leadership qualities are all founded on a reaction to his relationship with you.

I say this not to your blame, as I have no idea if you're unwittingly doing things to cause him to feel this way or not. At the end of the day, he's got to decide to be man enough to create his own frame. You can't lead him into doing it. At best, you can soften yourself enough that it makes it easier for him to make that decision if/when he's ready.

We'll digress to what life was like before we went to couples counseling and disregard all the work we have put in, in the last year to heal our marriage and sexual intimacy

So you found out about his affair last week, but have already been in counseling together for over a year. That says a lot. As I often say, marriage counseling is a joke and does not work unless you have one of the 0.1% of marriage counselors who actually gets it. 90% of marriage counselors will have interesting insights that sound logical and even seem to give epiphany moments, but it's a ruse. If they don't understand the Bible inside and out (and I mean better than 99% of pastors) and they're clueless on the true nature of men and women (i.e. not red pill), the best they can do is put a bandaid on it and hope the wound heals naturally. That's all that most of

counseling is: developing coping strategies rather than healing strategies.

And yes, most people do regress, even if they discover real answers to their problems. Why? Because reverting to our old ways is the most comfortable path of least resistance. Only Jesus can enact a permanent change in us by changing our actual *self* so that our "old way" is no longer the default mode we shrink back into; rather, it becomes something uncomfortable and distasteful. But without someone woke to disciple him, it's unlikely he'll magically get there on his own.

This is mind numbing to how angry this makes me

Right - and you're not alone. Every woman is infuriated by the prevalent cycle.

- Things get bad.
- Husband promises to fix it.
- Changes are made.
- Time goes on and things go back to the way they were.
- Husband promises to change it again.

And so on. This is part of **The Hopeless Cycle** I wrote about in 403.

He told me if I was going to divorce him that I should wait until our youngest is 18, which is in 2.5 years.

I'm not sure what a divorce would solve, unless you were planning on getting remarried. Of course, most women are not emotionally stable enough to honor the "no remarriage after divorce" concept in Scripture. My mom is the only one I've known. So, if you plan on sinning by marrying someone else, then yes, go ahead and get divorced now and don't feel like you're stuck because he said you couldn't. Chances are, by the time the divorce process is over, you'll be darn close to that 2.5 year mark anyway (it's 18 months in my state, from start to finish, unless you settle sooner).

If you do intend to honor the no-remarriage rule, then separating/divorcing is only valuable if the pain of being together is so great that it would cause you to fall into even greater sin. Just be warned that a separation like that only encourages him to keep sinning with someone else, further ruining the chances of an eventual reconciliation. After all, if he was willing to have sex with another woman while consciously legally married to you, he's certainly going to be willing to have sex with other women once that restraint is removed and he can ignore the spiritual marriage that still remains.

So, now I'm faced with either divorcing or living with a roommate and shutting down all the work that we have put in to try to heal our sexual intimacy

Why do you have to shut everything down?

This is what I don't get at all. I mean, I empathize with the reaction because of the emotionally tense and frail nature of your position ... but think about things from God's perspective.

- How many times have you cheated on God with another idol or false god? It sounds to me like you've already done this with your husband, and I'd be willing to bet there are at least a dozen more (kids, house, money, and other life expectations are common examples), just as I could name several in my own life.
- When you spiritually cheat on God with these things - focusing on reproducing more abundance of those things in your life than on spiritually reproducing with Christ (i.e. evangelism/discipleship), does God become so emotionally distraught that the relationship breaks down and he can no longer function? Sure, you're not

God. But that doesn't change the fact that God still feels - and feels more fully than we ever could. And yet you treat him this way every time he wants to reproduce with you and you're more interested in something else going on in your life.

- And if God has mercy for all the times you spiritually cheat on him, then fully embraces you with open, loving arms, and is still excited at the opportunity to create new spiritual life through - all because of the power of his forgiveness ... doesn't the parable of the unmerciful servant assume you should pass on to your husband, who has committed a lesser (yet categorically identical) sin against you, the same forgiveness, mercy, and grace?

I get that it's hard to get past your emotions. Believe me, in my [testimony post](#) I talked about the girl who cheated on me countless times. I know the emotional pain that comes with that, and it's really stinkin' hard to want to look at the other person, let alone touch them, or even kiss them - and much less have sex with them! Yet this is the model that Christ set for us anyway.

... if your husband is genuinely repentant. If he's not repentant about the situation, then there's no room for grace and forgiveness. But you don't get to define the terms of his repentance. Only God can set that. And the determination of his repentance is between him and God, not him and you.

Remember David, who cheated on his wives with Bathsheba, having sex with one of his best friends' wives and then murdering his friend to cover it up, and then getting Bathsheba's son killed as the consequence of all of this? Do you see how horribly he upturned her entire life? And yet in Psalm 51 when David is reflecting on this he writes, "Against you Lord, you only, have I sinned." Why? Because God is in charge of Bathsheba's life, not David. David doesn't owe anything to Bathsheba because he's not beholden to her expectations over his life; he's only beholden to God's expectations. Yes, she was affected by his sin, but if God paid for David's sin in the person of Christ on the cross (which applies past, present, and future, per Romans 4), then Bathsheba has no right to hold that sin against David when God has forgiven it because of David's repentance. Bathsheba's recourse for the wrong done to her is not against David, but through God and his sovereignty over her life. This is why Paul can say things like in Romans 12:19 - "Do not take revenge, my dear friends, but leave room for God's wrath, for it is written: 'It is mine to avenge; I will repay,' says the Lord." If it's an offense against us, how can it be for God to avenge and not us? Because all offenses are against God and not between people, if we are under God. And this really isn't a hard concept to understand because we do it all the time. When a person commits domestic violence, for example, the wife can't the next day claim a right to attack him to make things fair. It's for the state to decide if/how he's guilty and how to punish him - and she has to accept whatever judgment the state makes, whether she likes it or not.

With that blurb in mind, in God's society, which we call the Church, your husband's sin is against God and not against you. That's a bitter pill to swallow and can be tough to wrap your mind around, given how deeply it affects you. But hopefully it makes sense and can give you peace knowing that you can fully love and embrace your husband because God has dealt with his sin so you don't have to. And if God hasn't dealt with it already on the cross, then he certainly will on Judgment Day. Either way, God's got it covered and you can make the most of today.

Older female Virgin

3 upvotes · 15 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Good word. This did inspire one more thought:

saying that if an unbeliever leaves that Christians are free to remarry

The remarriage bit is never referenced in that passage. It only authorizes the leaving.

I told my son the other day, "Get off your tablet and go play with your sisters." He asked, *What if they won't play with me?* I answered, "Then you don't have to play with them."

Sure enough, he goes outside and comes right back inside 2 minutes later and hops on his tablet. "I thought I told you to get off your tablet," I refrained. He answered, *You said to play with my sisters and if they wouldn't play back, then I didn't have to play with them. They didn't play back, so now I don't have to play with them.*

At what point in there did I say that he could go back on his tablet? Never. He added words that I never put there in order to reach the conclusion that let him do what he wanted. As a result, he was highly motivated to behave in a way that prevented his sisters from wanting to play with him. How do I know? Because I watched out the window when he went out there and saw him picking on them and causing them to tell him to go away.

In the same way, people can add words to Scripture, then create the situation that justifies them doing what they added. A wife wants to get away from an unbelieving husband to marry who she thinks is a better man? Fine. She stays with him, but acts unbearably so that he divorces her and she's free to marry someone else (even though the Bible never added the "and then you can marry someone else" line; she did that).

Compounding into this is the way that my son defied my original command in the first place in order to rationalize his intended result. He never played with his sisters. He picked on them. He disobeyed me and thought that his disobedience would somehow justify to me that he go back on his tablet, which I never authorized him to do. Likewise, women sin by acting disrespectful and unruly toward their husbands so that he will walk away in order to justify remarrying, which God never authorized them to do.

Older female Virgin

3 upvotes · 15 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

That's the common churchy answer, but that's not what 1 Cor. 7 actually says - and the passages on the topic from Jesus are more telling. This has been discussed at length here and the general consensus is that remarriage after divorce is only non-sin when the divorced spouse dies, or is "preferred sin" when the sins you would commit if you remained single indefinitely (i.e. habitual non-marital sex, potential children out of wedlock, etc.) would have a greater impact on your ability to make disciples than the sin of remarriage after divorce.

As I don't have time to go into it, John Piper's article covers about 95% of the relevant content on this:

<https://www.desiringgod.org/articles/divorce-and-remarriage-a-position-paper>

I'm meeting her dad tomorrow. Any advice?

3 upvotes · 9 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

This is the correct answer.

I'm meeting her dad tomorrow. Any advice?

3 upvotes · 9 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Don't tell someone to "be yourself" unless you know their "self" is totally awesome. The only other way this advice works is if the dad is so weak that he'd never be able to muster up the strength to say no to the guy his little girl wants. Which is surprisingly common.

Recent Christian, about to just give up on women.

3 upvotes · 2 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

It's not a safe space to vent. But that's because most guys don't need a safe space for that. They can go to a counselor to vent safely. Vent here and we're going to challenge you, push your buttons, and overall push you to be better. It's not a safe space, but it's a good one.

"Aslan is a lion- the Lion, the great Lion."

"Ooh" said Susan. "I'd thought he was a man. Is he-quite safe? I shall feel rather nervous about meeting a lion"

"Safe?" said Mr Beaver ... "Who said anything about safe? 'Course he isn't safe. But he's good. He's the King, I tell you."

Women don't need men anymore. Why women in the west behave as they do.

3 upvotes · 1 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

It's longer than the New Testament

Bobby, you've made this claim several times now. I just did a word count and the new testament is over double the length of the sidebar. Speaking from your gut without checking the facts is a very democrat-like thing of you to do.

Even if it were longer than the New Testament, so is Wayne Grudem's systematic theology - and there's a lot of hit or miss there too. In fact, most Christian books are longer than our sidebar, and many are *actually* longer than the New Testament. Go pick a bone with the Christian book store. I guarantee you'll find WAY more pages that are non-New Testament than you will here.

more than half of the topics have to do with a female's frame

This tells me you're absolutely clueless about what "frame" means.

the focus should be on developing the man

If you're MGTOW, sure. But many men have different goals. What does it mean to "develop the man"? I could run off a list of people who will tell you the red pill is ultimately sexual strategy, not some circle jerk of men just wanting to be better men. "Develop the man" into what? Into your idea of what a man should be? Into his own idea of what a man should be? Into God's idea?

Does that include having sex? You've had sex, so either you're being a hypocrite or sex is a reasonable desire for a man to have. Is it okay for a man to develop into someone desires sex and is able to achieve it? Or would you have him develop into a man who desires sex, but isn't able to achieve it? That seems counter-productive. And if it's okay to desire and achieve sex as part of a man's development, shouldn't part of "developing the man" mean teaching him how to have sex? And if the man is already satisfied with most other aspects of his development in life except his sexuality, wouldn't it make sense to focus on conversation about how to develop his sexuality over areas where he is already satisfied with his development and progress?

You make these statements assuming that they mean something, but they're just fluff that lead back to the same conclusions contrary to what you think your point is. What you're really getting at is a MGTOW approach to life - that men can only be men if they act on their own independent of female influence - and this is just idiotic. If a girl decides to cut my arm off, she influenced me. I can't "frame" my way out of that influence. Women make up just over half the population of the world - you can't ignore their influence on your life. And the fact that you write these posts talking about the influence women have on the world is counter-intuitive to your very point in the first place. Aren't you writing all of this as a response to what women have done in society? Doesn't that mean that you were in the "meta-frame" of the feminine imperative when you wrote this post because you wouldn't have written it if you truly were free from female influence? And if you accept that you're under female influence as a matter of general fact and not a frame issue, then shouldn't you best figure out how to optimize your life in

light of that influence? Sure, you're welcome to try to change it, but complaining on an internet forum can only take you so far.

Unfortunately, when men get that and realize the women are fickle and not worth their investment, they will have buyers remorse.

And yet you still seem to be interested in having women along for the ride yourself.

But again, this is more of a black pill approach, which is wrong. If you want to debate why the black pill is better than the red pill, go to [r/purplepilldebate](#). I've never been there, but I hear they'll entertain this type of discussion. Or if you want to make a post asking why the black pill is wrong, feel free to do that. But don't push black pill sentiment disguised as someone who pretends to understand the red pill when you don't.

What I really see going on here is that you're a blue pill guy who has been jaded. You still want all the fantasy life to be true, but you realize it won't be true, so you've just given up. It's like when my son was 4 and playing with legos. He wanted to make a superman statue with them. He didn't have enough pieces. It was physically impossible to do what he wanted. If you were in his shoes, you would have just given up and said, "Then don't play with legos ever again." My 4-year-old son was smart enough to realize: "I guess if I can't make a superman statue, I'll just make something else that I enjoy instead." Don't be dumber than a 4-year old and assume the only choices are "blue pill fantasy world or bust." If you choose "or bust," that's fine - but don't tell other men that they must as well, otherwise "they will have buyers remorse" or some silly and ridiculous notion like that.

That conclusion only makes sense if you assume the man is blue pill going in - which for you makes sense because you think you understand the red pill, but you're trying to force it into the blue mentality that you just can't get out of your head, so you assume everyone else here is also doing the same thing. That's why you say things like, "It doesn't matter how red pill you are," and then go on about how you think the woman will hold the frame anyway and that she'll always be in power and it will only ever be a charade for a man to lead under current marriage laws. You think these things because you're not actually red pill and have not lived the married man red pill life. You're speculating about what you THINK might be the case, but you're wrong.

I don't want to hear anymore theory from you. I want to hear evidence. If you don't have observable reality about how red pill marriages function, then don't jump to conclusions and share them as if you somehow know your hypothesis is right before you've ever actually tested any of it.

I dare you. Go on MRP and ask the veterans how their marriages are going compared to how they were pre-RP. Ask them how the frame dynamic works in their homes. Ask them if the marriage laws have given their wives all the power in the home. You'll find that the results are extremely different from the message you preach.

The Red Pill & Religion – with Conk & Sam Botta

3 upvotes · 23 June 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I'll have to listen soon. I'm intrigued at your bullet points, though there's clearly a lack of understanding of what the bible actually says here. I really hope they clarify that they're only talking about cultural christianity and not biblical christianity. That is a massive distinction.

I can hold a megaphone and preach from the rooftops that men are better than women and call myself a feminist ... but would I really be a feminist if that were my message? At some point you have to reconcile the fact of a thing with the label that's slapped on it.

Also, there's a difference between what's good for men and what's good for God, or just what's true. The goal here isn't to advance the male agenda. *So stinking what* if "the church isn't for men"? If it's true and any other way is a path straight to hell, I'll take truth and heaven any day. Let's not let the red pill agenda control the church any

more than the feminine imperative does. Let the bible speak for itself. It happens to be "red pill" anyway, so that solution is far more internally consistent and theologically sound in talking "red pill and religion" than trying to impose secular philosophies on interpretation, application and expression of scripture.

Does she trust you to be a man?

3 upvotes · 19 June 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Solid. It took me several months to figure out that distinction between "king of the betas" and "panty dropper." More guys should be made aware that general self improvement alone is not enough.

The Second Kiss of Death

3 upvotes · 19 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Correct. Pair bonding isn't bad. But it has the potential to be dangerous - especially for singles. "Kids with dynamite" and all. Dynamite is incredibly effective, but thre wrong person in the wrong place at the wrong time, not knowing what he's doing, can really hurt a lot of people, including himself.

The Second Kiss of Death

3 upvotes · 19 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

That would make sense if this phenomenon were limited to my post-RP days. If anything, I'd say that this wavering is far more narrow than it used to be, but that's in part because she does step up her game some.

On Marriage And Mission

3 upvotes · 13 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

THIS POST

Shouldn't I ask, "What is YOUR mission?" In the west we are thoroughly individualistic.

Amen! I love the way you addressed this.

nations, not just the individuals who inhabit them

I've always been intrigued by this notion - and I'm guilty in isolating Matthew 28 from Mark 16 too, but the Mark account does more clearly state: "Go into all the world" and not "make disciples of all nations." The harmonious reading would be that we are to go into all nations to make disciples throughout all of them.

Of course, in saying this, I have to eat my own interpretive measure and deal with the fact that Mark 16 says to "preach the Gospel" and not "make disciples."

- Is the harmonious reading here that Matthew was being flippant with the word "disciple" and really meant "make converts," despite all the other times he talks about discipleship throughout his Gospel, and therefore Mark's view of "making converts" is really what Jesus meant/said?
- Or is it more likely that Mark was speaking colloquially about the Gospel as the foundation on which every disciple is made, whereas Matthew was being more specific of Jesus' intent here because it tied to the entire purpose of his book in the first place, as he is writing primarily to a Jewish audience to show how Jesus was the fulfillment of the prophesies of the Jewish Messiah and that he was the embodiment of Jewish law and culture made complete - and therefore Matthew had a reason for giving the specifics that Mark was less interested in and glossed over?

I think the latter.

vast majority of faithful Christians that have walked this earth have been born to Christian parents

Which is why I often refer to discipleship as a form of "spiritual parenting."

Marriage, and the Godly offspring it is intended to produce, is the primary weapon of evangelism wielded by the church.

I wouldn't call it primary, but it's certainly a powerful one. The Holy Spirit is the primary weapon - "Sword of the Spirit" and all, or even the Word of God, which is "sharper than any two-edged sword." Which begs a curious question: if the "Word of God" relates to the Father's communication to man, is that the Father's way of showing dominance over the Spirit that his Word is sharper than *any* sword? Or if we assume Jesus as the Word, the same question. Silly thoughts, I know ... but fun stuff to ponder all the same.

Paul here is not giving a blanket statement about marriage and singleness that upends God's creation order and consistently favorable disposition towards marriage

I would agree with you if Jesus hadn't affirmed Paul's view in Matthew 19 even before Paul spoke it. Verses 10 - "If this is the situation between a husband and wife [i.e. unfavorable divorce laws], it is better not to marry." Yes, the disciples were the first MGTOWs. 11 - "Jesus replied, 'Not everyone can accept this word, but only those to whom it has been given ... The one who can accept this should accept it.'"

In other words, Jesus is saying, "If it's at all possible to stay single, do it. But most people are too blue pill'd to realize the truth I just gave you, and even if they did hear it they still might reject it because of how culturally conditioned they are. So, the Spirit will have to intervene for some guys who want to have this better way of life."

Jesus was not referring to a unique time in history, but a very broad statement about his views on marriage going forward. Bear in mind that this was certainly not true in the Old Testament. In a pre-Gospel world, I completely agree with you that marriage was a very favorable thing and God encouraged and endorsed it - and appropriately so, as it helped people understand the Christ/church relationship later. It was a living, millennia-long parable. Now we've got the real-deal in Jesus, and he as much as says in this passage, "Stay single if you're someone who can."

fail to grasp the reality that the most important means of spreading the gospel to all nations that God has given the church is the family

Again, I agree that it's incredibly powerful and important. But I wouldn't elevate it to "*most important*" status. I'd say that if a guy has a family, then he should by all means make use of it. I committed when I married to have at least 4 kids (as I do) because then my wife and I will have multiplied ourselves through our kids - $2 \times 2 = 4$, so when we're gone we've left behind twice as many as we came in with.

My mission ... to disciple people and nations to be brought into God's dominion and kingdom

I love it!

God purposed marriage to achieve great ends; become the kind of man that can lead his family to those ends.

Amen.

FINAL CAUTION

I think there are a couple places where your "marriage is a great weapon" breaks down.

First, it assumes that every married couple will have kids. In that sense, marriage isn't the weapon; rather, child-rearing is. Marriage is simply a context in which that can happen lawfully for Christians.

Second, are you only talking about male Christians? I had a post recently on whether or not women can disciple other women. We don't actually see any examples in the Bible of women being endorsed disciple-makers even over other women. Dalrock certainly thinks they should not be, except as to life-skills. I'm not as persuaded as my post may have implied (a bit of devil's advocacy there), but the point still stands: if we truly take the view that men are the holders and teachers of doctrine in the church, then does that mean that only male children really count in this reproduction game. What does that say of my 1 boy and 3 girl set of kids? What if you have all girls, like my uncle who had 3 of them and no boys?

Third, and more importantly, is that you also assume a Christian's children will also grow up Christian. The statistics on this are quite dismal. [One website](#) pulled together several studies on this subject.

Study Findings: Data from the Southern Baptist Convention indicates that they are currently losing 70-88% of their youth after their freshman year in college. 70% of teenagers involved in church youth groups stop attending church within two years of their high school graduation.

Study Findings: 88% of the children in evangelical homes leave church at the age of 18

Study Findings: A majority of twenty-somethings – 61% of today's young adults – had been church-ed at one point during their teen years but they are now spiritually disengaged.

Study Findings: At least half and possibly over two-thirds of Christian young people will step away from the Christian faith while attending a non-Christian college or university. Between 50% and 66.7% of Assemblies of God young people who attend a non-Christian public or private university will have left the faith four years after entering college.

Study Findings: 70% will leave the faith in college. Only 35% eventually return. 7 in 10 Protestants ages 18 to 30 – both evangelical and mainline – who went to church regularly in high school said they quit attending by age 23. 34% of those said they had not returned, even sporadically, by age 30. That means about one in four Protestant young people have left the church.

Book Findings: 63% don't believe Jesus is the Son of the one true God. 58% believe all faiths teach equally valid truths. 51% don't believe Jesus rose from the dead. 65% don't believe Satan is a real entity. 68% don't believe the Holy Spirit is a real entity

Book Findings: 90% of youth active in high school church programs drop out of church by the time they are sophomores on college.

Not exactly on-point, but interesting nonetheless, in an RP forum:

Study Findings: This research, based on the American Religious Identification Survey 2008, addresses the religious beliefs and behaviors of those born from the early to mid-1960s to the late 1970s to early 1980s:

- Generation X has weakened its ties to Christianity (85% in 1990 v. 75% in 2008)
- Generation X has secularized over time. In 1990 11% were Nones compared to 16% in 2008; 13% of Generation X did not identify with a religion (including Don't Know and refusals) in 1990, compared to 21% in 2008

- Generation X Christian groups became more female dominated over time (with the exception of the Protestant Sects) while the Nones and Other Religions became more male dominated.

There are many, many more that I don't have space to include. Sadly, the Baptist Church's response is to blame the schools and develop more "Christian curriculum" to raise kids in.

As I recall, you're only just now pregnant with your first - and I don't mean this to knock you, but as a future-insight you will likely have. As much as I am a discipleship-minded man who raises my kids with prayer and the Word every day and relational life-modeling, etc., I still have concerns over whether or not my children will remain committed to the faith and become disciple-makers in their future. I just don't know. As perfectly as I may execute a plan to raise them this way, I can't control their spirit or force my plan on their future once they're out of my house. One of my kids gives me real cause for concern. Yes, she's only 5 ... but the makings for trouble in her future are there, and I can only do so much to mold and guide her.

Now, I of all people recognize that ~church~ Sunday service attendance means squat. But even a system designed to be as attractive as possible to young people is failing. So one of two things will result from a family discipleship model:

- It will be even more burdensome than the "sit in my pew and come to heaven" approach, so even more children will be repelled when they get out of the house, or
- Jesus's model will defy human logic, so parents who actually disciple their kids will find them continuing in the faith and making disciples.

Gravitational Centers - A Case Study on the MRP Journey

3 upvotes · 12 June 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Fuzzies = the relational things women say they're attracted to in a man, which make them feel warm and happy.

Tingles = the things women are actually attracted to in a man, which make them feel horny.

As I noted, it's not a perfect graph because if tingles are low enough, no amount effort to produce fuzzies will actually make her happy, so that red zone should actually stretch across the page ... among other things. Maybe I'll tweak it sometime in the future.

Gravitational Centers - A Case Study on the MRP Journey

3 upvotes · 12 June 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Fair enough.

Gravitational Centers - A Case Study on the MRP Journey

3 upvotes · 12 June 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

The same color as her soul: black.

Struggling with my faith

3 upvotes · 10 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

My question here is, why do I not see these?

Most people assume miracles are dependent on the faith of the person performing the miracle. This is false. Mark 6:5 notes that Jesus "could not do any miracles there [in his hometown], except lay his hands on a few sick people and heal them." Are we to suggest that Jesus lacked the faith to perform the miracles? No. The people

around him lacked the faith to receive them, as he explained in the previous verse.

Jesus was from Nazareth. It was his hometown. They knew him. He grew up there. When he outed himself as the Messiah, they didn't believe him because they thought they knew better. America is known throughout the world as a "Christian country." As much hogwash as that may be, America has known Christianity for a long time. We have a history together. When Christians proclaim to the country the miraculous wonders God can perform, they don't believe because Americans think they know better.

It follows that in America we "could not do any miracles [here], except lay [our] hands on a few sick people and heal them." And yes, these healings do occur.

As someone who laid down everything to Jesus (and lost my family because of it) I feel there should be some powerful evidence there

Notice that most of Jesus' miracles happen because someone approaches him with faith.

- The man at the pool cries out for the Son of David.
- The lame man is lowered through the roof to get to Jesus.
- The blind man asks to be healed.
- The centurion seeks Jesus to ask for healing for his daughter.
- The woman in the crowd touches Jesus's cloak and is healed even without Jesus intending to heal her!

How many people have approached you because they believed you could perform a miracle?

I'm sorry to hear about your mom and the difficulties your family has endured. I guess my point in this response is to take the pressure off of you. It's not about you. The lack of miracles present in your life isn't because you have somehow failed or lacked faith, but because the people around you aren't ready or willing to receive the good works God can do.

I certainly have seen miracles performed. I knew a family whose dead baby was brought back to life after two doctors a month apart confirmed the baby's death in utero (yes, she was almost a month past her due-date when going into labor). I've personally been healed and on two occasions have done the healing. These things do happen and they are for real. But they're not common. Even Paul feared for Epaphroditus when he was ill - and both of them were loyal, faithful followers of Christ who believed. Why wasn't he healed instantly? God had some other purpose - no doubt part of which was to teach us (the church throughout the rest of time) this exact lesson. But now I'm rambling. I hope this helps.

Going to be a father. Resources?

3 upvotes · 17 May 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Late to the party on this post, but here's what I came up with when in your shoes.

The Purpose of Parenting

You can't measure your success as a parent if you don't know what your goals are as a parent. These goals are neither overly broad ("I want him to grow up to be a godly man") or overly specific ("I want him to be a cardiovascular surgeon by the age of 35"). They are informed by the way God has parented us.

The world will tell you that the goal of parenting is simply to have an emotionally positive relationship with your children. If they walk out the door at the age of 18 knowing that you love them and are proud of them - no matter whether they deserve it or not, then you will have succeeded. This is total garbage. I study child psychology literally every single week and review the research. It's part of my job in knowing how to approach custody cases.

The evidence is just not there. It sounds good to emotionalist liberals, but there are countless people who felt loved by their parents who still wound up leading very unsuccessful, unfulfilled lives, struggling with depression, loneliness, unable to connect in a community, lacking meaningful romantic relationships, etc.

God does not tell us that a person is mature when they feel loved by him. Rather, he says through Paul: "Let those of us who are mature think this way, and if in anything you think otherwise, God will reveal that also to you. Only let us hold true to what we have already attained. Brothers, join in imitating me, and keep your eyes on those who walk according to the example you have in us" (Phil. 3:15-17).

That is, maturity comes from learning how to live in the example of our parents - and it is made complete when we no longer need our parents, though we may certainly still want them around. I don't take this to mean every single detail of our lives, just as Jesus doesn't compel all men to take up carpentry as their career. But it does mean that maturity comes from developing the same driving force in our life as our parents, which Paul explains in the preceding verse: "I press on toward the goal for the prize of the upward call of God in Christ Jesus." That is where spiritual maturity comes from - when we can emulate this "straining forward to what lies ahead" (v14) and an orientation toward achieving clear life goals. The same should be true of earthly maturity: that our children recognize their parents' goals and are able to strive to achieve the mission set out for the - which only works productively if we get our goals from God.

While I don't know much about what he teaches generally, I did read a book on parenting by Chip Ingram. The entire foundation of his book was that the primary purpose of parenting is to teach children how to obey. If they can learn to obey you, they can learn to obey God. I find it hard to argue with that conclusion - especially given all the talking I do about the parallel between the tangible and the spiritual. Just as tangible parenting helps us understand spiritual parenting with those we disciple, so also does *being parented* for a child by their physical father help them understand how to be spiritually parented by their Father.

In short, my goal as a parent is to teach my children how to obey and to give them a purpose bigger than their own self-interests that they can pursue, which will make a difference for eternity - a purpose that my Father passed down to me through my physical parents and through the man who God used to give me spiritual life.

Get on board with a purpose for your parenting and orient everything around that. As always: **Mission matters, nothing else.**

Methodology

With my stated goal above, how do I go about accomplishing this? Here are some practical tips that will mostly apply over a long period of time, and not necessarily during the first year of your child's life.

First, Kids are born believing that they are the center of the universe. They're not. Have your own agenda and let them know consistently: "You are important to me, but you're not *the most important thing* to me, and I do not orient my life around you."

Second, boys in particular get stifled enough by society as-is. They have ambitions and desires and crazy ideas that are totally risky and unsafe. Everyone tells them they shouldn't be this way and that they should just chill out and avoid these adventurous pursuits. This is how boys become feminized. Learning to obey the word "no" is crucial to a boy, but it must also be well-placed. If you can waken his adventurous spirit by finding a way to say "yes," then do it. For example: my son wanted to play with a hammer once. My wife immediately said no. It's really dangerous. He could break himself or something else. Makes sense, right? Don't let kids play with grown-up tools. Screw that. "Yes, you can play with the hammer - just wait until I can do it with you." See how easy that is? Adventurous spirit alive, appropriate cautions taken.

Third, do things WITH your children, not just FOR them or merely telling them what to do or how to do it. I defer back to 208 as the simplified methodology of disciple-making I see in Jesus life:

- **Tell them what.** Verbally explain to your children who you are and what you expect of them - both in the

moment and on broader life goals. This is only the first step because it's probably the least important of all of them.

- **Show them how.** Actually do things in front of them or show them through guided motions. A classic example is when the guy wraps his arms around a girl to show her how to swing a baseball bat. For my kids, when teaching them how to walk, I'd physically grab their legs and move them in walking motions so they would start to learn. When playing tether ball with my son, I show him how to hit the ball at the right angles to go over the other kids' heads by doing it in front of him.
- **Let them try.** Once you've shown them, give them a chance. With the tether ball example, he used to want to hit the ball up to go over someone's head. Makes sense to a kid: hit it up to make it go up. After telling him how tension on the rope will cause the ball to swing up if you hit it down, then showing him how it worked, suddenly he understood it and was able to hit the ball effectively on his own.
- **Send them out.** After they're competent doing something, you can stop supervising. They should be able to function on their own. My son can go play tether ball with other kids on the playground and employ the strategies I taught him even without me being there to remind him.
- **Pass it on.** As a person begins to excel at something, others start to follow them and want to learn from them. My 7yr old son got really good at folding paper into boomerangs and ninja throwing stars. He gets so excited to show me the new ones he makes after school. Other kids saw him doing it and wanted to learn, so now he's teaching other kids how to do it too. This is beautiful. I didn't have to arrange for this - but there are many things where I do have to be intentional about ensuring my son passes on the things I've taught him to other people. "Do you have any friends who don't know Jesus? Wouldn't it be great if they loved Jesus too? Wouldn't it be cool if you got to be the one to show them how to be like Jesus?"

Fourth, when in doubt, look to how the Father parented humanity. I used to be harsh against legalists. I now understand the value in it - especially as a parent. In humanity's early days, God crafted a covenant of legalism: follow my commands and I'll bless you. Paul later reveals that God never intended legalism, but that humanity without the Spirit and absent the cross was too blind to understand the full picture of God's relationship with his people. My kids are too young to grasp the way I want to relate with them. So, I have to use clear rules and boundaries to create a safe context for them to be able to love and relate with me appropriately. They don't understand why they must clean their room - only that they must do it. As much as I can explain that it's character-building to let them take responsibility for a small domain I've given them, they just can't grasp that concept intellectually yet. So, the law it is. As they mature, my 7yr old son can now understand bits and pieces of the reason behind the rules I place - that the rules are there both for his benefit and my good pleasure. To that end, embrace the fact that legalism, while not an end-goal or even a present interest, is still a practically valuable tool for parenting purposes.

Fifth, controlled emotional expression can be very valuable. I firmly believe that we, as humans, do not have the capacity to infuriate God. He does not emotionally react to us, as if I could flip off the sky and somehow he'd get all fiery-eyed. Yet we see examples of God becoming angry at human behavior all the time. Is God losing frame when this happens? I never understood this until I became a parent. This happens about every other night. My kids are sent to bed, but keep getting out of bed. It's usually for stupid stuff like, "I bumped my hand on the wall. Can I get a bandaid?" No, you cannot have a bandaid if you're not bleeding. It's silly kid stuff. Sometimes my wife and I just laugh - amused mastery. But I'm not trying to get my kids sexually attracted to me; I'm trying to get them to obey me. So, amused mastery isn't always the best strategy at developing obedience. Know what is? Daddy gives a stern look and starts walking slowly toward them. They think, "I made Daddy mad! I better get back into bed before he spansks me!" Was I actually mad? No. But I certainly needed to show them that side of me so they can develop a healthy fear that leads to obedience - and then I am well pleased with them when they stay in bed after that.

And I'm out of room ...

Women Feeling Threatened by Hyper-Sexualized Social Media

3 upvotes · 1 May 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Yes, I think we're defining the feminine imperative differently. Feminists today would not read Proverbs 31, accounting for the entire cultural context, and conclude that this is what they're striving for. As I understand, they'd say that's what they're running from.

Raiders of the Lost Covenant

3 upvotes · 21 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

This is a truly interesting article. I always love reading your stuff, especially when it comes from unique angles that aren't often talked about in RP circles. While my time is limited, let me hit some highlights. Although I understand that your book addresses religion in general, I'm going to reply purely from the Christian biblical perspective (as opposed to the Christian cultural, which the article demonstrates you're already familiar with).

I would still never remarry were I to find myself single tomorrow – I simply cannot endorse marriage, as it exists today, as a good idea for any young man. Remember, this is coming from a guy with a damn good marriage.

I've made remarkably similar comments in the past as well. While my intimate knowledge of marriage law may contribute to this conclusion, the Bible independently leads me to this view as well.

Covenant marriage presumes a mutual religious reverence and understanding of what is expected of a man and a woman before they enter into marriage

While this may be true of the cultural Christianity model, the Bible doesn't make any such prerequisite in the formation of a marriage. While I would still use the word "covenant," the Bible is extremely relaxed on what constitutes a covenant. For example, in Exodus 22:16-17 we see that when two people have unmarried consensual sex, even though they did not intend marriage, the option of marriage must be presented. The implication is that God views the two as married already (i.e. spiritual marriage), which is what triggers the option for a transactional exchange with the woman's father (i.e. legal/contractual marriage). That's not to imply that these laws are still "on the books," so to speak, but that's a much larger conversation.

Why marry at all if what you're taking away from it is nothing you can't get outside of marriage without the risk?

Right, but this goes to the underlying premise of the blue pill mentality in the first place, right? What a blue pill man gets out of marriage is not sex, service, support, etc., but the hope that his fantasies in these things might actually come true. There is a power in this ill-placed hope that makes the blue pill so alluring to people that they not only are blind to the red pill, but even those who are aware despise it.

This reminds me of a case where my client's husband exercised stock-purchase options in his company. It was a closely held corporation, so he was honored when they offered him the right to buy-in a 20% interest. He paid FMV. Turns out it was a sinking ship and the partners were trying to unload their interest before the next company valuation, which would have reflected the downturn. The poor guy bought the stock on the *hope* that being an invested partner would yield a greater result. What's a guy to do? Either he gave his goods and let the other parties walk away scot-free, or he buckled down and saved the company to realize the gains on his investment while the other parties free-loaded on his efforts, him resenting them all the while.

Sound familiar? The constantly devaluing "golden ticket" is the sinking ship.

And for the premarital sex mindset it's the only game in town if they want sexual access.

Biblically, there are a couple ways to take this.

- Per the Exodus passage, above, when sex occurs, an offer of marriage must follow. This is somewhat different from the assumption that an offer of marriage must come first with the sex to follow (at least insofar as a man's ideologies may compare to reality).
- This phrase also assumes that a man's want of sexual access would compel him to make an intentional effort of seeking a bride to wed. Philosophically, this is a logical leap to make, but it is still contrary to the theological compulsion of Scripture, so you're speaking only about those men who claim to adhere to theological truth while operating on philosophical principles for decision-making in their own lives.

it serves a purpose to convince oneself that a man's spouse is necessarily on the same page as they are with respect to his idealistic concept of love (versus a woman's opportunistic concept of love)

Assuming you've never heard my story, this was the exact situation that led to my marriage. Several years in, my wife admitted openly: "I lied to you about who I was - my sexuality, my spirituality, etc. - in order to get you to marry me." I know many men who can empathize, though their wives have proved less honest (or self-aware) with admitting to what I now see as a shamefully common trope.

he leads with his Emotional Process rather than his Rational Process.

Interestingly, even men in the reverse are not immune if their rational process has a low ceiling. I have met a couple men in the last few months who married because they believed it was the wise thing to do, given influence from church culture (in the absence of their own personal examination of the Bible), even though they felt no emotional passion toward the woman. Both ended up divorced very quickly after.

he wasn't willing to somehow give up on the heroic fight to reform the 'Contractual' marriage

Heroic or idiotically wasteful ... six or half a dozen. I'm all for legal reform, but the Bible only predicts the degradation of society, not a revival of godly principles among secular laws.

To assume a spiritual bond somehow requires acknowledgement from a secular government is nothing short of what should be the most offensive word to spew at any person who claims to follow a religious text: *eisegesis*.

This has been a constant theme among the Pastors and church leaders I've been interviewing

I'm not surprised, but exceptions do exist. I recently red pill'd one of my pastors. Sadly, he was fired by the head pastor after less than a year because his ideologies didn't line up with the prevailing church culture. Oops, I guess exceptions don't exist ... at least not for long. No, I don't attend that congregation anymore.

Churches are business franchises today

While I don't disagree in premise, as a matter of unpopular semantics, there's a difference between congregations that we culturally call "churches" and what the Bible actually defines as the church. Your thoughts only reflect those who are following the cultural definition.

For example, *Underground Church*, by Brian Sanders, goes into great detail about how he has formed a "church network" that does not depend on finances. As such, his ministry throughout Tampa, FL is not dependent on appeasing anyone to maintain a revenue stream. I follow a similar model of ministry that requires even less budget than he has, and I'd expect our numbers are not vastly different. This model frees leaders from the

constraints that force them to appease the feminine imperative. That doesn't mean all such leaders will reject the feminine imperative (even Brian Sanders embraces female leaders, for example); rather, that leaders can decide for themselves without financial constraints how they interpret the Bible and lead their people.

to ensure their Pastor is on 'team woman'

Oh, like when the head pastor of the congregation I just left once preached, "If Jesus were alive today, he'd be tweeting, 'I support #metoo!'?"

"*You should've married a 'real' Christian woman*" excuses are something I encounter a LOT from Christian church leaders

Sadly, it's something I've had to fight against regularly even on RPC. There are two ways this plays out:

- There are the cases like mine. I'm confident I was better at vetting when single than any of the guys I've yet met on RPC. But no amount of vetting could have seen through my wife's intentional and openly-acknowledged deception to get that ring.
- I have also known countless cases where the "real deal" happens to change after the wedding. All women are subject to change.

I simply cannot win the "God says so" clause

Nor should you. If God is real and did say so, wouldn't that be determinative? Nevertheless, as I have often proclaimed here: **the secular red pill is merely just now discovering from observation what God said through theological revelation long ago.** That is, God most certainly **DID NOT** "say so," as to the many things you're likely hearing from these pastors when they say that phrase. For example:

"It doesn't matter if contractual marriage is one of the worst decisions a man can make today – "God says you should marry."

1. The God of the Bible never actually says this.
2. Jesus says in Matthew 19:12, when the apostles suggest that it's better for a man not to marry: "The one who can accept this should accept it."
3. In 1 Cor. 7 Paul refrains numerous times that it is better not to marry.

Overall, excellent article. While you've hit the nail on the head with regard to mainstream religious culture, there are a few pockets of exception that I've found - many produced through my own ministry, but some even naturally occurring (Dalrock being a great example). These people often part ways with the cultural congregations that dominate the scene, but are significant nonetheless.

I'd be curious if your book presents only the mainstream view, or acknowledges the existence of the rising minority as an actual (perhaps only?) expression of the church. For example, is someone like Dalrock merely reference material, or does his ministry have credibility in your book as an entity to itself? While I'm sure you're unaware of the things branching out of RPC (as I have yet to disclose most of them publicly), would your book assume that groups like us do not exist simply because the mainstream has attempted to monopolize the word "church" under the prevailing cultural model?

I suppose my curiosity here is more in how well you understand ecclesiology and if your book will primarily be

targeting a structure that doesn't fit even the most basic bones of biblical ecclesiology in the first place.

Are Christian women really different?

3 upvotes · 12 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

No. You can remain single without being a whiny tard. Don't go MGTOW.

What's your perspective on tunnel vision within the context of dating?

3 upvotes · 8 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

What you think you like is often different than what you actually like

That reminds me of a great Seinfeld episode, where Jerry meets Janeane Garofalo. She's just like him - a female Jerry. He falls in love and it's not long before they're engaged. But as things go south, he breaks it off, saying, "I don't know what I was thinking. I hate myself! How could I ever be married to someone like me?"

Masturbation when your wife withholds: Go, or no-go?

3 upvotes · 5 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I decided to separate the comments on your post from the theological issues that I'd address separately. Here's what I think on what you wrote; check my latest post for more on the theological nature of the topic.

Great conversation material here. Props for posting it.

when I ask if we can have sex

"Can we have sex tonight?" is not the best way to initiate. There are at least two reasons for this:

- By leaving the decision up to her, you're creating a framework in your home that she holds all the power over sex. She decides if/when you have sex. You're like a child asking for a cookie that only his mother can give. This is a horrible frame to establish. Don't feel bad, it's the one society implicitly compels, so it's quite common, and something I lived through in my pre-RP days.
- If you're asking her for permission, you're implicitly giving her permission to say no. By framing it as a question, you're giving her two options and implying that both options are legitimate. She then has plausible deniability: "You asked a question, I answered. What did you expect?"

The better way to initiate is by revving the engine (check my married man game posts, also employ kino, have conversation on sexy topics, etc.) and then starting the process.

If she cuts you off, it comes from a different place. Instead of answering "no" to a question, now she's being defiant against your leadership. She may have good reason for being defiant (although that may or may not justify it), but at least you're putting her in a frame of mind that she must make a decision to follow or rebel. There's no room for plausible deniability here. No room for her hamster to rationalize why it's okay to have denied you. With a question, she's not denying you. When you put the moves on and she pushes you away, she is denying you. Keep the onus for the sexual dysfunction in the relationship on her, not on ambiguity and permissive denial.

conditions for sexuality

You can't negotiate attraction. Women will tell you it's possible. It's not. You can only negotiate behavior, which is what she's trying to do. "If you give me emotions, I will give you my behaviors" - and implicitly, "but even then

you still won't have my heart." She won't want sex. She's not attracted to you. Women who are attracted to their husbands don't negotiate with sex as a tool - they negotiate to get sex from their husbands, not to give it.

it puts me in pretty toxic mindset

The reason is usually that you're too emotionally invested. Do you have better things to do in life? If so, then there's no reason to be upset when she denies you - because you can go do those things. If not, then that's why she's denying you in the first place.

If a woman is designed to be a helpmate, then is she destined to be married?

3 upvotes · 4 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

That's one of many. Materialism is another huge one. How many mega churches do you see with massive projectors, stages, huge buildings, etc.? Ironically, the churches with the most resources are the most prone to operate on a scarcity mentality - while they have lots of resources, they have lots of expenses as well, catering their services away from the mission of the Gospel and toward what keeps the money flowing so they can maintain their massive budgets.

This is one of the things I'm talking about often with my red pill pastor (executive pastor, not head pastor), as he believes the church should switch to an abundance mentality built through crowd-sourcing rather than asset-accumulating, much like the difference between Uber and Taxi companies.

- Uber: Doesn't own a single car. Drivers not official employees. They make money by using other people's assets.
- Taxi: Must purchase lots of cars. Must pay lots of employees. Makes money only on the net after expenses are paid.

Switching this up:

- Modern Church: Spends money on buildings, aesthetics, coffee, staff, etc. in order to bring people to a focal center each week.
- Networked Church: Core, central leadership team works on a minimal budget (office space rent) with no significant expenses, training leaders and sending them out to build their own communities of believers (i.e. churches) in their homes, at coffee shops, public parks, at the gym, etc., essentially repurposing the expenses people are already paying to be used for God's purposes, thereby crowdsourcing the expense without actually increasing anyone's bottom-line by much at all - and the money that is tithed, after covering the salaries of the reduced staff, goes toward actual needs like world missions, assisting the poor, a benevolence fund for people in the church network in need, etc. rather than remodeling a foyer or buying new fancy chairs.

I've mentioned it before, but the book *Underground Church* references this networking church idea, as the author is actually living this out in Florida right now, having thousands of people within the church network. When they need to meet corporately, they rent a space or find a public location able to accommodate them (like a park) rather than paying millions of dollars on a mortgage to maintain a building to accommodate everyone.

Long story short, the modern church has bought into the materialism of first world countries by assuming we must be fancy and impressive in order to accomplish God's work. In reality, this merely placates people and forces the great commission from "GO make disciples of all nations" to "Hope all the nations come to you to be made into disciples." In other words, money is the biggest idol of the church.

And it's no surprise. What's the feminine imperative right now? Women just sit back and wait for men to come running over. That's how the sexual marketplace works. And how often do we see the bride of Christ say, "Jesus,

come to us, join us in our presence, meet us here"? All the stinkin' time. In reality, the bride is meant to **GO** to her husband and the purposes he calls her.

How idiotic would it be if I told my wife to give the kids a bath and she sits in the living room and says, "Kids, come here so I can give you a bath"? Even worse - what if the kids don't want a bath? They're not going to come. The bath isn't going to get done. My wife is going to end up yelling and screaming. I'm going to confront her about it and say, "Why haven't you given them a bath yet?" She's going to say: "Didn't you hear me? I've been shouting at them all day to come here so I can wash them, but they're not coming. This job you gave me is hard work, and I'm trying my best."

That's what the church is doing to Jesus. I would, of course, tell my wife: "If they don't come to you, then go get them!" That's the easy, obvious answer. But it's an answer the church isn't willing to take. "Don't bring them to the living room to get a bath. Take them to the tub." Church buildings are like the living room - that's not where sanctification happens. It might be where people get motivated to be cleansed, but the cleaning actually happens out in the world, as we live out the work God starts in us. At best, even if my wife did get the kids to come to her in the living room, she could only take off their clothes and get them ready for the bath ... at some point she still has to leave her comfy chair.

This is all more stream of conscious typing, going well beyond the scope of your question ... so I'll just stop there.

A question that I get sometimes from non-believers

3 upvotes · 3 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

[/u/cogmob](#) gave the correct reference to answer your question: Romans 1:18-20. People are without excuse because God has already revealed himself through creation.

It's also useful to know that God judges each person according to what they have been given. Luke 12:48 is also on point here: "But the one who did not know, and did what deserved a beating, will receive a light beating. Everyone to whom much was given, of him much will be required, and from him to whom they entrusted much, they will demand the more."

Then there's the parable of the talents, where the one given 5 was expected to produce 5, the one given 10 expected to produce 10, and the one given 1 was expected to produce only 1, and was punished for not even doing that. Or the parable of the unmerciful servant, where the man forgiven of much was expected to forgive as well. The one who has the entire Bible at his fingertips is expected to know and live by the entire Bible. The one without the Bible will only be expected to know and live by what God has revealed through creation - which is quite a bit, if you grasp the fact that the world was without written Scripture for thousands of years, yet still followed God during every age throughout human history - and the fact that most of the Psalms, Proverbs, and Song of Songs is written from an understanding of creation.

Similarly, as [/u/helaughsinhidden](#) brought up the issue of babies who die without knowing, Jesus says in John 9:41, "Jesus said to them, 'If you were blind, you would have no guilt; but now that you say, 'We see,' your guilt remains.'" This is reiterated by Paul in Romans 5:13, "for sin indeed was in the world before the law was given, but sin is not counted where there is no law."

For non-Jews, Paul explains: "For when Gentiles, who do not have the law, by nature do what the law requires, they are a law to themselves, even though they do not have the law. They show that the work of the law is written on their hearts, while their conscience also bears witness, and their conflicting thoughts accuse or even excuse them" (Romans 2:14-15). Children are incapable of this inherent understanding of the law and aborted babies do not have the ability to express a conscience.

Also, I got to play with my miscarried child for half an hour, so I know she's in heaven ;)

A question that I get sometimes from non-believers

3 upvotes · 3 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

what they 'would have Been had they Not been mentally ill.'

They would have still been sinners. This statement assumes that in the absence of their mental illness they somehow could have been good enough to warrant being saved.

What examples of F.R. are relevant here?

3 upvotes · 1 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

A field report is meant to be an experiment-result-conclusion story that shows a positive result. We're all instinctively familiar with what doesn't work in the world, so we want to "swap notes" about what does.

As [/u/helaughsinhidden](#) noted:

- If you had a difficult patch in your marriage and you tried something new that made things better, report on what you did and how it affected things.
- If you were feeling spiritually impotent and tried sharing your faith in a new way tell us what the change was and how it affected your evangelism and discipleship capacity.
- If your kids have been obnoxious and unruly and you tried a new parenting strategy that managed to get them under control, tell us what you tried and how that was the vehicle for their change.
- If you've been struggling to get a date and tried something different from your past habits and suddenly you have 3 dates lined up, what was the different thing you tried?

For many guys, this "different" thing will be the things they learned here. This reaffirms to people that what we discuss actually works. The rest of the Christian world would rather work on theory and philosophy than on pragmatic reality. The more we can prove our methods with tested results, the better.

But unlike the secular subs, I believe our understanding of intersexual relational dynamics is an open canon. While they may teach that they have already figured out the best way and any new information is frowned upon, I believe that there is room for intuition and trying new strategies that no one has thought of before. Many of them will likely fail, but some will succeed. We want to hear about those successes, give others an opportunity to try them out as well, and see if repetition breeds similar results - and if not, figure out why one man got a different result from another.

That's how FRs work.

Gentlemen, we should take more risks - We are god's people!

3 upvotes · 26 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

This is a solid reminder. I'm very much in favor of risk taking. While you allude to it, let me just be clear: the risks should be oriented toward disciple-making. "Seek first His Kingdom (i.e. advance it by adding more disciples and training them to be leaders in his Kingdom) and all these things will be added to you as well" - such as safety, security, basic provision, finances, etc.

While you have taken some more heat in this post than I would have expected, I'm impressed with your positive attitude toward the criticism. Keep trucking, brother.

Biblical marriage vows

3 upvotes · 26 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Good stuff, for the most part. Just some things to consider:

- I don't see anything in here about sexual denial or the importance of sexuality to your marriage covenant. If you want to sound all official-like you could say something like: "And as we consecrate these vows tonight, I vow to consecrate them to you every night and will not deprive you when you seek." 1 Cor. 7:5 is a good reference for that one. Your reference to 7:4 is weak, stopping short of the real meat there - and she could interpret "I give my body to you" in any other number of ways that would allow her to still deny you without breaking her vow. While I agree with [/u/Deep_Strength](#) that self-made vows are ultimately meaningless because she's going to break them anyway, that doesn't mean yo should make it easy on her by giving her plausible deniability - something women always look for in the first place. If it's there, she'll sniff it out and find it.
- I also don't see any references to your actual mission. As [/u/WarriorJesus1915](#) noted, you should clarify that she is to join you on your mission, just as you joined Christ on his. I would specifically spell this out by quoting the great commission in some capacity: "make disciples of all nations." This might be more of a challenge for you, if you haven't really adopted a clear mission yet or you don't even know what it means to make disciples (most likely because you are stuck with everyone else in assuming Jesus meant the church's vague notion of disciple-making rather than the specific strategy Jesus was referring to).
- I don't see anything in here about the purpose of marriage. Malachi 2:15 says that the purpose of marriage is "to produce godly offspring." In light of the Gospel and passages like Romans 2 and 9, we now understand that the physical offspring of the old testament were a parallel to the spiritual offspring we would have through Christ. As such, the purpose of marriage is to make disciples (per the above), producing spiritual children, just as Paul called his disciples his "children" and Jesus said of those who were his disciples that they had to be "born again" as spiritual babies (Paul also references spiritual infancy). The physical children you will likely have are a guide meant to help you understand how to bear and raise spiritual children. This needs to be in there.

I'm out of time, but I hope that helps. These are just the most important things about marriage, so I wanted to make sure you didn't somehow miss them in your wedding. This all needs to be spelled out to a woman up-front, otherwise she will kick and scream: "This isn't what I signed up for" when you start living these things out.

Solving a Foundational Problem on This Sub: Enabling Closet Bloops

3 upvotes · 15 March 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I agree - but I'll note two things:

1. You have to get the speck out of your own eye first. If you're a raging glutton with 35% body fat and struggle with sloth in the way you play on your phone all day instead of getting stuff done ... that's a pretty huge plank in your own eye that needs to be addressed first. So, this advice only works if the guy is already conformed to at least a basic degree of biblical masculinity.
2. When communicated, it needs to be done tactfully. Most guys who use this verse do it in the heat of an argument as an expression of their butthurt. That's not the way Jesus taught us to go about confronting someone about their sin in Matthew 18.

Breaking the Nice-Guy: Take Ownership, Ask For Help

3 upvotes · 13 March 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I'm having a hard time treating her with love as my wife/helper when she shows so little desire to invest in me and our family

That's because you shouldn't be treating her with love as your wife/helper if she's not acting like a wife/helper (at least as far as classic understandings of the word "love" go). The Lord disciplines those he loves. Is that incorporated into your definition of love? Or how does God respond to believers who are engaged in habitual, unrepentant sin? Is that incorporated in your definition of love in that God is love and everything he does is, by definition, loving?

To be clear, God doesn't yell and scream and stomp his fists as a form of discipline anymore - though he may have done that a select few times in the Old Testament when humanity was still in its infancy/childhood phase. Do contemplate the ways God interacts with his people in the New Testament and do likewise.

How should I respond when I ask for her help and she complains and says 'No' or says yes and just doesn't follow through?

If she says no, I start with a playful threat of punishment. "Aw, my little girl likes to say no? Maybe a spanking is in order." Wink, pat her butt, and say, "Get to it." This works most of the time.

If she still says no and puts a hard stop by refusing to do something, shift the playfulness to: "Not cool. I need your help on this. I can't handle everything myself. Are you my helper or not?" Usually she'll cave, but the times she doesn't she'll respond with something like, "I'm your helper, not your slave. Do it yourself." If you get that reply, maintain a positive demeanor, decide whether or not it's important enough for you to do it on your own, and proceed to making yourself less available for her. After all, her non-contribution is soaking up more of your time. That's going to come out of her time with you, not your free time.

To be clear: ever hear your wife or any woman say, "Maybe I'd have more time and energy for sex if I didn't have to do blah, blah, and blah"? That's a woman's way of conditioning her time and availability to you on your compliance. As the leader, she is the one whose compliance should be evaluated, not yours, so this is just turning the tables to be upright instead of legs up.

Am I going about this all wrong?

See above.

Do I need to keep being steady and taking care of everything I can?

Yes, as above.

Maybe this is a result of years of conditioning the wrong way... I was a sorry BP

Most likely. Mix in the fact that she's a sinner too and you'll probably be closer to the truth.

and now it will take years to undo the damage?

Ball-park: 1 month for every year of marriage. For feminists and intellectually superior women, even longer.

The submissive wife

3 upvotes · 13 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Haha. I appreciate the humor. But I have found that men will eventually get these things done - they just do it on a different threshold than women. A man's threshold for cleanliness is lower than a woman's, so if she waits he'll pretty much never do it in her time-line, but it will still get done when it crosses his threshold ... unless he's a hoarder.

Breaking the Nice-Guy: Take Ownership, Ask For Help

3 upvotes · 13 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Funny, that's what I say too. My wife does have a nook ;)

Breaking the Nice-Guy: Take Ownership, Ask For Help

3 upvotes · 12 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Why would it be wrong to bring new people to church every week? My college discipler came to christ because a girl he liked invited him to go to a service with her. I'm still against evangedating, but I think you get the point.

Submissive behaviour

3 upvotes · 12 March 2019 · /r/RedPillWomen

Yes! [u/RedPillWonder](#) wrote a fantastic post on the [r/RPChristians](#) sidebar in the "for singles" section directed toward women. I do believe he has another 2 part series addressing vetting from both genders' perspectives - part 1 was written in the last week or two, which should address the "options" part (i.e. what a guy vets for) and part 2 will be about what women should vet for. My post history also has a couple posts directed toward women that might be helpful.

My First Successful Fitness/Comfort Test [FR]

3 upvotes · 7 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I'm going to make it so ridiculous that she can't possibly top it - and I'm going to come off super proud of it. Just straight up irrational, goofy, dumb, silly, and perhaps a twinge obnoxious

Right on. This is what we call cocky-funny, mixed with AA.

"I'm not happy" signal

The way you word this is important. There's a difference between: "You're not making me happy" or "You're making me unhappy" and "I'm not happy." I'm not sure which one was really the problem here, but if she's focused more on her own feelings than your misbehavior, then you're right for treating this as a comfort test.

I was still having fun even if she wasn't

If more guys could have this attitude ... so many marriages would be saved.

if you don't want a hug - that's fine" and meaning it!

"And meaning it!" That's the key. You're not pouting. You're not playing the martyr. You're not guilt tripping her. You're just giving her space and being internally stable.

"You could ask me to stand up in a nicer way."

This is funny to me. You're literally laughing and playing with her to get her to stand up, reaching down to pick her up yourself in a light-hearted mood. I'm not sure how much nicer it could get. Her hamster is spinning, looking for some other way to rationalize being mad at you despite the fact that you already did address it in a nice way.

shutting up is usually my best option. So I ignored the comment and kept working, acting like she hadn't said anything.

Right on - not passive-aggressive silence that says, "I don't want to talk to you when you're like that." It's a silence that screams: "If you want my attention, I'm here, but you're going to have to work for it."

I just wrapped her up in my arms and rubbed her back with my hands - a bunch of knots - and we stayed that way for a good minute or two

No words. Just feels.

She melted and was immediately happy the rest of the night. It was as if the incident never happened

Right on. This is the result of a test passed with flying colors. You handled the fitness part, then gave her feels for the comfort part.

walking through the act of a fitness or comfort test isn't as hard as I was making it out to be. I needed (and need) to be comfortable in silence. I need to be cool in as many circumstances as possible. For RPC - this is placing your trust in Christ to work all things out. I don't need to be more witty than my wife, I don't need to jump through all the hoops right verbally or anything. I just need to have my own standards, communicate them, enforce them, not be the first to react to emotional situations, and literally just keep my mouth shut

I normally don't like large quotes - but this whole paragraph is gold.

You'd be shocked, not talking is really easy if you just don't open your mouth, guys. It's crazy.

One of these days I'd like to do a write-up on President Coolidge. He was known as "Silent Cal." One of my favorite quotes of his: "I have noticed that nothing I have ever said ever did me any harm."

He was also known for getting through more meetings than any other president. People would be in and out of his office so fast. Someone asked him how he got through so many meetings in a day: "People eventually just stop talking if you never talk back."

Bonus: He also maintains the same theological position I do: "The only way I know to drive out evil from the country is by the constructive method of filling it with good."

tired of trying to figure out how to be "perfect" so she wouldn't have an emotional night, whatever

Ironically, while nice guys think they have to keep her from becoming emotional to make the conditions right for sex to occur, the exact opposite is true. The more emotionally stimulated a woman is, the more sexual she feels - even if they're not positive emotions. There is, of course, a line, but that comes with common sense.

Theoretically, we'd divorce, it would suck, and at the end of the day I'd still be doing the work I do and hanging out with Jesus

This is the right mind-frame. Excellent example of a mentality that fosters outcome independence and amused mastery.

Excellent post.

I may have messed up (F/R)

3 upvotes · 7 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

The thing with walking on egg-shells is ... it's only a problem if you actually care about not breaking them. Put on some shoes and jump all over them. Have some fun. Learn that egg-shells are entertaining to break and smash all over the place. Why do you feel like you need to avoid stepping on any of them? Especially when they're on the floor instead of in the fridge.

If someone leaves an egg shell where it doesn't belong, they can't complain when it gets broken, just like my kids can't complain if I drive over a toy that they left in the driveway. It doesn't go there. If it breaks and they cry, I'm not upset about it - that's their problem, not mine. That doesn't mean I don't try to console them and help them feel better, but the pressure isn't on my shoulders when those things happen, nor is it on your shoulders when your wife gets emotionally wound up over things that are not warranted.

If her mother dies, that's a legitimate egg shell. Don't pull the shell out of the fridge just to smash it. If it's appropriately placed, let it be. Keep it safe. Coddle it, even. But don't let her misplaced emotions control you.

Apart from this - don't "just do it her way to avoid conflict." That's just going to build resentment in you and she'll pick up on it, which will negatively affect her attraction to you and your sex life.

Married Man Game Part 3: Sexting

3 upvotes · 5 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

After you're married, I assume ;)

Married Man Game Part 3: Sexting

3 upvotes · 5 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Update: So I decided to violate my own advice. I was practicing doing some of this before my lunch meeting, where I was going to take over as Trustee of one of my client's trusts. My wife asks: "Ok, will you get a trustee's fee?!"

"Mmm, babe. I'm getting so hot just thinking about it - that trustee fee is going to be so many dollars."

"I'm going to cash them out as ones and sprinkle them all over our bed as we roll around in one dollar bills."

- *Oh my gosh stop it*

"We're going to buy a new house someday. It's going to be sooo big. So many rooms, we son't be able to stop staring."

"Republicans are going to be in office for the next twenty years ... oooh, it drives me crazy just thinking about it and how Nancy Pelosi is going to get fired someday."

"That work better for ya? ;)"

- *You're weird*

Haha. I guess sometimes it's okay just to have fun with it.

RPC: a place to stay (or at least return to)

3 upvotes · 4 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

This sounds like I'm reading a CNN article. It's chock full of highly liberal sentiment that cares more about how people feel than what's true. After listening to the audio you sent me earlier, I'm more than a little shocked to read this, as I didn't expect such leftist thinking from you.

If someone feels something it is real to THEM

No, it's not real to them. It only feels real to them. Their feelings are real. Their beliefs are not. Like

u/OsmiumZulu said, no matter how hard a man feels like he is a girl, he is still a man. His feelings do not change reality.

The sentiment you're referencing was clearly stated, so let's not dance around it: "RPC isn't a place to stay but more of something to extract the marrow from and move on." This is either true or false. If there is never anything new to learn and such a man somehow has nothing to offer back to the community, and he also has the internal fortitude to practice what he has learned without sliding, then he may be fine to move on. If there is more to uncover from Scripture and shared stories and experiences, then this is not a place to move on from and the statement is false. Feelings have nothing to do with this.

Now, if the statement was: "Rainbows make me happy," then by all means, a person's feelings do, in fact, determine the truth and validity of the statement.

Sentiments are just feelings

Perhaps it's this singular word that got you confused about what OZ was saying. Sentiment has two different meanings. One of them is certainly related to feelings, and it is more commonly talked about as "sentimentality." The other definition of sentiment, which OZ was using, is (quoting google): "a view of or attitude toward a situation or event; an opinion." Some views, beliefs, and opinions are wrong. Not all - some things are certainly unique to each person. But if I'm of the opinion that Jesus was an arrogant know-it-all liar, I'd be wrong. Flat out, that's a wrong opinion.

negativity ... hostility ... judgmental ... arrogance and conceit ... condemning and threatening language ... hate and angst

Please, enlighten me on these comments. I can think of exactly one person's conversations who you could be referencing, and it's a guy who repeatedly undermines moderator authority and tries to convince people to leave this sub. I've seen pastors have harsher conversations over much less - and I have been chastised by the other mods for being too soft on him and giving him too many chances! Yes, this does happen in the church - and if you knew the quantity of conversations we have had with this user over multiple accounts (he always deletes one and creates another, presumably in an effort to deceive the community and the mods once he gets a bad rep), you'd probably be far more understanding.

This kind of behavior is not winning souls to Jesus

It's easy to make this kind of judgmental assumption. You're not a mod, so you don't get the praise reports of professions of faith. You don't get to hear about all the pastors whose churches are being reformed because of this place, or of the people here who have brought non-users to Christ because of the work we're doing, or the new small groups that are started, or people who have committed to join the mission field because of this place.

Around Christmas time I had looked back at what we had accomplished in a year and there were at least a dozen new believers **that I know of**, 17 people who had re-committed to following Christ, 9 new small groups, 2 church pastors and 3 elders from different churches who are reforming their churches because of what's taught here - and this and more all only coming from just those who have bothered to speak up and tell us. Who knows what all else is going on that we're not hearing about!

If there is no pain-of-disconnect, people will have not a thought of unplugging from this or any other sub

To reference the "or any other sub" category, MRP, TRP, and their respective "ask" subs all seem to have rapidly growing numbers, yet are among the most hostile places on the internet that I've seen. Pretty much everyone who asks even intelligible questions are called "autist" and "fag" and "beta" and accused of all kinds of horrible things. Nevertheless, when I first found TRP it was at 200k members, and it had nearly half a million last I saw before

the numbers were taken down from the quarantine. When I first found MRP, there were only 10k members. They're currently sitting at 24,508 - over double!

Something tells me the "feel good, make everyone fall in love with you, develop co-dependency" approach isn't the only way to get people coming back. Those are cheap manipulative strategies that liberals use because they don't have any other way of keeping people returning. Truth is what will keep people coming back here. Cold, hard truth. That doesn't mean we're being mean for the sake of being mean - but [u/RedPillWonder](#) wrote up a much better comment on that topic than I'd care to re-hash here.

I thought there might be a nice intersection of Christianity and RP thought and conversation

It is not meant to be that intersection. It is meant to be a Christian sub that appeals to a red pill crowd by showing through shared language that the Bible had all their ideas first.

As with the last time you posted around here, I do find it ironic that you are doing exactly what you accuse everyone else of doing. You are trying to shame people on this sub for the conversations that have been held. You are accusing us of being hostile and arrogant, while simultaneously having a hostile agenda against us and presenting yourself as someone who is better than everyone else and who hasn't decided if he's too good for this place or not, if only we could somehow rise to your level. You accuse us of threatening to ban someone, then make the threat of leaving and suggesting that other people should want to leave too.

I respect you and the things you're doing. I believe you have a lot to offer the Christian community and would love to spur your efforts on. But don't crap all over the work we're doing here, thereby advancing the very hostility and disunity that you accuse us of advancing. And please: don't let liberal ideologies cloud the way you think about how church people "should" behave. Take a good read at RPW's comment here and think about all the stern words that the apostles and Jesus gave people and recognize that it doesn't have to be fluffy feelings and rainbows and butterflies all the time - and that if there is someone who is a danger to the community, that has to be taken seriously.

Tag: [/u/Deep_Strength](#) - because OZ already tagged the others.

When i say No the boss Stonewalls me

3 upvotes · 1 March 2019 · [/r/askMRP](#)

This, OP. You certainly should have let him open so that you can learn he already told management you'd do it. As soon as you know that, you're in the position of strength. He wrote a check on someone else's dime: yours. He needs you to fund the check he wrote, so he's at your mercy. Either he looks like a fool when his check bounces and he loses cred with management or he works with you so that you can both end in a win-win (my suggestions for that negotiation being in my comment above).

But back to [/u/UEMcGill](#) - I don't think OP actually wants to improve his situation. I think he just wants to whine about it now that he realizes his boss has more abundance than he does, which came in the form of another co-worker who could be groomed to take over OP's position. If the boss has already gone too far down that rabbit hole, OP's chances may be shot. Whining here today doesn't compensate for the wisdom he should have exercised weeks ago when this all first went down.

How do you guys view/approach ghosting?

3 upvotes · 1 March 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

By not being much more invested than she is. What does she contribute that makes you need her so much more than she needs you?

To clean up any misunderstanding...

3 upvotes · 28 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Also don't make apology posts to justify your actions or opinions. This is a bit DEERy and if you are DEERING internet strangers, I'm guessing you are probably DEERING in the real world.

I just made this exact same comment in mod chat about another user, haha. Good to see you're seeing the big picture here.

What do you Christians think of MGTOW?

3 upvotes · 27 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I think what /u/Adamjensen2030 is saying in this exchange:

even if the laws are ever rigged in men's favour I wouldn't consider marriage anyway since I would have to sacrifice my time and freedom for a wife.

This is an example of a bad attitude

... is really more akin to 1 Cor. 7:32-34 - "An unmarried man is concerned about the Lord's affairs - how he can please the Lord. But a married man is concerned about the affairs of this world - how he can please his wife - and his interests are divided."

I don't think this is a bad attitude. I believe it is a godly one, as it is the very missional-focus that you allude to in your last paragraph. I can't vouch for this user's entire comment history, as I haven't checked it, but this particular language doesn't concern me, as evidenced in his follow-up: "Instead I can keep my freedom and spend more time with God."

The language that does concern me is: "If anything I hate the blue pill white knights that enable their Jezebel behaviors." This does show that, at least in part, some of his motivation is rooted in contempt.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (02/27/19)

3 upvotes · 27 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

just received the book "SEXY CHRISTIAN" and considering reading it and doing sort of a book report.

You should definitely do a post on that when you're through it.

I've been getting home late too, so it feels like ships passing in the night, so no actual sex this week

You ever wake her up in the middle of the night with your hands down her pants? It's a quick gauge of how attracted she is. If she's attracted, she'll get aroused quickly and won't care too much about being woken up or how tired she is. If she's not attracted to you and is just trying to placate you or fulfill a marital obligation (usually to make her feel good about herself), then she'll turn you down. At least it lets you know where you stand.

What do you Christians think of MGTOW?

3 upvotes · 27 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

u/redpillwonder just put up an excellent post on this subject this morning as well. I'd recommend giving it a read.

RMV Checklist: How to know if a woman is good marriage material

3 upvotes · 27 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Excellent post, brother.

BUT (to borrow the F.A.T. acronym from Red Curious) she does need to be faithful, available and teachable.

I discussed this with my RP pastor a few weeks ago and we both agree the "FAT" acronym isn't ideal. He suggested that relationships - both discipleship and romantic - *can* grow without these qualities, it just takes a massive amount more time and patience and it's a lot riskier, and thus the FAT acronym is really more geared toward relationships that want to develop at a healthy pace. Accordingly, these traits are an accelerant and make things move along much FASTER. See what he did there? Instead of a "FAT" girl, you want one who is "FAST" in the way the relationship can progress. The added S stands for "saved." This is true in disciple-making too, as it's not technically discipleship if they're non-Christians (similar processes and strategies, but evangelism is the other end of the spectrum). Of course, then there's the confusion about what the secular world means when they talk about a "FAST" girl, so it's still not ideal. Thoughts?

she's a nagger or not nice

Fair warning: if you're having this conversation verbally, I wouldn't tell someone not to date a nagger. You say, "Don't date someone who nags a lot." This is much, much clearer.

More broadly: what are your thoughts about the way these balance in dating v. marriage? Specifically, the Bible calls wives to hold to many of these traits (respectful, submissive, faithful, etc.), but pre-marriage relationships were culturally very, very different back then, so there are no direct guidelines for dating (principles of evangelism are the closest I can see, in parallel, which is still indirect).

For example, if you're dating a woman and her father tells her to do one thing and you tell her to do another and she goes with what her dad says, is that a "negative" on her check list because she's being submissive to the current male authority in her life rather than to you?

What if her dad didn't weigh in and she simply disagrees and says, "If I were your wife, I would submit. But we're not married yet, and that's a decision I simply cannot honor right now." Is that okay? Does it make a difference if your decision really is a poor one and her choice is probably the wiser of the options?

Just a few things running through my mind as I read this, given that I've heard women on several occasions make the claim in dating relationships: "We're not married yet, so those verses don't apply. If I were married to him, then I'd gladly follow those passages."

RMV Checklist: How to know if a woman is good marriage material

3 upvotes · 27 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I guess I overlooked this in /u/RedPillWonder's post:

this post is part one (for men) of a two part series (the second for women)

So I guess he'll be writing the second part sometime :)

RMV Checklist: How to know if a woman is good marriage material

3 upvotes · 27 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

This was discussed and decided it warranted a separate thread, otherwise this one would be ridiculously long. While the entire sub revolves around developing men in this way, a targeted post like this is probably worthwhile

too.

A Reply: Yes, the church and Christian writers really say these ridiculous things.

3 upvotes · 22 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

3 short points from your conversation with [u/whitified](#) here:

1. My post was a reply to someone who claimed that no Christians were saying these things. Yes, it's cherry picked, but intentionally so - and the fruit was very low hanging to find these (literally under 10 minutes of browsing). I wasn't trying to create a complete cross section of all of the church's teachings on the issue. I think this is appropriate in the context in which I was writing and not an error.
2. Bu sharing my google search terms you can see the questions I was asking. Every single article was trying to address that exact question: "should looks be important to Christians in dating?" One of the authors even asked that exactly in his post as the foundation of what he was writing. I do not believe I have taken any of them out of their intended context.
3. My background is in statistical methodology (prior to law), in which I have a "degree," so accurate research and data gathering matter to me too.

I'm enjoying reading all this, though. Good conversation is good conversation.

A Reply: Yes, the church and Christian writers really say these ridiculous things.

3 upvotes · 22 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Take yer upvote.

Introducing myself and looking for wisdom and advice

3 upvotes · 22 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Thanks for sharing your story. There are some good reminders in here of the dangers of living in a blue pill mentality - not only in the damage it causes to relationships, but in the way it distracts a man from any actual purpose in life. This is a clear plan from our enemy, and I'm encouraged to hear you're escaping the prison he had you trapped in for so long.

didn't have a task and purpose in life

This is the main thing I'd have you start with. Get through the 200s and give us another post outlining your mission and what you're going to do with all that you've learned! Be prepared to tell stories about the guys you plan on discipling and the non-Christians whose lives have been ruined by cultural influences that you could set free in Christ!

How screwed am I? 12 questions from Beta Bucks

3 upvotes · 19 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Amen. "Relationships are hard work" is one of the cultural lies I plan on raising in an upcoming post I'll be co-writing with [/u/warriorjesus1915](#). Nobody likes going to work, and even the paycheck doesn't always make it seem worthwhile. This attitude can kill a relationship fast, and yet with the wrong approach to relationships we end up forcing women to feel this anyway, then wonder why they never want to show up and give us a paycheck (sex) for all their hard work.

Any RPChristians Near Dayton, OH?

3 upvotes · 15 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Gotcha. I know of at least 2 others in dayton who have been active at times on RPC, but I'm personally too far from there to do anything in person.

I should note, though, that the guy who disciplined me is in Dayton. I doubt he'd have much availability for anything consistent, as he's already maxed out with all the pastors he disciplines (he exclusively works with pastors now), but he'd probably have good connections with disciple making churches in the Dayton area if you are looking.

Michael's Story?

3 upvotes · 13 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

1/2

Lots of things going on in such a short post that need correction. Let me pick two.

First, you seem to misunderstand the concepts of alpha and beta. When people say that sexless dating is "beta," they're using the term as an insult, not as a descriptor. It's the same thing as calling someone an a-hole. You're not trying to show how his behavior is similar to what a colon does; you're simply insulting him. Of course, there is also an element where such commenters probably do believe the behavior is "beta," but this is only based on projection of their own frame on someone else as if another man must have the same frame as him. I'll explain this latter part from the ground up.

Alpha and beta ultimately relate to a person's influential orientation. That is, alphas pursue their own purposes, uninfluenced by the criticisms or emotional reactions of others, whereas betas live to appease these things in others.

Most people on the secular RP forums project their own purposes on other people. They believe that enhancing sexual gratification should be a man's primary purpose because it's their primary purpose in life. The reason they're on a red pill forum in the first place is to enhance their sexuality or to help others enhance their sexuality. What they fail to recognize is that some people have higher purposes than sex, but still want to maximize their sexuality without compromising their higher goals.

This is somewhat self-intuitive to Christians because we all recognize that sexuality, while important to us, is ultimately subordinate to our mission for Christ. The secular world, however, predominantly buys into evolutionary models of human development, which glorify sexuality as the pinnacle of human existence because that is where propagation of the species and evolutionary development occur. That is, to the secular world, sex is the most important thing in all of existence because it is what drives evolution. If evolution is their god, sex is their holy spirit. In the evolutionary view, even if a guy doesn't consciously prioritize sex this way, his urges toward sexuality are still a biologically conditioned in him anyway, and he is merely rationalizing away his biological conditioning. It's no wonder, then, that they project epitomizing sex as a focal point for every man.

But this is also somewhat frustrating to me, as one of their own sidebar sources (the commandments of poon) says to focus on your mission above the pursuit of women. Again, while self-intuitive to the Christian, the secular world often ignores this commandment of poon or makes it moot by making their pursuit of sex with women their mission.

As a result, if sex is to be a man's mission and a man is in a relationship without sex, it sounds like the man is failing his mission, and therefore could be called "beta." In reality, what they mean to say is: "Sex is my highest priority. You're an idiot if it's not your highest priority too. So if you're not doing things the way I would, you're just a beta chump." They also confuse the alpha/beta dynamic as having to do with a man's sexual philosophy, whereas it is really more related to a man's frame. But again, in the secular world sex and frame are somewhat indistinguishable because many people (not all) believe that a man's frame should be oriented toward sexuality, and a failure to do so means you must have a weak frame because you are sublimating (a beta behavior) your

sexual compulsion to something else. That's why they say what they say - they're projecting their own life philosophies on others. As Christians, 2 Cor. 5 tells us that if we are in Christ we are a new creation. That is, the compulsions of the flesh (which might rightly be consistent with what the secular world believes and experiences) are no longer a master over us and we have different purposes, causing a conflict between our flesh and our renewed mind, as Paul references in Romans 7:25 (see also Romans 12:1-2). You can read more on this in the sidebar post: ["Defining 'The Red Pill' for Christians."](#)

Second, you seem to be misunderstanding the concept of "AWALT" when you give enough stock to the concept to even ask:

is it possible to go through college finding a future wife that will not cheat on you ... ?

There are so many issues problematic to your thinking inherent in this question that I can't address them all, so let me address the primary points, at least.

The obvious logical answer is "yes." It would be a ridiculous claim to say that anything is impossible when it comes to human behavior. Statistically, it's even more ridiculous to claim that every woman will cheat. So yes, it's certainly possible to find a woman who won't cheat. The question that arises, then, is how to find a woman who won't cheat. There are posts already around here that focus on how to vet women. [/u/Deep_Strength](#) has a section in his upcoming book about that. I'll defer to those resources on this topic and move on.

What's more concerning - and this isn't your fault - is the fact that you seem to misapply the concept of "AWALT" to believe that all women in college are sex-craved cheaters. This is false. "AWALT" exists to describe certain tendencies that are common among all women. The fact that all women have an inherent drive to control any man they're in a relationship with is one of these things. God told us this in Genesis 3 and it has remained true ever since. There are many more instinctive drives in women that we could reference.

But even the secular sources will acknowledge that women's drive isn't always toward sex for sex's own sake. Rollo spoke at the 21 convention, for example, noting that a woman's menstrual cycle proves beyond doubt that women, on the whole, will never be as sexually compulsive as men. Instead, when they ride the carousel it's not because they crave physical pleasure. It's because they crave the validation that comes from being with a high quality man. Female sexuality is not about having orgasms; it's about receiving validation that feels so good that it becomes orgasmic for them - and their orgasm is an expression of that validation.

To that end, when TRP says "AWALT" in reference to their potential for cheating, what they mean is that all women desire validation in a way that is most easily received through sexual expression, and if they're not getting that validation from their marriage (not because the quantity of validation is lacking, but the quality of the validation, as this levels with the quality of the husband) then they're going to look elsewhere to get it. That validation becomes a drug that leads to cheating.

These base impulses are within every single woman. But some women are better at controlling them than others. Secular women will have a much, much harder time because they don't know anything different. That's why the divorce rate sky-rocketed as soon as women were given a free-pass and even incentives to divorce men without fault in the 1960s. But mature Christian women live with the renewed mind that comes with the Holy Spirit and the transformed nature that I referenced above. This doesn't mean their flesh is gone - those compulsions are still in the Christian woman. She just has an actual means of combating those instinctive drives: the Holy Spirit and her new self. Some will still fail, and don't ever assume even after careful vetting that this is impossible for the girl you're with. It's not an on/off switch. It's a scale.

My wife is about 4% likely to cheat on me. That's not a high enough probability for me to concern myself with. For other men, their wives may be 80% because of their low spiritual maturity, cultural influences, and marital dissatisfaction, among many other possible factors. Those men are right to incorporate "trust but verify" as an

essential part of their frame, whereas I don't care all that much for the "but verify" part right now. I don't need to snoop on my wife's phone because I know that she is mine and mine alone.

Can you find a woman like that in college, who is under 5%? No. Women are still growing and developing in college. So are you. While she might be at a 1% risk in college, after graduation she may rise up to 75%. Why? Because college is a bubble and you can't know what a person will be like when they leave that bubble.

Why the Church misunderstands Jesus and how this screws up your view of leading your wife.

3 upvotes · 12 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

His missiological framework. Consider an obvious example: he told us to make disciples, but didn't preach a lesson (at least not that the apostles recorded) on how to do this. At no point did he say, "Here's what discipleship means to me, and here's how you can disciple someone else." Instead, he showed us with his life. When he taught lessons to the 12, it wasn't just about doing what he taught; he was also modeling how we should teach others. So, it's one thing to learn from the lesson, but it's another thing entirely to recognize: "Jesus taught this to me, I'm supposed to live like Jesus did, so maybe I should teach this to someone else too - and I should also teach that person how to teach others also." Most people get hung up on the lesson itself and never go past that, which is why we get churches that are so focused on sin-avoidance or instant action that they lack any appreciable vision for ministry.

Also, I agree that many people mistakenly think they're living like Jesus. This is, at the core of my post, because they focus on what he said and not what he did. But the words you used point out the problem here: "think they are already following Christ's **EXAMPLE** by following what he said." An example is a model that you can observe and mimic. Words are not an example. When I teach my son that making bad choices will result in discipline, he might get it at a theory level, but when I tell him, "Remember when you made a bad choice yesterday by yelling at your sister and how you went to time-out for that?" - now he has an example to look at. The example brings theory into reality in a comprehensible way. But there are also many things I want my son to learn that I haven't yet explained to him verbally. I go to the gym regularly. I never told him, "This is why I go to the gym. This is why you should too." But I started taking him on the track with me after my lifting so that he can see me running and run with me. That's all example, even though I never taught him about it. I want him to see my life and strive to be more like me as I strive to be more like Christ. Likewise, there are many things Jesus did that are recorded, but which were independent of anything he or the apostles verbally taught. Read through the book of John with this lens in mind and you'll see what I'm talking about.

Ideas to consider for men who follow Jesus...

3 upvotes · 11 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I can appreciate this reply. As I've said a handful of times: I merely offer men *A way*, not necessarily *THE way*. If you don't have a better plan, I'll give you one that has a proven track record that you can default to. Come up with a better plan and you're free to follow that on your own. This is, in essence, what it means when we say that "the red pill is a toolbox." You are to take what works for you and leave behind the rest. Every marriage and relationship is going to need different tools in order to be healthy and successful. If you don't like a particular tool, don't throw out the whole box. Just say, "That one's not for me" and move on. It's that simple.

The way you talk, though (and I assume this is yet another of your alts, Bobby), is as if it must be all-or-nothing. You think we're compelling men: "You must embrace everything we say here or you're not 'man enough' for us." Saying it openly shows that it's a clearly absurd view, but those are the words you seem to be putting into our mouths.

I will note that 1 Peter 3 requires a separate post altogether, so look forward to that soon, as it's one that many people remove from context.

But clearly, the only advice I've really given is straight from God- walk by the spirit.

And we give the exact same advice. We're just going the next step further and showing men how to do that. Saying, "Walk by the Spirit" means very little if you don't include a guide for how men can do that.

My critique is of the red pill in it's entirety. Which includes what you all would call secular red pill. I have a hard time separating the two

That's reasonable. I can see why it's hard to distinguish. But this is also why I make it clear that RPC is exclusively 100% from Scripture. I do not preach secular RP concepts as truth, nor will you ever see me reference Rollo or Roosh or any other secular writer as authorities toward conclusions.

Our reference to the secular manosphere is a matter of convenience, not source material. If I find something to be true in Scripture, I also have to find a way to communicate it to people in a way that they will understand. For the target audience we have here, rather than creating new terminology and letting a lot get lost in communication, it's easier to say, "Remember on that secular forum when they talked about amused mastery? What the Bible says is a lot like that," and then I use words that they understand in order to help them more easily understand the Scriptures. There is simply a lot of overlap because ... no surprise ... anyone who studies the *WORLD* God has made will find a lot of truths that overlap with the *WORD* God has made. God's Word describes the state of the world and His intentions for it and (shocking!) observations about the world actually line up with what God's Word says rather than being different.

So, why not borrow from observational terminology to help people understand God's Word? Bible translators do this all the time. As linguistics change in a culture, we get new translations that use the new lingo to reach the target audience. One of my pastors recently introduced me to the "Hawai'i Pidgin Bible." Read a few verses. It's crazy. But it's communicating the Bible to a culture in words that people in that culture can understand. That's what RPC is all about - revealing the truth of the Bible using words that the red pill culture can understand.

RPC - it's not clear I have use of it.

If it's not helpful to you, then don't use it. As a single guy who isn't actively seeking a wife (and I encourage all men to avoid actively seeking), you probably have relatively little use for the intergender sexual dynamics aspect of what gets discussed here. I do think you could learn a lot about disciple-making and how to stay mission-focused, but it seems like you've already drawn that from the content here. So, you've found the tools that work for you. Maybe later on in life, if you do find yourself in a relationship or married, you'll start to see value in the other tools. In the meantime, recognize that different people have different needs. So, while you think that much of the content here is misplaced with regard to your own purposes, recognize that it might be on-point for what other men need to hear to get back on track.

I just think living by the spirit is "complete"

That would be great if you were explaining how to live by the Spirit. How do you "live by the Spirit" as a married man? Are there any differences in this if you're single instead? Clearly there are because God has expectations for married people that don't apply to singles. But what about a single man who struggles with porn - how is he to live by the Spirit? It's easy to say, "Stop watching porn," but how does he actually do that?

You see, everything we teach here ultimately has an application. I try to include application points in most of my teaching posts. We're giving the people the "how to" behind the "what to do." "Live by the Spirit" is a what, but does nothing to help people who don't know "how to" do that.

Seek God's will

How? On our sidebar I have posts on getting into God's Word, memorizing Scripture, how to study the Bible,

prayer, etc. Telling someone to "seek God's will" is not of great value if you're not explaining how.

Seek ... God's Kingdom

What does that even mean? Good thing I have countless posts on what it means to do this, mostly focusing on the mission God gave to those in His Kingdom, which includes advancing it, sanctifying it, etc.

live by the [S]pirit and try to be like Christ + sanctify myself?

And how do we do this? What if a pastor preaches that part of living by the Spirit for a married man is to do whatever his wife says, because that's the best way he can serve his wife? Is that what the Spirit wants? Because that's what the church teaches ... never so bluntly, but that's the lesson countless men take from it.

Perhaps "living by the Spirit" for a married man means learning how to tell his wife "no." But what if a guy's small group leader is teaching him that he's sinning by doing that because he should love his wife and respect her wishes?

See how these things are not self-intuitive, especially when the church has been led astray by the cultural influences that even you seem to agree are harmful and ungodly? Telling someone to "live by the Spirit" means very little if they're going to go to the wrong sources to figure out how to do that. The result is that they'll think they're living by the Spirit when they're really living by cultural Christianity's expectations - and there is a huge difference.

That's a complete picture for me.

From a bird's eye view, perhaps. But zoom in a little bit and you'll realize as I've been saying that these phrases sound really good but have no actual practical value without a list of "how to"s. I openly admit that some of the "how to" stuff here may not be perfect or may not apply to every guy. That's fine - help refine us.

What I don't like seeing is, "Here are a bunch of things that are imperfect and need changed," but without providing any practical examples of what the problems are or what the change should look like. You can't say, "Don't do X" without adding, "But absolutely do Y."

Tag: [/u/rocknrollchuck](#) [/u/Deep_Strength](#)

Any RPbros in Oregon?

3 upvotes · 8 February 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

FYI - Tags in posts don't work. It has to be a comment.

309 specific to RPC or does it also have a RP equivalent?

3 upvotes · 2 February 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Something went over your head there. The left side is the spiritual reality, the right side is the "rp concept." Leading a family is the rp concept. Discipleship (giving birth to new believers and raising them in spiritual maturity) is the spiritual reality.

Frame?

3 upvotes · 31 January 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Read 113 parts 1 and 2, 207 and 211. If you still have questions, ask them more specifically.

Discussion: How do you "count others more significant than yourself." while still maintaining the I'm the prize mentality?

3 upvotes · 30 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Thanks for responding for me ;)

How to split expenses in home?

3 upvotes · 28 January 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

This is better for askMRP. Before it gets removed, let me simply say ...

1. Stop it with all the "she leaves all the expenses on me" garbage. What if you leave all the expenses on her? Don't let her use you as a default.
2. In these scenarios, the best attitude to incorporate into your frame is that it's your household, your budget, and your finances. She's the girl who goes off and makes half of the money that you will decide how to spend. Have her deposit her checks into a joint account, then set clear boundaries on how that account is to be used. I've even known several guys through my divorce law practice who managed to convince their wives to auto-deposit their paychecks into his account that she's not named on. If she has her own separate account, she will screw with you on this every time.
3. Allocate the expenses the way you want to allocate them. She has no business telling you how to allocate it. You tell her. The only reason she gets away with it is because you let her. Lead her instead.
4. From the sound of it, she's the one who picks up the mail and knows what all the bills are. If that's the case, that's your failing as a leader. You need to know your own financial situation. You be the one to get the mail and organize the bills. When you're in control of the bills, you're in control of how they get paid. If she deposits her money into a joint account that you can pay them from, you'll be good.

Weird but good things happening.

3 upvotes · 27 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

If you have that level of influence and voice in your father's life, leverage it into vision casting toward his mission in Christ. Read the "mission matters, nothing else" post in the 200 series to see how everything else will follow if you can be successful at this.

As to your questions:

1. My parents divorced years ago, but i got my dad to read some of NMMNG. It went well and we still talk about principles from the book, as recently as yesterday. As a former pastor he's still highly feminized, so he resists and tries to use passages like Philippians 4 to rationalize female equality in the church. He also won't officialize a relationship with the girl he's dating because "she's too hot for me," he says. Nevertheless, he's making progress, his faith issues being what hold him back. My mom was the self professed dominant in their marriage and post divorce is committed to remaining single. She is highly receptive to any biblical teaching I give on these issues - but I suspect it's because she'll never actually have to apply it again. She's the closest I've ever seen to a single woman embodying NAWALT, but primarily because she's taken herself off the SMP. Hypergamy means nothing to her anymore - a case study I'd like to look more into, as she's very rare in this.
2. Followers should follow both because of love and truth. We see this balance in our own salvation: it's not enough to say we love God if we reject the truth of his Word, or that we embrace the Word fully with no love in our hearts. Jesus also says we must have faith like a child (aka "trust at face value") while Paul says the Bereans were more noble than the Thessalonians because they didn't only take his word for it - they tested everything against Scripture to see if what he said was true (independent thought).

In RP terminology we call this latter concept: **"Trust But Verify."** Given recent conversations here I may do a

post on this soon.

Who Is to Blame for the State of the Western Church?

3 upvotes · 25 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Normally I'd object to blaming our problems or discussing blame at all, but because it was a reply and not the spontaneous product of internal brooding I'll let it slide.

More to the point of your post, I'm reminded of the best church I've been in - and I tell people what made it the best was that it was lay led. There was no head pastor. There were a team of elders with full time day jobs who fulfilled the pastoral role. It was also the closest to a red pill church I've ever been to. They actually did a 7 week series on song of songs and taught about doing oral between spouses and how women should dress up for their husbands, and how men should bear the weight of leadership in the home and not defer to their wives all the time. That was the earliest point of my red pill awakening.

Interestingly, the guy who was the pastor before it became lay led retired to open a cigar shop in Arizona. He was the definition of kind hearted, yet raw masculinity.

Too Little, Too Much

3 upvotes · 23 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Usually spoken from a misunderstanding of AWALT.

Too Little, Too Much

3 upvotes · 23 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Ah yes, because that worked so well for Hosea ... and David ... and Jacob ... and plenty of other people for whom God did the vetting. That's not to say those marriages didn't accomplish a godly purpose. They all certainly did. But they also brought with it a lot of the AWALT tendencies that weren't mitigated by the fact of God doing the vetting.

Too Little, Too Much

3 upvotes · 22 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Not everyone who gets divorced gets "divorce raped." Again, the cautionary tales you read of are almost always extreme situations, not common ones. As most are aware, I'm a divorce attorney. I can personally attest that the vast majority of my cases do not involve either side getting "divorce raped" by the other. There are certainly exceptional cases where that does happen, but it's a significant minority.

Suppose, being generous, that 10% of cases involve actual divorce rape - and 50% of people get divorced ... that's 5% of people who actually fall into the "cautionary tale" scenario. That's not insignificant - it's worth taking note of. But I wouldn't bend my entire life around trying to avoid being one of those 5%, especially when you can effectively mitigate that harm through other means without having to focus on it in the first place.

Too Little, Too Much

3 upvotes · 22 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Be mindful of the cautionary tales, but don't bend your entire life around them.

To quote my original post: "Be mindful of the cautionary tales, but don't bend your entire life around them."

What is the Christian RP Advice to a Wife for Getting Her Husband to Change?

3 upvotes · 17 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

That's the one.

Validation and Interdependency

3 upvotes · 11 January 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Validation for women can certainly be internal too. It's just not their biological or spiritual nature and there isn't the same compulsion for them to have internal validation as there is for men. I'd think this would be obvious just looking around the world.

We've done it, guys. "Traditional Masculinity" is now officially deemed "harmful" by the American Psychological Association. High-five to culture!

3 upvotes · 11 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I feel that if I tried to persuade them, I'd just have a bunch of clones running around who say the same stuff I do

Kinda like Jesus did with his 12? This is a good thing. It's called discipleship. It's what we *SHOULD* be *DOING*, not *avoiding*.

sometimes without really thinking about it or without considering what it could actually mean

If that's the result, it's the mark of a poor discipler. An effective communicator and disciple-maker should use strategies of helping people reach their own conclusions rather than telling them their conclusion. This is how I "persuade" people - not by telling them what they should think and arguing my point (which is the default position of most people on the internet - especially on reddit, where it's not designed for conversational format), but by asking them questions or telling them stories and letting them reach their own conclusions - and if they don't reach the right conclusion, you just ask more questions. That's what Jesus did with his parables and challenges to the Pharisees, the 12, etc.

The parables are obvious, but the questions are when he says things like: "Which is better: for a man to let his donkey die in a ditch on the Sabbath, or for him to get up on the Sabbath and save his donkey?" (paraphrased). The conclusion is obvious, but he's letting his audience (the Pharisees) decide for themselves - and they can't argue against his point because he hasn't made a point for them to argue against.

On reddit, you'll get people who say, "I see what you're doing, but here's the reason why I don't like your question." But dealing with that is easy. Just say, "I wasn't making any assumptions. I know what I would do, but I asked the question because I want to know what *you* would do and what *your* answer would be, because yours might be different from mine." This has been very effective for me.

Someone else (or maybe it was you?) suggested I write a post on how to communicate effectively - I feel more inclined that this is necessary.

Validation and Interdependency [MRP Draft]

3 upvotes · 11 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

That's a great question. My gut reaction is to agree with your suggestion. That said, on a closer look there's a difference between *needing* something for validation and *enjoying* something when it happens to occur. Many men *need* sex with their wives to validate their masculinity, but that doesn't mean it's inherently validation-seeking when another man who doesn't *need* it pursues sex with his wife and enjoys it anyway.

Of course, this all depends on how Glover defines a "love language" - if it's something that is *needed* to experience love, or if it's merely the most effective way of giving someone enjoyment in the relationship. At the

end of the day, it doesn't really matter because "love languages" are merely an interpretive categorization created by a man, much like "homo sapien" is a categorization tool that humans came up with. God didn't create 5 love languages and assign different ones to each person. Glover is just finding patterns and categorizing them, which is different from treating the love languages as if they are a definitive part of a person's makeup.

We've done it, guys. "Traditional Masculinity" is now officially deemed "harmful" by the American Psychological Association. High-five to culture!

3 upvotes · 11 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I change people's minds all the time. The world is not as polarized as the TV would make you think. Polarization just gets better ratings, so it's broadcast more. Most people in my day to day life are open to new ideas if they are communicated with tact - even against strongly held convictions.

For example, my secretary's dad was a senator in the democratic party for years. She grew up with democratic ideals and firmly believed all kinds of liberal and feminist propaganda and called herself a feminist. Last year I had a few conversations with her and she concluded one of them, "My dad would be rolling in his grave if he found out I'm probably a Republican now."

This happens all the time. Maybe I'll do a post someday on persuasion and tactful communication.

We've done it, guys. "Traditional Masculinity" is now officially deemed "harmful" by the American Psychological Association. High-five to culture!

3 upvotes · 11 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I think your orientation is right. I was just pointing out that "you can't really change people that don't want to be changed" doesn't apply to everyone - there are many, many, many people whose minds can and will be changed.

We've done it, guys. "Traditional Masculinity" is now officially deemed "harmful" by the American Psychological Association. High-five to culture!

3 upvotes · 11 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

This assumes a false polarization. The point of awareness and discussion isn't for one side to try to convince the other side - it's to reach all the people in the middle who either don't have a side or aren't strongly committed to their side.

Tag: /u/WarriorJesus1915

Life Lesson: Treachery of women even within the church

3 upvotes · 9 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

There's no fence for me. I wrote the sidebar here, brother. I'm happy to discuss why I have my wife working rather than cooking, but that's a little beside the point, so I'll defer it unless you ask.

What I really see going on here is that you tried to give men some situationally specific advice that won't apply in all contexts; I tried to give this caution while being generous to you in the tone of my reply, and you respond by calling me a blue pill beta - not in an effort to help, as when we expose blue pill ideations in field reports or advice threads, but in an attempt to sling personal insults and regain an air of dignity from anyone who might have read my reply to your post. This is further evidence of validation seeking (not to mention all the DEERing), just as all the cheating comes off as validation seeking. It does not help your credibility and judgment here. I look forward to future interactions being more productive.

Escalation the RPC way

3 upvotes · 7 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

That really is the whole point I'm making. If your heart is right then do what you want.

I agree ... but with one caveat: Psalm 37:4, "Delight yourself in the Lord and he will give you the desires of your heart." If you make God your delight, he'll give himself to you - not he'll give you the other things that you desire. Right?

The same principle applies here. Yes, make your heart right. But a heart that is "right" will inherently lend itself toward certain characteristics and behavior patterns. What are those characteristics and behavior patterns? That's what you're really debating. I don't think [u/OsmiumZulu](#) would disagree with the foundation; rather, the disagreement is in what behaviors a "right heart" inspires a person to do. The fat, lazy bum example is an extreme way we can all agree: a person with a "right heart" toward God will never end up as a fat, lazy bum because his heart will compel him to care for his body. But to what degree? OZ and I would argue that it's less about a destination and more about a direction - that we are constantly striving for improvement. So, a guy with a "right heart" about God's desires for his body will never be at 18% body fat and think, "I'm in reasonably good shape ... I'm not attractive, but I'm not morbidly obese either, so I can stop trying to improve my body now." But the person at 10% body fat may rightly think, "I would love to improve my body even further, and will indeed keep taking steps in that direction, but there are other areas of improvement that are more compelling right now, so I should work on those before killing myself to get to 9% body fat." Neither of them has given up the goal of improvement, but the amount of time and attention each one gives toward the varying components of self-improvement will be allocated consistently with the greatest need - ergo my prior post on "Fixing your SMV" all about addressing the low hanging fruit.

if your heart is right then your focus will be on things God wants

It's easy to say this while bifurcating out the fact that God also has wants and desires for how we maintain our bodies, or how we steward our skills and finances in the workforce, etc. I say a lot that God desires us to make disciples. So does that mean that the act of discipling someone - all the meetings, phone calls, texts, hang-out times, etc. - is all I'm talking about? Of course not.

A disciple is a follower. Followers have a direction they're moving - and that direction is painted with a clear picture of the path and the person they're following. They know what the outcome looks like from every angle. One must be a disciple before they can be a disciple-maker. So, I must look at all areas of my life that God has any interest in (which is all of them!) and try to conform to God's expectations in each area - and then allow myself to be the model for someone else, just as Christ (or the guy who disciplined me) was my model. That means understanding that God has an expectation about my financial stewardship, on my body size and shape, on my interpersonal skills, etc.

To say that we should focus on making disciples, and then forget what it means to be a disciple - living up to all of God's expectations for our lives - is to undermine any claim of having one's heart rightly oriented toward God and Christ.

However the secular red pill makes Hypergamy a god and a judge in some ways.

Exactly right. Their goal isn't to fix women or change culture, but to make the existing culture work for them. As Christians, we do have an obligation in Ephesians 5 to sanctify our wives, and a broader imperative in numerous places (Acts 1:8 and Matthew 28:19-20 not being the least) to change the culture. So there will be inherent differences in how we approach thing.

The value of secular RP to the Christian is not merely in how to utilize a right knowledge of our present culture to take advantage of it - though we can do that too ... but also because we need to know where we are in order to plot a course to where we're going. If the red pill is knowledge of how current cultural intersexual dynamics function, a man must be red pillled to be highly influential in that culture. It doesn't mean you serve the red pill - it

means you have the knowledge of the red pill.

As I've said here quite boldly before: if the Bible said to worship at my wife's foot and submit to her every desire and whim, I would do it. The "red pill" is not my god. Rather, the red pill is a discovery of what God had created in the first place. So, for me, studying "the red pill" - not merely in the secular sense, but in the biblical - is no different from trying to understand the world God created so I can maximize my influence in it. We don't worship the Bible, but it is perhaps the most useful tool we have in our understanding and worship of God. The red pill is another tool that ranks lower than the Bible, but is still a valuable tool all the same.

So, you don't reject or become ambivalent toward the red pill in favor of God because you're comparing two different things: the means and the end; the road and the destination. Nobody says, "I reject the freeway. All I care about is Disney World." There's no comparison. But the freeway is the path I'm going to take to get to Disney World. And while the Freeway itself might be the Bible, the red pill might be more akin to the driving laws - the context for how to interact safely on the freeway.

Escalation the RPC way

3 upvotes · 7 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

As [u/OsmiumZulu](#) noted, we aren't meant to follow Jesus' example to every detail. There are points where God expects us to derail - otherwise we would all be carpenters. If I were to tell a man that he needs to learn how to fix a leaky faucet to take care of his home - and this is something every man should be capable of doing - someone could easily say, "Ah, but Jesus never fixed leaky faucets, so you should stop telling men they need to learn how to do this."

Obviously the principle is what applies: know how to manage and take care of your home. Likewise, the principle applies: know how to manage and take care of your body. We don't know how exactly Jesus would have done that in a modern world. Given the severe health differences between food back then and food today, he very well may have taken supplements and spent extra time at the gym to offset the extra grease and carbs. And I don't see Jesus going vegan either ... but that's another conversation. The point is that we don't know what Jesus would have done, but we're making reasonably educated guesses by adopting the character of Christ and living in that - which for many of us includes going to the gym and whatnot, which is quite necessary to maintain a reasonable figure in light of the fact that I drive 10 miles from city to city instead of walking it, and that I have a car to transport my goods instead of carrying them on my back, and that I have power tools to do my carpentry work in my home and don't have to have the strength to do it by hand.

confidence it's usually in reference to God - not yourself

I used to struggle with this very thought, but the comments we see in Scripture is that God is in us - and that this indwelling nature of God in us is what is to give us confidence. It is not just having confidence in God like he's some external magician who we ask to work some magic for us, then have confidence that he'll do it. It's the confidence that God, working through us, will get the job done through what he enables us to do. This seems far more biblically sound to me than the external "magician in the sky" approach that atheists often accuse us of having.

I'm not sure how relevant it is, but I rediscovered a passage recently that is still somewhat shocking to me: "I said, 'You are 'gods,; you are all sons of the Most High' (Psalm 82:6). Jesus quotes this passage when accused by the Pharisees of calling himself God/Messiah, noting that everyone who is of God is also a "god" (lower case) because of our relationship to God.

So, no, we are not to have confidence in ourselves - but our connection to God can certainly be a source of confidence in what we do and what God does through us. Whether we say, "I know God can do it through me," or, "I know I can do it," is just a matter of semantics, and the former almost always comes off as false humility.

contrary to your point - surely there have been fat and timid men that have been useful to others throughout history

Here's where you're talking past each other. I made a post a long time ago about whether or not a man can have multiple priorities or if he should only have one priority from which all other priorities are derived. My conclusion on that matter was the latter: our priority is to do what God put us here to do - our mission: disciple-making. If a man says, "But I also must love my wife," then loving his wife has become a distraction to him from his mission, which is why Paul says in 1 Cor. 7 that those with wives should live as if they had none. However, if a man says, "I should love my wife as an example to the men that I disciple," now he is advancing his mission - his behaviors are the same in both situations, but his frame is very different, and the mission-oriented frame in the latter case will glorify God, whereas the wife-oriented frame in the former case will not.

OZ and I have a lingering disagreement on the role of intentionally seeking a wife. I'm the odd one out of the moderators, as I think I'm the only one who does not believe this should be an intentional pursuit. I tend to view being "useful to others throughout history" (assuming you mean in an eternal context through disciple-making) as being a higher pursuit that the intentional pursuit of a wife will distract from. However, I also believe (as is posted on the sidebar) that of the men who do this, in order to have sufficient help to accomplish all God has given them, they will need women in their lives, and in order to stay sexually pure among those women, a man will eventually have to marry one of them - and that this can also have benefits to a man's mission, even if, per 1 Cor. 7, it is ultimately less productive than if a man were to remain single.

All of that being said, the reality of life is that most Christian men will not accept this view of things. They want to engage in the intentional pursuit of women. While this may downgrade the degree to which a man can be devoted to God, I don't know that the downgrade is significant enough to be a rational consideration for men who otherwise know how to maintain frame. In 1 Cor. 7, Paul's reason for not wanting men married is because they will serve their wife instead of God. But that raises a big question: is he saying that as a matter of certainty that happens in every marriage, or as a generalization of what men tend to do - a generalization that is overcome and defeated for the RP man who knows not to pedestalize his wife? If it's the former, then my view of things is better for God's Kingdom. If it's the latter, then it doesn't matter if an RP man marries or not, as the concern Paul would have about shifting their devotion from God to a wife would be mitigated by their mission-oriented frame, so long as the man remains strong. He's still on "hard mode" in that situation, after all.

More to the point, OZ is clearly referencing the type of man who is in this latter position: a man who wants to intentionally pursue a woman, and who also wants to increase his ability to influence his world for God. I hope you're not contesting the fact that increased worldly qualifications also comes with increased influence in the world. This is just common sense, and it is one of the many reasons why Paul was able to be so influential in the early church: because he had more worldly qualifications than anyone else, so people listened. He references this in Philippians 3, but couples it with the statement that he considers them all a loss - not that it's wrong to have these qualifications, but they're only a loss "compared to the surpassing greatness of Christ Jesus." That is, he did not trust in his worldly qualifications or take pride in them. But that doesn't mean he didn't use them to get his foot in the door. God was strategic when he chose Paul. It wasn't because of Paul's good character that he was chosen, for he was killing Christians. Gamaliel would have been a better option, if that were the case - at least he was open-minded. It wasn't because of his bad character either, for he could have used Caesar Nero instead, if that was the case. Rather, God raised Paul up with a specific background, preparing him to have influence within the ministry he knew he would be called for.

In the same way, there is no harm in gaining influence with outsiders by meeting them on their terms. I know you're not saying men should let themselves go, but trying to counter the point that men should do what they can to earn influence among non-believers is also highly counter-productive. That's really the simple way of saying all of this ... but I felt like processing it in writing anyway, for my own benefit.

Yet, I don't think those are the criteria He uses to judge men

On a grand scale, God is our judge. On the dating scale of finding a wife, different criteria apply, and each woman is her own judge of who she will or won't marry. Context matters. OP was talking about escalating to finding a wife. You made a comment indirectly alluding to the debate over whether men should be doing this, suggesting that men shouldn't feel biblically obligated to make themselves more appealing to women. OZ appropriately responded with an implication that enhancing one's SMV has fringe benefits that also increase one's ability to influence others for Christ, so there's no problem in doing both. At this point, it's not clear, but it seems that you're only looking at it from a mission-framework, whereas OZ is looking at it from a finding-a-wife framework, which involves different judges and different criteria - and the framework OZ is operating in is one that may not have any negative effects on one's mission, but could have positive effects on it as well, and thus it would be unwise not to consider it.

Normally I'd polish this a bit, but I've got a client waiting on me, so I'm just going to have to let you figure out what all I just said without any edits :p

Would the Modern Woman be Attracted to Jesus?

3 upvotes · 27 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians

If you're just here to screw with the community and you've already made up your mind, you will be banned for trolling. You clearly have a false idea in your head about who Jesus was, basing your view on your feelings and cultural conditioning over what the bible actually says. This makes me very sad for you and for the man you will one day have to give an account for being. I wish you well. Just don't come here to whine.

NoFITS December update

3 upvotes · 15 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians

the rest of the book seems meh

More important than the techniques is the assertive bill of rights. While the techniques help on a practical level, they can easily be faked. Adopting and internalizing each of the bill of rights (with minor biblical exceptions) is what develops your frame into something that is actually strong enough to apply the techniques rather than merely fake your way through them in a conversation. I use that bill of rights frequently with men I disciple and in ministry leadership/training groups I lead at my church. If you haven't internalized this yet, go back - you're missing something huge.

i think they still prefer men to be tough not soyboys

That's all women, brother; not just them. It's just not politically correct for them to admit it here.

what is a good expectation in a potential partner, i mean, should i be hopeful of a 20yr old?

Your lifts are incredible - better than mine are. Your weight is still high. You're getting attention, and that's what matters. What's wrong with shooting for a girl in her early 20s? Sounds reasonable for where you're at. I've known countless people who have had 15-ish years as their age gap. I think my grandparents were over 20 years. My in-laws are 15 years apart. It's common, just not talked about. My dad is 62 and he mostly dates women in their 30s. It's only a problem if you're living in society's frame. She'll know the risks of being with an older guy - having and raising kids, retirement ages, etc. It's up to her if she wants to take those risks. Don't try to make that decision for her by not asking her out.

Single Moms? Divorced ladies? tell me what you guys think.

Personally, I wouldn't. But that's your business to set your own standard.

Yes i know once i get to a lower BF% i can open more doors, but lets take the here and now, not the maybe of tomorrow (but i am working on it).

This phrase really concerns me. I mean REALLY concerns me. I wish [u/OsmiumZulu](#) had posted here just to address this comment.

First, if you plan on lowering your body fat and opening those new doors, why would you even worry about settling for what you can get today?

Second, this implies that you think that you can settle for someone who will accept your current body fat and that because she dated you while you were at that body fat, she should be attracted to you after marriage while you have that body fat. This simply isn't true. A guy with 17+% body fat is simply unattractive. I know. I was there. After some recent events, I'm almost back there. I get it. But the fact of the matter is that if a woman marries you when you're not physically attractive, it's not because she wants to have sex with you. She might act excited and aroused by you now, but it's based on factors that will wear off after the wedding.

With where your lifts are at, there's no reason you shouldn't be sub-12% BF except for an awful diet. Dieting is one of my greatest weaknesses too. I do great for about 3-6 months at a time, then I'll have a month or two (usually November/December) that ruins it all and it takes me another 2 months just to get back to where I was. It's hard. But as a single guy with no kids, you really have no excuses.

Third, this phrase also implies that you're limiting yourself. Instead of going for what you want, you're going for what you can get. That's a weak frame that tells me you don't think you're the prize. And maybe you're not. I don't know. What I do know is that you should shoot for what you want, not what you can get. Guys who do that often find that what they want is far more attainable than what they may have previously believed.

Do Looks Matter – The Maroon Pill and The Apex Alpha Predator...

3 upvotes · 12 December 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Bobby, Bobby, Bobby. It saddens me to read this post, brother. It shows me that you've stopped thinking with Scripture and started thinking with mortal thoughts. Remember, there is a trilogy of sources on which your beliefs can be grounded: philosophy, science, and theology. You're relying on philosophy (logical thinking about attraction) and science (observational reality from tinder testing) and completely neglecting theology in this post, except to the degree that you can think of a few biblical examples to support what you believe to be a scientific conclusion - and weak ones at that.

I've read the black pill and studied it. I am not convinced. You're basically ignoring everything to do with SMV. To be clear, looks are a big part of SMV - and I count them as the largest, tied with a man's frame. I wrote up a post on it a while back: [here](#).

The standard "black pill tests" take a highly attractive guy and prove that women will ignore other negative qualities about him if he is visually attractive enough. In the short-term, this can work, but let those tests play out into a 6month+ relationship and you'll see the numbers vastly changing.

To be clear, the impression you're giving guys is that their only hope for marrying an attractive woman and for her to be sexually attracted to you is to be incredibly physically attractive, otherwise you can never break out of your genetic lottery SMV base. This is simply untrue. All it proves is that better looking guys can get away with more stuff. The red pill already addresses this: "good looking guys are playing on easy mode." That's it.

What the black pill tests cannot prove is the false implication that women will not be attracted to you unless you're good looking. I don't see any tests putting out the perfect guy who's rich, charming, confident, maintains

frame, etc. - but who is only average in appearance. And to test that guy, you've got to get off tinder. That's only self-fulfilling prophecy because tinder can ONLY realistically assess looks with the first swipe. So, you're making conclusions that the black pill does not and cannot reach based on the information it has.

And all of that is merely using the same sandy foundation as your post is based on: observational reality. And I could go on with more observations about women who are highly sexually attracted to mediocre or ugly men because of the other qualities that balance out their SMV. I have disciplined some of them and know the personal details about their marriages and sex lives. The attraction is for real - which is why frame is key also, among other things. All the black pill proves is that looks are significant. It doesn't prove how significant they are in comparison to frame.

What's more important in the matter, though, is what God says and how the Bible indicates men and women were created and how we were affected by the fall. This is all on the sidebar. I will stand by my theology as a more accurate measure of attraction cues than humanistic philosophies or black pill testing any day. Don't get lured away, brother. Stick with the Scriptures and you won't go wrong.

Tag: [u/deep_strength](#) - I think I'm echoing a bit of what you're saying here and I don't have time to flesh out my thoughts fully, as I have a hearing in 10 minutes.

What does RPChristians think about this marriage video from Larry J. Russell

3 upvotes · 6 December 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Priorities must be in order: Relationship with God, Spouse comes before the call of God, Children, Extended family/friends

This is just absurd. First, "relationship with God" is not the same thing as your mission for God. Second, your spouse does not come before your mission. Third, Jesus talks so much about the weakness of human familial bonds that I don't even know how we include them in our priority list. Example: "They are not my mother and brothers. You who do the will of my Father are my mother and brothers." Example: "If anyone does not hate his father and mother, brother and sister, wife and children, and even his own life, he cannot be my disciple." Jesus wasn't joking when he said that. It wasn't a gag. That doesn't mean you ignore your family. It means that your context for relating with your family is defined by your mission for God.

Build a solid, covenant relationship with spouse

What's the difference between a "solid covenant relationship" and a normal "covenant relationship"? Is a solid one the kind where you let your spouse do whatever she wants and you have to let her get away with it because you're never allowed to impose consequences or divorce her? The more you focus on the covenant, the worse your relationship will be. The less you focus on the covenant (in favor of your mission), the more secure the covenant becomes as a byproduct.

Establish a one-flesh relationship

Ok, have lots of sex. I'm on board with him here. Wait ... I didn't actually watch the video (at work). He is talking about sex here, right?

Ask your spouse about their needs and meet them

What if my wife says she needs a bigger house, better car, and a vacation to the Bahamas with her girl friends? This is stupid. Watch what they do, not what they say. Don't ask what her needs are - be observant and attentive and take charge. Don't say, "Honey, how would you like me to lead you today?"

Understand Biblical love: 1 Cor. 13, Patient, kind, no envy or pride, etc.

Ok, this really gets me ticked off. It's one of my pet peeves. 1 Cor. 13 is about unity within the church between members of the body of Christ. It is not about spousal love. That passage has been misapplied and misconstrued because of its false context for so many years ... if there's anything that ever gives me cause to doubt the Holy Spirit, it's in wondering how he lets people get away with this type of eisegesis for so long.

As with most Christian content, I'm sure there is some really good stuff in this video. I don't mean to be a total downer on the guy - especially noting that I didn't actually watch the video. I may get to it when a few minutes free up for me. Who knows. My point is that these types of falsities that creep into otherwise good content can be incredibly dangerous and they're the reason the church is screwed up so bad right now.

Let me be clear: I despise the doctrine that only ordained ministers who are seminary trained should be allowed to teach in the church. But when I see all the harm that amateur teaching has caused, I develop a sort of empathy for those absurd extremists. Of course, then I remember that seminaries have been tainted by the bad teachings even worse than everywhere else and that they're the cause of most of these problems ... and my empathy turns back into a combination of indignation and apathy.

Feminine Primacy effect on Doctrine

3 upvotes · 1 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This seems like a real stretch to me ... and I'm not even Arminian.

Go for the gainzzzz. Really? What do you think.

3 upvotes · 30 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

You can't possibly know that. At best, you can say, "The Bible doesn't record any accounts of Jesus doing weight training." I'd be shocked if, in actuality, Jesus wasn't playing around with lifting heavy things with the disciples from time to time. It's part of relating. Even my kids do it, without going to a gym.

Go for the gainzzzz. Really? What do you think.

3 upvotes · 29 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

If God/Jesus is the groom and the church is the bride on a spiritual level, just as we have groom and bride on a physical level ... how "spiritually jacked"/powerful is God in the relationship? That's the degree of attractiveness and power we should strive to emulate in our physical marriages as a groom.

Caught wife wanking off

3 upvotes · 15 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

or maybe she's just horny at odd times when you're not around

Timing is huge.

Protection of the innocent femininity

3 upvotes · 14 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Women will not be mods here.

Finding a Tribe, Rasied Weak, Lds, the one myth.

3 upvotes · 5 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I know you're not going to want to hear this, but I cannot in good conscience give you any reply without mentioning that Mormonism preaches a false gospel that cannot save anyone. Most of the advice I give people here about the importance of their mission has, at its foundation, the assumption that it is a mission that God actually supports. Accordingly, following the advice of much of what I write on RPC may not achieve the same results if you are pursuing a mission that God directly opposes. Although I don't support everything CARM says or does, here are two links that provide information on this: (1) [an address to those who are mormons](#), and (2) [a resource library for information on Mormonism from a biblical perspective](#).

For the record, my brother is marrying an ex-Mormon in a few months. I've talked to countless Mormons over the years. I've had friends who are Mormon. I've known people who have converted both into and out of Mormonism. A lot of what I'm saying here isn't just something I read on a blog somewhere, like CARM - it's based on things that I've heard from people who have actually been a part of the church in different levels of authority and who have either been blunt in their honesty or who have left and later saw the error of what was going on.

With that out of the way, let's get to the heart of your questions. First off, I can't make sense of half of your sentences. The grammar is so bad that I literally don't know what you're saying or asking half the time, so here's the best I can make of it.

Would they be able to help if a conflict happen "Scratch" no

It doesn't sound like your existing community would have your back if you needed them. Mormonism is an inherently selfish religion that exists almost entirely for one's own eventual gain. This is starkly different from Christianity, where Jesus teaches us that we should not act for our own gain or what rewards God might give us for our good deeds (though those will certainly come), but because we love God and he deserves everything.

The appropriate biblical attitude is one shared by Brother Lawrence in *The Practice of the Presence of God*: "I did not engage in a religious life but for the love of God, and I have endeavoured to act only for Him; whatever becomes of me, **whether I be lost or saved**, I will always continue to act purely for the love of God." That is, Brother Lawrence appropriately recognized that our obligation and desire to love God is completely independent of what we get out of it. While Mormonism teaches that God will give you things in exchange for your devotion, the biblical attitude, as professed by Brother Lawrence, is that he would continue to love and serve God even if he knew he was going to hell for it anyway.

While Mormonism may teach selfishness as a bad thing, it's impossible to eradicate it when it is at the core of their theology. There is no intense camaraderie among brothers who would stand by one another to the death. There is only a sense of doing what needs be done to maximize one's rewards in the afterlife. Don't expect them to jeopardize their eternity for the sake of any love they say they have for you.

Are there not any women that have my standards or "the one myth" there is a young single adults 18-29 but i am 30 and it seems like a problem within the Lds "mormon" according to google

Mormonism is such a small niche within the religious sphere that you are very unlikely to find a single girl who meets whatever standards you may say you have. That said, based on your story, it sounds like you have a lot of work to do before you are a high enough value man to attract that kind of girl in the first place. Get your past traumas and communication skills in order and that can be a big step.

the one myth: sure i bet if look hard there will be a someone hiting the wall looking to snag me up born again virgins all that jazz and Ill get told i should be happy I am with them

You don't have to settle. I would never encourage you to try to convert a girl to Mormonism. But if you are a high value man, a woman who is attracted to you will follow you anywhere you go. In my single days, I had several girls who professed that they would convert to Christianity for me. The pool can be larger than you realize - just don't evangelize. At best, evangelize with the prospect of dating afterward.

They put on faces "or fake act" if you show up to any lds house it will be clean you show up unannounced you will see how they really live

Most people do this. That's not unique to Mormonism or any religion, though I will say that even with 4 kids I do a pretty darn good job keeping my house in order every day.

It seems like a lot of the members are putting on an act and if you try to break out of this act and show your true way of thought you would be shamed

Not to beat a dead horse, but that's because (at least in my view) Mormonism itself is an act founded by someone (Joseph Smith) who put on an act. There have been psychological studies done to demonstrate that if something false is repeated to a person often and frequently enough that their brain will actually rewire itself to believe the falsehood - even if they know it's false ([example study](#)).

A great example of this is in being sick. I remember a few days where I would stay home from school claiming to be sick. I got pretty good at faking it. I knew I was faking it. But after faking for long enough something started to happen by the end of the day: I actually got sick. Or at least I thought I was actually sick. My nose would run, my throat get scratchy, my chest congested, etc. Then suddenly the next morning I'd be fine again, as if I was never actually sick. I had psychosomatically developed the physical condition I had deceived my brain into thinking I had.

This same thing can happen on a spiritual level. That is why Mormons place an incredible emphasis on a person's emotions and feelings as a source for discerning truth. *How do you know the book of Mormon is true?* someone asks. "Because the Holy Spirit has affirmed it in my heart through a powerful experience and burning joy when I read it," is a common response.

But the Bible doesn't give any such weight to emotions. This concept of emotionalism in spirituality is very dangerous and one that I actively combat against in churches that I visit. I have had to fight against it in my own home church until the leadership finally got on board. When that much weight is placed on emotion, it is easy to deceive anyone into anything by manipulating their feelings.

And let me be clear: feelings are very easy to manipulate. I used to make it an intentional point in my life, back in high school, to discern how to evoke emotional reactions out of different types of people. My goal at the time was to use techniques of emotional manipulation to cause people to believe in Jesus. It was twisted and dark, but I essentially had the same plan that Mormonism employs: use people's feelings as a rope to drag them wherever you want them to go. Don't fall for it. Don't be like I used to be, and don't fall for people who do what I used to.

There for trying to act or talk of red pill without slamming bible in it some how will be looked down on.

The red pill and the Bible will always be frowned upon.

Family is Every thing. I do not want children/cant.

Family is everything in Mormonism because that's how they keep Mormonism alive. If two people have 4 kids, they just tripled the number of Mormons in their home. If those kids each have 4 more, that's now 22 Mormons starting with 2 people.

It is very cult like and if my parents were not this way I feel i would be more willing to go.

It's cult-like because it *actually is a cult*. Don't let your relationship with your family destroy your relationship with God or hold you back.

I have a few goals in my life but I am indifferent if going will help me achieve them

Without knowing those goals, I can't say. If your goal is to become the leader of the Mormon church, then going will not help you achieve that goal. If your goal is to get into heaven someday, then leaving the Mormon church will absolutely help move you in the right direction. If your goal is to stay single for life (as it seems is the case right now), then leaving an environment where everyone is pressuring you to get married and have kids is probably a good idea.

btw i hate it when people give the advice pray and read the book because it seems like the answer when they do not know what to say also my friend got told that when i was around 14, she hung her self later that night.

I'm sorry to hear that. I agree with you that "just pray and read the Bible" is horrible advice - but it's common because many people don't know the answers in the first place, so all they can do is tell you how to find them on your own.

A question about tears in front of your LTR.

3 upvotes · 5 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

We call this: **A single man tear**. It's the only acceptable way for a man to cry.

Seriously, though - having emotions isn't bad. How you use them is what matters. Certain musicals can still wet my eyes. I enjoy that I can feel things in a beautiful way. But to do it in a context where it shows your woman that she can use your emotional responses as a mechanism of power over you - whether by getting you to cry as a negative reaction to the mean things she says, or by being sappy toward you to make you feel emotionally connected and obligated to her - that's not cool.

Have your single man tear. Just don't lose frame in the midst of it.

How to date "evenly" as a Christian

3 upvotes · 1 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Since that rationalization started affecting which marriages ended in divorce and which last ... or since 1 Cor. 7 was written ... or since the sexual marketplace was deregulated. A good argument could be made for any of those, and more.

Getting married without knowing why and just because you feel like it has always been a bad idea (except maybe before the fall). There have just been different points in history when the risks making it a bad idea were mitigated in different ways.

And the fact that you seem smug about having "got (1) and (2)" shows that you missed the point. Having 2 when you've already got 1 is counterproductive and undermines 1 in most cases. The goal isn't to maximize both.

Intro + question

3 upvotes · 1 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Welcome! I'm short on time, so I'm just going to be a bit blunt here.

Lifting: don't do to a persistent shoulder injury

I've only ever met one guy with an injury that actually prevented lifting. He was working for a moving company and got his arm ripped off while moving a piano down some stairs. It was sewn back on, but he could never lift with that arm again.

For everyone else, it's not a matter of "I can't lift." It's a matter of "I can't lift heavy weights." So, lift low weights and do endurance sets rather than heavy, short sets. You won't gain much strength, but your muscles can still balloon up from that. In fact, that's usually a preferred method for gaining the appearance of strength - the big, bulky frame.

developing my mission my top priority

Cool. Where are you at with that? I can't really help you with much else until you have this solidified in place. Why? Because until you have that mission down pat, you don't know what you're looking for in a helper and she doesn't know what she's signing up for. As such, the foundation of your marriage is purely worldly standards of what to look for in a prospective spouse and not godly standards of what will be effective at accomplishing your or His purposes.

I'm trying to figure out if I'm attracted to.

You're not. At least not yet.

we both seem half-committed

You mean not-committed. Yet. "Half-committed" isn't an actual thing. It's really, "I'm not committed, but I might be willing to commit someday, if some things change."

I know attraction can sometimes take time to develop

Right, but not usually. The longer it takes to develop, the greater the risk that it will (1) not ever fully develop, or (2) revert back to lower levels quite quickly because those lower levels were the foundation in the first place.

axiom that desire cannot be negotiated

Correct. But it can be manufactured. This happens when a guy or gal improves themselves to a degree that they become attractive, whereas they were not before.

I was honest with her

Correction: "I felt compelled to blab my feelings to her."

and texted her

"Because I was too chicken to call her or discuss it in person and it's easier to do these types of things when I can take my time crafting the perfect wording."

saying this in-between state is confusing and frustrating

Translation: "I want someone to make a decision about our relationship, but I'm too scared to be the one to make that decision, so I'm going to put my feelings under your control and let you decide what to do with them."

so we are meeting tomorrow to discuss how to move forward

"Because I don't know how to lead and I need her to tell me what to do."

I don't want to reject a gift of a Godly relationship

Who says this is a gift? A gift from who? If it's from God, you'd better take it. Period. If it's not from God, I'd send it back. How do you know if it's from God or not? You don't. So, the whole frame of thinking is somewhat pointless anyway.

What you really mean is: "I don't want to turn down someone who might have a lot of the qualities I'm looking for in a wife." But you haven't really said what those qualities are - and you can't possibly say what those qualities are until you know what your life mission is.

If your life mission is to have as much great sex as humanly possible, then you should be looking for women who are hot nymphos.

If your life mission is to start a fortune 500 company, then you need to find a wife who has no embarrassing qualities that would give you bad media attention, who can make you look good in public, and as an added bonus is very administratively talented, able to help you get that business off the ground.

If your life mission is to make disciples, then you need to find a wife who is godly, FAT (faithful, available, teachable), and preferably who has a knack for making friends and building deep relationships.

So, again, what's your mission?

Any advice on how to approach this situation with the mind and will of Christ?

Figure out what Christ wants your mission to be first. After that, assess whether or not she's presently skilled at the things necessary to fulfill that mission. If she is, assess your attraction. If she isn't, figure out if she's FAT, and if she is, then assess how attracted you are to her. After that, share your mission with her and ask her to start helping you do so, whether you're in a romantic context or not - this phase can be purely platonic. From there, make a decision on the romantic front if you're attracted enough that you keep thinking about having sex with her, and be an attractive guy in turn.

How do I lead as a man

By figuring out where you're going first. Again: you can't rightly enter a relationship if you don't know what your mission is first.

and figure out if I want to take the lead

Yes, you do. Any other answer is a failure of the biblical relational model and even under worldly standards would put you at a severe risk of having a dead bedroom or ending up in divorce.

and end this or pursue it for at least a date or two more to better discern attraction?

Attraction hits on multiple fronts. She's obviously not crazy hot, or else the physical attraction front would already be ringing bells everywhere. The primary other type of attraction that matters is whether or not you're attracted to the way she can help and support you in all that you're trying to do with your life. But you can't assess that until you know your mission.

Boldly sharing the Gospel - is it unloving?

3 upvotes · 30 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Thanks for being a good sport :) I'm sure you are well aware that all of this comes from a place of love. I don't know it all either, but I do believe this is within my gifting.

I agree with this as well, but should that be part of the initial Gospel presentation?

If you're asking about the "still fails to give people an actual purpose and pursuit" bit - yes, all evangelism should give people a direction to point themselves toward so they can start walking. By telling them to "follow Jesus" we are being overly vague to the point that it is useless and leaves incredible room for mainstream churchianity to screw them up, like the foster parents who are out there just to collect the check from the state without any actual investment in how successful their wards are after reaching the age of majority. Mainstream churchianity has no interest in maturing people; it has interest in creating new babies and keeping them in daycare forever.

When Jesus called people, he gave them a purpose. "Follow me and I will make you fishers of men" - that's what he told his disciples. Even those who weren't among the 12 still knew that they were being groomed for something bigger, which is why he preached so incredibly often about the "Kingdom of God" that he was building and what it was like and the role that people would play in that Kingdom. Pointing them toward that Kingdom and their role therein was an essential part of his evangelism process and what I believe made many of the genuine followers decide to follow him in the first place. And then for those who were faithful, he sent them out to start practicing their role.

What I don't see is Jesus merely saying, "Um, guys ... sin is bad, m'kay? So, let's not do that, 'kay? If you stop sinning, that's how you'll follow me. Got it?" Notice again one of my core verses on RPC to single guys looking to get married (i.e. the parallel to evangelism): Matthew 6:33 - it doesn't say, "Get rid of all your sin and all these things will be added to you as well," nor does it say, "Be saved from your sin by grace through faith and ..." it says, "Seek first His Kingdom and his righteousness." That is, we must make (1) the interests of God's Kingdom and (2) our own personal righteousness our priority in order for the verse to trigger.

In short, yes, I do believe that giving people a mission - a purpose in life that actually matters on an eternal scale - is an essential part of evangelism and is the foundation of how Jesus got people to follow him.

So how do we successfully integrate both?

One method is my forever refrain to everyone here: "What's your mission?" One of my pastors (the more red pill'd one) words it: "Who is your king?" That's his evangelism model - he asks everyone, "Who/what is your king?" Interestingly, after telling that to me, we went to a discipleship conference where the speaker refrained over and over throughout the two days: "What's your pledge of allegiance?" as in, where do your allegiances exist?

That's my method: get people on a mission that actually matters for Christ, then show them that their existing life behaviors, philosophies, values, etc. need to be reoriented toward something that is actually productive in accomplishing that mission.

Justin (my college discipler) once commented that he never actually says "the prayer" with anyone - or if he does, it's not until long after they've already been meeting with him, pursuing Christ together. The reason for this is that he doesn't want anyone tricked into believing that some emotional moment can save them apart from an actual pursuit of Christ by adopting the purposes he gives them. The Ray Comfort model of evangelism, among many other notable models, put the focal point on a single decision-making moment. I don't see Jesus doing this in the Bible. I don't see him saying, "pray this first, then come follow me." I do see him asking people just to start following him, and somewhere along the way they'll be saved or turn away - but that the exact moment of salvation is not actually important to Jesus.

reread the 400 Series again before commenting further

To be fair, I have drafted the 400 series in this context not as an evangelistic tool, but as a way for men to conceptualize their problems within a framework that allows the Gospel to transform those areas of their lives that are truly troubling them. That said, my primary use of it outside of RPC is as an evangelistic tool - connecting non-Christians with an actual solution to their felt-needs that gives them hope for a more important role to play in the conclusion as they bear the "image of God" (the end of the illustration) to the world.

I suppose I do often use it with other believers as a freedom ministry tool as well.

Yes, I think He enabled us to live godly in Christ Jesus, share the Gospel and make disciples.

Right. Mainstream churchianity wrongly stops at "live godly in Christ Jesus," assuming that as long as everyone goes from "sinner" to "good little boys and girls," they've done their job. They miss the mission-oriented nature of what it means to follow Jesus. Jesus wasn't merely a "good boy" - he was a "good man on a mission that actually mattered to eternity." Somehow being "good" is all that ever gets talked about in the church.

I see it as a necessary first step, but not the whole model. Perhaps my Gospel presentation does not accurately reflect the complete picture.

Interestingly, most of my evangelism doesn't even address the sin stuff as the first step. I used to. I found it far more effective to focus on the mission first.

My neighbor from a couple years ago is a great example. He was a video game addict - he literally made his living by playing WoW, building up and selling off characters and getting corporate sponsors for conventions and tournaments. He didn't feel like he had a mission at the time, though it could most accurately have been described as getting his main WoW character to be #1 in the world. This is the guy who I actually developed the Lens Illustration for - so that I could help him through some serious issues he was struggling with.

I started asking him questions about what he wanted to get out of life. I asked him how his pursuits at the time were helping him get those things. They weren't and he knew it. He had become a severe alcoholic, struggling with serious depression. Over time I was able to help guide him into a series of purposes that were more productive. While he moved away before I ever officially saw him come to Christ, last I knew he was attending church regularly, quit all video games, and joined the air force. While the mission the air force will give him isn't the one I wanted for him, this whole process of reorienting his life toward a purpose that actually mattered to him was immensely powerful and I do hope and expect that he is continuing to search for the truth about Christ (I had a phone call with him about a year ago and he affirmed this at that time).

At no point did I say "the prayer" with him, but there were many times that he would knock on my door asking to read the Bible together or what God would want from him in some area of his life. He was seeking and trying to follow. That's the kind of reorientation he needed - and in the process he abandoned his video game addiction, quit his alcoholism, and converted sloth into discipline. His sins were being worked out by this new mission orientation. But at no point was he ever worried about eternal judgment for his sins. That just never resonated with him when we discussed it (which is why I had to develop The Lens as a more effective tool to reach him).

So then what do you think about the Charles Spurgeon quote

I actually started addressing that very mentality, but ran out of characters and decided to cut it. In short, I disagree. I believe that this would be an incredibly effective manner of witnessing to Jews. It probably also would have been incredibly effective through the 1950s, when people actually cared to maintain a moral standard. Starting with the 60s, any regard for the law died almost completely.

Today, either people (1) disagree with biblical law in the first place, and therefore feel no condemnation under it, deferring to their own depraved conscience, or (2) agree that they are immoral sinners, but simply don't care

because they deny any actual judgment. Trying to argue on these points only leads to persuasive apologetics (i.e. "human wisdom"), not a "demonstration of the Spirit's power," as Paul references in 1 Cor. 2:4-5.

A post on this would be really helpful to me :)

Consider it done ... soon.

when you have time to share those methods

I believe 304 outlines the broader process I use, which is really less of a "Start here, end there" thing and more of a "figure out where they start and move forward from there" thing.

As for the Gospel presentation itself, my preferred method is the "What's your mission?" model (aka "Who's your king?" or "What's your pledge of allegiance?" - though those are less clear). I also call this the Matthew 4:19 model - give people a purpose and invite them to join you in following that purpose together. This is what I do predominantly on RPC. It's effective for both non-Christians and younger believers, though its weakest point is when people do have a purpose they like, but it's misguided.

The Lens Illustration is another presentation model I use.

The "Investigative Bible Discussion" model also works - a time to discuss with non-Christians what the Bible says in a non-threatening context where you're not preaching to them, but just exploring who Jesus is and suggesting they apply some of the things he teaches - if not because they believe he is God, then because they agree he was a moral teacher, and keep moving them forward from there as they become more devoted to Christ.

There are more, but I'm out of characters.

New to Christianity

3 upvotes · 19 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Darn straight. If my original comment wasn't clear enough, this is well warranted.

Blowjobs

3 upvotes · 16 October 2018 · /r/askMRP

Read more on preselection. It's one of the underlying principles that makes dread work. While it is typically used in reference to new girls evaluating a guy for the first time, it also affects a woman's evaluation of her LTR when she perceives that other women see in him something she's missing.

Help me out of this pit

3 upvotes · 12 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

You've had a lot of academic pursuit of God, but you sound like you've had no real fruit. How many people are living for Jesus today because of your life? I don't mean people who are going to church or call themselves a Christian. I mean the ones who are out sharing their faith, seeing new people come to Christ regularly, training up other believers, maybe even pastoring churches - and you look back and say, "I'm the reason he's doing that!"?

3 John 1:4 - "I have no greater joy than this: to see that my children are walking in the truth." That's the cure to your depression.

Also, when addressing how to recognize a genuine believer from a false one, Jesus says, "By their fruit you will recognize them" (Matthew 7), referring to the disciples we've made, as He says in Matthew 13's parable of the sower. We are the soil, the Gospel is planted in us, grows out of us, and generates fruit that bears new seed that falls into the nearby soil to produce new plants.

If you're not seeing that fruit, you're always going to question the authenticity of the faith and your own personal relationship with it. Have that fruit and you'll simultaneously kick your doubts and depression to the curb. That's why I preach a man's mission as the most important thing to get him started - it's really what grounds everything else in life.

More to your situation, you are an academic. You've learned a lot about the Bible, but are you actually putting it into practice? Are you adopting the whole of Jesus' life and ministry, or are you taking the things he taught in piecemeal as isolated teachings and not seeing the grander picture of the strategy he was employing toward the mission he was fulfilling? Your masters degrees in theology are something useful, no doubt, but everything Paul knew about Scripture - all his training and knowledge as a Pharisee - he called rubbish and worthless in Philippians. You seem to be treating God's Word as an external thing you learn from and then say, "That's a cool idea, I think I'll try that." You have to adopt and internalize it - it's got to transform you inside and out.

After the above, the second most important thing is to hit the gym. Once you're making significant gains, you'll find your depression lessening. Don't let that be a ruse to think that this will be a long-lasting cure. SL 5x5 is exactly what you should be doing, but how many days a week are you going? When I first started, the answer was 6. Now I'm at 4-5. You're going to need 6 with a 1 day Sabbath for a while. Get your muscles used to being ripped and torn apart every day.

Also, buy some protein powder and have a couple shakes a day. I really can't emphasize this enough. I don't give everyone that instruction, but if you're having trouble building muscle, it makes all the difference. As another user noted, you don't just want blank calories - you need the types of calories that will build your muscular framework. That's lots of protein.

Third, how much of the RPC sidebar content have you read? You haven't mentioned a single thing, so that's a little concerning. Make sure your reading material is on-point and that you're not just taking in the secular sources.

QUESTION RESPONSES

1. See above. Also, go in monk mode for the next 3 months. No approaches. No intentional conversations with girls. Just work on yourself. You sound needy, like you have this idea that getting a girlfriend will fix all of your problems. It won't.
2. Yes, wait until you're ready. I can't say when that will be - it's when you're satisfied that (a) you know your mission in life and it's making a difference for eternity and you are starting to see fruit flow from it, (b) you are no longer compelled by fantasies about getting a girlfriend - if it happens, great, but you don't need it, and (c) when you are comfortable enough in your own skin that you recognize you have become the prize - the kind of guy that girls should crave to be with.
3. RPC sidebar for now.

Mission First Women Always

3 upvotes · 6 October 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I like this. As I write a lot about how "**Mission matters, nothing else**" and that it should be part of a guy's natural lifestyle to always have women alongside him in his mission - **whether that's his wife or the girl he just can't keep himself from banging**. I suppose that's my longer way of saying: "Mission first, women always." I like that catch-

phrase. Purpose and pleasure certainly create a good balance.

Married Red Pill - Husbands submit yourselves to your wives...

3 upvotes · 3 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Another thought: be cautious of having the mental framework of wanting to know the "red pill interpretation," as if it's just another lens through which we see the world. The red pill is the truth - whatever that truth may be. If the truth were that women became more sexually interested in submissive husbands, that would be the red pill reality.

What you're really asking is how someone with a masculine perspective on intergender relational dynamics would interpret the passages. Quite frankly, I don't really care. I just want to know what the correct interpretation is. U/rocknrollchuck presented a solid biblical case that relied on scripture instead of his own philosophies. I've done it on this sub on those verses too. It's not about how men should look at the verses. It's about figuring out what they actually mean.

Now, I'm sure you already know all of this at least in concept. So why do I spell it out anyway? Because even though I'm sure you agree that the true interpretation is the right and most valuable one, you still asked for a specific lens's perspective rather than just straight up asking what the verses mean. This may sound trite, but it does give some indication of where some lingering blue might be in you. I hope this helps.

Married Red Pill - Husbands submit yourselves to your wives...

3 upvotes · 3 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

But your question wasn't whether or not that interpretation was true. You explicitly asked about how one can embrace this teachings and still be red pill - which assumes it's true.

Phil's September Update

3 upvotes · 3 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Thanks for the update, Phil. You should post these in the weekly OYS thread too. Don't worry about the awkward ask out. You already know the issue here. No validation seeking. Nobody else should have the right to tell you who you are or if you're on the right track - their judgments are worthless. A judge is only as good as the power he has, and they have no power to condemn you except what you give them. Sound familiar? "You have no power over me except what God has given you." That's right.

Need Some Help with a New Guy

3 upvotes · 1 October 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I had a similar guy in my group last year. He was a military guy with bpd, tbi, depression, PTSD, and a few lingering issues from his time in Iraq. I respected the hell out of ther guy, but he was certainly a unique case. It's up to you to figure out if it's worth the extra effort to help him beyond what you'd offer any other guy. That said, assuming you proceed, here are a few things I learned.

1. BPD goes in cycles. You'll think you're making progress as he shifts from a low to high phase. Then the low will hit and it's like you lost all your progress. I only got to see 3 cycles with him, but the first reset was certainly frustrating.
2. The most important thing to maintain permanence through the cycles and memory issues is for him to see things with his own eyes and do it with his own hands. Have someone in the group assigned to hang out with him outside of group time to help him practice new life skills and see it done right. This helps bypass short term memory and go straight to long term.
3. Follow Jesus's model rather than a rote teaching model: (1) tell them what, (2) show them how, (3) let them

try, (4) send them out, (5) pass it on. Just go really slow with each of the steps. It sounds like he's ready for step 2 on some stuff. But don't skip from 1 to 4 as most groups and teachers do.

4. Isolate logical and emotional approaches to your teaching style. I found that my guy lacked the capacity to retain logical information longer than a few hours, despite clearly understanding it. When something struck an emotional chord within him, that stuck with him into future meetings. I assume this has something to do with the part of his brain that was damaged, but I really don't know.
5. Don't let his issues dominate the group. My guy was generally quiet, so he wasn't my issue. But i did have another guy who had depression years ago who just wanted to talk about his issues all the time. He had great things to say, so people were encouraged to listen to him - but it was all intellectual. He had good thoughts, but it was how because his life didn't follow suit. Don't tolerate that.

I hope this helps.

TRP Has Been Quarantined - Meta Thread

3 upvotes · 28 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Yes. I just converted to feminism and will be shutting this whole place down in the next week.

Better Beta Divorce Strategy

3 upvotes · 27 September 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

just to be specific

State laws vary.

i'm kinda surprised actually you got that one through

I used to be surprised at these things. But now it happens so often that I'm ashamed for the quality of attorneys in my profession. I can get a party to the case not getting it, but there's no good excuse for the attorneys to let things like that slip by. Yet only about 1/3 of them pick up on stuff like that.

what else are you supposed to do with all those extra stacks besides put it in less liquidable after tax assets. in other words, i can only put so much into pre-tax accounts each year by law?

Stocks, mutual funds, whole life insurance, etc. I strongly urge all of my clients to meet with a financial advisor during the pendency of a case to address these types of questions, and also because they'll set up long-term budget planning to make their retirement goals work, which can help me know how hard I need to fight for certain things, which types of retirement accounts my client should get, etc. For example, I had a case recently where the parties had 5 different retirement accounts. Even after tax effecting everything to get a relatively normalized number, there were still peripheral advantages to having the IRA v. the 401K v. the pension v. the stocks, etc. The other side didn't know what was happening, but my client ended up getting the plan types with the most favorable terms and conditions toward their liquidity and future growth potential, whereas she thought he got an even shake because the post-tax dollars lined up. That's not something I could have figured out on my own, given that we were even splitting hairs between two different types of 401Ks, but the financial planner knew exactly what would be most beneficial and made it seem like there was a world of difference.

Long story short, outsource stuff like that to people who know better. Part of being good at my job is knowing the limitations of my own knowledge and experience.

Better Beta Divorce Strategy

3 upvotes · 27 September 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Maintain it through trial. Go hard alpha with enforcing the order afterward - don't budge an inch. But let me be clear: as long as the kids are minors you NEVER EVER EVER cuss at your ex unless you're doing it playfully and it's obvious. Those will always get brought up next time you go back and it is an easy way to lose shared parenting for being unable to communicate.

Am I being reasonable?

3 upvotes · 21 September 2018 · /r/askMRP

There is no metaphysical standard of reasonable. You want us to give you a standard? We can give you one. That just makes you our tool. Is that better than being your wife's tool if you succumb to her standard? Maybe, but not by much. Figure it out for yourself. This is literally the first or second chapter of WISNIFG.

Dread levels and having an infant (told to chill tf out)

3 upvotes · 21 September 2018 · /r/askMRP

I do see what you're saying by doing fun things together I'm still in her frame and approval seeking. I'll cut that off.

No, that's not what I'm saying at all. You should absolutely do fun things together. What's problematic is when your enjoyment of the activity is influenced by her emotional reaction do it. If you did an escape room and she didn't like it and decided not to participate and pout in the corner until the hour was up ... would that prevent you from having fun or do you have the emotional fortitude to say, "Screw you. I like escape rooms, so I'm going to do it by myself" and then proceed to enjoy it? Or would that affect you and bog you down and ruin it for you?

BJJ ... She actually hates it and wishes I would quit ... If anything it's my side mission

Yeah, so it's obviously not a mission she's excited to get behind. But that might actually be an *attractive mission* to other girls anyway, so I don't fault you for having this as a side-mission. It just doesn't work with your particular wife.

My goal is to become a nurse practitioner and work in trauma ICU

That's a career path, not a mission.

My mission is to live more authentically

That's not a mission either. That's just a vague statement. Also, if you meet a girl at the bar and she asks, "So what is it you want to accomplish in life?" and you gave this answer, is she going to say, "Heck yeah! That's an awesome mission. I can't wait to follow you on your path to authenticity." No. That's not an attractive mission, if it can even be called a mission at all.

Show my son in this world we live in it is ok to be a man.

Now that's a mission. Your mission is to leave a legacy to the next generation of your lineage. Great. But is it an attractive mission?

Again, let's use the same test. Girl at the bar asks what you're doing in life and you say you're raising your son to be a man. Is she going to say, "I want in. I'd follow a guy to the ends of the living room to fulfill that mission. How can I help? I can't pass up such an exciting opportunity." No. It's not an attractive mission.

Look at Indiana Jones. His mission was to find the lost ark or the holy grail. That's exciting. Look at James Bond. His missions always involve stopping global conspiracies and secret organizations. What woman wouldn't want to help him do it?

Now that's obviously fiction, but the point still stands. If a girl were to ask you what you're doing with your life, what answer could you give that would make her think, "I totally want to be a part of that!"? Winning a BJJ world championship actually sounds like a good mission to me. That's large-scale. It shows discipline and dedication. It's something where she could help you train, cheer you on at competitions, research new strategies and techniques, and possibly even learn it alongside you. It's just not a mission fit for your wife ... or at least not the way you've been leading her in it because you're an isolationist who just wants to go off and do crap by yourself all the time. It's good to get away, but not if you're not giving her something big to join you on as well.

I'm doing that for me. With or without her.

This is the right attitude. That's refreshing to hear. Just make sure that you're making "with her" an option in the first place. If she decides not to join in on your mission after you've invited her, that's her business. But don't exclude her in the first place, otherwise what woman would ever want to follow and submit to you?

My frame is paper thin

Your frame is as strong as your mission. The stronger your mission and the more dedicated to it you are, the less you will need validation from her. You'll get your validation from your mission and the progress you make along the way. The less you need her validation, the stronger your frame and the less likely you'll break it when she acts out.

Dread levels and having an infant (told to chill tf out)

3 upvotes · 21 September 2018 · /r/askMRP

My point ...

...

...

...

Your head.

It's not about how many fun things you do together. That's still in her frame. You're still trying to please her with exciting activities. "She complained on our anniversary" into "She had fun." What the heck? You're judging your success by how much fun she has now?

The "so did I" tag doesn't change the fact of whose frame you're living in. I can do lots of fun things while living in my wife's frame. I truly enjoyed a lot of stuff we did while I was a blue pill beta chump. But the fact that I liked certain parts of it doesn't mean she was begging me to flip her over and take her from behind like she does today.

What's it all working toward? Sure, mommy's proud of the way you fight in your bjj classes. But is that really your life mission? Are you planning on joining a world-class tournament someday, making this a journey that she's excited to follow you on? Or is it just something you do on the side because you like it? What's your life moving toward? Because if you're not going anywhere, she's can't follow you. And women are followers. If she's not following you, she's going to follow someone else. And once you are going somewhere that matters, you might just find yourself surprised at how many other girls want to follow you too.

Difficulty accepting my new reality.

3 upvotes · 21 September 2018 · /r/askMRP

I don't quite know what to do about this, where to put my mindset.

Not here:

I have a new epiphany every day about something my wife has done in the past, why she did it and what it shows she truly thinks or thought about me

Why do you care so much about what she thinks about you? Why does it matter why she did that stuff in the past? You don't have a time machine. You can't go change it all. You know how women operate today. You know how your wife thinks today. Don't worry about connecting old dots. Start making new ones.

I'm finding myself actually feeling resentful of my wife, our relationship's dynamic. Is this just how it is? Suck it up change it?

Of course you're resentful of the dynamic. Your relationship sucks. You've been a pussy and she's been wearing a strap-on. Yeah, change it.

That doesn't mean you have to get a job. I've seen women who are eager to make money and shower it over a high quality man. But being jobless does put you at a disadvantage. Regardless, I'm more talking about getting your act together in the first place. Why are you someone she should want to follow?

Here's the thing: in modern social economics, money is power. It hasn't always been this way. For a time, money didn't exist at all. Raw strength was power. Social status was power. Intelligence was power. She has the power of money. What are you going to do about that? How are you going to take the dominance back in the relationship? Because right now she has you trapped in a little psychological prison that you term as "I am currently almost completely financially dependent on her." Stop thinking that way. If you wanted to, you could beef up your resume, get a decent job, and make a successful life. It might take you a few years to complete that process, but I've seen people do this as late as their 60s and be just fine. She's not the only access you'll ever have to money. She's just the only access you have right now. Do you have options? Then you don't need her. Nevertheless, you can enjoy what she brings to the table and know that you're essentially divorce-rape-proof in the meantime. Sure, it gives you a more difficult time earning her respect and attraction, but it also means you have nothing tying you down to the marriage anyway. She's the one who's going to get stuck paying you child support if she leaves. Turn that into your advantage.

How do I stop going too far and over compensating?

Don't be an idiot. Have a reason for taking control of your life again and what you're going to do with it. Just acting more dominant for the sake of acting more dominant will certainly come off as pathetic, like you're building your frame on sand instead of on a rock. What are you trying to do with your life? What direction are you taking things? How can you change the frame in the relationship so that she works as financial support toward your mission rather than you taking care of the house and kids to support her work?

I don't want to chuck the relationship in the bin, I want it rebuilt differently. Does it have to be knocked down completely first, or is that what I am mentally doing at the moment?

I often take the view that you can't turn ashes to wood. When you've burned something to the ground, it's dead and there's no coming back from that. You can start something new with the same person, but you can't just apply a bandaid to the parts that weren't working and think you're somehow whole again.

Without regard for where you've come from in the past of your relationship, decide today what you want things to look like tomorrow. Imagine that if you were dating someone brand new you just met on Tinder how you would lead the relationship into becoming that. Now imagine she's entering the relationship with the same baggage you gave your wife and contemplate how an effective leader would unpack that baggage - or if he would at all before moving on to the next girl.

Is your wife really that high value that it's worth trying to stick it out with her? If her job is really that great, maybe. After all, you seem to have a pretty cush life. But is all that monetary power going to go to her head in a way she'll never overcome? You've got to figure that out on your own.

Is there a book that deals specifically with a red pill awakening while married?

BPP's book on the sidebar addresses it. I'm also writing one, albeit from an [r/RPChristians](#) angle.

Dread levels and having an infant (told to chill tf out)

3 upvotes · 21 September 2018 · [/r/askMRP](#)

What are you pursuing in life? Are you Indiana Jones or Dan in Real Life? What about you makes her think: "I want to go where he's going! I'll follow that guy to the ends of the earth"?

Your wife: *Well, he has a few bjj competitions that are fun to watch.* Oh wait, does she really even go to those?

Intro & Summary

3 upvotes · 21 September 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Dang, brother. That is some garbage you were put through growing up. I would ask what you're going to do about it moving forward ... but it sounds like you've already well moved on and made good progress. Props for that.

Question: What's your mission? What's that thing you want to tell God about on judgment day that will make heaven a better place?

Works and desire

3 upvotes · 21 September 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

If we only accepted the mercy and grace of God and forgot about the sin, we wouldn't have tempted ourselves again to sin and been able to walk free.

I've quoted it countless times, but I'll do so again. In Practice the Presence of God, it was said of Brother Lawrence that "when he had failed in his duty, he only confessed his fault, saying to God, 'I shall never do otherwise, if you leave me to myself; 'tis you must hinder my falling and mend what is amiss.' That **after this, he gave himself no further uneasiness about it.**"

That's powerful. Embodying that concept radically changed my life.

Good post, brother!

Do you fast?

3 upvotes · 19 September 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Yes, I fast periodically. But you're also not going to find posts in the sidebar about the proper role of baptism or whether or not we should all be speaking in tongues or plenty of other things. To be clear, this is certainly a Christian forum, but it also focuses on (quoting the sidebar):

discuss problems, solutions, and insights on relationships, sex, and biblical masculinity according to biblical

principles.

While one could argue that every single aspect of the Christian life somehow relates to "biblical masculinity," and therefore we leave the forum open for discussion on pretty much anything that could be considered related to one of those things, the sidebar content will be limited to those things which are directly related.

One could easily argue that fasting is part of being a biblical man. But women fast too. It's not all that unique to masculinity itself. The only sidebar exception is the 300 series, which is (to my discredit) far from complete and thus far only addresses the very basic disciplines, whereas I would consider for most people that fasting is more of an intermediate thing.

Tell yourself the Truth

3 upvotes · 18 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is an amusing concept. I was actually just having a text conversation with a guy I disciple yesterday about this. We were talking about his struggle to find a relationship and the importance of his mission in that process. At one point I said: *You know what I'm going to ask next, right?*

He didn't know. I explained, *If I can teach you to ask yourself the same questions I would ask you, my job will be done in your life.* I believe that. The problem is that most people can't think outside of their own frame to gain a larger perspective on an issue.

I went on to explain: *Sometimes when I'm stuck I sit down and have a conversation with Jesus in my head. He always asks questions, never gives blunt answers. But somehow those questions always lead me to what I need to be doing. That's why I ask you so many questions - to do for you what I believe Jesus does for me.*

What feels kind of off-putting in posts like these, though, is when people make broad-brush philosophical-sounding claims that don't resonate clearly from Scripture. For example:

Self-examination is a remedy for self-absorption.

or ...

Preaching the gospel to oneself is to bring redemption to the deepest part of you.

or ...

Re-align your shifted self and free yourself to come out of yourself and live fully.

Okay, so those were all in consecutive row. But these types of phrases make me stop and think: *What is he really trying to say here? Is self-examination really the remedy to self-absorption? What is self-absorption in the first place and why does it need a remedy? Does he just mean self-centeredness? And if so, how does self-examination actually solve that problem? And what exactly is the "deepest part of me"? Why does it need redemption when I'm already saved? Doesn't the Spirit do that? If so, what does it mean to preach the Gospel to myself? Don't I already have the Gospel? Does the Bible tell us to preach the Gospel to ourselves or is that just some churchy sounding catch-phrase? And what is my shifted self? What does it mean to "come out of myself"? Why can't I live fully in the self God made me to be right now? Is he saying to have an out of body experience?*

To be clear, I'm not necessarily disagreeing with some of these phrases. I do see great value in preaching the Gospel to ourselves. That's what the whole 400 series is about, after all. I'm just saying that making these vague claims without defining what you mean by them or giving Scriptural support for them can sound like you're trying to be some guru swami and it actually invites more questions than giving answers ... at least for me.

Either way, thanks for this post!

I feel sort of held back

3 upvotes · 17 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

i have to think so much more, especially around woman im really attracted to

I don't buy the fear explanation. It's too simple and doesn't jive with the fact that this only started after you began to follow Christ. That decision shouldn't increase fear - it should eliminate it (1 John 4:18). There are four likely reasons for this that I can think of, which would each be prompted by a sudden decision to follow Jesus:

- Because before you started following Jesus *any woman would do*, whereas now you're intentionally more selective, as [/u/Redactedddd](#) suggested
- Because the reason you want a woman in the first place has changed.
- I suppose dropping the alcohol, drugs, or whatever other substances you might have been using can also mean you're not as relaxed as you used to be.
- The most likely answer is that you now recognize that women can't fill the void in your life - only Jesus can. As a result, your mind tells you to get women because that's what you know, but your spirit longs for Christ and this conflict is hindering your social game.

The fact that you had a bad breakup can certainly put some psychological factors into play, and they might be tangentially related to fear, but it's more likely than not a form of depression. You likely still feel a sense of loss from the relationship that hasn't quite been filled by Christ. That depression, coupled with a not-yet-fulfilling spiritual bond with Jesus is what's at the root of your social anxiety. Find your peace in Christ and you will find your confidence again.

how can i get it back, the right way, from a christian perspective

I wrote most of this in the 400 series. Find a way to live on the other side of the mirror - the Gospel side - where you're expressing your confidence the way God intends. At that point, it will reflect back into your daily life, including with women.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (09/05/18)

3 upvotes · 11 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

[/u/rocknrollchuck](#) has given some great advice. Let me supplement a bit.

I started showing up at her work when the EA was ending and he came to me, begging for me not to "be his enemy".

Yeah, like chuck said, don't mate guard. But the fact that his ignoring her still bothers her is a seriously bad sign. It's also one you can't cure.

Women have an internal drive to be in good standing with everyone. They are ruined by the thought that someone out there might be thinking bad things about them. Why? Because women are designed by God to live in other people's frame. When women live in the frame of other women, it's the blind leading the blind because those women don't even know how to maintain their own frame, let alone keep someone else inside of it.

So, it's not surprising to me that your wife is so hung up on this guy avoiding her and not reciprocating attention. Even if she wasn't interested in him anymore, this would still get to her. The best solution is to strengthen your

frame and start getting her inside. If you can solve the frame issue, she'll find reassurance within and stop caring so much about why she can't get into this other guy's frame anymore. And if she doesn't, at least you'll be in a better place to handle the fallout.

I'm trying to help her find a new job.

This can help, but the more pressing issue is helping her find a new frame to enter: yours. If you don't buck up your frame, she's just going to repeat this pattern in the new job too.

How do you do this? Stop pandering to her. Stop pedestalizing her. Drop that body fat. Get a decent mission - one with actual eternal consequences. Suck it up and find a new church. No more "we very much dislike trying new churches." There is no "we" about it. You take the lead on this one. And too bad if you don't like it. Do what you've got to do to set yourselves on a good path again. Period. No excuses, especially not, "But I don't wanna!"

We are actively trying to find a new church ... options are limited

Then start one. Seriously, this could be a wonderful short-term mission.

her antidepressants have been hurting her libido

I made my wife switch from Zoloft to Bupropion. It was awkward for her to talk to her gyno about why she wanted to switch meds: to increase her sexuality. I led. She followed. It helped. Nuff said.

She tried to quit but didn't tell anyone and was acting VERY strange

Oh, like when my wife tried to go off Zoloft cold turkey and spent an hour in the closet crying and pounding the wall because I told her I wanted to go to the gym *before* eating dinner instead of *after*? That kind of psycho over-reaction stuff?

Here's the thing: mood-stabilizers are addictive. Just like crack, if you try to go off of them, you're going to get withdrawal. My wife experienced that first-hand. Also, the more you use them, the more tolerance you develop. So, the best way to start her dealing with this is:

- First, get her the right medication. I suggested Bupropion because it allegedly has no sexual side-effects, which is unusual for most antidepressants. Interestingly, my wife's Gyno independently recommended the same one.
- Second, Get her on a dosage pattern different from what her doctor recommends. Her doctor will say "1 pill a day" or something like that, just for consistency. That's a bad idea. My wife has busy seasons at work that last for 2.5 months at a time. I have her take a normal dose during this time - that's when she really needs it. After busy season ends, I have her wean down to 1/2 a pill then 1/4 a pill over a couple months, then off until the next busy season. This keeps her body from adapting to the medication and also gives a bigger mood boost when she needs it most because she's jumping from nothing to a full dose. It also keeps her from going psycho while weaning off. I don't know your wife's annual pattern, but a cycle like this can help. Maybe she only needs full pills during PMS and yours is a 1 month cycle instead of my wife's 6-month cycle. That's for you to figure out.
- Third, when she starts acting crazy, she's going to want to go back to a full dose, saying, "See? This isn't working! I need more." Don't let her. Acknowledge that there will always be withdrawal signs. It's inescapable entirely. The point is to get through them, not to give up when they happen.

I served her breakfast in bed this morning ... She loves food, so a lot of my acts of service are food related.

You say it like you're proud. There are times I do nice things for my wife, but it's out of a position of strength and reward. I get the impression that you're doing it to try to appease her. Stop living in her frame.

Also, do you want to encourage her love of food like that? In moderation, I'm sure it's fine. But this can be a quick and easy way toward obesity - especially after you've had your second kid.

[FR] "Lost" Frame for the First Time in a Long Time.

3 upvotes · 11 September 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I track with you. But that doesn't mean you just throw in the towel. Your model assumes a high-value man who is stagnant, who isn't going anywhere. This is why I always emphasize on [r/RPChristians](#) the importance of having a mission that transcends the relationship and the daily grind of life. Her excitement shouldn't be toward the man, but toward what they're pursuing together. His leadership in pursuing it is what makes him attractive to her. A man without a mission, no matter how high-value, will always be a bore. If Indiana Jones met the girl after he already found the Ark, the Holy Grail, and all that, she'd surely get bored. She wants to be part of the mission alongside him. This is what keeps her engaged.

Moreover, I wrote on a somewhat parallel concept on this sub just 2 weeks ago. Here it is again with applicable commentary in bold.

Consider the old saying, "Women are the gatekeepers of sex; men are the gatekeepers of commitment." Now also consider how much women enjoy dating around. Let's be honest, **it's not because they're just as horny as men all the time**. Just as a man considers himself to have "conquered" or been "successful" with a woman when he's had sex with her, so also does a woman "conquer" or "succeed" with a man when she's managed to lock down his commitment. Just as a man mistakenly assumes that marriage ends the chase of his wife's sexuality, so also do women mistakenly assume that marriage should end the chase of their husband's commitment **[in your terminology, this is when she gets bored, no matter how great he is]**. And just as men are polygamous with their desire for sexual conquest, so also are women hypergamous with their commitment conquests, which is what prompts things like branch-swinging **[just as a man gets bored of sex with the same woman after a while, so also does she get bored of commitment from the same man after a while]**. After all, once you've climbed Denali, you just don't feel as satisfied climbing Pike's Peak. You set your sights on Mt. Everest.

But what would happen if she climbed Pike's Peak, then the next day found that some tectonic plates shifted and the mountain's now a few hundred feet taller and harder to climb? Well, now she can't say she's really locked down Pike's Peak. She's going to have to go at it again. **[It's no longer a boring re-hash of what she's already done. It's a new adventure.]** What would happen if she locked down her man's commitment and got him to marry her, then she found out that his commitment wasn't as locked down as she once thought? Or what if she had his commitment, but found that there were other parts of his inner-most being that he was holding back - that he hadn't yet trusted her with yet? Surely she would find it a new **[non-boring]** challenge to get her man to commit even those parts to her, which he otherwise reserved for himself, which is why a man's attractiveness goes up as the woman finds more and more mysterious things about him. It's fun for her to chase after those things, persuading him to unlock them to her.

Just as men love the thrill of the chase of a woman's sexuality and will hop from woman to woman to get it, **in the same way, women love the thrill of the chase of a man's commitment and will hop from man to man to get it. [If the man is constantly changing or moving forward on a mission, this triggers the same "newness" and makes it exciting again. Most people just don't take this approach because it's hard work. But Variety is one of the most significant points of DEVI - and sexual strategy isn't only for the bedroom.]** It's as much of a drug to them as the high a guy gets from all the sexual IOIs he gets from

a new woman. When a man views "the marriage" as a concept in itself, it puts a stop to the chase. It re-frames how men and women relate with each other into an entirely new paradigm focused on intangible standards that make the man and woman assume that "the chase" is over and there are bigger fish to fry.

[FR] "Lost" Frame for the First Time in a Long Time.

3 upvotes · 11 September 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Perhaps if there's a better prize out there. Then again, if better men than you want your wife, maybe you're also a bit disillusioned about where the two of you actually stand in comparison with one another.

Field Report- Dropping the Betas, Standing my ground.

3 upvotes · 11 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I understand. But a modicum of patience is necessary as people receive instruction and learn. I've counseled him once to develop humility. Hopefully he takes that advice seriously.

Introduction + Question

3 upvotes · 5 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Good job on putting this list together. Without much time to go too into detail, I did at least want to comment on this:

You will find a lot of articles written about the TRAITS of a Godly woman. A lot of proverbs, and a bunch in the new testament too. Those only show the end product, not how the sausage is made.

This is very important to remember. As I often say: if you can't find a godly woman, raise one up. You've used a simpler and more common colloquialism to communicate this point. Well done.

OYS on Red Pill Christian

3 upvotes · 4 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I've been working sporadically to get auto-mod to post a thread on this and so far it hasn't worked. I'll have to check back in after I've figured it out better.

OYS on Red Pill Christian

3 upvotes · 4 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That's a good question. There were reasons initially, but I think they're mostly moot by now. I'll see what I can do about getting something like that set up to be posted weekly.

Church has nominated a female Deacon

3 upvotes · 3 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

So it sounds like, as I suspected, your church uses the title "deacon" for a role different from what the Bible means. In this case, they give more weight and authority to their deacons than the Bible would. This stems from a misbelief that a deacon/servant in the church should be rewarded with extra influence in leadership decisions. The Bible doesn't imply this; it's a human convention and assumes people in the church wouldn't serve just because God wants them to - that they'd only really do it if they got something out of it. Screw that.

To that end, yes, you must oppose this if they're giving these female deacons greater influence over leadership decisions in the church.

I'm still single ... just married [MRP Draft]

3 upvotes · 28 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Darn straight. That's a great way to think about it.

I'm still single ... just married.

3 upvotes · 28 August 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I am a divorce attorney. I'm positioned well enough that if my wife were to leave me, I'd have at least shared parenting with a slight majority of the time with the kids and would not have to pay support. Divorce is not a threat to me.

I'm still single ... just married [MRP Draft]

3 upvotes · 28 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

1 Cor. 11:3 seems to imply otherwise. My mission is to God. 1 Cor. 7 says I am to put that above all else, including my marriage. As I follow Christ, she is to follow me. This is a single line - a chain. You're referencing two parallel lines, which is the egalitarian view, which is not biblical.

Girl i nexted is pissed

3 upvotes · 25 August 2018 · /r/askTRP

If you had gotten what you wanted back then, you wouldn't have felt the compulsion to improve, so you wouldn't have had any potential.

Question on femdom fantasies.

3 upvotes · 24 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Great response. This strikes me in a strong way:

Down to what troubles me the most as a Christian. We should look for a relationship that mirrors the one that Christ has with the church.

This has long been my view, and it makes me wonder if there is ever a situation where Jesus would want this. I suspect so, but it would be very limited, at best. But even then, it would have to come from a different place than OP is coming from.

Specifically, I used to have femdom fantasies as well - mostly in my lowest blue pill days. But my motivation wasn't the enjoyment of my negative treatment; it was the excitement of seeing a girl who was so into me that she would force me to please her. In other words, it was major validation seeking. But I can see Jesus potentially being tickled at the thought of a Christian being super excited and aggressive about wanting to engage in spiritual reproduction with him, sharing the Gospel all the time and in very assertive ways, which is sometimes necessary (although not every time).

Ready to get engaged (in light of past PMO)

3 upvotes · 24 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Don't do it with her. That's like saying you're on the fence and can't decide if you should become a republican or a democrat, and then locking yourself in a room with Hillary Clinton for a while, praying that God will give you a clear answer.

Married Man With Girl Friends

3 upvotes · 24 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Weird ... not sure why reddit removed this post. Anyway, it's approved.

Before answering anything else, it would be helpful to know to what degree you experience temptation to cheat on your wife. My gut reaction is to tell your Bible study guys to screw off for making up "the Bible says!" phrases that the Bible never actually said. But there's also general wisdom in playing it cautious if you're the type of guy who's going to cheat on your wife when she throws a small tantrum. Be wise here.

ONE

They're right - you're to be the husband of one wife ... if you're a leader in the church. And there aren't dozens of verses that say this, I'm pretty sure you quoted the only one. So, I'm curious what other verses they were quoting. Nevertheless, I do interpret 1 Timothy 3:2 as a directive that we should all strive for. That verse simply needed to be said because as a practical reality polygamy was still practiced in that day.

As for whether or not you can have friends of the opposite sex other than your spouse, just look at the apostles. We know for a fact that at least Peter was married (Matthew 8:14), and that so were at least some of "the other apostles" (1 Cor. 9:5). Yet we also know that the apostles spent time with Mary, Martha, and likely several other women as well. In 1 Peter, we see him reference a greeting from the woman who is at Babylon. So, presumably Peter was interacting with other women on a regular basis. He also is the one who spoke about the type of beauty that women should adorn, meaning he was actively looking at other women and contemplating what is godly in a woman and what's not, from which we can presume he spent time around other women. I find it hard to believe he'd set huge standards like that, which were ultimately canonized as Scripture, if he were using his wife as the only template - especially given that we don't have any indication of her godliness, despite other women being singled out for that purpose.

I can't find a direct passage that says, "It is not a sin to have women friends other than your wife" because that just doesn't exist. But the verse that says "Thou shalt not spend time with a woman other than your wife" equally does not exist. To that end, each man is to develop his own conviction, per Romans 14.

TWO

You seem to want to orient this talk around "she ... she ... she." It's her problem. She's the one who wants to control you. She's the one who's selfish. That's weak talk, brother. That's living in her frame, letting her state of being define your conduct and how you approach the conversation.

Another way you're living in her frame: you're assuming you have to have a "talk" to begin with. Why do you assume this? Because you "can tell she wants to have another 'talk.'" See it now?

If you don't want to have that talk, don't have that talk. If she tries to make you have that talk, you can decide if you want to talk back or STFU. You conspicuously left out of your stats the sidebar content you've read. Have you been through WISNIFG yet? If so, look back at your assertive bill of rights #2, 4, and 10.

Depending on how she approaches it, if she's saying, "You shouldn't do this ... You're bad of you do that ... You, you, you," then it's a fitness test. Fog, NI, and AA it away. If she goes into her own insecurities (which is doubtful, but I'll entertain the idea - and a skillful use of NI should bring it there anyway), then it's a comfort test. Reassure her that you're a big boy and she's your little girl and that being extroverted doesn't mean you're going to cheat on her.

Sex Addicted v. Sex Starved [MRP Draft]

3 upvotes · 22 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

If it's on the sidebar, I'm sure I have. I do keep encouraging /u/Deep_Strength to keep posting more of his content here too. It's good stuff and hopefully it would be mutually beneficial as it drives more reddit users to his blog as well.

Pastor's role

3 upvotes · 21 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is the answer right here - far more concise than I would have put it. As a sub-point of #1 (which is appropriately on top), I'd be clear that they must make an intentional, conscious effort to abandon preconceived notions about the faith and stick to rote exegesis of the Scriptures. This, of course, is much more difficult if you're talking to a Catholic/Orthodox pastor/priest because Truth for them is not defined by exegesis and intentionally incorporates "tradition," which implicitly includes concepts that have been a part of church culture for any length of time, at which point you then have to take a more historical approach than a biblical one.

Masculine immaturity is placing responsibilities before roles

3 upvotes · 21 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Excellent post. I really like this. Similar to [u/rocknrollchuck](#), I used to use the analogy of a shoe store owner who always gave away his product to his favorite customer for free going that one day she'd just voluntarily want to start paying him because she liked his shoes so much that she didn't feel right taking them for free.

In reality, she's taking all the money she saved from the store owner to buy some high end Italian designer shoes that she otherwise couldn't have afforded if her freebie giving fan hadn't helped her out so much all that time. Then when she has her designer shoes he gets jealous, asks her to start paying and she laughs at his mediocre stock, walking away with class.

His only real solution here is to make a better product than the Italians and cut her off. Sell to other people to show that he's a high quality businessman and eventually make her jealous ... but by that point he won't care because he's already got tons of other people lined up to buy what he's selling.

What is love?

3 upvotes · 20 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

If we incorporate God as the inspiration of our will, I agree and that becomes a wonderful definition. Otherwise, I could very well murder someone and call it love because:

- It was an act born of my will
- Prompted by my emotional hate of the person
- That emotion led to my act of killing the object of my hate
- And because I believe I am doing him and the world a service by removing him from it

This is why I have never liked the "others more than me" definitions of love. First, because that already has a word: humility. Second, because it gives no objective standard and anything can be rationalized as an act of love.

This is why any good definition of love must account for the fact that "God is love" and therefore nothing can be love if God is not in it.

Q&A on Divorce and Remarriage

3 upvotes · 16 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I agree with what I think [u/Rian_Stone](#) is saying. She's the one who has done wrong here, so no need for you to feel guilty over anything.

As you say, you're still married spiritually and legally for now, so screw with her all you want. From there it's just a matter of whether you're acting wisely or not, and it's up to you to figure out how far you're willing to "swim in another man's juices" ... just be careful about getting her pregnant ;)

As for after the divorce, you're free to develop your own conviction. Personally, I find your intentions wise: have nothing to do with this pathetically stereotypical woman. With regard to other women, as I alluded to in my post, there's a reason why Jesus said in Matthew 19 that not everyone can accept a life without sex and why God and his apostles and prophets have had to make concessions throughout history to account for the fallen state of the world we're in, including our own brokenness.

To that end, remarrying may technically be sin ... not unlike the way I technically sin all the time too, but it's a far better option than many other options, including being so preoccupied with controlling sexual urges that you become incapable of doing what God actually has you here for.

"Three reasons why Christian parents are raising slutty girls and beta males"

3 upvotes · 14 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I'm not sure how this logically follows. Non-Christians produce cultural children. As [/u/matrixtospartanLV](#) said, Christians who parent like non-Christians (i.e. "weak Christian parenting") will also produce children of the culture. The fact that these are the same doesn't say anything about what "strong Christian parenting" would produce in the face of culture.

Married... with Children

3 upvotes · 13 August 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Solid post. My kids are 6, 4, 3 and 1. I know exactly what you're talking about, and my solution was very similar: mission (which you call vision). I hammer this constantly as the single most important aspect of a sexually fulfilled marriage upon which all other things are built. That's what keeps a man out of his wife's frame and in his own.

Strict Objectivism Necessitates Recalibration

3 upvotes · 13 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Okay, I didn't understand half of that, but this ...

Should she marry anyone at all it's not me; but Jesus Christ within

is the epitome of "she's not yours, it's just your turn."

[FR] Duty Sex Doesn't Exist

3 upvotes · 13 August 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Fair enough. Maybe, maybe not. I'm not in your shoes so I really can't say.

Although your preconceived notions on the topic are coloring your feedback - it's feedback I requested all the same. Thanks for the input.

Churches misunderstand attraction

3 upvotes · 10 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Touche. But is that the right reference?

Kicking Porn For Good

3 upvotes · 9 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

So, I was on mobile while writing that other comment. On further reflection, here are some additional things that have come to mind.

sexual sin does not exclude you from bearing spiritual fruit

Very true. I don't think I ever said that it did. What I said was the reverse: that bearing spiritual fruit is part of the process of overcoming sexual sin. God can use anyone to produce fruit, regardless of their sin, and I fully embrace that concept. But that doesn't mean those people will be free of their sin merely because of the way God uses them.

spiritual fruit in one area is not a cure

Correct again. But a lifestyle oriented toward doing what God put us to do is. When we are facing the right way and taking steps in that direction, by nature we are walking away from the bad directions. The problem is that most Christians define their direction by which way they're not facing. This practice of sin-avoidance doesn't actually orient or point them toward anything godly and ultimately causes many men to fail.

In all of this, I think I agree with the thrust of what you're saying - that God can still use us despite our sin. This is a good word and one that men would do well to listen to. But this post isn't for the men who are questioning the validity of their fruitfulness in the midst of sin. It's for men who want to know how to kick their sinfulness altogether. That requires addressing the issue from a very different angle.

To that end, you'll note that I didn't say "start sharing the Gospel and discipling guys and you'll be free of your porn habits." I laid a foundation that a man must first start with the Gospel, embracing it fully as it relates to his problem (which is more fully fleshed out in the 400-series), and then be operating within his own frame ... and only then does a properly oriented life direction actually start to make a difference.

That's why there are many men who appear to be great evangelists and disciple-makers who still struggle with these issues: because they do not have one or both of the foundational issues supporting their ministry. In my experience, it's usually both. I've rarely found a seminary-trained individual who actually understands the full impact of the Gospel - but even more rare is a Christian who operates in his own frame, and pastors are the worst about this, constantly trying to appease culture's frame or their wife's frame or the elder board's frame, etc.

Kicking Porn For Good

3 upvotes · 9 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

My pastor said the exact same thing actually.

When he learned to make disciples the way Jesus did, he changed his mind and found this worked for him too. He's one of the 15+ guys I referenced. Others include my dad, who was also a pastor at one point and had a lot of fruit to point to, 6 or 7 guys on staff with parachurch miniseries, 3 small group leaders in my current church, etc. All these guys allegedly had fruit to point to.

There were two threads that many of these men had in common: (1) most of them were taking credit for fruit they hadn't personally produced, simply because they organized or facilitated the environment where someone else could make it happen; and (2) none of their previous fruit were bearing other fruit, so they successfully raised up a tree that was fruitless and defunct ... which some could argue is better than no tree at all (the parable of the fig tree makes me question this).

To be clear, I'm not saying sin prevents us from being fruitful, and don't put words in my mouth on this. You're absolutely right about that! Philippians 1 is for real - "It is true that some preach Christ out of envy and rivalry ... doing so to stir up trouble for me while I am in chains. But what does it matter? The important thing is that in every way, whether from false motives or true, Christ is preached. And because of this I rejoice."

But you're missing a few things in what I wrote. To name a couple: (1) you suggest I'm guilt-tripping men into ministry, but the very first foundational point I laid is that none of this works if someone retains their guilt after the Gospel. (2) You missed that I referenced making a lifestyle of this. If God indwells you, it changes you. You

don't need that indwelling to bear fruit, but you do need it if you want the sanctification that comes with God in you.

To go back to my pastor, as he's a great case study on this: he said at one point (combining a few phrases he said over the course of one conversation), "I realize now that I've been doing ministry the wrong way. My seminary schooling never taught me any of this, and I never figured it out in my years of pastoring and studying on my own. I can't believe I had missed something so obvious for so long. I was trying to bear fruit the way secular and church culture modeled it for me and not through the example Jesus modeled for me. It was like I was trying to bear fruit in a lab rather than through the processes God designed in the first place." 6 months later, after he followed a different model of evangelism and discipleship, he reported that he suddenly stopped being tempted toward porn ... and he "couldn't explain it" (the conversation I referenced was merely about changing his philosophy of ministry he got from seminary to a biblically theological one, and it was not in the context of dealing with his porn struggle because, as you say, I didn't want to be the one to disqualify what God could do through him despite his sin, and I rightly assumed that fixing the way he followed God with his ministry would fix the way he followed God with his sexuality). As he last reports, he's still free of porn today and he has me starting an initiative to replicate this in other men in the church as well. That initiative won't work, but it's a good thought and maybe a few will be helped as a result.

Sexual Addiction v. Sexual Starvation

3 upvotes · 8 August 2018 · /r/TheRedPill

As often as I want, which right now is anywhere from 2-5 times a week. I've got more important things to do in life than chase pussy all the time. The important thing is that I get it when I want it.

Sex Addicted v. Sex Starved [MRP Draft]

3 upvotes · 7 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I'm glad to hear this resonated with you :) What led you to the red pill in the first place? Usually it's something guys stumble on more than women.

How do you reconcile TRP with Christian values?

3 upvotes · 5 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Great response!

The Proverbs 31 Woman In The Modern Era

3 upvotes · 3 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Misguided though it may be, there is room for men to express their rage. I'd rather a raw man who shows us who he really is inside than a coward who hides it to fit in. I can help the first man, but hardly the second.

You just have to also accept the counsel that [/u/Deep_Strength](#) is giving: to learn to move past the rage. The anger stage is a foreign concept to me. I think this is probably because I had already started seeing a lot of this stuff in my job long before finding the red pill (I'm a divorce attorney), so I'd already accepted the failures of both men and women in modern society. But even though I haven't felt the anger stage myself, I do empathetically experience a piece of it when I read about men whose life circumstances have given them good reason to be angry. My heart goes out to you. Keep being real. Don't tone it down as a facade to appease us - tone it down because you want to be a better man in Christ.

The Proverbs 31 Woman In The Modern Era

3 upvotes · 3 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Proverbs 31 was written by King Lemuel. Some people think he's a pseudonym for Solomon. Others think that

Solomon was writing in Proverbs wisdom that he learned from King Lemuel, whoever he may be. Either way, Solomon also said that he didn't find one righteous woman of a thousand (Ecc. 7:28).

What you're suggesting is not a new phenomenon. The Proverbs 31 woman was rare back then. She's rare today. Solomon said she didn't even exist back then. She probably doesn't even exist today.

So, trying to single out the "modern era" doesn't do much for me.

We men literally must tell her how to be this woman by killing her ego and humbling her and then rebuilding her up.

This does resonate with me, though. I have said repeatedly on this sub: *If you can't find a godly woman to marry, make one.* Pick a woman who has many of the attributes you're looking for, then lead her into developing the rest. When looking for a girl, prioritize the attributes that will be more difficult to lead her into developing. Most notably is her Faithfulness, Availability, and Teachableness. You can't instill these traits in someone easily. But if you find someone with those traits, you can instill anything else in them you desire.

Introduction

3 upvotes · 1 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Hi there, NoFITS!

You've done an excellent job laying out where you're coming from. I really appreciate that, as it gives us plenty of information to work with as we fellowship with you going forward.

The weight thing has already been addressed well by a couple other commenters, so let me go in a different direction.

FIRST

Why do you want to be in a relationship in the first place?

I'm not asking that rhetorically, as if you shouldn't desire this. You were created to desire it. I get it. But the underlying motive for seeking that relationship is different for many people and it speaks volumes about your underlying framework for perceiving the world that can help us reorient you toward swallowing the pill.

And to be clear, [/u/matrixtospartanatLV](#) is absolutely right: you still haven't chosen a pill yet. Your post is filled with an apparent intellectual understanding of several foundational red pill concepts, but also has significant undertones that you're still harboring a blue pill ideology of what you think your life should look like.

Understanding why you want to be in a relationship in the first place can help us uproot some of that and steer you in the right direction.

SECOND

What's your low hanging fruit?

I just made a post about yesterday. Obviously looks will be a big one, but if you're evaluating yourself at a 3 right now, at best you're going to get up to a 6 - and even that will take years. What else can you be doing in the immediacy to work on those other 4-ish points that you're lacking? You won't be spending all of your free time at the gym - only most of it. And dieting doesn't consume additional time (if anything, it saves time as you spend less time cooking or going to restaurants). So, what can you work on in those additional hours?

THIRD

With all due respect, you're being picky and choosy right now. Your SMV is high enough to pull single moms and older women who are broken. You say "geeze" to them, but higher value women are probably thinking "geeze" to you. Accept that and embrace it. Then develop a plan to be better.

Getting a girl isn't the best motivation for improving yourself, but if that's what it takes to get you started, get started. Work on your OI and DNGAF attitude along the way. When you've truly become independent of your desire for sex and women, you'll be better off spiritually for it, and you'll be in a position where you're unintentionally more attractive to women anyway.

FOURTH

Lastly, what's your mission?

I see things that you're doing for the Kingdom and to upkeep your own spiritual growth, but what's it all leading toward? Do you have a decisive picture of what your life will be in 10, 20, or 50 years and what you'll have accomplished? Or are you just doing things because you think and know that they're right to do right now? Be intentional with your spiritual disciplines and don't just go with the flow of what you feel like you should be doing in the moment.

[FR] Fixing your SMV

3 upvotes · 31 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Nice. Point noted.

That said, it's actually not as easy as one might think. How's your work-ethic? Are you the guy who browses reddit all day on the job? What about your lifestyle consistency? Do you actually live out everything you preach? Are you telling people not to watch porn, but secretly jacking it in the basement at night? Do you present yourself as a generous and benevolent man, and then walk right by the homeless guy without even glancing his way?

Just having a high moral standard at an intellectual level doesn't mean a woman will perceive you as a moral person with an ethical approach to your life and affairs.

Church Discipline

3 upvotes · 30 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I don't recall Matthew 18 suggesting the discipline be public. The only conclusion I recall there is that if the person continues in non-repentance, they are to be regarded as a non-Christian. It isn't until 1 Cor. 5 that we get further clarity: if they continue to identify as a Christian in the midst of their non-repentance, then we are to cease contact with them. But even that doesn't demand a public proclamation.

Recent breakup - emotional aftermath and conflict

3 upvotes · 30 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

2/2

Now, you might argue back, "But I'm not the greatest catch either. I'd love to have the perfect godly man that you're implying I should look for, but is that man really going to want a girl like me? Someone who's had oral sex and who isn't all that fashionable, etc.?" That's where *the red pill* can help.

The typical church answer to that question is just to "be yourself and God will bring the right person along." This isn't going to work. Those types of marriages usually end in divorce. I'm a divorce attorney - I see a lot of it. What happens is that these types of people don't make a ton of effort to be attractive all the time, so when someone does finally notice them they get emotionally invested and irrationally infatuated with the relationship. This infatuation typically lasts for about 3-4 years in a dating relationship or until 6-24 months after a marriage, then it dies. After that, the two are left wondering why they even married in the first place - because they let their infatuation/emotions guide their relationship instead of wisdom. When the emotions fade (and they **ALWAYS FADE**), they realize that the other person really isn't the type of person they would have wanted to marry if they had been sober-minded (i.e. not in an infatuated state). This is what you're feeling toward your ex. You had an emotional infatuation toward him, but if you were to marry him you'd realize after a few years and possibly some

kids that he's not actually the type of guy you want to spend the rest of your life with.

This is made even more clear to me when you write:

his distance has also made me realize that I love him.

You seem to be defining love in this sentence by the emotions you experience. Those emotions are "infatuation," not love. Love, biblically, is not an emotion. It is a behavioral orientation. Seriously, look through 1 Cor. 13:4-7, for example. Whenever it says "love is," it's describing something that is an active choice. The times that it uses emotional words (envy, pride, easily angered, etc.) it says "love is not." Or if we look at Hebrew words for love in 103, we see that *Raya* is defined by the things we do with one another, *Ahava* is defined by the decisions we make in furtherance of our commitment to one another, and *Dod* is defined by the way we actively express our passion for one another.

Emotions can prompt us to act in a loving way toward others - especially in a romantic context; but what about when those emotions fade and we're no longer feeling that way? Does that mean it's impossible to love our spouse when we're upset with them? No, because love is defined by the orientation of our conduct - toward someone else or against them - and not our emotions. Jesus did not say, "The one who has gushy feelings for me is the one who loves me." He said, "The one who obeys me ..."

I say all of this simply to point out that you don't really love this man. You want something from him. You want the emotions that you believe he can keep giving you. The sooner you can accept this, the sooner you will be able to move on from this unhealthy relationship.

There's a ton more to say on the practical aspects of your situation, but let me shift gears even further. The point of marriage isn't to make you happy. I get the impression that you're looking for a spouse who will give you the "happily ever after" that Disney always taught you to dream of. A long-standing principle of "red pill" thinking is that "happily ever after" doesn't exist. There is no point where you can stop working and things just magically work out. There is no situation where you're going to be happy for "ever after" that point forward. There will be ups. There will be downs. There will be a ton more mediocre days than either of those. Embrace this. Truth and reality are what will give you sober judgment to make wise decisions. I believe this is why Paul says in Philippians 1 that our "love" should "abound more and more in knowledge and depth of insight." Notice he didn't say that love should abound more and more in our emotions and feelings?

So what is the purpose of marriage? To do God's will. How does that get accomplished in marriage? God gives a man a mission and the man invites a woman along to help him fulfill it. That mission is the purpose of your marriage.

You found a guy who is not on a mission for God. He's on a mission for his own pleasure and gratification. I know you want to defend him in a million different ways, but that's the truth. As we often say on red pill forums: *watch what they do, not what they say*. Actions speak louder than words. If you were to get this guy back and he proposes and you get married ... you'll still be with a guy who isn't contributing anything of value to God's Kingdom.

When judgment day comes, you will have to answer to God. God's first judgment will be on your husband. Do you want to be the guy who on that day makes excuses or the guy to whom God says, "Well done, good and faithful servant"? Because after your husband is judged, God will look at you and your answer must be, "I helped him do it." So, if your husband is a guy who wastes his life away on things that don't advance God's purposes, you're going to have to tell God, "I helped him do it." But if you're married to a guy who has done God's work and who has produced great fruit for God's Kingdom, you will tell God joyfully: "I helped him do it."

Which woman do you want to be? What vision do you want to help your husband accomplish? And let's be clear,

if you marry a guy who isn't doing God's work, and he makes excuses to God on Judgment Day and your turn comes up and you say, "I didn't help him do all that, I did my own thing in your name," do you think God will be proud? Do you think God will say, "I designed you to be a helper to your husband ... but phew, I'm glad you didn't listen to me on that one!" No, he's going to ask you, "Why weren't you faithful to your husband? Why didn't you help him?" And then you will be stuck making excuses to God between your obligation to Him and your obligation to your husband. You don't want to be in that position.

Let this guy go. Read [/u/RedPillWonder](#)'s post. Become the best prospective bride you can possibly imagine. Go find a guy who is doing something productive to God's Kingdom with his life. Then, if he's not already attractive, send him here and we'll kick his butt in gear.

Recent breakup - emotional aftermath and conflict

3 upvotes · 30 July 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

1/2

I know I'm a little late to the party, but this is my first day back from vacation. There are certainly a lot of really good answers here - most notably from [/u/RedPillWonder](#). He wrote an incredible piece early in this sub's development, which might be of use to you: [here](#). It goes through a lot of the things that a single woman should be doing and thinking about to prime herself for a successful marriage and to optimize the type of guy she (you) can get. I know it sounds weird talking in those terms, but the reality is that social dynamics do involve a sort of "tiering" or "class" system, where the phrase "he/she's out of my league" actually makes sense in a somewhat literal way - that there are actually leagues, and people will only date within their own league (or very close to it).

With that in mind, it sounds like this guy you've been chasing is in a lower league than you. I get the impression from everything you're describing, including from your comments in this thread, that he's not necessarily a high value man, but that you've somehow pair bonded to him due to your past relationship and you're afraid of the ongoing pain of embracing the loss of that pair bond.

This is a very difficult thing to experience. But it's also a necessary and important thing. Without experiencing the pain of a loss like this, you will not know the gravity of divorce in the future. That's not to say everyone should experience such a loss just to make them more cognizant of the effect of divorce; rather, it's to say that there is something to be redeemed out of the pain you're feeling, which can contribute to your being a better and more faithful spouse in the future.

To get on to the bulk of this, the first thing I want to address is the spiritual maturity aspect to all of this. As [/u/matrixtospartanatLV](#) said, you are unequally yoked. You have an actual interest in pursuing your faith. He does not. It sounds like he has developed some weird version of Christianity that is easier for him to follow than the real thing, but you're making excuses for him by simply saying his theology is "complicated." Don't make excuses for him. He abandoned the fellowship, he abandoned biblical convictions on sexuality, and he's continuing in a life defiant to God's wishes and expectations. You don't need a man in your life like that. It will do you great harm.

But let's be clear about this as well: you can't expect him to remain sexually pure when you haven't maintained that boundary either. From one of your other comments, it sounds like you engaged in oral with him on occasion. I get the impression you try to justify it by acknowledging a conviction against doing it before marriage and saying it wasn't often, but the bottom line is that you had a boundary that you chose to cross for this man. You engaged in sexual sin with him, now he's engaging in sexual sin with someone else. In all likelihood, now that he's been overtly sexually active with someone else, for him there's no going back to the way things used to be with you - especially not if you renew your commitment to remaining pure until marriage.

I wish I had something easier to say/hear on that point, but this is the reality of the matter. The fact that you teach

Sunday school or have good feelings about God from time to time when you pray or read the Bible, etc. doesn't negate the spiritual immaturity you lived in while in this relationship. What can negate it, though, is a renewal of your commitment to Christ as your top priority and the one who decides your boundaries. For many people, they end up crossing "personal boundaries" because they're just that: *personal*. If we recognize that Jesus - our spiritual spouse - is the one who sets our boundaries and that they're not ours to decide whether to keep or break, that can go a long way in bolstering the strength of our determination to keep those boundaries secure.

More to the point, the fact that you are at least oriented toward Christ and he is oriented away speaks volumes of his value as a man. In secular terms, he might be a great catch. I expect he's really good looking, very charming, has a lot of great career prospect/success, etc. But as Christians we don't value things the way the world does; our perception of value is defined by the value God assigns to something. If God values sexual purity, then sexual purity contributes to how we should value a prospective mate. If God values fellowship, then we should value in a prospective mate their drive to fellowship with other believers as well.

When you look at his behaviors and compare them to the traits that God values in a person, do you believe he is the type of man that *God wants you to be attracted to*? Or is it just your flesh that desires a guy like that? And let's be clear - as [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) has noted before - that your flesh will always contribute to your sexuality. Just because God gives you a new spirit doesn't mean he gives you a new libido to match it. So, I get that your flesh will be all tingly for a guy like him, if he's as high value in the secular sense as I assume he must be to have you so hooked on him. But: is it wise to be pursuing a guy like this? The answer must be a resounding no.

Training the Next Generation

3 upvotes · 30 July 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I was on vacation when this came out, so I wasn't responding to much ... but this is a good topic that needs to be addressed more: how to raise our kids to know the truth of what God expects in marriage and relationships.

Sadly, there is virtually no content in mainstream Christianity that will give an actual biblical look at relationships. The best I can suggest is to do your own personal study with your kids to address these issues. Don't have it be a 1-2 week thing. Let it be ongoing for months.

Where to start? If physical marriage between a man and woman is parallel to spiritual marriage between Christ and his church, then the pre-spiritual-marriage process (evangelism) should also parallel the pre-physical-marriage process (dating). So, study evangelism. Learn how God draws his bride to himself and how the bride is meant to respond. Consider all the principles of what God will and won't do with non-Christians. Look at how God selects and initiates and pursues, etc. Look at the types of people he rejects and turns away from. These are the guiding principles we have for how we should be seeking a potential spouse as well.

Relationship started Secular/RP and now I'm wanting to reset it in the way Christ designed. Is it possible?

3 upvotes · 29 July 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

The degree to which it is possible is directly proportional to the strength of your will power and the internal orientation of your heart. If you are oriented rightly and have a strong will power, it won't be a problem. But you're describing yourself as someone with a weak will power and your heart orientation is still in the "calibrating" phase. You now are aligned the right way, but you don't really know what that means or what it looks like in practice. The fact that you have a mentor at all, though, puts you in the top 3% and will greatly accelerate your progress.

With weak will powered men, the only way a "physical step back" in the relationship actually ever works is if you cut off physical touch entirely for a time and only ease it back in very gradually. Whatever boundaries you set, one you're aroused you'll always cross them.

From what you've written, I get the impression that she will be more of a distraction to you than a help. You're

already physically distracted by her and can't stick to your own frame/boundaries. You're preoccupied with the red flags you've noticed. Your feelings toward her seem very wishy washy to the point where you want other people - whether us or your mentor - to tell you how you ought to feel. Long story short, you're already distracted.

But that doesn't mean you can't refocus and make her part of your mission to make disciples. Start discipling her. Set a boundary that you can't be on the same page with a relationship until you're on the same page with Christ first, so the relationship is on hold - public settings only, so you're not tempted. When you're satisfied with her progress and sure she's worth a long term commitment, propose. If you decide it's not going to work, then move on.

In general, though, I'll refrain u/OsmiumZulu's recurring line: "If it's not a hell yeah, it's a hell no." More to say, but I'm sick of typing on mobile.

Should I keep this girl around to potentially LTR later??

3 upvotes · 16 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Yeah, I definitely didn't get the impression that girl 2 was masculine/dominant. My point isn't about who she is, but in how you interact with her. You seem like you have her on a pedestal and you'll bend to her will. It's not so much that she's trying to lead you as it is that you're trying to follow her and that this will be the orientation of your mind in the relationship.

It's great that girl 2 played an instrumental role in your faith journey. That's a wonderful thing, and I've written a post on the way opposite sexes can do that. But the fact is that you should be getting that guidance from other men, not from her. If you don't have those types of men in your life, I can understand why this was so alluring to you. Your girlfriend, on the other hand, is responding the way a wife should.

I hope this helps :)

Embarrassed and unsure

3 upvotes · 16 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I remember having wet dreams until I was around 21, so that's not unnatural. They stopped after one particular dream.

I was in a dark, but large closet making out with a crazy hot girl. I'm feeling her up and eventually pause, then step out to get a drink. Outside the door, I was apparently at an outdoor bar on an island/beach and all my Christian friends were there too, having no idea what I was just doing. I ordered a milk from the bar (which is weird because I hate milk), recouped my thoughts, talked to my discipler for a brief moment (I don't remember what he said), then went back into the room. She had stripped down to black, highly revealing lingerie, pushed me against the wall, and started sucking on my neck while grinding on me.

I softly pushed her away and said, "This is wrong. I can't do this," and left the room.

Everything immediately faded into blackness and it was just me in the middle of nowhere. Then a voice spoke, "Yes, [RC], even in your dreams you must obey me." Then I woke up. I've never had a wet dream since. I also have very lucid dreams and I make sure not to put myself in that position, though some dreams make it hard. But my mind is oriented, even in my subconscious, toward obedience. That's not to say I'm always perfect - not by a longshot. But I do believe that was a small piece of prophecy over my life and one of two times I have audibly heard the voice of God (although I don't say that often because most people - even Christians - think I'm a loon as soon as I say anything about hearing God audibly).

I've been having sex with my girlfriend is it possibly to reset our relationship on the right path?

3 upvotes · 16 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Hah ... this is the right answer. Get married or get out. I mean, it's possible to keep dating and just cut off the sex, but as a practical matter, once someone falls into temptation repeatedly, it's unlikely they're going to be able to suddenly resist that temptation without a clear "goal date" in mind. In this case, that "goal date" is a wedding date, where they know the "resisting temptation" phase will only be temporary.

Understanding The Outliers?

3 upvotes · 10 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

2/2

Perhaps the most significant reason for the change is aligned with what [/u/Willow-girl](#) said about her perceiving herself as a sexual being. My wife was always very attractive and had men interested in her, but she had stifled any thoughts of that interest at all so deep that she never felt sexual. She saw their sexual interest in her not as a sign that she was sexually attractive, but as a sign that men are just pigs and will screw anything under 200lbs. Interestingly, she takes every other comment, glare, or subliminal context involving her incredibly personally ... but sexual interest she casts aside as not being personal about her.

Even today she still tries to avoid anything that might cause other men to become sexually interested in her, but around our own house she'll now make comments about how awesome she is and how I should feel lucky to be married to such a "hot mama." I AA my way through those types of tests well enough that she knows she's really the lucky one - and she'll admit that from time to time too. But my point here is that she's starting to embrace, at least in private, that she is a sexual being.

This happened because I started making her feel sexy. That was the foundation for my writing [104](#) about making your wife feel sexy. Interestingly, a few months later I almost deleted it and tried to renumber the entire sidebar to exclude it, thinking it was an embarrassment to the sub. It had very beta vibes to me, teaching men how to pump up their wives' egos even more. Yet as we stand today, with voting locked, it's the second highest rated of all of my sidebar content. That blows my mind that my least favorite of all of my content is rated so highly. But looking back, I understand why: because church women are taught not to feel sexy, but teaching them to feel sexy is the exact answer to unlocking their inner-nympho.

My wife explained at one point during an argument before I wrote [104](#) that she didn't ever feel like having sex because she didn't feel sexy. She was embarrassed of her body in the wake of a pregnancy/delivery, especially because several months post-delivery she still had not gotten back to her pre-pregnancy weight. No amount of blue pill supplication with my words was going to solve the problem. I had to show her with my actions, per Corrolary 2 of [104](#): *Your wife needs to know that she is so irresistible that you will fight through any barrier to get in her panties - even barriers that she herself puts up.*

My wife didn't start feeling sexy for the first time in her life until just over a year ago - about the time I created RPC. It's not just about "being more alpha" in your daily routine, how you lead the family, etc. It's about how you initiate with her. How you talk to her. How you touch her while she's eating dinner. How you tease her. The standard self-improvement stuff is the foundation to make all that stuff work. But you still have to make her feel like you're undressing her with your eyes every time you look at her.

But that's disrespectful, Red. It would be awkward to stare at my wife that way. She'd think I'm some kind of creepy perv and that I only want her for her body.

So?

Who cares what she thinks? My wife has made the comment, "You only want me for sex!" so many times I've lost count. She even said that during our 18 month dead bedroom (no sex at all), which still blows my mind. But instead of denying the claim and defending my "honorable character" and the fact that "men should want women

for more than just sex" ... I now just say, "Of course not, honey. Hand jobs and groping your boobs are pretty great too." She rolls her eyes, knowing that I'm teasing her - but that teasing, especially as the frequency picks up, is what starts making her feel like a sexual being again.

If I didn't have my crap together with my job, around the house, with my physique, etc. then I'd just come off as icky, but with the proper foundation there's room for her to appreciate the raw desire that I can express to her. We have 4 kids. Sometimes I'll even hammer her against the wall to make out even when they're around. She gets all embarrassed, protesting that we can't do that in front of the kids. I just whisper in her ear, "I know, but I just have to have you right now. I don't care who's watching." With that line, I'm not teasing. Sometimes I legitimately mean it. Other times I'm merely expressing what I want to be feeling toward her because I know that's the starting point to get both of us really in the mood. But the goal is to get her to believe it. We obviously don't have sex in front of our kids on the spot, but it does get her ramped up to put the kids in bed asap, especially if I'm start dipping my hands below her waistline before letting her stop me.

I can't pretend to know your situation exactly, but it seems like you're at the same place I was a year ago. You've probably made a lot of progress on improving your own personal life overall. But I get the impression that you think you being a great guy is what's going to make her wet for you. It's not. That's what enables her to become wet for you. You still have to do something in the moment to trigger her hormones and get the juices flowing. It sounds like you've let her general asexual attitude shape the way you initiate with her, or that you think foreplay starts when sex is actually a possibility. In reality, "foreplay starts in the morning" - but not the way beta Christians say that phrase. It's not because you're doing all the chores and going to work and all that to impress her into sleeping with you. It's because you start playing with her in a sexually alluring way from the beginning of the day.

Peep in on her while she's taking her morning shower. Grope her while she's trying to get her shirt on. Kiss her passionately on your way out the door to work. Tease her through text message while you're at the office. Call her on your way home and tell her she'd better put on something that shows good cleavage because it's been a long day staring at a computer and you need something a little more ... pleasant to look at when you get home. Put your hand on her leg while you're watching the kids play at the mall, then slowly and gradually, bit by bit, slide it up her thigh over time and see how far you can get before she notices.

Chances are that even if she doesn't feel sexy, she still idolizes those who are sexy. She looks at the other women and thinks how easy their lives must be, looking so gorgeous all the time, meeting guys who can give them a 5 bedroom house with granite counter tops and 3 full baths. She either wishes she could be one of them or resents them because she can't be. If you can get her feeling like she is one of them, not only will she start acting like one of them, but she'll also start taking steps to begin looking like one of them too.

Tag: [/u/Deep_Strength](#) - because you tend to have some different thoughts on "gaming your wife" that might bring some balance to anything I've said.

Understanding The Outliers?

3 upvotes · 10 July 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

1/2

I have incredible experience with a woman like this: my own wife. At least, so I thought. My first askMRP post was about this issue exactly. Some of the advice I got was: "Some women are hopeless; divorce her and move on." Others said, "You're clueless. She's just like all the other girls, you just haven't figured out how to tap into that side of her yet." Over a year later, it turns out the latter crowd was right.

As much as you might think you're married to one of the "good girls," I'm sure I was 100x more convinced than you think you are that my wife was an outlier. You talk about your wife having never identified herself as a

sexual person - my wife specifically and intentionally identified herself as an anti-sexual person. She thought sex was dirty and gross and only existed to reproduce and keep men from watching porn. She refrained things like, "My parents only ever taught me two things about sex: it's bad and it hurts a lot" and that ingrained in her psyche.

She did not have the party years, did not ride the c-carousel, I'm the only guy she ever dated, ever kissed, and ever held hands with (except her dad). Growing up, when she had sexual desires she stifled and repressed them as evil and refused to think of men in a sexual way. She wouldn't watch movies and think, "He's hot." If any hint of nudity came on, she'd walk away.

That's where I was coming from when I started my journey. As [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) points out, some of these women marry men because they want a soft, easy, comfortable life. My wife still brings up every now and then that she's disappointed I didn't become a doctor like I went to school for when we were dating ... I'm only an attorney. She's also made comments that she was never sexually attracted to me, even when we were dating - that she was just told by "the church" to "find the most spiritually mature man you can and marry him," so that's what she did. She also admitted to lying to me about lots of things about herself, including her sexual desires, in order to get me to marry her.

All of that being said, I have still made uncanny strides toward sexual fulfillment. There are some boundaries she hasn't crossed yet, like giving a blowjob. But I can see us moving in that direction. There are other boundaries that I thought she'd never get into that suddenly she's going crazy over.

For example, a few weeks ago she had her first vaginal orgasm and was excited about trying something new. Sex was always silent before, but just last week I literally had her screaming my name so I'd let her have her orgasm. She actually came up with the idea just under a year ago to tie rope to the bedframes, or in another case to bring food into the bedroom.

All of these things that she's now doing are things that two years ago I would have said: "Impossible. My wife will never do that no matter how alpha I become." They're also things that she verbally said she would never do because "anything other than missionary or girl on top is carnal and evil."

No, I didn't give her a theology lesson on sex. She didn't go to a sex therapist or marriage counselor. She didn't talk to any girl friends about it. She didn't hear a sermon on the topic. She didn't read any books about sex, and heaven forbid she ever google "sex" or read a blog post about it.

Things changed because I led her into that change with my actions, not my words. It happened because of all of the content I have put up on the sidebar here.

Tag: [/u/rocknrollchuck](#)

Sex god method... RPC Perspective?

3 upvotes · 9 July 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Where do you think her conviction is coming from: the bible or prudish piety from church culture? That should tell you whether you should honor her conviction or not. If her attitude toward sexual acts that make her husband feel honored and loved is one of pride and condescension against it, that should be rooted out, not honored.

Would anybody be interested in RPChristians Handbook?

3 upvotes · 8 July 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

To be clear, I said I was working on a book that would include some of the sidebar content, although heavily updated and revised and with lots of new stuff. That said, I'm still many months away from finishing.

Reworking the Sidebar

3 upvotes · 7 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Not a bad idea. It will still be quite a while, of course.

Happy Belated 4th, men. Here's my bi-monthly example of what NOT to do. Link in comments.

3 upvotes · 5 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

It reads more like a fake/troll post to me anyway. I think Glass just got a little bit gullible on this one.

Apparently there's a sidebar

3 upvotes · 4 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

It's in the 100 Series and 200 Series link. I also just put up links to all of that content as their own compilation threads. I think it's 101 and 203.

What if all you ever did was fail in life.

3 upvotes · 4 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I can certainly empathize with your frustration, my friend. As much as I'd like to help, there are some basics that will really help. In no particular order ...

1. Stats? Body fat, lifts, height, weight, etc.
2. How much of the sidebar material have you read? NMMNG? WISNIFG?
3. How's your relationship with God? How would you rank yourself in each of the seven basics right now (see 300 series)?
4. What's your mission in life? What steps are you taking to pursue it?
5. How's your social network? Do you have lots of friends or one or two close friends or no one at all? What are you doing to meet new people? What are you doing to follow-up with new people you meet?
6. Are you involved in a church? What do you do with your church other than weekly services? Can you articulate the Gospel? Do you feel comfortable sharing the Gospel with anyone else?
7. How's your sense of style? Are you wearing gym shorts and t-shirts or sweats everywhere? Do you have well-fitting jeans and some polos/button-ups?
8. What have your last few dates been like? Who initiated? How was the conversation? What types of things did you do? Why didn't it work out?

These types of things will give us a much better insight into your character and the types of things where you might be falling short which can really help you in the long-run.

Social Influence and Defying Context

3 upvotes · 3 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

No joke, I was just looking up your number last night to see how you're doing, but I ended up getting side-tracked.

Anyway ... that LAHWF stuff is incredible. That was me in high school/college. I mentioned on MRP once how I used to "run experiments on people." My stuff wasn't as overt as this, but it certainly helped me stand out from the crowd.

My favorite was a bit I called the "Cuban banana." In essence, you introduce yourself to someone, ask about something innocuous like the weather. Whatever they answer you just say, "Oh yeah, that's just like Cuban

bananas" (or make up some other nonsensical phrase). She thinks it's weird that I just said that and I say, "Why do you think that's weird? Don't you know what I'm talking about?" She laughs and acts clueless. I say, "Interesting. You've got my attention ... so what did you think I was talking about?" (note: I don't actually explain anything). She then starts trying to rationalize something and I'm like, "That's totally weird. Why would you think I'd mean to say something like that?" and I'll follow-up with related questions that put the pressure on her to reveal information about herself without questioning me anymore: "Are you some kind of botanist or something? I mean, why would you think bananas respond to the weather that way?" I keep asking these types of questions until I have a decent bit of information about her. When I'm done I just say, "Well, this has been an interesting conversation, but you don't have to try so hard." She says, "What are you talking about?" I say, "I just commented on the weather and you started telling me x, and y, and z about yourself. It's not like I'm interviewing you to be my girlfriend or something. Or maybe that's what you wanted. Whatever. Want to go for a walk?"

I wrote it up in more detail [here](#).

I'm fairly new to redpill, but with my Christian beliefs I don't fully trust redpill.

3 upvotes · 3 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

In response to your post and many others, I have stared today the process of reworking the sidebar to make content more accessible to singles. [/u/rocknrollchuck](#) gave a few great links. I wrote one a few months ago [here](#). There are more if we go further back.

My ultimate position on pre-marriage advice goes something like this. God set up a clear parallel between the husband/wife relationship and the Christ/Church relationship. It makes sense, then, that the way we enter into each of those relationships should also be parallel. In the Christ/Church relationship, we call that process evangelism. So, if we study and read up on evangelism - how it's done, the goal/focus, methodologies, etc. - we get more insight on how we should engage in relationships before marriage too. The parable of the sower is probably the best place to start for that.

Reworking the Sidebar

3 upvotes · 3 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Ugh ... good to know. I have been avoiding the redesign as much as possible.

Dealing with ONEitis

3 upvotes · 3 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

The love of women is fine. This is natural for men. The idolatry of women in their hearts is the problem that causes men to treat women like their god. The solution is not for a man to become more feminine, but for him to abandon idolatry and look to Christ.

Are Christian events a bad date idea...why?

3 upvotes · 3 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I agree with [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) - what you're reading on these other forums is bad advice. Want some good advice? Do whatever you feel like doing. You want to stay for 10 hours? Stay for 10 hours. You want to leave for coffee after 15 minutes? Go get coffee after 15 minutes. You want to introduce her to your male model friend named Chad? Go introduce her.

The phrase "just be yourself" gets a lot of heat, but it's actually good advice. It gets a lot of negativity on red pill subs because most people interpret that as, "It's okay to be shy, nervous, lazy, and idolatrous toward a woman." But are those really traits that define you?

Once you've started your path toward self-improvement (BTW: we don't have your stats and bio here), being yourself IS the best advice. At that point *yourself* should be pretty darn awesome and attractive to any woman.

Being anything other than yourself would imply that you're ceding who you are in order to appease a woman. Don't do that.

TL;DR - If who you are sucks, don't be yourself - improve yourself. If you've already started that path, don't change who you are to impress a woman; you don't want the woman who forces you to do that in the first place.

Phil's June Update

3 upvotes · 3 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That's because most churches and small group leaders don't understand discipleship the way Jesus practiced it - life on life. When I lead a small group, I'm calling up the guys when I have to go to the grocery store, when I feel like going to a movie, when I read a book and just have to tell someone about what I learned, or when I heard a song on the radio that I thought was cool. Many of them learned to do this back and bonds develop that just don't happen naturally under a modern first world culture.

The solution, though, is not to run from the church like the man who ran back to his gang. It's to transform the church. To be a leader who re-introduces fellowship to God's Kingdom the way God always intended and modeled through Christ. I don't want to hear "It's too hard" or "No one will listen." That's putting a limit on God as if it's your job to do His work.

RPC approach to dealing with Body Dysmorphia and other psychological insecurities?

3 upvotes · 14 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is the answer right here. Nobody cares. Hair is hair. The classic RP answer is to own it. Short guys have it worse than balding guys, but they always seem to make it just fine anyway.

She wants God not you

3 upvotes · 11 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

The passage you referenced plus Genesis 2.

[FR] Calculate your "cost per fuck"

3 upvotes · 8 June 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Better now than 10 years from now. Staying longer only makes financial sense in a marriage if you're staying forever or if you're the one divorce raping her.

[NSFW] Sexual Techniques, Strategies, and Games

3 upvotes · 5 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

We were both virgins when we married, so this is all stuff we figured out together.

lol's from women at church

3 upvotes · 4 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Once a woman commits to a man in marriage, especially a Christian woman, it takes a significant emotional betrayal to get her considering other men.

I would qualify this with the spiritual maturity of the woman. There are countless women who self-identify as Christians and attend church services 4 weeks a month, but who would readily succumb to temptation. I have seen it over and over again.

I have also seen very spiritually mature women who married alpha men who were not spiritually mature. These women then lost their maturity, regressed in their relationship with God as a result of the poor leadership of their

husbands, and then ended up cheating on their husbands (I've seen this happen at least 3 times in the past few years).

The conclusion here is that if a man wants his wife to remain faithful to him, it's not just about making sure she's a Christian and that he's good looking - he must lead her into spiritual maturity so that she takes her faith commitment seriously. Incidentally, this will also draw her toward her husband and not merely condition her away from leaving her husband.

Maturity is dependent on the mission, so once the man develops his mission from God and orients his life toward the fulfillment of the same and appropriately leads his wife in understanding her role as his helper on that mission - that is when she will be most faithful.

express your fear to your wife

I'm with [/u/Deep_Strength](#) on this one - this is generally a bad idea.

I'm not convinced that [/u/palmorwrist](#) has made his looks an idol. Maybe he has, maybe he hasn't. What I do see is that he has misunderstood how women evaluate male SMV. Men evaluate female SMV based on looks almost exclusively, so he may naturally assume that women evaluate him that way too.

In reality, looks are only one factor of many that women use. In a man's evaluation of a woman, 8 points may be based on looks alone and the other 2 based on a miscellaneous number of factors. For women, a man's looks might be worth about 3ish points. His charm might be worth another 3 or 4 points. His income is another point, his social status another, etc. At the end of the day, looks might still be the highest contributor, but a downright ugly man could still be a 6 or 7 in a girl's mind if he has all the other factors going for him.

To that end, my impression is that OP's issue is not idolizing looks or fear of what she might do if he's no longer the best looking. It's based on a misunderstanding of how women evaluate a man's attractiveness. Notice that his post and comments here point to his "game" and charm as being what attracted them, yet he assumes it's his looks that did it. If he reorients this understanding all will be well in the world.

Talking About Attraction

As [/u/Deep_Strength](#) noted, trying to discuss this issue with her directly could be counter-productive. It's often said in RP: "Women don't want to talk about game; they want a man who naturally understands how to play the game without needing the affirmation of whether he's doing it right or wrong."

- When a woman has to explain to her man how female attraction works, it tells her that he was never naturally attractive to begin with - that he was faking it and eventually his charade got tripped up by a misunderstanding.
- The explanation conversation also sows a seed of doubt because she's now giving him the tools to fake it. If she consoles him with, "It's not just about your looks. I love you because of your x and your y and the way you z," now she's telling him attraction triggers that may have been natural for him, but she'll start to question whether after that he's doing those things because they're natural (which she questioned due to the previous point) or if he's living them out because she gave him inside information. Either way, she no longer knows if she married an attractive man or a man who's good at pretending to be attractive.
- Looking for affirmation from a woman is also more generally a display of low value. It can have a short-term immediate boost to "intimacy," but intimacy levels fade quite quickly as soon as one's attention is redirected toward anything else. After the short-term intimacy boost is gone, the permanent effects on how she views her husband afterward sets in.

- If it were purely a matter of humility, then it might have some permanent boost; but this isn't that. She might see him as more humble as a result of the conversation, but which do you think she'll hone in on more: the fact that he was humble enough to admit he's a fraud or the fact that she married a fraud? 9/10 it's the latter. Even worse - if she gets this impression when he really was the natural alpha all along!

I have experienced all of this in my own marriage. I had that conversation with my wife. I also had her tell me weeks later, "I have no idea if you're doing this because it's who you are or if you're doing it just because you think that's what I want you to be." It's insanely frustrating and had a serious negative impact on our long-term sexuality. What made it so frustrating is that the behaviors she questioned were things that I had always done all my life - even before we were married. But as soon as she had to tell me that she liked those behaviors, suddenly doubt crept in about the authenticity of who I was as a man to her. That's a sucky place to be and I don't recommend any man make the same mistake I did.

Women want to know that their man is the real deal. She wants to know that he's a man who just naturally "gets it" and doesn't have to put on a facade to look the part. For the man, it doesn't matter if he's actually faking his way through it or not. What matters is that she sees it as authentic and he's working toward making it authentic.

OP sounds like he is genuine and authentic. He's not faking anything. The way he interacts with women is part of his natural way of life. So, to express his insecurity about attraction-triggers to his wife will cause her to talk about it and question whether or not he is a genuinely attractive man or if he's just putting on a show to cover up these alleged insecurities.

In reality, I get the impression that OP isn't insecure about his SMV to his wife at all; the only thing he's insecure about is whether or not his SMV is causing him to sin. This is an important distinction. To that end, if his wife is aware (as the original post makes clear she is) and she respects his spiritual maturity (the only variable left open), then she would feel no shame or remorse at convicting him on her own accord when she thought he was acting out of line or leading women on. My wife has had that conversation with me before - and I appreciated that she felt open enough to communicate when she believed my behaviors were crossing a line that might lead someone else on. I made the appropriate adjustments and all was well. But for him to express a false insecurity over what might not actually be an idol and instead could really just be a misunderstanding of SMV factors women look at ... there just seems to be a lot of risk in there over nothing.

To that end ...

Humility's Place

I'm not saying he should avoid showing her his weaknesses. I'm simply saying that he should make darn sure they're weaknesses before he expresses them. And when he does display his weaknesses, it shouldn't be in the context of going to ~~mommy~~ his wife to fix all of his problems for him - and it most certainly should not be him going to her for validation of his masculinity and attractiveness. He should get that from God. Validation-seeking will have far more long-term harmful effects than the short-term intimacy boost.

Instead, presentation of weaknesses should start with a clear acknowledgment of the issue coupled with a statement of repentance and corrected action. "Wife, I realize that I have been doing x. I should not have done that. I've decided to be a better man. In order to be that better man, I'm going to do y and z from now on to address the issue." That's called being transparent, which is almost as big a boost to intimacy as the validation-seeking conversation you suggest.

But let's convert rote transparency into vulnerability. Add after the above: "This won't be easy and I'm going to need you to help me with the y and z parts. You could help me best by doing a, b, and c." Now he's inviting her into his weakness. Even better, he's being a man by leading her in the process of how she can best help him, demonstrating both vulnerability and strength at the same time.

I discovered this formula about six months ago and have had to use it often. I'm not a perfect guy. I screw up a

lot. The key is that when I screw up I don't go to my wife for her to tell me, "Everything's going to be okay. Now let me kiss it and make you feel all better." That's what a mom does. I don't want her to feel like my mom. I want a wife who helps me, not a mommy who coddles me. I have this conversation with my wife about once every 3 weeks. Something happens, I realize I made a mistake - or sometimes she lets me know when I've made that mistake, which is fine too - and I address the issue head-on. Admit, repent, improve, involve. That's all there is to it.

lol's from women at church

3 upvotes · 4 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is the correct evaluation. Getting IOIs is healthy and normal for a man who is awesome. Getting IOIs because they're solicited through game is not normal - it's invoked. That's not to say it's totally wrong to employ charm with women other than one's own wife. It just means that one should not do so to a degree that it surpasses his ability to maintain self-control.

To that end, [/u/palmorwrist](#), my advice is simply to get a better sense of where your self-control boundary is. As long as you don't cross that boundary, you're fine. But if your natural/unintentional game is causing you to cause that boundary, putting your mind in the gutter, then you might want to do one of two things: (1) increase your level of self-control, or (2) make a conscious effort to decrease any activity that might put you past your level of self-control.

The first is hard, especially when what you're trying to control is your own thoughts. That said, I can personally attest that it is possible. The second is the easier route. But I also come from the viewpoint that we, as men, should be striving toward what improves us, not running away. The second option strikes me as running away from the problem. The first option - growing one's own self-control - continues to improve you as a man and develop your character into godliness. Remember, Jesus had prostitutes fawning over him, and yet we don't see him shying away. If you want to be more like Christ, the goal isn't to avoid brothels; it's to become so self-controlled that you could walk into a brothel and not have to worry about where your thoughts might lead you. And let's be clear here - we're not even talking about brothels at this point; we're talking about going to church ;)

What is the problem with porn?

3 upvotes · 1 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Based on 3 and 4, you could argue that use of sexually explicit materials in marriage is fine, if it's creating unity.

I was tracking with you until that point. So you're telling me that Matthew 5:28 has an implied exception, "Unless your spouse is okay with it, then it's fine"? To me this is the same thing as the government condoning homosexual marriage. The government doesn't have the right to define what marriage is; only God does. They can steal the word and call something marriage when it's not, but that's the extent of it.

Similarly, we can't delegate the power of defining sinful lust to one's spouse. That rests in God's hands alone. As the human supreme court justices have no spiritual authority to absolve homosexuals of their sexual relationships; likewise the human husbands and wives out there have no spiritual authority to absolve adulterers of their lusts over people other than their spouse.

I like a lot of what you write, but that line is walking on extremely thin ice.

Of course, if by "sexually explicit materials" you mean that those materials are depicting the husband and the wife themselves, that's obviously fine ... or if you're talking about toys or things like that, that's all fine ... unless, of course, one starts entering into objectophilia, but I'll just assume we haven't degraded that far yet.

What is the problem with porn?

3 upvotes · 1 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

You're looking at materials themselves and trying to define sin by the inanimate object. In Romans 14:14 Paul says that nothing is unclean in itself; rather, it is only unclean if someone regards it as unclean in his heart. Accordingly, sin is not defined by external factors, but by one's own heart.

As such, reading Song of Solomon - the first thing on your list - could be sin to one person, which is why the Jews forbade young men from reading it. Similarly, a forensic analyst for the FBI might be able to watch videos of sexual acts without lust in his heart because he's so honed in on finding some clue relevant to his case.

Now, as a practical matter, Romans 14:23 also says that anything that does not come from faith is sin. So, that same forensic analyst is sinning if he's doing it just to catch a bad guy; but if he's a Christian and doing his job to the glory of God (1 Cor. 10:31; Col. 3:23), then it's not sin. Similarly, if an atheist is reading Song of Solomon for the purpose of proving something against the Bible, it's still sin.

A redditor on [r/TrueChristian](#) once said several years ago that "*porn is anything you lose interest in after masturbating.*" While I wouldn't word it the same way, the sentiment is close. Porn is anything that a person utilizes to cultivate lust. If a man looks at something and happens to lust, it's probably not porn to him. If he then lingers on it because he likes lusting after it, then it becomes porn to him. If he goes looking for more things to increase his lust, those are all certainly porn to him.

I guess you guys might give me some insight here

3 upvotes · 23 May 2018 · /r/askMRP

You're more into her than she is into you. You communicated this verbally, so did she. You're ticked because you wish she were more into you, but she's not. What exactly do you need insight on? This is pretty darn straight forward. If you want her more into you, improve your SMV. If your SMV were high enough she'd be begging you to say ILY to her, not withholding the phrase from you. And trying to force her to say it ... really? You're just showing her that you're a beta wuss by doing that.

Advice. Legal next moves. Etc.

3 upvotes · 22 May 2018 · /r/askMRP

You need to file for divorce ASAP. Stick to your guns and you'll almost certainly get custody. If she earns more than you, as it sounds is the case, many states have a statute precluding the court from contemplating the financial circumstances of the parties. She pays you child support, which solves your money problems.

If you out earn her, as long as you get custody you'll probably still get child support anyway.

Depending on who has more debts, you also may want to request a de facto termination date of the marriage, which would have the assets and liabilities split as of the day she abandoned you and the kid rather than as of the day of final hearing.

Parental abandonment is a big deal. She won't be able to overcome that unless the child is reasonably mature and gung ho on living with mom. Request a phase in period to reacclimate the child to exposure to her mom. Just making that argument in the right context (which you have), even if you don't win on it, changes how the court perceives your case in your favor.

In the meantime, marginalize her time with your child. If old enough, let your child be an active participant in how much she sees her mom. With greater tact and being more veiled, tell her, "I don't want to stand in the way of time with your mom and I will support you seeing her, if that's what you want. But I also don't want to set a precedent that could cause long term harm to our relationship and the home we have established here together. Let's talk about what's best going forward." Giving too much time to mom too soon will undermine all your other arguments and could leave you dead in the water.

(Q4Men) how can i keep my man happy?

3 upvotes · 20 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I would love to answer this question in full, but /u/RedPillWonder already did it in the beginning of this sub's creation far better than I could:

https://www.reddit.com/r/RPChristians/comments/6nhfri/advice_to_young_women_today_for_a_better_happier/

What is the Greek word for “submit” or “submission” in Ephesians 5?

3 upvotes · 20 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

When addressing the context of the word, I would not only look to the historical understanding of the word in a strict sense, but also to how the author uses and applies it in his own life. In this case, we know that Paul directly ignored the mandate of Emperor Nero to have all Christians killed. If Paul were to have submitted to that mandate, he would have turned himself and all of his brothers into the government. So, we know in Romans 13, for example, that Paul does not mean strict obedience to every governmental and societal mandate.

Instead, we see Paul going about his business, doing what God told him to do, but submitting to the legal repercussions of his actions. If that means going to trial, he goes to trial and makes his argument. If it means going to prison, he goes to prison. If it means being put to death, he submits to death. It does not mean he blindly does whatever the government tells him.

In the same way, for a wife to submit to her husband doesn't necessarily mean blind obedience to every command he ever gives her. It means that she orients herself in a manner that respects and accepts her husband's authority over her. It does not mean that if he tells her to cut her wrists she'd better do it. So, if a wife decides to ignore her husband's instructions with regard to how much money she can spend by buying a \$200 purse, if he takes away her credit card she'd better accept that repercussion without any kicking and screaming.

Lessons from two divorce cases

3 upvotes · 14 May 2018 · /r/askMRP

Hah ... send me a PM. I try to avoid doxxing myself.

Thoughts on "Intended for Pleasure" by Ed Wheat?

3 upvotes · 13 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I had it on the sidebar originally, but was persuaded to take it down. The book is really only helpful to virgins about to have sex for the first time, so it has limited application. It has some helpful techniques, but also some very blue moments to watch out for. If you're marrying someone who has never had an orgasm or has trouble with orgasms, the book promotes a positive attitude that will both help with patience and eager anticipation for helping your bride experience pleasure in sex. For men all he had to say was, "Maybe if you clench your butt cheeks some people think that makes it feel better."

But he's also fairly limiting in that his concessions can dissuade eager experimentation. To this day I can't tell if the book was perfect for my marriage because my wife is one of those who can't orgasm from internal stimulation, or if the book cursed us because my wife has in her head that she's just one of those girls and thus isn't willing to try, and that book justified her in feeling that way. Be prepared.

I'm at a loss...

3 upvotes · 8 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

When men hear that their wives want a divorce most people fall in one of two categories: (1) they step up and try to fix it or (2) they give up and let their wives take over ... because what's the point in trying if it's over? You sound like someone who has a mind for the first but your practical reality has been the second.

get things done around the house

Here's the thing - and you'll find several men around here who disagree with me, but bear with me. You're treating the house work like it's her responsibility and you're going to be a "real man" by stepping up and helping her out with it.

In reality, you need to act like you're single. As Paul says in 1 Cor. 7, "Let those with wives live as if they had none." Legalities aside, you need to start living as if you're a single-dad/bachelor and you've got a live-in girlfriend. When you adopt that mentality you'll realize that all of the responsibility for the house, caring for the kids, grocery shopping, etc. is on you. If she happens to help, great. If not, that's fine too. After all, it's your house, your kids, your life, your responsibility, not hers. If she decides she does want to be married to you and wants to join in on what you've got going, then that's her call - but she's going to do that on your terms, not on hers. You've let her run the show for too long.

Am I correct when I assume that she's usually the one who keeps the calendar? That she's the one who talks to the kids' teachers and figures out when the special school days and field trips are? That she's the one who schedules the doctors and dentist appointments for them? That she's the one who decides what chores need to be done and then is asking you to help out with a few of the items? This should all be the reverse.

blessed to find a Christian mentor who has been helping me deal with some deep-seated spiritual issues.

This is wonderful! But don't limit it to free counseling. Have him drive you hard on application. The point isn't just to figure out internal stuff going on. It's to change your life.

haven't significantly increased my muscle mass. I lift 5 days per week at home

That seems to be the issue. Do you have enough weights at home to increase your muscle mass? Most home gym systems don't have enough. Also, you should switch to a SL5x5 (see the sidebar). It's the best routine I've ever found for gaining muscle mass. What you linked to seems to be more about toning, which won't help you bulk.

I had been hoping to finish my cut before moving on to bulking

Why the heck are you cutting?!?!?! No cutting until you're benching over 250. 4 months ago you had multiple comments telling you you're too skinny and you need to be bulking ... and you're still cutting? I don't understand this at all.

Food quality and preparation are things I know my family needs me to better lead with

Maybe if they need to lose some weight. When you're bulking any calories will do, although proteins are the best, of course.

broken record calmly telling her I would not tolerate her continued disrespect, after which she demanded a divorce

Yeah, this sounds totally butt-hurt. See my "anatomy of butt-hurt" post on the sidebar. Broken record is a tool to be utilized to get your way on transactional things. It's not a tool to change how another person is feeling or how they communicate with you. STFU would have been the more appropriate response. If you've got the balls for it, when my wife gets like that sometimes I lean in and tickle her. It's totally out of context and drives her crazy, but it displays an amused mastery - lets her know that her fits are a cute little joke to me and that she can't ruin my mood. It also helps pull her out of it because the drastic change of context forces her mind to think about something other than what she's been ranting about, then she can't switch back easily. So yeah, tickling her when she's ticked like that makes her even more ticked at first, but it also goes a long way toward pulling her back

down to earth.

To be clear, it usually goes something like this: (1) tickle, (2) she gets mad and says to stop it, (3) I tickle a bit more and make a wise-crack like, "Oh, you mean to stop tickling you here? <tickle again> or here? <tickle again>" (4) she gets mad and says, "I'm being serious. Why don't you take me seriously?" (5) I look her dead in the eye and say, "Babe, you know I love you. I know you're upset. I know we have our issues. I hear you. Things are changing. Give it time. In the meantime, let's have some fun <tickle again>." This works about 90% of the time, even in situations that would have otherwise turned into main events.

I then went radio silent and left the house for a few hours. She didn't appreciate this since I apparently fail too many compliance tests and I suspect she expected more of the same.

Again: butt-hurt. This was more of the same. You failed. Oh well. Accept the loss and move on.

it's no wonder my life is still a mess

Spiritual disciplines don't fix your life, but they are a prerequisite to having a fixed life. If you're not following through here, nothing else will work with any permanency. She has to respect you as a spiritual leader before the other pieces can fall into place.

You're also correct that I don't want her around, if only because I don't find attractive the ...

I get it. There are times I didn't find my wife attractive either. There are some days where she wears completely unflattering clothes and puts on an attitude that makes me want to run for the hills. But I also know that if I want her to adopt my attitude and my charm/appeal, I've got to get her exposed to me. Women are malleable. They're going to be influenced by someone and that's always whoever they spend the most time with. This fails for most couples because the most of their time together is an hour or two after the kids go to be watching Netflix. That's not time together. That's time next to each other. So who is going to influence her? Is it going to be their girl friends? Her family? Chad? Co-workers? Or you? Let it be you.

nearly 10 years of evidence that other people in her life (parents, sister, and kids) have had a far higher priority than I have

Whoops ... there's the answer. It's her family. Change this. Take control of the calendar. Don't be demanding. If she says she already made plans, don't go Rambo and say, "Cancel them, you're coming with me." That will come in time. You're not there yet. But be more intentional about exposing her to your (new) lifestyle.

Glad this has been helpful. That's what this community is for :)

For Singles: Finding the Girl You Can't Keep Yourself From Banging

3 upvotes · 26 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Three things:

1. Who is the one who sets the path and decides where to go: the pursuer or the pursued? And, therefore, if the woman pursues the man, who is really the one leading?
2. You're treating the relationship as a thing in itself, like it's a substantive yet intangible entity. In reality a "relationship" is merely a word that arbitrarily categorizes how two people interact. The notion that it is anything more than that prior to marriage is at the core of all blue pill thinking. There is no such thing as "the relationship" - it's just him and her and each of their own sets of goals and desires until a covenant (marriage) enters the picture.

3. Your comment assumes there is a relationship before marriage, and therefore someone must lead it. My model assumes there is no "the relationship" and therefore there's nothing to lead. If the woman asks for the DTR talk the man can simply say, "There is no relationship. My focus is God and the mission he gave me. If your focus is me and helping me fulfill that mission, that's wonderful and I want to be around people like you. And if in being around you I find we can't keep our hands off each other, I may even propose to you one day. But my goal isn't to get married; it's to make a difference for eternity. If I do get married someday it'll be because that woman meets two requirements: (1) I find her helpful toward my mission and (2) I'm sexually enticed by her."

This notion that a man must "lead the relationship" assumes that the relationship itself is his goal because it's the direction he is going. But I don't believe this is biblical, as a man cannot serve two masters ... and I don't buy into the "first priority, second priority" philosophy. I've never seen a person capable of living it out - even myself.

Should there be secrets within a marriage (specifically a Christian marriage)?

3 upvotes · 26 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This once again falls into the subtle distinctions between theology, philosophy, and praxeology. I wrote a lot more about that [here](#).

It is a theological truth that a husband and wife become one flesh. But you have created a philosophy of what that means and are treating it as a theological conclusion. When you say "that's how I view it" - it's just that: how *you* view it. It doesn't mean it's the only possible correct view. As such, your reply to [/u/chuckus_mangionus](#) is not well taken, as you are asking a question, but then insisting that your original impression is correct and condemning him for not aligning with your philosophical conclusions.

In this particular situation, I do not share your conclusion. Specifically:

- Many presume Samson and Delilah were married. They were certainly having sex, and therefore one flesh. Yet it's obvious that Samson was meant to keep a secret from her.
- Esther kept her nationality a secret from the king, her husband, and this was clearly wise to do until the proper time for her to reveal that secret.
- Proverbs has many passages that talk about the wisdom of keeping secrets and the foolishness of people who can't.
- In the Old Testament the Father refers to himself as Israel's husband, and yet Deuteronomy 29:29 says he has secrets.
- Jesus also often asked people to keep secrets about what he had done for them, stating that they should not tell anyone about their being healed.

In short, in their proper context secrets are good and appropriate and it is wise to keep them. But as [/u/purifash](#) noted, if you set a boundary you must follow through with it or else change the boundary. The Bible clearly shows examples where keeping secrets, even between spouses, is perfectly appropriate, but it doesn't mean that you are biblically mandated to keep and maintain that as your own personal boundary. You have the freedom to set whatever boundary you like.

What parts of "Game" should a RP Christian utilize? Which ones should we not utilize?

3 upvotes · 20 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

True. As I often tell guys: you break it, you buy it ... referring to her hymen, of course, though the same applies even if she's not a virgin.

Phil's April Update

3 upvotes · 20 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

As Dawson Trotman once said:

If I were the minister of a church and had deacons or elders to pass the plate and choir members to sing, I would say, "Thank God for your help. We need you. Praise the Lord for these extra things that you do," but I would keep pressing home the big job - "Be fruitful and multiply." All of these other things are incidental to the supreme task of winning a man or woman to Jesus Christ and then helping him or her to go on.

So no, unfortunately, I don't quite count that. They're wonderful things. They're excellent and worthy of high admiration that you do them. But they are not a replacement for what God's actually called you to do.

Imagine your boss giving you a project that is incredibly important to the success of the company. You do 20 other projects that are much easier and more along your interests instead of the one that matters. Your boss comes asking for the finished product, but you don't have it. You tout off the other 20 things you did, hoping that will impress and please him. Think he's going to be happy and excuse your blatant defiance of his management decisions? Probably not - especially if the company takes a hit because you didn't get the job done.

That's how the balance between the great commission and discipleship works.

Google's model probably has the best parallel to this. They have a primary mission they give you, then they also let their employees spend 20% of their time working on independent projects that benefit the company, but which the employee gets to choose and start up on their own, or they can work together with other employees on stuff they're doing. In the same way, as believers, we should spend a portion (20% or so) of our efforts on the side stuff, but the majority of our ministry efforts (80% or so) should be focused on the, as Dawson puts it, "big job."

The reason you say kids ministry "doesn't feel like a mission" is because it's not the mission God designed you for.

Tag: [/u/rocknrollchuck](#) - that's why I wouldn't count it.

Screening for a Wife: The Foundation (Part I)

3 upvotes · 18 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Excellent post here.

Disclaimer

To clarify what I think you're saying, AWALT is true with regard to the underlying defaults built into the female human condition (men have it too, just in totally different ways). Some women are better at exercising self-control over their AWALT traits. The point of vetting is to find those who have a higher baseline threshold of self-control. What I mean by that is that:

- Some women have no self-control and can't even fake it.
- Some women have naturally low self-control, but can fake it quite well if given the proper motivation ("He's such a perfect guy, I have to hide my crazy!").
- Others have naturally high self-control and don't need to fake it.
- Others have a naturally low degree of self-control, but have learned to raise their default so that they exercise a high degree of self-control from x point forward without having to fake it.

These last two types of women are who you're vetting to find. 3 is the ideal, but 4 is acceptable if you have a

rational basis to put a high degree of trust in the transformation. For example, most of the self-control problems were pre-conversion to the faith, so you can clearly identify Jesus changing their heart and behavior, which is a reliable source of life-change warranting trust.

You cannot determine whether or not she can be a helper to you if you do not know what you need help with.

I can't emphasize this enough.

I wish I had more time to reply further.

What Do I Do? My Wife Is Openly Unattracted To Me + Interested In Other Men / Past Relationships

3 upvotes · 9 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Is it a mission? Yes. Is it a good/attractive one? Probably not, depending on what you do. For secular girls, sure - it's a great mission. And if your wife is a "self-identified Christian" but doesn't actually prioritize her faith, then it'll probably work just fine too. But if her faith is her top priority, as it should be, then she's going to need to see you make a difference for eternity. Most professions don't do that, unless your profession is evangelist, missionary, etc.

To be clear, I'm an attorney. I practice domestic law. I'm constantly helping people who are victims of domestic violence, helping children who have been raped and molested or abused, etc. I'm good at what I do. I have multiple judges singing my praises to my boss. I make great money. But my professional successes were not enough to maintain attraction with my wife, even in the midst of being physically fit, having a wide social network, etc.

I often tell people that the mission needs to be something outside the home and which has an eternal impact.

Steven Anderson on women's roles according to the bible.

3 upvotes · 1 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I don't know that I'd call him a fellow believer. From what I've heard, his understanding of the gospel has some serious issues. But it has been a while since I went through all his stuff.

Is there anything we as young men we can do to slowly dispel a Jezebel spirit with RP principles?

3 upvotes · 29 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is exactly the mindset I've been operating from, without saying a word

Ah, but she's not a psychic. Women communicate covertly. They use body language, subtext, implications, etc. to convey what they're really thinking, regardless what their words say. Don't be like that. Men are direct and to the point. They say what they mean. It's not an "I need to talk about feelings" conversation. It's an "I'm going to tell you like it is and you can either stay or walk away" conversation. The way /u/rocknrollchuck worded it is great - use that word for word if you have to.

Bible commentaries: What can you recommend?

3 upvotes · 29 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I generally recommend guys stay away from commentaries until they've been through the entire Bible a couple times on their own. Commentaries often get used as a crutch that hinders a person's ability to study the Bible for themselves.

That aside, when it is appropriate to use a commentary, I try to avoid ones that do the interpreting for you and stick to the ones that just give additional relevant information, such as historical context, unusual issues in the original text, translational problems, etc. This minimizes the degree to which I'm relying on others to do my work for me.

To that end, the best one I've found for this purpose is the Jamieson, Fausset, Brown Commentary Critical and Explanatory on the Whole Bible. It's available for free on biblestudytools.com (specifically [here](#)), but a hard copy can be found [here](#).

If you insist on using a "please do all the hard work for me" commentary, I recommend using at least 5 different commentaries every time so you at least get a balanced perspective.

marriage prep: confront her with my past sexual sins?

3 upvotes · 28 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This might be one of those places where RPC might differ from secular RP. As [/u/rocknrollchuck](#) noted, if she is serious about her faith, virginity in her spouse will be highly treasured, not despised.

To be clear we're probably talking on two different wavelengths. For the sake of raw sexual attraction, you're right. If he had slept with dozens of women, she'd probably be more sexually attracted to him. However, given the spiritual implications of this, it would likely cripple their marriage in many other aspects, which would also likely affect her sexual openness toward him. Mix that in with the fact that Christian marriage has other purposes beyond sex (unlike most secular marriages for men) and you can see quickly how things aren't as cut and dry as the secular community might experience.

Is Sex Outside of Marriage a Sin? An Official Stance.

3 upvotes · 26 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Yeah, I thought he addressed it. I was mistaken.

Anyway, my view is that God often takes into account the reality of life as compared with theological technicality. So, when Moses permitted people to get a certificate of divorce that didn't suddenly make divorce "not sin." It was God's ways of saying, "You're all going to divorce no matter what I say, and if you're going to sin no matter what, at least let me mitigate the effect of your sin by creating some laws and boundaries around it that will help minimize the harm you're going to do."

When it comes to modern day non-virginity ... yeah, it's hard to find a non-virgin. My guess is that God would put things in the same boat: "Yeah, she's sinned and has bound herself to another man, but I'm not in the business of stopping everyone from sinning, especially when they're non-believers and can't do otherwise anyway. So, let's make the best of a bad situation." For some people, maintaining a standard of "virgin-only" makes sense. For others, it doesn't and the harm/sin that would result from their staying single until they found a virgin might be greater than the harm/sin of marrying someone in an adulterous capacity.

From there, that's where John Piper starts to speak - that if you're already in one of those adulterous relationships, the best thing you can do is honor the covenant of that relationship rather than getting divorced to seek someone else. I thought Piper went more into the bit above, but I guess not, so there's how I connect the dots.

Pastor injects Feminism at Wedding Ceremony

3 upvotes · 23 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

The guy who disciplined me officiated my wedding and I made him include Malachi 2:15 as the primary and central verse to talk around: "And why did the Lord God make them one with a portion of his Spirit in their union? To produce godly offspring." I then had him talk about discipleship as the primary purpose of the marriage - to produce not only physical offspring through physical oneness, but spiritual offspring through spiritual oneness.

So, not every "sermonette" during a wedding is bad :)

Is Sex Outside of Marriage a Sin? An Official Stance.

3 upvotes · 21 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Ditto.

Is Sex Outside of Marriage a Sin? An Official Stance.

3 upvotes · 21 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

[/u/OsmiumZulu](#) summed it up nicely. Note the beginning of my post:

legitimate conversation about the following are still perfectly acceptable: (1) whether or not it is actually sinful, (2) why God or the church believe it is sinful, (3) the practical and spiritual ramifications on life if one side or the other is true (ex. if it weren't sinful, let's explore what that would look like), etc.

I'm not censoring discussions about the subject. Rather, like OZ said, it is the advice that needs to be reigned in from time to time. To be clear, every sub does this. TRP and MRP are notorious for content censoring. There is very little censoring that happens here, so I don't believe [/u/Whitified](#)'s or your concerns are appropriate at all.

As to the use of profanity, 95% of posts that are removed by the auto-mod for profanity are ultimately approved by us anyway (the only ones I have not approved have been by blatant trolls). We just like to filter how the profanity is being used before it goes public to keep trolls at bay. To that end, I just scrolled through your history and didn't find a single post/comment that was removed from the time this sub was created through the present.

As for the polygamy/monogamy issue ... ?!?!? Where did that come from? As OZ said, we've already had conversations about that and it sounds like you're making snap-judgments about what you think this community believes without actually reading up on it. You're too used to assuming everyone is like the first world church.

If you want to know where we stand on something, either individually or as a community, just post about it. Make sure the post follows the rules and there won't be a problem.

For Singles: Finding the Girl You Can't Keep Yourself From Banging

3 upvotes · 20 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Personally, I recommend guys wait until 30 also. That said, I have less objection than other manosphere bloggers to marrying much younger, as long as the criteria are met: you're on a mission for Christ, she's helpful in the fulfillment of that mission, and you can't keep from banging each other for long.

Personally, I married at 23. It was always a goal of mine to have kids at a younger-ish age so that all of my kids would be 18+ by the time I hit 50, when I intend to retire from secular work into full-time ministry. Given that my 4th and last kid was born when I was 32, I came pretty darn close to meeting that goal.

That said, I was also significantly less informed about the ways of the world before I married. I had many inherently red-pilled traits at the time, but did not intellectually understand it in full to the degree of being able to make informed decisions on how long I should have waited. I'm not sure if I would have done things differently or not, given my other life goals.

A Guide to Manipulation - Part 2: The Tactics

3 upvotes · 15 March 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

The fact that some of these are "manipulation" is pathetic.

It's only "pathetic" if you have an aversion to the word "manipulation" as a negative thing. Everyone manipulates

everyone else all the time. Manipulation isn't "bad" ... it just *is*. Now, as I noted in Part 1, the author is coming from the standpoint of trying to protect women (and to the degree that the book is written gender-neutral, weak men) ... so I'm sure she means "manipulation" to be a bad thing. But heck, I manipulate my kids into developing healthy disciplines, learning important skills, eating vegetables, etc. and no one's going to cry about that.

A Guide to Manipulation - Part 2: The Tactics

3 upvotes · 15 March 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Read part 1 for more info, but defending against manipulation is only one possible aspect of utilizing this information for sexual strategy purposes.

Another possible purpose is to recognize when you, as a man, are employing these tactics. By recognizing that, you can then discern what works appropriately within your frame and not.

For example, we all know that #27 "rationalization" should probably be recognized and removed. But #30 "trance and hypnosis" are very fun and valuable for intense sex and a tactic that my wife very much enjoys when I employ for that purpose, as it is essentially within the "I" of DEVI.

That type of discernment and categorisation is what I was calling for at the end and didn't have time to write-up myself in full (on mobile now).

How to connect with and influence others using stories

3 upvotes · 15 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Excellent post. Given how much I write and tell stories and parables IRL I'm actually a little embarrassed reading this that I don't do that more often here.

I'll tell you for sure that this helps in marriage as well. Although this type of information communication doesn't resonate with me personally all too often, my wife doesn't learn through lectures, targeted questions or assigned tasks like I do. But if I can connect something to a personal life story, she absorbs it.

Thanks for this post :)

How to transition into celibacy?

3 upvotes · 14 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is a good question and a very difficult issue to deal with. Whenever I broach the subject, the guy I'm speaking with usually enters the conversation with the belief that self-control is an automatic. It's not.

Self-control is a discipline that is not given like an on-switch. It is learned, exercised, and practiced into full functionality. Your post is consistent with my experience in that you're seeing options A and B - one where you exercise total self-control and one where you don't exercise it. It's more like a dimmer switch.

When the light is off, you must be extremely cautious where you tread because you can't see. Crank it up to a faint glow and now you can get around enough to not bump into chairs, but you might still step on toys. Get to mid-level and now you're seeing some of the larger objects on the floor, but you might still step in the syrup caked on the tile and get your foot all sticky. Turn it on all the way and you can roam freely, fully capable of seeing and dealing with any obstacles in the room which you lit.

Every room in the house has its own light. You might be extremely self-controlled when it comes to gambling with the light fully on, but when it comes to sexuality, the light's off and you don't know how to flip the switch because it's a knob.

Application: start slow and work your way up. Begin by only placing yourself in group contexts where you know sex can't happen and refuse to engage beyond that. Your self-control here is not restraining from having sex; it's restraining from putting yourself in more intimate settings, learning to ignore your impulses to push boundaries.

Once you've mastered that phase (which could take as little as weeks or as long as years), then go on solo dates and practice not asking her back to your place. After a while of that learn to hang out alone in a private setting during the day, but have a hard cut-off at night time. Any time you accidentally or intentionally push a boundary, back your boundary up to a previous phase for another couple weeks/months.

The key here is to be intentional in all of this. Right now your default mechanism is to be controlled by your impulses. Read 114 on the learning cycle so that you can introduce self-control and make that your default mechanism in this context as well.

Girl problems

3 upvotes · 6 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

You're probably thinking that *she deserves an explanation*. Does she really deserve anything from you though? If you want to do something for your own reasons - to get things off your chest, for example - then go for it, but know that it will make you look weak and give her fuel to get sympathy from her girl friends. But if you're moving on, what do you care? Just do what you want.

Girl problems

3 upvotes · 6 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

No, it's about intergender relational dynamics from a secular praxeological perspective. It is worth the read nonetheless. Just test everything against scripture.

Matthew 16:24-26 interpretation by RPChristians?

3 upvotes · 6 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Correct. Imagine a kid wanting a cookie. Sometimes this is fine and within the boundaries of my will, but as a parent I must sometimes deny my son that cookie. That is me denying him. He is too young to make the wise choice himself so I exercise difficult grace over him when necessary for his well-being.

As an adult that balance changes. If he wants a cookie I'm not going to stop him. I have commissioned him to make that decision for himself. He can eat hundreds of cookies if he wants, then die of a heart attack or diabetes. Or he can learn to deny himself the thing he's pursuing, which in this case, in a more meta sense, is self pleasure through food.

That's a bit unrealistic in an RP context where we understand some value in maintaining our bodies. But what if instead of cookies we're pursuing money? Or sex? Or marriage/love? Now it hits closer to home for many of us and 1 Cor. 7 starts to make more sense alongside Luke 9's compulsion to "deny oneself." And on an internal scale this is what 403 and 404 are all about - learning to embrace the Gospel in lieu of the way we want our desires met, which won't actually do us any good.

Matthew 16:24-26 interpretation by RPChristians?

3 upvotes · 6 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Where are you seeing this "empty your ego" phrase? I'm not sure where you're getting that from. The verse says to deny ourselves. The context is that this means to abandon the path we once walked, which was focused on our own purposes, hence "and follow me" instead of the path we had otherwise laid out for ourselves.

There may be other passages about the "empty vessel" concept that some preachers like to utilize (2 Tim. 2:21 comes to mind, but that's more about emptying sin), but it doesn't come from this passage, which is otherwise about the life directive we're on. It's no coincidence that Jesus says this immediately before the transfiguration, where he would discuss his coming death with the 12. That is, just as Satan tempted Jesus with abandoning his mission or finding another way other than God's to fulfill it, he now again had to come to terms with the fact that he must choose between his own path and that laid out by God on the cross (see also the Gethsemane speech in

the other gospels). Just as he was making that choice here tells his disciples they must make the same choice - to abandon their own life expectations and directive in favor of spreading the Gospel throughout the world through the disciple making process Jesus's had laid out for them. It was their path or Jesus's. This verse compels them to abandon their own ideologies, not to devoid themselves of any identity.

What were Christ's "boundaries"?

3 upvotes · 5 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Christ came to bring freedom. Before Christ our boundaries were sin and only sin and nothing else. After Christ we have the freedom to do good. That is, the boundaries of our past life were removed. Some people would like to add new boundaries to keep us from returning to that sinful life, but the truth is that as long as we're in these earthly bodies we're always going to have one foot on the other side. So, if you tried to set up a clear, objective boundary, you're going to be building it right between your legs. As Paul says in Romans 7:25, "So then, I myself serve the law of God with my mind, but with my flesh I serve the law of sin."

What you're really getting at is this question: *What should RP Christian men be doing to minimize sinfulness in our lives?* Is that a fair re-phrasing of your question? If so ...

Sin is obviously bad. We shouldn't do it. But most people, especially when talking about boundaries in relation to sin, are talking about the negative sins only. That is, in order to avoid breaking the command "do not kill" they generally don't keep C4 and nuclear missiles in their homes. In order to avoid breaking the command "do not commit adultery" they work toward having a healthy sex life with their wives and try never to be alone with another woman. In order to avoid breaking the command about looking lustfully at someone who isn't our wife, we put up porn blockers and get accountability partners, etc.

That's all well and good, but what about all the positive commands? What about Ephesians 4:2, "Be completely humble and gentle; be patient, bearing with one another in love"? First, are we actually humble, gentle, and patient? If we are, what safeguard do we have in life to make sure we don't fall away from being humble, gentle, and patient? See how often only half of the spectrum is considered when we talk about "boundaries against sinning"?

As James 4:17 says, "If anyone, then, knows the good they ought to do and doesn't do it, it is sin for him." It's not enough to avoid evil - we must do good also.

With that context in mind, I have found the process of avoiding breaking negative commands to be far easier when one is actively living out the affirmative commands.

- **Negative Commands:** Do not.
- **Affirmative Commands:** Do.

It's literally that simple. In Matthew 12 Jesus says that when one casts out an evil spirit, the spirit will wander for some time and decide to return to its former home. If it finds the house empty, it will re-inhabit it with 7 others even worse than the first. Translation: If you manage to kick out a negative command problem in your life, that's fine, but if it's not replaced by an affirmative lifestyle, you're just going to wind up wasting your time on other negative commands instead, and in all likelihood falling back into the same original sin anyway - this time worse off than before. Or to be more direct to the meaning: if an evil spirit was tempting you to evil things and you kick it out, the Holy Spirit should be indwelling in you instead, who will incite you toward good things - following the Affirmative Commands.

Conclusion: The best "boundary" you can set to avoid breaking negative commands is to start living by the affirmative commands. The most important are summarized in the three greats: (1) Love **God**, (2) Love **Others**,

(3) Make Disciples. More on this in [110](#).

How to approach sexual relationships as red pill christian entering my 20s?

3 upvotes · 4 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That last bit ... spot on. My thoughts exactly.

How would one approach this text and hold frame in a beneficial way coming from a Christian perspective?

3 upvotes · 2 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

So just keeping the mindset of abundance mentality is enough to have the high quality man persona?

Well, that's one of many things necessary to be a high value man. It's not just one thing.

how would you recommend cultivating a confident approach to other women rooted in Christ's frame?

That depends on your purpose. If your purpose is "I want to find a wife, so I want to maximize my ability to look for one in a Christ-like manner," my answer is simple: don't do that. I'm guessing you came over from one of the secular RP subs, in which they very much preach a cold-approach to wooing women to you. This makes sense in their secular framework because sex is their goal and marriage doesn't matter. Learning to "confidently approach women" is a great way to get premarital sex or even find relationships in the first place.

But Paul and Jesus seem to be clear enough that we should not be actively pursuing a spouse. We are to be actively pursuing God. If in your pursuit of God you find yourself alongside a woman with whom you share an intense mutual lust, then you've just found your bride. And let's face it, there are so many women in the church that this is pretty darn likely to happen. I just wouldn't be looking for it to happen. After all, marriage laws are so feminized today that not only is this a biblical expectation, but it's also a practical imperative. The idea that "I should want to get married because marriage is awesome!" is a byproduct of society and a contrast to what Jesus and Paul taught. Yes, it's an old testament imperative too - but one that was fulfilled on the cross and redirected to the spiritual imperative of our marriage to Christ as part of his bride, and thus no longer a physical command in an earthly/worldly sense. Long story short: don't be pursuing marriage.

But with this framework in mind, and also knowing that it's 99% likely you're going to find yourself in that "burning passion" situation with another woman anyway, my suggestion is simply to take romance out of the equation. The fear and trembling that comes with approaching a woman only exists because you are looking to her acceptance of your romantic directive toward her as a sign of validation on you as a man, and if she rejects you that means you must not be "man enough" for her, or something along those lines. If you're not looking for a romantic relationship, it's 10x easier to just talk to someone because that validation-seeking isn't there. You're just chatting with her to have fun or because it furthers your mission of disciple-making in some way. If that conversation then organically develops into a romantic, "burning passion" interest in each other, so be it. But you've started with the Christ-like frame of disciple-making, which set the context for the relationship, which will also help it be the rightful foundation of any potential marriage that flows from the relationship as well. That's how you maintain Christ's frame when approaching women - that you stop looking for a romantic relationship with them and start interacting with people more generally because an increased network advances your ability to make disciples, then let things flow from there as they may.

But, how would one lead my ex to Christ? I still care for her. Should one just pray for her, or?

That's the ONEitis talking. We could quote the "Jesus left the 99 to get the 1 sheep" all day, but we're talking about someone who was already one of his sheep and was wandering away. When we're dealing with someone

who likely was never saved to begin with (given that your description portrays her as a "self-identified only" Christian), we see Jesus spreading seed to all the different types of soil, but only cultivating the seed that landed on good soil. From there, we have the whole "do not throw your pearls among swine" concept. That is, you share the Gospel, but don't invest all of your efforts on one person. Don't pick thorny soil and think, "I'm going to keep working on this one patch of soil and try and try and try until something grows out of it that produces fruit!" That's a bad theological model of evangelism. Yes, throw the seed to the thorny soil, but don't concentrate all of your efforts there - keep scattering elsewhere too. This is another nudge toward the notion of "spinning plates" and a "shotgun mentality" but in the realm of spiritual reproduction and not merely physical reproductive partners.

Everything else will fall into place (aka; my high value will come and women will come to me instead of me being low value and me pursuing them).

That's the right attitude. I don't see much in the Bible that encourages us to actively seek a spouse for ourselves. I do see a lot of examples of fathers arranging spouses for their children (i.e. God's got it under control). I do also see a lot of examples of women seducing men into relationships - so if you were a woman, I might be telling you a different story. And I do see some passages that discourage us from seeking spouses. But there is scant little in the way of compelling us to marry - especially in a new testament, post-Gospel framework where all the physical commands of the old testament are now spiritual imperatives in our relationship with Christ anyway. That is, any old testament imperative toward marriage is satisfied by our union with Christ through the Gospel and is not necessarily something that must be maintained in a post-Gospel world on a physical level, as both Jesus and Paul affirm.

I'm not saying not to get married. I'm saying you probably (very highly likely) will end up getting married. But I'm also saying that you're going to have found your wife in a more godly way if your godliness draws her to you rather than you desperately looking around to find "the one."

How would one approach this text and hold frame in a beneficial way coming from a Christian perspective?

3 upvotes · 2 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

keeping the option open ... keep the option open ... keep the option open

You say this a lot. In other words, "I kind of have ONEitis, but I'm trying not to. Closing off the door to my ONEitis forever is too hard. I need a fall-back in case this red pill stuff doesn't pan out with anyone else." Fair assessment?

Look, if you're a high value man you could text her back, "Screw off, whore. I never want to talk to you again," and two days later she'd still take you back with a simple line, "Meh, I changed my mind." High value man = options open. Playing into her frame *can keep your options open*, but it only leads to a path of staying in her frame.

I want to be in Christ.

Excellent. I'm glad this is first on your list. What does that mean to you? Everything you describe is self-puffing.

- Confident
- Stands in the fear of God
- rooted in his Love and Humility

- embody Christ in me
- do what he would do [and here's the catch] *in this situation*

What about what he would do in every other situation? I'm guessing you'd say, "Yeah, that too, obviously!" But what did Jesus orient his life around? Raising up disciples who would spread the Gospel after he was gone. You have that yet? That's where most people run away and say, "Oh, I don't really mean I want to do everything Jesus did; I just want to be a good person like he was." You're either going to live like Jesus lived or not.

My priorities are ...

all good things that you should be doing. But where's your mission? It sounds like your eventual career is your mission. Making money is a valid mission, but it's a crappy one that is not satisfying in the long-run ... not to an authentic Christian anyway. As a famous rich man once said when asked how much money was enough, "Just a little bit more."

In reality, I don't see your priorities aligning with the things Jesus gave his life to. You want his character, but not his mission. Don't worry - you're not alone. 97.3%-ish of Christianity is in the same boat. Start taking a look at what Jesus prioritized. Consider Matthew 6:19-21 that concludes, "For where your treasure is, there your heart will be also." What is it you treasure? The things you listed as your priorities are all things that "moth and rust destroy and where thieves break in and steal" and things that will be useless in heaven.

- good grades: your college degree will be worthless in heaven
- workout: in heaven you'll have a glorified body, and your physical body here will be dead and gone
- read scripture: good stuff, but you'll be more efficient at this in heaven, as you'll have direct access to divine wisdom and knowledge
- meditate: on what? on things that will survive into eternity? again, this will be more efficient in heaven anyway
- better person: in heaven you'll be a perfect person
- approaching other people confidently: this is a gateway to value, but what are you approaching them for? if just to have friends and relationships, that too will likely fade away or is something you could have more efficiently in heaven anyway

Let me be clear: those are all great, excellent things. But why are you doing them? As the passage says, "lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust destroys and where thieves do not break in and steal."

What are those treasures? You can't bring your body, your money, your degree, your house or car, your career, etc. into heaven. You can bring people into heaven, though. All of the things you listed above can be utilized for the purpose of bringing others into heaven, but they are worthless if left as pursuits in and of themselves.

Repurpose them to an evangelistic degree and suddenly:

- good grades: earn the respect of your peers and make you competent in many relevant areas to foster relationships
- workout: earns the respect of your peers and make you someone they want to be around
- read scripture: gives you the foundational knowledge helpful to sharing your faith and discipling others
- meditate: lets you connect with God for the purpose of directing your purpose of evangelism and discipleship

- better person: earns the respect necessary for people to trust what you have to say and want to hear it
- approaching other people confidently: is absolutely essential in being able to foster new relationships for the sake of the Gospel

All of those are beautiful things - but do you see how their primary value comes not for their own sake, but for how they can be utilized to store up treasures in heaven? Those treasures are the only things we have any capacity to bring into heaven with us in the first place: the souls of the lost.

With an appropriate directive of your purpose, you can then ask: "Is keeping my options open with her going to help me advance this purpose or is it going to detract from that purpose?" 1 Cor. 7 is pretty clear: pursuing romantic relationships will always detract from that purpose.

However, if you're stuck in lust for a woman, and she back to you, then your inevitable sexual sin will be *even more of a hindrance* to that mission, and thus that's when you should really think about getting married. That's just my reading of 1 Cor. 7 though :p

How would one approach this text and hold frame in a beneficial way coming from a Christian perspective?

3 upvotes · 2 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Excellent comment. I'll address the frame issue separately.

Husbands, love your wives - Interpretation?

3 upvotes · 15 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Good reading material on this is very rare. Or to be more clear: there's lots of good material that references one side of the story, but because it completely excludes the other side, it is all grossly misleading.

How did Christ love the church?

- If we disown him, he will disown us (Matthew 10:33; 2 Timothy 2:12)
- If we are wrong, we are to be rebuked, sometimes even publicly (1 Timothy 3:16, 5:20)
- If we disregard his instruction, we are to be disassociated with and put to shame (2 Thessalonians 3:14)
- If we are caught in unrepentant sin, we are to be cast out and not to have community with the family, and we're not even allowed to eat with them (1 Cor. 5:9-13)

Consider how well this would go over in modern feminized church culture (I'll follow the same order to maintain the parallel):

- If a wife divorces her husband, he can counter-sue her for divorce right back. Sure, some churches accept this, but many push the idea that we must keep fighting against the divorce and be gracious and generous in giving from our wealth as she tries to leave. Does God do that when people disown him? Does he still offer his spiritual provision to those who forsake him and leave the church? I think not. [Not that I'm arguing for a no-support law; God is also perfect and human men are not. I do argue that no-fault divorce laws be repealed, though, which would restore a better balance to these types of situations.]
- If your wife does something wrong, imagine assembling all of the children together so that you can rebuke her in front of them so that they can take note not to make the same mistake she just did. What church would endorse this?
- If your wife doesn't follow your instructions, you disassociate with her and shame her by letting her friends

and family see that you have separated yourself from her.

- If she is callous and unrepentant in her sin against you, you evict her from the home and refuse to give her any food or shelter. Obviously this isn't even legal today.

Now, I'm not suggesting that these be done at the drop of the hat. "I told her not to burn dinner, but she did it anyway - so now I'm going to shame her in front of her whole family!" Obviously that's not appropriate. Romans 2 says that the judgment is "according to what [s]he has done." There is also *always grace* and a "forgive and forget" attitude (Hebrews 8:12) for those who are repentant.

But the point is that "love your wives, just as Christ loved the church" is always taken to be the positive type of sacrificial love and rejects the harsher realities of the relational dynamic. Why did Paul then only mention the sacrificial part in this passage? Because husbands were naturally living out the other part. What modern culture finds deplorable, they found commonplace. Husbands were already disciplining their wives and dealing with them quite harshly. Paul put the "gave himself up for her" part in there not as a means of excluding all other aspects of how Christ relates with the church, but to remind them to incorporate this into the way that they were dealing with their wives because it was out of the cultural norm to do so.

Today, when the cultural norm is to be utterly beta toward one's wife, I imagine Paul would have emphasized the other side instead of this.

"Author is Giving Writers \$2,800 If They Write a Crime Novel Without a Female Victim" - What to make of this?

3 upvotes · 14 February 2018 · /r/askMRP

Ah ... it's reminiscent of Rollo's observed cycle between feminists saying "masculinity is toxic" and "you need to man up and take care of her." Or was that MMSLP?

Asking wife's consent?

3 upvotes · 14 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

[/u/Whitified](#) already linked to the Dalrock post I had in mind on something like this, so go read that. But in the meantime, I do think you're taking that one tiny phrase a bit too far. I get the impression that he's saying, "All sources are on board with this."

My guess is that what really happened is that he got the news, went home, told his wife about it, she said, "That's great, dear," he explained to her in more detail what the job would entail and she expressed a few concerns, and he said something like, "I can't do this without your support," and she said, "You have my support," and that was it.

What I seriously doubt happened is him going home and saying, "Honey, this great opportunity came up. You're the boss, so I need to have your permission before I do it. Can I do it?"

Although the first example is still a fairly weak way to approach it, it's not technically wrong. Her job is to be his helper. If he doesn't have his helper's help, that could cause problems. I know this is all just speculation, but that's how the majority of those conversations go that I've heard - and I've heard a lot. He's not asking for permission: he's asking for support from his helper. The second option would, of course, be repulsive, and I do know that many men approach things this way as well.

why is this sin new? I am fairly sure this sin did not exist till about the 1980's

Well, in Romans 1 Paul did say that people would "invent new ways of doing evil." So yes, it's possible that new sins could have been created in the 1980s - and probably still today.

I was also taught at Church that a man who expects his wife to care for the home and kids and support him is selfish and sinning

That is, of course, not sin. The reverse would also be "not sin" - if a man determined that his wife would work and he stay and home and take care of the housework. The important thing is that the man is the one leading and making the judgment calls on how to run the ship. The specific allocation of tasks isn't where the sin is found, although (as I wrote to you in another comment elsewhere) it does affect each party's temptation to abandon the biblical leader-helper dynamic, which would be sinful.

Misogyny is a sin?!! <https://www.russellmoore.com/2018/02/12/teach-boys-respect-women/>

3 upvotes · 13 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Men and women were created separately, although both were created in the image of God.

Let me note something that almost never gets said - even on this sub. God created Adam and was, at least from our temporal perspective, presumably done. When God created light he knew he was going to create the stars next and the waters and the birds and plants and all of that. He knew he was going to create man.

On a theological level, sure, he knew he was going to create woman too. But do note that God's creation of woman was reactionary to his creation of man. Not to muddle with omniscience, but the way Moses writes the narrative is as if to say that God created man, started to marvel at all he had done, then thought, "Oh, I probably shouldn't leave him alone" - as if the creation of women was an afterthought, not part of the original intent.

Now again, omniscience tells us otherwise - that God knew he was going to create woman all along, just as omniscience tells us that God knew the fall would happen all along. Consider the parallel:

- The narrative of the fall ignores God's omniscience and assumes events unfolded in a cause-effect manner where the effect of sin was distinct from the initial condition that God caused in creating the tree of knowledge of good and evil.
- The narrative of creation ignores God's omniscience and assumes events unfolded in a cause-effect manner where the effect of woman's creation was distinct from the initial condition that God caused in creating man.

Despite the parallel analogies, we find theologians and apologists vehemently trying to explain away the cause-effect dynamic as to the fall, yet fully embracing the cause-effect dynamic in the language of the text as to the creation of woman. Of course, in the interests of full disclosure, I have no problem embracing God's omniscience in the institution of evil in the world and I don't feel any compulsion to explain it away. So, I suppose under my own theology I'd undermine at least this aspect of my argument.

Nevertheless, omniscience or not, there's something to be said about the fact that the narrative is framed this way. So there, I said it. Oh yeah, Paul also said it first in 1 Timothy 2:13 (accounting for the context).

if we define a pagan patriarchy for what it is: one that bases the worth of women and girls on their sexual attractiveness and availability to men.

That's the definition of patriarchy? Could have fooled me :p He needs to open a dictionary: "a system of society or government in which the father or eldest male is head of the family and descent is traced through the male line."

I bet the author cannot cite one example of this in the past 5 years.

This point is the most worthwhile one you've made. It emphasizes that popular opinion is based not on factual representations, but on phantom allegations that pop in and out of reality, or otherwise on the one isolated anecdote that stands as an island in the sea of contrary evidence.

Misogyny is a sin?!! <https://www.russellmoore.com/2018/02/12/teach-boys-respect-women/>

3 upvotes · 13 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

First off ... why are you reading this guy's stuff in the first place? Are you really shocked that people in the church would have a pro-women sentiment?

This guy is an SJW telling Christians supporting trump is a sin

He never mentioned trump once in this article. Maybe you're talking about another article? Can't comment on this.

or the misogyny of Jesus who chose 12 MALE disciples...

I think you're confusing misogyny for gender bias. Misogyny involves an actual contempt and dislike of women. I love women. Like Sweeny Todd, I could watch pretty women all day long. /u/Whitified had a beautiful comment a few months back in a post on femininity that would knock your socks off. Misogyny in its common definition is not cool. It might even be a sin. After all, is it right to show contempt for a half of the population that God loves and adores? Gender bias is perfectly appropriate. That's what we're really addressing here - not that God prefers men over women, but that God has certainly throughout history prioritized men in certain positions of authority which have been usurped by women in modern culture.

Are these people really saved? are they really shaped by God?

We've addressed this quite a bit on this sub. The Gospel is not "grace through faith and rejecting feminism." Holding a feminist ideology doesn't disqualify someone from salvation. But it does present an incredible hindrance to someone's ability to bear fruit for God's Kingdom. Are they still made in God's image? Absolutely. Are they doing a poor job of reflecting that image to the world? Absolutely. When the fall happened, that image was broken generally. By embracing blue pill ideologies, they're simply saying that there's a part of the mirror that they're not going to try to fix because they think it looks beautiful as-is.

The Wisdom Series: Proverbs; Part One

3 upvotes · 13 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Well said. I did a study on the concept once. Guess what I found out the Greek and Hebrew words for fear *really mean!* ... fear. There are other words in Greek and Hebrew that could have more accurately communicated the concept of reverence. But the biblical authors (yes, several of them!) repeatedly say fear instead.

I'm convinced that it is the feminized church who has tried to change the meaning of this phrase to soften up God's rougher, more masculine qualities.

I mean, seriously ... imagine a husband telling his wife: "Fear me!" Instead husbands are taught to fear their wives and their emotions.

Tag: /u/Tylistanis - per your conversation with /u/OsmiumZulu, this is the prime connection to RP concepts that I see. I do agree with OZ, though, that the connection needs to be made much clearer in the future posts you put up. You'll note that my 300 series (which is ongoing) is mostly about Christian living. But in the first one I set the

context for why it's all relevant to developing godly masculinity, and in most of the posts after that I keep weaving deeper relevance. Follow that model and you should do fine.

FR: The Spousal Support Scam

3 upvotes · 9 February 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

It really has no place in modern society.

I was with you up to this line. There is something to be said for lost earning capacity due to the lifestyle practiced during the marriage.

So, if a couple gets divorced in their 20s, yeah ... spousal support is probably not necessary and most courts won't award it (or if they do, not much) because the person has plenty of time to recover any financial loss they may have incurred from abandoning their career for a few years.

But what if you have a woman who has been married for 45 years and is getting divorced at the age of 65 (a case I'm currently working on, representing the wife)? You can't say that spousal support has no place in this case - that she should just be kicked to the curb while her 56 year old husband has another 12 years of earnings at over \$150k/yr. Yes, there are some assets to be divided, but not nearly enough to get her from 65 to life expectancy. And there's no way she's going to find appropriate employment to sustain herself when she's 3 years before retirement age.

So, between these two types of extremes, where does the court draw the line? In my county it's about 10 years of marriage. If you're married for less than that, there's probably not going to be any support - or if there is, it's not much - maybe a year or two at most. Once you're over 10 years the court says that a decade of lost earning capacity is significant enough to warrant giving her a kick start in the right direction ... and the further on it is and the less likely she'll ever be able to recover, the greater the award and duration. This system makes sense. But the way it's employed in the "equalizing income" sense is pretty grotesque when you acknowledge that the other person doesn't have to give a similar return of what they were contributing - that's where the real problem is ... not in the award of support in the first place, but in the unequal lifestyle contribution.

Why the Church is Dead

3 upvotes · 9 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I was very tempted to go orthodox at one point myself. The more I looked into it the less I could swallow it. That's not to say they're bad or non-Christians or anything ... The theology is just too far off from scripture to me on several points. They're definitely not sola scriptura.

How many of you guys have hired a PI?

3 upvotes · 9 February 2018 · /r/askMRP

Variances from state to state notwithstanding, this is what I would have said.

However, if there are kids involved, a competent PI can work wonders ... But it's not worth it just for cheating. I once caught someone taking the kid to the gym. PI got footage of the kid being left alone, exiting through a back alley door, and playing barefoot atop broken glass in the alley. Psycho parenting neglect right there.

The Feminine Imperative has replaced the Holy Spirit

3 upvotes · 8 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Exactly. If a person uses their faith to push any agenda other than the one God gave us, I'd argue they're serving a different master.

The Feminine Imperative has replaced the Holy Spirit

3 upvotes · 8 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

You're absolutely right. But we're not necessarily talking about alpha men who became impotent to put a woman in charge. We're dealing with a woman who wanted to be a leader and impotent men are drawn to join that kind of a flock. They were already impotent. She was already pursuing a leadership role. They happened to find each other. This is how society works. People of similar conviction flock together.

An anatomy of butthurt and the impact on frame

3 upvotes · 7 February 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Point of the post ...

·
·
·

... your head.

This had nothing to do with whatever random example I threw out. It was about internal emotional condition during whatever response you give.

An anatomy of butthurt and the impact on frame

3 upvotes · 6 February 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

And that is my point in the alpha positive section.

211 - An anatomy of butthurt and the impact on frame

3 upvotes · 6 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

You punish her for testing you in the first place.

I still don't get your compulsion to reject compliance tests as a legit thing. Every time we pray to God to make our headache go away, we're compliance testing him. We're seeing how much God will bend his will to our own. Sometimes he does it ... if he feels like it. Other times he says no. If God just did everything we asked all the time like a beta, this world would be screwed up. We trust him because he knows in his infinite wisdom when to say yes and no - but the request itself still matters.

I would hate a world where God punished every person who asked him to heal their sick grandmother. "Don't test me! I'm God! You don't ask me to do things! I'm going to make your boss fire you now, you ungrateful peasant!" That's not God.

A 'real man' holds her responsible for not testing him in the first place.

That's about as irrational as believing that you can get rid of the feminist imperative sometime next week.

Self-Righteousness, Pietism and RP

3 upvotes · 6 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I did see that post. What you're describing though is a level above. A guy can't do that stuff freely if he feels like he has to out of obligation. Once he learns to say no first, that's when he becomes capable of saying yes of his own accord.

So a plate blocked me.

3 upvotes · 6 February 2018 · /r/askTRP

"So this plate blocked me."

Your answer is in the title: So ... ?

Wife had abortion without telling me

3 upvotes · 5 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That is what's tipping me over the edge that this is almost certainly a troll post.

There is no "Christian version" of anything

3 upvotes · 1 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

*Supposed to be

True, true.

Problem is, that we live in a world where the church is just a copy of the World

True again. This is a sad reality that I often have to break to men in my own church. The secularization (or as historical scholars prefer to say: paganization) of church practices and form has been a crippling issue for centuries, and is one of the greatest hindrances we have in fulfilling the great commission.

lagging behind the World in all moral/social issues by about 20~ years

I'm not sure I follow on this one. Are you suggesting that 20 years from now the "church" will "catch up" to the world and finally embrace things like homosexual marriage? ... as one example.

contemporary music --> contemporary gospel music. Dating ---> Christian "courtship" (dating with a fancy name). Tinder ---> Christian dating sites/apps, with the "Christian" version supposedly holier than it's secular equivalent.

That's exactly my point. nothing about "contemporary gospel music" or "courtship" or "Christian dating sites/apps" are inherently "Christian." They're not scratching off the paint. They're trying to take black paint, mixing in some white paint to create gray, and then lathering it all over themselves and saying, "At least gray is lighter than black." None of this is what God originally intended.

That's not to say that he disapproves of all of it or that there is no utility in some of it. After all, the whole point of RP isn't necessarily to change the world, but to utilize the existing structure for our own purposes. As Christians, we do have an obligation to the "ministry of reconciliation" - to reconcile the things of this world to God. But because we know that this job will never be complete, there is a degree to which we can utilize the system to accomplish our higher calling of making disciples of all nations.

There is no "Christian version" of anything

3 upvotes · 1 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Good thoughts. Of course, you have to consider ...

1. This only makes sense if the Holy Spirit isn't guiding us. The Bible says he is. We may not get it perfectly, but on the whole I believe the Spirit will keep us moving in the right direction, even if we do end up zig-zagging a bit.

2. The above argument notwithstanding, I believe that once a Christian is regenerated, they become slaves to righteousness in their minds, even if they remain slaves to sin in their flesh (Romans 7:25). So, I do believe we can *think rightly* even if we don't always *do rightly*.

Conclusion: If we are regenerated by the Holy Spirit, we can scratch away at the black paint because (1) the Spirit helps us do it, and is actually the one who does it for us, and (2) because the Spirit renews our minds so that we are capable of thinking rightly, despite our behaviors otherwise.

Wife wants to take Girls Weekend to Tahoe

3 upvotes · 31 January 2018 · /r/askMRP

Good point. I rescind my statement to the degree that OP might live in one of these places.

FR: The Spousal Support Scam

3 upvotes · 30 January 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

He historically contributed finances, predominantly. She historically contributed services, predominantly. But under the current system he must keep giving what he historically contributed, whereas there is no like expectation for her. Also, post divorce he has two jobs in his home: his and hers. She only has one: hers. This is unequal.

How Can I Bring My Girlfriend to a Relationship with Jesus?

3 upvotes · 29 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

that will hurt her tremendously and will push her much further from God's grace.

You're right. It will. But you're not responsible for how she might hypothetically react to you making a godly decision. If God says, "This is what you must do," then God is responsible for the consequences of that decision, not you. Let him figure out if/when he's going to draw her to himself. Remember: the Spirit is the one who draws people, not you. Don't pretend you can somehow stifle what the Spirit may be trying to do in her heart, or don't pretend that your staying with her can prompt something in her heart that the Spirit isn't otherwise ready or willing to do. Your job is simply to obey God and let Him be responsible for what results.

Leaving her without at least trying to minister to her in my opinion I think is the last thing God wants me to do right now. That's why I'm so lost.

This is you trying to justify your behavior with covert motives. You really want to be with her because you have ONEitis, but you're trying to convince yourself and the rest of us that it's some noble spiritual purpose.

What you're really saying, though, is that you need to trick her into thinking she has a chance at marrying you (when you really know the Bible says you can't) in the hopes that living as if this lie is a possible reality she might change her mind about Christ. That doesn't seem very Christ-like. More to the point: your underlying motive in putting on this trickery and facade is so that you can justify marrying her once she's saved without it being a biblical taboo. That's even more devious and proves even more that your heart isn't in the right place to continue this relationship.

Do I stay with her and help her find the Lord and hope she does at the expense of my own spiritual well-being

No.

or do I break her heart and push her probably permanently away from salvation so that I can abide by scripture?

Such drama here ... "probably permanently"? Who saves people: you or God? Is the fate of her eternal soul on your head or God's? Is God sitting up in heaven saying, "Sludgerants, you'd better get this right, because if not I'm blaming you for sending her to hell, and I'm not going to send my Spirit to clean up after your messes. I'm not doing anything to fix your sin!"; Of course not.

You sinned by getting in the relationship with a non-believer in the first place. Yes, there are negative, dirty consequences to that, which you'll have to deal with. But are you going to exacerbate the problem by continuing in the sin on the hope that maybe more sin will make something good happen?

Then there's her to think about too. Imagine 5 years from now and she's down your throat on why you haven't proposed yet, and you say, "Because you're not a Christian yet," and she realizes that she just wasted the last 5 years on a dead-end relationship, when she could be off pursuing things that matter to her more? Maybe your staying with her is denying her the same mud-slinging that led the prodigal son back to his father. Are you willing to gamble her potential happiness in life on an off-hope that you can do something that's beyond your power to control? "One man plants, another waters, but it is God who makes it grow." You've planted, you've watered - it's in God's hands now. Your ongoing efforts to proclaim the Gospel to her are wonderful, but if she hasn't responded to your evangelizing imperative by now, she's in God's hands, not yours.

God bless, brother, and I pray wisdom over you in this very difficult, emotional decision!

How should one phrase to a woman that they don't want to have premarital sex, however, you still want to pursue the relationship?

3 upvotes · 29 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

As my goal is to be a Marriage and Family Therapist, it's been drilled into me that emotional connection is the way to create a foundation for dating.

Yep, and every bit of that training is going to be very, very, very blue pill. Remember what you need to pass your tests, then toss it out the window.

all of the girls I've dated so far have never met my ideals in both of those aspects

Well, do you have a clearly defined mission? Have you communicated that mission to the girls you've dated so far? Have you had in-depth conversations with them about what it looks like for them to pursue that mission alongside you? Have you talked to them about their adopting your mission as their own also?

They're not going to be able to meet your ideals on those things until you lead them into it ;)

my goal is to become more like Christ through theosis and in turn becoming more fully myself through Christ

That's an excellent goal, as long as we remember three things about Jesus' life. Everything he did revolved around three of these things. He didn't do anything if it wasn't advancing all 3 of these simultaneously:

- Love God
- Love Others
- Make Disciples

He says plainly that he only acts to the glory of his father. I'd look up the verse, but I'll assume you take that as a

given. We also see his entire ministry as a means of serving others not only in physical ways, but in spiritually drawing them toward God and to himself, which is the most beneficial service we can give another. We also see that he was always amassing followers and, although he tended to the crowd, the majority of his ministry was targeted at training the 12.

So, while I fully endorse your mission in the way that Jesus actually lived his life, when most people say their goal in life is just to "be like Jesus," they usually mean: "Sin as little as possible, know theology as best as possible, and be a good person as often as possible." This type of thinking leaves out the most important aspects of what Jesus came here to do, which he then commissioned us all to do :)

If that's my mission, then how would one pursue that mission and have a woman that helps you with that mission?

Because "love God" and "love Others" are basic concepts that virtually every church already works toward, the only thing about your mission that makes it unique is the "make disciples" part. That's why I just skip to the chase and tell people that my mission is disciple-making. And I 100% believe that this mission is given to all believers, no matter your background, gifting, character, personality, spiritual maturity, age, etc.

As for how you invite your wife alongside you, it starts with theological conversations where you passively (and if she's willing: actively) teach her that her greatest contribution to God's Kingdom is through disciple-making.

Once she's on board with the vision intellectually, she's got to try it on for size. Rather than re-inventing the wheel, I'll defer you to [208 - Leadership Part 2](#).

Once she's living out your mission on her own, you then combine your efforts and start working collectively as a team, whether by jointly leading small groups to train new waves of disciple-makers, or by picking another married couple to disciple together, both through joint and gender-isolated time together. Or maybe you do it in the context of counseling other married couples in your church jointly, but utilize the opportunity to lead them closer to Christ. Or maybe you start a ministry where you and your wife invite others to go rock climbing and you jointly try to transition the conversation to talk about Jesus. Or maybe you invite neighbors over weekly for a meal to build a relationship toward the goal of talking about Jesus - and in any of these options you have time alone between the two of you to debrief about how the time was and how you can take the next steps. See how this one mission can apply in countless contexts?

Or is that not what you mean by mission?

That just depends on what you mean. As I say in 108, a mission that's focused on only you, her, or the marriage is a garbage mission and often results in so much internal conflict that the marriage dies - even if that mission is something like "grow closer to God together." Yes, it's technically a mission, but it's one that's doomed to fail if it doesn't extend into the world for the purposes God put you here for. The mission is to make disciples. You and her can decide the context in which you do that.

I honestly just want a woman that I enjoy being around and is one of my best friends in life. I hope that isn't blue pill of me to say, haha, but I'd rather that than a woman that I have no friendship/emotional connection with.

It is certainly very blue pill to say, haha. The thing is: if you try to make that type of a relationship a goal to pursue, you will always end up failing. If you abandon that goal and pursue a red pill praxeology about your life, you're going to get your original goal met anyway. You will have that "best friends in life" type relationship with her. But it only happens when you abandon that as a priority, otherwise that friendship will die (reference 108 again).

To be clear, this is similar to the way we become great in the Kingdom of Heaven. If we're trying to be "great"

Jesus says we will actually become the least. But when we give up on that goal and simply do what we're supposed to do, that's the only way we can actually become great anyway. Likewise, if you try to make a "best friends" type marriage work, it will fail; but give up on it and just do what God designed you to do as a man, you'll get that anyway.

How should one phrase to a woman that they don't want to have premarital sex, however, you still want to pursue the relationship?

3 upvotes · 29 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

want to date (get to know her on a deeper emotional level) still

This phrase triggered me to reply again. The purpose of dating isn't to develop an emotional connection. That's your blue pill ideologies coming back to haunt you.

In Malachi 2:15 God makes clear that the purpose of marriage is to produce "godly offspring." That can be physical (as was the case in the OT) or spiritual offspring (as Romans 9 clarifies). In short, because we're in a post-Gospel world, the purpose of marriage and sex is no longer about having babies (i.e. the Catholic attitude), but to produce spiritual generations from our relationship.

Put more clearly: when dating, your goal isn't to develop a deeper emotional connection; rather, it's to work together toward the purpose of making disciples. This is what you should be assessing: "Is she going to help me be a more effective disciple-maker, or is she going to be a distraction?"

Now, in 1 Cor. 7 Paul says that marriage will always be a distraction over service to God. I agree with him entirely. In Matthew 19:10-12 Jesus and the apostles reach the same conclusion - that it's better to remain single so you can be fully devoted to advancing the Kingdom of God (note: Jesus says "for the Kingdom" and not just to edify one's own personal relationship with God, redoubling the focal point on discipleship specifically).

In RP terms, I'd think of it this way: You're the man. You must have a mission. You're inviting a woman to walk alongside you in that mission as your helper. If you make a "deeper emotional level" with her your focus, you are distracted from the mission, and this will cripple your relationship long-term. So, just go do your thing and if she's adding value to your pursuit of your mission, then bring her on board and marry her. If she's not adding value, keep on your mission without her.

"But shouldn't I be adding value to her as well? Shouldn't it be mutual?" You don't add value to her by pursuing her. Your value contribution to the marriage is that she gets to vicariously leech off of your successes in Christ. Whatever you do, as the woman at your side she gets to share in the credit as the one who helped you do it. This is my wife's attitude. This is how women throughout Scripture viewed their marriages. It is the way it should be.

Now, because I'm a sucker for musicals, let me quote a song from the movie *The Last Five Years* (wonderful film chock full of red pill principles!). The guy is a brilliant, successful writer and Anna Kendrick is a failing actress. She's jealous of his successes, but starts to realize her role in all of it:

And then he smiles

His eyes light up, and how can I complain?

Yes, he's insane, but look what he can do

And I'm a part of that

And it's true, I tend to follow in his stride

Instead of side by side I take his cue
True, but there's no question, there's no doubt
I said I'd stick it out and follow through
And when I do
Then he smiles
And where else can I go?
I didn't know the rules do not apply
And then he smiles and nothing else makes sense
While he invents the world that's passing by
And I'm a part of that ... aren't I? I'm a part of that

In other words, he's doing all of these amazing things, and even though she's failing in her own arena (despite his support of her), she finds value in the fact that she has contributed to his successes. She gets to take part in all of his accomplishments as the one who supported him, inspired him, etc.

What's your mission and are you looking for someone to be "a part of that" in your life?

How Can I Bring My Girlfriend to a Relationship with Jesus?

3 upvotes · 29 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Haha, I like the message, but I'd prioritize it this way ... "Never, ever, EVER get involved with a non-Christian, especially a feminist one."

How Can I Bring My Girlfriend to a Relationship with Jesus?

3 upvotes · 29 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I fully endorse this. Let me add two things, though:

1. In 1 Cor. 7 Paul says that even marrying another believer will lead you away from making God your first priority. How much more if you marry a non-believer!
2. There are very few reasons a guy would refuse to leave a non-Christian girlfriend. An extreme example might be that they have a kid together and he risks losing custody. At that point you're already steeped in sin and now just dealing with the consequences. But the most common reason, which I think is OP's clear issue, is a severe ONEitis for the non-Christian girl. Seriously ... what's so unique and special about her that you have to violate Scripture over her? If he doesn't have ONEitis, then he'd have no problem backing out.

This is part of why ONEitis is so dangerous.

FR: The Spousal Support Scam

3 upvotes · 28 January 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Yeah, didn't see that post, but if you can settle without an attorney, do it. I tell my consults that all the time,

suggesting they only come to me to review their documents after they reach an agreement.

The Red Pill Documentary

3 upvotes · 27 January 2018 · /r/RedPillWomen

As a heads up, I think it's on Hulu, if you're already a subscriber.

Christian dating: Good book 2 read together?

3 upvotes · 26 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Yeah, those are definitely not books to read together.

How to Handle a Veiled Threat of Domestic Abuse?

3 upvotes · 25 January 2018 · /r/askMRP

You threatening to go to the church elders is weak.

For context, [/u/stormtrooper10933](#) is referencing the Matthew 18 process. It's incredibly likely his wife understands this aspect of church culture and biblical doctrine, so she wouldn't take it as him crying to mommy. Instead, a Christian woman would understand this to mean three things:

- he's willing to escalate the matter to the highest degree of reprimand that the faith permits
- that he will have her deemed an "apostate" or a "non-Christian" (depending on their denomination), thus crippling her ability to participate in many church functions
- with her being deemed a non-Christian, this is the first step in opening the door to divorce without him losing his standing in the church

This last one is most likely what she would take from the threat. In short, this is a Christian way of saying, "Get in line or I'm starting the process to get out." RP suggests men make this threat all the time (assuming it's an honest one). But without knowledge of church culture and biblical doctrine, it's easy to mistake that phrase the way you did ;)

THE FOUNTAIN OF TRUTH

3 upvotes · 25 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Good to see some things here have helped you :) I'd love to hear more of your story. Why not make a post and let us know what your journey has looked like so far? Give all the same information you would in an FR or a post on the OYS threads in MRP!

Question about dating - denominational question - (22 y/o male)

3 upvotes · 24 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

All theologically conservative denominations seek out objective truth the best they can. Some are just not intelligent about it. For example, SDAs keep following false prophets. Pentecostals trust in individual prophetic revelation, which on some occasions may be genuine, but there's no real standard for filtering out all the phonies.

I recommended LCMS (not all Lutherans) because they have the best theology I know of AND because you said you see value in tradition and want to find that in wherever you go. To be clear, I'm not LCMS myself, but I do have a deep respect for them.

Question about dating - denominational question - (22 y/o male)

3 upvotes · 24 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Avoid Episcopalians like the plague. They are on the most liberal end of the spectrum among protestants. They reject objective truth and instead believe that culture is the lens through which scripture should be interpreted. So, as culture changes so does the meaning of the bible, ergo their broad acceptance of homosexuality, abortion, etc. The Episcopalian church by me has people on paid staff who are open atheists.

From what you're saying, Lutheran Missouri Synod would be perfect for you. The LCMS also does not have a hard stance on birth control, add I believe other Lutherans do. LCMS also has the strongest scriptural basis for their theology. Also, as Lutherans, they value tradition while appropriately placing it as subordinate to scripture.

To be clear, anything I say in this thread is my own personal views and should not reflect how I intend to moderate the sub. I welcome Catholics, orthodox, Episcopalians, etc. to share their views as well. Although I may have some strong disagreements, I still embrace brothers in Christ who do not compromise the core elements of the Gospel.

Filtering RP through a Christian Worldview

3 upvotes · 23 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Interesting story. Asking a girl to lunch crosses my boundaries, but if you can go further safely, that's your call. But the further you go the greater your temptation.

What I really wanted to note, though, is that the plate was spinning the first time she laughed at one of your jokes over a year ago.

What to do from here is play the Fiona/Donkey game from MMSLP. Your wife is Fiona (presumably most of the time, that is) and this other girl is donkey. Shrek has fun with Donkey, spends time around Donkey, and has playful banter with Donkey. But he's never going to put himself in a position where he's tempted to screw Donkey.

Fasting and lifting

3 upvotes · 22 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

With your stats, I wouldn't recommend doing a cut fast. As [/u/Whitified](#) said, there are other ways to fast than food.

Otherwise, you could look into intermittent fasting. Personally, about 5 days a week I skip breakfast and lunch and only eat dinner, usually right after I get back from the gym after work. The fact that I'm not eating for 22-ish hours before I lift might have an impact on my lifts, but my body knows the routine by this point, so I really don't feel it much.

Fasting and lifting

3 upvotes · 22 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I second this.

Thanks for the sub, here's my story

3 upvotes · 11 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

A ... a familiar tale, sad to say. I lived this in a microcosm with my first girlfriend. We weren't married, obviously, but she constantly cheated and I constantly tried to reconcile and it was all just a vain effort. I've also seen countless (literally) people who have been through what you're going through. Just a couple months ago a guy from my church went through this. He asked his wife how many guys she was with while they were married and her response was, "Less than 20." She also gave the "I'll figure things out with God after I settle down with a man" line. Of course, she has yet to settle down.

I don't say any of that to minimize your pain, but to tell you you're not alone. Go to your beta/blue friends and you'll probably hear something like, "Sorry, dude. That sucks and all. I guess it just wasn't meant to be" or "If she's not happy in the marriage, what's a guy to do? I hope you can move on quickly" or "She shouldn't have done that, but you should still be trying to win her back. You can do it! She's worth it!"

The RP community (this one in particular) is about the only place where you'll get the truth: "She's a sinner just like the rest of us, and you can't change that any more than she can change herself - only Jesus can do that. A dog returns to its vomit. Unless she's truly transformed in her identity and spirit by Jesus, AWALT - and even then her old temptations will always haunt her. The fact is, she found a better man and hypergamy ran its course. Now, get back on the saddle and start reading and lifting."

I wish you the best, brother.

Thanks for the sub, here's my story

3 upvotes · 11 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Have yer upvote! This is one thing I often tell my otherwise hesitant clients.

Blood sacrifice? Really?

3 upvotes · 9 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I'm mostly in agreement with this comment. Everything about this thread makes me want to remove the whole thing, but I agree with the reasons you kept it up - and I was even planning on asking your input in modmail until I read your comment.

More to [/u/Whitified](#) - what kind of RP men would we be if we broke frame every time someone gave a bold, highly charged criticism of what we believe? Just as OZ did to Catholics, I could do to Baptists, Pentecostals, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, especially Seventh Day Adventists, Wesleyans, OZ's own Reformed Theology, my own home church: Nazarene (though I don't identify as such) ... basically everyone except the Lutherans ... They just make too much doggone good sense (though I'm not Lutheran either).

My point is that every branch of the faith has some screwed up beliefs. It's especially bad between the Catholics and the reformed because ... Well, you know ... the reformed declaring the office of the papacy to be THE antichrist and all.

Should we intentionally poke jabs at each other? Of course not. But does that mean we must cower and hide the genuine advice we have to offer for fear of upsetting someone else's security in their theological framework? I say bring it on - **when the context calls for it**. The context here called for it. Poking fun at Catholics in a thread not uniquely tailored to Catholic practices and beliefs would be less appropriate. OZ's reply can essentially be summarized: "Your beef is with Catholicism, not the bible." That's a legit reply. A Catholic defending his theology to OP is also a legit reply. Although they are clearly opposing and charged positions to hold, the value-add is there.

That said, OZ certainly trailed from respectful theological discourse. What he said added value, just as his Catholic responder also added value to the conversation. When value is being added, I'll just assume we're all man enough to take the theology-centered (as opposed to person-centered) criticism that comes with it. I err on the side of not censoring things whenever possible.

As for division, I don't think even highly charged denominational criticisms will cause much of a problem in sparse examples. If everyone started ganging up on Catholics en masse, I'd have a problem with that. Until then, I believe censoring people from expressing deeply held convictions is more likely to cause division from this particular sub when "hold frame and engage in the conversation with amused mastery" is so clearly an option for those of the aggrieved denomination. How do you think I still survive in MRP after all this time?

Blood sacrifice? Really?

3 upvotes · 9 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This would have been far more tasteful if written as a reply to OP and not an emotional (read: frame breaking) rant against another rant :/

Not a virgin

3 upvotes · 4 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

**Virginity:* That's up to you. God accepts those who were whores for other "gods" before coming to faith, and he still incorporates them as His bride. Personally, I took your path and found someone who was a virgin because that was important to me personally. My point is that there's no biblical compulsion that you must marry a virgin (rather, Paul assumes non-virgins can marry too), but it's certainly a standard that was honored among God's people for millenia. As you say, the character implications are most important to me when making that assessment, not even just the virginity itself. God can purify her, but to be sanctified ... there has to be mutuality in that and my trust over whether or not wants to pursue sanctification is lower for a woman who has a longer history of sleeping around as compared with someone who has only been with 1 or 2 people as compared with a virgin.

Red Flags: Yeah, these are serious concerns. She probably doesn't meet your standard of character. To pursue a relationship with her would be to lower your standard. Are you okay with that? I mean, really, that's what you're asking us: "Hey guys, should I lower my standards? Are they too high?" Your standards are yours. Personally, I don't compromise much. But when I was dating, I also didn't have to compromise. I was the prize. It wasn't until after I married that I lost my alpha and had to rediscover it over the last year +.

Where to Find: Look up OZ's guide for singles on the sidebar. [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) really hit it out of the park with that one.

Now, more generally, what you're dealing with is the "Pick 2 of 3" principle. The three things are: (1) Attractive, (2) Single, (3) committed to Christ. The likelihood of finding someone who meets all three is astronomically low. I think [ruizbujc did a statistical analysis](#) on it and found that if you attended 9 churches simultaneously, each being the median church size in the country, that's what it would take to find 1 person who was the right gender, spiritually mature, single, and of an acceptable age. If you remove the "spiritually mature" part and just go with "genuine Christian," this changes to only needing to attend 3 median-sized churches simultaneously to have 1 girl in that whole crowd. Then, of course, you have to find a way among all those people to actually meet this girl.

At this point you have two options: (1) pray and hope God exercise divine authority to bring you together, which does happen on rare circumstances, or (2) compromise on some point. Here's how this plays out:

- **Attractive:** If you want to compromise here, go for it. This is your easiest way to finding someone who meets all of the rest of your criteria. But be cautious about what type of "unattractive" you look for because that has implications elsewhere. For example, a seriously obese girl likely struggles with gluttony and self-control, implying that she's probably not as spiritually mature as she thinks she is. So, while she might be a virgin - is that because she is self-controlled with her sexuality to be able to follow God, or is it because her lack of self-control has put her in a place where she's never been tempted toward premarital sex in the first place? Looks aren't everything, but they certainly do matter and tell a lot more than just surface-level information.
- **Single:** This is the easiest one to compromise, if the options are there, but it's also a bit of a catch-22. If she's already married, obviously stay away. Don't break up her marriage. She wouldn't be a virgin at that point anyway, so it would violate one of your given standards. But if she's attractive and spiritually mature and only dating a guy, I say you put yourself in the mix and see what happens. I wouldn't try to get her broken up, but if you're a high value man and she's dating a spiritually immature sleaze ball, for example, then you're probably

doing her a favor. But if she's with a guy who's a quality man and she happens to notice your presence and availability and decides she likes you better, let her make that judgment call - don't take that choice away from her merely out of respect for the other guy ... **UNLESS** the other guy is someone you're spiritually investing in. I have a long story on that, but I'll spare you the details. Suffice it to say, your investment in someone you're discipling is a higher priority than a potential relationship that may or may not turn into marriage.

- **Spiritual Maturity:** This is the one where you're most likely going to have to cave. The question is simply how much. If she's so spiritually immature that she's sleeping around with other men, I wouldn't touch that. Chances are she's not even saved if she has no discretion in following Christ. Those who are transformed live as one who is transformed and repent quickly when they fail, not returning to their vomit constantly. But do remember that Christ pursued us while we were still sinners. He didn't wait for someone else to meet his standard first. He became a standard and used his perfection to deem us perfect and to sanctify us into becoming perfect. [The 105 post](#) goes way more into detail on this.

In short, my solution is that if you can't find a spiritually mature woman with the convictions you're looking for, raise her up. Don't date non-Christians. But if you see a non-Christian who has what you're looking for, while avoiding giving any IOIs, share the Gospel with her. If she responds and comes to faith, then begin discipling her and let the relationship blossom. Whereas secular RP will say "create your slut," I say "disciple your bride." It's the same concept, but addresses the whole of what you, as a man, should be doing for your bride-to-be anyway, per Ephesians 5.

Thoughts on "premarital sex" and polygamy

3 upvotes · 4 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Dang, brother ... I had no idea it was this bad. Thanks for the info on this!

Thoughts on "premarital sex" and polygamy

3 upvotes · 4 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I agree with everything you've said. The primary reason for bringing up PMS isn't to encourage it, but to cause people to take it more seriously - to realize that having sex with someone is entering into a spiritual bond that shouldn't be taken lightly as it often is today.

The RP is tearing me apart. Don't know what to do.

3 upvotes · 2 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

There was no conversation. He was trying to convince you to abandon the red pill altogether. The merits of that position would make for an interesting discussion. I wouldn't mind entertaining theologically grounded purple pill debate here. But he didn't even try - he just linked to other subs with no actual words/thoughts of his own to explain why. This is low-effort/quality and doesn't give me enough room to bend my own rules in favor of my more intellectual nature that loves a good conversation that challenges deeply held convictions. If he tried to pull that on MRP he would have been banned instantly for "concern trolling." I tend to be more lenient.

Merry Christmas RPC :)

3 upvotes · 25 December 2017 · /r/RPChristians

You all too!

Red Pill for my wife?

3 upvotes · 24 December 2017 · /r/RPChristians

If you mention anything with "red pill" in the name beware. Think of it like you're a magician on stage. There's someone in the crowd who loves your magic and is fascinated by the whole thing and even dabbles in it a bit herself.

Now, imagine pointing her to a website that explains how all of your tricks are done and it's where you go for all of your content. You think, "This would be perfect for her! It's just the kind of thing she'd love!" And she does love every second of it. She pores into the theory, studies the concepts, trap designs, etc. and is impressed at how much you've been able to master for use in your act.

And then she shows up to your next show. She wants to be impressed ... But somehow the magic is ... gone.

But yes, women are welcome here. For Christian women this will hopefully one day be a better forum for her than RPW. As it stands, there's not much harmony between TRP/MRP and RPW. RPW even recently had a popular post that explained that RP women **do not** want an RP man (in the TRP sense, at least). They have embraced the same core set of truths, but have different agendas in utilizing them.

In Christianity this is different. The male and female agendas are in harmony (albeit in a very convoluted way, due to sin), so an RPC man and an RPC woman should naturally be drawn to one another. The only problem for your wife looking to this sub at present is that we simply don't have enough women to give her a reasonable breadth of perspective from her own sex. I'm okay with that and don't intend actively to seek to change the status quo on this, but I'm also cool if a shift happens ... just have to see how that plays out when/if the time comes, and would probably have to crack the whip more on modding.

Be the Judge

3 upvotes · 19 December 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I'm not postulating, you said as much before.

Saying so was either out of context (as in a case W&S once cited) or was from when I first discovered RP and was working the blue out. To quote WISNIFG: "IV: You have the right to change your mind."

With all due respect to your grandfather, it sounds like you were expecting human church authorities to be the deterrent to any of the divorces either of them may have gone through. That's not what I was referencing.

How to get out of "sure I'll do that for you honey" fram and into "sur, if you make sure you deserve it" frame?

3 upvotes · 15 December 2017 · /r/askMRP

This is the answer.

Book Suggestions?

3 upvotes · 12 December 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Check out the "working on the sidebar" thread (stickied). It has a lot of suggestions in there.

She's not your's it's just your turn

3 upvotes · 17 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I can't count the number of times I've seen people who had the appearance of great godliness - even to their spouses - and who were leaders in the church, preaching sermons, leading ministries, etc. ... who ended up getting caught cheating on their spouses. As you say, "there is no guarantee. None." Even the most seemingly secure

relationships always have that chance. Now, the risk is insanely low for some relationships ... but it's still there.

Wife complains that she feels like I am "leaving her behind".

3 upvotes · 13 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Well said.

Visualize yourself

Fake it til you make it ... it works more often than not.

Failed a fitness test tonight

3 upvotes · 13 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Good word.

These conversations should be separated by time though.

This is key, but even more importantly is to remember that the man must be the one to initiate the reincarnation of the conversation. If she has to bring it up again a couple days later and say, "Did you pray about that?" she's back in the captain's chair and being condescending as if she's your mommy who has to make sure you're doing your chores.

By being the man and initiating that renewal of the conversation, you're showing her (1) that you take her position as your first officer seriously, which helps her take your position as captain seriously, and (2) it lets you set the tone for the conversation on your terms with her doing minimal prep in what she wants to say, so you get to control the course of how things go, which helps avoid DEERING if she were otherwise to put you on the defensive.

What is the difference between an "alpha" and a sociopath?

3 upvotes · 10 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Watch the tone.

Hypergamy for the Married Man

3 upvotes · 9 November 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I appreciate the feedback here. But let me be clear: divorce is certainly an option for me if ...

1. My wife initiates it
2. She cheats on me
3. She expressly disowns the marriage, even without committing 1 or 2
4. Possibly **if she becomes too sexually defiant**
5. If remaining in the marriage would lead to greater sin than divorce
6. If I'm willing to admit that I'm not as spiritually mature as I purport to be

Yes, I have a higher threshold that must be reached than most of you, but at the same time, even if I were a non-Christian I wouldn't divorce my wife under her current behavior. She is simply responding too well, which tells me that most of her sexual denial issues were not her failing as a wife, but my failing at being a man and leading.

True story, woke up in the middle of the night three days ago to a hand job - with three of our kids sleeping on

the floor in our room. The thought of doing something like that with kids around before would have never crossed her mind ... and hand jobs were rare based on her prior framework of what types of sexual acts were acceptable and not.

The things I referenced in my post as practical application points were simply things I do naturally that I've seen good results from - not me pining over how to get my wife to screw me because I'm too weak to get pussy somewhere else if I wanted it.

Seriously, I don't fully understand how I'm constantly accused of being purple. I'd wager I'm more detached from my wife and outcome independent of the relationship as a whole than even many of the endorsed contributors. I've even told my wife to her face (not that I recommend this) that if she died or left me I would not be crushed, as it would make it easier to pursue my mission without dragging her along. Since that conversation, now she's my scout ship - the smaller vessel that chugs ahead to find opportunities for me to steer toward.

She's abandoned her mission and is doing a lot of the footwork in mine - and has completely adopted and internalized it as her own ... AND is actively teaching other women to do the same for their husbands. Literally just last night she was bragging for my approval about how she was with a group of girls whose husbands were drunk captains (not that she knows it by that name) and how their marriages would be so much better if they could help their husbands find a mission, then be first officers in helping him carry it out and how they'll be miserable until this happens. Her attitude toward me was basically, "Didn't I do a great job, master? Are you proud of me?" And if I hadn't literally just had my balls cut up a few hours before (vasectomy yesterday) she was giving me the "Screw me hard right now!" look. I almost did it anyway, until a bandage fell off and I changed my mind.

She's as much on my mission as I am! She's totally hot. She's sexually responsive. She's gradually increasing sexual boundaries. She's submissive to my leadership. She gives me no attitude 363 days out of the year.

Is she perfect? Not at all. Could I find someone younger and mold her too be better than my wife? Easily. But why would I go through all that time and effort when in the last year (especially in the last 6 months of being RP) I've got her living almost exactly as I want? Why would I abandon all the progress I've made or put the relationship at risk just to prove a point to the fine people of this community?

If that makes me purple, oh well. I'd rather have everything I want and be called purple than risk a good thing just to earn a title among men I've never met.

I'm not sure where these accusations come from that I'm in her frame when I literally feel right now like I'm the one getting everything I want out of my marriage ... except oral (and who's to say that's not another few months down the road?). I suppose I would like it if her initiations were stronger ... but [/u/BluepillProfessor](#) has me pretty well convinced that I should expect my wife to be the initiator anyway - and I'm content in that.

Other than those two things, I feel like I'm in a pretty darn ideal and perfect world lately. So with all respect, screw whatever "purple haze" or "purple pill Christian" labels people here want to give me. My goal here is to help men get a piece of what I have, not show them how to earn titles or respect from internet strangers.

Back to Basics – Mystery Method, The Game, and the Rules of the Game, Married Edition

3 upvotes · 3 November 2017 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

Fantastic post. And I thought I was long-winded!

Back to Basics – Mystery Method, The Game, and the Rules of the Game, Married Edition

3 upvotes · 3 November 2017 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

Interesting. I've never heard of the cube, but after reading up on it, I'm reminded of the way I used to experiment on people (and occasionally still do). One of the examples that would get positive responses (as opposed to the many things I tried that didn't) would go something like this:

- **Intro:** I approach someone on an innocuous issue. It might be, "Nice shoes," or "Can you hand me that?" or "Hey, did you just see that guy do ____?" For the sake of example, let's say I start with, "Nice weather." Her reply doesn't matter. Maybe she says, "Not really, I don't like snow."
- **Random Assertion:** I say something random out of context as a categorizing statement ... let's go with: *It's just like the Cuban bananas thing.* She gives a weird look and says, "That seems ... random" or "I've never heard of that."
- **Pressure-Flip:** For a split second I sound autistic, but my confidence demands a different conclusion, and I flip the pressure on her to make her feel like the weird one for not understanding: *Huh, that's weird ... why do you think that was random?* I keep pressure flipping until she gives the inevitable answer: "Well, we were talking about the weather and then you said something about Cuba and bananas, and I don't get it."
- **Interest Flip:** I respond: *Interesting. You've got my attention now. Give me your best guess* [as if it was her trying to get my attention rather than the other way around]. She makes up something about how maybe the weather in Cuba has chemicals in the rain that would cause Cuba to grow weird bananas and that must be what I was talking about.
- **Unsolicited Disclosures:** Whatever her answer is, I point out how ridiculous it is: *That's ridiculous. Why would the weather in Cuba cause bananas to grow any differently there than anywhere else?* Then I highlight something she said and connect it to her personally. Ex. 1: *I mean, are you some kind of chemical botanist? or It's interesting that you mentioned rain; I never said rain. Do you have some kind of a rain obsession?* Whatever it is, it's obvious that the answer is no, but the question is designed to make her seem like the weird one and get defensive, then reveal a truth about herself to correct my bizarre accusation without me ever directly asking her for that information.
- **Loop for More:** I keep up a cycle of asking these types of questions, refusing to allow the conversation to follow predictable patterns, always revolving around the one random statement that she can't figure out. After a while, she's totally confused about what I'm talking about, but the confidence with which I'm talking makes her think that I must be making perfect sense and it's just her that doesn't get it, adding to the mystery.
- **The Ta-Da:** Whenever I'm ready, I stop and say, *You know, this has been an interesting conversation, but you don't have to try so hard.* She's all like, "What are you talking about?" I say, *I just commented on the weather and you start telling me your whole life story ... how you work as an interior designer for a home remodeling company and you love going running in the rain and your sister visited Cuba a year ago and you were jealous that you couldn't join her,* etc. She's vaguely impressed that I had learned so much about her and she knows nothing about me. Sometimes I'd get a light punch me in the arm out of playful enjoyment at having met a guy who could dupe her with a fun little game, displaying my dominance of the conversation and intellectual value/cleverness at keeping her going.
- **Epilogue:** Sometimes she'd not get it right away and assume the Cuban bananas line really did mean something and would ask about it at the end. I simply say, *Hey now, I just made that up to see what you'd say and you practically threw yourself at me. I'm not that easy, you know.* Since I'm more of a catch-and-release guy, the two times I've tried this routine since finding RP I've also ended with making a joke about my wife finding out some stranger is hitting on me and how she must have some serious balls to hit on a married man and that I'm not into people with balls anyway. She points out she had no way of knowing, and I just laugh it off with, *It was nice to meet you, but I've gotta get going.*

The World vs Faith

3 upvotes · 2 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I get what you mean by "missing out." I used to feel that way too, and someone else wrote a post on that very _____

subject a few weeks ago. My response is essentially that sin is like meth. Yeah, I know it must feel insanely good. But I also see its addictive nature, the way that it ruins people's lives, the way it affects their brain chemistry, and the host of other negatives that go along with it. Result? I'm curious at what it feels like, but I'm perfectly fine avoiding that path entirely. For more information, check out [207](#), which addresses how we're meant to handle temptation and sin like this.

But I think what you're getting at is really more of a reconciliation of certain red pill expressions with our faith. "The red pill" has a dichotomy between its *descriptive* components and its *prescriptive* components ([see this foundational post for more information](#)). As a descriptive understanding of how the world works, *the red pill* is insanely accurate - far better than scientists and psychologists and politicians have figured out. There are some practical realities that simply can't be tested by an authentic scientific method, so trial and error, experience, and common stories are about the best that the secular world can get, which is what the red pill is, at its core. Someone like [/u/Whitified](#) will tell you that it stops there.

But the reddit community decided to take "the red pill" to another level: *turning it into sexual strategy*. Indeed, the *descriptive* aspects of the red pill that form its core were discovered in an effort to develop sexual strategy in the first place (TRP started as a breakaway from seddit), but there started to develop an attitude that if someone *really* embraced those descriptive aspects, then he would inherently embrace certain tangential ideologies too. One of those tangential ideologies is the "anti-marriage" notion that you've picked up on. So, anyone who is "pro-marriage" or "marriage-neutral" is not truly a "red pill man" even if he otherwise embraces all of the other underlying truths. This attitude actually makes perfect sense *if sex is a man's highest priority in life*. So, if we stick to the notion that RP is sexual strategy and nothing else, then these tangential ideologies really must be embraced for a man to be truly "red pill." That said, at RPC we are firmly convicted that it is *appropriate* and even *necessary* that men have other priorities in life higher than sexual fulfillment. From a secular standpoint, sex is the epitome of pleasure, so it makes sense that they would make sexual fulfillment their highest pleasure. But for Christians, we have higher priorities, which allow us to embrace 100% of the *descriptive* red pill truths and acknowledge that even the *prescriptive* strategies laid out on places like TRP and MRP are actually the best models, while still giving ourselves freedom to maintain priorities that are higher than those strategies, and thus we may pick and choose which tools to use in our sexual strategy tool-belt, while rejecting the tools that are inconsistent with our higher priorities.

divorce rates are terrible

Secular RP is really worried about this - and rightfully so. The secular divorce rates as well as the divorce rates of "casual Christians" are really high. That said, among Christians who have an active lifestyle of evangelism and discipleship, I seem to recall the rates being something like 5% or less. That means that if you actually live out your faith and it's not just something you think about on Sunday mornings, you have a 95% chance of maintaining your marriage for life.

How can anyone tell someone to spin plates or run game on a woman with just the intention to have sex and nothing more, and be a godly man.

Again, you choose which tools you want to put in your belt. If spinning plates isn't one of those tools because it's inconsistent with our faith, then don't use that tool if your faith is a higher priority to you (as it is for me). That said, spinning plates doesn't require "the intention to have sex." To quote Rollo: "Spinning Plates doesn't necessarily mean you're f---ing all of your plates. It's more of a spreading out of your efforts across a wider pool of subjects." To that end, having a friendly conversation with the waitress across the street from your office periodically is technically "spinning a plate." It develops confidence and abundance mentality, and as long as you're not doing it for the purpose of trying to cheat on your wife, there's nothing unbiblical about it. I get other women showing IOIs toward me periodically - some where I've initiated a harmless conversation and they escalated it to that level and others where they initiated. There's nothing unbiblical about just talking to another

woman. It's the modern church that tells us we must set our boundaries higher than biblical standards to make sure we don't cross biblical lines - that's where the problem lies. When the Pharisees did this, Jesus rebuked them for it.

I want to do right, but it just seems to me that right is not only not respected, but isn't valued to any extent really whether it be women or anything else

If you're looking for validation from people - be it RP, women, or the church - you're already moving in the wrong direction. Galatians 1:10 is clear: if you're seeking to please people or get your validation from them and not God, then you aren't rightly a disciple of Christ in the first place. So, who cares whether or not you get respected or valued by other people for doing good? You're not supposed to care about them when you're doing these actions - what you do you do for God.

What's the possibility of a "divorce explosion" in the near future?

3 upvotes · 1 November 2017 · /r/askMRP

I'm inclined to agree with [/u/BobbyPeru](#). Marriage rates are on the decline, so there will be fewer divorces. Statistically, that alone doesn't affect the rate/ratio, but the people who would likely have ended up divorced are the ones who are choosing not to marry in the first place (wise decision, IMO). So, of the people who do get married, they're the ones who had a stronger chance to hold out anyway. Accordingly, I anticipate things will plateau where they are now or the divorce rate may marginally decline in the next couple decades. As [/u/creating_my_life](#) said, the interesting thing will be to see what happens when the 20-somethings are at the point that they would have been getting divorced had they married.

Broken beta asking for help with RP career advice

3 upvotes · 30 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Your solution is a blend of upcoming 300-level and 400-level content (sorry, been too busy to write much lately). Specifically, you need a mission and you also need some internal healing.

What's your purpose in life? My guess is you really don't feel like you have one yet and you think your job (whatever that ends up being) will give you one. Wrong.

- *We are human beings, not human doings. Don't try to define yourself by what you do; live out of who you are.*

Who are you? If you're saved, you're a child of God. Period. Let that truth sink in and percolate for a while. All of your internal healing will come from that one core acknowledgment. Of course, it spreads outward from there, but that's going to be the center of it - that because of the Gospel (Jesus' death and resurrection to save you from sin), you have a restored relationship with God as one of his adopted children and the bride of Christ. [Note: that always fascinates me - that it's not enough God wanted me as his son-in-law by virtue of my union with Christ; he went the next level to adopt me of his own accord.]

As with all children, their identity is given to them by their parents - both in the genetic sense and in the way that we're raised. Eventually we get to move out and become our own people, but as Christians we will dwell in the house of the Lord forever, so we continue to draw our identity from Him for all of time. With that in mind, along with our identity comes our purpose. You cannot decide your purpose for yourself, if you want any true satisfaction in life. You've got to live out God's purpose for you.

- *When we acknowledge that we can't live life on our own because we have no life apart from God, that's when we are able to let God step in to begin living His life through us.*
 - Are you living your life or God's life? If it's your life, where'd you get it from?
- *If you're not living out the reason for why God put you here, that's a pretty darn good explanation for why*

you're not satisfied with the life you're living.

So, what's God's purpose for you? They're summarized in the three Greats:

- Love **G**od (greatest command), Matthew 22:37-38
- Love **O**thers (second greatest command), Matthew 22:39
- Make **D**isciples (great commission), Matthew 28:19-20

These are inextricably linked. If you fail in one, you fail in all three.

- If you don't love God, you can't love others (1 John 4:8) or make disciples (Matthew 12:30).
- If you don't love others, you can't love God (1 John 4:20; Matthew 25:40-46) or make disciples (John 13:34-35).
- If you're not making disciples, you can't love God (John 21:15-17; John 14:21) or love others (John 15:16-17).

Most Christians think they have the G and O parts down, but they forget the D, or otherwise try to find ways of rejecting it because that means they actually have to *do something* - something *uncomfortable* sometimes. It's much easier just to assume God's only purpose for us is to avoid sinning (i.e. "not doing something"). God is a God of action, not inaction. Find that thing he wants you doing, then go do it. That's where your satisfaction in life will come from. I am confident that this is the mission to make disciples.

Why am I confident about this mission? Because it's only one of two things that we can do on earth that cannot possibly be done in heaven. You want to avoid sin? You have all of eternity in heaven to be sinless. You want to study theology? You have God Himself at your disposal in heaven to learn from. You want to worship God? You have all of time to sing His praises. You want to evangelize and make disciples? Oops, can't do that up there. Oh yeah, that must be why we're here instead, then. In fact, Paul says this plainly: "I desire to depart and be with Christ, which is better by far. But it is more necessary for you that I remain in the body. Convinced of this, I am certain I will remain and will continue with all of you for your progress and joy in the faith" (Philippians 1 somewhere). Who are you helping to "progress" in the faith? Who are you giving the "joy" of faith to in the first place? That's your purpose.

Now, Jesus lays out another plan: "Seek first His Kingdom and His righteousness and all these things will be added to you as well" (Matthew 6:33). In other words, if you're worried about your job or money or clothes or time or finding a wife or whatever - God's solution is, "Don't worry about it. Just pursue the mission I have set for you and I'll take care of the rest." Interestingly, RP teaches that being DNGAF is the best way to show strength and attract a wife to you. It also demonstrates confidence in your performance to employers (if your work quality stands on its own, of course). But you can only *actually* maintain that attitude if you have a purpose beyond your work itself.

As for the internal healing ... that will have to be a conversation for another day. I can help with stress, anxiety, and all that, but it's a much longer conversation and it will ultimately fail if you don't have a mission anyway. So, you've got to get started with this. Easiest way? Find someone to disciple you.

How do I know if marriage is right for us?

3 upvotes · 20 October 2017 · /r/askMRP

This past weekend I caught my wife telling my son, "You have to learn to be nice to everyone."

Me: "Not necessarily. Son, unless someone is causing a problem, you should be courteous, polite, and respectful to everyone - but you don't have to be nice." <Aside to my wife> "I don't want him to be a pushover."

My wife gives me a weird look. Says, "Hmm ..." and thinks for 5 minutes in silence. Out of the blue she turns off the radio: "I think you're right."

Me: "Of course I'm right."

Failure, not sure why

3 upvotes · 20 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Haha, this is great. Made me laugh out loud for real.

Failure, not sure why

3 upvotes · 19 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Mirroring isn't a bad response IMO, but we never see Jesus really mirroring.

That's a good point. I hadn't thought of that.

When he challenges people, he often does it with a question.

A la my recent post on negative inquiry ;)

206 - Brace Yourself for Battle

3 upvotes · 19 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Glad I could help :) Just being honest ... it was written specifically with you in mind, based on our most recent exchanges.

Failure, not sure why

3 upvotes · 19 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I'm not sure RP has an answer. My guess is, assuming she's a Christian, that she has an image in her head of what Jesus looks like and you deviated from that image more than normal.

Now, would Jesus have called that guy out? Probably. He called people out for their garbage all the time. I don't know if you were sinful in how you approached it. Maybe you were, maybe not. But your wife certainly thinks it was sinful. So, maybe it's not the display of bravado that turned her off as much as the display of spiritual immaturity.

That's why we have the 300-series - to help Christian men develop the spiritual maturity necessary to keep their wives attracted (as a secondary purpose, at least). This is a unique facet among Christian relationships that the rest of the RP community simply doesn't have to worry about.

I don't care how "RP" a non-Christian guy is - if a Christian girl is even half way living by the Spirit she's going to be disgusted with him. That spiritual maturity component is absolutely crucial for us. It's not enough to be a man. You must be a *godly man*.

Defining RP for this sub - and understanding the toolbox

3 upvotes · 19 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Interesting thoughts, but go ask for a definition at TRP or MRP and see what you get. I'd guess your view is the overwhelming minority. I know because I used to treat it exactly like you (partly because of you) and it got me ridiculed for trying to "change" what the red pill really is, and it always came back to sexual strategy. I don't know all of the origins of RP doctrine (some congressman started it, I gather), but I do have a pretty good idea of what it is today.

206 - Brace Yourself for Battle

3 upvotes · 19 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

It's not a battle against her - it's a battle to save her. She just happens to be an unwitting participant. I thought you of all people would appreciate that the fight is against the feminist conditioning, not your wife herself.

How does this advice change for dating?

3 upvotes · 19 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I agree with everything /u/rocknrollchuck said. Read it all a second time, if you haven't done so already.

I will note: When he said "God will change your heart" there's another implication to this - *you'll be glad you "missed out" on all the stuff that you want to do as a non-Christian*. This is true both in the immediacy, as you start to understand what God has to offer, as well as in eternity when you finally have a right perspective about what sin really is and what it does to a person.

Have you ever done meth? I haven't. I know it must feel *INSANELY GOOD*. But I also see what it does to a person who gets hooked on it. Result? I don't feel like I'm "missing out" by not doing meth. I'm genuinely glad I've avoided it all my life. It's the same way with sin. Once your heart is changed by the Spirit and you can see sin for what it really is and the spiritual corruption it causes to a person, you'll look back at your life and think, "Phew, I really dodged a bullet there. Glad I got off that train when I did!"

Developing the RP Unfazed Attitude

3 upvotes · 18 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

This is a great post - and a necessary attitude to maintain in developing an attitude of stoicism and maintaining frame.

This was never really my struggle. In fact, after taking the MMPI-2 (the most widely used mental health test), I only had 3 scales that were out of ordinary acceptable ranges, and one of them was "cares too little about what others think of him."

That said, my wife is a full-on emotional people-pleaser. Even random strangers giving her a weird look can ruin her whole day if I'm not there to talk some sense into her. This is something I'll be sharing with her - and really anyone else who gets butthurt easily.

At the end of the day, I think what you're saying boils down to this: *Only value the opinions of those who have the proper credentials to chime in*. My mother in law is a great example - she's pretty darn psychotic and was, by my wife's admission, a pretty darn horrible parent. Yet my wife somehow feels all kinds of shame and pressure when her mom criticizes her parenting abilities. Why would she care about what a horrible parent has to say on the topic of parenting? Good path to follow ... I'm in.

Now, to the rest of the men here: **Why do guys get all butthurt at the things their wives are saying?** If get confused about the tax code and my wife wants to ridicule me about it, I get it ... she's a hotshot accountant. Her opinions on tax issues matter.

But if my wife decides to criticize me over how I run my house, how I father my children, how I fix the deck, etc. - she's not an expert in any of these areas. I am. Her opinions on those types of things shouldn't matter to me. And your wife's opinions on those types of things shouldn't matter to you.

Of course, you listen, STFU, fog, AA, AM, etc. through the conversation - but remember that God put you in charge of leading the household for a reason. Listen to what your first mate has to say - and don't throw the baby out with the bathwater, but also don't assume everything she says has value simply because she's your wife.

And this makes sense when dealing with your boss, your friends, your neighbors, that annoying douche at the gym, etc. Solid post.

Question I always had about Christianity (but every pastor/priest is too bluepillled to answer)

3 upvotes · 17 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

"Science" tells us to do date night and buy presents. Red Pill is not based on "science" but on experience and observation.

Or to clarify: RP is not based on "science" - it's based on science (no quotes).

In contrast, the Bloop culture used "science" to ask women what they like and what they don't like.

My degree in statistical methodology wants to tear itself apart when it reads how most "scientific studies" are actually performed. That's not to say the PUA's methodology is free of things like sample specification, confirmation bias, etc. I haven't ever seen a true scientific study done on these things. The "scientific" community at large simply can't engage because sleeping with a subject gets too personally involved and can't really be done in a closed environment, which taints the reaction. The PUAs have a stronger ability to report actual field results than the scientific community ever could, but the fact that they're mostly not trained in how to engage in research and interpret results leads me to question a lot of things.

As I noted somewhere else, it's easy to figure out which buttons to push to cause different lights to blip, but take off the panel and try to figure out the wiring underneath - the PUAs simply aren't equipped to do this. So, when I posted my "sleeping naked" field report, I specifically denied any actual knowledge on why it worked - I only knew that this button created that result for me. Many flaired people wanted to ignore my suggested rationales and say, "It's because of your DNGAF attitude," but there's no scientific basis for the conclusion that the DNGAF attitude is what caused the response in this situation. They do have confirmation that pushing the DNGAF button will produce a particular result (over time) in other scenarios, but even at that they can't say *why* pushing that button works. This is the problem in the research methodology employed by PUAs and RP guys.

Unfortunately, when you do have someone like me who comes around who specifically oriented close to 2 decades of my life mastering the art of statistical methodology in real-world environments ... because of my faith and marriage, I simply won't engage in most of the studies necessary to confirm a lot of things from a more scientifically appropriate standard. So, my ability to experiment is limited to my particular wife. I'm okay with that, but it does limit the quantity of useful information I can present, whereas with others I'd be more concerned with the quality of the useful information presented and whether it meets the requirements of actual scientific scrutiny. That's not to say I doubt the results - the consistencies in reports are too overwhelming to ignore. But it does mean a lot of the *why* is suspect, and there is also the possibility that every time a specific result recurs people were pushing both the red and green buttons, but are only giving the red button credit for the result, not realizing they even pushed the green button in the first place.

Tag: [/u/Slipknot_Is_Metal](#)

Share A Tip Saturday

3 upvotes · 16 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

This is solid.

Deconditioning the wife who is disgusted at your touch - 10 Levels of Kino

3 upvotes · 13 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Reasonable doubt, but I am being honest. The 275lb me was in February and virtually all of the loss was between

then and June 8 when I was doing exclusively cardio and heavy dieting. Once I was down to 235 I started lifting. I used to lift in high school and college, when my max bench was 275. When I restarted in early June I was struggling, but would do 160 5x as part of the SL 5x5 routine I began. Two weeks later I made the easy gains to 185 as my max 5x set, lifting 6 days a week and running 2-3 miles before each workout, which helped keep the weight off while I ate a lot to keep my muscles building.

By mid July I was benching 5x 205, late July was 225 (two plates). I hit a plateau there for a month until my brothers came at the end of August, so I actually had spotters and put up 250 as an ORM. From there I started doing 235 as my heavy set and worked up to 255 as a 5x by the end of September. Two Saturdays ago I went to the gym with my dad so I had a spotter again and did 275 once (tried a second and failed). Last week I kept up 255 as my 5x set and this week added another set of 5s to 285 as my current ORM.

My goal has been to get to 300lbs before doing a big cut diet, so I've been pushing super hard, but I'm not going to make it. My wife and I go to Great Wolf Lodge every year with the in-laws and my wife always ends up feeling like crap because her sister and her sister's husband look like super models. Every year in the past I've been grossly overweight (around 265lbs) and it's honestly just been embarrassing. We're going late November this year and I know I'm much better looking than he is now, but I still want one month to cut my body fat down from 15 to 12% and I know I'm not going to keep making gains during that month due to the necessary calorie deficit.

For the record, I don't take steroids. I looked into tren but got too scared by side effects and how easy it is to use it wrongly. I did take protein shakes sporadically for 3 weeks early on though.

More info on my routine [in this post from a while ago on RPC](#). That was toward the end of my plateau.

Clever girl, I wasn't paying attention

3 upvotes · 6 October 2017 · /r/askMRP

The ATBM crowd is still in the emotional honeymoon phase. Remember how it was when you were dating your wife? It's like being on a high. A few months after marriage (2 years on the long end for some couples) and those emotions die down and reality sets in. So, for the already-married, we're not clouded by that emotional voodoo. For the ATBMs, they're not able to think straight. They think these feelings will last forever as long as they're with the person and don't realize that emotional re-stabilization is inevitable and will approach a lot faster than they expect.

Sleeping Naked

3 upvotes · 5 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Of all the people going to hell, she actually likes you the best. She thinks being pro-Israel will get her a bigger mansion in heaven. My guess is that she's going to end up getting an up close look at your afterlife crib herself, though ;)

Sleeping Naked

3 upvotes · 5 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I still have young kids who come down still

Yeah, my kids do this too - I have 4 that are all between the ages of 0 and 5. It's a 100% rate that one of them will come in throughout the night, sometimes two. That said, they know just to bring in their blankets and sleep on the floor next to our bed - they're not allowed on the bed anymore. So, neither of us actually have to get out of bed to deal with it, and we often don't even wake up for this. Also, they get up before we do and leave on their own :p

upgrading to silk sheets about a year ago, and my wife who was always "cold" and had to sleep in long PJ's now just sleeps in panties and a top

Interesting. Good timing: I just bought her silk pillowcases for her birthday coming up in a couple weeks. Maybe I'll get the sheets to match too.

I really like being cold while I sleep, though. Will the sheets cause me to end up overheating? I always have to have a fan blowing on my face.

Sleeping Naked

3 upvotes · 5 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Fair point. Maybe she can wear some panties. But even then, I'm not sure how many women really have leakage that bad when the crimson tide isn't rolling in.

She's Mad Because She's Losing

3 upvotes · 5 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Apart from my divorce work, I've represented several business owners as well (highest net value: \$17.5mil - this is also what gives me an edge in working with cases involving self-employed spouses). I can affirm what you're saying.

It's not about winning or losing - it's about the long-term investment you're making in individuals. This is different for mega corporations, where they don't have any interest in seeing people advance from within - they just want someone to serve coffee until they quit and they can hire someone else. With most non-mega companies, the investment in the individual is the driving force behind the relationship. So, rather than it being "We're losing money on Bob because he's not bringing in enough sales," it's, "How can we get Bob from point A to point B so he can generate the sales we need to turn a profit on him?"

Mega corps have disposable income, so the high turnover rates don't kill their business. Small, mid, and even large companies (again, everything short of "mega") have much more to risk with high turn-over rates and often are far more successful if they can help employees improve rather than making snap "win/lose" judgments before taking action.

Tag: /u/sd4c

Looking for resources on modern ways to walk into Christian marriage without the state involved. Are there any foolproof ways?

3 upvotes · 2 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

What you're saying makes sense and I agree. But when you term it as "I wouldn't divorce my husband," it makes it sound like you do have a power to divorce that you'd choose not to exercise. What you're really describing is an "I can't divorce my husband" situation - because as humans we are incapable of dissolving what God bound together. To that end, I agree wholeheartedly - the original marriage bond does not go away, despite a civil divorce.

Looking for resources on modern ways to walk into Christian marriage without the state involved. Are there any foolproof ways?

3 upvotes · 2 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

It sounds like you want a situation where your eventual wife has 100% of the risk of being with you. No society (even Old Testament Israel) has ever been that one-sided and I don't see God supporting it.

absolutely no alimony

What if you've been married for 30 years, she has serious health problems preventing her from working, and you simply didn't save up enough for her half of the assets to get her by for the next 20+ years of life? *Too bad, old lady - you can be homeless for all I care* seems like the opposite of a Christ-like attitude.

I saw your other comment about this sub involving "men who are Christian but are also seeing the reality of marriage in this day and age." Sure, but the solution to the present reality is not to implement another completely screwed up system. Just because the present system is broken doesn't mean your "no child support, no alimony" system is a better alternative.

I would want the following guarantees: - equal custody

What if you end up beating your children to a bloody pulp. Do you demand equal custody then? Or what if you get injured and become a blind paraplegic? Should you get equal custody then? I think you have these nice idealized notions of what your future should look like, but you're not thinking of every contingency and the fact that no one can *ever* decide what's best for a child before knowing what the actual situation will be.

For this reason, courts always retain jurisdiction over the placement, care, and support of minor children and these things **cannot be waived, no matter where in the US you live**. No court will compromise the well-being of a child because of a hypothetical future dispute between you and your hypothetical future wife.

heavily monitored as to what the use was with receipts proving that every penny was going to the kids

I get so fed up with this attitude. I had a case once where the husband was ordered to pay \$500/mo in child support and he tried to comb through his wife's bank statements to prove that she was blowing the money on herself. Sure, she spent more than \$500/mo in restaurants, clothes, etc. for herself - but so did he for himself. She also had a \$1,300 mortgage and over \$400/mo in utilities. If she were to have lived in a house suitable only for herself (i.e. didn't have enough space for the kids), her rent/mortgage would have been around \$550/mo and her utility usage would have been much less. In other words, from rent and utilities alone, she had at least \$900 of additional expenses just for the kids (noting that he was living it up better than she was). His \$500/mo covered just over half of rent and utilities that she spent for the kids, meaning any hair cuts, food, restaurants, clothes, school fees, extracurricular costs, etc. - those were all on her and he didn't contribute to them at all.

At least in my state child support is not making one party pay 100% of the expenses for the kids. It's calculated by taking the combined incomes of the parties, then referencing that income number to a chart. That chart was created by researchers in the 70s who published their findings in the 80s as to how much it costs for families at varying income levels to raise children who are not socio-economically disadvantaged. These numbers have not been updated since the 80s, therefore don't account for all the inflation and economic factors that have occurred since then, thus men actually get a huge break. Once the combined income level is cross-referenced in the chart to get how much the family should be spending on the children (different columns based on how many children there are), each party's % contribution toward the joint income is then taken with respect to that number. So, if the chart says for 2 kids at \$100,000 joint income that \$10,000/yr should be spent on the kids, if Mom makes \$20,000/yr and Dad makes \$80,000/yr then dad pays 80% of \$10,000 in child support = \$8,000/yr (i.e. \$667/mo). Mom is still responsible for the other \$2,000/yr - but because she's now primarily responsible for the expenses for the children accounted for in the research that produced the chart, the presumption is that her \$2,000/yr is going toward those expenses. 9 times out of 10, the mother ends up paying all of the extraneous stuff too and dads end up paying less than their fair share.

There are certainly some divorce laws that aren't favorable toward men - but at least in my state child support is not one of them. Also, the entire scenario would play out *identically* if you were to switch Mom's and Dad's roles. So, don't screw your children's lives over just because you don't understand how these things work.

What you really want is a pre-nup. You want a document that says, "Under such and such circumstances, neither party shall pay alimony to the other." If you just say, "No alimony," virtually no court will honor it because you haven't specified the conditions in which that would apply. You have to show the court that you have both carefully considered possible future scenarios and that in each such scenario you're both agreed that alimony would not apply. My guess is that when you start contemplating such scenarios, if Christ is in you, you'll realize that there are actually many scenarios where you should be paying alimony and you'll rightly agree to it.

But, those scenarios will also be far more limited than what the default laws of your state would likely otherwise provide. Although I do believe child support laws are rational and appropriate, I don't question the fact that custody and spousal support issues usually end up favoring women (regardless of the actual statutes). But don't swap out one bad plan for another - find out what is righteous and do that.

As far as getting spiritually married without having a state marriage, what's your reason for wanting to do this? If it's because you want to have the freedom to divorce your wife with no negative consequences at all - do you really think God will honor that course of action simply because it's not technically 'divorce'? You'd be a fool.

I'm 99.999% sure God cares less for what label the sin falls under and more about what it is you're actually doing.

Looking for resources on modern ways to walk into Christian marriage without the state involved. Are there any foolproof ways?

3 upvotes · 2 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Common law marriage has been abolished in most states and the states that retain it have greatly watered it down or made it much harder to prove than it was in the old days. Each person should look to a local attorney to figure out what your own state says. My state specifically rejects all claims of common law marriage and will not award property or spousal support on those grounds. That said, if property is commingled sufficiently that it becomes impossible to sort out whose is whose, then the general civil division can get involved, but this doesn't go to the domestic relations court. It's more akin to two farmers who can't remember who bought the tractor 20 years ago fighting over who owns it.

alimony is the right and just thing for most couples where one party makes financial / career sacrifices

Care for the children or not, this is true either way. My state's laws specifically have a statutory presumption that both partners have contributed equally to the marriage regardless of financial contribution. As a result, no one can ever argue, "I bought everything, she contributed nothing." The court's response is simple: *As soon as you decided she wasn't pulling her weight, that's when you should have gotten divorced. If you continued in the marriage despite the imbalance in contribution, that's on you, not her.*

RP takes their concern about divorce WAY too far for Christians

Agreed. The traditional RP position is that finances are the only thing that matter and women should take 100% of the risk in marriage. This is even more unfair than the current state of the law. That said, in the current law, men do tend to have a greater share of the risk.

time would be better spent vetting

I couldn't agree more.

very conservative Catholic woman

I totally understand your reasoning - but that also brings other baggage with it. So, as with all things ... pros and cons.

Looking for resources on modern ways to walk into Christian marriage without the state involved. Are there any foolproof ways?

3 upvotes · 2 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I'm not Cathodox, but I do believe their position is the reverse - that Scripture actually only has authority because of tradition - that it's the cornerstone of tradition, but cannot be looked at apart from tradition.

I do believe there is value in tradition - but not as an authority. Nevertheless, if [/u/rpw111528](#) wants to write from the position of tradition having authority, as you say, this may diminish the number of readers who will take the argument as credible, but in the end it's still a valid and unique perspective, different from what many other people would be able to offer. So, take that for what it's worth :p

College Kid... Relationships are hard

3 upvotes · 27 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

1/2

she really loves me

How are you defining love here? That's a huge question to wrestle with and one that, from your post, I get the impression you haven't spent enough time figuring out yet.

she's not aligned towards Christ either

If a girl isn't aligned toward Christ, you need to separate yourself from her. 1 and 2 Corinthians 6 are both pretty clear that you should not be binding your life to non-believers. I'm not a big fan of going around telling people what God's will is for their life, but I can say fairly definitively: *God's will is that you not date or marry non-Christians.*

I don't want to be alone ... I get a lot of joy out of companionship, but I don't know if it's gone too far.

Yes, it's gone too far. This is what's clouding your judgment. Because you aren't yet satisfied in your relationship with Christ, you're looking to women as a shortcut toward satisfaction. When you are satisfied with Christ, then you stop caring about who you're with or why because your mission in Christ (see 110 and the 300-series) will be all that matters. Incidentally, as [/u/Chinchilla_the_Hun](#) implied, this mission is what's going to attract the right kind of girl to you.

My Parallel Story

Here's the deal ... I've been exactly where you are. I was weak and looked to girls to satisfy me. In my arrogance, I thought God was my center, but because I had not yet adopted a mission I was ignorant. I wasn't oriented toward anything. I was just wandering aimlessly through life without a clear purpose. Sometimes I sought joy or happiness, other times I made sacrifices to feel like I contributed to something noble. But on the whole, I knew that when I died and stood before God and he asked me what my life was all about, I would only have a hodgepodge of things I'd tried, never a clear, decisive mission to articulate that brought him glory.

The result of this mentality in me was that I started dating an extremely hot girl who was "not aligned towards Christ either- only the idea of God in general." She said she was a Christian, so that was enough for me. To

describe her, "she has a history with anorexia, depression, isolation" ... "and she's absolutely broken inside. Depressed, anxious, insecure, distrusting, erratic, manipulative, bitter... But she really loves me and I think she's a really great partner when she's not in the wrong mood." She had been sexually and physically abused in her childhood and hopped through several foster homes. She was the exact kind of trouble I was attracted to (although I didn't realize I was attracted to troubled women at that point).

Throughout the relationship, she cheated on me constantly (sometimes with her exes, other times with new guys altogether) - every guy on campus wanted in her pants, and she gave it up because she knew I was committed to waiting until marriage. She would also say things like, "You're the guy I want to marry ... but I'm too young to have met you. I need to have my wild, fun days before I settle down."

Despite having no psychological or spiritual training (though I thought I did at the time) to do so, I continued in the relationship on the following thought process:

- No matter how many times she screwed up, I was committed to forgiving her because I misunderstood the "forgive 7 times 77 times" thing Jesus said.
- I thought I could fix her - that because she had few other Christians in her life leading toward Christ, it became my obligation to leverage the relationship for the sake of the Gospel. This process is known as "evangelizing" and is something the Bible actually says not to do, though I was ignorant of that at the time.

Part way into the relationship a guy started discipling me for the first time in my life. It took him all of two seconds to let me know that the relationship was unhealthy and holding me back. I didn't believe him and decided to trod forward anyway. As it turns out, he was right. By making her my project and emotional center of my world, I was stealing away from what God intended to do through me. After I did eventually break up with this girl, within days the mission of disciple-making started to manifest in my life. I spent the next 3 years without any compulsion toward finding a relationship.

To be clear, I did have interest, and did pursue a few women (never to the point of actual dating, though). Women were also constantly swarming me too. I had a 9 who was obsessed with me, but wasn't a Christian. She promised to convert for me, which was tempting but I knew it wouldn't be real, so after a little struggle I gave a hard no. I had several 7.5s/8s who would orbit me. There was even one point where I was absolutely convinced that God wanted me to pursue a particular 9 who was showing clear IOIs (long story), but ultimately was able to step aside - because the guy I was discipling was into her and my mission was more important than finding a mate. That was one of the best decisions I've ever made.

As I continued to pursue that mission, and women kept flocking to me. There are two reasons for this:

- They saw that what I was doing had eternal value and they wanted to associate their lives with mine so they could get credit for helping in the mission God was fulfilling through me (for women, this is a good reason to pursue a guy; I don't say this negatively at all).
- Once I had killed the compulsion to be with someone, I became more attractive to women because everyone wanted to pin down the heart of the guy who wasn't needy or clingy and who everyone thought couldn't be pinned down. That's when God finally opened my eyes and gave me the go-ahead to be with the woman who is now my wife.

FR- Mid divorce

3 upvotes · 27 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

No offense taken. Being "the best client in the history of clients" is good for everyone. The attorney makes less money, but his job gets that much easier and more fun and can focus on spending the retainer on more important things rather than the mundane crap that most clients can do themselves. The client saves a ton of money in the

process and ends up getting better representation. It's a win-win.

How can a client help?

- Get all of your financial documents in order. That means everything for the last 3 years for: bank statements, tax returns, W-2s, credit card statements, a copy of your credit report, social security earnings statement, and pretty much anything else you can think of. Get all of this for your spouse as well, if you can. Organize everything categorically (i.e. income docs first, then assets, then liabilities, etc.).
- Create a list of all of your assets and debts, complete with the last 4 digits of every account number and the exact date of each value you put in the spreadsheet, and set each referenced exhibit in a separate stack (keep the historical stuff on its own).
- Get an app that converts text message lists to pdf while retaining the "chat bubble" look (more likely a court will accept it as authentic). Download your entire text message history with any relevant person to your computer, highlight every important text message (don't overdo it), and send it to your attorney.
- Upload any relevant pictures, social media posts, call logs, e-mail history, or the like and send those to your attorney as well.
- Don't call everyday. Give weekly updates, and boil each important thing down to one or two sentences. If it's a major thing, give the 1-2 sentence summary and ask for a call to give more info. The more concise you can be in all communications, the more you will save and the more your attorney can help you.
- For the love of all ... don't try to do legal research. You're wasting your time. Non-attorneys just don't (and can't) get it, no matter how much they think they do. The most annoying thing (and time-consuming) is dealing with a client who thinks he knows the law better than I do.

In essence, pretend like you are an attorney. You'll be a crappy attorney, but if your attorney's job is predominantly to review your work and fix it, that's a heck of a lot better and cheaper than doing it all from scratch.

How to hold sexual energy without losing my mind?

3 upvotes · 26 September 2017 · /r/askTRP

You aren't wrong though - the ultimate answer for where to put that energy is directly into some hot young vag.

Totally not what I meant at all. But anything helpful I would have to contribute wouldn't apply to you. Best wishes, friend.

110 - Stay Plan is the Go Plan

3 upvotes · 26 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Lens is 400-level ;) Getting closer though. My time is freeing up a lot more now that work is in an "ebb" mode before the next "flow" in the cycle starts.

How to hold sexual energy without losing my mind?

3 upvotes · 26 September 2017 · /r/askTRP

The answer to how to deal with your urges depends on what you mean by "doing the Lord's work every time I go out."

110 - Stay Plan is the Go Plan

3 upvotes · 26 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

if they do, it's basically "Jesus loves you, pray this prayer ..."

So true. Or it's preaching at someone (whether from a sidewalk or even in a personal, one-on-one lecture session) rather than coming alongside them like Jesus did. Jesus did preach to the masses, but his strategy was always to live life alongside those he was trying to reach. Interestingly, when Jesus preaches, we don't often see much reaction from the crowd other than those who oppose him. When he comes alongside one person, we usually get some kind of follow-up of the person then going out and telling everyone about what Jesus did. Conclusion? Coming alongside someone is more effective than preaching to the masses.

they believe "If I just live a good Christian life, people will notice my example and ask me about my faith in Christ." Yeah...still waiting for that to happen to me.

I've always despised the saying: "Preach the Gospel always, and when necessary use words." Most people interpret it as an "if necessary" instead of "when." This totally pollutes the good in the saying into a cop-out people use to get away from actual ministry. I have had people ask me about my faith - but only because I initiate. Something the standard beta church-goer can't even do in his own home, much less with a stranger.

handing out Gospel tracts

Room for disagreement on this, but I very strongly discourage this practice. For every 1 person who responds positively, at least a dozen are even more put-off, making it that much harder for other Christians in their lives to make actual progress.

The most effective method of evangelism I've found is what I have dubbed the "expanding core" model. In essence, you've got to find a core of 3. That's either you + 2 other men, if it's a male core; or you and your wife + 2 other couples, if it's a couples core. Build a rock solid fellowship - a bond that makes other people envious. Then, invite a non-Christian guy/couple in as the 4th. Over time, as they (1) see the bond you have in Christ, and (2) see how your faith deeply impacts each of your own lives for the better, and (3) see how your faith is the glue that binds your relationship ... that will attract them. In this model, you don't have to preach the Gospel at the non-Christians ... you talk about it openly among the core in the presence of the non-Christian, but waiting a bit to do this until after the relationship is established.

The best part about this model is that it's natural. It's easy to talk to Christians about Jesus, the Gospel, the Bible, etc. - especially your best Christian friends. Because that's a fundamental part of your relationship, you're demonstrating both relational evangelism and proclamational evangelism simultaneously without coming off as preachy - just as people talking about something they enjoy.

Then, when the non-Christian does start following Jesus (sometimes this process only takes a couple months, sometimes it's a few years), the 4 of you split into 2 and 2 and start building on again. You can add a 5th before splitting, but I've found it's too hard to maintain schedules that way, so someone always ends up left out.

Also note that none of this depends on how much you know about the Bible, as long as one person in the group is competent. You might be the Christian guy who gets the conversation rolling by asking questions, or the guy who brings the concepts down to earth by telling a story about how the concepts apply to your own life. Who knows. It's more about the relational osmosis process than about a skillful presentation where all the pressure is on you. The pressure is, instead, on the spirit of the group, which is the Holy Spirit.

Thanks, this was just what I needed to hear today

Maybe I'll do the evangelism write-up next :) Glad I could help!

The real "Red Pill" that you need to swallow

3 upvotes · 26 September 2017 · [/r/ExRedPill](#)

Black pill ... that's even worse than the red pill :p

A month out from the wedding... Finds TRP... Do I call it off?

3 upvotes · 20 September 2017 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

To be clear, the bible is totally RP. It's feminized pastors who are the problem. Don't blame God for what some of his people do. Check out [r/RPChristians](#) to chat about that more.

I know the redpill advice, want to hear yours.

3 upvotes · 15 September 2017 · [/r/ExRedPill](#)

Gotcha, the "e" threw me off. As recently noted by one of the mods in MRP, virtually none of the mods or flaired individuals has been divorced since "discovering RP." That said, note that my flair (which I didn't ask for) is akin to: "don't trust this guy, he's not really RP yet." It's their way of abating the fact that for a while I was making a lot of posts, but not all of them were widely accepted by the community.

That said, one of the reasons I started RPChristians is because I'm anti-divorce (despite my profession - long story there) and I got sick of reading all the comments on MRP: "She's crazy; divorce her" or the more recently disgusting posts on how to cheat on your wife and get away with it (see the one they just made as an announcement, for example).

I'm probably one of the few/only people who hovers here because it's a good balance for me. It helps me challenge what I read in RP stuff to make sure I'm not just blindly accepting things that aren't right - and I do actively reject things. The point of RPChristians is to accept and apply the reality of how God created men and women, much of which RP has accurately discovered, but to apply those truths in a way that fosters an appropriate love-respect dynamic within the marriage, as opposed to the more demeaning aspects of traditional RP advice.

My dad keeps shit testing me what to do?

3 upvotes · 15 September 2017 · [/r/RedPillParenting](#)

You can talk to him about stuff without mentioning "the red pill." I've seen lots of minds change on these topics.

Field Report: From verbal sparring to compliments

3 upvotes · 13 September 2017 · [/r/RedPillWives](#)

The truck to him was a symbol of masculine validation. He didn't want the truck; he just wanted to feel like a man. Although biblically it's not ideal, most men experience validation through their wives, but if a wife isn't validating then a guy will look to his stuff (house, cars, TV size, etc.).

Buying the truck would be a stupid decision in light of their circumstances (I'm taking her word for it, and context of how she represents his demeanor about the truck). He knew it was a bad decision, but he wanted that validation. She gave him that validation in a subtle, humorous way, which was what he needed to feel like it was okay to get the car he really wanted (the luxury one) rather than the one he felt like he should buy to compensate for his otherwise lack of rugged manliness.

Question I always had about Christianity (but every pastor/priest is too bluepillled to answer)

3 upvotes · 11 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Props to that. The non-Christians over on askMRP (including a couple with the "MRP Approved" flair) affirmed this in a thread within the last couple days.

Question I always had about Christianity (but every pastor/priest is too bluepilld to answer)

3 upvotes · 11 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Is this not a valid concern to notice/raise?

No, I think you're inverting the way the covenant was meant to be taken. Circumcision was the symbol of a pact between God and his people. To bear that symbol in a physical way presumed that in your heart you also had that connection to God that those without the symbol did not have. To allow women to be circumcised would be to undermine the unique relationship God has with husbands by giving wives direct access to God, circumventing their husband's authority.

It's like when Moses is at Sinai and the people say, "We're too scared to talk to him, you go talk to him for us." Moses was acting like the husband to Israel, the bride, just as God is husband to Moses, his bride. I also referenced the Exodus 4 passage, where God says, "I'll communicate with you directly, but not with Aaron - he's your responsibility." In the same way, circumcision of the flesh was a symbol of circumcision of the heart, which gave a man a direct connection to God through the covenant, and thus elevated his status above his wife from a purely cultural inequality to a spiritual one as well (note: inequality of role, not value; I will still maintain this distinction).

though I did learn a lot from the rest of your post, but it is only this paragraph onwards that really began to answer the question ... "male dehumanizing/female pedestalizing" concept ... do you not find my atheist friend's argument convincing as well?

The rest of my comment was meant to address (1) your other questions in this thread and, more importantly, (2) the allegations of your atheist friend. Circumcision wasn't about pain/dehumanization - it was a symbolic gesture whereby one should be honored to partake in it. It was a symbol of pride among the Israelites, even though they did not understand it until centuries/millenia later. Its function was tied to the very core of the Gospel and God's mission for the church. This is not "dehumanization" - it's whatever the opposite of that would be. So, no, I don't find it convincing in the slightest.

What would you say against his argument?

I've already said most of what I'd have to say. If I took his words directly, the notion that circumcising an 8 year old boy is somehow meant to make him think in adulthood that it's okay for him to view his life as disposable ... especially in light of the actual gender inequality dynamic present at that time, where women were the disposable ones ... it's just an absurd theory to make - and your atheist friend didn't even identify that as his theory, just a "popular" one. He's not sharing "another angle" - he's literally making up motivations that may never have existed.

If you want to call what I've written an "angle," so be it. But it's an angle that is cohesive with the entire Scriptural narrative and is supported by passage after passage, whereas his directly goes against Scripture without any historical or spiritual evidence to support his position. So, between someone who's speaking hypothetical theory out of his butt that suits his own interests and a position that is consistent throughout dozens of historical texts and several individual authors over thousands of years, I'm going to choose the later every time. The fact that modern betaized pastors are too weak to look into what the Bible really says about these things doesn't minimize the fact that: (1) the Bible says all this, and (2) God's people throughout time who have lived apart from the feminist imperative have reached similar conclusions.

how do you explain God suddenly going *"Oh circumcision? Nahh never mind that loool"* in the New Testament?

He doesn't. Per my original comment, circumcision was always meant to be a thing of the heart. This is preserved in the new testament. This view is most evident in Jeremiah 9:25-26, "The days are coming, declares the Lord, when I will punish all those who are circumcised merely in the flesh ... for all these nations are uncircumcised, and all the house of Israel are uncircumcised in heart." Paul isn't preaching new theology in his epistles - he's explaining what the legalistic Jews failed to understand from their own Scripture.

More to the point, Paul did still preach in Romans that there was still value in circumcision: "What advantage, then, is there in being a Jew, or what value is there in circumcision? Much in every way!" (3:1). What you're missing is that circumcision was a law and covenant with Israel. But most of Paul's books preach to the Gentiles. So, to Israelites, Paul is saying, "If you want to identify as one under the law, you'd better follow the law. If you're not under the law, then you're better off not adopting the law." So, Paul vehemently opposed any Jew who tried to force a non-Jew to be circumcised.

That would be like a Chinese person trying to argue in an American court that his robber should be sentenced to death because Chinese law would require that. If you're not in China, screw Chinese law. If you're not an Israelite, screw Israelite law. That's the attitude of the New Testament. Now, there's still value in understanding OT law because it was written by the same God who wrote the spiritual laws of the new testament, but we must always look at it from the perspective of what we can learn about our God from knowing what he did then to apply it now - not as rules that must still be followed today.

Do you agree that ... God's old covenant is therefore also directly with the male slaves ... but somehow the man's wife is not directly in a covenant with God if not through her husband?

I think I already answered this in another comment. Physical circumcision is an external symbol, thus is really only about clean v. unclean. Spiritual circumcision is the internalization of the covenant, and thus is a salvific issue. So, if you're asking about salvation, the answer is totally different. But if you're asking purely as a matter of physical circumcision, the answer is yes: the physical symbol was only with men. So, a male slave had a more direct external status as 'clean' in regard to his authority to approach God (think of the requirements to be in different layers of the temple) and others (requirements regarding interpersonal interactions with unclean people) than the slave owner's wife, whose 'cleanliness' was only derivative through her husband (i.e. she was deemed clean because of her husband's circumcision).

If her husband was not circumcised, he was unclean, but so was she, so it didn't really matter. But if a circumcised man were to sleep with a woman from outside of Israel (i.e. whose father was not clean/circumcised), she was unclean until he married her, at which point she was naturalized as an Israelite, allowing circumcision to apply to her by virtue of the marriage, and thus their relations were deemed clean.

What about the female slave then? Hypothetically, say one who has never been allowed to marry?

I think I answered this in another comment. I'll paste it here anyway, though:

Female slaves were still property just like any other women at the time - although they were hybrid property of their husbands and their husbands' masters. As such, they would have had their identity derived through whatever man happened to own them at the time, whether husband, father, or master. If their husband/father/master was circumcised, she was sanctified by virtue of being his property (again, not the same as 'saved'). This meant the relations between her and her husband were "clean" despite the fact that there was no covenant for female circumcision.

Question I always had about Christianity (but every pastor/priest is too bluepillled to answer)

3 upvotes · 11 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

More to /u/Whitified - I'm simply shocked at the reverse nature of this conversation in the first place. My first reaction is to note that circumcision doesn't make a man "disposable," nor does it imply his subservience to women. If anything, in a biblical context it's a rite of passage that solidifies his position as higher than that of a woman because he has a more direct connection with God than she does, whereas her connection was found through whichever man she belonged to.

But more to the point, the Old Testament is 99.9% of the time accused of being misogynistic and anti-women, and yet somehow because of one single thing (that actually furthers this "anti-women" agenda), it's somehow become gynocentric. This is totally shocking to me.

Try to google anything about the old testament being "anti-men." Do the same for "anti-women." You'll find almost nothing on the first and droves of material on the second (coupled with a ton of blue pill pastors trying to explain away the apparent misogyny).

viewed through this lens

This is exactly what /u/Whitified is doing. The only possible way to read the OT in a gynocentric way is to go in specifically looking to find it. Any natural or objective reading will swing so far the other way that it's virtually impossible to miss. Not to justify every aspect of that; but the facts are the facts.

Question I always had about Christianity (but every pastor/priest is too bluepillled to answer)

3 upvotes · 11 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

As I wrote in my longer reply, what you seem to be missing is that physical circumcision never actually saved anyone. It was an external representation of an internal change. But even more than that, it was a symbol of a "clean" person as opposed to someone who was "unclean." Moses understood this while writing Deuteronomy, and Jeremiah reaffirmed this: that salvation-based circumcision is ultimately of the heart, not of the flesh. By far, Paul was not the first one to reach this conclusion.

As /u/BluepillProfessor notes, God usually talks about a communal relationship with his people more than a personal one. Although I reject the model of "household **salvation**" the Bible is abundantly clear in favor of "household **sanctification**." So, if a man was circumcised physically, his whole family was adopted into the covenant as "sanctified" so that it was not an unclean relationship.

As for slaves, a male slave in those days was usually more akin to an indentured servant. He held an identity of his own, but was still beholden to his master for life and provision. This is a sort of hybrid relationship, but on a grander scale, and even outside the "indentured servant" type of slavery, look to Israeli families during their captivity in Egypt before Moses freed them. You'll note that they were both "slaves," and therefore "property" of Pharaoh. But at the same time, men had their own family units.

Female slaves were still property just like any other women at the time - although they were hybrid property of their husbands and their husbands' masters. As such, they would have had their identity derived through whatever man happened to own them at the time, whether husband, father, or master. If their husband/father/master was circumcised, she was sanctified by virtue of being his property (again, not the same as 'saved'). This meant the relations between her and her husband were "clean" despite the fact that there was no covenant for female circumcision.

Angry Sex - Lessons Learned

3 upvotes · 11 September 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I've always wanted to experiment with this, but it's incredibly rare for my wife to get truly angry, and far rarer for

me. So, does it have to be both persons being angry or can it work if only the woman is angry and the guy is just forceful/dominant?

I have noticed separately, though, that women do generally like it when a guy find them so irresistible that they spontaneously engage in sex at inappropriate times. If my wife is wearing a tank top that shows some nice cleavage, sometimes she'll be in the middle of telling me a story about her day and I just go to town. Totally inappropriate timing, but those are some of the best times. I'd guess angry sex tops it all off because it's the most inappropriate time, meaning your passion has to be extremely high to overcome the natural aversion.

Picking the right attorney

3 upvotes · 10 September 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Good call. I do occasionally find a client I have to nudge along. I had one client who had \$10k of income per year, but his wife earned \$450,000. I advised him repeatedly that he was entitled to over \$15,000/mo in spousal support from her. He was too beta and had such ONEitis for her (thinking she'd come back to him someday if he was nice in the divorce) that he ultimately settled at half of what he was entitled to. I wasn't trying to be a money-grubber there. He legitimately would have been better off financially if he paid me \$10,000 to earn him an extra \$8,000 every month for the rest of his life. But, alas, he wanted to settle, so I let him settle (after getting a release from him acknowledging that he was being an idiot).

Picking the right attorney

3 upvotes · 10 September 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Out of every area of law, family law has the highest rate of going to trial. So, there is that. Even then, though, a majority of cases do settle.

More to /u/BobbyPeru - depositions are a waste of time in 90% of divorce/custody cases. I usually advise my clients against them and only do it (1) if I know for a fact I can get something good out of it, (2) if I need information that I know the other side won't give away in interrogatories (i.e. repeated evasiveness), or (3) if my client insists (which is rare).

Picking the right attorney

3 upvotes · 9 September 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Unfortunately, this is a common story.

Picking the right attorney

3 upvotes · 8 September 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

That makes sense. I've had exactly 6 where I was appellant, and lost 2 flat out (hence the easy math). I was trial counsel in one of those 2. Of the other 4, I was trial counsel in 3 of them.

Two of them were dead easy wins though. In the first, the judge made an egregious math error, among other issues. The parties were fighting over the value of an item of property. Mom said it was worth 10,000, dad said it was worth 2,000. The judge reasoned that the most equitable solution would be to subtract the two numbers, thus deciding it was worth 8,000?!? I successfully argued that this method was idiotic because of mom thought 10 and dad thought 8, how could you say it's worth 2?

In the second case, the magistrate prohibited my client from presenting hearsay testimony of what a police officer said when the other side objected. When the other side was up (represented by a hometown hero, I was an out of townner), I made the same objection and it was overruled. I argued inconsistent application of the rules. She stupidly said on the record: "It's my courtroom. I can hear whatever I want or reject whatever I want. If you don't like it, go cry to the judge. Good luck if you think he'll ever reverse me." Indeed, he did not. But the appellate court did!

Picking the right attorney

3 upvotes · 8 September 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Yeah, that flat fee arrangement is something I've only done once. I'm 99% an hourly guy also.

As for appeals, good for you on those! I usually charge around \$10k if I'm defending, \$15k if I'm for the appellant, and another \$3k if there will be oral arguments - but even that is all hourly, those are just the amounts that the hourly work ends up being. I've never lost a case defending an appeal, but am only about 2 for 3 when I'm trying to get a decision overturned ... but even that I think is a pretty good rate for divorce work.

50/50 v. OYS/Value

3 upvotes · 8 September 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I like what you're saying in concept, but I'm not sure how many couples it would work for in practice. Certainly an equal 50/50 mindset is out. But even the concept of "equity" seems troublesome. If she can ever argue, "It's not fair," you've got yourself a problem. So, following an equity model gives her authority over you because you have pre-agreed that the concept of fairness is a higher priority than either of you individually. Few people can agree on what "fair" is because we all value things differently.

The golden rule of any relationship is: *The one who needs the other less has the power.* Associated with this: Increased power = increased value = increased attraction. I'm not even talking about how that power is used. Just being a powerful man in your wife's eyes draws her attraction to you. Even guys who use their power to beat their wives find their wives incredibly attracted to them (although she may still want out for obvious reasons). Likewise, for beta guys where the wife is the one with all the power, they're pining over her with unfulfilled desire. Power is sexy.

When you try to create a system of equity, you're essentially deferring your power in the relationship to an intangible concept that transcends either of you individually: *the marriage*. Idolizing *the marriage* over the people within the marriage, in my experience, is not healthy. This is where women start to hamster out on loving the idea of "being married" more than actually loving the person they married. Men idolize the idea of "having sex" more than they care about the woman they're having sex with.

When that power is deferred and the marriage becomes a higher priority than either individual, the husband loses his wife's attraction with the loss of power. The wife loses her satisfaction when her husband inevitably fails to live up to the ideals of a "true equitable marriage." By feeding into her idolatry of *the marriage* and adopting it as your own, you're setting yourself up for failure at some point. Maybe your wife, specifically, has a naturally high libido or your other qualities overcome the loss of power that you have given to *equity*, but my guess is that most guys' sex lives would suffer significantly from deferring power to an intangible, unsustainable ideology.

Another potential pitfall of "equity" being the target is that it once again sets up "effort" as an objective standard that she can hold against you. This can work if you are both completely, 100% on the same page about everything in your marriage. But as soon as your standards and expectations deviate, the balance of each of your efforts shifts. 99% of the time, the wife has the higher standard of cleanliness in the home. So, 99% of the time she's going to do more work. She'll perceive her increased *effort* as an inequity in the marriage. This is a time where I see AWALT as undeniably true.

If she's doing work that she thinks you benefit from and you're not contributing to it, she'll whip out that objective idol (*the marriage*) and put you in your place. Or, maybe she doesn't for whatever reason and just ends up fostering resentment until she cheats on you with Chad.

For you, this seems to work for now because you apparently are 100% in agreement on meals, allocation of responsibilities, life direction, etc. That type of mutuality is overwhelmingly rare. You might be one in a million. In virtually every marriage, there will be significant disagreements and one person has to have the authority to

resolve it.

I've said it here before, and I'll say again: *It's not submission until you disagree*. My wife and I naturally agree on about 80% of our day to day lives. That's not a huge %age, but it's acceptable. We don't need a weekly meeting to talk about these things because our natural lifestyle accounts for that 80% and we communicate openly with appreciation that neither of us is lazy. On the stuff where we disagree, I don't defer to some objective equitable concept of "the good of the marriage" that we both submit to - because that concept doesn't actually exist. She thinks her way is the more equitable "better for the marriage" way, just as I think mine is. At the end of the day, I'm responsible for my kingdom, so I make the call.

For a long time, I always made that call consistent with her wishes. This was idiotic. I was a puppet leader by choice. She told me what my decision should be. I submitted to her will by adopting that decision as my own. I, therefore, became responsible for her decisions. Bad situation. When things started to go wrong she would blame me: "I was just voicing what I wanted. You didn't have to listen to me. This was your call to make." Arguing, *But I made the call you wanted me to make!* was never satisfying to her. It was a show of weakness. She lost attraction and our sex life died almost entirely, even after we had recovered from whatever low point we were going through at the time.

Perhaps the most important angle of this is that my wife married me because I was a man on a mission - and still am. She had no purpose or direction in life. She saw that my mission was a higher-value purpose than anything she could come up with or accomplish on her own, and that no other single man she had met to that point had a comparable or more important mission.

When I deferred power to *the marriage*, that compromised my mission. The result is that she lost sight of the reason for why she married me in the first place. Although I continued to pursue the mission, she pursued the concept of *the marriage*. She fed into *the marriage* and I fed into *my mission*. The result is that she felt that she was the one bearing the burden of supporting the marriage so that I could accomplish my mission, and that she wasn't a part of the mission.

I had to tear down the concept of *the marriage* as an ideal in itself before we could re-focus on the mission. Once she re-adopted the mission the relational troubles began to resolve themselves. Now, I do take *the mission* as being a higher priority than her or myself. That's inherently a part of being a Christian, and I'm at peace with that. I'm not saying other guys have to be there. More to the point, though: I am infinitely more capable of fulfilling *the mission* than she is. So, equitable or not, I tell her what I need to do to advance the mission and what she has to do to enable that to happen and she readily complies. Instead of seeing her efforts as contributing to *the marriage* which, in her mind was an equitable arrangement, she sees it as contribution to our greater purpose in life. She is working within one context for the purpose of enabling me to work in another. And I actively open doors so she can have direct involvement in the mission as well, rather than being purely sideline support - that way she can taste the fruit of her own labor. All of this happens in the context of me taking care of my own business around the house - not because I have an obligation to be fair and equitable to all that she does, but because it's my house and I'm the one ultimately responsible for it, not her.

I'm not sure how much that clears up, but idolizing *fairness* or *equity* still seems to be a source of trouble for most guys. The "us against the world" mentality seems better, but I don't see that as being tied to equity or fairness between the two of you at all.

I decided to read a Focus on the Family article on developing a "satisfying" sex life.

3 upvotes · 8 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I get what you're saying, but it's the same stuff marriage counselors have been peddling for decades that simply doesn't work for most of society. I agree that emotional and mental intimacy are essential to a successful

marriage, but in my experience, and that of virtually every Christian married man I've disciplined, the different confection points are mostly separate.

- A strong mental and emotional intimacy will not spontaneously generate physical attraction.
- A strong physical and emotional intimacy will not spontaneously generate respect for the other as an intellectual.
- A strong physical and intellectual intimacy will not spontaneously generate emotional passion.

For Christians, we add spiritual intimacy into the mix too, which is also entirely distinct. These things all have separate triggers. Most Christian men are exceedingly good at developing emotional and mental intimacy, but totally lack the ability to cultivate physical or spiritual intimacy. Their wives hang all over them and cuddle and act all lovey dovey and will profess their emotional fuzzies to other women in the church all the time. The pair bonding is there. But the physical drive is absent, even when they're otherwise in great physical shape.

50/50 v. OYS/Value

3 upvotes · 8 September 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I understood what you meant. I'm a divorce attorney. I get people to true 50/50 all the time. Of course, I see true divorce rape happening too. Either way, thanks for sharing your thoughts.

Q about Starfish

3 upvotes · 7 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

Rule 1: *Never turn down sex before it starts; only after, if it's bad.*

Early on I made the mistake of prematurely turning down sex before it even started because I could tell it wouldn't be any good. This sent the wrong signal: *Don't initiate*. The signal I wanted to be sending was: *Don't be lazy when we're having sex*. You have to start sex to get her to realize that's her problem. Even if you can tell she's not into it before you start, you still have to start to show her you're not interested.

Rule 2: *Don't get butthurt; don't explain yourself.*

If you're butthurt, she may get the hint and realize she needs to step up her game. But you're also associating sex with you getting angry at her. That's a bad association to build. "Thanks for revving my engines. I gotta get stuff done now." *But neither of us finished?!?* "Just priming the pump for next time! Be ready."

Rule 3/Last Resort: *Keep going, but don't finish.*

If all else fails and she's still starfishing you and you're not into it, just roll over and ask her to get you off. Let her try for a while before she ultimately gives up. "Don't worry, babe. Maybe next time." Then smile and smack her butt as you walk away. Let her hamster do the work for you. *Why couldn't I get him off? Am I not good enough for him anymore?* When she sees that her "best moves" aren't cutting it for you, but that your frame is unphased, she might take that as a cue that she actually needs to try. I call this a last resort, though, because if applied long-term it will make her think: (1) that you're low libido and just aren't as into sex as you pretend, or (2) that you're unattractive because you can't finish what you started in the bedroom. Don't let it get to that point. One or two times only as a gentle nudge, then get back on the horse.

Or course, as others have said, before you go denying anything make sure you're actually as high value as you think you are. From our past conversations, you've mentioned that she's a pretty alpha girl herself. SMV is not a static scale we measure everyone against. It's fluid with each person's perception. If she's pretty alpha, she may not perceive her SMV as being lower than yours, even if the rest of the world would think so. You've got to shift

her perception of this. (1) Actually improve your SMV. (2) Apply a few levels of dread.

Just realized my best friend is dating a sociopath. Is there any way I can possibly open his eyes or is he a lost cause?

3 upvotes · 5 September 2017 · /r/askTRP

You've described a beta guy, not a sociopath girl. He's flowering her with money, love, and attention for free. How is she a sociopath for accepting this? Any girl would - and they do. AWALT.

She's not his problem. He's his own problem. He has ONEitis. Don't confuse the issues and blame her for his beta failures. Sure, she has problems too, but I'm guessing not all that different than any other woman he could be dating.

Buy him a copy of NMMNG as a gift. That's the best you can do for him.

Can RPChristians use real dread?

3 upvotes · 5 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Rest assured, it is not lost on me who is the source of my strength.

I decided to read a Focus on the Family article on developing a "satisfying" sex life.

3 upvotes · 4 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

It's not necessarily wrong, I'm just not a fan. My wife used to do that a lot (still does on rare occasions) and it usually means, "I'm not at all into it right now, but I'll put up with it if you need me to." I loathe that attitude and would rather have no sex at all ... but RP has also taught me not to turn down an initiation, otherwise she'll just stop initiating. Instead, I help her adjust the way she initiates and get herself in the mood long before she ever asks.

[Field Report] Sickened by how little marriage counts and how much physique counts

3 upvotes · 1 September 2017 · /r/TheRedPill

She wasn't a "practicing Catholic." She's a "self-identified Catholic." This is, unfortunately, true of most self-professed religious people. Based on a study of over 400 regular church attenders, 18.65% of regular churchgoers would meet a basic biblical standard of "saved." Most people in church think they're saved just because they go to church and participate, maybe even help as a volunteer every now and then, but they don't have a real relationship with Jesus.

My guess is she's one of those people who participates and volunteers to make herself feel good and give some false reaffirmation, but she hasn't legit been transformed by God yet. If you had found one of the 18.65%, my guess is that your experience would likely have been different (depending on how mature in her faith such a girl would be) - not that the woman herself would be any different (AWALT), but that (at least from my view, take it or leave it) God tends to step in and protect those who pursue him from succumbing to temptation like this. She'd want to, but she would be convicted and stop herself.

Fiance is away for 3 years, need advice

3 upvotes · 30 August 2017 · /r/askMRP

I've discussed ... breaking up, but she won't take the bait.

All I can do is laugh at this. How much power have you given her? You think she has oneitis for you, but it's obvious you have it for her really, really bad.

You're talking about breaking up not because you actually want to, but as a manipulative tool to get her to have

sex with you. You're giving her an ultimatum and that never works. [See this list of other crap that doesn't work that you've probably tried](#). Ultimatums aren't attractive. They don't increase her sex drive for you. They can manipulate behavior, but not negotiate attraction - and that behavior, if unaccompanied by genuine desire, will revert to its natural state. Instead of negotiating for her to desire you right now, become more desirable later. But why play the game on hard mode if you're not actually married? That's what I can't get past. Easy mode is an option to you - jump into easy mode.

I can't figure out how she can be asexual, and this causes a lot of insecurity with me

You didn't read what [/u/justpickanyusername](#) said - she's not "asexual." She's "asexual for you." That's a huge difference. If you want her to be sexual for you, you have to become the guy she will be sexual for. 99.9% - that guy exists. Women with true asexuality are even harder to find than the unicorns we all wish we'd discover.

Show outcome indifference, or take charge?

3 upvotes · 30 August 2017 · [/r/askMRP](#)

I'll just leave this here ... <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-4EDhdAHrOg>

Dread-game may be the most important aspect of a Redpill LTR or marriage.

3 upvotes · 29 August 2017 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

I call this [the comparison game](#). It's something that can truly be used to a man's advantage.

Mitch's Red Pill

3 upvotes · 29 August 2017 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

Nah, I've been in bed and didn't see any of this until just now. And I don't think my "cronies" (if I have any) follow me around here. Any username mentions I get are just people looking for me to throw out some free legal advice. Either way, I tend not to downvote things I agree with.

Your "alternate universe" example is something I accepted long before ever finding the red pill. That's just common sense. That's why in my alpha days as a solo musician/hobbyist I would write songs about my girlfriend (now wife) and she'd swoon, but after I developed all the beta traits post-marriage, writing songs for her just became cheesy and unwelcome - "Why did you waste your time recording that when you could have been doing ____?"

cling to the disney dream of a happily ever after style marriage (or at the very least you are willing to compromise on your own happiness for the "sake of the marriage")

I just addressed this in another comment, so I won't go too much into it here other than to ask: where have I expressed this mentality?

I didn't mention it in my other comment, but it's probably also worth noting that for all my life I've rejected the concept of "soul mates" and have for years preached that "happily ever after" doesn't exist (which took a long time to get my own wife to come to grips with).

The guy who mentors me put it best in [this comment, a couple years ago](#). Like Merlin, God essentially opens the door and says, "With a few exceptions, you could really be with anyone you want - just name her and I'll tell you if she's one of those exceptions." Merlin says Guinevere is one of those exceptions, but Arthur says, "Screw you Merlin, I'm marrying her anyway," and it's certainly not a happily ever after for him when Guinevere cheats on him with Launcelot, starting a chain of events that leads to Arthur's final downfall.

Arthur's bigger problem is that he ended up looking for a wife not because he wanted one in the first place, but because his barons and nobles pressured him into it. That's the big flop most people make - getting married

because society tells you it's the right thing to do. In Matthew 19 and 1 Cor. 7, we see both Jesus and Paul saying that we're better off not getting married - and this is how I counsel men today. "Cool your jets and think about whether or not this is what you really want to do - because marriage isn't the sunshine and rainbows the world tells you it will be." That's the feminist agenda - and even when it reveals the harsh truths about marriage, it's usually in a sitcom that makes people think, "See how funny it is to have a crappy marriage? You can laugh it off too" - and that's how they placate guys into sticking it out. That's why I can never watch an episode of Everybody Loves Raymond again :/

FR Just filled for divorce

3 upvotes · 26 August 2017 · /r/askMRP

Custody and more parenting time automatically means more child support, right?

Not in the slightest. At least not in my state. Child support is calculated based on a rote formula. If a guy gets more than "local rule" parenting time, then child support can go down, but giving the mother additional parenting time does not increase his child support obligation - it's only a one-way deviation. Technically the law allows it to work two-ways but there is absolutely no precedent in any jurisdiction I've ever researched in my state for an increase.

Many cynics believe women want custody and maximum parenting time precisely because that maximizes the child support payments to them

They're not cynics, this is real. I just finished representing a woman on this exact issue. Granted, the guy more than deserved it (constant acts of physical violence enacted against the mother and the child both; lying about his income; concealing assets; back-alley stock transactions with a privately owned corporations; etc.).

which they can spend however they want, not necessarily on children

So, this accusation always strikes me as potentially truthful, but most often ignorant. In my state, the child support numbers aren't based on future out-of-pocket expenditures alone. It includes things like rent to afford a place big enough for the kids; additional utilities the kids use; additional groceries to keep them fed; etc. In other words, basic living expenses that the mother would have to pay anyway are higher because she has the kids than what she would require if she were alone. The court builds these into the calculations. So, if you've got a child support obligation of \$750/mo and the mother has to pay an extra \$250/mo to have a 2-bedroom apartment instead of a 1-bedroom (or comparable situation for a house), then 1/3 of your child support obligation is built into this price differential. Tack in an additional, say, \$100 for increased utility consumption and \$300 for food, that leaves her with \$100 left for clothes, extracurricular activities, school expenses, shoes, entertainment, etc. That's obviously not enough - and the courts expect mom to pay the rest out of her own income. Obviously I'm using round/estimated numbers, but that's how it works. Most guys mistakenly think that child support is just about the out-of-pocket stuff that you decide to buy and they forget about the cost differential for all the base necessities of just living.

How could a man "leverage" the female desire for parenting time such that she'd agree to "she gets more parenting time but in exchange he pays her less money"?

"I could fight for shared parenting with 50/50 time, but if you waive child support I'll let you have custody, I just want my time" and if she doesn't bite, "What if I let you have an extra overnight per week, as long as I get the after-school time that night?" Women eat this up. You offer that, she'll usually give you anything else you want financially - including a larger chunk of the retirement. The maternal instinct to feel in control of the children is insanely powerful. The guy can go off and control things in the world all he wants. A wounded woman doesn't

experience that control the same way, so her children are her only source of power and stability in life - she'll give anything to keep that security.

About 80% of men I go against don't actually care about custody when they realize that custody has nothing to do with time with the children. They didn't care who picks the pediatrician or the dentist when they were married, and they don't care much more after the marriage is over. Really, those are the only big decisions custody affects. In some occasions it can affect extracurricular activities too, but those usually get spelled out as being joint decisions even in sole custody plans. "School decisions" gets talked about a lot, but in reality there aren't many to be made - you go to school in the district where you live and until high school you don't have much choice on classes, and even then the kids themselves are usually the ones who pick those with a guidance counselor, not the parents.

So, a guy has to ask himself at some point: is it worth \$750/mo to be able to choose which pediatrician and dentist your child sees? She could, of course, pick an insanely expensive one and you'll always get stuck with 1/2 the med bills (sometimes more, but rarely) - but this hurts her wallet too, and a cheap doctor v. expensive one won't usually be a cost differential of \$750/mo - so you're still saving.

RPW, please don't have this mindset when you get older

3 upvotes · 24 August 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

Well said.

The alternatives

3 upvotes · 20 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I wrote more about plate theory [here](#), so feel free to reference that.

The general concept is that plate theory exists almost exclusively to foster an abundance mentality. Once you have the abundance mentality, as [/u/chinchilla_the_Hun](#) says, "you won't have to" spin plates anymore - or never will have to at all, even in the first place. This is the exact reason why I wrote the 204 post on abundance - to give an alternate route to developing an abundance mentality that doesn't require spinning plates.

That said, I have come to accept that "plate-spinning" in its pure form is not actually problematic. Spinning a plate doesn't mean you're having sex with someone. It merely means you're fostering interest. The key is in how much interest you're generating. Never "awaken love before it so desires" (per Song of Solomon). If she's merely giving IOIs, that's fine. You can get that even without trying. But if you're leading her on to a point where she's become emotionally invested in her relationship with you, you've gone too far.

Ok ASKMRP, riddle me THIS!!!

3 upvotes · 18 August 2017 · /r/askMRP

This is a good and fair reply. Thanks for typing this out.

Plate theory

3 upvotes · 17 August 2017 · /r/askMRP

Plate theory is not about who you're having sex with; it's about who you could have sex with if you wanted to. It exists to give you an abundance mentality if you don't already have one. If you already have an abundance mentality and can maintain it in full confidence with only your LTR, you don't need plates.

So, maybe there's a secretary at work who's never noticed you. You start improving your performance, showing off your alpha, wearing better fitting suits to work, and now she's showing IOIs. For me, it stops there. I know that if I wanted to I could add game and she'd be on me - but I don't need that temptation to cheat.

Other guys would add gaming her, maybe go out to coffee or lunch a few times or something. They do that

because they need to prove to themselves that the IOIs were real and not them fantasizing. For me, I don't need that validation. So, I don't take this step and avoid the temptation to cheat. Some guys would go all the way and actually cheat - that's their choice.

I do the same thing at the gym. I chat with the girls there in a non-creepy way. It starts with, [Expected intro] "Hey, mind if I grab that weight over there?" --> [Transition with context] "It gets crowded in here, doesn't it?" -> [Conversation start] "I guess it's nice when it's mostly people you see regularly; get to know who you're working out with. You meet many other people here?" Of course she hasn't. Most of the guys at the gym are alpha-wannabes who wouldn't dare approach her. [Note: between each phase, she gives a response, but it doesn't matter what the response is.] After this short process, I walk away to work out in a different area of the gym without actually starting a conversation. About 40% of the time she'll migrate over 5 minutes later and initiate a conversation with me. I'll be friendly, but give no further IOIs. Why? Because I don't want to be tempted to cheat on my wife. I just do nominal stuff like that to keep reminding myself that if my wife did cheat or leave me, I'd be fine.

To that end, some people could say I'm plating - I put a plate up on the pole and give it one good spin, then walk away and never look back. But plate theory is more about keeping those plates spinning, not just seeing if you could get it to balance in the first place. That's where I draw the line in my own personal life. If you need to keep 3 plates other than your wife spinning to have your abundance mentality, some guys need that. If you can keep your abundance mentality just by knowing you could plate if you wanted to (where I'm at), then test the waters and stop. If you can keep an abundance mentality without ever seeing an IOI outside your marriage, then do that. As /u/GargantuaBlarg29 said, if it helps, do it; if not, don't.

Redpill Caught on Tape, one of the best example of Redpill Principles from a HBO Documentary

3 upvotes · 17 August 2017 · /r/TheRedPill

I'm pretty sure anyone who takes a camera into a bar could create a documentary of RP principles.

On Initiating Social shit vs. being invited, how to expand and what to expect

3 upvotes · 16 August 2017 · /r/askTRP

Because it's easier to talk about theory than practice. Most people really don't know the answers. The ones who are good at social status are naturals and their tips only help if you have certain features that give context. Others are garbage and only talk about what they think might work.

I, personally, am one who was a social-awkward who learned to be a social dominant. I've done a lot of writing about this, including a fiction book simulating most of the key steps that I went through in this phase in the main character.

That said, it's late and I'm too tired to do a full write-up on this sub. I'll probably save that for later and post it in MRP/RPC another time.

Question about fogging

3 upvotes · 16 August 2017 · /r/askMRP

Well, if you actually did cheat on her, obviously don't use that line! I was giving you the benefit of the doubt there :p

Why I'm not afraid of divorce rape - and how to get yourself there too.

3 upvotes · 16 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Well, I refuse to play the traditional strategies (cook the books, embezzel funds, conceal assets in hidden accounts, etc.), but they are all very effective if the other attorney is not qualified at forensic accounting (which is fairly rare) and is too dumb to know when he needs to hire a forensic accountant.

Beyond illegal means that other attorneys recommend, the best thing you can do is find someone you really trust, tell him that you're legit not going to be able to focus on the business as hard for the next couple of years due to marriage stuff, but that you'd like to go at it full-force once the problems subside. During this time, give him a stronger interest in the company so that your interest diminishes. Get divorced during this time. When it's over, tell him you're ready to resume your prior level of commitment. If you've picked someone trustworthy, this pans out. I've seen this happen about 3 times ... but I can't necessarily advise it because as soon as I do someone's going to get screwed by picking someone not-trustworthy and I'll get blamed for it.

The real winner strategy is to bury the gains in offsetting debt. A good accountant will see through some of this, but 9 times out of 10 it's a winner. I had a case once where a guy co-owned an excavating business. Every time the business started to turn a profit, rather than taking a draw, he'd buy a new piece of heavy machinery with a cost that exceeded the rote profit so there was a loan at the end. Because these assets don't have an immediate resale value upon purchase (same concept as buying a used car and it declining in value significantly as soon as you drive it off the lot), you're essentially growing your business long-term while generating losses in the short-term. So, here's what the transaction looked like:

- Bought a brand new heavy-duty vehicle for \$70,000.
- Shortly after purchase and use it has an immediate resale value of \$40,000 (could get more, but courts will always look at the immediate liquidation value).
- Put \$10,000 down on it.
- \$60,000 still on the loan.

Here's the effect:

- By putting \$10k down, he has legitimately reduced his income by \$10k for that year in exchange for growing his business.
- However, from an accounting standpoint the business has also taken on more debt than it has assets, so there shows a loss of \$20,000 on the books, diminishing the appraised value of the company.

So, when wife divorces him, just from that one piece of equipment alone his income just went down by \$10k and the amount he has to pay her to buy out her interest in the business has gone down by \$20k. And at the end of the day, his business is actually growing as a result of taking these losses, so as soon as the divorce is over he has more capacity to earn money than he did in the first place - and because it's self-employment the court has no ability to impute a prospective earning capacity to him.

Multiply this by multiple machines and larger equipment or other business assets (ex. buying real estate like this and not just machinery) and these phantom losses can be astronomical and seriously reduce his exposure for paying her half of the business or spousal support on what he's actually able to bring home. And because it all falls within legitimate business purposes, nobody can fault him for what he's doing.

Why I'm not afraid of divorce rape - and how to get yourself there too.

3 upvotes · 16 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I still think the game is rigged against men

I'm not saying it isn't - it's just nowhere near as bad as I read some people make it out to be. For every story where the cops escort the guy out, I see 7 or 8 more where their response is, "You have no evidence, go get a court order if you want us to do anything about it."

Even when the woman works it is generally a part time or low skilled job, while the guy brings home the majority of the income.

True ... but whose fault is it for marrying her? If the guy is worth his salt, he should have options and wouldn't have to marry someone who can't contribute equally. Granted, most guys aren't worth their salt right away and they grow into their SMV long after the wedding day. So, all they can do is mitigate their losses for making bad decisions when they were chumps.

Glad to hear people are speaking out though!

Why I'm not afraid of divorce rape - and how to get yourself there too.

3 upvotes · 16 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Don't assume it's one extreme or the other. Middle ground actually exists. The MRAs aren't actually in the trenches most of the time - they're outside observers hearing the horror stories of people who come to them with the worst of the worst. Nobody is going to these guys saying, "My divorce is going amicably - please help!" When all you get is the horror stories, it makes sense you'd assume the divorce boogeyman is a lot scarier than it is. And, again, that's really just giving the feminist agenda the fear-control over men that they want. Everyone needs to stop being so afraid of it and giving up because "they're out to get me" and start prepping like they can actually do something about it - because they can.

Why I'm not afraid of divorce rape - and how to get yourself there too.

3 upvotes · 16 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Best way to preempt the issue: call the cops on yourself. Tell them, "My wife is crazy. I'm about to file for divorce. She's likely to falsely accuse me of stuff. Can you put something on record affirming that I have warned you about this?"

I had a client do that and it worked out spectacularly well. The psychologist in the case said that was the single smartest thing he did in the entire case. When the false allegations came, she was treated with great skepticism and lost major credibility when her other "evidence" didn't pan out. Of course, it helped that the wife was a flaming narcissist and our client tested clean as a whistle.

As for in the moment, when you know tension is high, have your phone audio record every conversation workout her knowing.

After the fact, have friends and witnesses confront her. I had one case where the wife alleged spousal rape. 5 other people confronted her about it and she was dumb enough to tell them all: "It didn't really happen. My attorney made me do that." Instant win.

Why I'm not afraid of divorce rape - and how to get yourself there too.

3 upvotes · 15 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Re-read the post as well as my other comments here - I have addressed that issue ad nauseam.

Why I'm not afraid of divorce rape - and how to get yourself there too.

3 upvotes · 15 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

here in Ontario assets are always split 50/50

Well, you're talking laws of a different country entirely now. But more to my point: assets are always 50/50 no matter where you go in the US too. I was referencing spousal support. The longer you wait, the longer you'll have to pay, and sometimes the more you'll have to pay.

every day that goes by is a day I don't pay child support or alimony

You actually are paying these things by virtue of having her and your children live with you. You're just in more control over where that money goes. But you're still paying for them.

Also, every day that goes by, not only are you paying for all of their costs in-full (as opposed to the partial payment that SS/CS would be), you're increasing your duration for SS/CS - so you're paying more to keep her around.

There is ZERO validity to your statement that I'll be worse off in the future

My statement is: "If she decides to wait another 5-10 years then screw with some other guy and divorce you." If you remain married forever, then you're in a much better spot, assuming you're happy in the marriage. But the longer she postpones the divorce, the longer you're going to pay spousal support, while financing her lifestyle during the time you're still married too. You're fooling yourself if you don't see how this math works.

In the future I won't have child support payments.

True, but (at least in my state), if it's a spousal support case, that doesn't matter anyway. The lack of child support means you have more funds available for spousal support. My state treats the income split as based off of a combined SS/CS calculation, so if one goes down the other goes up. So, you've got to nip it while the SS duration is shorter than the CS duration if you want to make progress. Waiting a decade (to use a random duration) for your kids to turn 18 is increasing the duration of your ultimate spousal support award, while keeping the amount static, assuming static income levels.

More likely, you'll be getting raises during that time, so you'll actually have a higher combined support award if you wait than if you went for it now with a present income level. If your income actually tanks, the courts are more amenable to lowering support than increasing it.

IF I was ordered to pay spousal support it wouldn't be much since that is one component that they do take the reason for divorce into account.

That must be unique to Canada. That's not how it is in the US. I can only speak to my US state's laws.

if she was screwing some other guy and we split she wouldn't see a cent from me in support payments.

Good for Canada. It's not that way in the US.

I have a retirement account that is in MY name and I am keeping as a parachute.

Divorce courts here don't care whose name is on the account. If it was acquired during the marriage, it's marital, not yours. So, the longer you stay together, the longer this accumulates, the more you have to give her (if you were here, that is).

Why I'm not afraid of divorce rape - and how to get yourself there too.

3 upvotes · 15 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

A wise man once said "Expect the best, but be prepared for the worst."

That was me ... for about the past 20 years ;)

You're right that we'd be idiots to assume it couldn't possibly happen to us. But at the same time, walking on

eggshells in constant fear of divorce is only going to exacerbate the problem and give the feminist agenda more power in this arena. As Rollo pointed out in his Divorce Inc. post, the change won't come from the top down. Law makers and judges won't fix the problem. It has to come from the bottom up when men stop fearing the feminists.

My post was predominantly about how to set yourself up to avoid that "worst case" scenario. What you're suggesting is that you can't stop a crazy girl, so just accept the fact that it's out of your control ...? That's not helpful.

Why I'm not afraid of divorce rape - and how to get yourself there too.

3 upvotes · 15 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

What you are describing is a myth. It does happen, but nowhere near as commonly as people like to think. That is the feminist agenda trying to keep you afraid, when they don't have as much power in the courts as they think they do. There are certainly some judges to be afraid of, especially in smaller county's, but on the whole most judges won't rule without evidence.

The short term injunction from entering your home or being with your kids is a real threat. That is something that can happen on her word alone. However, the long term implications of it are almost non existent if it is her word alone. This is clearly reversible error if she does not have any documentation or exhibits to backup her claim. I have appealed these cases many times and the Court of Appeals always rejects the case if there is not a sufficient preponderance of the evidence to show that it is more likely that her word is true than yours. That standard always requires some proof beyond her word alone, unless you have negatives working against your credibility, like a prior history of convictions for things like domestic-violence or drug-abuse, etc.

It is true that if you try to go alone, you will very often wind-up far worse then if you had an attorney. But, that's just common-sense. If you can't afford an attorney, I often recommend having clients hire me as a consultant rather than representing them in court. Then, they get the benefit of my legal knowledge, but don't have to pay me thousands of dollars for every court hearing, trial prep, negotiations, etc. This keeps the costs highly mitigated, while still giving them the advantage of knowing how to argue their own case.

Why your wife should work at a real job

3 upvotes · 15 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Since /u/JDRoedell summoned me, I'll respond to this.

Most states refuse to apply a straight income-computation formula for spousal support (although almost every state does for child support). There are tax-effecting programs to address the tax implications of an award of support, but very few judges follow it by the letter, as the tax implications are only one of about 14 total factors. I've actually had about 4-5 judges tell me point blank: "I do not run any numerical calculations. I go with my gut and in X years on the bench I've been appealed Y times and have never once been overturned."

To that end, the "sacrificed her career" argument is actually an extremely powerful one. But it also relies on affirmative evidence that the higher-earner (even if that's a girl) asked the lower-earner to step out of a career path against the lower-earner's desire. If the lower-earner voluntarily chose to take the role, or it was done by mutual agreement, the impact of the argument is mitigated - especially when the lower-earner is the one begging not to have to work. That's not a sacrifice, and the higher-earner invariably always argues (as I've done successfully many times) that he encouraged her repeatedly to work and advance her career and the lower-earner refused. I recently had a case where a woman was earning \$98,000 as an engineer with an international automobile manufacturing company. Just before filing for divorce she was fired. She had 2 other job offers after that but decided she wanted to stay home with the kid instead. Dad (my client) agreed to that for 3 months, but no longer. After that, she still didn't get a job, stole the kid, and ran off to another state. Dad filed for divorce, the court ordered her to seek work. She got a job making doughnuts at a local restaurant for \$9.50/hr and argued that

was her income capacity. The magistrate wasn't buying it and agreed that because Dad encouraged her to get a job repeatedly and she refused, her failure to earn at her capacity was on her own head. Dad got custody, mom had to pay him child support based on an imputed \$98,000 income :D Big win for my client, who actually earned about the same amount.

As far as future earning potential, yes, this is a serious consideration. It is most often brought up when you have an indefinite support term (i.e. married 25+ years), but can apply much sooner than that if the circumstances allow for it. But if a couple has only been married for 10 years, that's not enough time for a court to believe that one's income has been impacted with great significance in most cases.

It is probably worth noting that I did have a case where my client (wife) went through med-school, internship, and completed residency, passed all of her boards, etc. and was a fully licensed doctor - and then quit before actually practicing. That's a butt-ton of education and experience, but the parties agreed she would be a housewife. Fast-forward 18 years (now a 27-year marriage) and the court considered her education and experience so outdated that even though she could potentially re-license herself and earn triple what the husband was making, that is not the lifestyle that he provided to her for the majority of the marriage, so the court only applied her present income-earning capacity of approximately \$30,000. Another huge win for my client :)

Although my firm specializes in custody cases involving psychological issues, I'm a numbers-geek. So, I get all the cases involving support calculations and even crafted a tax-effect program for use in my state that a forensic accountant in one of my cases determined to be far more accurate and user-friendly than the prevailing support calculation software used by virtually every court in the state. Unfortunately, my software programmer buddy backed out and the program got too outdated to use anymore and I don't have the time to market the product, so the cost to re-develop it would outweigh the potential profits.

Got married prior to discovering TRP. Now having sadness over the feeling of "not having had sex with enough women."

3 upvotes · 10 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Now you have found RP knowledge and understand women. Holy crap! I could have slayed it as a kid. Gosh dang it all!

This was my gut reaction after finishing NMMNG - thinking about all that could have been. Although I'd been there before in different ways, at that particular point, that phase lasted for about 24 hours.

My practical answer is that one wet hole is almost exactly the same as the next.

Without experience, I've always assumed this. Or, more directly - an orgasm is an orgasm is an orgasm. There might be some that are better than others - but that's usually a product of my mentality or positioning at the time, which can be replicated with anyone who I find attractive. There will always be something inside me (the Bible calls it my sinful nature) that says, "But that hotter girl - she would actually be better," then logic kicks in and tells me: one wet hole is almost exactly the same as the next."

Command the tempting spirits to "get behind you" in the name of Jesus Christ. It works.

THIS! A million times, this! ... such an underappreciated aspect of applying our faith.

Need help pulling my life together after rape charge

3 upvotes · 10 August 2017 · /r/askTRP

By keeping it within marriage.

Always DEERing

3 upvotes · 10 August 2017 · /r/askMRP

You can't go verbally toe to toe with a woman ... She's probably adapted her kung fu quicker than you.

Bear with me to prove a point ... I'm actually better at arguing than most women. As an attorney, that's my job. The best strategy is what I call *mental aikido*, which i wrote in brief about [here](#) and [here](#). It's basically a modified A&A by agreeing with a ridiculous premise and suggesting one carry it out to its logical conclusion - a conclusion that the person insisting on the ridiculous premise wouldn't like. With this tactic in my arsenal (among others), my wife readily acknowledges that she can't beat me in an argument - so, if I choose to DEER, she knows I can "win" every time. If I choose to "mental aikido" her, I win. If I choose to blah blah blah, I win - and she will even acknowledge that what I'm suggesting is objectively better than what she's saying.

Here's the thing, though: "winning" is not actually winning. All I've done is ticked her off or made her feel like an idiot - neither of which makes her want to have sex with me. No matter how gentle you are with the delivery, winning an argument by beating her down with reality isn't going to make her cup overflow into sexy time ... it's just going to make her feel beaten and down. Rather than engaging, she withdraws.

Also, my wife just stopped playing the game after a while. When she realized she could never win, she changed the rules: "I know it's not smart or logical and that you think I'm being dumb ... and I know that what I'm saying actually is dumb - but this is what I want anyway. I wish I could want the smart thing, but I can't - this is what I want and nothing you say is going to change that." *Instant loss* - and shame on me for playing the game until she got there.

As [/u/FF0000_captain](#) said, if you feel compelled to have the final word in an argument, you've already lost the argument. This is true in virtually every arena - whether marriage, arguing to a judge in court, arguing with friends, or arguing on the internet. Ironically, the reason we do it is because we think the last word means we win. That's an idiotic notion.

Tag: [/u/leorycrankins](#)

Always DEERing

3 upvotes · 10 August 2017 · /r/askMRP

I go there occasionally too - not to learn anything, but to practice spotting issues and processing solutions through an RP framework.

My wife doesn't test me very often, so I don't get a lot of practice on my own and this actually makes it harder to develop her respect. So, given how rare tests are for me, I want to make sure that when one does come I'm ready for it. So, I see what's going on in other people's marriages to figure out where they went wrong and how to respond to different situations - and this keeps me on my toes for when the real thing comes my way. It's a pattern that has worked quite well for me so far, and I've had at least 3 or 4 times in the last month where something I read on [r/deadbedrooms](#) happened to me and I was able to execute exactly as I suggested to an OP on that sub - because I had already prepared for the situation in advance by having read a thread there and replied to it.

In essence, if AWALT, then [r/deadbedrooms](#) is the place to go to find out what things I can expect my wife to do to get out of sex or to respond to sexual advances, etc. It's like going to the driving range before actually hitting the holes.

My husband is now TRP

3 upvotes · 9 August 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

I'm not sure I'm good with this.

I am sure for you: You're not good with this.

I don't want to take on the extra work. I'm not ready for a kid.

The problem is that he's reading about RP without being RP. He's going Rambo, he's telling you about RP (which is like Rule #1 - no talking about fight club), he's making irrational demands, he's not owning his stuff. He wants all the benefits of RP praxeology without actually being RP. Tell him to make a field report on [r/marriedredpill](#) or to ask if he's making the right moves on [r/askMRP](#) and he's going to get his butt ripped by people like [/u/\[deleted\]](#) (yeah, you've helped me more than I like to let on) telling him that *actually being RP is not the same as demanding people to treat you like you're RP*. You don't get the submission until you're a guy worth submitting to.

Idk is this what TRP is about?

No.

Is this a phase?

Yes, it's called going Rambo. It's when a guy discovers RP for the first time and tries to implement everything all at once before he's actually internalized things and improved himself. The phase will last until someone knocks some sense into him or until he actually becomes the kind of man where you can actually respect these requests (whether or not you agree).

When his SMV is higher than yours, that's when he's earned the right to start calling the shots - and you'll actually agree with him. From the sound of it, you're bringing a heck ton of value to the table. He's not bringing much. He needs you more than you need him. This means you have the power. Until he gets his act together enough that you need him more, his demands are laughable. But this is going to take a lot of effort and work and more time than he's willing to commit. So, what does he do? He takes the cheater-method: he bluffs it in the hope that you'll believe him. Sure, "fake it til you make it" has a place, but not when your spouse knows you're faking. Then you just look like an idiot.

Can I talk him out of this?

No, probably not. You can't control him - you can only control you. If he's reading RP subs without posting for feedback, any resistance you put up is probably going to be interpreted by him as a fitness test, making him want to try even harder until he "tames" you or pushes you away so far that you just leave him - at which point he'll blame you and call you feminist trash or something because you're a woman who doesn't need him.

If he does ask for feedback and start posting stuff, **assuming you're giving an accurate representation of the situation** (and I never take this assumption lightly), he's going to get his butt handed to him and will probably be told to go into monk mode for a few months until he actually learns what the heck he's doing before ruining his marriage.

Since he's already open with you about it, probably the best thing you can do to get him in line is to learn RP yourself. He has glorified RP in his mind - he won't listen to you, but he will listen to "RP." So, learn it better than he knows it. If he's falling out of line with his own commitment to RP, show him some sidebar material or posts that explain where he went wrong. Do this enough and he'll realize real fast why we all refrain: "Don't talk about fight club - especially not with your SO/spouse!"

That said, so you don't come off as a shrew, you're probably better off just suggesting he post on [r/marriedredpill](#) or [r/askmrp](#) to get answers from people who he'll actually listen to. Say things like, "If AWALT, then I'm like that too - so go ask your RP buddies how to deal with me and see what they say." But when you say it, be dead serious - not snippy or sarcastic or anything like that. The best time to approach this kind of stuff is actually out of the blue, not in response to anything he says or does. If it's reactionary, he'll presume an attitude in you. If it's out of the blue and part of a serious conversation he might actually take it seriously.

Disclosing RP/RPW knowledge to your SO

3 upvotes · 9 August 2017 · [/r/RedPillWomen](#)

I agree with [/u/RedDetergent](#) and [/u/i_have_a_semicolon](#) that it's usually preferred not to introduce your SO/spouse to RP stuff. That said, if you do decide to get him on board, [r/RPChristians](#) might be a better place for him to learn about these things without being jaded. We reject things like spinning plates, the "sex is the only thing worthwhile in life" attitude, nexting/divorcing someone as soon as they're not meeting expectations, and lots of other non-biblical attitudes that understanding RP praxeology often creates in places like TRP/MRP.

As has been said here before, RP praxeology itself is descriptive, not prescriptive. The conversations that happen on [r/theredpill](#) and most of its offshoot subs are people having prescriptive conversations about how to utilize their understanding of descriptive red pill praxeology to get what they want. So, you don't go to [r/theredpill](#) to learn about red pill praxeology - you go there to learn how to abuse red pill praxeology for your own advantage. If you want to learn about red pill praxeology, you go to outside sources like several of the linked blogs, books, etc. on the sidebar.

[r/RPChristians](#) is more about biblical world-view descriptions and prescriptions while maintaining RP terminology as a tool (as opposed to the blueprint, which is the Bible).

Custody theories that could ruin you ... and the merits of shared parental rights

3 upvotes · 3 August 2017 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

She's mainly trying to limit my overnights because she wants highest support available to move into the best apartments in town.

In my state, support does not increase based on additional parenting time (it theoretically can, but I've never seen it happen), it only goes down when a father has more time. That is, there's a guideline calculation, which is the baseline. If a father gets equal parenting time, a deviation may apply, decreasing the support amount by up to half (other deviation factors may apply as well).

So, yes, often mothers will try to get additional overnights with the kids to try to keep you from getting that deviation. However, if you get the quality of time you're looking for, you can always argue to the judge - "What extra cost does she have from the time they go to sleep and wake up the next day? However, even if I have less overnights, during my two evenings, I have to pay for their food, the utilities they're using, gas to drive them around, etc., etc."

In the end, most judges and magistrates will not look at the "overnights" as the basis for a deviation due to parenting time - they'll look to who has the higher share of awake time (or "quality time") as the basis for awarding that deviation. This argument is very strong in my county and I've been able to get deviations granted on it in many cases where my client has no overnights other than his every other weekend - because I can prove that the expense shift that would happen in a true 50/50 arrangement is happening anyway, even if it's not 50/50 purely because of the overnights or time at school.

Single Father v. Single Mother Stats

3 upvotes · 3 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Great question. I don't know. I do know that after most custody battles a mother will speak as negatively about the father as she can get away with. Even when the kid sees father being loving and caring during visitation time, the poisoned mentality does continue to screw with the kid, who will often believe his mom over his own actual experience.

106 - What doesn't work

3 upvotes · 31 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

or there is no strategy that will work because their spouse has some other problem getting in the way that needs to be addressed.

To this, I ask the question: if she was single, would she legitimately remain sexless? Or would she end up finding someone else within a few months (assuming no emotional recovery period) who piques her interest?

If it's the first option, you may well be right. But if she's likely to find another guy within a few months, that means her problem isn't really "getting in the way" - it's just getting in *your way*. As such, you've got to become the guy she would hook up with if she was single. If she'd do it for him, she'd do it for you - but you have to become him or better.

There is, of course, an internal conflict in this process:

- **PRO:** The fact that you're already married gives her more comfort to sleeping with you, so her guard will innately be lower with you than with Mr. New, meaning she'll more readily accept the new you than Mr. New
- **CON:** Her long-term familiarity with you will make it take longer for her to see the changes and realize you're as good as or better than Mr. New, who is still overall a mystery to her, and that mystery makes it a tinge bit more exciting. When I wrote in my previous post in "the comparison game," I pointed out how if other women start taking notice of you, she might regain this sense of mystery: "Why do they want my husband? What are they seeing that I'm missing? Has he really changed that much and I just can't see it yet?" So, you can still be on par with Mr. New, but she'll be the last one to notice without some kind of other female attention showing it to her.

The RP Can Only Do So Much Married To An Alcoholic

3 upvotes · 31 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I agree with [/u/not-my-hands](#). Be prepared for the worst, but still hope for the best and pursue the best option. My guess is, to some extent, you probably are fairly unhappy in the relationship and are actually somewhat excited (commingled with nervousness, anger, resentment, etc.) at the prospect of getting out and finding someone new. Who wouldn't want to get out of a bad situation and start over? But don't let those feelings cloud your judgment in prioritizing your marriage if at all possible.

Remember, Jesus left the 99 sheep to go after that one that wandered away. He hunted it down and carried it back. If that sheep had said, "Screw you, Shepherd. I'm not coming back," Jesus may well have let it leave, but he would do this with a heavy heart and not an attitude of, "Yes! Now I don't have to worry about chasing that sheep down every day!" Chase your sheep down, and maintain a right love for her throughout the entire process, even if that love is a hard love.

I even wonder if she's a narcissist

I wrote up a Part-1 post on mental health issues, which I cross-posted in this sub, but declined to write part 2. As you and [/u/BluePillProfessor](#) have noted, RP is not an answer to mental health problems, yet most RP people only

want to hear that "MORE RP!!!" as the answer to everything. This is the same mistake Mr. Nice Guy makes when he thinks the solution to his marriage problems is to be even nicer. Sometimes there are things that RP will not fix, but there are other solutions that can - and they can be carried out without destroying an RP frame.

Sadly, most mental health professionals are fairly ignorant on what works and what doesn't. If you want to find someone good, go ask a divorce judge: "Who's the best guy in town to help an alcoholic recover?" They're the ones who actually see people at their worst and when they recover (because that's when the recovered addict re-files for more parental rights - so they know when it works and when it doesn't), so they know specific names of people in your area who can actually help. Looking up random websites simply won't get you there, no matter how well you think you've vetted someone.

That said, I wouldn't be quick to confuse "nothing is ever her fault" with narcissism. Yes, this is a huge overlap, but this is also a staple characteristic of all addicts. They believe that if something is their fault, it will clue people (including themselves) into the fact that they have a problem, and if they admit they have a problem then they have trouble rationalizing continuing the problem. So, in order to hide their problem, including from themselves, they have to pretend to be faultless in most every situation.

201 - Healthy Sexual Desire v. Lust/Coveting

3 upvotes · 27 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

But what about the distinction in Job ... How do you reconcile the two?

Job 31:1 is another example of a crummy English translation. The Hebrew word is *etbovnen*, a conjugation of the root *bin*, which means "to understand" or "consider," sometimes "discern." In rare uses, it is translated as "observe," but usually in a comprehension capacity, not a "passing by my eyes" observation. The only time it's ever translated "gaze" (as the ESV uses) is in this one verse.

"Understand" or "discern" is actually the strongest interpretation and is consistent with the Septuagint's translation, where the 70 Jewish scholars in 300-ish BC translated Job 31:1 with *sunieimi*, which is the Koine Greek word for "understand" or "perceive" (**this can help**). That's not to say a Greek translation of the Hebrew is more accurate; rather, it's to say that the Jews in 300-ish BC believed that "understand" was the best word there rather than merely a "gaze" or a "look," for which there were other words like *atenizo* (gaze) or *idou* (look, behold).

This tells me that people far more fluent with the Hebrew language at that time believed Job was saying more than just passive observation - that it was being processed in the mind in some capacity. In fact, parallel uses of the Hebrew word usually are in the context of "wise and understanding/discerning" or "wise and discerning/understanding and experienced" or "a discerning/understanding heart" or "discern between ..." etc. In short, it's a reference to someone who has deep thoughts about something, not just passive observation. It's also interesting to remember the temporal proximity in that Job was probably written in the 500s BC and the Septuagint was written around 300BC. That would be about the difference in language development between today and when America was founded - or in other words, not much. So, those 70 Jewish scholars would have had a pretty strong understanding of the language Job was using.

To that end, I don't think Job is distinguishing between "looking, and letting his heart be enticed." I think Job 31:1 is certainly a reference to a deep contemplation in his mind. Job 31:9-10 then shows the fruit of that deep contemplation when it is put into action. In fact, I get the impression that 9-10 are a reference back to 31:1, where Job is essentially saying, "If I do break that covenant, this is what such a breaking would look like and what I hope would happen to me if I did that." Or, in other words, 31:9-10 are strong indications of what Job meant when he said 31:1 - that he assumed 9-10 were the natural conclusion of a violation of his covenant in 1.

I know word studies can seem like a lot of voodoo because some people like to claim they did a word study, then

pick the one bizarre, rarely used translation and run with that to force the verse into their own framework of understanding. So, as with the Bereans in Acts 17, I urge you to challenge me on this. But I do feel pretty confident about my conclusions on Job 31:1 (sorry for the vomit ... this isn't the first time I've been asked about this :p).

Jesus said ... Aren't you concerned about falling on the wrong side of the line here?

Not at all. If I were afraid of judgment, then I would not have been made perfect in love (1 John 4:18). Instead, Jesus states the own terms of what he means in Matthew 5:29-30, and I don't blow it off as hyperbole as most people do (I don't ever see Jesus speaking in hyperbole).

Most people want to look at what Jesus said to do: gouge your eye out; cut your hand off. But they ignore the rationale for why he said to do this: "it is better that you lose one of your members than that your whole body be thrown into hell." To rephrase: *If you could save yourself from hell by gouging out your eye or cutting off your hand, you should do it!* But we know that won't actually save anyone from hell. To understand why he's saying this at this time, we need to see the greater context of the sermon on the mount:

1. 5:1-16 - God's expectations for how we should live
2. 5:17-20 - God demands perfect obedience; this hasn't changed since the law was given
3. 5:21-48 - People are more sinful than they realize; trying to avoid sin is impossible and won't save you
4. 6:1-34 - Even when you try to do good, you fail and still sin
5. 7:1-6 - We'll be judged by our own failures; comparisons won't exonerate us
6. 7:7-29 - We can avoid God's judgment and find his provision when we seek Him, trusting Jesus' words

This should look familiar, as we often present it more like this:

- A. We were created perfect
- B. We sinned and became imperfect
- C. Our plans to solve the problem (good works, morality, religious practices) always fail
- D. We personally need a savior
- E. Believe/trust in Jesus, following His Word as evidence, and you will be saved

You'll note that this blurb in 5:29-30 about cutting off your eye or hand if it would save you from hell is in the "but you can't avoid sin because it's impossible and won't save you" part, which sets a really, really strong context for Jesus meaning this section both literally and as a pointless endeavor because Ch7 is where he says what the real answer to the problem is. In 5:29-30 he's still expressing the hopelessness of the problem. It's truly a beautiful sermon - to see Jesus presenting the Gospel for the first time, and before he even died, and before the Holy Spirit indwelt people to help them understand it! They didn't have Romans to give them context first. This must have been mind-blowing! I always smile thinking of the sermon on the mount :)

Princeton's new 'men's engagement manager' to combat aggressive masculinity on campus

3 upvotes · 26 July 2017 · /r/RedPillWives

I think that would make international news! It kind of reminds me of [this article](#) I just read yesterday (I like having my views challenged, so I read opposing views frequently). It totally bashes any "men's rights" attitude and

acts like feminism is the best thing that's happened in civilized history.

The misconceptions and out-of-context statements are astounding. But what I'm most intrigued by is that they quote the TRP Glossary for feminism, explaining how convoluted and horrible it is. Then they quote the dictionary definition: *The theory of the political, economic, and social equality of the sexes*, as if this describes all of feminism. As far as I can tell, feminism hasn't been about "equality" since the 90s, or even earlier (I was just a kid in the 80s, so I'm not as clear).

Then, what gets really funny is that after trashing the complex definition and quoting an over-simplified one, their **VERY NEXT POINT** is: "Cult leaders offer a simple solution to increasingly complex world problems."

Sorry for the mini-rant. I'm all for loving, caring for, and respecting women ... but the denial some people are in about what that should look like is just shocking.

Internalizing Red Pill ideologies significantly changed the way I think about men and relationships.

3 upvotes · 25 July 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

This was a very interesting read. Thanks for sharing! That said, there's one section that I'd like more information on:

Note: Sexual attractiveness can be operationalized in either the physical sense(appearance), mental sense (intelligence), or prestige (power)

For ages, I had intelligence absolutely mastered. My wife would constantly remark on this and most people who meet me will comment that I'm the smartest person they've ever known. I'm not trying to toot my horn here ... just bear with me.

As far as power goes, outside the home I am a man of influence. When I speak, people listen. It usually doesn't take more than 12 months for me to be in a position of leadership in whatever I do, sometimes much shorter. A good example, about a year ago the pastor of our church (read: man with all the power) asked me to disciple him so he could learn to lead like I do. This is how it's always been in all social gatherings, whether it's just having a "game night" with old college friends or being involved in community groups, or dominating everyone in a racquetball league.

- To be fair, inside the home I was a pedestalizing wife-worshiper, thinking that God's plan was for me to serve, serve, serve my wife to love her, as that was her "love language." So, I lost points for that. But when she'd ask what I'm reading and I said, "A book on improving leadership and assertiveness," her response was to laugh at me and say, "You should be writing that book ... and I don't think you need to be any more assertive."

But from all practical perspectives, even with those two things in place to some extreme, we still had a dead bedroom. Why? I was about 50-60lbs overweight. I've now lost 40 of that and am seeing significant progress (although we still have a long way to go).

So, with something like this in mind, how would that statement you made be interpreted?

- Women are turned on by one of those three. If hers was physical, it doesn't matter how intellectual or powerful you were, she's not going to be attracted.
- Women are turned on by a combination of all of these three and the level of sexual attraction is only as strong as the weakest trait. Your physical shape was crap, so her attraction was crap. Raise the physical above the power and the power will be the new limiting agent.
- Your wife should have been attracted to you because your intellect and power should have more than made up for your physical appearance. There must be more going on here than this model would account for.

I'm guessing the middle one, or some variation of it. But I'd love to hear your thoughts on this :)

As for your conclusions, I'm sorry that you feel this way, although I've often wondered if this wouldn't happen to some women. It has often been said: "The best is the worst enemy of the great." You'll never find and marry "the best man" because no man is perfect. You will always find some flaw. It's like George Costanza in Seinfeld (or his similar role in the movie Shallow Hal), who will dump an otherwise perfect girl because she had a slightly crooked toe nail.

More to the point, as his helper, one of the best things you can do is accept a man who isn't perfect and help him. After all, if you find a man who is already perfect and doesn't need you, where is your sense of fulfillment in the relationship?

I'm guessing you don't have a Christian background, but if you can ignore the spiritual side, I wrote a post about this [here](#). The conclusion is that:

A person is considered "attractive" if they have the appearance of: (1) being able to fulfill their duty; and (2) being able to let the other person fulfill their duty also.

For men, their duty is to be a leader/provider/alpha; for women it's to be submissive/helper/seducing. You're looking exclusively for (1) - someone who fulfills his duty perfectly. But I think if you embrace (2) you'll find your options opening widely - embracing the fact that you will not be satisfied in a relationship where a man will not let you fulfill your role for him because he's soooo alpha and independent that he doesn't have a place for you.

In reality, this subtle "need" (if you can call it that; sometimes he doesn't need it, he just wants it) is an imperfection. It is a defect that is designed by God in his character. So, ironically, the "perfect man" who is a 10 is someone who is imperfect if left to himself. You'll never find this guy on the SMP because a 10 doesn't become a 10 until he's got a woman at his side. There are 9s who abound in plenty, though. Let your hypergamy embrace this. You be the one to make a 9 a 10.

Field Report: From verbal sparring to compliments

3 upvotes · 25 July 2017 · /r/RedPillWives

Brilliant response! Love the theory behind it too :)

Your opinion of open marriages?

3 upvotes · 24 July 2017 · /r/askMRP

In addition to the comment I made that [/u/rocknroll](#) chuck linked to, there are a few more reasons why an open marriage is a terrible idea.

The biggest one is that you're giving her a blanket invitation to turn her hypergamy back on. When you're in a committed relationship, hypergamy looms in the background, but is often outweighed by the fact that a divorce will decrease her SMV and lower her position in the FSM, as well as from an enjoyment of the beta comforts she receives in the marriage/LTR.

A woman can raise her SMV really fast when some of these threats aren't present or have a psychological impact on her. Although you might be a 7 right now and she might be a 6, with a little makeup, some sexy moves, and that little black dress, she might be dolled up to an 8 and will be pulling better men than you.

In fact, in virtually all marriages, "The grass is always greener." If your SMV hasn't gone up drastically beyond hers, you're probably going to be pulling women on-par with your wife/LTR, but you'll enjoy it more because of the newness of it. You might find people slightly higher. But she's going to realize just how high her heights can go. If you're going to do an open relationship (which I never recommend), it'll almost always backfire if you do it

before she turns 40. Even a little post-wall, she can doll herself up a lot faster than you can.

If it helps, I had a client who went this route-ish. He and his wife were very sexually active, but it just wasn't enough for him. So, they started doing threesomes. They began with FFM at first, but she eventually persuaded him that it wasn't fair, so he brought another dude in the picture. One month later, his stuff is on the street, the new guy is living in his house, and he's calling me to handle his divorce. Don't be an idiot. Don't be that guy, whether it's through threesomes or an open relationship. It never works.

Mini-FR - The vasectomy conversation

3 upvotes · 24 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Have you considered that maybe she knows that once you do this, sex will be for pleasure only?

Well, it will have other purposes, but pleasure will certainly be the primary one at that point. But this is a good thought. I doubt she'd consciously think of it this way, but at a subconscious level, now that you've brought it to my attention, I'm very confident that this is going to be an issue I'll have to work through. She certainly does need a "mindset shift." But I also don't want to approach it from the angle of, "I must fix her mindset!"

I'd much rather address it from the angle of: *I'm going to be so awesome that you'll be so horny for me that your hamster will try to justify using sex for pleasure instead of procreation.* When I have the hamster working for me instead of against me, that's the sweet spot.

105 - Non-Negotiable Attraction

3 upvotes · 21 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

The fact is, when it comes to sex, what man wouldn't want his wife to be totally depraved? ;)

Don't be afraid to tell a girl straight up that you like her or find her attractive. They love that shit if it's coming from a place of confidence and non neediness.

3 upvotes · 21 July 2017 · /r/TheRedPill

I recently made a post about how to compliment a woman in a way that makes her feel sexy. The premise is that when a woman feels sexy, she's more likely to want sex (wives in particular).

What you're proposing is general compliments. To that end, if guys are still noobish about the approach, even though it shouldn't matter sometimes it feels safer complimenting something peripheral, like her shoes, shirt, or interesting jewelry. A couple weeks ago I told one of the gym workers I liked her shoes (she was in gym attire, but shiny, business-attire black flats). We laughed and she made a few comments back. Now, every time I go to the gym, guess who's coming up to me flashing her shoes with a smile ...

But I'm not interested in cheating on my wife, so I leave it at the general with other people. With my wife (and I recommend with any LTR), I go a step further. Here's how I break this down in a few easy examples:

First - Clothes

- **Generic:** "That dress is driving me crazy"
 - Her interpretation: "He might have a fetish for this style of dress."
- **Specific:** "The way that dress fits over your body is so tight, and your hips curving out that way ... it's turning me on."
 - Her interpretation: "He noticed the way my unique body shape is complimented and accentuated by my dress - and that makes him want me." Women care less that you notice the clothes than that you notice

them and what the clothes say about them.

Second - Hair

- **Generic:** "I love the way your hair looks today."
 - Her interpretation: "He likes this hair style on women, generally."
- **Specific:** "When you put your hair up that way, it reminds me of when we were at that one event, and the sex we had afterward - I can't get that out of my mind. [Playful/sarcastic:] Go change your hairdo or I might actually go insane."
 - Her interpretation: "He likes this hair style, but his memories of me are what's turning him on. We must have a strong connection."

Third - Skin

- **Generic:** "Your skin looks so smooth, I just want to rub my hands all over you."
 - Her interpretation: "He generally likes soft skin. I happened to use lotion today."
- **Specific:** "Your skin feels so smooth, I want to gently glide my hands across your legs and feel all the goosebumps that come up."
 - Her interpretation: "He's attracted by the way my body responds to his touch, and the way I take care of my skin helped facilitate that!"

Guys are notoriously bad at compliments. We stick with the generic because it's easy, but wives and LTRs want to know that **it's her and her alone** that we crave. If she thinks it's just about getting sex and any woman will do, that's a huge turn-off. To her, you've just become like the stereotypical sex-craved man-pig who would hump a rock if no one was looking. Show her she's wrong and she'll be putty in your hands! As I said above, when she feels sexy, she feels like sex.

By contrast, a woman considers herself beautiful when she feels like she radiates a positive aesthetic in her environment. This is very different from "sexy." Feeling sexy leads to sex. Feeling beautiful leads to efforts to improve her environment.

My wife used a stun gun on me and I took it

3 upvotes · 19 July 2017 · /r/askMRP

People are telling you to get out. I won't contradict that advice, but be forewarned that even if she is pretty crazy, if you can't drive, you're probably not getting custody because you can't meet all of your child's needs. If you have an alternative plan that you believe is sustainable your chances go back up a little.

Was this the an RP move? Need advice/input.

3 upvotes · 18 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

That's what holds the beta back: showing interest in "discipling" or being friends with her, when really he wants to date her.

Great points. I just want to comment on this briefly. One guy I know and trust once told me: "Dating is discipleship. Marriage is discipleship. Any time you try to divorce these concepts, you've lost the point and you're no longer leading her the way God intended."

To be clear, this assumes a Jesus-model of discipleship and not a rote teaching-model.

In the future, resolve to make your interests and intentions known as soon as possible.

[/u/mista_resista](#) - This is key in avoiding the "friend zone." Most people assume the friend zone is something a girl does to you. "She put me in the friend zone!" we say. In reality, we put ourselves in the friend zone. The friend zone is created when we develop oneitis and begin treating that woman differently from the way we would treat a practically identical woman for whom we have no oneitis. It didn't take RP to figure that out, but I think many guys miss this.

The woman you have oneitis for picks up on these differences and responds exactly in-kind. Those differences are almost always beta traits. Why? Because we're not idiots: we know that beta traits develop comfort, which will make a woman stick around. If you don't foster those beta traits, she's going to be gone when the fun is over.

The problem is that if you are all beta from the get-go, you'll get her to stick around, but without the alpha the relationship will never be excited or exciting. So, when you're friend-zoning yourself, you're getting exactly what you put in: she's around you and not leaving, but she's also not willing to escalate because you're not putting in alpha currency.

I have pondered much on what [/u/bluepillprofessor](#) dubbed cholomite's law: *Tingles without fuzzies won't last. Fuzzies without tingles are worthless.*

This should go without saying, but:

- Beta traits foster longevity.
- Alpha traits foster excitement.

As with most guys, you've already figured out the longevity part. You need to grow the alpha. I like to use the word "excite" (verb) for this because I'm a physics nut. Atoms have a ground state with no charge. In that ground state, they're not very interactive and rarely bond with other atoms. However, when something happens to excite the atom, its electrons jump to higher energy states/orbits around the nucleus, making it much easier for that atom to bond with another nearby atom. This is somewhat risky because too much excitement can cause free-radicals to start bouncing around in a system, which is incredibly dangerous. Interestingly, that danger is noticed by the other atoms around and (because of entropy), they are drawn to this atom, feeding off its excitement, preventing it from becoming a rogue-free-radical. The result is that the excited atom doesn't blow its top and the surrounding atoms have their electrons more excited than before. So, even without the excited atom trying to form bonds, other atoms will make their way to it to bond with it anyway, hoping to feed off of its excitement in order to harmonize/equalize the energy within a system. That's what you want.

To simplify this without the physics babble: become more exciting and other people (including girls) will want to be around you. When you find a girl you want, escalate: apply your exciting energy onto her (physically, emotionally, spiritually, mentally, relationally), making her more excited and taming your excitement by gratifying it through the relationship (not just sex, for which you should still wait until marriage).

One final science lesson that might do more to tie this together:

- Guys get excited about sex for no reason (i.e. high electron energy state), whereas girls remain in the ground state most of the time. We cannot expect otherwise.
- Like the electrons, the more the energy state escalates, the more edgy other atoms' electrons in the area become; they start to get excited to, hoping to bond with that electron. This is akin to a guy sending his sexual vibes to his wife (intentionally or not; it doesn't matter).
- Whether the atom initiates or its neighbor (wife) does, a bond is ultimately formed (i.e. sex).
- The probability of atoms forming electron-sharing bonds is often directly related to the degree of excitement

of electrons between the two.

- After the bond is formed, the excited atom's electrons are stabilized, often hopping down a rung or two in its excitement levels (ergo the lull after a guy has sex); but the reactionary atom's electrons are often held in a higher state than when they started (ergo the wife's ability to remain aroused for some time, even after her first climax, and also what is commonly called the "afterglow").

Rejecting appreciation ... weird concept, but it works for me.

3 upvotes · 17 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I'll definitely look into that. Thanks for your insightful analysis.

Promiscuity and pair bonding

3 upvotes · 15 July 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

That's what the psychologist recommended. My client decided to settle ... but at least he got custody.

Is Red Pill truly congruent with Holiness?

3 upvotes · 14 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

The question you're asking is really way ahead in the series I have been posting, so I won't likely address it in detail for quite some time yet. That said, here's the short answer.

God intentionally designed physical sexuality to be the height of The Human Experience. I honestly believe this. The reason behind it has to do with what sexuality parallels in the spiritual realm, which is evangelism and discipleship. As a result, it is incredibly important in fostering our desire for an understanding of evangelism and discipleship to have a healthy sexual appetite. A lack thereof almost always correlates with spiritual impotency as well. Although correlation does not always imply causation, biblically I think this mandate is established as a causal relationship.

I have experienced this in my own life, and many men who I have discipled have a firm this as well: a dead bedroom kills motivation for evangelism and discipleship. Someone who does not see physical reproduction positively and as something to be enjoyed will likely not see spiritual reproduction that way either.

Now, you also mentioned something about being too self-centered. The church often teaches a false organization of how love relationships work. The church says to use the joy acronym: Jesus, others, yourself. That is, we should love Jesus first, others after him, and ourselves as the lowest. This is true as far as priority, but it is impossible to follow it in practice.

You quoted the Golden Rule, but missed what Jesus was really saying about how to love others. "Love your neighbor as yourself" assumes you have to know how to love yourself first. If you don't know how to take care of and appreciate yourself and your own desires, you will be incapable of loving others as well. The as yourself part must come before the love others part, in practice.

Likewise, in 1 John 4:20, it says, "Whoever does not love his brother whom he has seen cannot love God whom he has not seen." So, before we can love Jesus effectively we must first learn to love our brothers.

With this order in mind it makes sense to me that we must learn to love ourselves first, so that we are capable of knowing how to love our brothers, and when we love our brothers that is when we become able to love God effectively.

That is not to say that we should be self-centered, rather this is the founding principle of every overflow / abundance ministry. You must make sure that your tank is full first, then your life will overflow into your family, then your family's well-being will overflow into your friends and church, and as your church becomes healthy that

health will overflow into a community, which will overflow into a city, which will overflow into a state, etc. That is not to say that we should ever ignore any of these areas of life altogether while waiting to get our own act together, but it does establish a degree of efficiency and how we should approach ministry. Countless pastors will tell you over and over and over again: if you are not emotionally, spiritually, and physically healthy yourself, you are destined to be burned out and ineffective in your ministry.

As I noted in the beginning of this comment, sexual health is an incredibly important area not only in your physical relationship with your spouse, but also because of the subliminal implications it creates on your spiritual life as well. I know I'm being a little vague with this, but I hope this answer is at least a little sufficient for now. Don't worry, I will write more on this later, with the scripture to back it up.

That said, there are things that RP praxeology gets wrong and which violates scripture, and there are some things that it misses altogether, but which the Bible affirms to us. So, you're right in saying that RP only gets you about 95% of the way.

Woman's desire is to their HUSBAND according to God

3 upvotes · 13 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I think I mentioned a couple of them in my previous comment (Eph. 5, 1 cor. 14), but other examples that show the parallel between human marriage and our relationship with God include:

- Isaiah 54:5 - "For your Maker is your husband"
- Matthew 9:15 - Jesus referencing himself as our bridegroom (parallel in Mark and Luke)
- John 3:28-29 - John the Baptist referencing Jesus as our bridegroom and us as the bride (parallel in one of the other Gospels)
- 2 Corinthians 11:2 - "For I betrothed you to one husband, so that to Christ I might present you as a pure virgin"
- Revelation 19:7 - "for the marriage of the Lamb has come and His bride has made herself ready"
- Revelation 21:2 - "And I saw the holy city ... made ready as a bride adorned for her husband"
- Revelation 22:17 - referencing us as "the bride"

Clearly God intends human marriages to parallel our relationship with Him. 1 John 4:20 gives one additional point of clarity on what I'm suggesting:

- "He who does not love his brother whom he has seen cannot love God whom he has not seen."

This clarifies the direction of the parallel - the physical is a pathway to get to the spiritual. In essence, God gave us physical representations of spiritual concepts as a means to an end. If we want to learn how to love God in the context of a spiritual relationship, loving others in a physical relationship is what will open our eyes to what that's supposed to look like. Then there's Hebrews 8-10 (see specifically 8:5 and 9:23) and Colossians 2:17 that say quite plainly that the earthly things are parallels (literally "copies and shadows") of the heavenly things.

Other good examples of this:

- Physical circumcision correlates to spiritual circumcision (Romans 2:25-29)
- Baptism by water (physical) as compared with baptism by the Spirit (spiritual) (Matthew 3:11)
- The physical nation of Israel correlates to a spiritual nation of God's people (Romans 9:8)

If you want, re-read the book of Leviticus with this in mind and your reality will explode :D

Woman's desire is to their HUSBAND according to God

3 upvotes · 13 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Very true.

Although it does flow both ways, from Scripture I get the impression that the physical relationship a wife has with her husband is meant to be a road map to help her understand the spiritual relationship God intends the woman to have with Him also. In that sense, a woman's ability to submit to her husband is a stepping stone on her path toward developing an appropriately submissive relationship with God also.

That said, when a woman is struggling with an unbelieving husband or a spiritually immature husband, she often learns (unintentionally) to bypass her husband as a path to connecting with God and building that relationship directly. In these situations, it is then the submissiveness to God that helps them understand how to submit to their husbands, even though this is backwards from what I believe God designed and intended. 1 Cor. 14 and Ephesians 5 come to mind as setting up the "God to husband; husband to wife" structure.

I'm curious what [/u/RedPillWonder](#) thinks about this, though?

Woman's desire is to their HUSBAND according to God

3 upvotes · 13 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

He's trying to trap you into a semantics game. RP strategy says to use fogging in arguments like these, especially when he has a point that's legitimately true. *Repent* in a technical definition way means "turn around" or "turn away." In Jonah 3:10, as he points out, God turned away from what he suggested he might do. There are many interpretations on this, but if nothing else, from God's expressed communication to his people, he "repented" of his decision, even though he wasn't in the wrong for any of it. The same could be said of God's command to have Abraham sacrifice Isaach - he told him to do it, then he "repented"/turned away from that decision to do something else instead. God's repentance doesn't have an impact on his unchanging nature, nor does it change the fact that repentance in the context spoken to flawed humans is almost always a turning away from sin. In that sense, I would just fog - agree with him where he is technically accurate, but stay assertive as to your equally valid and more prominently true point without backing down.

Remember ... RP tactics aren't just applicable in marriage settings ;)

Woman's desire is to their HUSBAND according to God

3 upvotes · 13 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

1 Corinthians 5 is the conclusion on this matter to me: "For what have I to do with judging outsiders? Is it not those inside the church whom you are to judge? God judges those outside. 'Purge the evil person from among you.'"

In short, if Courage1611 is stating definitively that homosexuals are outside the church, then this verse states definitively that it's God's place to judge them, not his. If, however, a homosexual attempts to identify with Christ and claim he is within the church, then he subjects himself to the judgment of those people God has put in charge of the church, the penalty for which is excommunication so that they take their rightful place outside the church. If it helps, I once made [this illustration](#) to help bring clarity to the matter ... kind of cool to bring it out again after it hasn't been used in so long.

It's also worth noting that Romans 1 does not say that homosexuals are given up to the "reprobate/debased/depraved" mind as Courage1611 suggests. The depraved mind is actually the next layer after

being given over to homosexuality. It's a 4-step process:

- Ignore God, worship other things; if you don't repent, God gives you over to ...
- lust and general sexual sin; if you don't repent, God gives you over to ...
- homosexual acts and "dishonorable passions"; if you don't repent, God gives you over to ...
- the depraved mind.

Although I agree that for someone to be beyond forgiveness they must first reach the depraved mind status, I don't see any Scriptural evidence that everyone with a depraved mind has necessarily committed the unforgivable sin or is somehow beyond repentance.

Also, Courage1611 is on the verge of having his comments removed if he keeps talking disrespectfully. Don't be afraid to report him or PM me if you see something out of line.

Part 1 - Signs your wife might have a personality disorder

3 upvotes · 12 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Did you read the second paragraph of the post? It appears you are commenting without actually having read what I wrote. Even without that, I would have assumed the title "PART 1" would give the answer here away.

Part 1 - Signs your wife might have a personality disorder

3 upvotes · 12 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I couldn't disagree more. Understanding why a person acts the way they do can help drastically in developing strategy for how to get them in your frame. I have to do this all the time when my client also has a PD.

Although we can't control her behavior, we can certainly set our boundaries and enforce them in a way that will maximize the probability of her response conforming to expectation. That's why it's often said here that RP tools are just tools, the man has to figure out which tool is needed at what time and how to use it in a given situation. Understanding why a person does what they do can go a long way in helping to identify not only which tool to use and how to use it, but also in inventing new tools when an existing one won't get the job done.

Also, every book on the sidebar I've read so far starts off with the "why people do what they do" conversation before actually going into the substance ... NMMNG, WISNIFG, MMSLP ... they all see the reasoning behind the method as important. Why? Because "why" does matter. If no one ever asked why, there would be no red pill at all.

MRP opinion on birth control?

3 upvotes · 11 July 2017 · /r/askMRP

It was my way to guarantee 100% control of conception

I personally know 3 different guys who all got girls pregnant after having a vasectomy (DNA results confirmed). I handled their child support cases. Trust me, they were ticked. I do hear it's solid for the most part, but it's certainly not 100%. Be careful.

How did you end up discovering Red Pill truths?

3 upvotes · 11 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

What brought you here? - I hit a low point a couple years back (including a long period of sexlessness in my marriage) and started making small improvements; ramped up my efforts about 6 months ago by running, dieting and being more intentional about being a leader in the home. I can't remember what linked me over, but I saw a post that interested me, caused me to read a few more posts, ended up spending the whole night reading crap and realizing how it's exactly what I had just been doing for the last 6 months with a few extra "tricks of the trade" that I hadn't picked up from reading the Bible alone.

Issue - Crappy sex life was probably the biggest thing for me. My wife wasn't attracted to me. 2 years ago (my low point) she told me point blank: "You're fat and I'm not attracted to you" ... hence my agreement with TRP/MRP that fitness really does matter ... glad I'm knocking that one out of the park now!

T/MRP Advice - In short: *Lift, OYS, sidebar*. There was also a lot of really bad advice about, "She's broken; get out; she's just too low libido."

Church - 5LL over and over and over ... "Covert contracts are great. Do this and your wife will overflow with love for you!" They wouldn't be so blunt, and I bought into it at first, but that's essentially what I realize they were saying now.

Successful? - Church advice was not successful at all. I will say this in bold: **Pastors should NEVER confuse biblical teaching with psychological teaching.** 95% of sermons I hear nowadays (even from great pastors, like Tim Keller) are psychology with a little Bible to support it. I don't want teachings that are merely "consistent" with Scripture; they must be "produced by" Scripture. What I read in the Bible that I was implementing for the last 6 months has been very effective; all of it has been T/MRP stuff that I just learned from Scripture. T/MRP added a few new things that have been equally successful.

Search - Can't remember, but it had nothing to do with marriage improvement; it was just an accident.

Faith - My first post was titled "RP and religion ... ?" I'm pretty comfortable, although I get a lot of heat from the "RP and Christianity don't mix!" crowd.

Church Contribution - I disciple my pastor, so I'll probably have him read NMMNG pretty soon. He's totally beta and constantly makes jokes from the pulpit about his wife leading the household. He says it in a joking way, like, "I really lead, I'm just being humble and playing on a Christian trope," but from what he and I talk I get more the impression that although he may "lead" the house by making the final call, that "final call" is 99% aligned with what his wife wants and he calls it "service." In my experience with church discipleship ministries (specifically with the Navigators), if you don't get leadership on board you can't change a culture.

Original Post - https://www.reddit.com/r/askMRP/comments/6jjldo/rp_and_religion/

leader ... I thought I was, but I really wasn't

This was totally me reading NMMNG. There were a lot of things I was doing right, but then several other things would hit me hard. Interestingly, at one point after NMMNG when I was reading WISNIFG my wife asked what I was reading and I said, "A book on how to be more assertive." She laughed and said, "You are the last person in the world who needs to learn to be more assertive." So, apparently she didn't perceive me as a "nice guy," but I still felt like one. I was just better at hiding my overly-beta traits.

one month for every year you've been married

[/u/BluePillProfessor](#)'s time-frame suggestion hasn't been too far off for me. Our 9 year anniversary is in 2 weeks and I started my process 6 months ago (pre-RP, discovered RP 2 weeks ago). The first 6 months were laying the groundwork, then the last 2 weeks have been night and day. I described it to someone: it's like a dad traveling

from Disney Land (beta) to the summit of Pike's Peak (alpha). My first 6 months pre-RP were the actual distance being traveled. Once I found RP I was already at the foot of the mountain, wandering aimlessly, not knowing how to climb up - only over. RP was the tipping point, and everything started changing immediately. I can only imagine where we'll be when we officially hit the 9-month mark.

RP Christians: Great Idea

3 upvotes · 11 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

That it does :)

Welcome to Red Pill Christians

3 upvotes · 10 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Glad you're here! I do understand the need for rough and tumble motivation. That said, I also believe it is possible to deliver hard, cold truth in a blunt yet respectable manner. This is often one of my strengths with guys I disciple, and I believe others can pull it off too.

102 - Desire and the Curse

3 upvotes · 10 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Great advice. I think the issue is this:

- TRP assumes we are unitary beings - we have physical impulses and that's it.
- MRP assumes we are binary beings - we have physical impulses and emotional longings, both of which must be satisfied for an LTR to work.
- CRP knows we are trinitarian beings - we have physical impulses, emotional longings, and spiritual authority, all of which must work and be exercised in harmony for a healthy person and relationship.

I should say, we also all have a "mind," but this is really a common aspect of our being that balances the different aspects of who we are. So, TRP would say our "mind" is what figures out how to get our physical urges met; MRP would say it balances physical urges and emotional longings; CRP would say it is the tool God gave us for implementing body, heart, and spirit. Alternatively, some people lump "heart/mind" together or "spirit/heart" together. I'm not that invested in one particular model ... just to know that we cannot leave out our spirit from the equation.

Red Pill Advice for a 17 year-old?

3 upvotes · 10 July 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

Didn't mean to come off angry or accusatory, just giving a different perspective.

I don't think extroverted = RP and shy = BP (although there is certainly a trend that can't be ignored), but I do see what you're saying a lot better now. I think these clarifications help complement your original post much better. Thanks for the follow-up! That said, [/u/RedPillWonder](#) gave some great advice ... worth a read for guys too.

Help

3 upvotes · 10 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Most women can't, but this is especially true with BPD. BPD = hamsters on steroids.

6 Questions for Christian Merps

3 upvotes · 10 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

All great points.

I would reject Mormonism as a legitimate Christian denomination, but I do see where their family structure is more in line with what we see in biblical cultures. Mennonites are another example of a people group that holds a very sound family structure, biblically ... but they're so absent from the rest of inter-church relationships that most people don't consider them a "denomination." They're branded as their own thing entirely.

When you say divorce is preferable to flirting and higher levels of dread, do you see a problem with at-will divorce when someone is unsatisfied, or do you stick with the more traditional, "Only when your spouse dies, cheats, or walks away without coming back" triad for breaking the marriage bond?

101 - Fitness develops attraction

3 upvotes · 10 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Good thought! I love those verses too :) I used to use that passage to address physical fitness also. The problem is that when I studied it those verses aren't talking about how physically fit someone should be. They're talking about not being sexually immoral with your body.

The closest we can get to imputing a "fitness" context from that passage is several verses earlier when Paul uses the phrase, "Food is meant for the stomach and the stomach for food" (v13) - but then he immediately goes back to sexual immorality and doesn't bring up food again, and after talking about sexual immorality that whole time, that's when he finally brings up the "your body is a temple" part.

Using those verses to talk about physical fitness is not a definitively wrong interpretation ... I just don't find enough context to make it an authoritative interpretation either. That said, I have no qualms with those who disagree on this relatively minor point.

How to bring out the Alpha in a Beta man?

3 upvotes · 9 July 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

The point isn't to make women do any of this. It's purely for women whose men won't lead them in the first place.

Help

3 upvotes · 9 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Great thoughts. One thing ...

find a church that values biblical gender roles and start attending worship there

How do you go about finding this unicorn? I've searched endlessly. I have found countless (literally) churches that verbally preach appropriate biblical gender roles, but absolutely zero (literally) where the congregation actually takes them seriously. I have found exactly 1 church where the pastor modeled biblical gender roles in his own life, but he was only at the church for 2.5 years before relocating.

6 Questions for Christian Merps

3 upvotes · 8 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Great questions. Here are over-simplified answers on otherwise extremely lengthy topics.

ONE

The message of Christ is a simple one:

- Admit we're not perfect
- Believe in Jesus and repent = only way to become perfect

- Commit in your heart to live in light of the truth

The message of the red pill is this:

- Admit that you're a beta screw-up
- Believe in a MAP and repent
- Commit internally to live in light of the truth

For Christians, Jesus is the penultimate expression of manliness, including the aspects of sexuality ... but that's a much, much longer topic and one that I've gotten into way too many times on reddit to re-hash here.

One of my good friends once explained: "TRP has done a stellar job identifying a problem; but they have gone too far in offering a solution." MRP tones the "shack and sack" concept down significantly to coincide with biblical views on LTRs, but still goes too far in promoting active divorce where the guy initiates the leaving.

As for Paul and Peter, Peter had a wife who followed him around on his missionary journeys. He was the alpha with a mission and she helped him on this mission as a supporter (1 Cor. 9:5), while maintaining an appropriate balance of beta traits to give her security in the midst of the dangers they face. Paul wasn't married, but he certainly gave a lot of advice, which rarely (if ever) conflicts with MRP principles.

TWO

I reject the theory that feminism is the cause of this split, as we see gender discrepancies in the church much, much earlier than the feminist movement, which didn't really begin until the 1800s. To give the brief synopsis of my theory:

- In the early 300s AD Emperor Constantine politicized Christianity. Women had no political power, so they were free to connect with it on an emotional/spiritual level. Men could not discern political power from spiritual power; so, although numbers remained equal, their motivations for being involved were very, very different.
- 1600s - American puritanism abuses Christianity as an aggressive manipulative ploy against women, further solidifying that the men's hearts were in the wrong places. Men became more and more attached to other aspects of "the new world" and faith became less appealing when they had other more natural/less-harmfully-manipulative means of controlling their women.
- 1800s - After the American revolution, religious freedom sparked around the world. There were no longer cultural mandates that everyone must attend church, so the men who weren't really into it started trickling out because they weren't socially pressured to the same degree. Women never lost the emotional/spiritual connection, so they remained.
- Late 1800s - The rise of women's suffrage gives the church a new platform in public forums. People had long used biblical concepts in first world countries for the suppression of women's rights, so when the subject became at issue the church's input was actually invited. Different branches played both sides, leading to the split of numerous denominations.
- 1900s - Feminization of the western world gains cultural momentum and the church hops on the bandwagon as its only hope from dying out in an otherwise anti-faith culture. Scriptural interpretation officially changes to meet liberal demands. Industrialization shifts the focus from alpha males b/c most jobs before then were very alpha in nature; desk jobs became more prominent, leading guys to adopt more beta traits; this trickled over to pastors and elders who needed to justify their newfound beta-ness as it was becoming more prominent worldwide.

THREE

I don't know that I would put it so bluntly, but yes, feminism has certainly invaded much of the church. The church can't get around most clear, unambiguous biblical passages, so they'll still verbally preach male headship in the home, but they get around it by applying it in very beta ways that put women on a pedestal. For example: "Men, it's your job to lead the home. This means loving your wife like Christ loved the church, which he died for [Ephesians 5]. So, you need to place your wife's needs, wants and desires above your own and lead with this type of self-sacrificing love."

Interestingly, Jesus set the model of extreme love, but we also see repeatedly, over and over again in Scripture that he did it because that's what increased his glory the most. As many a theologian has said: *We are not the center of God's universe; his glory is the reason he's doing all of this, and we exist to glorify Him.* Philippians 2 says plainly that God "gave [Jesus] the name that is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow in heaven and on earth and under the earth to the glory and praise of God." That's not to say we should be arrogantly seeking our own glory all the time, but we can't abandon this context when we look at the facts of why God sent Jesus to die in the first place.

FOUR

None in the western church ... pretty much all of them in third world countries. Feminism has really only swept through first world countries. It's part of the "worldly wisdom" of which Paul says, "Although they claim to be wise, they became fools" (Romans 1). I find many first world denominations openly rejecting feminism with their words, but the culture of their congregations still radiates female-headship in the homes. As a result, it's impossible to say which ones really mean it and which ones don't. I haven't found a denomination yet (including my own home church) who "really means it."

FIVE

I've given a lot of thinking to this. My gut-reaction was to say, "No, dread is unbiblical." But then I start looking at all the times Jesus uses dread and I can't get around it. We (the church as a whole) are his bride, but he still says of people who think they're "in" - "I never knew you; away from me you evildoer" (Matthew 7:23). He also preaches quite a bit about hell and all the dangers of what will happen if we're not engaged in a loving relationship with him. It's really quite terrifying.

Here's the thing though ... I don't think he's saying that to scare us into loving us; he's saying it to make us aware of the consequences so that we can make wise and informed decisions. Likewise, we should not intentionally use dread to scare our wives into being sexier for us; rather, it's beneficial for them to know, "If you disown me, I'll disown you **before my Father in heaven**" (Matthew 10:33) ... or to put it another way, "If you reject my advances [vis a vis the Holy Spirit], I'll divorce you" (eternal security issues aside, of course).

That said, Paul affirms this in 2 Timothy 2 with an additional caveat: "But if we are faithless, he remains faithful." This means that we must, to some degree, give our wives the security that we will love her and be faithful to her even when she isn't perfect in her role ... but if she openly rejects us, all bets are off.

Couple this with combinations of Matthew 18, 1 Corinthians 5 and 1 Cor. 7 we get a much more full picture of how dread levels rise in the church.

SIX

I did a study on "head coverings" about 2 years ago. It was very interesting and resulted in my wife and sisters all going out to buy them (even though that was not necessarily my conclusion). Paul says the reason for head coverings is to show male headship in the home. I started to wonder how the world would be different if all women had a constant reminder of this - and men had that constant encouragement from the women: "I'm giving you permission to be my leader, and this symbol is a reminder to you to take your God-given role."

Suffice it to say, yes, I do believe the next generation can bring back this authority, but I find it highly improbable

as long as (1) education, (2) government, (3) media, (4) arts and entertainment, and (5) businesses keep catering to a liberal agenda.

Liberal thinking is to fantasy/idealism as RP thinking is to science/philosophy. Get people grounded in the pragmatic aspects of how the world actually operates (typically because God created it that way) rather than fanciful idealistic notions (usually born from our sinful nature) and that's about the best shot we've got.

Dealing with the stressed wife.

3 upvotes · 7 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

He told me that they both took the Love Languages quiz

I actually posted about the 5LL last week. My conclusion is this: *5LL fosters fuzzies; RP fosters tingles. If you're trying to improve your sex life, 5LL will fail. If you're trying to improve her comfort and trust in the relationship, 5LL is perfect.*

But yes, I also noted that 5LL is all about covert contracts. That's the major flaw with the book. As BPP said, 5LL has value in that it opens our eyes to different methods of gaming our wives. So, stick with using it for that purpose.

The biological step-mother.

3 upvotes · 7 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I was confused for a while because I thought this conversation was in the other thread (I was on mobile when I read and responded to you at first). Regardless, thanks for keeping me in check on this. I don't think I ever correlated our actions to her actions in the way most covert contracts work, but I probably did leave that impression and have made two edits as a result. In my summary, I clarified:

[Edit: assuming no other psychological barriers]

[Edit: Desire doesn't always mean sex or action conformity. Women desire things but don't do anything about it all the time. All you're doing is fostering a psychological condition in her that opens doors for active conformity and puts shiny things on the other side; she still has to choose to walk through, and women don't always make the logical choice.]

That said, cultivating psychological conditions is almost purely reactionary. Athol Kay does this a billion times in MMSLP. Whether or not she acts on that psychological conditioning is a different story. As has often been said, women don't always follow logic. So, you can put a pot of gold in front of her and there's always that chance that she might walk away from it for otherwise incomprehensible reasons. To that end, I feel confident in the "this for that" of how you can cause a woman to perceive you, but assuming they will adjust their actions to align with their perceptions is a fantasy that cannot be controlled. That doesn't mean we're without hope, though, or should just ignore her actions and response altogether. This is where probability and statistical methodology comes in.

Lawyer job aside, math and statistics are ingrained in my education and lifestyle. So, where the absoluteness of a legal contract doesn't apply, probabilities and confidence intervals take their place. This is actually true even in the legal world as well, which is why we have contempt of court actions when people break contracts - all we can do is foster a condition where they are likely to act the way we want. If I put a piece of cake on one end of the table and broccoli on the other end, then point my kid at the table, I have created a high probability that he will move toward the side of the table with the cake. The fact that I'm showing him cake (something he naturally desires) is not a covert contract, just like the fact that you expressing yourself to your wife in a way that she naturally desires is not a covert contract, and there's nothing wrong with expecting her to desire you when you act consistently with what she desires. It only becomes a contract when we build an expectation of action into the

mix. Those expectations are never contractual obligations (and it ruins it if they become that); but establishing high probability both maintains the fun when you do get what you want, while also keeping you grounded in the possibility that condition does not always produce action.

This prompts me that it might be a good idea to do a post on confidence intervals. They work something like this. There is a normal distribution curve with the "mean" or median (depending on which model you use) being the peak. This represents how all people act within a given system. There are certain outliers on both ends, but the majority of people will fall right within the middle. A confidence interval is the % degree of confidence someone can have that a particular data point will conform to a specific range from the mean. Establishing a psychological setting shifts the mean up or down the scale to get it where you want it. So, on a scale of 1-100, given a certain set of conditions that I have established for my process, I can say, "I am 95% confident that the result will be between 76 and 84." As we widen the range to, say, 70-90, my confidence level increases because I now have an easier target (i.e. the CI might be 98%). If we narrow the range, our CI drops because it's a harder target.

So, as men, we have to decide the range of acceptable outcomes and adjust our system so that we develop an acceptable degree of confidence (usually 90% or higher; sometimes 95% if you want to go by most business standards) that our setting will produce a result within that range. Sure, the 10% or 5% chance might actually happen with our wives, and we build that into the system. But this is a case-by-case basis and not a person-by-person basis. So, out of 20 attempts, my wife might deviate from my expectations 1 or 2 times if my CI is accurate, but certainly not 7 or 8 times. If she does deviate 7 or 8 times, then there is a missing variable that I have not accounted for and it's back to the drawing board. In the midst of all of this, men should continue to be OI in how they proceed, but that doesn't mean we can't be intelligent about how we foster probability. We just can't be upset when we set up a 95% confidence condition and she chooses the 5%.

For the most part, OYS, passing tests, getting fit, and the other good advice here are all of the primary variables. But every individual woman has additional variables that only her husband will know about - they're her unique quirks. For example, my wife hates the word "juicy." So, although I may do everything else right, if I say in the middle of dinner, "This steak is so juicy," that's going to push her to become an outlier, increasing her probability of deviating from the mean and defying the confidence interval. So, I have to start accounting for that in future interactions, whereas men and women who just meet (i.e. TRP people instead of MRP) can't account for these things, giving married men an advantage if they have actually paid attention to their wives even only a little bit throughout the relationship.

I'm not sure how much of that you agree with, and I know math and formulas can't explain everything, but this is how my world functions and I'm finding it to be reliable on a consistent basis. It also explains concepts we see a lot like, "If you always do what you've always done, you'll always get what you've always got" - because the same formula always produces the same data points. To be clear, it's not about setting up a covert contract; it's about fostering probability.

how she responds to all this is irrelevant IMO

In a perfect world, I would agree. Unfortunately, this is TRP thinking and not my interpretation of MRP thinking. If men treated wives like plates, where they just drop and replace her when she doesn't conform, there would be no point of MRP in the first place - everyone would just keep using TRP. The fact of being at MRP presumes that men want to preserve their marriage in some way. So, "you'll easily find her replacement" might be true and a nice preparatory mentality, but it's not what most of us actually want.

This is where men have more variables than TRP accounts for, because there is value in the LTR that often gets undermined. This value causes us to seek to bolster our marital relationships and restore them to their former glory rather than "ditch and replace." To that end, my wife's response does, in fact, matter - just not to my plan for improving and securing my life. I interpret OI meaning that I will keep improving regardless of whether or not my wife responds. It doesn't mean I create an emotional or biological (i.e. sex-drive) detachment to her

responses, which would just be a sucky way to live. Even to that end, the "ditch and replace" model actually says the same thing: you are so emotionally and biologically attached to her responses that if she's not meeting that emotional need with her responses you need to find someone else who will.

Legal consequences of divorce alone are enough to prove this. If you're in a 25 year marriage and your wife rejects sex all the time, you can't just say, "What she does is irrelevant; I'll just keep being awesome." At that point you have to accept the sexless life, which will have an impact on you whether you like it or not; or you can fool around on her, she divorces you, and you're stuck paying spousal support for life ... which will have an impact on you whether you like it or not. No matter what, her actions will impact you in some way. She can't control your emotions, but her response to your actions does impact your life condition. This is a reality best not left ignored.

(secret sex club) Does the 20/80 rule follow into extra-marital affairs?

3 upvotes · 26 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

Divorce attorney here. About a year and a half ago I did an analysis of over 200 of my cases for why the divorce happened. Of the ones that involved marital infidelity, about 60% of the time it was the wife and 40% it was the man. I went by who cheated first, as the other usually feels no remorse in extramarital affairs after that, which would skew the numbers.

Interestingly, of the 60% of women, about 2/3 explained that Facebook was the culprit, almost always involving someone they had previously been in a relationship with or otherwise had a longstanding connection to (i.e. rarely a one-night-stand at the bar). Most guys aren't actively invested in Facebook stalking to the same degree as women. When women use Facebook in unsatisfying relationships, they remember these past SOs or long-term friends/colleagues and their minds start to wander. Next thing you know, they're sending a very nice "thank you" message or leaving a comment about how cute their kids are. That initiated contact snowballs.

Tag: /u/5xtheflava

Unknowingly married someone with BPD (and was pressured into doing so)

2 upvotes · 27 August 2025 · /r/RPChristians

****Caution to ALL Men****

This is why I ****DO NOT**** recommend marrying someone on less than a year of knowing them. 2-3 is more ideal. Yeah, yeah, "But I want to have sex now!" Sure, if having sex a year earlier is more important than ensuring you don't get into this type of situation, go for it - your decision, your risk, your consequence.

If she truly has BPD, I give you 80% odds you end up divorced. If you have a kid when you divorce, you are dealing with it for the next 18 years, including likely child support and her constantly trying to manipulate everyone in the child's life against you - teachers, doctors, coaches, church friends, and on and on. BPDs almost always fabricate claims of abuse and think their (ex)husband is the one with the mental problems, and they make sure everyone knows exactly what they think/feel about you. Their stories are insanely believable because through what's called "confabulation" they rewrite history in their own brains to comport to their twisted emotional experience instead of the facts, meaning they really believe the things they're saying, which causes others to believe it also ("It didn't look like she was lying when she told me about it, so I trusted her").

****Understanding BPD and DBT****

The good news is that BPD is treatable with quite high success rates if (1) she is correctly diagnosed as a BPD, (2) she engages specifically in dialectical behavioral therapy, and (3) she agrees with the diagnosis and treatment, wants help, and is committed to following through.

FWIW - BPDs have constant cognitive dissonance, where their thoughts, feelings, and senses all communicate different information to their brains. If you say, "I became frustrated when you did this" and she feels like it's an attack on her, (a) her ears will hear "I became frustrated when you did this" but her feelings will receive it as (b) "You are an awful person for having done this to me; I hate you," and when she tells the story she will genuinely believe that you said she was an awful person and that you hate her (i.e. the confabulation bit) because her brain cannot reconcile the conflicting inputs and it gives her feelings precedence over the facts.

DBT is a type of counseling that focuses on helping borderlines (and other people) recognize that conflicting thoughts can both simultaneously be true. For example: in the exact same moment I can say, "I really want to go to this social event at my church" and also say, "But I'd also rather just veg out at home after a rough week at work." BPDs have massive dynamic swings where they feel like they must always massively love something or massively hate it and are constantly forced to choose. When they recognize that conflicting feelings are acceptable to have - and not just on an intellectual acknowledgement level, but to truly internalize the concept - it helps resolve (a) their ability to perceive facts more accurately, and (b) their ability to self-regulate when they find themselves shifting toward those super swings.

Unknowingly married someone with BPD (and was pressured into doing so)

2 upvotes · 27 August 2025 · /r/RPChristians

History of abuse or significant number of sexual partners/sexual impulsivity are DSM-V diagnostic criteria for BPD. When I do premarital counseling I make the couples take the MMPI test for personality disorders just to make sure they know what they're getting themselves into. In this case, having that information before marriage would have been significant for someone (whether OP or someone else who is advising him who might be more familiar with what red flags to look out for in terms of mental illness) to see those things in order to let him know what he's getting into before committing for life.

Not sure what to do, need guidance.

2 upvotes · 16 August 2025 · /r/RPChristians

I was going to give a bullet-point list of all the obvious red flags in your post, but [u/Praexology](#) already did that, so I'll move on.

I saw you post your stats in a comment and [u/DonnieWearsVelvet](#) hit the nail on the head. You're a super low-value man right now. Physically, spiritually, mentally ... you have nothing to offer her. Why in the world would you expect her to stick around? I'll give you a reason: because you can be better. That's what every girl wants - a husband who's constantly improving and maturing. On the one hand, every girl has a hard time walking away from a guy who's showing genuine life improvement. On the other, you've probably proven a repeated pattern of "I'll get better" for about 2 weeks followed by "Nope, just went back to my old ways again" for the last 12 years, so she has no reason to believe it'll actually stick this time. And I'm not even talking about the alcohol. I'm talking about everything - the mission, the job, the physique, and on and on.

Okay, so you don't know an action plan to take? I'll give you a freebie and make one for you:

- Next 12 months: no alcohol or drugs. At all. Period. Join a recovery group if you have to.
- Next 12 months, you're hitting the gym 5 days a week. She's not talking to you anyway, so that's a lot of extra free time on your hands. Don't have a gym? Fine, use this bodyweight routine: 200 pushups, 200 squats, 200 lunges, 200 sit-ups, 5k run. Every day. Can't do it? Fine, go until muscular failure every day until you can do it. That's step one.
- Simultaneously (i.e. don't wait), start having daily quiet times (minimum 1 chapter, start in the book of John, then move to Acts, then read the epistles, ending with Romans then Revelation) and 10 minute daily prayer

sessions. Alone. You're not doing this to impress her with your newfound spiritual endeavors. In fact, avoid getting caught doing it. If she catches you, add an extra 50 pushups, squats, lunges, sit-ups, and an extra 1 mile jog that day. Do it because you love God and your life is in his hands.

- Simultaneously, find 10 things you can practically do to increase your income. This could be adding certifications to qualify for a promotion. It could be taking on odd-jobs from Craigslist. It could be applying for a new job altogether. Your call. Pick 1 of those 10 things every week and do it. No exceptions, no excuses.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (04/15/24)

2 upvotes · 17 April 2024 · /r/RPChristians

How wet she could get before using lube

Why are you married 6 years and still using lube?

I haven't analyzed it yet.

Yes, a lack of analyzing is the problem. Or perhaps you just push through the LMR and see if that works. If it does, turns out that was the problem. If not, then go guess at what else it might be.

She begged to be allowed to give a handjob as an "appetizer" before we had sex.

On the whole, listen to [u/Moist-Bath5827](#). He's solid. That said, while the underlying principle of his approach is correct, I wouldn't recommend using the word "no" in connection to your wife initiating sex. MMSLP has a principle that's probably the most valuable thing in the book: *Never turn your wife down when she initiates*. Doing so just conditions her to associate sex with rejection. Accept her invitation, but dominate it by turning it into what you want rather than what she offers. Let her start the hand job. Once you're nice and hard, pull her skirt down and show her how you want to finish. If she insists that it has to be a hand job and nothing else, it's not because she actually wants to give you a hand job.

Most likely, it's either (a) because she wants to placate you, reducing the imperative to have sex later in case she wants to look like she's being sexual toward you while still holding the cards on whether she feels like going through with it or not, or (b) more likely because she's not getting aroused by you throughout the day and she thinks giving you a hand job might be enough sexual contact for her to start thinking about it so she can work herself up to actually wanting to have sex with you later. If she's got that much problem getting wet that you need lube, I'm about 99% sure it's (b) and you just don't know how to make her horny throughout the day.

find some resources on pushing through LMR

If she's consistently offering the "handjob, sex later" deal, LMR isn't your (or really: her) problem. Arousal is. A woman who is sufficiently aroused rarely puts up much, if any, LMR.

Goals: This week: Initiate each morning and night until business travel starts again. Future weeks: Initiate pre-workout at least 2-3 times a week and post workout if no sex pre-workout. Start morning initiations.

Huh? You're legit planning on initiating morning, night, and also before/after workouts? You must have the fastest-producing testicles I've ever heard of, unless you're just planning for that much rejection.

Assurance of Salvation 8/10

Evangelism 0/10

100% the reason your AoS is 8/10 is because of the 0/10 on evangelism. You may think, "No, it's because I still question these things and wonder about those things," but you're wrong. It's the absolute lack of mission/purpose in life. So let's look at that ...

Vision: Be filled with joy and hope, abounding in steadfast love. Generous to all and a solid rock of good theology and truth in my family, church, and community. Be financially secure, but not wasteful, give generously to those in need around me. Encouraging good morals and uprightness in the people around me, an example for the community.

Mission: DRAFT: Use my joy and analytical skills to be a man who stands for truth and righteousness, gives generously to the poor and missions, and strengthens the spiritually weak, so that I can lead in my church and community, creating disciples and giving God more glory.

Okay, Jesus said your mission is to make disciples of all nations. Your mission is a lot of contemporary Christian lingo with no substance. The reason I encourage writing a "vision" statement in addition to your mission is because it's meant to give substance when people are inevitably vague or wishy-washy about their mission. A vision is, by nature, how you see/envision your mission playing out in your life. Yours is basically, "Just be a standup guy."

Imagine you're Sir Sebben, knight of the round table. Your King, Arthur, sends you on a mission to capture the evil sorceress Morgana and bring her back for Merlin to question.

- If Lancelot was assigned this task, it would be ... **Mission:** kidnap Morgana and bring her back to Camelot. **Vision:** Take a horse to her castle, swim through the moat, climb in through the kitchen window, slay the servants working in the kitchen before they make a sound, make my way to her chambers, knock her out with the hilt of my sword, toss her over my shoulder, and leave the same way I came.
- Sir Sebben's take ... **Mission:** Use my a couple of my better personality traits to stand up for virtues I value, and to help other people in a generalized sense, all for the glory of Arthur, my king. **Vision:** I will accomplish this mission by having a bunch of good personality traits.

Imagine Arthur saying, "Go kidnap Morgana." And then he's like, "Now just to make sure you understood: repeat the mission back to me," and you say the above. What is Arthur to think?

Now imagine God saying, "Go make disciples of all nations," and then he's like, "Now just to make sure you understood: repeat the mission back to me," and you give him the mission statement you wrote above. What is God to think?

Sure, Arthur and God will both say, "Yes, we want you to be a good, standup guy." But they're also going to think you're an idiot for completely ignoring/misunderstanding the mission and having no vision for how you'll carry it out. Process that for a bit.

Question about dating as a single Christian man who's looking for a Christian Woman in 2022

2 upvotes · 13 October 2022 · /r/RPChristians

Perhaps, but I'm not sure if this is a fair comparison.

Think about it this way: if God interacts with us a certain way and you have the option of "follow in God's example" or "make up my own way because I'm not sure God wants us to do with others what he does with us" - which option is the safer route?

I get it. There are some things that are unique to God that we simply can't do. I can't create an entire universe, so I can't follow God's example on that issue. Jesus was a carpenter. I can do some woodworking, but it's not my skillset. I don't think we were supposed to "be like Christ" in that particular aspect of our daily lives because there's a mountain of evidence to show that's not what the Bible means.

But if you have an example in God/Christ and an opportunity to live it out or do your own thing, the safer thing is to behave like God did. In the end, when you are before him on Judgment Day, I would much rather say, "I only did what I saw you doing" rather than, "What you did didn't make sense to me and I didn't agree with the comparison, so I'm going to make up my own thing that I think is better."

Still not too comfortable with this. I'll gladly morph her into a better person of course. But to transform her until something she isn't in the sense you'd turn a normal girl into a tattooed, chain-smoking degenerate.

There's a principle of philosophy that's well-accepted: everybody is constantly changing everyone else around them. The very fact of our existence in someone's conscious awareness has an impact on their lives. This principle is so broadly accepted that the show *Girl Meets World* declared it in multiple episodes to be the meaning of life ("people change people" is their exact wording). There's two directions to take from here, assuming we're agreed that you will influence people just by existing around them, whether you like it or not (if you want to debate that point, I'm sure there are a number of people who would be willing to engage - I might, if I have time).

FIRST: "transform her into something she isn't"

Who's to say who she "is" in the first place? God, of course. If you do find someone who is a "tattooed, chain-smoking degenerate," do you think God wants that for them. Do you think that is, on an identity-level, who God designed her to be? So if that's who she "is" today, wouldn't it be God's desire that someone help her change out of that?

From there, presuming you're a godly man, don't you think the things you look for in a spouse are going to be more godly than where she is now? Sure, you're absolutely not going to be perfect. You will have expectations of a prospective spouse that will not be godly, however subtle or grand they may be. But if your model, after doing the best you can to seek God's wisdom, for what you're looking for in a wife is coming from a set of expectations that are more godly than the upbringing of the world she was raised in (again: assuming we're not talking about someone who's already a mature believer), then even your imperfect set of standards for a spouse will be better than where she is now. From there, "transforming her into something she isn't" is just a natural part of helping a younger believer (presuming you won't be dating non-believers) become both more godly and a better prospective spouse.

Now, this does change slightly if we shift the conversation to non-sin-based differences. If she likes super hero movies and you're more into spy thrillers ... is it fundamentally wrong to teach her to learn to enjoy spy thrillers with you? That's changing her. She didn't originally like spy thrillers. She is developing new tastes and interests because of you. Is that wrong? And what if you learn to enjoy super hero movies with her? My uncle loves hot sauce. Intensely. It's one of his life passions, looking for new ones and burning his tongue in different flavors. He couldn't stand coffee though. I don't blame him. Coffee is also disgusting to me. His wife was the reverse: 5 cups of coffee a day, but she couldn't handle the heat of hot sauce. They made a deal: she'd learn to eat hot sauce for him, he'd learn to drink coffee for her. They did this for so long that he now drinks coffee on his own, even without her - and she puts hot sauce on her food, even when he's not around. They have both changed into something they weren't before. Are you suggesting this is somehow evil or immoral to expect to change things about your prospective spouse?

SECOND: to influence others or not?

Simply put, with all the bad influences in the world, if you are trying to be like Jesus, shouldn't you invite others

to be more like you as you become like Christ? For reference, this is *exactly* what Paul says in ...

- 1 Cor. 11:1 - "Be imitators of me, as I am of Christ."
- 1 Cor. 4:16 - "Therefore, I urge you to imitate me."
- Philippians 3:17 - "Join one another in following my example, brothers, and carefully observe those who walk according to the pattern we set for you."
- 1 Thessalonians 1:6 - "And you became imitators of us and of the Lord when you welcomed the message with the joy of the Holy Spirit, in spite of your great suffering."
- 2 Thessalonians 3:7-9 - "For you yourselves know how you ought to imitate us ... we wanted to offer ourselves as an example for you to imitate."

You're going to influence/change people whether you like it or not. Best to do it intentionally to something productive rather than passively. It should be no surprise that the enemy frequently uses our passivity against us, as he did in Eden.

I get that many people are nervous and say, "I'm not an apostle, so I can't call someone to be like me." That's bologna. Hebrews 13:7, for example, says, "Remember your leaders, those who spoke to you the word of God. Consider the outcome of their way of life, and imitate their faith." This is an apostle explicitly passing that command of imitation down to others.

From there, someone could argue, "But I'm not a leader, so I shouldn't be calling others to imitate my faith or how I live it out in my own life." Then don't get married because that, *de facto*, makes you a leader. And if you agree that you should be a leader of your wife and children, then that also means you have an obligation to invite your wife to imitate you.

Question about dating as a single Christian man who's looking for a Christian Woman in 2022

2 upvotes · 9 October 2022 · /r/RPChristians

Then the RMV checklist posted here is useless:

That checklist isn't an "all or nothing" thing. You don't have to have every single criteria met. It's just things guys should be thinking about before committing the rest of their lives to someone.

So, if she isn't Godly, then does that mean she's not Christian or just not a devout Christian as she should be? Could that mean she's still saved and not yet Godly? Or does that mean she's outright secular/agnostic-atheist?

When a non-believer becomes a Christian they are "born again." They're infants at first, not mature. They are not yet "godly" in the practical sense of the word. As someone grows in their faith, they grow in godliness. From there the word "godly" is fairly arbitrary in how it's used and where that line is. Personally, I wouldn't call someone "godly" if they are not actively sharing their faith with others. "Good at avoiding sin"? Sure. "Knowledgeable"? Sure. But "Godly"? If they're not participating in God's purpose to build his Kingdom on Earth, no.

Godliness means someone is "like God." Jesus showed us what it means to be "like God" as a human. Jesus spent his entire ministry building a Kingdom and he told those who were trying to be like him to do the same (i.e. the great commission). You can't claim to be like Jesus (i.e. "godly") if you're not living out the purposes of Jesus in your own life. Simply "avoiding sin" or "learning a lot about the Bible" or "having good emotions toward God" are useful, but drastically miss the point of why we're here on earth in the first place.

I'd rather have her be attractive from the start

Sure. Just remember that "beauty is fleeting." In the end, if you're marrying someone *BECAUSE* of their attractiveness, you're going to be disappointed at some point down the line. I can't count the number of people who were extremely fit, great facial features, etc. and were drop-dead gorgeous on their wedding day ... then I see them again 3-5 years later and they're plump and clearly haven't bothered to put in much effort toward looking good. Don't be surprised. If you're marrying someone *for their looks*, you're going to have issues. Yes, looks matter. Just be prepared that they can also change.

Because its almost like molding her into a whole different person than the one I met. That I like a certain version of her that I want her to become, but isn't that way right now.

Isn't this what God does with us, though? We're only following in his example. He finds us as sinners. Does he say, "I love you exactly as you are. Don't change. Keep being a sinner forever because I love you as you are"? No. He says, "I care of you *despite* who you are, and I will help you change to be sanctified into the person I desire you to be." That's God's plan for us. And if we want to be with him, we must embrace this. If we refuse to allow God to sanctify us or cleanse us from our sins, are we actually saved and do we get to be with him in a covenantal relationship at that level? In the same way, if a woman isn't willing to adjust her life to you, why should you think it appropriate that you somehow have to deal with it and marry her and live with her for the rest of your life anyway, even though she has openly told you she refuses to conform to the standards you're looking for in a wife? That's not to say you need to become some tyrant who's overly nit-picky about every single detail of her character. It's just to say that you expect her to become a better person over time, and that you will help her do this.

And this isn't a slant against women. You're expected to do exactly the same. 1 Cor. 11:3 says that just as Christ follows God, so are men to follow Christ, and women follow their husbands. The same way you can have standards about who you marry, and that your wife has an obligation to work to meet those standards, so also does God have standards and expectations on you and he expects you to work to meet those standards. Just God helps us meet those standards through the Holy Spirit, so also will you have to help your prospective wife. And just as God is gracious and forgiving when we prove imperfect, having died for us to show the extent of his willingness to deal with our failure to abide by his standards, so also are you to be gracious toward your wife, willing to bear the burden of her failures on yourself ... once you have chosen to take on the role of husband in her life (never confuse the line between your biblical obligations as a "boyfriend" v your biblical obligations as a "husband").

Most women want the man she's with to love her for who she currently is and that includes physical appearance and personality caveats.

Obviously women want that. Who wouldn't? But this is a silly idea. People change, whether they like it or not. Overall, statistics show that women, on a personality/character/interests level, tend to change way more than men over time. But even more to the point, the whole "love me for who I am today" is another way of saying, "Never expect better from me."

Think of it in the context of a company. Not an ideal parallel, but bear with me. If you got hired for a job, imagine how you'd feel if the boss said, "However you're performing today, on day 1 of your position here, I never expect you to improve or to do any better. You're free to perform as adequately or inadequately as you do today for the entire rest of your career." As an employee, would you want that job? Absolutely! That's a free ride. But do you think a company like that will succeed? Absolutely not! As an employee, you have the ability to leave that job and find a better one on a whim if the ship starts sinking (i.e. parallel to divorce/remarriage). As Christians, divorce/remarriage isn't a biblical option, but for the secular crowd the whole "take me exactly as I am" concept makes sense because they can enter a marriage with an easy "no expectations on me" ride, and if it

doesn't work out because a leader who has no expectations is destined to sink the ship ... well, they just divorce and hop onto another ship. Among Christians, women have to be way more careful that they are following a leader who is actually going to thrive. Nobody wants to commit themselves to a leader who makes poor decisions, and having zero expectations of improvement from those who you are meant to steward and lead is a massive sign that you will fail as a husband.

Again, that's not to say you become some obnoxious tyrant who makes perfectionist demands. You communicate expectations, help those you lead to live up to them, and have significant grace when they can't, bearing the burden and responsibility of their failures on yourself, just as Christ did for you.

It's my mission to live a Christian life, have a Christian family with an attractive wife and children whilst helping my fellow Christians bring more people back to Jesus via evangelizing and discipleship. So, it is partly my mission. :)

Hmm ... I think that's significantly different from what you originally posted as your mission ;)

Question about dating as a single Christian man who's looking for a Christian Woman in 2022

2 upvotes · 8 October 2022 · /r/RPChristians

Extremely black pilling...

Eh, I think you're misusing the word "black pill" here. Black pill is more about whether or not your own looks preventing women from showing any interest in you, and the hopelessness associated with that.

Genetics matter, especially to me which is why I vet them based on this too. Hence why I'm not willing to settle.

Sure, so that affects the "attractiveness" quality. But personality is mostly non-genetic. Although it has genetic traits, it's more a product of how you're raised in the home. Likewise, godliness is absolutely not a genetic trait. These are learned behaviors. So, the only one you're not going to compromise here is that you want someone physically attractive on a genetic level (i.e. someone who doesn't need better clothes, better hair style, weight-loss programs, etc. to become physically attractive). But even then, people with good genetics can still turn out quite unattractive if they let themselves fall into it. This is clear from the countless movie actors who have great genetic traits, but still have candid shots that show how "blah" they look when they're not on set, or how if they gain weight for a role, they look as normative and unattractive as most people. I wouldn't put too much stock into the "genetics are everything" black pill nonsense.

some things aren't teachable e.g. genetics

Again, you're technically correct. But genetics related to "attractiveness" are only one component of attractiveness. Someone can be highly attractive even with bad natural genetics.

Now, if you're not interested in "attraction genetics," and you're instead focusing more on making sure there's no history of cancer, heart disease, high blood pressure, etc., etc. - that's a different matter, and those are things that probably cannot be overcome by qualities that *are, in fact*, teachable.

That's fine. If she's Christian, attractive and FAST, then I'm good. I'm still on my way to Godliness, but I hope to have a wife who will come join me along the way. :D

Glad to hear it, brother :) You've moving in the right direction with this!

Question about dating as a single Christian man who's looking for a Christian Woman in 2022

2 upvotes · 8 October 2022 · /r/RPChristians

That means that my prospects ... are extremely low

Relevant:

https://www.reddit.com/r/TrueChristian/comments/3s17lr/do_dedicated_christian_women_still_exist_out_there/cwtr1hu/

I agree that the prospects are generally really low if you're in "I'm going to find someone ready-made" mode.

I mean, this rule's essentially asking men to settle for less in terms of physical attraction in favor of the other two attributes

Not at all. I think you're missing the point, which I'm going to get really repetitive on. The point of the 2 of 3 (or 3 of 4) rule is that you aren't likely to find someone "ready-made" in the first place, leading to the conclusion that you're better off helping someone grow and develop in these areas.

While the 2 of 3 rule may apply as to those particular traits, it does NOT apply to the FAST qualities. There are lots of people who meet all 4. Find a FAST person and you can overcome the lacking in any of the "2 of 3" traits.

Personally, I think of the 3, godliness is the easiest to develop in a FAST person. If someone has the S and is truly saved, the Holy Spirit bends them toward sanctification and growth in pursuing Christ, so you already have that advantage working for you. You just have to be open to God using you to be the vehicle that helps them move forward along the path.

Training someone to become physically attractive is much more difficult. Doable, but difficult. You might be working against certain genetic qualities. It could be a financial burden (new wardrobe, hair styling, etc.). People also tend to take their personal appearance more personal than they do the fact that they need to grow in Christ. Most women will very readily acknowledge, "I'm not perfect and I can do a lot to improve in my faith," but very few will take a similarly proactive approach to changing their personal appearance, even if they are teachable on the issue.

Likewise, if it's a personality issue, very few people will admit that they have a defect in their personality. It's too personal, and because it's often not distinctly related to obvious sin or spiritual growth failings (for which there's a far more objective standard), most people would rather say, "This is just who I am" than admit, "You're right, I probably need to work on this" - and without that objective biblical standard to "prove" that they're wrong on the point, it becomes just a matter of personal preference.

To be clear, I've had to make personal improvements in all of these areas, myself. I had fundamental personality defects that I had to overcome - things that weren't sinful, but were interfering with my relationships nonetheless, including with my wife. I also had serious attractiveness problems. I was overweight, dressed poorly, had no muscle, horrible haircut, etc. I've also constantly had to work on issues of godliness throughout my life, and continue to strive in growth in these areas. Suggesting that you can help a woman grow in these areas toward becoming a better potential spouse isn't a crude or inappropriate suggestion. If anything, it would be sexist to say, "I as a man can overcome these things, but a woman can't." If she can, and you see potential in her and care about her, it can only be a good idea for you to want to help her work on these things. And if, as she improves, she becomes someone you want to marry, you can propose. All of this can occur in the context of inviting others, including women, to join you in your mission from Christ to make disciples ... if that were your mission ;)

Question about dating as a single Christian man who's looking for a Christian Woman in 2022

2 upvotes · 6 October 2022 · /r/RPChristians

Are there still attractive Christian women out there who aren't egotistical via being corrupted by their beauty and secular world, but instead remain faithful/devout and true to Christ? If so, where would a man like me be able to find them?

Sure, these women are all around. You just have to remember that the more attractive a woman is, the higher degree of temptation there will be for her to abandon her faith for worldly passions. Unattractive women don't get many men pining over them with love and attraction, so there will be a lot of women who "aren't egotistical via being corrupted by their beauty and secular world" and who "remain faithful/devout and true to Christ" because the temptation is low. The more attractive a woman gets, the greater that temptation gets, which increases the number of people who will fall away. Not everyone, but this is just basic common-sense. Put yourself in their shoes. Imagine you were a total stud and had super-model caliber women trying to sleep with you all the time, constantly pressuring you to have sex outside of marriage, compromising your faith. I don't know how high your self-control is, but most guys would admit that they'd cave. Now knock yourself down several pegs and imagine you're a pimple-faced video game geek and women show no interest in you. Pretty easy to stay "faithful/devout and true to Christ" in the face of this non-temptation, right?

Again, there are plenty of attractive women out there who "aren't egotistical" or "corrupted" and who "remain faithful/devout and true to Christ." They exist. But in many cases, they are still very young and new to the faith. Another point of common-sense is that the most attractive women will find relationships the fastest, so they're harder to find single. This goes double in the church for attractive women *who are also godly*. Because of how quickly and easily such women can find men who are interested in them, you're either going to have to be in the right relational network and right place at the right time to meet someone and "hit it off" who hits your ideal (i.e. the "unicorn"), which is rare ... or you find someone who is willing to learn and grow alongside you into the level of "non-egotism" "non-corruption" "faithfulness/devoutness" and "trueness to Christ" that you're looking for. In short, I always tell men not to look for unicorns, but to make them. Nobody is perfect. Unicorns don't actually exist. But by discipling a woman who is passionately drawn to serving Christ alongside you, it's very possible that God can help her grow into becoming a unicorn, using you as the vehicle to do it. Just practice prudence and caution along the way and remember that she has the charge: "Daughters of Jerusalem, do not awaken love before it so desires" - meaning you may have to be patient.

Red Pill Christianity

2 upvotes · 6 October 2022 · /r/RPChristians

Hi there. The topic of "Red Pill can be integrated into Christianity" has already been beaten to death here, so I won't rehash that other than to say we aren't integrating anything. We're merely showing where the overlap exists, especially as it stands in contrast to the things mass-culture promulgates.

What I'm more interested in is where you say:

Purpose breaks down into particularities and is different for everyone: someone can be a fireman, an artist, a lawyer - we all have different purposes

I used to conflate "career" and "purpose" too. It's assume your career is your purpose because you spend so much time in it and it often-times derives from your talents and gives a pressure to create your identity around it.

As Christians, our identity is in Christ and our purpose is the one he gave us: "Go, therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and teaching them to obey everything I have commanded you." That's our purpose. It is not different for every person. It is singular, as Paul says in Philippians 2, "Make my joy complete by being like-minded, having the same love, **being one in Spirit and purpose.**"

Now, that doesn't mean we don't have unique angles for making disciples. We do. That comes from our spiritual

gifts, mainly - though talents, hobbies, career skills, etc. can all funnel in as well. Someone who is spiritually gifted as a teacher will find people to disciple among his students, but must still learn how to show them mercy, practice hospitality, model strength of faith, shepherd them, etc., even if those are not their gifts. Likewise, someone spiritually gifted in hospitality may use their home as an opportunity to invite others over who will eventually be discipled - but they must still be willing and able to teach them, pray with them, help them, exhort them, encourage them, etc., even if those aren't technically their gifts. If we add in career paths, it just means plumbers may have opportunities to share Christ with others who have leaky pipes, or lawyers may find people in need of legal help who are also in need of help following Christ to disciple. You don't disciple someone by being their lawyer, but being their lawyer could very well provide you an opportunity to disciple them.

Christ knew and lived his purpose with impeccability. He said, "For this purpose I have come!"

Absolutely! And he also told us what purpose he would give to anyone who claims to be his follower: "Come, follow me, and I will make you fishers of men." This was the very beginning of his ministry. The entirety of his ministry was showing him how to do that. In his last supper before his death and resurrection, he taught repeatedly the importance of their fulfilling this mission. Even after he died, at his ascent his final words were to "make disciples of all nations." In every step of his path with the 12, he was passing on the purpose that we ought to become "fishers of men" for His Kingdom :)

When we live our purpose, we live a life that mirrors Christ

Yes - but only if our purpose also mirror's Christ's purposes. Christ's purpose was to build a Kingdom set apart for God. He did this first through his death and resurrection so that Kingdom could exist at all, and second through discipling those nearest to him so they could, in turn, disciple others as the "firstfruits" (as Paul calls them) of the Kingdom he was building, which we now call the Church (capital C). The "For this purpose have I come" verse you quoted is in John 12. If you keep reading clear on through 12:32, just a few verses later, you see the conclusion of that purpose: "And I, when I am lifted up from the earth, will draw all people to myself." That was his purpose. And our purpose, as given by Him, is to draw others to Him also. That purpose must be what "mirrors Christ."

Overall, good thoughts. I'm glad to see you thinking about these things. Just some little nudges here on further ways to expand on some of the ideas you started.

Smash The Overton Window

2 upvotes · 30 July 2022 · /r/RPChristians

That's why I don't

Oh, I know. I was agreeing with you. Just emphasizing your point. Great video, haha.

highly literate population of Twilight readers

Nice. Point well taken. You're just not talking about literacy anymore.

Normal is the new radical

Right. I think we talked about this on one of the podcasts on the topic of "reactionary politics" or something like that.

Smash The Overton Window

2 upvotes · 30 July 2022 · /r/RPChristians

As I recall, OZ interprets "make disciples of all nations" to mean that the national, corporate entity is "discipled." I interpret Jesus as saying, "What I just did with you for the past few years, go do that with people throughout the whole world."

The pragmatic difference is that my work, then focuses on the individual. Politics is a hobby interest that brushes shoulders with moral responsibility, but not a biblical imperative. For OZ, politics is a biblical mandate. I'm not sure where he stands on one-on-one (or even micro-group) discipleship, which is what I take to be the biblical mandate.

[u/osmiumzulu](#) - am I representing you fairly?

No, it's not okay.

2 upvotes · 27 July 2022 · /r/RPChristians

This comment is the definition of malicious interpretation.

BPD wife - I need a miracle from God

2 upvotes · 20 April 2022 · /r/RPChristians

This is wrong. They will not "return to some semblance of normal SOON." If there's going to be a change, it will take lots of time and years of therapy. You have to make the decision now if you're in it for the long-haul to get her help or if you're out the door. There is no "soon" when it comes to borderlines.

Very Basic "2-2 Dinner Party" Social Skills

2 upvotes · 26 February 2022 · /r/MarriedRedPill

That's a Wisconsin thing? My brother and I do those here too. Good stuff.

Very Basic "2-2 Dinner Party" Social Skills

2 upvotes · 26 February 2022 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I agree in principle. But people have also quoted me 3 times this week without me even realizing I was the one who said it. So, sometimes people remember things you say too :p

Abundance Fatigue and "The Meaning of Life"

2 upvotes · 23 February 2022 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Agreed.

Fixing Your OYS - Your Life Will Keep Sucking Until You Read and Apply This Post

2 upvotes · 23 February 2022 · /r/RPChristians

This could be a low-testosterone issue, but I'm not so quick to jump on that bandwagon.

I have found through personal experience that an abundance mentality can (not always "will") have an "I've taken this too far" effect where the previously unattainable becomes so easy and commonplace (i.e. actual abundance, beyond just the abundance mentality) that it no longer holds value to you.

Women do this all the time. They have an abundance of male attention. Women don't get wet from male attention anymore the way a female-attention-starved male will get hard every time a woman talks to him. Abundance can turn a previously rare and valuable commodity into swag.

Imagine if a meteorite storm hit earth containing 10x the amount of gold as exists on the whole planet right now. Would the price of gold go up, stay the same, or hit rock-bottom prices with the sudden influx of free/cheap

gold? That's what abundance can do to a person.

If you say that "I approach out in public ... Talking to a girl I am genuinely attracted to is not the issue," what's the chance that the game has become too easy for you (or at least that you have the perception that it's too easy) to the point where you don't see women as a valuable commodity in your life?

That's not a bad perception, by the way. I wouldn't fight against it. If anything, I'd encourage it. I don't think you're in a "bad" or "harmful" situation. Leverage it for the Gospel, 1 Cor. 7-style.

Own Your Shit Weekly - December 07, 2021

2 upvotes · 9 December 2021 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Speaking of vague - did you see his mission? This guy has no clue what he wants out of life yet. Can't improve much if you don't know what you're improving into. That's where he needs to start.

Sexual needs in deadbedroom

2 upvotes · 14 October 2021 · /r/RPChristians

What do Christinians red pillers do when there's no sex?

This is an oxymoron. While it's vaguely possible in some remote parallel universe, your wife is not a special snowflake. If you were a "red piller" you'd be getting sex. It's as simple as that. So, there's no scenario where a Christian is a "red piller" but not getting sex.

More to your original post, /u/UpTanks has some great comments here, so I won't push too much further. The main thing I'll toss out in addition is this:

- Because you're committed to remaining a non-Christian, your wife will never respect or follow your life mission.

A bad tree cannot produce good fruit (Matthew 7). Her mission in life is to produce good fruit (Matthew 28:19-20, John 15, etc.). While she has an obligation to remain with you and not divorce you (1 Peter 3, 1 Cor. 7), without a respect for your mission, her respect for *YOU* as a man will also be non-existent. As a result, her attraction to you can only be made up by an excessive abundance of the non-mission-oriented traits, which is difficult because mission is the primary source from which all those other traits flow. You can have those traits by committing equally to a non-Christian mission, and you will become naturally more attractive as a byproduct, but because she knows it's all built on a foundation of sand rather than rock, it's unclear (and I presume ad hoc rather than a broad-based rule we could give in all scenarios) whether she will ever overcome the cognitive dissonance between a physical desire for you (if you otherwise exemplify these mission-derived qualities with great proficiency) and an underlying rejection of your life goals and ambitions.

At that point, flip a coin and that's about the same odds as guessing right about whether your situation can be solved in your current faith-state. You'll be able to turn her body on because all vaginas are the same, Christian or not ... but her mind is still a powerful agent in the mix and it can just as quickly turn her off.

In your particular scenario, although I despise the concept of divorce, if you are committed to your abandonment of the faith, the most loving thing you can do for her and the kids is to walk away in a context where you remain an involved father, but allow her to raise them in the Christian faith. The most beneficial thing for your own purposes would be to remain in the marriage in order to optimize the possibility that your heart may soften to the faith again someday in the future, even though you don't foresee that as a possibility now - and IF that comes true, that would be the best scenario for both your wife and your children.

If your hangup is your personal past trauma, that's something that can be worked through. But I can empathize with your skepticism on that ground, so I won't push that button here.

Reading through the guide and having some trouble, can someone help me out?

2 upvotes · 14 October 2021 · /r/RPChristians

Agreed. [/u/bekfastinbed](#) - studies have been shown that women are more aroused by a muscular guy with extra lbs over a thin guy who has no muscular build to him.

Sometimes I resent my pregnant wife because of her past

2 upvotes · 15 September 2021 · /r/RPChristians

1 Timothy 5:14 - "So I would have younger widows marry, bear children, manage their households, and give the adversary no occasion for slander."

Those men they ought to marry gotta come from somewhere. Broadly, though, I agree with you. Widow isn't a "high priority" wife candidate. But I don't see why it should be a deal-breaker either. That said, there are certainly the "wrong kind" of widow that the passage talks about too, so a guy's still gotta be wise about who he considers.

Anyone want to explain how this post is right/wrong? And in what ways? I'm new to RP and still learning what it's all about...

2 upvotes · 7 August 2021 · /r/RPChristians

Solid.

Conversation Strategies You Won't Find in WISNIFG

2 upvotes · 6 August 2021 · /r/RPChristians

I can get behind all of this. But the "be overt and direct" strategy is not always the best one, and even when it is best it only works for guys who have the frame to pull it off. That's more for communicating plans and expectations, not long term character build and development.

Christian Plate Spinning (Part 2)

2 upvotes · 5 August 2021 · /r/RPChristians

Having an affair as a Christian means you have a weak frame and no business trying to spin plates at that point anyway.

To be clear: if you're a Christian, part of your frame will naturally evolve as you are sanctified toward Christ-likeness to a rejection of infidelity. If you're already there, then having an internal stance of being against infidelity would require you to be weak in order to cave to temptations toward infidelity. If your frame is weak enough that you'd do that, then it's weak enough that you should be focusing on strengthening your frame before working on spinning plates.

From there, if you do have that frame and infidelity isn't a concern for you, then "spinning plates" is just a matter of building abundance - to know that you are the prize and that you are desirable in the world. Once you have that abundance, you don't need to build it anymore and there's no need to spin plates on a sexual dynamic level unless you feel like it just for fun.

There is still value in having female friends, especially if some of these women will be helpful to you in your mission.

The Image You Reflect

2 upvotes · 13 April 2021 · /r/RPChristians

One of the dangers of red pill Christianity I see is that it tricks many men into thinking they have arrived at

their sanctification, not realizing that you never arrive until you are dead and raised to life anew

Yeah, I'm not aware of many Nazarenes around here who buy into total sanctification. If anything, the RPC concept of OYS shows that even the most mature and experienced people are still working on making progress. None of us have 'arrived,' and if you see someone who seems to pretend otherwise, let us know.

For that matter, even though I founded RPC, I've still consistently reported my struggles in my OYS and had to issue a public confession of ways that I made mistakes on the discord. This is necessary - and it's important, especially as a leader, to model these things for others to see and follow. So, I'm not sure where you're getting this characterization from.

However, I think in light of our works being filthy rags ...

I have been seeing this and other similar passages being misused lately, as if to assume that these are true of the believer. Isaiah 64:6 is the verse you're referencing - "all our righteous deeds are like a polluted garment." But clip-quoting the passage gives the wrong impression that it's applicable to believers. Let's broaden it:

- *Behold, you were angry, and we sinned; in our sins we have been a long time, and shall we be saved? We have all become like one who is unclean, and all our righteous deeds are like a polluted garment. We all fade like a leaf, and our iniquities, like the wind, take us away. There is no one who calls upon your name, who rouses himself to take hold of you; for you have hidden your face from us, and have made us melt in the hand of our iniquities.*

This is clearly talking about an unbeliever. There's another way we can confirm this: because Paul quotes this exact passage in Romans 3 in reference to unbelievers, reaching his final conclusion that "all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God." As such, the passage is saying that trying to *earn* God's favor through good deeds is no better than trying to hand a filthy rag to him.

Hebrews 11:6 is more on-point and adds clarity: "And without faith it is impossible to please God." Does that mean our good deeds after we have faith are also impossible to please God? Of course not.

If the "our good deeds are filthy rags" concept applied to believers, how could passages like Philippians 4:18 be true, where Paul says, "I am well supplied, having received from Epaphroditus the gifts you sent, a fragrant offering, a sacrifice acceptable and pleasing to God"? So either our good deeds are (1) *filthy rags that God views as a fragrant offering that's acceptable and pleasing to him*, or (2) viewed differently by God based on our motivations - the believer doing things because we love Him, the unbeliever doing it selfishly to earn something from him. Whichever your view is, the result is the same: for believers, we certainly have the ability to do good things that are pleasing to God without our acts being detested the way filthy rags would be.

Now, what I think you're getting at here is that there will always be *some* minor degree of taint in our motives - that we will never be exactly 100% pure in our motives. And that may be correct. But it may not be either. That precludes the possibility that we ever act in a manner led by the Spirit, as the Spirit is the one who influences and affects our motives. I used to think the same way - that God uses us *despite* ourselves. Now, having studied the Scriptures further, I'm of the view that God does things *through* ourselves because of His Spirit's ability to use us and transform us. No, we will never be perfect indefinitely. But we can have moments of perfect intent while influenced by the Spirit - otherwise Scripture itself would be condemned by the same measure of taint that you might argue is "unavoidable." Yet we say it is inspired and infallible because we believe God was able to inspire the authors through their own motives - not that the Spirit controlled their bodies to write each pen stroke, but that God so moved in their hearts that their writings were completely and irrefutably aligned with God's will. And if God did it then, why would we believe he would be any less active in us today when his Word says the opposite - that we would do even greater things?

I don't think our motivation/"who we're doing it for" has really changed that much

For some, I'm sure that's true. But it also seems like the same skepticism that I've heard from non-believers. One friend noted recently that "my wife doesn't believe any true Christians actually exist - people who actually love God. She thinks everyone does it for selfish motives because they think it'll get them into heaven, and nobody is actually pure in their motive. And if every believer is tainted by their own selfishness, then the whole thing is a sham."

The reality is that there are lots of believers who have transcended this obvious plateau. Yes, some are stuck there - many, even. But Paul writes in Romans 9:3, "For I could wish that I were cursed and cut off from Christ for the sake of my people" - that is, that he could wish to go to hell so that others he loves could be saved, just as Jesus says, "No greater love has a man than this: that he would lay down his life for his brother." In *Practice the Presence of God*, Brother Lawrence says something similar: "Whether I be lost or saved, I will always continue to act purely for the love of God." I have often found myself in the same position at times also. Yes, we can easily fall away, but I do also believe that people can genuinely change in their motivations too - and even with a degree of permanence. But, of course ...

Seeking a wife is a good thing, starting and leading a family is a good thing. You can serve God that way. But of course it will take your heart away from God at times.

As you'll note, I'm very much on board with this line of thinking. I'm not sure if you've read our sidebar yet, but I wrote two posts titled "Finding the girl you can't keep yourself from banging" with the mid-reveal tag-line "(by not trying to find one)". As I've said a number of times: the goal here is to get guys following God. Most guys can't do that because their relationship/marriage/sexuality problems are so insurmountable in their eyes that they can't focus on anything else. Resolving that problem is one waypoint on a broader journey in following Christ. So, if we can get them moving in that direction, it's not hard to take advantage of that inertia to keep them moving even past that issue toward the bigger, better things God has in store for them.

All of that said, I also strongly agree with everything else [/u/UpTanks](#) has said.

Announcement: Red Pill Christians will now exclusively be a male only space

2 upvotes · 25 March 2021 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

One step ahead of you.

Announcement: Red Pill Christians will now exclusively be a male only space

2 upvotes · 23 March 2021 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I don't intend to take anything down that was up. It's not a retroactive thing. But I haven't run that by the other mods. Maybe they think differently. I'd be surprised, though.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (03/17/21)

2 upvotes · 22 March 2021 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Right. One clarification:

Just a clear indication that you did not enter the contract voluntarily at the time

As a matter of technicality - it's not an indication of this. It's an indication of your *belief* that you didn't enter into the contract voluntarily. While it may seem a small nuance, it's one that matters at law ;)

Curious how/whether you would reconcile Paul's statement to the WISNIFG/MRP doctrine that "you are the ultimate judge of your own actions."

I don't. Paul is right, Manuel Smith is wrong.

That said, there is still utility for those who are just getting started to learn to be their own judge as a waypoint in moving from others' judgments to God's judgment. So, for the blue pill believers, WISNIFG's point is still a useful lesson (among many, many others that would stand alone even if we were to completely nix this one point), but it's not one we linger on indefinitely.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (03/10/21)

2 upvotes · 10 March 2021 · /r/RPChristians

FYI, you posted this as a general comment, not as a reply to anyone. Who was this addressing?

Own Your Shit Weekly - March 02, 2021

2 upvotes · 9 March 2021 · /r/MarriedRedPill

As [/u/brainmeatjuice](#) alluded to, I started RPChristians as a way of bringing order to chaos, so to say. I saw people in TRP and MRP observing God's created world and coming to the same conclusions the Bible predicted they would - conclusions that others have ignored with a blanket default cop-out of "that was just past cultures," not realizing that women haven't changed throughout history. Only their strategies and methods for expressing their nature has.

But just as secular "note-swapping" has its limitations in being focused on the details of anyone particular action, when we see through the Bible what the bigger picture looks like, there's an immense amount of clarity that I don't think can be found elsewhere.

If you have specific questions on what you want to "make sense of all this" about, feel free to let me know.

The problem of guilt

2 upvotes · 24 February 2021 · /r/RPChristians

This is the way. Too many people get hung up on wanting to blame other people. Blame is a waste of time. Even if you're right about who to blame, it doesn't solve anything. Even worse: blame, when reasonably placed, makes you feel better about the situation. That feeling placates us so we *accept* our situation rather than working to *improve* it.

What does it mean to be "fruitful?"

2 upvotes · 18 February 2021 · /r/askRPC

Jesus started with uneducated nobodies. Paul spent his entire life training to be the exact opposite of what God was creating within the Church. Timothy was very young. No excuses.

You're also thinking within the destinalional fallacy of discipleship. It's not about arriving at a destination. It's about the direction you're going. If you're going the right direction, even if you've only just begun, you can invite others to follow you.

What does it mean to be "fruitful?"

2 upvotes · 18 February 2021 · /r/askRPC

Review my comment history. I have addressed this exact question dozens of times quite thoroughly with references and analysis of the relevant passages. Hint: the answer is "make disciples."

Merry Christmas - I've put together my "Tricks of the Trade for a Fun Frame" list as your present - good ideas for fun during the holidays

2 upvotes · 27 January 2021 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Nice. I've done some variation of all the of these also. Good reminders.

Sectarian issues finding relationships?

2 upvotes · 26 January 2021 · /r/RPChristians

You'd be surprised by how many celebrities are beta and blue pill, despite having attractive qualities. The fact that you call it an "alpha facade" and say "no man can keep it up forever" tells me you have no idea what alpha really is.

Children before marriage

2 upvotes · 25 January 2021 · /r/RPChristians

I think my comment went way over your head. Suffice it to say you're too worked up about this issue and your statements are inconsistent. Take a time out.

Children before marriage

2 upvotes · 25 January 2021 · /r/RPChristians

You're very confused and wasting tons of time defending a stupid position. Here's the bottom line:

- To God, Marriage = Covenant + Sex. This has been well established through numerous posts throughout this sub's history. I encourage you to scour back to our early days to find them.

When people marry before a governmental entity, the government requires a covenant. By definition, lawful marriage in virtually every known government and religion requires an exchange of vows (or, in secular terms: agreement to contractual terms). The presumption is that after marrying in any of these other entities, you're also having sex.

In this, covenant + sex exists in any of these other contexts. It's not that marrying before buddha somehow means God sanctions what buddhist priests do. It's that God saw a covenant and he saw sex, so you're married in God's eyes, regardless of the context. The judge, priest, pastor, rabbi, brahman, or whatever are completely unnecessary or incidental to the whole thing. They're useful, but not a requirement.

In this, your conclusion is correct that people who marry in a muslim mosque or even before a priest of atheism are still married in God's eyes. But this whole "the government is established by God" argument is the wrong method of getting to the correct conclusion.

How to vet for virgin woman quickly without wasting time?

2 upvotes · 20 January 2021 · /r/RPChristians

Eh ... the ORM calculators have been fairly inaccurate for me. They calculate my actual ORM much, much higher than it actually is. For example, I remember using it at one point when I could do 285x5, but capped out at 305 1x. It suggested I could do 320. I did eventually work up to a 315 ORM, but certainly not when I ran the calculator.

Of course, maybe I've just trained my physique and psychology to push higher reps at close-to-max weights than a normal person. That was when I only did max-weights I could handle for 5 reps all the time (i.e. no endurance lifting mixed in).

How to vet for virgin woman quickly without wasting time?

2 upvotes · 20 January 2021 · /r/RPChristians

My thoughts exactly.

Great Resources about Marriage, Divorce, and Singleness

2 upvotes · 20 January 2021 · /r/RPChristians

Right. I removed the post for these and other reasons.

Great Resources about Marriage, Divorce, and Singleness

2 upvotes · 20 January 2021 · /r/RPChristians

I'm removing this. Generally, rules 4 and 8 (just noticed 8 only references videos - it should be all outside content) don't prohibit this type of post without a clear, detailed analysis of the content on the website and why it's valuable or what you found valuable out of it.

For anyone else who wanders back here, this stuff is as blue pill as they come. I took his quizzes:

- The "affair-proof" quiz asks only about how much room there is for temptation. It doesn't even ask about actual temptation. It certainly doesn't ask about the single most significant factor in all of this (discipleship), much less the second: self-control. How can you assess how high-risk someone is for an affair if you don't ask about self-control?
- The "love" quiz emphasizes the same communication-centric approach to marriage that [/u/Deep_Strength](#) already touched on. It mentioned nothing about passion, attraction, sexuality, etc. which are all greater tangible evidences of the bond between a husband and wife. I don't care how well you communicate - if you're lacking these things, you don't have a loving, functional relationship.
- The "marriage communication" quiz assumes both spouses answer to each other equally. This is egalitarianism and it's unbiblical.
- The "marriage health" quiz also pushes the same egalitarian view and only has one question vaguely alluding to sexuality, though "intimacy" could just as well mean deep, heart-felt conversations with each other.

I know countless people on places like [r/deadbedrooms](#) who could take these quizzes and score extremely high in marital health, yet who are contemplating divorce. It's all a sham.

Sorry, but even if you do comply with the rules on this one, I'm not going to push this content as relevant to this sub, unless you can show me very clear quotes from his book that demonstrate a more biblical framework than this modern culturally-approved garbage.

Why is the single parent rate rising in the US??

2 upvotes · 13 January 2021 · /r/RPChristians

Bear in mind that "single parent household" in stats includes divorced couples with co-parenting arrangements. The stereotypical "single parent" is the mom whose boyfriend ran out on her and wants nothing to do with the kid. The far more common reality is that dad is fighting for equal rights with the kids and mom is doing everything she can to keep him out of the picture, then she goes around complaining how she's a single mom and the kid's dad is a deadbeat and she needs the world to sympathize with her.

In a technical sense, they're "single" and they're "mothers," but when you have a co-parenting arrangement and the other parent is active and involved, it's hardly what we think of when the image of single parents is "I'm raising these kids all by myself."

There are a lot of legit single moms out there too. But in all my time doing custody cases, I find the legit cases to be EXTREMELY rare. Like ... in over 10 years, I've only seen 3 cases where the other parent was totally uninterested and uninvolved kind of rare.

Getting your wife back after a separation

2 upvotes · 13 January 2021 · /r/RPChristians

Deciding to divorce is impulsive.

This is a joke, right? Very rarely do I find my clients taking divorce lightly or impulsively. This sounds like you're just making things up out of your butt to justify your position.

I do agree that there are some who file just as a threat. And maybe a couple of my 11+ were still living together. But the vast majority of my clients are already separated at the time of coming to me - sometimes in an apartment, other times with family.

Getting your wife back after a separation

2 upvotes · 12 January 2021 · /r/RPChristians

Eh, I've said my peace. If you want to keep DEERING your way out of learning today, maybe you'll get it tomorrow.

Marriage is a disaster and I'm not sure where to go...

2 upvotes · 12 January 2021 · /r/RPChristians

Gotcha. I'd avoid using those terms interchangeably. Words have to keep their appropriate meaning or else we end up in the same craziness liberals create when they start redefining words. ;)

From what I can tell, the most accurate statement would be: "I don't know if he's red pill or not - probably not. But he does come off as alpha." Alpha and red pill aren't the same.

Getting your wife back after a separation

2 upvotes · 12 January 2021 · /r/RPChristians

Amen.

Marriage is a disaster and I'm not sure where to go...

2 upvotes · 12 January 2021 · /r/RPChristians

The biggest problem you have is your mission is STILL based around your wife. You said you don't need a woman for that, but it's still based on healing which has her at the center.

Bingo. Nuff said. When he gets past this point, I'll weigh in.

Has anybody read rollo's book on red pill and religion?

2 upvotes · 11 January 2021 · /r/RPChristians

Would you suggest it to someone whose faith has been a little shaky lately?

I would not. From the way he talked in precursors announcing the book, his views probably aren't all that different from my own, but he definitely takes it from the perspective of a secular red pill man looking at religion - not as someone from within evaluating our own. As a result, there's bound to be lots of condemnation. The book is high on my priority list to get through soon.

How to prevent or assess sexual incompatibility in a potential wife?

2 upvotes · 26 December 2020 · /r/askRPC

I was an avid disciple-maker at the time we met. But even though this expression of maturity was present, I

believe she was ignorant of biblical criteria for maturity and she likely assessed my maturity on more superficial things that can be faked to give an appearance of maturity, like the fact that I was the worship leader in our organization, on the leadership team, she said I was the first person she'd ever met who knew the Bible better than her, and I was extremely well respected by other believers.

How to prevent or assess sexual incompatibility in a potential wife?

2 upvotes · 25 December 2020 · /r/askRPC

I was told by a professional that vaginismus is psychosomatic. Solve the psychological factors and it goes away. When she desires sex, the anxiety about it greatly diminishes, and when that desire is consistent over several months, the anxiety completely withers away altogether. Vaginismus cured. Apparently doctors who treat it are trying to figure out the physical condition, hence all the unknowns. Many therapists/counselors who run across it never conquer the blue pill framework that precludes actual desire from forming, thus only focus on *willingness* as a way to relax anxiety/tension, which doesn't actually solve the problem because conscious effort toward relaxation works against desire, functioning as a distraction (it's an attempt to eradicate certain feelings, whereas desire inherently involves putting feelings on).

How to prevent or assess sexual incompatibility in a potential wife?

2 upvotes · 25 December 2020 · /r/askRPC

Considering that they agree to marry, they are most likely attracted to each other

I wouldn't make that assumption. My wife commented years after we were married: "I was never attracted to you. Not even when we were in dating, or newlyweds, or when you were in great physical shape."

doctrine that you need to get into bodybuilding to build a fancy body that is sexually desirable

That's not right either. TRP emphasizes lifting because it makes PUA easier. But that's ultimately a cessation to a woman's frame - trying to cater to her desires to get sex from her. The purpose of lifting is to give a man the more personal benefits that help him develop self-confidence, increase his energy, and give him a motivation to live out of his own frame and pursue his mission, while earning influence with those around him.

If looks are as critical as the RP/RPC theory claims

You're talking about the black pill. I've written before that looks aren't necessary (as long as you're past a minimal threshold). Rather, looks decide the difficulty level you're playing on when it comes to sexuality. A guy who isn't all that good looking can still do extremely well with women. Owen Cook is a prime example - short, balding, slightly overweight, and on the autism spectrum ... yet dates playmates. More on that here:

https://www.reddit.com/r/RPChristians/comments/kfv5cl/rp_christians_and_the_black_pill/ggb7uhc/

how could you negotiate sexual incompatibility

I'm more with u/r3dTull1p on this one: sexual incompatibility, by and large, does not exist. What you are suggesting is distinct from "negotiating," though. You can't negotiate desire, but you can evoke it. In the same way, conditions that you call "sexually incompatible" are likely (in most cases) just desire issues which can be resolved through standard biblical living with red pill awareness.

you have to change the shape and size of your dick

Aaah - so what you mean by "sexual incompatibility" is literally parts just not fitting. In that case, this is a FAR less common phenomenon than you might think. I actually used to believe that this was the case with me and my

wife for several years. Even after giving birth, she still experienced a tense pain when I'd insert. We talked to people about it and chalked it up to "incompatibility" - that our parts literally just weren't mean to fit together.

Turns out the "physical pain" she experienced was actually psychosomatic. It was a severe case of vaginismus that 100% away as soon as red pill'd myself and desire entered the equation. But while I was unattractive, even with lubrication, the lack of desire created a psychological pain around sexuality and what we thought was a physical incompatibility turned out to be nothing at all. Go figure.

So, I'm not prone to listen to a guy who claims "my bits and pieces don't fit" until after he's been living the RPC life for a few years, has his wife trying to jump his bones regularly, and still suggests it's a legitimate size issue. But women's bits and pieces are generally so stretchy once that desire component is there (and sometimes even without it) that I just don't buy the "it doesn't fit" excuse in most cases. It's a copout. The very existence of "fisting" should prove this because I'm extremely confident that no man's dick is thicker than a fist. And yet if a woman can be stretched and trained to have an entire fist inside of her, I'm sure even an extremely wide-girth penis on a tiny woman can still be worked to fit ... *if she wants it to*.

Deuteronomy 24

That's in the context of "something indecent." You'll have a hard time convincing me that his dick being too big is her being "indecent." In fact, it's the norm today that most guys prefer a woman with a small/tight hole. Most likely, the verse is referring to him discovering she's not a virgin (but I'd have to look into it more to confirm that).

RPC doesn't really provide an answer for this and it isn't something it should dismiss as non-existent, since it may even be considered a more serious factor than lifting to look good

I disagree, for the reasons above. As stated, I'd want to see a guy RPC'd for a few years - fully internalized, not just "I read it" and apply a thing here or there - before I'd even entertain that conversation. My guess is that most men who think this is an issue will have the same result I did and it won't actually be an issue any longer.

ask a question about this in [/r/TrueChristian](#)

I can tell you their answers:

- "I deal with that too. It sucks. No good answers, but I feel for you."
- "Try praying about it."
- "Go see a doctor."
- "Try having non-penetrative sex."

You get the idea ... mostly useless garbage that doesn't actually address the problem.

And yes, this is absolutely an RPC question because I do believe that RPC and its offshoots is the only Christian forum I've seen on reddit that will actually give advice that might possibly solve the issue - unless there are other forums in [/u/osmiumzulu's](#) bank of blogs and podcasts that might have more info on the topic that I'm unaware of.

And lastly, to avoid misunderstanding, do not participate in pre-marital sex.

Agreed.

Tag: [u/one7thing](#)

Do not be unequally yoked, part two: electric boogaloo.

2 upvotes · 18 December 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Dang, bro. My heart goes out to you for that one.

I've been robbed before too, but nowhere near as elaborately.

My Kingdom Come

2 upvotes · 18 December 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I like this. First thought that comes to mind (and this will be more a monologue of thoughts inspired by your post - maybe not directly related): I can't remember the last time I prayed for some of these thigs. Most of my prayer time is just talking about life with God, and if I ask for help, it's in an OYS capacity - "I'm struggling with this. Mind helping me out?" When I make targeted requests, it's usually big stuff - things that seem impossible for me to do with the empowerment he's already given men.

I'm not sure if this is a good or a bad thing. Maybe every now and then I should go back to those types of prayers I used to pray when I was a late-teen. Could be worthwhile.

But off the cuff, asking God to help me with something like getting a filing done in one of my cases would feel like my wife asking me for help washing a pan. She's fully capable of it. I wouldn't have delegated that task to her if I didn't already know she could take care of it. But if she were to ask me to do something like ... I don't know: open a pickle jar - maybe she's legit not strong enough for it.

I remember in my younger years I was really hung up on creating a codependency with God. "I MUST rely on God for EVERYTHING - even the air I breathe, or the fact that I can even breathe at all." At some point I started reading the passages and realized they weren't about creating codependency, but on keeping us from being arrogant by remembering that God has power over us ... you know, the same way many women need to have their egos kept in check by remembering they have a husband over them (hence the point of head coverings).

For me, that codependency created a solipsism in my faith - everything was about me and God, and even when I was doing external ministry, it was to advance a me-and-God feeling rather than an actual commitment to the mission.

So, I read things like, "Behold, I have given YOU authority ... over all the power of the enemy" and "he called the twelve together and gave THEM authority over all demons and to cure diseases" and "if two of you agree on earth about anything they ask, it will be done for them by my Father in heaven" and to Peter, "I will give YOU the keys of the kingdom of heaven." God doesn't want us to be codependent on him. That's the whole reason Jesus left in the first place - "It is better for you that I go," he says. He didn't want us to be codependent on our relationship with him to do what he has delegated and empowered us to do from his authority transferred to us.

So, now I take personal responsibility to wield the authority Jesus gave me in a wise and effective manner, and my prayer with him is conversation about what I'm doing with that authority, not begging for his help on things he's already authorized and empowered me to do.

Like I said ... probably a bit off topic. But that's what comes to mind with a post like this. Good food for thought all the same.

How do you interpret 1 Peter 3:7?

2 upvotes · 16 December 2020 · /r/askRPC

Given that someone else just asked a parallel question today on the discord, I'll just paste my answer there over here also:

QUESTION

@Married I've been taking a look at 1 Peter 3:7. What has it looked like for you to apply "show honor to the

woman as the weaker vessel, since they are heirs with you of the grace of life" in a practical sense?

What specific actions have you done which "honor" your wife?

Even though I do not have a wife, I can see how having this understanding will free you up since you no longer have incorrect expectations she cannot fulfill. I read the Colossians passage and combining that with Ephesians it makes more sense.

I also began thinking about why God would create women to be the weaker vessel. One of the possible reasons I thought of is it makes it so the husband can fulfill the Ephesians 5 passage more effectively as well as promoting trust/respect from the wife to the husband which is a reflection of Christ.

ANSWER

having this understanding will free you up since you no longer have incorrect expectations she cannot fulfill

I don't follow. How YOU express honor TO HER shouldn't affect your expectations of how SHE will think/ behave TO YOU. But yes, it's important to know in advance so you can develop a character that behaves biblically by nature rather than having to learn it on the spot once you're married.

why God would create women to be the weaker vessel

Your rationale is circular and overly complicates the matter. Saying, "God made women weaker so men could lead them" begs: why should men lead their wives? "Oh, because they're the weaker vessel who need leadership." When asking *why* God created men and women that way, the list of possibilities includes that God COULD have made not only women to be stronger, but he could also have even changed Ephesians 5 if he wanted. So, using Ephesians 5 doesn't resonate well.

Instead, the answer is much, much simpler. God designed marriage to parallel his relationship with his people. The Church is weaker than Christ, so God made women weaker than men. Done.

how you have honored your wives in a practical sense

The Bible leaves this open. One man may honor one way, another another. That said, there's a contextual clue in the passage: "as the weaker vessel." If you can figure out how women are weaker, you can figure out the type of honor Paul was referencing. In this situation, my particular expressions include, without limitation:

- Providing - because she's weaker in her ability to maintain mental health through full-time employment
- Protecting - because she's physically weaker
- Being emotionally stable/uplifting - so that she has a rock to stand on when her weak emotions get blown around like a storm
- Leading our family - because she is weaker in her capacity to process and make biblical decisions beyond her own self-thought

In short, the way I honor my wife is by being the type of man who makes her happy to be around. It's not about pedestalizing her as if I am subservient to her needs. It's about living up to the pedestalization that is due me.

Much of this is also addressed in my post on "the comparison game" in the 100 series.

Podcast Debut Today on The Red Pill YouTube channel: Christianity vs. Churchianity

2 upvotes · 19 November 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I initially misread this as basura.

Don't Be Autistic

2 upvotes · 18 November 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Pick one or two concepts a week and apply them before moving on. Also, keep an outline of things you want to practice so you don't forget. Add to it when you learn something new.

The Basics of Female Frame

2 upvotes · 12 November 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I like this as a starting point, though it needs to be re-organized. I'll work something out - but I appreciate adding to the thought-pot.

"Alphas" at gym, "betas" at life

2 upvotes · 25 October 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Maybe you're at a "cheap" gym and all the successful older people are at "expensive" gyms.

This.

I was at one of the expensive gyms. I ABSOLUTELY knew people 45+ who were jacked and successful. Their college-age kids worked out with them.

I also think /u/ScholarLad is possibly confusing "successful-looking" people with "successful" people. If you assume successful people aren't jacked except in proven cases, like Arnold, then when you see jacked people you assume they're not successful, then you go around questioning: "Where are all the successful jacked people?" It's a self-affirming mentality. Unless OP is going around asking all the jacked people he sees whether or not they make 6 figures, this type of preconceived, stereo-typed observation is useless.

As to OP's original questions, though: I do agree with /u/Deep_Strength that lifting exists to achieve certain goals in life. Once you're achieving those goals, you switch to maintenance rather than growth. If you find you're slipping and your goals are dipping, then get back to gripping those weights.

Look at what they do, not what they say

2 upvotes · 24 October 2020 · /r/RPChristians

But doesn't that make them liars by default?

No.

If my actions and words are not congruent, wouldn't that make me a liar and untrustable?

Most people believe what they're saying and, therefore, are by definition "not lying." The problem is that they don't realize the incongruencies between their words and actions. That is, they are mistaken about their own motives, behaviors, impulses, etc. People subconsciously disillusion themselves all the time in order to cope with the incongruity between their thoughts and their feelings - or what they want and what they wished they wanted, and therefore they repress their actual desires from conscious thought to the degree that they only come out in the form of behavior.

Or is it only women who are not consciously aware of RP concepts that we need to observe this way, where

as a feminine RP woman will not be this way?

There are degrees. But on the whole, regardless of how feminine or honest she may be, when it comes to how her vagina works, there's a good chance sexually successful men will have better advice than she will.

I think if someone says 1 thing and does another, they are not congruent in their being and are untrustable.

Untrustable insofar as their incongruencies are concerned. But if they're not being intentionally deceptive, they can generally be reliable where their behaviors and words are consistent.

A letter my Fiance wrote me after I began implementing the red pill threatening to leave?

2 upvotes · 6 October 2020 · /r/askMRP

The theology of mutual submission is wrong. That's called egalitarianism and it's unbiblical. It's based on forced and obvious misreadings of Ephesians 5.

I also don't agree with the whole "duty" concept of marriage. This is based on complementarianism, which sounds biblical to many because it appropriately teaches headship (man = leader; wife = follower), but it mixes in other roles that aren't found in the Bible, making it ultimately an extra-biblical view of marriage (possibly even unbiblical). Specifically, complementarians assign certain "duties" to husbands and wives that the bible doesn't. These can be either physical tasks (husband mows the lawn; wife folds the laundry) or categories (husband provides finances; wife helps around the home) or even relational paradigms (when raising kids, husband is the disciplinarian; wife is the comforter/nurturer).

In my post [No, Your Congregation Doesn't Preach "Biblical Headship"](#), I address these and note that a man is free to set his own paradigms for how his marriage is run. If you want to be the stay-at-home dad while she works, go do it. If you want to make her mow the lawn while you fold laundry, go for it. If you want to nurture the kids and she be the disciplinarian - or even that you both do both (my preference) - that's your call. The guy sets the framework for the marriage, the wife is to operate in it.

The problem you're facing is that your fiance doesn't know what your frame is or how to operate in it, and as a result she doesn't want to. Sure, there have been some good shared memories that have caused her to *want* to figure out more of who you are and what it would be like married to you. So, she asks questions that she THINKS are important and gets answers she doesn't like, so she's questioning whether she really wants to commit to your framework at all.

As for dealing with the blue pill content she's ingesting, dealing with it is extremely simple: "They're wrong. Let's open the Bible and see what it actually says. If you think they're right about something, show me the passage you think proves it, and we'll talk about it." Use it as an opportunity NOT to defend your position, but TO teach her your position. Let her choose if she's willing to embrace your position or not. But for the love of God and her love of you: be fun while you do it.

Of course, this approach assumes you actually know your stuff ahead of time. Read the RPC sidebar for the biblical foundation of many things you'll read on the red pill forums.

How important is context to communicating mission?

2 upvotes · 21 September 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Working on the weight loss/working out. Not a part of my mission.

I used to say the same thing. I used to also say things like, "Doing house chores isn't part of my mission, so why

does MRP put such a big focus on 'maintaining the ship'?" As I matured I realized that's all crazy talk.

People follow attractive people who have their crap together. Nobody wanted to be disciplined by me when I was a 35% slob. As I developed my physical appearance (and still going), I noticed my influence among others starting to change as well.

I see lots of Christian in your mission, but ZERO Red Pill

not my call beyond incorporating into discipleship efforts

I'm inclined to agree with you here. Contrary to [/u/RedPillGlasses'](#) statement, RPC takes the viewpoint that red pill praxeology is merely an observational study of the theological realities already present in Scripture. That is, we're not blending secular red pill with the Bible, as if we must force some mixture between the two. We just take the Bible as it is, which happens to have on its own many of the things observed about human nature in the red pill communities.

Further, because of the observational nature of the red pill, even the secular red pill communities don't demand a guy incorporate "the red pill" into their mission. If a guy wants his mission to involve training a stronger breed of men in the world, the secular red pill would approve. But if he also wants his mission to be making lots of money, the secular red pill would equally approve, as many have done. And the same would go with any other mission, like writing a best-selling novel, or climbing Mt. Everest, or mastering archery. To the red pill, the mission doesn't matter. What matters is whether or not you accurately understand the true nature of the world and women in the way you go about accomplishing your mission, and that the mission is uniquely yours and not the product of external pressure telling you what you should want.

As Christians, the more we are sanctified the more we take on the image of Christ - not from a behavioral modification standpoint, but internally to our own nature. We are literally becoming a new creation, and have already been deemed as such even while still in the process. That new creation, if it is at all becoming like Christ (or else it wouldn't be new), would also involve taking on his mission - not as an external "okay, this is the next thing I have to do to be more like Jesus," but from an internal, "I find myself suddenly wanting to do this, not because the Bible tells me to, but because this passion is just erupting out of me!" way.

In this, "make disciplers" is certainly an appropriate mission, and the only adjustment I'd make from your current mission of "make disciples." Not having the "r" at the end is reflective of a lack of long-term vision. As you note in your post: everything else is just context. Pastoral ministry? That's context. You can make disciplers without being a pastor. Writing? That's just one thing you do to earn credibility and influence so that others see you as someone potentially worth discipling them.

But do work on that weight issue, as it seems you are. I guarantee that the more attractive you become, the greater your influence will grow.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (08/19/20)

2 upvotes · 20 August 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Stats: 35, 6'0", 18% BF, Married, 1k lb club

Weekly Summary: Crushing it with billing, having great time with my kids, still need to connect with one of the guys I disciple locally who bailed on me yesterday due to his kid's tennis camp. Making progress on the playground again. Looking forward to a weekend with no travel, no guest visitors.

Physical: Body weight lifts on track. Cardio down from previous weeks - shifted to intervals, as I tend to talk to guys I disciple on the phone while getting my run in, which slows me down if the conversation is serious enough

or requires continual participation. Goal: In the next 7 days I want to purchase at least \$1,000 of items for my home gym (has to be done to get my wife's work credit of 50% up to \$500 before she quits) and begin researching contractors to help us remodel our basement to fit the home gym.

Mental/Emotional: Never been better. I'm super pumped about life right now - so many good things going on and great conversations happening. I'm meeting lots of new people. Neighbors are engaging more often. Randos on the street are remembering me and stopping me to chat while I'm out for a run, whether with my kids or on my own (another facet forcing me to do interval running rather than paced distance runs). Wife is noticing that I have more relationships outside the home than she was aware of and that the relationships she was aware of were actually more intentional and tangible than she realized. Healthy dread is setting in.

Spiritual:

- AoS: 10/10 - Never an issue. Lots of fruit.
- QT: 9/10 - I'm getting that daily relational time with God.
- Bible Study: 2/10 - Shocking for me, but this one has been unusually low these past couple weeks. More relational time. I'm okay with that.
- Scripture Memory: 2/10 - Intentionally low; will be hitting this back up again in another month.
- Prayer: 3/10 - Unintentionally low, but rising due to the prayer threads here reminding me throughout the day. Props for that, boys!
- Evangelism: 7/10 - Relationships with non-believers growing, as above. Conversations deepening.
- Fellowship: 10/10 - Never been better, despite COVID.
- Goals for the week: Develop consistency in praying for others.

Temptations: To be excessively harsh or crude with some people in contextually inappropriate times. Wanting to scale back in my career to take a break.

Relationships/Family: Where it needs to be.

Mission: On track.

Do you have any concerns about how it seems like this view errs on the side of control of your wife over her personal growth and freedom?

2 upvotes · 15 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I think what [u/Datanami](#) is getting at is simply this:

I'm an attorney. I have another attorney who is starting his own law practice who I'm "mentoring." He's exceptionally good at researching legal issues. After all, that's what law school taught him to do. He knows absolutely nothing about building a case for court.

Should I spend all my time talking to him about how to do legal research because it's important to his role as an attorney? Or would my time be better spent giving him a framework for presenting his case in court - one part of which is legal research? Obviously it makes more sense for me to emphasize the latter.

Now, imagine this guy is such a legal research nut that when his clients hire him he only researches their legal issues, but never actually files the complaint, never attends any hearings, never puts together exhibits or sets up an argument, etc. The most effective approach isn't merely to add on other things to his legal research. I must actively tell him to stop doing legal research for a while. He can't keep up that level of legal research and still do all the other things; he must actually decrease the amount of legal research he's doing so he can fulfill his other

responsibilities to his clients.

That's the husband/wife dynamic in a blue pill marriage with a guy who first discovers the red pill.

No, your congregation does not preach "biblical headship"

2 upvotes · 14 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I knew you had one not all that dissimilar. The baseball bat story is one of mine ;)

"Abuse" now means....made a woman feeeeeeeel bad or "raised your voice."

You notice nowadays that "yelling" has also been redefined to "talked to me in a way that made me feel bad"? My business partner literally just told me a story about how he told the secretary: "I've told you 3 times now, and here it is again: you need to ask opposing counsel where that entry is. That's all." The secretary does so, gets off the phone and starts balling, raised her voice at my partner (i.e. her boss) about how awful it was that he was "yelling" at her. He replies:

- Did I raise my voice? Her: "No."
- Did I make a nasty scowl when I spoke? Her: "No."
- Did I clench my fists or hit a wall or pound my desk? Her: "No."
- So you tell me what I did that you interpreted as yelling.

Her: "When you said that it was the 4th time you had to tell me to do this, it was clear you were frustrated with me and it felt like you were yelling."

Palm. To. Face.

I've had that same conversation with my wife years ago when I was new to developing frame.

I think women (people, generally?) are used to associating "you're not obeying" with their parents verbally yelling/screaming at them when they were kids and can't disassociate respectful rebuke from the aggravation of a raised voice, so they experience both despite only getting one.

No, your congregation does not preach "biblical headship"

2 upvotes · 14 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

My definition of love in short is to act in someone's best interest

I'd recommend exploring Scripture more on this.

not necessarily more accurate in the legal setting as you point out, but I would still contend that general public understanding of abuse has improved

I'll still differ. The courts wouldn't be assessing abuse cases the way they do if there wasn't a public opinion inspiring these women to make the claims as they do. Again, most women who make false allegations of abuse actually believe they have been abused. The number of women who believe this are still significantly greater than the number of courts who will give any weight to their claims.

The reality is that the word "abuse" and how it's understood is subjective and relative. God doesn't define abuse or suggest he has some universal standard we must all abide by. So, if it's left in man's hands, which man has the right to say his definition of abuse is better than another's? What you really mean to say is: "modern definitions of abuse are better to me than the old ones," not that they're "more accurate" - because "accurate" in comparison to

what standard?

and hence you might unfairly extrapolate those extreme views to the general public

On the contrary: the general public has to believe their claims are rational before it gets to the courts in the first place. Nobody files a law suit on grounds that have absolutely no public support or legal basis - and things don't get codified into laws until the public generally reaches that consensus. I promise you: the courts, as bad as they are on the matter, are FAR less likely to call something "abuse" that gets pushed by feminist bloggers, social justice warriors, and Facebook posts all over. It would be actual lunacy to think otherwise.

Seriously: [check this link](#). Apparently just calling someone "stupid" or yelling is *abuse*. This isn't John R. Andom's blog. This is healthline.com. You're going to tell me the court opinions of abuse are more expansive than this public opinion piece?

he is redefining marital rape maybe even encouraging it?

I assure you he is not encouraging sexual assault toward one's wife. But do recognize that, historically, marital rape didn't even exist as an offense until the 1970 and even into the 1990s it still wasn't recognized by most states. Rape, **by definition**, is against someone "not one's spouse." Historically, it has always been well-established that getting married establishes a precedent for all sexual conduct. That doesn't mean all sexual conduct is permissible within marriages. It's just charged as other crimes, like "gross sexual imposition" or "sexual assault" - but it was not "rape." I'm confident what chuck means is that the Bible would not ascribe the word "rape" to any sexual activity between a husband and wife, but it would certainly condemn certain hostile behaviors in the way a man may coerce his wife against her will.

Is your understanding that the secular cultural definition of marital rape, is not a sin but that you do not encourage it because of the potential negative consequence?

No. My position is that culture defines words differently from the Bible. In the biblical sense, marital rape does not exist, even if culture has changed to call it that - just like "gay marriage" does not exist in a biblical sense. It's not marriage, despite culture using those words. But even without calling it "rape," certain conduct is still prohibited by a husband's obligation to love his wife and treat her body as he would his own. At that, I like my body to be in good shape, well-nourished, hydrated, and given lots of powerful orgasms. I don't punch or kick my own body, so I don't do that to my wife. Only a fool needs to coerce sex from his wife.

At the moment I feel convicted that the Orthodox church is the one true church

This is a somewhat absurd statement to make. You're conflating an earthly organizational structure with an intangible spiritual Kingdom of Heaven. Anyone - Orthodox, Protestant, Catholic, or otherwise - who claims to be the "true Church" has no biblical concept of "the Church" in the first place.

Look, I went down that road too. I was literally in talks with my wife about ditching our Protestant congregation and going Orthodox. I understand the appeal. But the more I examined Scripture, the more I realized how absurd their ecclesiology was, and of all branches, I now place the Orthodox perhaps even below the Catholics, though they all have their problems.

But now I feel validated because so many of the errors are refuted by Orthodox theology and their ecumenical councils in the past.

As has been done by countless other believers within the universal (i.e. only actual "true") Church, regardless of

which earthly structure they identify with. This is certainly not exclusive to the Orthodox.

For me once I heard a solid argument against sola scriptura (if there is a silver bullet it might be this, for me it was the last punch to crack open my current framework

This is somewhat absurd. There are many protestants who reject sola scriptura too. In fact, I'd wager that *most* educated protestants do. The majority fall, instead, under what we'd call *prima scriptura* - which is that Scripture is the primary source of truth and wisdom from God to man, but not the only. As I understand it, that's a doctrine even the Catholics and Orthodox believe. The reformed camp are the ones who seem to push the solas the most.

But even more concerning is that you're basing your assessment of the "ideal congregation" on something as trivial as "the Orthodox reject sola scriptura and reformed theology, therefore I'm going to side with them." I've often written that I care very little what denomination or "sect," if you don't like to call it a "denomination," any man participates in. I only care that he believes the Gospel and is making disciples. And when selecting a congregation you should be less interested in technicalities of theology and more interested in assessing where you will be most capable of making disciples the way Jesus did - how receptive are the people? Are there FAST people in the congregation or primarily pew-sitters? Is there room among the leadership for you to grow in influence within the congregation in your mission to make disciples? These are the things you should be looking at. Theological technicalities are a horrendously awful basis for selecting a congregation and is among the reasons our faith has become so backwards in the first place.

No, your congregation does not preach "biblical headship"

2 upvotes · 14 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

idea of the husband should be the primary pursuer in the husband-wife relationship

https://www.reddit.com/r/RPChristians/comments/84gbdv/for_singles_finding_the_girl_you_cant_keep/

I've also commented before about a study I did of every time the Bible uses the words "pursue, pursued, pursuing, seek, etc." and found that for every one example of God pursuing us, we see 20-22 examples of us being implored to seek God and His Kingdom. Huge role reversal there from what's standardly taught.

No, your congregation does not preach "biblical headship"

2 upvotes · 13 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Haha ... brings back memories.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (08/12/20)

2 upvotes · 13 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Fair enough. If it's actually to hurt you, record the incident immediately after (without letting her know, if your state permits), and get her to admit that she hit you while you talk very calmly. Call the police and file a report. Show them the video. Tell them she's threatened to file false charges on you before - even if only implied. Once that's documented they're far less likely to mess with you if she goes running to them later.

No, your congregation does not preach "biblical headship"

2 upvotes · 12 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

even if you are RP conflict is inevitable

I disagree. As [/u/rocknrollchuck](#) often says, "It takes two to argue."

I have a post on this on MRP that was pretty popular a while back, titled **Be the Judge**. Probably time for a re-post, as I apparently never put it on RPC.

Edit: I just created an updated version for RPC, which you'd be better off going to:

https://www.reddit.com/r/RPChristians/comments/i8hx6w/be_the_judge/

A picture of a relationally solid church community

2 upvotes · 11 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Well said on a lot of this - and spot on with your conclusion! All of this sounds like behavioral modification rather than internal transformation. It's the leadership saying, "You're not allowed to have your own frame, so you must live in mine," rather than teaching them how to develop strong, healthy frames for themselves.

Update: Looking for guidance

2 upvotes · 11 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I know I wouldn't want to have sex with a man who is lazy and entitled.

Of course not. But that's just the thing: *you don't want to*. But even when the man isn't lazy - he's actively doing things to make his wife happy all the time - the overwhelming majority of women still don't want to have sex with such a man. I've been there. Countless other men have too. It's the Nice Guy Syndrome - the belief that if we are just "nice" enough and "serve" enough and "help out" enough that eventually these things will make her want to have sex.

But the reality is that a woman's vagina doesn't start tingling because the dishes are done and the floor is picked up. On the whole, when a man pedestalizes his wife, treating her like a goddess, she ends up feeling contempt toward him, not attraction. It comes off as pathetic and only bolsters in her mind that she is the leader in the household - because whatever she says goes. And no woman wants to have a man who isn't strong enough in character to lead his family well either.

That's why I say: marriage counseling may solve a couple small problems, but it does it by creating bigger ones. It looks to short-term patch jobs without treating the long-term problems - even encouraging them to persist.

I don't think you would be qualified to diagnose someone with depression or a personality disorder

As a matter of licensure, no. But I do it in an unofficial capacity all the time as part of my career. My law firm focuses on divorce/custody cases that involve mental health issues. Before entering into a court-ordered psychological evaluation I will often have my clients take an MMPI-2 (the official test used to assess personality disorders) and use what I've learned from how psychologists interpret results in other cases as well as from continuing education classes to discern in advance what issues my client is likely to come up with. Over the last 2 years I've been 100% accurate in regard to what the forensic psychologist actually finds. So, am I "qualified" on a licensure level? No. Am I "qualified" in the sense that I know what I'm talking about and am always confirmed by the people who do have the licensure? Absolutely.

And in a marriage, a mental health issue could very likely be causing all of the problems, not just faulty communication

Right, but now you're talking about individual counseling, not marriage counseling. That changes the entire game. I'm 100% in favor of individual therapy when done correctly. Marriage counseling is what I suggest is damaging.

The Origins of the Ekklesia ("Church")

2 upvotes · 7 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Right. You have some fair points. I'm not fully persuaded. But, admittedly, I haven't looked into the concept of the OT assembly of Israel as a parallel for the Church before. I'll give it some thought and study soon.

But I'd be extremely skeptical to take a tangible-tangible approach. Generally, everything God does in a physical/tangible way in the OT is meant to foreshadow spiritual concepts in the NT that couldn't be known until after the cross. So, to say that (to make up an example) the assembly of Israel followed a certain tangible structure, rather than saying the Church must follow that tangible structure, it'd be more consistent to suggest that there is a spiritual reality to God's Kingdom that the tangible expression of the Israeli assembly was attempting to parallel.

The Origins of the Ekklesia ("Church")

2 upvotes · 7 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I think it's safe to say that the core concept of "ekklesia" in the NT is whatever the "assembly of the LORD/Israel" was like in the OT

This would make sense if it weren't for 2 things:

1. Jesus was constantly condemning the Jewish people for their misunderstandings of God's intentions, making the Jewish practices generally unreliable for God's spiritual Kingdom
2. While the Septuagint was in Greek, Jesus was likely speaking in Aramaic or, I'm sure at times, Hebrew. When the apostles were writing the epistles, they chose the Greek language because they were writing primarily to a Greek-speaking audience, many of the epistles being directed toward non-Jews who would have understood the Greek ekklesia at Athens without having any clue about the Jewish structures referenced in the Septuagint.

Are you *TRULY* Red Pill?

2 upvotes · 5 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

RP Option D is a red pill man. He just discovered the red pill independent of the red pill community. Right? Rollo has a number of podcasts where he talks about certain celebrities and the dynamic of "are they red pill or blue pill?" Chances are, for anyone we'd label "red pill" out in the world, they haven't actually read the red pill forums. But that doesn't mean they're not red pill - it just means they're ignorant of the formal concept and they would know it by a different name - by their own internal study and observation of human nature.

For the Christian man under option D, I intentionally left that a little vague, but with the implication that yes, I believe such a person is saved. I believe Romans 1 is clear enough that this limited knowledge from creation is sufficient, even without an actual Bible-in-hand. I also believe there are enough references in Scripture to God judging each person according to what he has been given that it seems to me that if someone was given less knowledge of the Gospel, they will be judged in light of the knowledge that *has been made available* to them rather than the knowledge that hasn't.

Are you *TRULY* Red Pill?

2 upvotes · 5 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Define "trust."

OFFICIAL: Cross-posting from other subs. Do's and don'ts.

2 upvotes · 4 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Two things to add, which I thought of after the fact of reading this:

1. When you paste a link, use a .np link and no suggestion of brigading.
2. For extra clarity, "ideally" doesn't mean some redirect posts are okay, just not ideal. What he means is that redirect posts WILL be taken down. Period. I don't care how useful the discussion is over where you're redirecting.

When you have "feeeeeelz" for someone else

2 upvotes · 4 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Have an up-vote for actually watching the movie! I've probably seen it a dozen times now - and listened to the soundtrack many more. So much food for thought, especially when understanding that it's based on a true story.

Both of them resort to unhealthy habits to stand the situation, he starts cheating, she becomes a harpy.

I interpreted the song *If I Didn't Believe in You* as his "last effort." After that, she completely detaches from him and, essentially, ends the relationship, at which point he has nothing left to try, so he says, "You want to be a harpy? Go for it. I have no room for harpies in my life. I'm moving on."

Or, to be more succinct: her being a harpy is what drove him away; not that his cheating would have occurred independently of her conduct toward him.

That last song, the notion of a goodbye that will last one day and the goodbye that will last forever was so sad i don't recall a time i felt that much despair in a movie.

It's beautiful when a movie can evoke that kind of feeling! Even better: that's an aspect of the song I hadn't really focused on before.

The last movie that made me feel that way was *La La Land* - though it was less *despair* and more an oxymoronic combination of forlorn hopefulness.

It's sad to think we, as members of the bride of Christ, often become that girl that just wants to make the husband's life a hell. God help us to be more grateful.

Right. Yet she embodies the churchianity culture. That Christ is glorious, yet we want our piddly congregations to take center-stage, making a name for our own brand of the faith rather than limiting our brand to the name of Christ.

The song *A Part of That* is, in my view, the epitome of how a wife should understand her context to her husband's mission - and how the Church should relate itself to all that Christ does in the world. Yet just as she abandons this philosophy for her own career ambitions - such as in *A Summer in Ohio*, where she leaves him to pursue a gig that lasted a few months - so also does the Church depart from the ministry of discipler-making that Jesus established in order to pursue its separate career of congregation-building.

The Origins of the Ekklesia ("Church")

2 upvotes · 2 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Very well said. I think I agree with all of this. Two points to note as clarification, though:

1. Shepherding/pastoring is a legitimate gift/role in the church. Just because people who falsely call themselves pastors have tarnished the word doesn't mean it isn't a legitimate position that many are called to fulfill.

2. Bearing in mind everything you've said - there's still no better place in the world to find people who at least claim to want to follow Jesus. So these congregational structures are still the best resource we have for making disciples because the people who call themselves pastors have already done the hard work for us of gathering such people in one place. Rather than rejecting what they've accomplished because we disagree with aspects of their ministry model, let's figure out how to piggy back off of their work for our own discipler-making mission. Right?

OYS - Where Progress is Made (07/29/20)

2 upvotes · 2 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I believe it's on the discord. Just ask [/u/r_horizon](#) or [/u/aaaquad](#) for it. I think one of them has a pdf index that includes my latest version (which is still, admittedly, extremely old).

OYS - Where Progress is Made (07/29/20)

2 upvotes · 30 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

1/2

1/3 of the world being killed

I assume you're referring to Revelation 9. For context, remember that John isn't in this vision wandering the entire earth with a tape-measure and a calculator to assess everything in global proportion. There's no indication that he's in a space-craft orbiting the earth to see the 40% or so that would be visible even if he were zoomed out all the way to see the whole earth.

He's watching the war between Rome and the Jewish zealots at Jerusalem. We have to assume he's talking from the frame of reference of what he was shown. The entirety of what he saw was "the world" to him. If he saw the battle between Rome and Jerusalem, "the world" was everything he could see going on during that battle and wouldn't have included the people thousands of miles away that he wouldn't have seen.

In this, on the whole throughout Revelation, Rome is described as a beast and an army of monsters, the same way Daniel's visions refer to the kingdoms as beasts. The Jews were not monstrous beasts, so they're described as humans. With that context in mind, let's break this down:

- 1 The angel sounding his trumpet is likely a literal angel in heaven that brought on the upcoming events.
- 1 The star falling from the sky is the same language used to reference Satan's fall from heaven. It indicates an angelic being descending from heaven to accomplish something on earth (at this point, it's neither clearly demonic or good-angelic).
- 1 The Abyss is generally a reference to the depths of the earth, hell, the sea, or any other number of *deep* places. It is also used in other books (of Scripture) as a reference to the Gentile masses.
- 1 The key to the Abyss indicates that the angelic being had access to do as it pleased with the Abyss.
- 2 Opening the Abyss is indicative of a volcanic eruption, much like Pompeii, which would involve rising smoke, a giant furnace, and darkening the sun/sky by the smoke.
- 2 Tacitus (Romans historian) recorded without much explanation that "Whole towns were burnt down or buried throughout the richest part of the coast of Campania" (incidentally, the area where Pompeii is located, showing that it did, in fact, have volcanic activity there and during that approximate time-frame).
 - Alternatively, if not a volcano, Rome generally had a "scorched earth" policy with regard to rebellious cities in its empire, slaughtering them and burning everything to the ground to dissuade others from being

rebellious. This equally would have fulfilled the passage.

- 3 In the wake of a probable volcanic eruption within the Roman empire (the Abyss), the armies (locusts) leave to swarm the earth (Israel), armed with swords and spears (like scorpion stingers).
- 4 Josephus writes in *The Wars of the Jews* 6.1.2 that the Romans were forbidden from applying the scorched earth policy on Jerusalem at first because of a vast scarcity of resources. The Jews were actually trying to burn down the trees so the Romans could not use them to make battering rams to enter the city. The Romans were ordered to protect the trees with their lives. See also Deuteronomy 20:19-20, explaining Israel's awareness of this aspect of siege warfare.
- 4 In Deuteronomy 20:19-20 the test for whether to cut down a tree or let it stand was whether or not it bore fruit, which can only be the case if it's a good tree (i.e. saved). The implication is that the Romans, sparing the fruit-bearing trees while cutting down those that didn't, were God's judgment against the Jewish rebels who forsook Christ, whereas those who escaped to Paella earlier in the war were among those who later converted to Christianity.
- 5 The siege on Jerusalem lasted exactly 5 months. Many were wounded from swords, spears, arrows, etc. during this time.
- 5 The reference to not being allowed to kill them during this time could be God literally not allowing the Romans to succeed in breaking through the city earlier.
- 6 This describes how many would have felt during the war.
- 7 Many of the Roman armies would have been on horseback during the battle. The commanders wore golden helmets and obviously had human faces. Do remember that John is watching this entire battle, so while not necessarily zoomed out to see as if from space, watching the entire world (in which point he couldn't have seen the battle or nearly as much detail as he reports), he was still at enough of a distance to see the entire scene, and not so close as to see the details of the armaments, only being able to make things out from a distance. In this, the armor certainly would have appeared exactly as described, and the "human faces" would probably be the only human aspect actually visible.
- 7 Alternatively, many archaeological finds have shown that the Roman horses in battle wore horse-helmets, often molded with human faces on them. [Here's an example](#).
- 7 It's also worth noting that in Joel 2 we see some of the exact same wording used - an army of locusts looking like horses. Joel 2 is a clear reference to human armies, validating the view that the locusts here are actual human armies.
- 8 The helmets the Romans wore would have looked as described. [Here's an example](#) where you can see woman-like hair and the teeth coming down the sides like lions. [Here's another example that could be interpreted similarly](#).
- 9 The Romans literally wore metal breastplates.
- 9 As they swarmed toward the city, they certainly would have sounded like thunder and the literally horses/chariots rushing into battle would have sounded exactly like horses/chariots. John may have been observing from too far away to recognize that they were actual horses/chariots.
- 10 This could be a reference to spears, the tail being the shaft that would drag behind, as the soldiers would hold closer to the heavier metal to maintain balance. Alternatively, the Roman ballistas were called "scorpions" so frequently that some translations of *Wars of the Jews* actually translate "ballista" as "scorpion." These would have been carried on the tails of the horses/chariots to get them into battle.

- 11 Abaddon is a transliteration of the Hebrew word for destruction and it is used virtually interchangeably with Sheol or the Abyss. It's likely a reference to an actual angelic being (good or demonic, I don't know) influencing the battle.
- 11 Abaddon/Apollyon is also likely a dual (or at least alternative, in the sense that "angels" were those sent as messengers to do God's work) reference for General Titus, son of Emperor Vespasian and who also later became the Roman emperor, whose legion at the time was known as the Legio XV Apollinaris, or more colloquially: "Apollo's Fifteenth Legion." In this view, Titus's legion was the one enacting the scorched earth policy against rebellious cities within Rome, being the one who literally caused the fire and smoke in verses 2-3. Titus is the one in charge of the war against Jerusalem and ultimately the one who destroyed the temple in 70AD.
- 12 This is John's commentary; nothing to explain

Leadership Lessons Through a Comparison of Christ and Alexander the Great

2 upvotes · 29 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Not every test is conscious or intentional.

Locked down and lacking motivation

2 upvotes · 28 July 2020 · /r/askRPC

Funny ... [/u/skimthedross](#) was literally just talking about that distinction in today's podcast.

Leadership Lessons Through a Comparison of Christ and Alexander the Great

2 upvotes · 28 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

He's fitness testing you. He threw some negative comments your way and you fell for it by getting caught up in the conversation. If you disagree with him, why care so much as to reply? If it benefits you to do so, in order that you learn better how to process the issues, that's one thing. But this seems more like you're just getting huffy. Maintain frame and move on.

Leadership Lessons Through a Comparison of Christ and Alexander the Great

2 upvotes · 28 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Well, if we want to get technical ... yes. Jesus did do this in a more perfect way.

- Death: Jesus accomplished it through his own death.
- Destruction: Jesus refers to his death as "the destruction of this temple." Also, the destruction of the physical temple of Jerusalem in 70AD contributed to the expansion of Christ's spiritual Kingdom.
- Pain: Jesus was whipped and crucified, experiencing horrific pain.
- Satiating the need for power and position: this was the pursuit of religious leaders before Christ; because of Christ's "death, destruction and pain" we no longer prioritize such things for ourselves.

See how that works? Not to say this is at all what [/u/BalmoraBoy](#) meant, but it's true all the same.

How do I support my brother while also being loyal to God

2 upvotes · 27 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I agree with much of what you and [/u/Billy_King](#) have said. I think what [/u/NoFaithInThisSub](#) is referring to is the way that Jesus and John the Baptist were preaching repentance and baptism to who we generally presume

were non-believers. This argument is used a lot for a works-based "salvation through repentance" soteriology (not to say NoFITS meant it that way). The key here is to remember that they were both preaching in a pre-Gospel world. Jesus hadn't died yet, so grace through faith, while being the prevailing model through all time, was not understood in the same way - and couldn't have been until the resurrection.

That being said, [/u/rocknrollchuck](#) and I have had this conversation a number of times - whether or not the Ray Comfort "make people realize they're sinners so they'll want to be forgiven" model is actually effective. On this, I tend to land on your side of things and believe it is not. I see that lots of Christians will applaud this model as making biblical sense to them, but I don't see him winning as many believers through this model as would warrant the attention it gets. On the whole, it seems ineffective.

That said, I also tend to veer away from the "generic gospel message of Jesus came to die for our sins so that we can be reconciled to God" presentation as well. At some point this does need to be communicated, but most people have to be primed with a context to receive it before it becomes effective.

Lately, the majority of people who I've brought to Christ over the last few years have been men seeking a purpose. When they realize that life isn't just a cycle of wake, work, eat, repeat - that their life actually can make a difference in a grander plan - that seems to be alluring to them. That's what gives the context for them realizing that they want to join God's Kingdom rather than being a drop in a bucket among the rest of the world, pretending their life will matter when inwardly they know it won't.

Divorce and Biblical Dread Game

2 upvotes · 27 July 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I know the biblicalgenderroles website has some pretty terrible content. [/u/Deep_Strength](#) has addressed some of this before. I can't recall the others off-hand.

I do agree that Jesus was openly aggressive when confronted by those who would intentionally lead others away from godliness and repentance. There are a lot of blue pill people today to whom that kind of treatment is warranted. But what I saw in your post was not warranted aggression. It was bitter resentment mixed with exaggeration to the point of factual inaccuracy. That's what I'm concerned about.

Divorce and Biblical Dread Game

2 upvotes · 24 July 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

No. Mods can't edit someone else's post. It's either all or nothing. And I know at least one of his linked sources is not content I would want anyone here reading.

Episode 9 - No Frame, No Game

2 upvotes · 22 July 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

For most guys, that's actually the truth. In fact - even for the vets, it's still the truth. The issue is less about whether or not she has a frame and more whether or not it overlaps with his.

Episode 9 - No Frame, No Game

2 upvotes · 22 July 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Foundational Truth is the material you build your frame out of

I'd clarify that it's the *ideal* material. Many people built their frame on lies. They even have extremely strong frames built on lies. Look at North Korea. They've persuaded everyone in their country that their leader is a god and the rest of the world is destitute compared to their glory. That leader has a massively strong frame built on falsity. Crazy yet: people LOVE living in that frame. It's both strong and alluring to them. They don't even know

they're being oppressed. If the man is a god of any kind, he's a god of projecting his frame, despite operating on falsity rather than truth.

Also, have an up-vote for the *Hamilton* reference ;)

40 million reasons and not a single excuse

2 upvotes · 15 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

So many up-votes ... so few comments ... so confused. Solid stuff, though, brother.

I have often discussed the difference between reasons and excuses with small groups or men I've disciplined. Because you didn't toss in a definition (at least not that I saw), let me give the simplified way I have tried to boil this down for people:

- **Reasons:** When you accept responsibility, but other people want more information for why you made the mistake.
- **Excuses:** When you deny responsibility and insist that other people hear more information for why you made the mistake.

Excuses are compulsive and reactive. Reasons are contemplative and responsive.

What's important to remember here is that both reasons and excuses can be valid or invalid. The validity of a rationale does not automatically make it a good reason rather than an excuse; and the invalidity of a rationale doesn't equate to making up excuses. It merely communicates that the person was not thinking clearly.

Instead, the categorization of a reason/excuse is internal to the person making the statement. Motive matters here.

In all of this, I frequently tell my clients: "Embrace that you will take responsibility for your parenting mistakes. But couch that responsibility in the circumstances under your control which you will strive to change. This is how you will win the heart of the judge and GAL in your case." Moreover, if psych evals are involved, genuine narcissists cannot bear the thought of accepting responsibility for their faults - so learning to accept unquestioned blame pretty much precludes you from testing with an NPD as a man.

Help. // Porn sucks

2 upvotes · 14 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Haha. That's a good way to put it. Admittedly, I didn't read the comments on this one.

Help. // Porn sucks

2 upvotes · 14 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I'll ask you the same thing I ask every single person who complains about not being able to overcome porn: **Is he disciplining anyone?** If not, it's like asking the question: "How do I take this screw out?" I ask if you're turning your screwdriver the right way and you say, "Oh, we don't really think we need a screwdriver. That has nothing to do with getting screws out. But can you help us get this screw out?"

Spiritual reproduction is the screwdriver and porn (watching fantasizing about physically reproductive acts) is the screw. They go hand-in-hand. Why people don't connect these dots and insist that they're unrelated is beyond me.

Also, have you read the 400 series yet? The entire 400 series was originally designed to help people overcome internal struggles, like addiction, guilt, shame, loneliness, depression, etc. I have used that series and its ultimate compulsion toward spiritual reproduction as an effective cure for porn use with countless guys. It works. It's on the sidebar.

Also, you call him an addict. How do you know he's not just starved? Are you actively having sex and he's still watching porn immediately after? Then he's probably addicted. Is he watching porn even when he's not masturbating, just because he likes it? Then he may be addicted. Is he watching porn even during personal crises and missing work over it, or skipping classes, or failing to see a family member hospitalized and in critical condition because of it? Then he may be addicted. Those are things addicts do.

Otherwise, if these types of descriptions don't apply to him, it sounds like he's not addicted, he's just developed an unhealthy habit associated with sexual starvation. I have a post about that in my post history if you want to look it up.

If someone is starving, all they can think about is food. All the time. That's it. Food. Food. Food. As soon as they've had their fill, they move on and think of other things. Sexual starvation is no different. It looks like addiction because of how much you think about it and how much it consumes you - and RIGHTFULLY SO! Someone starving for food needs to have that imperative so they don't starve to death by failing to look for food. In the same way, someone spiritually starving would be spiritually famished and possibly die (depending on your theology) if they never eat spiritual food - God's Word.

Someone spiritually failing to reproduce SHOULD be craving the next person they can share their faith with and ultimately disciple. This is a healthy imperative. Physical sexual starvation is meant to point us to this spiritual reality, and therefore is also a healthy drive to have. But it is meant to be fulfilled not merely through the shadow of physical reproduction, but through the reality of spiritual reproduction. Go there and his spirit will be aligned sufficiently that the temptation in the physical will be out of sight and far from troublesome.

any advice for me as a partner/ female in this fight for my boyfriend would be deeply appreciated

Yeah, you can be the first person he gets to start discipling ... if you're not so offended at him having spiritual authority over you that you refuse to learn from him in a direct way. Most women nowadays are so averse to headship that they insist on chanting "more is caught than taught" as the only way they'll let their husbands teach them anything. Don't be that girl.

Look at how he is following God better than you and ask him to teach you how you can follow Christ the way he does - and that you want him to show you and empower you to do it on your own.

But, if you're like most other women, you don't think he's a "stronger Christian" than you ... most likely because many women are condescending against male porn use to a degree that they believe it surpasses their own sin issues, of which they're generally ignorant. You don't actually want to be more like him; you just want to get the benefit of what he has to offer without having to change yourself. Don't be that girl.

And if he genuinely is not more spiritually mature than you, what are you doing with him in the first place? Why follow someone who will lead you backwards? That makes no sense. That's also a sign of immaturity on the woman's part when it happens, and it calls into question her assessment that the man is really less mature than her.

How the Truth Set Me Free From Masturbation and Pornography

2 upvotes · 6 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

"Give no regard" in the beginning is best understood in the context of "do not seek after them" immediately after. It's not saying to ignore them. It's saying not to have any respect or desire for what they may claim to offer. As /u/Praexology has said, there are many examples where Jesus and the apostles talk to them directly. Your other comment makes me think you understand better than your comments above let on, but I wanted to say this just to be safe.

How the Truth Set Me Free From Masturbation and Pornography

2 upvotes · 6 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Can you give time stamps? I don't have time to listen to these.

How the Truth Set Me Free From Masturbation and Pornography

2 upvotes · 6 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Your discretion here is wise. I live by a similar principle. There are some things I believe, including along the lines of this topic and deliverance ministry, which are best left to very specific situations rather than open forums.

How do I build competence?

2 upvotes · 5 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Haha. Well said. I once heard frame described in terms of characters in a movie. If you're in someone else's frame, you're the supporting character. If you're the star, everyone else revolves around you, even though they may have their own separate lives and separate movies.

In this sense, the narrative comes from the script-writer. We are conditioned through social scripting to believe certain narratives about our lives, many of which are untrue. But if we can take not only the role of the star, but also the writer, then we create our own narrative and carry it through. The direction the plot flows is, then, the course of a man's mission, and the supporting characters and villains are those who help or oppose him along the way.

In this, it's probably wise to advise guys not merely to frame the movie around yourself (i.e. "develop your frame"), but also to learn how to write your own narratives. This idea could use more attention.

Feeling discouraged with many churches' support of the Black Lives Matter movement, including my own.. Are there any truly alt-right/conservative churches left that don't buy into this?

2 upvotes · 2 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

The same responsibility white believers have to any other believer. James 2 dives into this quite clearly, warning against showing favoritism in the first half and against inactive faith when others are in need in the second half.

Consider:

- I see a black man being beaten up by white men. What do I do? I intervene and stop the assailants, or (if I'm incapable of doing so), I get help.
- I see a white man being beaten up by black men. What do I do? I let him get beaten up and do nothing to help him because he's white and privileged and does not need the same help as my black brothers, right? Of course not. **I do the exact same thing.**

Our obligation to help others does not change because of the color of their skin. I owe nothing more and nothing less to black people than I do to white people, nor am I to show favoritism to one over the other, for we are all one in God's Kingdom. "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is no male and female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus." To suggest that one person deserves better treatment than another because of the color of their skin - even if there is a shared "history of oppression" tied to that skin color - is still a sign of favoritism, which is forbidden within the Church and not modeled by God.

Feeling discouraged with many churches' support of the Black Lives Matter movement, including my own.. Are there any truly alt-right/conservative churches left that don't buy into this?

2 upvotes · 1 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Haha, that was the reason for the reference. Any time I can sneak superman in I will ;)

I once thought about writing a post on superman as the epitome man who wears and balances both blue and red.

Anyone else frustrated with their church leadership re: COVID?

2 upvotes · 1 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Fair enough. Yes, the media decides what is sin for many people to the degree the people develop their own personal convictions from the media rather than Scripture.

Anyone else frustrated with their church leadership re: COVID?

2 upvotes · 1 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

As I recall, the original ekklesia in Greece was on a hill, not in a building. The term referenced the people, not the location or the structure. It was tied to specific purposes, usually war-related and focused on how to achieve the objectives of that greater community purpose. This purpose had little to nothing to do with getting more people to show up to the next meeting; it had everything to do with the advancement of the nation.

This is a far cry from the modern concept of "church" which references a 501(c)(3) organization headquartered in a particular building. Instead of focusing on a clear, united mission, the purpose seems to be to sing some songs, hear a message that might have individual relevance for some people, and get more people to keep showing up so the 501(c)(3) can have a larger user-base.

More to the point: what we see in Scripture is that all believers everywhere are part of a spiritual ekklesia, being "one in Spirit and in purpose" regardless of where we are physically located. The fact that people were meeting in each other's homes as a network of interconnected believers throughout a community rather than in mass meetings doesn't go against what I'm saying - it supports it. The initial structure of the early Church was discipleship-driven, focusing primarily on individual relationships and parenting one another in the faith. It wasn't until the early 300s AD that we see the current congregational model start to rise as a response to Theodosius I mandating Christianity as a national religion, bringing in so many people that the Church shifted away from a discipleship model to a congregational mass-production model. This, of course, is what started crippling the entire thing leading into the dark ages because it abandoned what Jesus taught (discipleship) and took on a worldly appearance in its organizational structure, and the congregations became less like parents and more like spiritual orphanages.

Anyone else frustrated with their church leadership re: COVID?

2 upvotes · 1 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I've met many people who think it's a sin. My own mom and her sister got in a big fight over the issue and haven't talked since. Several congregations are up in arms saying that if you don't wear a mask you're defying God's imperative to love and protect our neighbors, whereas others say the exact opposite. I don't agree it's sin. I've just seen it from soooo many sources that it can't really be denied.

Anyone else frustrated with their church leadership re: COVID?

2 upvotes · 30 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Actually, I believe you're mistaken. Paul in 1 Cor. 8 expressly authorized eating meat sacrificed to idols, and he fought against it being enforced in the early church in the Acts 15 council. There was a big debate over the issue and the council ultimately concluded that even though these things may not technically be sin, it was a necessary command to keep the peace between the Jews and the Gentiles, after which Paul confirmed this view by authorizing eating food sacrificed to idols as part of our freedom in Christ - just not in a manner that might cause someone else to violate his own conscience. This, of course, relates to Romans 14:14, where Paul says that

anyone who believes something to be sin and does it anyway is sinning. So, if you eat meat sacrificed to idols, if it's not sin, but your doing so causes someone who believes it's sin to do it, then you are responsible for causing them to stumble.

The point is: the parallel does line up because neither eating food sacrificed to idols nor is refusing to wear a mask outside, or congregating during a pandemic. So, between "not sin" and "not sin," Paul does still give the alternative command that even if it's not sin for you, respect that others don't share the same conviction and don't do something that would cause them to violate their conscience.

In this scenario, many people DO believe that it's sin to go outside without a mask because it puts others at risk. Others DO believe it would be sin for churches congregations to defy the government by meeting in person again. As Romans 14 alludes, those of us who are mature know better - that we have freedom in Christ on these issues and it's not actually sin - but that doesn't give us license to cause someone else to stumble through how we behave in front of them.

In this, I agree with /u/rocknrollchuck's point on this issue, specifically, even though I may apply it differently and ultimately weigh other considerations in as well, which would affect the conversation.

Anyone else frustrated with their church leadership re: COVID?

2 upvotes · 30 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

The link I cited specifically says "The case fatality rate is the number of confirmed deaths divided by the number of confirmed cases."

Right. This affirms what I said - that they're only looking at "confirmed deaths" and not necessarily the cause of death. From what I've read, many of these statistics are including causes of death that may have occurred even if the person wasn't corona positive, but because they were corona positive, it's getting included anyway.

For example, someone has a severe case of pneumonia. They die and are found to be corona positive. There's an 80% chance that person would have died anyway even without corona, but because it's hypothetically possible that corona influenced the death, it gets added to the corona deaths anyway.

Some studies are even including deaths for things like car accidents or gun shot wounds and accounting for those in the corona fatalities simply because the person was corona positive at the time they died.

The OP was talking about an actual church with (I'm assuming) members that skew towards the older and more vulnerable end of the spectrum

What in his post would give you that impression? I currently attend a congregation of around 250-300 adults. I have yet to see a single person over the age of 80, and I'm pretty confident we don't even have anyone over 70. 95% of our attendees are between the ages of 16 and 40, with a select few in the 40-50 age range. This is pretty normal for a lot of congregations these days.

So why would you assume OP's congregation is "skew[ed] towards the older" people?

One last nitpick: the OP said 0.02%, not 0.2%

That's fair. I've seen the .2% number so frequently that my brain just processed it as that. Nevertheless, [this website](#) cites a study from Switzerland that found a death rate of under .01% (.0092% to be exact) for confirmed positive cases for those between 20 and 49 years old - which is a very broad age range. So, even .02% is not an unreasonable number to use, depending on which studies you rely on.

How to know if I'm (F) dealing with a narcissist or with someone who has narcissistic traits

(who is a bit arrogant & entitled)?

2 upvotes · 24 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I literally almost wrote: "He sounds more like an ENTP than a narcissist." I am also an ENTP, and on the spectrum from "My life is completely pointless, I might as well just not exist" to "I am the god of the universe and everyone must bow to me," ENTPs err slightly on the latter end. Those who err on the other end naturally assume ENTPs are farther along than they actually are because they're *more* in that direction than the non-ENTP is.

This stems from a fallacious view that we assume we, ourselves, are always balanced. We can always point to someone more extreme and someone less extreme than us.

- "I'm more evil than Ghandi, but not as evil as Bill Gates"
- "I'm more evil than Bill Gates, but not as evil as Steve Jobs."
- "I'm more evil than Steve Jobs, but not as evil as Chris Brown."
- "I may be more evil than Chris Brown, but I'm not as evil as Hitler."

And then it's made worse when we lose where we are in the spectrum and say:

- "I'm more evil than Ghandi, but less evil than Hitler."

This is where most people land in self-evaluation - and this applies not just to "evil," but to arrogance spectrums, attitude for service, intelligence, compassion, etc. Most people point to extremes and say that because they're between the extremes they're probably fine.

But we then use our own sense of self as the mid-point. So, if my wife thinks she's balanced as a "good person" "ought to be" in regard to her disposition toward self-deprecation v. self-grandiosity, then when she looks at me she sees someone who is "not balanced" to the degree I differ from her and I am more toward the self-grandiosity level in her eyes than a person should be. In reality, our MMPI-2 results showed that I was within ordinary levels for my sense of self-import, but she was so far in the self-deprecation level that my attitude looked abnormal and extreme to her. To put it more simply: She thought she was a 5 and I was a 9. It turns out she was a 2 and I'm a 6.

It reminds me of a Twilight Zone episode from a year or two ago (the recent reboot). A meteor struck the planet and all men became violent raging beasts. They just attacked one another for no reason and were extremely hostile. I kept waiting for that classic "Twilight Zone Twist," but was shocked when there was none. The episode was literally just about a meteorite that made men go insanely aggressive. Yet I had been telling my family as we watched: "I bet the twist is that the meteor actually turned the women so non-confrontational that the women are going to view normal male behavior as if it's unbearably harsh." Sadly, I was wrong - but that's the concept that actually happens in real life psychology.

At first it struck me the way he would say he genuinely thinks he's better than so many people

Is he? I mean, Moses called himself the most humble man on the entire planet. Does that make him arrogant? Jesus constantly berated the disciples for having so little faith, condescending as better than them in that area. Does that make him prideful and ungodly? No. Why not? Because they're perfectly accurate statements to make.

It's often said, yet not often received, that humility is not thinking less of yourself than others; it's thinking accurately of who you are before God and man. It is having a right perception of your own status and living in light of that. That's why, you'll note, that even the secular world in crafting the DSM-V has figured out that narcissists aren't only those who puff themselves up, but also those who berate themselves. Whichever direction you go, it's an inaccurate sense of self that gives more importance to your actual function (for good or bad) than is warranted.

another time, he said while talking about a specific situation that he would be better suited for that position instead of the person they assigned, and that that person wasn't impressive..

Maybe he's right. Maybe he was emotionally wounded by the bad choice and that's his way of rationalizing the situation to make him feel better. It's a defense mechanism, not a sign of arrogance.

What is repetitive though, is talking about things he did that make him look good, from normal day-to-day tasks to charity.

Right. My dad does this all the time. He does something nice for someone, then wants to make sure everyone around him knows and gives him credit for his good deed. I attribute this type of attitude more to obsessiveness about one's reputation rather than a sign of narcissism.

He doesn't accept criticism, especially if it's too personal..

Most people don't. This is a pretty normal trait. Actually, narcissists are MORE likely to accept criticism than non-narcissists because their inflated sense of self makes them care so little of the "feeble minded" opinions of others that the criticism doesn't matter. They only care about the criticism if it's by someone in a context that will hinder their pursuit of grandiosity. So, if their boss criticizes them, they'll care because they want to be rich and any indication that they may fail financially is a huge blow to them. But if their wife criticizes them, they don't give two hoots because "having a good marriage" (whatever that means) isn't a grandiose enough goal to worry about it when it's called into question. So, criticism from their wife often gets ignored rather than affecting them.

Obviously a positive response to criticism is ideal, if it's in the context of being taken seriously. Then there's the positive, yet blowing-you-off response. Then there's the bad response, and worst of all are the apathetic responses.

Not the best with emotions as well

Sensing them or expressing them? ENTPs are generally non-expressive with their emotions, except excitement at their own ideas and ambitions. This is a product of their creative thinking patterns mixed with extroversion. I'm like that and had to learn to overcome it to get my wife's feels up.

But narcissists are so unempathetic that they don't even realize how others are emotionally feeling (contrasted with antisocials-types who realize it, but just don't care).

although he says he's usually upbeat but only from the outside, as he says usually he feels sad from the inside..

Right, the upbeat bit is from the creative excitement of being an ENTP, whereas the "sad from the inside" is likely from a mix of other sources, as there's no correlation between depression, loneliness, sadness, etc. and being an ENTP.

FR: Rejection is Better than Regret

2 upvotes · 21 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

This is almost worse than your original reply

I actually liked [/u/Continuous-Metanoia](#)'s original reply. But I agree the modified version is a step-down. It's self-deprecating, saying that you're the type of guy no other girl wants to be with and they all give the boyfriend excuse. It's also not absurd enough to be taken completely as a joke, so the woman might believe there's some

truth to it. You're better off amplifying even worse and go with a number like 42.

In this case, an amused "Oh really?" or "Oh really now?" would have been best

I'm more a fan of:

- "I know. So, how about that drink?"
- "I do too! What a coincidence. You're not gonna tell him we're going to hang out tomorrow, right? That'd make things a bit awkward for me."
- "Only one?"
- "Don't worry, I'm not the jealous type."
- "That's so cute! When's he going to propose?"
- "Give me his number and I'll ask him out too. Then it'll be fair."

FR: Rejection is Better than Regret

2 upvotes · 21 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I like your conclusion. One of my more popular MRP posts ("[Initiate Often, Confident Always](#)") was based on the same premise ([RPC Draft Here](#)). You might find it useful in bolstering your own view on the value of facing rejection.

I'm not sure why the "missional dating" thing had to come up as a preface here. But because you brought it up, note my comments in OZ's thread (which I'm going off of memory; didn't actually re-visit the link). I'd encourage guys not toward evange-dating, but "evangelism-to-dating." That is, don't start the relationship, but let the relationship be something that dangles in front of her as an incentive to getting her pursuing Christ today.

The guy who discipled me was saved because a hot girl invited him to a Bible study. She had no actual interest in him, but he was interested in her. She knew he was interested. She used his interest as leverage to get him following Jesus. They never dated, but countless people are following Jesus today because of his life - literally tens of thousands or more. All because a cute girl used his attraction to draw him toward Jesus.

I have no objection for doing the same in the reverse. But if the boundary was: "I'm not following Jesus unless you date me," that should be a hard pass. Even if they do allegedly "convert" at that point, there's no way to know if it's genuine or only a passive byproduct of the relationship. Be wary of that situation.

RPCC Episode 3: The State of Marriage

2 upvotes · 21 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Gotcha. I think I was referencing some of his general writings. I know he has a book titled "Saving a Low Sex Marriage," which addresses some of this. His podcast series also addresses this. Both of these are on the sidebar. His newer stuff (the "intermediate course" on Gottman) addresses more heavily the tools a man can use when his wife is acting out, which can be helpful.

Actual Conversations With "Abuse" Victims

2 upvotes · 16 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Haha, never been there, but I might visit. Thanks for the tip.

Explaining the Double Standards around Sex

2 upvotes · 14 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Haha, I had the same thought and would have replied as such if you hadn't already.

Explaining the Double Standards around Sex

2 upvotes · 13 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Spot on.

Actual conversations with "abuse" victims.

2 upvotes · 12 June 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Oooh, so you're a woman. I thought this sub was male only and was handling the conversation as such ([u/bluepillprofessor](#) - is that not the case?).

Either way, what I'm hearing you say, then, is: "I don't like having sex with my husband, but he gets mad if I don't, and it's not worth it to fight him on it, so I agree. See? My abuse is real." You're literally affirming the exact point of my post.

I also come from a place of believing: "Do not deprive each other except perhaps by mutual consent and for a time, so that you may devote yourselves to prayer. Then come together again so that Satan will not tempt you because of your lack of self-control" (1 Cor. 7:5). Notice that it requires mutual consent within marriage to DENY sex, not to have it.

So, I'm not really inclined to have much sympathy for your position. You don't like having sex with him anymore? File for divorce and you won't have to. By staying married, you're communicating to the world, "What he does to me isn't so bad. Even though I don't like it, I still prefer to be married to him," which is your implicit stamp of approval that you're okay with it. If it's not significant enough of an issue to make you divorce him, why do you think anyone else should take it as significant when you, who are actually experiencing it, don't?

OYS - Where Progress is Made (06/10/20)

2 upvotes · 11 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I've heard of apps for pay that will do this. We're still using freeware at this point. But if you have suggestions, we're open minded.

RPC Video Chat

2 upvotes · 10 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Working on it.

RPCC Episode 3: The State of Marriage

2 upvotes · 9 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I noticed the same thing. [u/angusisin](#) had me listening to a series on Revelation that was 29 episodes long, each over an hour. I started it at 1.5x speed and found it too fast, so I dropped to 1.25x. After about 15 minutes I put it back at 1.5x and had no problems, and the next episode and from then on, I was at 2x, which was the fastest the player supported.

I've had to learn to keep my speech pacing down for the sake of the court reporter. At times, it sounds awkward in how I leave pseudo-intentional pauses, but I've trained myself to do it second-nature now because there's nothing worse than when a judge yells at you to slow down because the stenographer can't keep up.

A Complete Idiot's Guide to Conversation

2 upvotes · 7 June 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Dang. I thought I was long! Good stuff though. I'm reminded of the conversation stack, which helped me early on. The idea is that it creates a series of pictures that follow through a general order of how to start a conversation and keep it going when you are otherwise unable to make it happen organically.

- Imagine a name plate. "Hi, I'm John. What's your name?"
- The name plate is on a house. "Where do you live?" or "What part of town are you from?"
- The house has a family inside. "Do you have any kids?" "How is your family doing?" "How hot is your wife?" [Okay, maybe not that last one.]
- The parents are wearing work gloves. "What do you do for a living?"
- The parents are holding tennis racquets with their gloves. "What hobbies do you have?" [I'll never forget one awkward couple, where I asked what they do for fun. "Fun? I'd have to think about that. I don't really know what we do that's fun. We do have lots of sex. That's fun."]
- The parents pack the racquets in the car and the family leaves for vacation. "Have you traveled anywhere interesting lately?" "What places have you been?"
- They drive to a football field and park under the goal posts. "What do you want out of life?" "What makes you passionate and excited for tomorrow?"

The idea is that the conversation gets progressively deeper or more personal as you shift from one topic to the next, leaving room to camp out at any stage for as long as you like. It's also meant to give a clear path for ideas to take the conversation forward every time an individual topic becomes stale.

It's a bit forced, at times, but great for those with social anxiety or a complete lack of conversational skills who are first learning.

Actual Conversations With "Abuse" Victims

2 upvotes · 5 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Agreed.

Actual conversations with "abuse" victims.

2 upvotes · 5 June 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

The first is absurd because "yes" means "yes" under any system. The only time there's an actual dispute is on whether or not "no" means "no" or "no" means "I'm playing hard to get, but I really want you to show your dominance by trying harder."

The second is absurd because because it's obvious he didn't actually "make" her give blow jobs. She didn't feel like it, but decided to do it anyway because it was the path of least resistance for her over saying no. If he actually did "make" her, she would have been talking about how he forced her mouth open or tied her down or how he threatened her so heavily that she didn't feel comfortable biting his dick off while she was down there. There are so many ways to get out of a blow job if you didn't want to, and if he did anything that would *actually* prevent her from taking those alternative paths, she would have brought them up as even more severe forms of abuse that simply didn't occur.

What are your views on prenups with Christianity?

2 upvotes · 3 June 2020 · /r/askRPC

Exactly.

How do I stop being a nice guy?

2 upvotes · 28 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

On the spectrum of nice to jerk, most Christians stay far on the nice side because it's more socially acceptable than being a jerk. But both extremes are destructive. The thing is, if you've been on the nice side for too long, you have to live on the jerk side for a while before you can figure out how to find balance - otherwise you're going to end up being slightly less nice, but feeling like a jerk and thinking you're done, while still being pathetic.

So, go be a jerk for a while. You can do that without sinning. Apparently I wrote another post for the sidebar that never got added: [116 - God is a jerk](#). Maybe it contributes a bit to the conversation.

Some good news and some questions

2 upvotes · 21 May 2020 · /r/askRPC

Whatever did happen with that girl this post was originally about? It's been 5 months. You still together?

r/RPCWomen is now active.

2 upvotes · 21 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I'm not active enough there. But I do encourage you or others to do so :)

Some good news and some questions

2 upvotes · 21 May 2020 · /r/askRPC

What makes me curious here is why you replied to a 3 month old comment? Haha. I'd completely forgotten about this post.

Either way, if you don't like what someone has to say, just STFU and move on. No sense arguing with internet strangers, unless you feel like you have something to prove to them or you want to learn from them and the "argument" is more about fleshing out different angles of the conversation.

Women are the beloved creation of Gods hand before they are temptation to you

2 upvotes · 21 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Let's be clear. Lusting isn't a sin. Lusting after a woman who isn't your wife is adultery and adultery is a sin. There is no sin of "lust" in the Bible. As I've often noted, Romans 14 is pretty clear that "nothing is unclean in itself." Rather, it's the context and motive that makes a thing unclean.

- Is murder a sin? We have to look at what murder is. "Killing with malicious intent." Killing is an act. Malicious intent is the context in which it's performed. Killing is not sin - God ordered people to kill others all the time. The malicious intent makes it sin.
- Is premarital sex sin? Sex is an act. "Premarital" is the context. Sex is not sinful - it's directly created by God to be a wonderful thing. The context of doing it before marriage is what makes it sinful.

Similarly, lusting in itself is never called a sin. Adultery is the sin.

- Adultery is being married and having sex with someone who isn't your spouse. Having sex (the act) isn't sin. The context of doing it with someone who isn't your spouse is the sin.

Some people dive into this and suggest that a single man cannot commit adultery, therefore he cannot sin by lusting because lusting is not the sin - adultery is.

I tend to go the other way and take the view that we look to the example Jesus set with the Church. Does Jesus ever attempt to engage in spiritually reproductive activity in a way that excludes the Church? No, therefore physically reproductive activity that doesn't involve a wife (i.e. jacking off) is still sin. As for the wandering

thoughts, for single men - does Jesus long to reproduce disciples through people who aren't his bride yet? Absolutely! But once the Church was established (i.e. his bride came into being), does he show any indication of desire to reproduce with those who aren't of the Church? Nope.

It's tricky, but worth thinking about and studying.

Finally, as with another recent post, please bring your own thoughts, not someone else's

COMPLETELY agreed ... 99% of the time. The one exception, which is rare but may actually apply here, is when the poster is a woman and she doesn't want to teach her own views (i.e. the whole "I do not permit a woman to teach" thing), in which case it makes sense to relay the message from a man to other men.

Oh, and don't come to our subreddit and imply that men only think of women as sex objects.

Right. As [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) says, they're baby making factories too ;)

A Quick Reminder about Women's Competency

2 upvotes · 19 May 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Right on. There are differences, for sure. But there's no sense throwing the baby out with the bathwater. Take what's valuable and leave the rest.

Is marriage worth it?

2 upvotes · 18 May 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I do agree with you on this comment. If a guy feels like paying for a date, what's the harm in him expressing generosity? Yes, she may use and abuse his generosity for a quick meal, then ghost him. But that's kind of the point of generosity: you're doing it without expectation of anything in return, not because you demand she spend at least the next x months at your side or because you're trying to buy her affection that simply wasn't there.

I'm more concerned with the fundamental compulsion of a man to seek a wife in the first place - that he would want one so badly that he starts paying for things to get her to give him the time of day. That's backwards to me. But if they come across each other while he's out and about making disciples and they notice a mutual sexual attraction that could easily go down-hill if some boundaries aren't put on, then there's no harm in him saying, "Let me take you out to dinner and let's talk." Even the secular world gets this - when they're hiring "helpers"/workers/employees/whatever, when have you ever seen the person desperately applying for the job, hoping to work for their dream employer, be the one to pay the interviewer's meal? It never happens. And yet this generosity from above doesn't compromise the desire dynamic or the abundance mentality of the employer in knowing they could easily interview a few dozen other candidates for the same position.

That said, there is a measure of attraction that can be increased among some types of women when a woman sees that he's high enough value that she has to vie for his attention rather than him spending money to get hers. That attraction factor is probably inherently in all women as a fundamental concept of hypergamy - but it is also overcome by cultural conditioning in those who are raised in highly traditional, conservative homes, as you suggested.

Tag: [/u/da_independent_varia](#) [/u/benjiii1995](#)

Is marriage worth it?

2 upvotes · 18 May 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I can obviously only speak to my own jurisdiction, but our office did have a case where the parties specifically avoided filing a marriage certificate with the state, thinking this would protect them. They remained together for 25 years. They had a ceremony in their church about 10 years into the relationship (again, with no marriage

certificate). The wife filed for divorce. The husband moved to have the complaint dismissed for lack of jurisdiction over a non-marital relationship. The wife presented their joint tax returns. The judge said, "You have two options. You agree that you were married and give up half your retirement or I'm calling the IRS about your tax fraud. Which is it?"

Now, I can't say what would have happened if they hadn't filed joint taxes. Maybe they would have found "constructive grounds" for creating an implied marital contract, even despite common law marriage being abolished in my state. It's possible. Alternatively, they could have invoked the "technical error" doctrine and say that the parties meant to marry, but it was a mere "technical error" that they didn't file the marriage certificate, and therefore still deem them married.

If you really want a non-legal marriage, the best thing you can do is establish a mutual contract in lieu of marriage (which is, essentially, the same thing as a prenup). This contract would specifically state up-front: "WHEREAS, Party 1 and Party 2 agree that they do not want to bind themselves to the marriage and divorce laws of this state and, therefore, intend this only to be understood as a spiritual union before the God they both profess and not a legal union before any governmental agency." That language in a contract should show enough intent and a clear meeting of the minds on the issue that would help rebut any "implied" or "constructive" marriage later on.

All of that said, none of this helps with the ultimate issue of children. Virtually every state issues default custody of children to mothers because their genetic relationship to the child is evidenced and witnessed by hospital staff through the birthing process before they are permitted to check out (unregistered natural births at home being an obvious, yet unlikely loop-hole). Fathers cannot be proven to have a genetic relationship until after testing. So, even with an affidavit of paternity, the father-child relationship isn't legally established until you file a case in the juvenile court about it ... unless you're legally married, in which case parentage is presumed. Why signing an affidavit of paternity doesn't create a similar presumption is beyond my comprehension. Legislators suck.

The point is: if you refuse legal marriage, you have no legal rights over your children until something is filed in court. So, she can do whatever she wants with the kids at any time and you have no ability to tell her no because you are not lawfully the father until you file an action in court to establish yourself as such, and even then you only have the rights allocated to you by that court.

So, you have four options:

1. Never have kids.
2. Have kids at home and don't assign them a birth certificate (no, being on the birth certificate as a father does not give you the same legal rights as being on the birth certificate as a mother).
3. When you do have kids, file a court action on agreeable terms stating whatever you believe to be biblical. In my state, I'd recommend shared parenting with Father having final decision-making authority on disputes. The reason I don't suggest sole custody to the father is that it precludes the mother from doing many practical things that would be useful to the father, like scheduling doctor's appointments, registering the kids for school, etc. - all things that many guys actively want their wives doing (even though I usually recommend against it, if you want a shot at long-term custody in the event you do split).
4. Just get legally married.

The point is: even if you do manage to avoid legal marriage, it only applies to property division and spousal support. You're still stuck with the laws on child custody/visitation and child support.

So, yes, there's some value in doing it that way. But you have to plan it out properly and take the legal precautions necessary to make sure it actually plays out the way you want it. I would not proceed in that direction without a

lawyer.

Tag: [/u/IceBear---69](#) [/u/Torn4_025](#) [/u/benjiii1995](#)

How to deal with irreconcilable differences of opinion on very serious issues

2 upvotes · 13 May 2020 · [/r/askMRP](#)

At the launch of my drunk captain phase

Okay, so this isn't a current situation.

I feel like the same dynamic keeps playing out in my life, and I keep making the same mistakes.

Why not tell us about the current mistakes? Don't get so hung up on how you handled something in the past that you can't change. Ask about the current problems and how you're handling them now that you should know better.

Discovered an inappropriate relationship

2 upvotes · 11 May 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Are you suggesting that talking and laughing with an attractive person of the opposite sex is adultery? Yikes! I guess I've committed adultery a number of times then. Obviously that's not the case. Yet this is about how most people characterize the "emotional affair." Emotional affairs are not a concept in Scripture. Covetous lust is equated with adultery. Not feeling any particular emotion.

Frame Fail?

2 upvotes · 7 May 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

You don't have to try to keep up with me because that also includes loving you, understanding you, and honoring you as best I can as the Bible says.

I'm not sure I'd say this. It over-affirms and gives the impression that she doesn't need to follow because he'll always be good to her no matter how nasty she becomes to him.

I'd word this: "The things God has called me to do will always have a role for a wife to help me fulfill." This lets her know that she will always have a role in his life, but that there is still some imperative to keep growing alongside him, simultaneously reassuring her in the midst of the comfort test and setting a precedent that she should, indeed, grow alongside him as best she can.

Tag: [/u/RBdadbod](#)

Roosh V on Jessie Lee Peterson

2 upvotes · 4 May 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Be careful to balance this view with 1 Cor. 9.

Every Christian Man's Mission

2 upvotes · 1 May 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I'm a little disappointed ... after our prior discussion, I was expecting this to be something I'd disagree with and we could start a fascinating conversation on mission ;)

This is all good stuff - and I greatly appreciate the references to back it all up.

A few things to think about ...

Jesus told his followers their Mission - To make disciples of all nations ... Mark 16:15 Go into all the world and preach the gospel to all creation

I'm a bit surprised you didn't use the more obvious Matthew 28:19-20, as it's more clear on the disciple-making language. Given that most scholars agree Mark was written first and Matthew had Mark available to him when writing his book, it's generally accepted that Matthew wrote his "make disciples" bit as a clarification of the calling as being not merely to preach (which, of course, would have been an essential part of it), though the discrepancy can also be in the differing audiences, where Mark is more open to the idea that Gentiles would be reading his book, and therefore wouldn't be as fluent with Jewish concepts of discipleship as Matthew's Jewish audience.

But, I do get that you were trying to use a passage that focused on the "words" component.

But what about existing believers? Is that part of the mission? Of course! We are to serve one another

If I wanted to be nit-picky, this is probably where I could dig in a bit. But I'm guessing we'd end up both saying "semantics!" on the interplay between discipleship and evangelism and what discipleship actually is (i.e. not just verbally preaching).

Even still, when you get to this point:

Paul's writings exhort believers to support and serve others so let's add this to our Mission

Why isolate this into the Christian mission and not the tons of other things Paul's writings exhort believers toward as well? Not that I'd remotely propose this myself, but: Paul also exhorted us not to be sexually immoral, so why not add, "The tertiary Christian mission is to avoid sexual immorality," and then when we read an exhortation not to eat food sacrificed to idols in front of a younger believer who believes it is sin, we add, "The quaternary Christian mission is blah blah blah"? Why is "support and service" singled out here?

I had a conversation a while back with [u/TheChristianAlpha](#) and [u/angusisin](#) about how churchianity's focus on "service" was really off-base. It seemed to resonate with them at the time, so I'll let them chime in if they want. The gist of it is that we don't see Jesus LOOKING for service opportunities. They find him and he engages (though also often running away and avoiding them - though that was more due to the quantity). Modern churchianity is OBSESSED with looking for service opportunities, which ultimately becomes a distraction from their mission to make disciples, which is why we see all kinds of "I love my city" projects nationwide among congregations, but virtually none of these congregations actually train men in [the basic principles of discipleship that Jesus modeled](#).

Every Christian Man's Mission is to be outwardly focused

Here's where you seem to have gotten into a semantics game with the MRP guys. First, they don't accept the notion that a man should get his mission from an external source - someone else telling a man what he must do with his life. I **COMPLETELY** agree with them. A man's mission should come from within. When God gives us a new heart and begins sanctifying us and transforming us with the whole "renewing of your mind" stuff from

Romans 12, we internally change. Just like secular RP sees all the "I'm a new man" stories, Christians literally become a new person. God creates in us desires that are aligned with his purposes - and those desires increase as we continue to be transformed. This is why Paul can say in Philippians that the true measure of spiritual maturity is taking part in the discipleship principles of life modeling - because it's inherent that as we grow in our faith, we will eventually, of our own initiative, have the same compulsion toward discipleship that Jesus modeled.

At that point, we're not doing it "because the Bible says so" - a rationale that I vehemently reject as an end-reason for doing anything. We do it because we have internally been transformed to someone who WANTS to do it. It is part of our core being - the very essence of Christ, because Christ is in us and one with us, therefore we do by nature the things Christ did. The one who merely does it "because the Bible says so" is merely functioning on behavior-modification. But if it is not flowing from internal transformation, we can only conclude that he's operating on a works-mentality. Yes, there are phases of life where behavior-modification is inevitable. I have to employ these tactics with my children while they are very young. But that's just it - it's a sign of immaturity when people operate on that level. This is why on every red pill sub guys will implore to noobs: "Lift! Start working out. Go to the gym." They don't explain why. The guy just has to conform his behaviors. But if he never internalizes it, it's a pointless endeavor. But by beginning with the behavior, if he does eventually internalize it as a part of who he is as a man, he no longer does it "because the MRP guys will ridicule me if I don't." He does it because he wants to.

Now, I suspect you agree with all of this - and I'm not pretending you don't. But the key word in the phrase I quoted of yours is "Christian." For non-Christian men, they don't have Christ internally changing them toward unity as a singular body being "one in Spirit and in purpose" (Philippians 2). Because they don't have a common, singular purpose, non-Christians can feasibly, within their own frame, develop other missions that make sense and can be internally focused (such as many Buddhist monks trying to achieve a state of zen) or externally focused, just as they can be small (earn \$1mil) or grandiose (cure world hunger).

But for the Christian, specifically, all of us collectively being part of a singular body with a singular Spirit and a singular Head and a singular purpose - it only makes sense that the mission we innately want for ourselves from our inner-most being will ultimately emerge to be the one that Jesus lived - and to do it in the way that he lived it. And because Jesus' mission, while internally sourced, was externally focused toward changing the world, so should ours be. In this, you are precisely right in what you said.

"We let our lives point to Jesus," which would be great if it worked. But I don't see it producing fruit. It sounds good, but rarely is lifestyle alone effective.

This is spot on. The whole, "Preach the Gospel always, and if necessary use words" is a total farce (by the way: the original quote was "WHEN" necessary, not "IF"). But the "words" are only the first part. I already linked 208, above. Jesus only ever started with the "tell them what" phase. This is mostly all we can do on reddit as a red pill forum - we can tell people what they need to know. But true discipleship moves on to "show them how," "let them try," "send them out," and ultimately, "pass it on."

Congregations all over the world love to SKIP from "tell them what" to "send them out" with no actual life modeling. This is the real danger. And it's the cause of what you're noticing. People don't know how to verbally share the Gospel because nobody has shown them how or given them an opportunity to practice it.

I believe in the 50s things were different. If you lived a good life, people would assume, "He must be a Christian." Nowadays people just think, "He's a good person." Lifestyle alone doesn't cut it. There has to be intentionality and initiation as part of the process. This is, of course, no different than dating/marriage. What kind of moron walks out the door to go to a restaurant, then gets mad that his wife didn't follow him ... when he never told her where he was going or invited her to come along.

But again, there's the point. Jesus lived a life that people wanted to follow. He DID invite them. But he invited them while he was doing his thing. He didn't hunt them down (except maybe Paul - he could be an outlier).

Be careful however because we are commanded to proclaim not persuade

I agree with this too. Though I think proclamation is not where it ends. We are also called to model - and not in a passive, "I hope someone comes by," pining for external attention kind of way. Rather, we model by projecting our frame and self into the world. Jesus did his thing. Along the way, he saw people who he could use and he invited them to join him. From there, he not only proclaimed the truth - he told them, "Look at me. Watch what I do. Immitate my life. Walk as I walk." Then he put himself out there in a way that they could actually observe and comprehend. This is why the proclamation of the prophets still resulted in a failed people - because even proclamation doesn't cut it. Even the people who BELIEVED the prophets were the ones who killed Jesus. That's why God said, "Fine, if you won't listen to what I tell you, I'll become one of you and you can see the model of my life through my physical presence - and I'll make sure, through discipleship, that model is passed down for spiritual generations for thousands of years until the earth is filled."

Francis Chan

He's one of the few guys who seems to understand discipleship. You watch his Multiply Movement videos with David Platt?

discussion about Mission isn't what is lacking in this sub, what's lacking is action

I wouldn't say it's lacking - but that's because I get all the PMs, phone calls, small group conferences, etc. that nobody else here gets to see. I watch it happening first-hand. It's a beautiful thing.

Is working out THAT important to find a potential spouse.

2 upvotes · 1 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Spot on. And this is why we see so many "good Christian women" who somehow magically forgot about 2 Cor. 6:14 for a few years, then suddenly rediscovered it when they decided being married to a non-Christian guy was far more disruptive to their faith than they expected. Go figure.

Is working out THAT important to find a potential spouse.

2 upvotes · 1 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Working out is not about attracting women.

This. The same act can be done in the female frame or in your own frame. Guys need to figure that out.

If a guy doesn't want to lift, he doesn't have to. That can be part of his frame. But don't be surprised if your weak body results in having a weak frame because you don't get the psychological benefits of lifting ... or that your weak body doesn't get you the results you want. So yeah, you can be in your own garbage frame that nobody else wants anything to do with - and if you're cool with that, then better for you.

But this is why a man needs to figure out what he really wants out of life. This is why mission is so important. It doesn't matter how strong your frame is if its *shape* is not something uniquely suited to meeting your goals. If you have no goals, you don't know how to shape your frame. If you do have goals, but the shape of your frame isn't suited to accomplish your goals, then you have a problem.

Idealism and Opportunism are not sex specific

2 upvotes · 1 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

This is an extremely polarized post for me. When I first started reading, I thought, "This needs to go up on the sidebar, it's so good!" But then there were other parts that seemed off.

- **"if we look to Jesus we see that He initiates but does not pursue"**

I don't know why I've had a hard time putting this so succinctly. I've had long conversations around this concept with guys (and girls) who just don't seem to get it. This puts it EXTREMELY well.

men generally don't ask out and pursue women that they are unhappy or not satisfied with, but women do accept dates, boyfriends, and even marriage sometimes with men who they aren't satisfied completely with

This is another fact that needs to be ingrained into EVERY single guy's head. I can't stress this point enough!

That said, this very claim undermines part of the point of your post. It's another generality that can easily be said in the reverse because there are so many women out there who will drop a man as soon as they find something better, or even just because they're unsatisfied; and there are also many men (even here, as evident from some of the new guy posts we see) who are with women they're not completely satisfied with - even who are only dating, yet still feel some obligation to keep her around.

idealistic (agape) love

I would not consider these synonyms. Agape is one of the noblest forms of love and is based in truth. When "God so *agape[d]* the world," he knew exactly who humanity was in its fullest and still expressed this virtue toward us.

But when we say that men love "idealistically," I have always understood this to mean that men create an ideal - or ideology - in their head of what the other person is, which is inaccurate. We fantasize and fall in love with the fantasy we create for ourselves, which is nothing like the actual thing. This view is consistent with your battered woman example, yet I'm confident that most biblical scholars would not view battered women as expressing what the Bible refers to as "agape love" toward their abuser because it is founded on a false ideology. It is a delusional love.

This is why men who are blue pill are so prone to such idealistic love - being still wrapped up in fantastic, yet inaccurate notions of womankind - yet red pill men seem to remove the idealism from how they view their spouse to follow a more pragmatic love. I believe this pragmatic love based on full knowledge of the female nature is far more akin to agape than the idealistic love found in blue pill circles. But the point is not to confuse the two as synonyms.

What's really fascinating here is that you're referencing a divide between red pill and blue pill people. Consider:

- You reference men who love idealistically in the context of blue pill examples: "women can do no wrong," "the man must pursue the woman," and churchianity notions of what it means to love like Christ.
- You reference opportunistic men in the context of red pill examples: "spinning plates, cheating, and otherwise can't keep it in their pants"

But doesn't this make sense? Part of the point of the red pill informing men of the trend that "men love idealistically and women love opportunistically" is to help teach men not to be so idealistic in the way they view/love women so that they can level the playing field and not be taken advantage of. So, is it that the saying is false or that the saying is true, but the red pill helps guys learn to overcome the way that this dichotomy takes advantage of them?

While it is much rarer, a woman can pursue a man at all costs

I agree. I also noticed this on occasion in college (but not often), and hardly at all afterward. Even in college, the girl's way of "pursuing a man at all costs" was still just to make herself available and pine over him for years to her friends until senior year when she finally gave up ... or until the brief stint when they do get together and it turns out not to work.

But the point you make here goes against the thrust of your post: "it is much rarer." When we say that "men love idealistically and women opportunistically," we don't mean it's a 100% infallible rule that can never, ever be broken. We don't even mean AWALT in that way. Everyone recognizes there are outliers and scales and ability for people to defy their internal wiring through conscious choice or learned behaviors.

Women can choose to love idealistically in terms of Christ. Although I find this to be much rarer

Again, you're referencing the exception to the rule as a rarity. The fact that it's rare affirms the rule. It doesn't break it.

what Abraham put her through with Abimelech and Pharaoh, that is some idealistic love

It's certainly a submissive love. But, again, it lacks the rosy beer goggles that cover over all the flaws. We also see that same Sarah laughing at Abraham when he told her they were going to have a child.

saying one sex and the other is idealistic and opportunistic has some half truths

In this case, I'd suggest it's more like a 90% truth. Yes, there are exceptions. 10% is not insubstantial. But ...

Yes, there is some bias

And that bias leans in such a way that the guys we say this phrase to are the exact guys who are in the 90% and need to hear it. We tell guys all the time: you need to lift more, bro - even when we know very little about them. But you'll never catch me saying that to someone like [u/red-sfplusplus](#) ... because he's in the minority of guys who the go-to advice doesn't apply to anymore (not that he should stop lifting, of course).

but they are not perfect by any measure

This, of course, is absolutely true. And it needs to be said. But "not perfect" isn't the same as "it's useless, so stop saying it," which is the vibe that this post gives off. Maybe you didn't mean it that way ... or maybe you did. But as I've said a few times to different users recently, sometimes when you're a 1 and you need to be a 5, you need to hear a 9 or 10 to get to the truth of the 5 - hearing the 5 and nothing else might only ever move you to a 2 or 3.

Or as [u/weakandsensitive](#) once told me (paraphrasing): "Most guys have been beta so long that you can't just teach them how to be an oak from the get-go. They have to learn to be a jerk for a while, living on the other side of the line, before they can figure out how to find their own balance."

In this case, I'd say that some guys need to be told what you call "surface level" tropes because it's the counter-point that makes them critically evaluate their prior framework for viewing the world - and only after fully processing it can they go back and decide for themselves if it's a fundamental truth they're going to live by or the thing they needed to hear at the time to get them where they were going.

To go to the source of the red pill - even Neo needed to be told by the Oracle, "You're not the one," when we all know he was. It wasn't true. But it was what he needed to hear.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (04/29/20)

2 upvotes · 29 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I use an Excel spreadsheet. I'm actually studying Daniel right now too. Interested in a zoom call? I can walk you through how to do all this. Chapter 7 will throw you for a loop too. I'd be interested in your thoughts when you get there.

Refreshing words and an encouragement to start conversations

2 upvotes · 29 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

None of the above. I generally avoid labels like these as much as possible because most of my views don't align very well with any of the labels I've seen. It'd look more like an incredibly complex multi-part venn diagram all over the place. If you have specific questions, feel free to ask them.

No / Bad Sex - Always His Fault?

2 upvotes · 28 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Body fat - doesn't have to be super accurate. Most online tools just ask for a few quick measurements and you can get a ballpark within a % or so. But if you're 22% or 9% - that's a huge difference that matters.

his mentality (of automatically assuming that it must be the man's fault no matter what)

Show me where he communicated this mentality. Quote me the exact words he used.

Has anyone seen dynamics change lately

2 upvotes · 28 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I do believe it's pretty well established that you cannot emulate whoever's body type you want. Not everyone can look like Dwayne Johnson, no matter how much they lift, or even dope. Maximize your body type.

There was a research study done a few years back on this exact issue. Granted, it focused on college students, so take that for what you will. But the results were clear: women always preferred a muscular-looking man over a weak-looking man, even if the muscle brought extra fat with it. Of course, if you have muscle, seeing it is better than having even more muscle that's hidden under fat so you can't see it. The point is to look strong. But there is a threshold where it starts to back-fire, like the hyper-body-builders. If I to order it, according to the study ...

- This is the top of every woman's list
- But this is still better ...
- ... than this, which is better ...
- ... than this, which is still better ...
- ... than this

Can't stop disrespecting women.

2 upvotes · 28 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Right. Plus the fact that /u/lilrobin50 had no problem writing in proper English without the use of ebonics. Most writers are encouraged to "write the way you speak" to make it flow more naturally. OP, try speaking the way you

write.

That's not to say you should give up ebonics in every scenario. But you do need to know how to communicate in an effective manner to accomplish your goals. If your goal is to build relationships for Christ among those who speak in ebonics, then speak ebonics with them. If it's to attract women or build relationships with those who don't speak ebonics, you're probably better off setting that aside.

Question about my youth group

2 upvotes · 27 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I don't think being married and being red-pill are at odds with one another

Why would they be? There's an entire sub, which is where this sub was primarily born from: [r/marriedredpill](#). Check it out.

I see red-pill more of a lens into our animalistic nature. The natural world.

For the secular crowd, that may be true. They are looking at the way God created humanity and learning from observing it. At RPC, "the red pill" is the exact same "truth" that the secular crowd is uncovering through observation - we just have a textbook that tells us what that truth is up-front.

Think of it this way. One person says, "I'm going to read the Bible to learn about God." Another says, "I'm going to ignore the Bible, but look at nature to learn as much about God as possible." The second person is going to come to a lot of true things about God's nature, but will have a hard time discerning everything. They may even come to some wrong conclusions from time to time, but that's mostly due to misunderstanding the data they're collecting - not that the data itself is wrong. But at the end of the day, they're both still studying the same overarching thing. They're just using two different, yet completely compatible methods of getting there. But the one who utilizes the Bible will have more reliable information than the one who is still experimenting.

Of course, there's also the difference in goals of what people want to use that information for. But that's a different story. My point is ...

I am unsure how much red-pill is the end-all-be-all but rather a lens or a tool to refine and aid our understanding of reality

When you say this, I can understand the confusion, but you're misunderstanding how the red pill functions. It is not a lens through which we interpret the Bible any more than a science text book is a lens through which we interpret the Bible. Rather, it's peripheral supporting information that helps us understand how biblical concepts play out in the real world. While the Bible may be authoritative on an academic level, it's not until we get into the real world that we actually figure out how it's all applied and functions, which is where the red pill comes in.

Question about my youth group

2 upvotes · 27 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

<https://www.reddit.com/r/RPChristians/wiki/glossary>

Question about my youth group

2 upvotes · 27 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

It is not "area dependent." As I've commented before: there are no red pill congregations that I'm aware of. Too many people think that a congregation is "red pill" just because they preach biblical headship. Even the congregations that do preach this often don't have a flock whose marriages follow it - or they pay lip service to headship in the Bible, but teach practices of living out headship that completely undermine what the Bible means.

by it - such as "happy wife, happy life" as a framework for how you lead, or "~~servant~~ subservient leadership."

When a ~~pastor~~ congregation leader starts preaching from the Bible on fitness tests, hypergamy, and preselection/dread, let me know and I'll believe there's a red pill congregation out there.

More to the point of your question: the "blue pill" isn't necessarily defined by being "not red." There are shades of purple, to some degree, though I could be persuaded that purple doesn't actually exist, just as there are not "shades of salvation." Being blue is defined more by the way one still clings to the ideologies that marriage is a blessing, encouraging everyone to be married and praising them when they do, putting incredible burdens and shame on men for marital problems, refusing to talk about women's marital sin issues, such as sexual denial, disrespect, failing to submit, etc. - or treating those issues with extreme caution, while having no problem coming down hard on men. Then there's worship music. If they're still singing songs that say, "Holy Spirit, squirt your grace all over my face," or, "Come inside me. I want you to fill me up with your presence. Fill me again and again." All this fem-centric emotionalist garbage is a product of the blue pill - the notion that congregations are catering their content to women or otherwise trying to feminize and hyper-emotionalize men because "feeling God" is somehow much more important than obeying God.

Get the idea?

Even the so-called "macho" pastors out there are pretty blue pill. Mark Driscoll was often praised as the "pastor for men" because of how "edgy" he was. Yet he still preached the pedestalization of women and man-blame for everything that went wrong in marriages.

No, this is not an "area dependent" thing. It is in every congregation everywhere. Yes, the degree to which it is obvious varies. But I've visited a lot of congregations and others across the globe have done the same. I have yet to hear of a single true "red pill" congregation. I'd be happy for you to prove me wrong.

Is compatibility essential (or even useful!) in a marriage? No, not really.

2 upvotes · 27 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Read the verses around that. She's asking, "Why won't you give me a child?" If they were sleeping together, she'd know it's a pointless question. More likely, her infertility was a cause of tension that interfered with their sexuality.

This is made clearer from the timing of the conversation, being more than enough time after everyone would have known about Rachel's infertility.

Also, she throws her servant at him, as if to say, "Fine, if you won't keep trying to impregnate me because you think God's closed me off, at least have sex with her so I can take the baby."

In short, I disagree. The evidence seems to lean the other way.

Is there anything that we can do to help him?

2 upvotes · 27 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

CHRISTianity where Christ has been replaced by the church. CHURCHianity. In short, the focus is on the growth of the church, not the mission of the church. There's little care if the growth is artificial, as long as people are in the seats. To maximize this growth, compromise with Scripture had to be made, maintaining political correctness and an appeasement of feminists.

Need some advice, long post. And apologize for the scatter brain

2 upvotes · 27 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Amen.

Need some advice, long post. And apologize for the scatter brain

2 upvotes · 26 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

"You don't feel like? Then why'd you wear that outfit today?" Glide you'r hands across her body, let her feel how hard she's made you, then add, "You know what it does to me when you go around looking/acting that sexy."

That's one of countless examples. You go figure out more and report back.

Reposting as text: Advice on how to manage and potentially create a Red Pill women's subreddit for Christian women.

2 upvotes · 26 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Yes, James 2 seems pretty obvious from its own terms.

- 14, "What good is it, my brothers, if someone **CLAIMS** to have faith but has no deeds?" - he starts the conversation in the context of someone who only has an intellectual acknowledgment that he calls faith, but is not actual faith.
- 18, "Show me your faith without deeds, and I will show you my faith by my deeds" - showing that the deeds are the evidence of faith.
- 22, "his faith was made complete by what he did" - showing that the faith is the initiator and the deeds are the evidence that consecrate it.
- 24, "a person is *considered righteous* by what they do and not by faith alone" ... as compared with Ephesians 2:8-9, which references salvation, specifically - salvation is by faith, but a reputation as a righteous person, including before God, requires works.

The conclusion is hard to miss: faith is what saves a person and does not require works. Works will always flow from someone who has faith ("A good tree produces good fruit ... a bad tree cannot produce good fruit," per Matthew 7). So, if someone has no works, there's no evidence of their salvation (James 2:18), calling the authenticity of their faith into question.

Another way to put it: Suppose a man marries a woman. They exchange vows, enter into a covenant before God, sign the marriage certificate, hold a ceremony in front of all their friends and family, go on a honeymoon, etc. But they never actually have sex. Maybe they try, but for one reason or another they always get distracted, or it just never happens. Eventually one of them dies before ever having sex. They never consecrated the marriage. They didn't "make it complete." Does that mean they weren't married? Certainly in such circumstances it could be annulled if they chose to annul it before the one died, but everyone would agree, even within biblical terms of a spiritual union, that once they entered into a covenant before God, that covenant became binding as a marriage, even if it wasn't made complete through sex. Under both God's and man's laws such a person would be entitled to all the benefits of property transfer rights a marriage would afford. That is, the covenant created the marriage, but sex makes it complete.

That's perhaps the best example I can see of the relationship between faith and works. Yes, "works" are an integral part of the marriage process in virtually every authentic case. Virtually every couple who gets married will have sex. No, sex on its own cannot make someone married in the absence of a covenant. Yes, a covenant before God can make someone married (albeit a marriage that can be annulled) on its own, even without sex. In the same way, faith by itself can save even without works, but works by themselves without faith cannot ever save anyone; yet in 99.9% of cases, the one who authentically has faith, entering into a covenant relationship with Christ (referred to as the "new covenant" in Hebrews), will have works as part of the process, making complete what faith started. You could also say it's what "seals the deal" in more legal terms.

Reposting as text: Advice on how to manage and potentially create a Red Pill women's subreddit for Christian women.

2 upvotes · 26 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Agreed. It's shocking that even with how controversial our content comes off, you're 10x more likely to get into a heated debate on [r/TrueChristian](#) here. I think that speaks a lot about the character of men we're trying to breed.

Reposting as text: Advice on how to manage and potentially create a Red Pill women's subreddit for Christian women.

2 upvotes · 26 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

That's a fair point. I do give more credit to Catholicism than most do. If I had to boil it down, my view is that

- Salvation = Grace + Faith + 0 (i.e. nothing else)

... whereas some people tend to hold to the (in my belief) FALSE view that

- Salvation = Grace + Faith + Proper theology on other issues, like the role of works

... or

- Salvation = Having a soteriological model of Grace + Faith + 0

in which case the soteriological understanding becomes of greater significance than the grace and faith itself.

In my view, while they do teach many wrong things, many Catholics, even under their own doctrine, do ultimately have faith in Jesus, as their doctrine teaches. So, they have faith and accept that it is by grace. So, why should the addition of any other components somehow make faith and grace no longer sufficient? Unless the additional teaching somehow undermines the authenticity of the faith.

In short, while I believe Catholics may have a wrong soteriological model, it could just as easily be said that Arminians believe Calvinists have a wrong soteriological model for suggesting it is by predestination, or vice versa for suggesting we have a choice in the process. Many people have soteriological differences, but as long as grace through faith is a part of that theology and not undermined by the rest, it makes it hard for me to say their particular model won't lead to salvation, even in its core teachings.

That, of course, doesn't mean their other erroneous teachings are acceptable - it only means that they're not so off-base as to make them heretical, as some claim. Not sure if that makes much sense, but it's how I break things down.

Either way, I think your view of staying out of it is a respectable one. I have tried to do the same here, and have been fairly relaxed about leaving up content from Catholics (such as the respect post from the one guy who listed Mary as an exception).

How to make wife stop being a hysterical bitch anytime the kids cry or she is stressed?

2 upvotes · 25 April 2020 · /r/askMRP

Everyone's already said it, but you have no frame. Seriously, did you even read what you wrote? You probably could have deleted the post before submitting it because it's so obvious.

No, you're not a great dad if your 3yr old tells you what to do. That's not "picking your battles." Picking your battles is about STFU during the ones you can't possibly win. If you're a good dad, there's no such thing as losing a battle with your kids. If you're a great dad, you not only win, but you get them wanting you to win. It's not that hard, even with 3yr olds. I've been through it a number of times. I have kids who are 2, 4, 6, and 8. You're on your 3rd kid. You should know how to do this by now.

Also, I just wrote this a couple weeks ago. It addresses exactly what you're talking about. You read it? If not,

you're not reading enough. Or maybe you are, but you're not actually internalizing it.

https://www.reddit.com/r/marriedredpill/comments/fu3k1v/have_you_swallowed_the_red_chewable_tablet/

Let's Have a Little Talk About Respect

2 upvotes · 25 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Agreed.

Let's Have a Little Talk About Respect

2 upvotes · 25 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Everyone deserves respect in a general sense

Absolutely not. People must earn my respect.

I think what you mean is that everyone deserves common decency. But even that is unbiblical, if you look at what God says we actually deserve.

Perhaps a more biblical way to put it would be: Nobody *deserves* our respect, or even common decency, but we give it to others consistently with the way Jesus modeled his life for us because *we respect Christ* and we recognize and honor the way he views and interacts with others.

Tag: [/u/chaseemall](#)

Let's Have a Little Talk About Respect

2 upvotes · 25 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Right. I just had this conversation with [/u/thechristianalpha](#). To some degree, the post is something of a bait and switch. It comes off with one clear and obvious meaning to the majority of the world, but the actual meaning turns out to be something quite different, and it only comes out once you really dive into the technicalities of what OP is talking about.

While I only skimmed the post, from reading the comments (including some of his), I'm inclined to think he meant well because he already had a biblical definition in his head, but he forgot that the majority of the world doesn't go by biblical definitions. One should reasonably assume that this is a safe space for that - but particularly with the MASSIVE influx of growth we've had (especially from trolls and objectors), this isn't a safe assumption anymore.

Defining My Mission Statement - OYS follow up.

2 upvotes · 21 April 2020 · /r/askRPC

Your mission statement is good. I have no idea how your vision connects to that at all. Think about it this way:

OVERARCHING GOAL

This is the broadest level of understanding your purpose. When a nation takes action, its overall purposes are broad: to keep its citizens safe, develop economic success, and improve the world. God's overarching goal is that he be glorified by building a kingdom for himself. This is what he asked Adam and Eve to do when filling the earth with godly offspring - it's what he did through Abraham, and what he did through Jesus and the Church, and it will be complete in heaven.

MISSION

A mission is a sub-task that drives forward the overarching goal in some way. It is the broadest way that an individual person can understand their contribution to the overarching goal. In this case, if God's goal is to build a

kingdom, he has tasked the Church with the specific mission of making disciples. This is not the only way God is building his kingdom. He has a personal hand in what he's doing. The Father, Son, and Spirit are all working in different ways throughout the world rather than individually discipling people themselves.

This is like a General who orders one battalion to complete one mission on the battlefield - perhaps to rescue hostages, or destroy an enemy base, etc. But he may order other battalions to do something else. Regardless, the Church has its standing orders: make disciples. If you are part of the Church, this is your mission also, as you are within the Church battalion.

Your mission should not be too personal because it's really common to all believers. The problem is: if you don't personalize it in some way, most believers will never internalize it and adopt it. So, I gave the outline as I did in order to help people realize that this is YOUR responsibility just as much as it is mine or a pastor's, etc.

CALLING

Your calling is the context in which you will fulfill that mission. So, once the battalion gets its orders, the leader of that battalion has to decide how best to fulfill it. Suppose the order is to destroy an enemy communication base. He may say to Adam, "You're great with demolitions. You place and prepare the bomb." He may say to Bob, "You're great with transport. It's your job to get Adam to the communications array." He may say to Carl, "You need to lead a team of ground troops to protect the transport." Then he'll say to Dave through Zeek, "You're part of Carl's team." These are all individual callings within the scope of the mission.

God says to some, "You're really good at teaching. I want you to find people among your students to disciple." To another, "You're excellent in the art of hospitality. I want you to invite people into your home to disciple them." And to another, "You're gifted in how merciful you are. Go find those experiencing tragedy and show them mercy, then disciple them." These are where Spiritual gifts come in.

But our own life context is part of it too. "Alex, you're an engineer, so I've got a group of other engineers who I want you discipling. Also, your analytical mind will be great at developing plans to help streamline others toward accomplishing the mission. Bruce, you're a lawyer, so I've got a group of attorneys, judges, and prospective clients I want you working with, as well as neighbors in the suburbs where you live. Go disciple them. Also, your ability to put together a case shows me you can see the bigger picture in what we're doing. I want you to take charge of creating and organizing the structural aspects of how others in my Kingdom will understand and live out the tasks I have for them." This is how our individual CALLING works.

VISION

This is the specific of how you see yourself accomplishing the goal. Once Adam is given the task of blowing up the communications array, he's going to be processing, "What explosive will work best? How many do I need? Where should I place them? etc." The commander will be thinking, "What time of day should we initiate the assault? Which direction should we move in from? What phases can we break things down into in order to better plan and understand what we're doing? etc." Carl will be thinking, "I've got to protect that transport, so how do I position my men? Which gear should we take with us? Where do we anticipate the enemy to be positioned? Do we focus on defense or taking out their offense? If x situation happens or y, how will we respond?"

Your vision is how you SEE your mission playing out in your life. What is your specific, unique role in accomplishing the goal? When we talk about "mission," I'm usually using that as a generally used term, but I really mean for guys to develop their vision. Because a mission is generally quite vague if you don't have any perceptible way of how you're going to accomplish it in your life.

But your vision will also fluctuate over time. If you get injured and can't work anymore, that's going to change a lot about how you see yourself making disciples if your previous plan was to do it in your workplace. You also may discover, along the way, that the communications array has a weak spot you didn't see before, so you need to pivot your approach to a new way of doing things.

For me, my mission is to make disciples; my calling is to craft overarching structures for men to operate within in order to best accomplish our shared mission; my vision is to have spiritual generations flowing from my life throughout the world - and most specifically to have 60 discipler-making pockets of people flowing from those I disciple in 60 different countries by the time I'm 60 years old. That's a huge mile-marker. In order to accomplish it, I have to break my life down into smaller phases - within 5 years I'll have to be x far, and within 10 years y far, and after 20 years, z far, etc. That's my vision for how I'm going to accomplish the mission.

The fun thing with God's overarching purposes is that he gives us all the same mission, but he also gives us all complete autonomy with how we're going to live it out in our own lives. Take ownership of that. Set unrealistic goals that can only be maintained if you have uncanny faith that God will work miracles through you. Then set mile-markers for different points in your life that you can gauge your progress against.

Find Something to Lift around the House

2 upvotes · 20 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I thought about removing this ridiculousness for a number of reasons ... but the community has spoken. I'll let this stay up as a warning to you and others.

If you assume everyone will pussyfoot around your emotional temperament or that you have the right to demand that nobody else every says anything to offend you ... this isn't the place for you. Unless you're learning and trying to grow. Then we can be patient with you.

Someday is a dangerous word

2 upvotes · 17 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

You're like my grandma who turns the TV off and walks out the room the instant she hears a cuss word in a show. "I can't handle that godless filth." Seriously, take what value you can out of this and leave the rest behind. It's not that hard.

The primary thrust of the video is about how to map out goals for your life. I'm not telling you to adopt his goals - just the strategy of mapping them out. Apply common sense and this shouldn't be that hard.

Galatians 5, or The Answer to "Is XXXXXXXX a Sin?"

2 upvotes · 16 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Or, rather, making disciples. I wrote more about this [here](#). The most relevant part:

So, what's God's purpose for you? They're summarized in the three Greats:

- Love **G**od (greatest command), Matthew 22:37-38
- Love **O**thers (second greatest command), Matthew 22:39
- Make **D**isciples (great commission), Matthew 28:19-20

These are inextricably linked. If you fail in one, you fail in all three.

- If you don't love God, you can't love others (1 John 4:8) or make disciples (Matthew 12:30).
- If you don't love others, you can't love God (1 John 4:20; Matthew 25:40-46) or make disciples (John 13:34-35).
- If you're not making disciples, you can't love God (John 21:15-17; John 14:21) or love others (John 15:16-17).

Most Christians think they have the G and O parts down, but they forget the D, or otherwise try to find ways of

rejecting it because that means they actually have to *do something* - something *uncomfortable* sometimes. It's much easier just to assume God's only purpose for us is to avoid sinning (i.e. "not doing something"). God is a God of action, not inaction. Find that thing he wants you doing, then go do it. That's where your satisfaction in life will come from. I am confident that this is the mission to make disciples.

Why am I confident about this mission? Because it's only one of two things that we can do on earth that cannot possibly be done in heaven. You want to avoid sin? You have all of eternity in heaven to be sinless. You want to study theology? You have God Himself at your disposal in heaven to learn from. You want to worship God? You have all of time to sing His praises. You want to evangelize and make disciples? Oops, can't do that up there. Oh yeah, that must be why we're here instead, then. In fact, Paul says this plainly: "I desire to depart and be with Christ, which is better by far. But it is more necessary for you that I remain in the body. Convinced of this, I am certain I will remain and will continue with all of you for your progress and joy in the faith" (Philippians 1 somewhere). Who are you helping to "progress" in the faith? Who are you giving the "joy" of faith to in the first place? That's your purpose.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (04/15/20)

2 upvotes · 16 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

allow me time to read more through the 300 material on the topic and begin to develop those skills.

Find a partner and practice your observations. [u/TheChristianAlpha](#) (at least when he had more time availability) was interested in practicing this skill too at one point. I'd encourage you to reach out to him to partner in your Bible-study skill development.

A Primer to Visual Arousal Patterns

2 upvotes · 14 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Yep. I've seen that before too. I forgot about it. I can't remember if it's that study or another one, but the result was that women overwhelmingly were more attracted to stronger guys, even if it came with extra fat, over a weakling who had a 6 pack out of scrawniness.

The 3 wisdoms

2 upvotes · 7 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Right. I'd love to see you do just that! Just make sure you're actually using a biblical lens. This means making sure you have biblical support for what you're saying. If there's a passage (or series of them) that says, "There are three types of wisdom, here they are," then add that and it's far more likely to go up. Otherwise, it comes off the same as someone who says, "There are 5 stages of grief." That's some psychologist who came up with that. It might have some value to categorize behaviors that way, but it's not a biblical concept and shouldn't be confused for one.

Now, you might be able to find verses to support these three different types of wisdoms - but you didn't use them, which leaves the impression that you're using secular thinking about biblical topics (and therefore assuming it's biblical thinking) rather than actual biblical thinking. Be cautious with that.

When do the lines begin to blur in Christianity?

2 upvotes · 4 April 2020 · /r/askRPC

That's understandable. This can be a tough crowd at times. I will say, there's a reason I included the 300 and 400 series, but you'll also note they get referenced the least in comments and other threads.

I'll also note that my original intent was to make the 300 series the 100 series, as that is truly more foundational

than the other stuff. But then I had to remember the target audience and realize that if you want people to get to the things that actually matter, you have to start with the things that matter to them.

When do the lines begin to blur in Christianity?

2 upvotes · 4 April 2020 · /r/askRPC

"Therefore, we don't need the law, all we need is faith"

Yeah, I don't take that conclusion. As I understand it, he's just saying that you don't follow the law for the law's own sake, as if it creates black and white lines. Rather, the law is there to reveal the character of God, as you noted, and to tell us the operative principles of our faith. That's why Jesus was able to "work" on the Sabbath - because he read the law, understood the operative principles, but also recognized that (1) his picking food on the sabbath was from a right, unburdened conscience, and (2) that it served a purpose to advance his ministry with his disciples (i.e. from faith). In this sense, he wasn't compelled to obey the sabbath for the sabbath's own sake ("man was not made for the sabbath's [sake]"), but rather recognized the fact that the sabbath was given for man's benefit - a benefit mankind would not have received early on if it wasn't commanded to do so ("but the sabbath was made for man").

I wrote more about this in (what admittedly has the worst word-choices of any post in the sidebar series) 112.

The pendulum has the potential to swing very hard either way on this one: judaizers vs. lawlessness

Right. I find that most Christians are one or the other, more commonly known as legalists and antinomians. The reality is that young believers need legalism to get a firm foothold in the faith, just as children need hard rules. But when a child becomes a mature adult, they are free from their parents' rules and instead get to operate on love, making use of the spirit of their parents instilled in them since childhood by the way they were raised. Unfortunately, too many people never actually mature this way in the faith - to a point that they personalize a relationship with a spouse and start reproducing (biblically, an expectation of men and women throughout most of Israel's history, per the "be fruitful and multiply" command). We just now understand this to be a spiritual reproduction and multiplication ("make disciples," as you referenced) and not merely a physical one.

On Testosterone

2 upvotes · 3 April 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Gotcha, I'll ignore, then. Unless there's a short-term reason to want to have that look ... like our annual weekend waterpark trip. Thanks for the tip!

When do the lines begin to blur in Christianity?

2 upvotes · 3 April 2020 · /r/askRPC

So what would be your take on this post a buddy of mine wrote on [r/TrueChristian](https://www.reddit.com/r/TrueChristian/comments/f8vuke/is_this_a_sin_is_that_a_sin_not_the_right/)?
https://www.reddit.com/r/TrueChristian/comments/f8vuke/is_this_a_sin_is_that_a_sin_not_the_right/

I'm 100% on board with what he said there.

When do the lines begin to blur in Christianity?

2 upvotes · 3 April 2020 · /r/askRPC

Right. So why don't you be the one to make one of those posts? I usually try to avoid recycling old content. But from a fresh source - that can have value.

When do the lines begin to blur in Christianity?

2 upvotes · 3 April 2020 · /r/askRPC

I would argue that Mosaic law isn't meant for sanctification either. But I get and agree with your underlying point about the way it was never intended to be used.

When do the lines begin to blur in Christianity?

2 upvotes · 3 April 2020 · /r/askRPC

I endorse this.

Most Christians Do Not Love Women

2 upvotes · 2 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

This is exactly what I was going to say. These things often have negative connotations in society - not because they're inherently evil (they're not: nothing is inherently unclean, per Romans 14:14), but because the feminist influences in the world have decided they don't like associating these historical traits of women with who they want women to be today. It is a cultural conditioning that causes people to see certain traits as negative, not an inherent design by God through creation.

Married Man's Guide To Dating

2 upvotes · 31 March 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Solid post, brother.

I realized some girls just don't like me. Worrying about why is pointless.

This is the point of the polarization concept from *Models*.

It's not that you are bad, it's that the top 5% are so much better.

Right. This is hypergamy at its most basic levels.

exchange numbers with plans to hang out. I do this with both men and women

This is key. It shows that it's who you are, not a facade you're doing just to get a date that will fade away once you're married.

You can be great at meeting and relating to people if you do it often

Also massively powerful for evangelism. People who say, "That's just not me. I'm an introvert, so I'm excused from doing that," don't realize your underlying point here: **IT'S A SKILL**. Go work on it. Period. Even introverts can initiate conversations. On the M-B spectrum, I can almost guarantee my wife is a bigger introvert than any guy on here. In fact, after taking an MMPI she scored extremely high for having an avoidant personality disorder - that's how bad her introversion is. Yet I've taught her to initiate with people so that she now invites people over for dinner, hosts game parties, starts text message chains, hosts a small group, etc. She learned the skill.

be the guy that actually follows up

This is a major difference between an evangelist and a disciple-maker. The evangelist is a one-and-done. The disciple-maker keeps going back.

Why is mission so important? Because ...

2 upvotes · 19 March 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Give me a couple examples please

The obvious ones are what I've heard from a number of guys on MRP:

- Grow my business to become a fortune 500 company
- Become a 10-millionaire
- Sleep with over X number of women

These are missions. They just don't involve making disciples, so they're unbiblical.

I think you're looking at this purely from the perspective of a mature believer who has already bought into the great commission. Props for you on that! But even on [r/TrueChristian](#) I've had encounters where people will say things like, "The Great Commission is only for pastors/priests. Jesus didn't give that command to everyone - only the leaders of the church." This is, of course, completely contrary to not only the way the apostles interpreted the Great Commission in their letters, but also the very language of the great commission itself. But my point is that even Christians have unbiblical missions that don't involve making disciples.

Or perhaps a more accurate way to put it is: God gave them a mission to make disciples - so that is, in fact, their mission ... but they've abandoned it for their own ideas of what they want to do with their lives. In this context, when I talk about a man's mission, I mean the one they're actually pursuing, not the one that's implicit in the background that they may be ignoring.

Why is mission so important? Because ...

2 upvotes · 18 March 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Solid, brother. I love this. I'll just clarify: a man CAN have other missions, but if they don't involve making disciples, they're unbiblical.

I also commonly tell people that God has given us all a singular mission (whether we're accept it or not), but our specific gifts, passions, and life circumstances create the context for carrying out that mission. Glad to see you get it!

Coronavirus Mega Thread

2 upvotes · 17 March 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Not as good as squats and bench press, but among the best if bodyweight routines.

Coronavirus Mega Thread

2 upvotes · 17 March 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Well said.

Whose game are you winning?

2 upvotes · 16 March 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

It's different for every guy. I talk about my mission enough on [r/RPChristians](#) that I don't need to push the idea here. But you can come up with your own mission. But if it's a weak/crappy mission that's too easy to accomplish and doesn't ultimately amount to anything, it's not going to be attractive. Missions can even be ridiculous and still be attractive - but only if they have long-term substance and aren't wife-focused. For example:

- Bad Mission: "I want to build up the courage to yodel in my driveway sometime in my life." This is idiotic.

You can do that tomorrow.

- Good Mission: Even sticking with the yodeling theme: "I want to become the best selling yodeling artist in the world" - now you've got a mission that shows real ambition ... even if it's a weird/silly one. It's going to take work and dedication. It will require significant commitment and displays of masculine traits, because one can't become the best yodeler without that.

Buuuut ...

- Bad Mission: "I want to become the best selling yodeling artist in the world *to impress my wife*." This is unattractive. She'll smell the crappy motive a mile away.

When a guy's "mission" is simply to goof off on the weekends, he's going to have a few fun lays, which is great for TRP, but if you want to maintain sexual health in the context of a marriage (i.e. MRP), the mission becomes essential.

Third commandment of poon: "You shall make your mission, not your woman, your priority."

So... you got the "I love you but I'm not in love with you" (ILYBINILWY) speech?

2 upvotes · 12 March 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

There's that too. Then again, my mom just commented recently about how shocked she is at how some of her 300lb co-workers with bumps on their faces will still manage to find reasonably good looking, in-shape guys they wind up getting engaged with. The power of the blue pill knows no bounds at deluding men. As long as guys remain clueless, women will retain the advantage in the sexual marketplace against them.

Whose game are you winning?

2 upvotes · 12 March 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Yeah, I feel like sometimes with me you try to force some kind of flaw in my approach. But there are some things that are just basic common sense :p

Whose game are you winning?

2 upvotes · 12 March 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Right, which is what we do. Under \$50 a few times a month - no questions asked. No sense wasting my time micro managing her.

Whose game are you winning?

2 upvotes · 12 March 2020 · /r/RPChristians

That's a fair caution. Materialism is so far from me that there's no chance I'll ever come close to out-spending her. If I do spend funds, it will be on taking guys I disciple out to eat. Beyond ministry-oriented expenses, I save up for joint vacations to do together.

Appreciation Post - For advice given 1.5 years ago and Question about how to identify Masculine Churches

2 upvotes · 9 March 2020 · /r/RPChristians

advice given 1.5 years ago ... Reading: 1. Read 60% of RPC sidebar

I'm glad you've finally found some release from a bad relationship. But this incongruity needs to be fixed. The 300s and 400s are where the depth of spiritual growth takes place. In reality, if you are solid with those, you can

figure out the 100s and 200s for yourself. As such, they're even more foundational because everything you live by will be derived from those spiritual disciplines you learn therein. Also, they directly relate to ...

Any advice on what to look for as an identifier of a good masculine church?

If you had the spiritual foundation, not only would you have figured out long ago that you should get out of a dead-end relationship, but you also would be far less concerned with finding the "right" "church."

A "masculine church" should not be the goal. Consider that you admitted that you're "very immature," spiritually. Yet you're also believing you're mature enough to know what kind of church you're looking for - you just want us to help you find something that meets the qualifications you believe are best. In this situation, you're not likely to find a masculine congregation, and even if you do it's likely to have so many other problems that it's going to screw you up in other ways that you won't know to look out for.

Now imagine I'm looking for a new job as a website designer. I've done a lot of research on wordpress and know how to use all of its formatting and design. I realize that a lot of companies don't know how to use wordpress properly - to a degree that's embarrassing, but this is because they're the experts at html, which I'm clueless about. So, I go find a company that uses wordpress the same way I do, but they have no clue how to use html and they keep teaching me the wrong way to do it. At the end of the day, I'm no better off in my expertise in the profession than I started, right? I still know how to use wordpress and not html - except now I think I know how to use html because I've got a company training me on it, but they're training me wrong and I'm clueless.

Imagine that I took the other job instead. They can teach me all the wrong ways to use wordpress and that's fine because I know better. I just ignore their advice and for clients that want a wordpress page I create a stunning product for them that surpasses company expectations. Yet when they teach me html, I'm now also learning something of actual value and able to make use of that in the world. Now I am better off.

This is how it is with spiritual growth. I often advise people never commit to one individual congregation, as if a singular congregation is "The Church." It's not. You can attend a congregation for as many years as you can derive benefit from it, and then move on. And that benefit is not limited to your learning, but your capacity for ministering to those around you as well. I may stay in the same body for 50 years if it continually furnishes me new people who are hungry to be discipled and does nothing to stifle the mission God gave me.

Chances are, you know enough about biblical masculinity from what you learn here (if you'd actually finish the sidebar!) that there's relatively little risk that you're going to be led astray on that point by a feminized congregation. However, you also now have something to offer that congregation - an aspect of biblical truth that they lack and which you can provide, thereby benefiting the body in the way they may benefit you in other areas.

Now, it could be that they're a company that sucks at both html and wordpress. Maybe they just offer nothing of value at all. That's possible too. Though I do find that the spiritually mature will always find use of someone else doing the hard work of pooling people together for them.

To become such a spiritually mature person, begin with the 300/400 series on the sidebar and seek out someone you trust to disciple you. I know there are guys on here who would love the chance, so ask around. Just make sure you're faithful, available, and teachable and not someone who's going to fizzle out as soon as the excitement wanes.

In the meantime, you're better off focusing on Scripture than looking for a congregation to spoon feed you. Learn to feed yourself first. If you need a place just to make some friends because you lack the ability to develop a social sphere for yourself, then look for a congregation full of active people rather than passive pew-sitters. You find active ministers among the non-staff members rather than mere passive attenders and that's a congregation worth investing your time in so that when you do become mature you already have the relational clout and history of commitment to the body that will allow you a place of influence among the leadership.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (03/04/20)

2 upvotes · 5 March 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Props for the reply, chuck. I didn't mean to call you out or shame you - this is actually one of the most commonly misused passages, especially on [r/TrueChristian](#). So, I don't fault you in the slightest.

That said, on further thought, the relationship between Paul and Timothy is another great example within Scripture of an adult discipling a minor. Their relationship shows an incredibly close relational bond throughout Scripture, referencing parental terms as though it stretches beyond the mere status of Paul as Timothy's spiritual father and into the specific ways of how they interacted in their ministry together (Philippians 2, I believe, addresses this).

How do we know Timothy's age when Paul started discipling him? From Acts 16:1-5 we know that he was picked up on Paul's second missionary journey. 1 Timothy was written 14 years later. 4:12 says, "Don't let anyone look down on you because you are young." I believe the average life expectancy for a Roman (excluding infant mortality) was around 55 years old (best records we have from that time period; also likely the highest life expectancy of anywhere in the world at the time). I can hardly assume someone would be called "young" who was over the half-way hump. So let's say, at the high end, Timothy was 27 when 1 Timothy was written. Subtracting those 14 years to when Paul first started discipling him and had him leave his family to follow him, that would make him 13 years old - and that's on the HIGH end. Even with modern life expectancy, we don't think of "27" as being "young" in the sense that one's age would impact their credibility in ministry. As I understand it, people could become pharisees, even, at much younger ages - and they were considered the most authoritative "elite" ministers among the Jewish communities that Timothy and Paul came from.

So, back to [/u/dansnapsit](#) - There's absolutely nothing biblically inappropriate about discipling minors, as this is modeled by Paul. Many people even believe the original disciples were teenagers (based on the years they died relative to) when they first started following Jesus.

Peter is, perhaps, a possible exception, as people think he may have been older because he was married. However, people were also married at much younger ages, back then. Under Jewish law, boys could marry at 14 and girls at 12. So, even with him having a wife, it's still probable that he was a teenager when Jesus first began discipling him.

Never let youth detract you and if adults in the congregation are opposed to this, make sure they're fully aware of the model Jesus and the apostles set for us and the way that the apostles and Timothy are often hailed as being the epitome of what it means to be a disciple - and that this epitome presumably always starts with those who are young.

The Wife Who Truly Loves You

2 upvotes · 4 March 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Exactly.

Anger, Frame, and Power

2 upvotes · 4 March 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I'm not sure about all of this, but I do agree with your conclusion. The most essential phrase you've given: "The truly strong don't feel a need to prove their strength." Solid. If you're trying to prove anything to anyone, you're in their frame.

Now, there are concepts when it's okay to operate in someone else's frame. If you want a promotion, you might have to prove to your boss that you're the right man for the job. He has power and authority to decide within his own framework who gets the position. So, keep that caveat in mind.

I tried to share the good news but I think I failed miserably.

2 upvotes · 2 March 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Props for the turn-around in your life and actually trying to share your faith with those in need. A few notes:

explaining the holy spirit, if they keep on sinning then they are not spirit led yet

You can't become Spirit-led by quitting sin. You quit sin by being Spirit-led. You've got the process backwards.

How do you be Spirit-led? First, Luke 11:13 says to ask God for his Spirit. Second, you repent in your heart - which means not just a repentance AWAY FROM sin (which is not actual repentance by itself); rather, it's a turn TOWARD God's plan for your life. Remember that "anything that does not come from faith is sin." This means that repenting of one sin is still sin if it just leads you to another sin to fill the void. Imagine you're in a room with 360 doors - one at every degree. The door at the 90 degree mark from where you're facing is the only door that is godly. Turning 180 degrees from the sin door you're facing is technically a repentance, but because you haven't turned toward God's plan either, it's a pointless repentance.

What is God's plan for you? "Go, therefore, and make disciples of all nations" is the overarching imperative. If one isn't on board with that first, repentance is a pointless endeavor because you will never be turning toward the door God actually wants you walking through. Once someone starts living on-mission to make disciples, the sin issues get worked out as a byproduct because the Spirit will be the one leading you toward God's purposes for you, which inherently means away from sin.

Too many Christians think sanctification happens in a vacuum - that God will just start sanctifying them because they asked for it. But in reality, sanctification is a refining process meant to qualify people for a purpose. That purpose is inextricably tied to God's overarching goal of making disciples of all nations. So, never ask people to repent for repentance's own sake, as that's a futile venture.

This is the first time I've ever mentioned God to anyone or tried to educate fellow christians and I feel like I failed big time.

As /u/Deep_Strength said, don't sweat it. A big part of the burden is on us - but an even larger part is on Christ. Go back to spiritual reproduction: the wife is to be open to her husband's initiation, but he's still the one who leads in the bedroom. She can have some input on what makes the experience more enjoyable, but most women seem to prefer it when the man takes charge and they don't have to run the show. When you get worried about your performance like this, it's like you're trying to run the show yourself. But Jesus is ultimately the one in control. I could tell stories to back this up, but take my word for it: you do what God told you to do and let him be the one to decide how the people on the other end are receiving it. Do your best to be tactful and improve your skill, but don't put that kind of pressure on yourself any more than you'd want your wife to feel the pressure of your entire sexuality being dependent on her performance in the absence of your leadership in the bedroom.

As far as strategy goes, I wouldn't use "educating" them as your primary method of getting the Gospel across. Most people don't like being told that they're wrong or that their understanding is incomplete. As soon as you do that, even if you can persuade them, their general disposition is to fight against what you're saying to see if maybe you're the wrong one. You have to get people to think things are their own idea first.

The best way to do this in evangelism is simply to ask lots of questions about what they already believe. If they ask you something early in the relationship, answer by asking back first (before you answer): "What do YOU think is the answer to your own question?" Get them talking about their own beliefs enough that (1) you can understand where they're coming from so you know better how to share Christ with them, and (2) they feel comfortable discussing these things to a degree that they start asking you back about your beliefs. Once they're asking you quite regularly what you believe, that's your opening to share your own personal views. When you do this, because it's not you trying to persuade them you're right, they're not psychologically predisposed to fight

against what you're saying. They're just listening because they want to know and understand you. And this is when they're most receptive to learning and growing.

In short: If you tell someone what they should believe, they will be skeptical; if they ask you what you believe and you answer, they are receptive. The issue, then, is simply to get them curious enough about what you believe that they actually start asking - and the best way to do this is to find contextually appropriate ways to ask them first, and eventually they will extend the courtesy back.

When you do get the chance to share, it's best to do this through your own testimony first. Again, this comes off as you sharing your own view rather than attempting to persuade them of what their view ought to be. Eventually you can switch to directly attempting to change their view, but it seems most efficient to start here first.

What about BDSM and Roleplay?

2 upvotes · 2 March 2020 · /r/RPChristians

What are you trying to insinuate here?

What about BDSM and Roleplay?

2 upvotes · 2 March 2020 · /r/RPChristians

This seems like needless bickering. /u/Deep_Strength already included in his original comment "form/appearance" - so both translations were covered ("kind" is the other common translation, which is included in "form").

More to the point, are you really challenging the premise that if "you think it can cause others to stumble or you think it might be questionable, don't even engage in that behavior"? Or are you just nitpicking on which verse he used to get to that otherwise perfectly biblical conclusion?

Seeking Godly Counsel 1/2

2 upvotes · 27 January 2020 · /r/askRPC

A few quick tips:

- A man with an abundance mentality will never be hurt and "sobbing" when relationships end.
- Shift from a sniper approach to a shotgun approach to inviting women into your life. The invitation doesn't have to be for the purpose of dating. But having a broader social network, including of women, does help with not only dating, but virtually everything else you'll need for your mission also. If you want to go overseas, how do you think you'll get funding with no social support system? How do you think you'll find people who can teach and train you? How do you think you'll practice for ministering overseas if you don't have a network of people to practice with now? How do you think you'll find a partner?
- Memorize Galatians 1:10 and recite it to yourself 5 times a day (at least an hour apart each time) for the next 30 days.

Update us when you've worked on these things.

Joseph's journey—and maybe yours

2 upvotes · 27 January 2020 · /r/RPChristians

What I can't understand is what is the purpose of presenting my requests to God through prayer and petition?

My wife has brought the request to me many, many, many times that she wants a dog. I always refuse and say we will never get one. But she still loves dogs. She still tells me how much she'd love to have one. Somewhere, deep

down, she's hoping she can change my mind, even though I am steadfast in my determination on this issue and have reaffirmed the same repeatedly.

At some point, it's no longer about trying to change my mind. It's about communicating her heart, thoughts, desires, etc. to me so that I know and understand them, lest she think: "Maybe he said no because he didn't realize how truly, deeply I wanted it - and maybe if he knew and understood, then his mind might change." Of course, there's also the parable of the man asking for bread in the middle of the night, where Jesus concludes that the man will wake up and give his friend bread - not because they are friends, but because of the audacity and shameless petition of the one seeking the bread.

To un-muddle some of this - the point of prayer isn't to get from God, but to relate with God. It's just like when my wife talks to me in the evening. She doesn't sit down and plan: "Now's my time to convince my husband to do all these things for me." Instead, she expresses what's on her heart so I know and understand her and can incorporate her wishes into my plan as I see fit. I only incorporate them if I will to do so - that is, I won't incorporate her requests that aren't in my plan (like getting a dog), but there are many things that she requests that I didn't originally intend, yet I add to my plan because my plan is flexible and allows room to incorporate the desires of those I love.

And we know that this matters for God too, as James says plainly: "You do not have because you do not ask. And when you do ask, you ask with wrong motives." In other words, if we don't pray to God, even though he may, through omniscience, know our desires, he will still choose not to incorporate those desires into his will/plan if we don't care enough about them to relay them to him. But even beyond getting what we want, the true value of prayer is in the relational conversation of knowing that our groom understands and knows us, just as a bride longs to know that her man understands and knows her, and thus cherishes the ability to share her heart with him through conversation.

While I deny that conversation is as vital to marriage as many marriage counselors would suggest, I don't deny that it is an important facet of a relationship, more generally. Likewise, some people hang their entire relationship with God on prayer, as if it's the most important aspect of the spiritual life. It's not. But it's certainly AN important one. Just not THE most important one.

Tag: [/u/Deep_Strength](#) [/u/RedPillWonder](#)

WISNIFG - the 1st assertive right through God

2 upvotes · 12 January 2020 · [/r/askRPC](#)

Shouldn't I consider God's judgement and frame as my guide instead of my own?

First, God hasn't judged you yet. That won't happen until Judgment Day. So, it's more accurate to say you will be judged by God someday, but until then you must judge for yourself your own life and actions.

Second, the function of sanctification is to make you more godly/Christ-like. In doing so, your own judgment becomes more aligned with God's so that your self-judgment is consistent with God's eventual judgment over you.

Third, your frame is often described as "your best self." This would be a sinless version of you, as a sinful version is less than your best. As such, living in your frame (i.e. the "perfect you") inherently assumes you are sinless and are, therefore, judging yourself consistently with God's judgment over you. When you sin you break your frame (or show that your otherwise unbroken frame was a bad one), which should offend not only God's eventual judgment over you, but also your present judgment of yourself.

Also - what [/u/Deep_Strength](#) said.

2 Year Field Report

2 upvotes · 12 January 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Solid report, brother. I appreciate you sharing this. Being mission-oriented is certainly one of the most foundational concepts RPC has to offer, without which everything else falls apart no matter how well you seem to master it all.

Her priority was everyone EXCEPT me and it was a major irritation.

A simple note here: this is natural for women raised in modern society. They believe the husband is to pour his attention on her so her cup fills up to pour out on everyone else. This originates from the "stay at home mom" shift that replaced "housewife" as the job title. The wife's responsibility shifted away from meeting her husband's needs around the house and toward caring for the kids. How did she have time and energy to focus so much on the kids? Her husband, of course. He would provide all of her needs for her and give her emotional support so she could keep doing "God's work" in raising the kids. And if it's not kids, it's the neighbors or friends from church or anyone else she feels like she wants to spend time with. Church girls, in particular, use the "spiritual impact" of those relationships as a trump-card to keep husbands stuck in that framework.

In reality, the husband should be the outward-focused one. He should not have to make his wife and kids his everything - but he should be calling them to his side constantly, which lets them know they're valuable and needed in his life, which is what a woman really wants to know from her man.

How would a turnaround for the church look like? Making it more RP than Feminist.

2 upvotes · 22 December 2019 · /r/RPChristians

But practicing homosexuality in itself is a false reflection.

How would a turnaround for the church look like? Making it more RP than Feminist.

2 upvotes · 22 December 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I think the relevant thing here is that it's not wrong because Paul said so. It's wrong because it reflects a false image of God to the world. This is the essence of the new covenant: not only that we are free from the law into grace, but also that we are reconciled to God and restored in our capacity to reflect his image.

Our obligation to obedience is not "because the bible says so" - whether that's the law, or Paul, or even Jesus. Our obligation is to live up to the perfect creation we were once made in Eden and now can be again, as defined in Genesis by the image of God.

Anyone who lives by the letter of scripture - even new testament scripture - will be judged by the letter, which is an impossible standard. Better to understand and know God than merely his commands.

How would a turnaround for the church look like? Making it more RP than Feminist.

2 upvotes · 22 December 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Note the context of the conversation was my telling him you can't use old testament law as an authority on the issue of homosexuality. OT law is informative, but non binding on all issues.

How would a turnaround for the church look like? Making it more RP than Feminist.

2 upvotes · 22 December 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Then what do you make of all the passages in the new testament where Paul says non Jews aren't subject to old testament law?

Advice on moving forward with Christian dudes who are bp?

2 upvotes · 17 December 2019 · /r/askRPC

Solid.

Christmas Songs

2 upvotes · 17 December 2019 · /r/RPChristians

What about A Weight in a Manger? The one where baby Jesus shows the wise men how buff he is?

Christmas Songs

2 upvotes · 17 December 2019 · /r/RPChristians

For that matter, most practices we see in Sunday services have pagan origins. Are we to give up on Sunday services too? Some say yes. I'm not there yet.

FR: Fatherhood. Some early observations.

2 upvotes · 17 December 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Excellent post in its entirety!

Babies have amazing frame.

I'd contemplated doing a series on parenting and this was exactly one of my points. Kids, in general, virtually always operate from their own point of origin. Most parents believe their entire job is to train their kids to stop doing that. I'm taking a slightly different approach with my son. Results TBD, but it's working.

I admit, when my son is screaming his head off for reasons I have yet to diagnose, it can become frustrating.

That was one of my advantages as a younger father. I can deal with 4 kids screaming bloody murder at once and keep reading/eating/whatever. Too many parents are obsessed with attending to their kids' every need. This will ruin them down the road.

The newborn phase is not the time to skimp, pinch pennies, and save.

I'd say this more depends on your phase of life when you have kids. I wouldn't let your newborn change your financial goals. If you're younger, then you should absolutely pinch your pennies. You haven't had the time to save up a war chest yet. Financial wisdom for long-term planning doesn't change because you have a kid. If anything, it becomes harder. If you have a kid later in life to the point where you actually have discretionary income, then go for it. But I would not recommend that path for those who are having kids in their 20s.

Some products, like cloth diapers, work far better than their disposable counter parts and save you a ton of money in the meantime.

So ... this is the exact opposite of what you just said. Cloth diapers are also way more time-consuming than their disposable counter-parts. Either way - your underlying point is absolutely true. There are some things that should not be compromised on, though, so watch out for that. For example - don't buy a used car seat that was in a car accident. Or don't buy used shoes for kids.

Going to the gym is more difficult now.

Welcome to my world ... finally!

Leaving the house to go to the gym also means leaving my wife alone with a newborn. It's doable, but it isn't fun.

It gets worse when you have multiple kids and your wife is adamant that she cannot handle the chaos. The trick is to find ways to bring your kids with you. My 8yo son now works out with me (and good luck finding a gym that will actually let 8yo kids use the equipment!). I also pay for the other kids to have access to their play area ... but even that is less than ideal because then you're shoving your kids in a daycare-type center for most of your quality evening hours every week, if you're doing that every time you go. Another alternative I've found is leaving work early and getting extra hours in at night after everyone else is in bed ... but I also have a job where I make my own hours and not everyone does.

Anyway, I've long been telling people that gym-time is much harder when you have kids (especially multiples who are young), but most people think I'm crazy. It's definitely doable, though. You just have to make sacrifices on some other priorities.

it means you cannot be indulging yourself wasting time screwing around between sets

That's the direction I've taken lately. I used to spend 2.5 hours there 5 days a week (even after my 4th was born). I've lately shifted to about 60 minutes of high-intensity lifting and do my cardio at home. As you note, my gains have stopped. I've probably even dropped a bit. I'm no longer benching close to 300 - I now hover around 265 for my sets (sometimes less if I'm low on calories). I really haven't pushed PRs in months. I only do that when I know I've got an easy couple weeks that I can really dedicate to it.

Another thing worth noting: dieting will become more difficult when your kids are old enough to eat real food and you want to start establishing a pattern of family meals as a time to process your kids' day with them. Before kids, my wife and I often ate separately and I had a lot more autonomy over things. Nowadays, it's awkward if everyone else is eating and I've got an empty plate, or if I've got something different from what everyone else has. I still do it from time to time, but it creates a sense of disunity that I prefer to avoid when I can.

It's not as hard as people make it out to be.

More common advice I often given. It's as hard as you psych yourself out to believe it will be. Having kids is easy. One of the things that my wife claims to be ticked off most about me is the fact that I can manage all 4 kids in public, out to eat, at a playground, walking through stores, etc. with a smile on my face and no problems at all, whereas for her the very thought of walking down the street with all 4 brings a wave of paralyzing stress over her.

Glad to hear this is all going so well for you, brother! Keep being an inspiration to the group.

no offense but wouldn't islam/judaism accomplish your goal faster of having a nuclear family and resisting feminism?

2 upvotes · 12 December 2019 · /r/RPChristians

(correct me if I am wrong) But it seems like you guys want

This is obviously where you're wrong. Our goal/desire has nothing to do with this world. We want what God wills. It just so happens that God wills a lot of the things you referenced. They are our goal not because we want them as an end in themselves - we want them because God wants them.

If God desired feminist domination and that men lick toilets to clean them, that's what I'd be fighting for as well. We are not manosphere guys who have chosen to be Christian. We are Christian men who have found commonality between God's desires and the manosphere.

Tag: [/u/rocknrollchuck](#)

Own Your Shit Weekly - December 10, 2019

2 upvotes · 11 December 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Some people just can't see their own issues. This guy's obviously one of them. You picked the exact two statements I was going to single out until I saw you already did so.

The thing is: he thinks his drinking isn't a problem so no one else should see it as a problem either. But that's not how it works. If there's a claim of alcohol abuse, ANY drinking at all is viewed as a problem and a risk.

I just went through this with another client. He was furious that the mom was drinking and using meth while breastfeeding. He couldn't wrap his head around why it wasn't okay for him to be using coke and ecstasy. "But I'm not breastfeeding, so it doesn't get in the baby's system, and I don't do it when the baby is with me, so why does it matter?" Idiot.

Then he went to rehab and cleaned up ... until he was caught buying alcohol. "But I'm in rehab for coke and ecstasy, not alcohol," he says. Really?! But that's how people think.

Regardless ... I just spoke to the psychologist this morning, who is recommending my client to get custody, so I was able to wiseen my client up over time. But it took months of idiocy before he finally started to understand how the court would perceive his actions.

This particular user doesn't yet realize that being a standup guy to the court means out of court too - any time anyone involved with the cour could ever figure out what he's doing, including the kids and his stbe. Not just at the actual hearings.

I feel like this girl wanted me to kiss her last date.

2 upvotes · 15 November 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Me.

A place for your questions and off-topic discussion.

2 upvotes · 8 November 2019 · /r/askRPC

You don't see the line that says "Refer to the RPC sidebar for rules and recommend reading materials"?

A place for your questions and off-topic discussion.

2 upvotes · 8 November 2019 · /r/askRPC

The sidebar incorporates thre RPC rules. Maybe that never got ported to the redesign, if that's what you're looking on.

Sharing church with soon-to-be ex-wife

2 upvotes · 6 November 2019 · /r/askRPC

Solid.

Confession & Repentance?

2 upvotes · 4 November 2019 · /r/askRPC

It's up - unedited, but I ran out of time.

What are your thoughts on kissing a girl on the first date?

2 upvotes · 4 November 2019 · /r/RPChristians

not some "line" that you cross but are rather a "direction."

Beautiful. I often teach guys the difference between a "destinational" and "directional" mentality. Most of Christianity only makes sense in a directional framework. The destinational crowd often makes an idol of their own view of Jesus rather than the living, moving, active Jesus who's on the go.

"how much can I do until I'm sinning" is establishing a law that you have to work to keep when, as Christians, we are told to live under grace

Right again. I often tell guys when they ask, "Is <blank> a sin?" that their motive is in the wrong place from the get-go. 99% of the time it's because they're looking to the law to justify their actions. Even if the law justifies that particular behavior and deems it "not sin," the fact that one looks to the law in the first place as their source of justification means they're not looking to Christ to justify them. So, the same law that vindicates them in this one area will condemn them in countless other areas - a standard I'd never want to be subject to in the first place. Better not to look for legal technicalities in Scripture at all and follow a Romans 14:14, 23 approach instead.

Living in grace causes us to desire to do what is right

Yep, because the best way to keep from sinning isn't to try to avoid sinning, but to start doing what's right.

1 Cor 7:1-2 is close: "It is good not to touch a woman"

In that verse, Paul is quoting what they were saying and spends the rest of the chapter clarifying why this is a false/misleading statement and when it's appropriate/not to do so.

How to deal with atheist parents

2 upvotes · 31 October 2019 · /r/askRPC

if they're already dismissing something as concrete ... then something as abstract ... would not really touch their hearts

For your purposes, the point right now isn't to persuade them. It's to set a clear boundary. By focusing on the abstract, as /u/helaughsinhidden suggests, you're showing them that conventional atheist thinking will not persuade you away, so they are wasting their time trying to pull you away. When this happens, they will respect your commitment - and when they respect your decision on this, they'll be more curious as to your commitment to it, despite the fact that it defies their comprehension.

How to communicate self-improvement to a potential partner?

2 upvotes · 27 October 2019 · /r/askRPC

More accurately: you don't have a frame yet; you've learned to be confident and assertive within someone else's frame.

Straight from the horse's mouth: Fuck Chad while you string along Beta Billy for months on end. Another WAATGM in the making.

2 upvotes · 24 October 2019 · /r/WhereAreAllTheGoodMen

This is how you get [r/deadbedrooms](#). This is how you get [r/theredpill](#), [r/marriedredpill](#), and [r/whereareallthegoodmen](#).

Hey, you forgot [r/RPChristians](#) ;) The Christian guys are by and large the most duped among all the beta males - and I was once their royal blue king.

Is my marriage salvageable?

2 upvotes · 23 October 2019 · /r/askMRP

Ah, then you're good.

DEERing? DAREing? Something else?

2 upvotes · 21 October 2019 · /r/askRPC

You're spending too much effort trying to condition your wife. Stop that. You're in her frame, caring too much what she thinks or feels. If your wife thinks the moon is made of cheese, how does that belief stop you from living out your mission? What is your mission, by the way? I didn't see that in your post.

I think STFU wouldn't work here because it implies that I can't disagree with her because she's right

Implies it to who? If you know your own reason, then it doesn't imply anything of the sort to you. If you're talking about what it implies to her, that's textbook evidence of you giving too many craps about what she thinks. This is what I mean by trying to condition her - you're trying to get her to see things from your perspective. Bad strategy.

She will never understand you. I know that's not a true statement, but it's what you need to tell yourself right now in order to get your head out of your butt. **She will never understand you.** Chant that to yourself for a few days. If you can fully embrace this concept, then DEERing becomes pointless in the first place. Why try to do the impossible? Why try to convince her of something she will never understand?

Now, in reality, we all know that she will understand you sometimes, but not other times. Right now you're living solely for those "some times" and getting inordinately frustrated when those "other times" come up. When you play the DEERing game, that's life. But by embracing the "other times" as all the time, you'll find

- because you're not forcing your perspective on her, she will be curious about it on her own initiative, which is the starting point of her sliding into your frame
- because her understanding of your position is genuine from her and not external from you, it's more authentic and leads to greater submissiveness and respect
- you'll be more prepared to deal with the frequency of her misunderstandings of your perspective because you take that as the norm rather than assuming she *must* understand you at all times
- you'll be more pleasantly surprised in those instances where she does see things your way
- you'll also be more attractive to her because you are becoming a powerful man whose perspective on life and reality does not depend on her, rather than being a peer to her who is always trying to communicate eye-to-eye with her, which only motivates her to fight against you due to her curse from Eve.

No matter how you look at it, this is just a better approach all around.

Question: Understanding Passive game vs. Approaching

2 upvotes · 20 October 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I must say - I'm impressed at how spot-on all of your comments are in this thread. I couldn't agree more.

/u/SingularityOne198 - If it helps, imagine a guy who's a 2 learning all kinds of "active game" strategies to pick up women. His mastery of active game might get him up a couple points to a 4. But what has he really accomplished? His goal is obviously to get a woman in bed with him - something Scripture says is a distraction from his mission that should only be engaged in to avoid temptation, yet he is running toward that temptation full-on.

Conversely, a guy decides he wants to be the best disciple-maker he can be. Screw the pursuit of women. He realizes:

- People are more likely to hear what you have to say and follow you if you're fit, so I better get fit.
- People aren't going to follow you for long if you're a crappy leader, so I'd better learn how to lead.
- People won't trust me if I'm not even confident about what I have to offer, so I'd better work on my confidence.
- I can't get people to follow me if I don't know how to relate with people, so I'd better work on my social skills.

The list goes on. In doing all of this, instead of a 2 trying to pretend he's a 4 to get a 3, now you've got a guy who's fit, a skilled leader, confident, socially talented, etc. - he becomes a 7. Maybe even an 8!

Did him doing these things distract him from his mission like the 2, or did they advance his mission? They were purely for the purpose of advancing his mission. No distractions. He's not even looking for a date. But how much easier do you think he'll find one than the other guy who was emphasizing active game as his primary strategy for upping his SMV? Let's explore that.

That 2 wanted to get a 3 by gaming his way to looking like a 4. It was hard work and he faced a lot of rejection learning how to up his SMV to a 4 through active game techniques. How hard do you think the guy who's a 7/8 has to work to get a 3 to follow him? He probably doesn't even have to ask - they're already doing it just by virtue of the fact that he says hi to them at all. Even more so: he's not even interested in that 3 anymore - he's able to pull 6s and 7s with ease, not even by approaching them, but by them approaching him. He doesn't need active game at all in the first place, though perhaps it could be useful to help him get 8s and 9s.

So, he uses it anyway - but not for the sake of getting an 8 or 9 in his bed. He does it because he's growing a following. People are taking notice of his ministry and the difference he's making for Christ and the women around him start to realize how awesome he is. He realizes he's not reaching many women on his own so he starts inviting women to learn from him so they can go reach the other women that he'd rather not spend his own time on. He strategically picks women he knows have the capacity for great influence. What are the characteristics of that woman?

- She's attractive, because women are highly sensitive to the popularity dynamic among other women and inherently view the most attractive women as the most popular - part of the crowd they wish they were in, though because of their competitive hypergamy, they rarely admit this and will instead pretend to hate her, secretly wanting to be her. Seriously, look how many 9s follow 3s and 4s for life wisdom and guidance. It doesn't happen. But women flock to those above them.
- She's faithful, because someone unreliable won't be trusted by the women you're training her to reach.
- She's available, because she can't help you make disciples if she isn't willing to make the time.
- She's saved, because she can't make disciples if she's not.
- She's teachable, because she won't help your mission if she's not - she'd only be advancing her version of what she thinks she's doing, which may not actually line up.

That's right, she's attractive and FAST - the exact same characteristics a guy should want in a wife anyway. And as he disciples her (and preferably several other women like her), he's going to find that he's becoming sexually attracted to one or most of them to a point where it's hard to keep his pants on, so he decides it's time to marry one of them - not because of how many dates they've gone on, or because they've met some social norm of a relationship context that would dictate proposal as the next step, or because she expects him to propose. He does

it because he doesn't want to fall into sexual sin with anyone, and of all the girls he's tempted to do that with, she's the one most helpful to his mission (or at the very least, the least likely to interfere with his mission).

Yes, this is all in the sidebar in the singles section.

Boundaries and Boundary Enforcement

2 upvotes · 18 October 2019 · /r/askRPC

I fully endorse this answer.

Being Supportive on Attitude Issues

2 upvotes · 17 October 2019 · /r/askRPC

Opus Dei, which emphasizes work as a path to sanctification

I've heard this theology before. It's dangerous.

He said his spiritual director said he was actually farther along than many men because he actually WANTS to be home with his family (rather than using work as an escape)

I'm guessing his spiritual director (whatever that means) is a baby boomer. That was true of their generation. It is not true of the majority of men in the present generation of middle-class workers, who are generally lazy on the job and just want to go and chill with their kids all day. This has fed into the breed of working moms to SAHDs that are gradually on the rise. The norm is shifting and your husband is in the new norm.

Ultimately, he's not in a role like lawyer where you bill your hours and clock out.

Yeah, that's not how my job works.

Imagine that you were working on a long, long case that wasn't going to go to trial for a year; your boss keeps butting in to give you advice on what to do, but you think that what your boss is telling you to do might cause you to lose.

That's how my job works. Most of my cases are this way. It's one of the reasons I'm excited to be taking over the firm in 2 weeks - I won't be subject to my boss's bad advice. His advice is incredibly good at making the company money, but incredibly bad at helping clients outright (except in a handful of niche circumstances). And virtually every one of my cases is on an 18 month docket + 6 months for trial and getting a decision - so 2 year projects for each case.

my husband's boss HASN'T successfully delivered a product like the one he's working on. It's not at all obvious that the boss's advice is good for anything besides rising higher up within the organization

I think that's what I just described. I know this exact situation very, very well.

What would you do if you thought following your boss's advice would lose you a case and win you a promotion?

Submit to my boss's authority, even if it violates my own better senses. This is the biblical solution. It is not for me to undermine those God has placed in authority over my life. If I follow their advice and it blows up, that's on them. You just have to document your objections along the way.

I'm a Star Trek junkie. Imagine if Riker or Spock undermined Picard or Kirk every time they disagreed on a

matter of principle. Spock was much, much smarter than Kirk, after all. And yet the ship succeeded time and again because Spock knew his role and submitted after voicing and documenting his concerns. And if Kirk did screw up, that documentation of concern would cover Spock's butt the same way I document my concerns against my boss's advice in the form of e-mails to the company or to my boss - especially because he had a habit for a while of giving advice, then getting mad at me for taking it, not remembering he's the one who told me to do it.

and he ultimately thought I had valuable input

How honest was he being here? Or just trying to make you feel valued? I used to do that with my wife, even when I had every intention of disregarding what she said - because she needed to feel that her contribution mattered in the moment.

To be clear: I'm not trying to make a dig at you and suggest you have no value. I'm just making sure you're weighing the other side of what he might be perceiving.

That's not really a realistic expectation with a one year old. I'm doing better at having dinner ready, etc. but our daughter is EXTREMELY needy.

I'm sorry, but I simply can't identify with this. I have 4 kids, including a 2-year old. I've lived through the phase you're at 4 times and with 3 other kids the most recent time. When my youngest was 1 my others were 3, 4, and 6.

My wife has busy seasons where she works 90+ hours a week (like last week), leaving me to (1) work a full time job, (2) take care of all 4 kids, (3) do all of the cooking, (4) manage all of the house and yard work, (5) do all the pick-up/drop-off with school, (6) maintain all of the extracurricular activities for 3 of the kids (youngest isn't old enough), (7) help with homework or general life/relational issues, and (8) do all the night-time routines. All of that falls on me 5 months out of the year (2.5 in spring, 2.5 in fall).

And yes, the house is spotless and dinner on the table every day (granted, I do order out a couple times a week during this season). The one thing I don't keep up with 100% is the laundry - I'm usually a load behind. This past busy season for her I was also working 25% extra hours over what I normally work at my job, due to all the added load of setting up for taking over the company.

My point is: yes, this is INCREDIBLY doable - especially if you only have one kid who isn't even into the 3s yet (the worst age range).

And yes, my youngest is very needy also. I'm often cooking dinner with her in my arms or folding laundry with her in my lap. She follows me around everywhere and doesn't keep herself occupied. Sometimes it means letting her cry it out while I go do other things.

On that point - parenting tip: most psychologists are recognizing that the advice from a decade ago to coddle your kids' emotional needs has proven more harmful than helpful, and the growing trend in advice is that kids need to know that their parents have more important things going on in life than them. The wave of millennials we have now - especially with how screwed up the sexual marketplace is - stems from the fact that when they were children they were taught that they were the center of the universe and their parents' lives revolved around them. I actively tell my kids that I have more important things to do in life than coddle their every need - and that I can help them have an important purpose like that too. This helps mitigate the clinginess when they're older while also instilling the importance of having a biblical mission from a very young age, and hopefully will prevent them from having the same selfish ideologies that plague the millennials today.

So with him, she will fuss for a little bit but he can ignore her and she will go do something else

My wife and I had the same problem. And you already gave the answer: he can ignore her. My wife built a

pattern of not ignoring the kids - they were the center of her universe. Result? They knew that she would keep making them her center and give them attention whenever they demanded it. So, for her they'd keep fussing and whining, even at 1 year old, because they knew it would work on her.

We actually found the cure: her busy season. She was forced to start ignoring our kids when she'd work from home. At first, they abused her with whining and clinginess thinking old tactics would work for attention. After a few weeks, they finally gave up and started treating her the same way they did me. It was a painful time for her to let the kids cry it out like that, but the workload forced her to do it. Result? Now when my wife refuses to hold our 2-year-old, instead of crying to be held she goes off and plays with the other kids, building peer-to-peer relationships among the siblings rather than all of our kid's relational energy being focused on the parent-child bond alone, which is unhealthy in exclusion. I know you don't have other kids yet, but it could transition into learning how to play with toys or keep herself occupied.

That sounds really unhealthy. I'm sorry that you were so afraid of your wife's judgment. I know a lot of law firms can be very brutal in the hours they demand; it's a flawed system since more hours don't always mean higher quality work.

When I said I wasn't performing up to par, I didn't mean in the context of a demanding system, but in a lazy way. I have incredible flexibility with my job. I always have. Neither my past nor current employer (and especially not when I become partner of my own firm!) cared what my hours were as long as the work got done, so I always went in and came home as I pleased. I do work from home almost every night after my family goes to bed, but I was referencing lazy days at the office where I would screw around on Reddit or do logic puzzles online for hours. I was truly dishonest for years - but I legitimately didn't have the work to support all the office time, but also didn't want my wife to think I was lazy, so I hid my laziness by doing it in the office where she couldn't see. Fortunately the last few years have legitimately kept me busy and I've been more up-front with my work-load ever since.

primarily he engages in emotional eating

Ah, one of my former vices. He doesn't yet have internal motivation to better himself. This is a sign of spiritual immaturity, even if in the face of a wealth of spiritual knowledge, as I had. There was a traveling preacher who visited our congregation at least once a year who preached on freedom ministry. I remember the "pastor" commenting once, "If he's so free in the Gospel, why hasn't he become free of gluttony yet?" The guy was massively obese and the lack of discipline over his body clearly undermined his spiritual influence.

He also copes with stress by binge watching TV, but then he feels like a loser afterward

Everything you're writing is EXACTLY me 3 years ago. There's hope for him, but he's got to want it himself and probably hit rock-bottom first. And even then, there's no guarantee.

While I greatly appreciate your heart toward encouraging your husband, the way you describe him it almost sounds like your positivity is turning into enabling more than it is helping. Yes, he's happier for it - but so is a drug addict when you give them more meth.

The one who leaves every day for work doesn't appreciate the immense luxury they have just being able to go to the bathroom ALONE

Having been in both roles in differing phases for most of my marriage, I'd prefer being a SAHD over working any day of the week. Period.

[FR] Initiate Often, Confident Always

2 upvotes · 15 October 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

She works from home. And no, she hasn't rejected me when I initiate - I was commenting that if I initiate, she follows and does likewise; if I stop initiating, she stops initiating too.

Red Pill observations at a coaching seminar

2 upvotes · 14 October 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

But what are his thoughts on intergender relational dynamics? A guy like that can still look to his wife for validation. He can still make her his primary mission, as he seeks to excel in his job in order to provide for her every need. He can still fail fitness tests. He can still get butthurt when she rejects his sexual advances.

This is why we can't confuse mere self-improvement with an understanding of sexual dynamics - at least not if [u/Rollo-Tomassi](#) has anything to say about it. This man may have been attractive, but we don't necessarily know that he is "red pillled," from the way I understand the term.

Going to the same church as your ex

2 upvotes · 14 October 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I'm with [/u/ENTPunisher](#) on this one. You said this below

If you're talking about committed Christians active pursuing Christ, then yes the behavior would be important regarding the church's quality

If these are the only people the congregation leader is influencing, he's preaching to the choir. Biblically, the role of the pastor is not to hone the quality of the good sheep who don't wander (that's the job of prophets and teachers); it's to keep the wandering sheep from going too far.

If the congregation leader is focusing only on those who actually pay attention and ignoring those who aren't interested in what he has to say, he's failing at his job. He has a pool of people there who need Jesus more than the choir - people who he already has a context to share Christ with - and if he lets them to their sin rather than addressing it through teaching, rebuking, correcting, and training in righteousness, then that's on him and says a lot of his leadership inadequacy.

To such a congregation leader's credit, this is actually the default of most so-called "pastors," which I say ironically because that title completely ignores the actual biblical role of the pastor.

But the point is that a shepherd's success at his job is not measured by the quality of the sheep who stay, but by his failure to pull back in the sheep who wander off. He is to herd them. Sheep-herder = shepherd. The shepherd is judged not by the ones who follow him, but by the ones who stray. If one wants to take on the title of "pastor," which in a biblical sense (as opposed to the current cultural use) involves shepherding, then the pastor is **absolutely** to be judged by the least of his flock, not the best of them.

To be fair, the same can be said of teachers. Some people naturally learn quite well. But is a teacher in a classroom successful because of how brilliant his smartest students are, or because of his ability to get through to the kids who would otherwise reject any interest in their own education?

I do agree that at some point a person has to be cut off. But in the case of someone who is in habitual, unrepentant sin - especially, for example, of a sexual nature (not to impute anything on OP) - 1 Cor. 5 would require that such a person either stop identifying as a believer or that they be excommunicated from the congregation until they either (1) repent or (2) stop identifying as a believer (in which case their participation becomes evangelistic in nature). If the "pastor" is not willing to live out this verse, and thereby degrade the quality of his flock by allowing people to participate who have this unrepentant relationship with their sin while

claiming the title of "Christian," it gives the Church a bad name - indeed, the name that churchianity has today.

In my view, those kinds of "pastors" should be called to leave the pulpit, regardless of how technically on-point their theology might otherwise be. If they want to teach theology, they should become teachers, not pastors.

... oh, but in modern churchianity pastors are the ones who do the teaching. Per our mod-chat conversation, [u/OsmiumZulu](#) - this is another reason why words like this matter. Because churchianity structure today ends up causing way more confusion than it's worth by adopting biblical-sounding words for frameworks and position-titles that don't actually mirror what is present in Scripture.

But I'll get off the soapbox now.

I fell in love with a Muslim girl. What now?

2 upvotes · 11 October 2019 · /r/askRPC

The Muslim god is not the Christian God. The Christian God is triune: Father, Son, and Spirit. If they worship a non-triune god, it's not the same god. Cue the stereotypical, yet highly appropriate "don't be yoked together with unbelievers" verse.

Also, you don't "fall in love" with people. You get obsessive infatuations with them. This is called ONEitis. It is a psychological disease that is unhealthy. Why would you feed into it?

[FR] Comfort Test About Finances and More

2 upvotes · 9 October 2019 · /r/RPChristians

She's fiscally conservative but we seem to spend our excess on improvements and projects the last few years as opposed to regular savings

These two statements don't add up. My wife is the same way. If I let her, she'd drain every penny we have on home improvement projects. Most of them are a waste of money. Aesthetics. Women do this. They like pretty things. They realize that if the pretty thing is a trinket for their own personal enjoyment, they're going to get backlash for the waste of money, as the husband sees no value in it.

When it comes to the house, they believe that because "our home is a reflection of who we are," that somehow the husband has to accept it. Then she'll be more specific: "Your home is a reflection of you too." If she's clever, she stops there or deflects to how *other people* might judge you by your home. But what she really means is: "I'm judging you by the home you let me keep." And then it's purely a matter of how much you care about her judgments of you. That's a frame issue.

We don't have a vision, a direction and that's my fault

I still don't see this vision articulated here.

My vision for my finances is to retire by the age of 50 and switch to full-time ministry. We're on track.

A lot of this has meant deferring home projects in order to put more money into retirement. My wife knows my long-term goals are more important than my short-term goals. She tries to appeal to my mission: "But wouldn't it be better to make disciples now if we fixed up the house now so we could host more people over here now?" No. I can meet people outside the home. And the fact is that 99% of the guys I'd ever meet with simply won't care if there's a section of our basement that's unfinished that we'd like to finish someday. I'd rather let that \$25,000 to finish the basement sit in an investment account earning average 10% interest for 2 years before playing with it.

I made a mistake here and didn't share the vision first

You shouldn't have to - but that's her sin issue. Yes, it's better to share the vision, but her respect should not depend on you doing things the most attractive way first. It just goes to show that she's run by her AWALT innate tendencies rather than being able to make conscious choices toward her role as a wife.

"We don't sit and talk in the morning and we don't have coffee outside anymore."

Translation: *You used to be emotional tampon. Why can't you go back to being that again?* You: "That's what I did. This is what I'm doing. Do you want to join me or keep dwelling on what things used to be like?"

I wouldn't be surprised if in your head somewhere you're thinking, "Yeah, if you get on board with sex, I'll get back on board with coffee outside in the mornings again." But that's regressive thinking. This is the point of my 108 post - you can't regress and expect to make progress. Sure, you might start having coffee outside in the mornings again, but the point of doing that should NOT be a regressive reward ("You were good to me, so now I'll go do one of those old things that you liked as a reward"), but because it fits into the plan moving forward. And if coffee and chat in the morning doesn't fit into the new plan, then it just doesn't fit and it's no longer a viable reward for her.

Me: "I want to share the goals and vision I have for our finances with. I should have done that first and got us on the same page. I skipped right to the actions."

I read this as you saying it with a solemn expression and apologetic tone.

Here's a tip that I've found effective lately: **absolutely** OYS on stuff like this, but let it protrude from your frame, not as a weakness in your frame.

- "I screwed up and didn't tell you why I wanted to make these changes. Haha. That was stupid. It's because I want to save up for a giant death ray to take over the world. I'm pretty sure those are expensive. We cool now?"

Compare that to:

- "I screwed up. I know I shouldn't have handled the conversation that way. I will try to handle things more appropriately in the future."

What impact do you think those two are going to have on her attitude and ability to absorb into your frame? Even though you're not directly placing her in a position of power on the second one, it's implicit entirely in both the words and the tone: "Will you forgive me?" - and the moment you imply this (even if you don't say it!), you're subjugating yourself to her judgment of you.

The first option, on the other hand, makes it clear that you know you screwed up, but you don't care about her judgment of your screw up. You're going to keep being a happy, fun-loving guy regardless. By teasing her about your own faults and not taking her seriously you're implying: *Yeah, I goofed. But you whining about it is something of a joke too. So, let's laugh at the joke and move on.*

The later brought resentment and hurt because I was accidentally covertly telling her that I didn't trust her and think she's fiscally irresponsible.

But ... she is fiscally irresponsible. She clearly knows how to set a financial plan and follow through. But her "plan" is only ever in-the-moment expenses that make her feel good about the house and her life. That's an irresponsible vision for the family finances. She cannot be trusted with the money if that's how she's going to spend it. You need to have bigger goals - goals that encompass not just what you do over the next 2 years, but over the next 40 years. Figure that out first, then back-track to figure out how much discretionary room you have left for these house projects.

And don't for a second validate her fiscal responsibility, unless it's to give her a vote of confidence in her ability to help carry out YOUR vision. "I do trust you with the finances. But I'm starting to think longer-term about our future. And if you want to be the old couple sitting on the porch swing together someday, we have to start planning now. Here's the goal. Here's what we need to do to meet that goal. Here's the discretionary room we have in the budget now that can go to house projects, entertainment, sex toys, and if there's any money left over, feeding the kids."

My plan is to add back in communication slowly.

Nah, the damage is done. As [u/rocknrollchuck](#) said, you're obviously in a standoff with her and taking this course of action will communicate your willingness to cave in the expectation that she'll cave too. If you were on the brink of divorce, my advice might be different, but I don't get that impression here. Sure, you went a little Rambo, but if the explosions are grenades and not nuclear bombs (i.e. "I'm furious at you!" v. "I'm packing my bags"), you're better off dealing with the damage rather than trying to fix what you blew up.

The plan shouldn't be to un-Rambo yourself at this point. It should be to Jim-Carey yourself. Just have fun. Watch the movie *The Mask*. Without the mask, IpKiss is a beta pussy. He puts it on and he's a total alpha. People are literally shooting guns at him and he just laughs it off - sometimes even taking it straight on just to show how effortlessly he can deal with the assault. People complain and yell and whine at him and he turns it into a joke. The girl shies away from him and he pushes even closer with exaggerated silliness that finally draws her in.

But as much as Carey is a goof-ball, he Carey cares. Yeah, he laughs at all the bullets being shot because they can't hurt him, but they CAN hurt his girl. So, he protects her. He wants to see her safe. Her well-being matters and is a motivation for all of his zany antics - and those zany antics are the exact means by which he demonstrates his care for her. Oh, and when Rambo blows stuff up, he leaves craters and the audience is tense in their seats. When Jim Carey blows stuff up people laugh and he goes right on laughing with them. And this is basically his persona in all of his movies.

So, don't go Rambo, but if you do, instead of trying to be the medic who cleans up after Rambo, be like Jim Carey.

Second, I feel it's time to share the vision and mission I have with her.

This shouldn't be a prerequisite to her following your lead, but it certainly helps. But share the vision in the context of **HER ROLE** in that vision. Jesus didn't tell the disciples up-front: "I want to make disciples of the whole world!" He spoke in terms of their role in the process: "Follow me and I'll make you fishers of men." I could tell my wife: *Follow me and we're going to retire young and I'll make you a girl whose life has an eternal impact*. Granted, I've always done this through my actions and not so much through my words. I suppose in my 5-part understanding of Jesus's model of discipleship (tell them what, show them how, let them try, send them out, pass it on), as much as I harp on the church for skipping "show them how" and "let them try," maybe there's some value in starting with the "tell them what" phase too - maybe words do matter. But they don't matter if you stop there and don't follow up with showing and empowering.

What are you going to tell your wife?

(1) encouraging/praising her

Don't validate her toward the things she wants to be validated in. Validate her in the things that are useful to you. "You look hot in that dress." "I love it when you bend over like that." "Good job saving money this week!"

(2) be more fun, teasing and flirting

Jim Carey.

Of course, he's just one example. Really, what I'm suggesting here is that you find a man who you respect and whose life you want to mirror and learn from the example he shows, then try it out, then make it your own ... you know: let him disciple you, even if he doesn't realize he's doing it. On that point, a fictional movie character probably isn't the best choice, but if there are traits you want to learn that aren't common among men these days, you gotta start somewhere.

Recommendation for a Patriarch's Study Bible?

2 upvotes · 9 October 2019 · /r/askRPC

There's going to be human error no matter how you translate it. But if you have to lean feminist or patriarchal, because the authors were writing in patriarchal societies, translations that lean patriarchal in their language choices are going to put you closer to what the author was thinking when he wrote it. This leads to more accurate interpretations.

As for an existing translation, I study out of the Young's Literal or a Greek-English Interlinear Bible. I read from the ESV. Personally, the KJV-onlyists have put me so far off of the KJV due to the research I've done against it, that I simply can't stand reading from it anymore. It's also part of the stereotype that gives Christians a band name today. 2011 NIV is total garbage - if you can get back to the 1984 NIV, I might prefer that to the ESV.

AWALT and M/W-Complex

2 upvotes · 7 October 2019 · /r/RPChristians

True. This topic really deserves more than the snip I gave it - especially among Christians.

Main sub being banned soon.

2 upvotes · 2 October 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Nah, I overtly say things like red pill, hypergamy, AWALT, etc. quite openly and don't have any problems.

I do get what you're saying, though. My guess is that most people don't know how to communicate effectively enough to segregate the stereotypes about the red pill from the actual underlying praxeology of it. It's the difference between TRP and MRP, really.

Complete Lifting Reset

2 upvotes · 1 October 2019 · /r/askRPC

Makes sense. But it's also a lot of DEERing, and none of that affects your bench.

How to deal with disrespectful tones?

2 upvotes · 1 October 2019 · /r/askRPC

Hmm ... the other comments here are a little disappointing. Way too much emphasis on what to SAY. Depending on how you manage your frame ...

- You could do like [/u/Deep_Strength](#), [/u/rocknrollchuck](#), or [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) suggest and just set a clear verbal boundary, like you did: "Don't talk to me like that!" Or ...
- You could say, "I like your boobs. Honk, honk!"

And either option would get you roughly the same response from her. In fact, the latter, as demeaning as it is, probably fares better than the first, even. What you say matters very, very, very little. How you say it and the presence that is communicated when you say it is what matters.

The thing is: you're too hung up on trying to change your wife. There is certainly a degree to which you want to

train her and raise her up to be a godly woman. However, the more you get invested in this concept, the more covert contracts will creep up in your life.

- "How many times have I had to tell you to stop talking to me that way?"
- "What's wrong with her? She doesn't listen to the things I'm saying."
- "Is this going to happen in front of our kids too?"

You're going to find yourself constantly spinning circles in your mind about why she won't conform to your expectations that at the end of the day you're going to forget: you're a man and she's a woman. She's not going to think and act like you, and that's okay.

Do you have amused mastery yet? I don't mean if you can practice some conversational art you call amused mastery. I mean actual amused mastery - a mental state that sees the universe from a broader perspective than your immediate circumstances. If you do, you wouldn't give two craps about how disrespectful she talks to you because you realize: (1) in the grand scheme of things, how she talks to you matters very little, and (2) you have more important things going on that can make a difference for eternity than to worry about someone who talks to you that way.

When you understand those two concepts in conjunction, you don't feel the need to snap at her, lecture her, try to change her, etc. You simply give her a choice: "This is what I'm doing. You coming along or not? Oh, and if you want to come, there are some rules. You okay with that?"

When I go to an amusement park, my kids aren't tall enough for half the rides. But the rules are the rules, right? Are those rules an effort by the park staff to force my kids to be taller so they can get on the ride? No. That's absurd. They're kids. I can't force them to be taller, neither can the park staff. It'll happen when it happens, as they mature. In the meantime, they're enforcing their boundaries all the time by refusing my kids the ability to ride the big rides. But they're not yelling at the kids for being too short. They just say, "Sorry, you can't ride the ride because you're too short." There is no anger or animosity. It's just how it is.

See how that works? Now go have that attitude with your wife and the way she speaks to you. Don't let it get to you so much. The instant you feel like you have to talk to her the way you did, the more power she has over you. This very much came off as a loss of frame. Don't tell her what to do. Tell her what you're going to do. Don't tell kids to grow taller. Tell them you're not going to let a short kid on the ride. She can do what she wants, but you're going to do what you want too.

Understanding what vetting does and does not do

2 upvotes · 26 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I surprised at the extent to which I agree with this post. But I think that this is because you and /u/rian_stone are talking about two completely different things that you're both calling "vetting." But before I get to that ...

It's important to realize that:

- Vetting does not increase the quality of the woman you're vetting.
- It does not increase the quality of women that you are capable of getting.
- It does not affect the probability that any particular woman won't screw you over.

What vetting does do is:

- Help you discern quickly which women are lower-quality than they may at first appear.
- Decrease the pool of women you spend time on to be only those of a higher quality (to your/Scriptural taste).

- Affect the chances that the types of girls you spend your time on are less likely to screw you over.

With the above being said, Stoney is working with the cultural definition that is used by most people in the world, including the majority of Christian men I've talked to about vetting. It's a personal-taste/preferential model. You (Deep) are talking about testing a woman's character against Scripture by observing her behaviors. I don't think Stone would call this vetting; he'd call it: *Watch what she does, not what she says*, combined with: *You do you*, in that you decide whether or not you're okay with something after you've educated yourself on what's happening.

The fact is: most so-called Christians are so clueless about what the Bible says about dating, what to look for in a spouse, etc. that their version of vetting is identical to what Stone is calling out as hogwash - and he's right. They come up with their own personal preferences, but have no idea where they got that list other than some subliminal cultural imperatives that have been pressed in him for decades, and then he goes off and makes stupid decisions, realizing after it's too late that he didn't know what was best for him.

God does know what's best for us, but that's only categorical. God doesn't say: "Cindy is what's best for you in a wife." He says, "A good wife should be blah, blah, and yadda." So when a Christian guy tries to vet a girl today, he's usually trying to see: *Is Cindy smart, funny, good looking, etc.*? I'll never forget the shower-thought I read on reddit once: "I never realized how irrelevant *liking the same bands* would be in a spouse until after I was actually married.* My brother did this - he tried to date girls purely because they had the same musical tastes. Idiotic. But the church told him to look for someone with common interests, so that's what he did.

Most guys are not asking in their vetting process: *Is Cindy financially prudent, a hard-worker in the home, submissive, etc.*? Why? Because they don't even know what the Bible suggests to look for in a spouse in the first place - and if they think they do, it's usually coming from the hordes of blue pill'd pastors who tell them that the ideal Christian wife candidate has three kids from a past relationship and a ton of financial debt, because you can really save her like Christ saved the church. That's utter foolishness - but that's what most Christians think the Bible expects of them. Heck, even I thought that for a while before I was married.

In that scenario, a guy would be better off heeding Stoney's advice than playing games with his own culturally-infused ideas about vetting.

What makes your post most valuable, though, is the appropriate constraints you put on the capacity of vetting. Some guys think that vetting is the holy grail of wife-selection techniques. It's not, and you recognize this as well. Stone appropriately recognizes that no matter how hard you vet, there are still no guarantees you'll find that unicorn - because unicorns don't exist. Your point is also appropriate: maybe you're not going to find a unicorn, but at least weed out the donkeys if you want a horse.

For the record, if there *is* any "holy grail" advice on wife-selection, I don't think it's vetting. I think it's a thorough embrace of AWALT (in the way MRP means it, not how the average TRP rage-stage guy uses it) and preparation on the guy's end for the possibility that she loses her ability to repress those traits. So, while I completely agree with you that it's good to weed out the people you **KNOW** aren't good matches, I want to re-emphasize with great clarity what you merely allude to: **The people who pass the vetting test may still end up being just as bad as the people who failed it; they just hid it better until after the ceremony.** Vetting only accounts for the readily apparent issues.

Yes, you have weeded out the people who are 100% likely to screw you over, and probably those who are 90% likely ... but you've kept someone who is still 10% or 30% or even 60% likely to screw you over in the hope that probability will work in your favor - or if not probability, then the influence of the Holy Spirit, which only works if the Holy Spirit denied people the choice to act on their flesh from time to time, in which case there would be

no sin in the world in the first place. As long as she's still in the flesh, that chance will never be 0%. A guy's vetting "technique" (noting that you haven't addressed that angle) might be able to narrow the pool of women he spends time with down from everyone toward only those who **he PERCEIVES** only have a 20% chance of screwing him over - not because vetting somehow fixes any one girl to become more trustworthy, but because he's finding one who is less inclined to act on her AWALT tendencies in the first place. This, of course, severely diminishes the pool of women a guy can be with, making abundance a practical impossibility to have, if his risk-threshold is something really low, like 10% (which again, is still based solely on his perception of the risk, not an objective reality).

More to Stoney's point: women change. I love my college roommate's saying: **Women want men to change; men want women to stay the same. In the end, neither gets what they want.** Women change. It's a fact of life. So, what you vetted for today may not be true of her tomorrow. My wife openly acknowledges that she's not the same girl I married - and that has worked both for me and against me in various ways at various times. I've met countless Christian women who were 100% committed that divorce would never be an option because it's against the Bible ("murder before divorce") ... until I'm welcoming them into my conference room because the husband wasn't doing it for her anymore and someone convinced her that she had some bad theological influences because God would really be okay with it if she made a decision in favor of love ... you know, love for that new guy that God obviously wants her to be with. So, finding that girl who at least *appears* rock-solid in her theology about divorce is great - but only if she doesn't change her theology. Women are constantly changing, usually in ways they themselves are not controlling, so it's not like she can just will-power her way on certain issues - especially if it's against her own emotional proclivities.

In all of this: **vetting should be an easy, early-on weed-out process, not something that you rely on for years.**

At the end of the day, I do prefer [/u/rian_stone](#)'s method over vetting - not that we do away with vetting altogether, as it can be a quick way to sort out the pond (though, again, I'd wager Stone would call this "having standards" and not "vetting"). If vetting is to have any value:

- it has to be understood that it primarily occurs in the first several weeks of the relationship
- that it is to be based on objective biblical standards and not personal taste
- and that it only weeds out obvious flaws, but that the weeds who pass the test could be even worse than the ones who fail it

But all of this puts too much emphasis on a concept that I have always opposed: **finding a girl in the wild**. At the risk of sounding like I agree with all those blue pill'd pastors, even they will argue that marriage is something you figure out after-the-fact, and that a lot of personal refining and growth has to happen after "I do" for the situation to work. Everyone who has ever said they met "the one" before the wedding day has eventually recognized after the wedding day, "Okay, so she wasn't as perfect as I thought," even if it's followed by, "But I still love her, and she's still my *one*." I'm by no means suggesting people rush into marriage; but it's to say that everyone - both the red and the blue - acknowledge that you're going to discover things after marriage that you couldn't have predicted, which may affect the way you feel about the other person.

Also, over-estimating the value of vetting puts too much emphasis on the woman's natural state. While vetting diminishes the pool, setting boundaries and being attractive increases the pool. Also uniquely: it works on individual women and not merely categorically.

Accordingly, the better indicator of a successful marriage than the natural state of the woman is the natural state

of the man (i.e. not still in the "fake it" phase). Combine this with vetting and you might find:

- Vetting gets you down to a perceived 30% chance that she'll screw you over
- Being the highest value man in her life gets you down to a 20% chance that she'll screw you over
- Combined, that makes for a 6% chance of being screwed over.

Of course, my approach on the sidebar inherently takes care of most of the vetting factors as part of the model itself without vetting needing to be an intentional part of the process. But I recognize I'm also a crazy-crackpot who hasn't been looking for a new wife anytime in the last decade.

Men of Iron

2 upvotes · 25 September 2019 · /r/askRPC

Haha. The only good answer is to stop being a noob - learn Scripture inside and out so you can call BS when you see it. Initially this means researching every issue for yourself as you hear about them, even if you're not particularly interested in it. That's what I did - that and always having a discipler who knew scripture better than I did.

The good news is that you really only have to research each issue once. Most of the time the answer sticks with you. After enough, you've seen it all at least a dozen times until new concepts are the rarity and not the norm, and you can see through bogus claims reflexively.

An easier way, if you have context to do so, is to challenge people: "How do you know that's what this verse really means?"

Meditating on scripture also really helps. More on that in my scripture memory post on the sidebar.

Forbearance and Meekness vs Standing up for Oneself

2 upvotes · 25 September 2019 · /r/askRPC

That's a good word, brother.

Men of Iron

2 upvotes · 25 September 2019 · /r/askRPC

Purple or not, my thoughts here mirror my thoughts on [this chain of comments](#). There's so little in the way of actual disciple-making that if people can get more right than they get wrong, that's a win. Sadly, most congregations can't pass that test, so when things like this pop up that do, I'd rather support them than undermine them because of a few side-issue disagreements.

In this situation, the fact that they're getting guys on board with disciple-making is huge for me. Historically, I've found that if guys spend enough time in the Scripture through discipleship, they're going to get to the right conclusions eventually. The problem is that most people who teach Scripture nowadays are doing it from the perspective of looking up verses to support their topic of interest at any given time. They're not studying Scripture, they're quote-clipping Scripture and calling the time finding those quotes "research." If these guys are teaching actual Bible study, among other disciplines Christian men need to be equipped with (and I don't know - maybe they're not; but if they are), then they'll eventually get where the Spirit wants them to go and I can support that.

I don't know enough about their model yet to endorse or disown them, but I'm certainly intrigued. Props to [/u/Iseeitnow7](#) for asking about it in the first place :)

Indonesia to outlaw sex outside marriage

2 upvotes · 20 September 2019 · /r/askRPC

Haha, good for them. I think [this is the post you're referencing](#). Generally, I'm not into state-mandated morality, as it steals the heart from it. But I'm really interested to see where this experiment takes things. Do you know what religion they're following to do this? Indonesia strikes me as more Buddhist or Hindu than Christian.

Help! Stunned by wife

2 upvotes · 20 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

What makes it obvious trolling is the fact that he says this, then proceeds to give advice on female sexuality. Total garbage, even beyond the whole "prayer is pointless" thing.

My Wife's Emotional Affair

2 upvotes · 16 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

[/u/helaughsinhidden](#) hit the ball out of the park on this one already, so let me hit a different angle.

First, props to you for wanting to help other guys learn from your mistakes. We appreciate that around here. But, as has already been said, your mistakes might go beyond what you originally thought.

You should know this by now, but men and women are not on an equal playing field in relationships. Women thrive when they know their husband is attractive to other women. Men just get jealous. When women have a husband who is desired by other women, they up their game to join the competition for his attention. When men have a wife who is desired by other men, they get jealous and protective. Notice two things here:

- When a man causes dread, the wife most often responds positively. She doesn't make or trust her own judgments; but when other women judge a man, her hive mentality kicks in and suddenly she's on board. This is good for a marriage - for a wife to know that her husband is the guy all the other girls want.
- When a woman causes dread, the husband most often responds negatively. He doesn't care what other guys think about his wife's attractiveness. He cares only how hot she is to him. When other guys find her attractive, he gets jealous and over-protective and it stifles her. Some women claim that excessive boundaries make her feel like he "cares enough to protect the sanctity of our marriage" - but that only owns up to the beta bux side, guaranteeing that she keeps getting that provision from him. And notice these agreements are always mutual - she only ever agrees to tone down her outward gaze if he does too.

In reality, a wife wants to know that her husband is desired by other women. Women don't trust their own judgments of a man - they always defer to the herd. If other women find a guy attractive, they conform to the majority view of the guy and accept it. But guys are more narrow in focus, contemplating only their own tastes over what makes a girl attractive to him. Don't fall on the wrong side of this line by creating mutual barriers when the game isn't mutual in the first place. You're acting like God created men and women to have egalitarian roles in marriage. He did not. If marriages are not egalitarian in Scripture, don't make egalitarian compromises in the way you (pretend to) "lead" your marriage.

[FR] Unstoppable Emotional Inertia

2 upvotes · 14 September 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Highest in last 6 months is a 295 bench, 365 squat.

Confronting the myth that you have to “earn sex” in marriage, and that if your wife deprives you, or worse, cheats on you with another man, it is completely your fault as a man for not being “red pillled” enough to stop her. This attitude is blue pillled, and takes away responsibility from women.

2 upvotes · 12 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

[u/redpillwomder](#) already referenced that these conversations have taken place here.

But at this point you're mixing church and politics in a way Jesus never did. You're moving toward political revolution, which was never his goal. If caesar wants to let women vote, that's his prerogative, let God's people be managed by God's designs - and that means a male led church.

In God's Kingdom, women do not get a right to vote. If political revolution was my goal, I'd have to reevaluate my entire framework of thinking in the first place - and I'm not going to do that just to answer a question. So for now, the simple answer is caesar to caesar's, God to God's.

Confronting the myth that you have to “earn sex” in marriage, and that if your wife deprives you, or worse, cheats on you with another man, it is completely your fault as a man for not being “red pillled” enough to stop her. This attitude is blue pillled, and takes away responsibility from women.

2 upvotes · 12 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Let them howl. That's one type of abuse that I have yet to see a judge give much credence too. I'm handling a case right now where my client acknowledged in a temporary orders hearing that he put his wife on a tight budget - didn't give her access to credit cards, no access to bank accounts, he bought groceries weekly for her to budget with the kids, etc. She had zero access to any of the family finances. Yikes!

Even worse: opposing counsel is cross-examining him on his bank statements showing that while he left the wife and kids at home to eat peanut butter and jelly, he spent \$175 at a high end Italian restaurant one day, \$300 at a penthouse steakhouse two days later, \$750 at various bars and restaurants the day after that, etc. The guy had spent, on average, \$9,500/mo on food and drinks for himself while leaving his wife to cook from the groceries he bought a week ago and no money for even a pizza. I was sweating bullets.

I argue that: (1) he had a high-profile job that required a high-end lifestyle to impress his clients (even though he testified he wasn't paying for them most of the time), (2) his culture (Muslim) found it socially acceptable for a man to engage with the world while the woman stayed home, and she agreed to this arrangement when she quit her job and married him, and (3) she knew this was going on for literally over three decades and didn't file divorce before, so she cannot *ex post facto* whine about her own past inactions.

My argument ultimately came down to the fact that my \$450,000/yr client should not pay ANY spousal support to his non-earning wife because he had to use his income to pay the marital credit cards (that were used to fund his lavish lifestyle that she didn't share in - close to \$350,000 in total debt). Opposing counsel was appalled and called my argument misogynistic, at which point I called him out for disrespecting Muslim culture and being racist.

Not surprisingly, the magistrate agreed with me: despite the incredible disparity in income, he ordered NO SPOUSAL SUPPORT - only \$1,500 in child support - a pittance to his budget. My client kept the credit card debt, keeps maintaining his lifestyle, the wife was asked to get a job to contribute to the marital finances and the immense marital debt.

Most importantly: the concept of financial abuse, despite being argued by the other side, was totally dismissed on the grounds that "financial abuse is not a legal standard the courts recognize" and "spouses have the prerogative to spend as they will during the marriage, and if at any point one spouse doesn't like it, it is their obligation to file for divorce then, not let it continue on for over 30 years without saying a word."

So yes - they will howl. No, that howling won't do squat. This was the most extreme case I've had, but I've **NEVER** seen someone win on a financial abuse case if that's all they've really got going for them.

Confronting the myth that you have to “earn sex” in marriage, and that if your wife deprives

you, or worse, cheats on you with another man, it is completely your fault as a man for not being “red pill” enough to stop her. This attitude is blue pill, and takes away responsibility from women.

2 upvotes · 12 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I'm still not sure where you're remotely getting the idea that we're "compensating" rather than following the Bible. [/u/RedPillWonder](#) explained this well. We hold women to biblical standards. The Bible doesn't spell out a step-by-step approach for how to get women to fall in line, but it does tell men how to lead. We teach men how to lead, and the red pill has discovered that when men do this, women fall in line.

This is not compensating. This is men living up to biblical standards and discovering that the natural byproduct of this is the sanctification of women - a goal that we could not consistently manufacture on a large scale any other way through secular means.

[/u/Deep_Strength](#) talks about this often when he writes on Ephesians 5 - that the duty of the husband is to sanctify his wife. The mods here have spent **INCREDIBLE** time studying the Scriptures and have discovered something very obvious:

- Shaming and guilting women for their poor behavior does not sanctify them into better behavior or more pure hearts. It increases their rebellion.
- If a man becomes someone she desires to submit to, then when he calls out her sin she will submit to him and take steps toward sanctification because the Spirit working through him helps her.

But the man has to get the plank out of his own eye before he can go yelling about the speck - or even plank - in his wife's eye. This process of the man being right before God first is the process of becoming a godly man, which makes him more attractive and places her in a position of desiring to submit to him.

I see nothing biblical about utilizing guilt and shame and calling in dozens of family members to pressure her into changing. This, to me, is the unbiblical compromise because you do not believe the biblical model of discipleship actually works in marriages. If that is the case, you would be wrong. That biblical model is best summarized in 1 Cor. 11:1 - "Follow me as I follow Christ." It's not surprising that 2 verses later is where it says that Christ is the head of man and man is the head of woman - indicating that the way to get women in line is not by chasing after them to submit all the time, but to follow Christ yourself, independent of her, because your eyes aren't set on your wife, but on Christ.

This whole notion of fixing the wife that you can't get out of your head is a fundamental frame issue - you're in her frame. Stop worrying so much about whether she's rebellious or sexually defiant or whatever. Focus on living up to the full weight of the model Jesus gave you.

I know it sounds like a crazy and ironic catch-22, but the more you try to fix your wife, the more broken she will become; the more you set your eyes on your mission and stop making your wife the center of your world - no matter how well or poor behaved she is at any given time - the more attracted she will become to you, and the more likely she is to start following you as you follow Christ - and as Christ fixes you when you follow him, her act of following you will fix her - not because you're actively trying to fix her, but because living in biblical orientation has a spiritually sanctifying side-effect that does not occur when we live out of biblical alignment.

Confronting the myth that you have to “earn sex” in marriage, and that if your wife deprives you, or worse, cheats on you with another man, it is completely your fault as a man for not being “red pill” enough to stop her. This attitude is blue pill, and takes away responsibility from women.

2 upvotes · 12 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Amen

Confronting the myth that you have to “earn sex” in marriage, and that if your wife deprives you, or worse, cheats on you with another man, it is completely your fault as a man for not being “red pillled” enough to stop her. This attitude is blue pillled, and takes away responsibility from women.

2 upvotes · 11 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Not sure why this got downvoted. Solid.

Fun fact: after Hosea buys her back in Hosea 3 -

3 Then I told her, “You must stay at home with me for many days. You will not be like a prostitute. You will not have sexual relations with another man. I will be your husband.” 4 In the same way the people of Israel will continue many days without a king or a leader. They will be without a sacrifice or a memorial stone. They will be without an ephod or a household god. 5 After this, the people of Israel will come back and look for the Lord their God and for David their king. In the last days they will come to honor the Lord and his goodness.

This is the phase Israel is in right now without a temple, without their high courts, without any ability to enforce the Law of Moses. Fascinating that the state of a nation not just at that time, but across ages of human history is so closely associated with a single man's marriage. Not that I want Hosea's marriage in particular, but I want my marriage to have that kind of power, influence, and reflection to the world of God's character and relationship with his people.

Confronting the myth that you have to “earn sex” in marriage, and that if your wife deprives you, or worse, cheats on you with another man, it is completely your fault as a man for not being “red pillled” enough to stop her. This attitude is blue pillled, and takes away responsibility from women.

2 upvotes · 11 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

You'd be a crappy manager if that was your only recourse. I'd reassign the dud employee to janitorial work and cut his wages down to minimum wage until he either shaped up or walked out. This is what Honda does with crappy employees. They refuse to fire people for some reason (at least the branch near me), but they usually get people back in conformity or out the door.

Your views on divorce rape are skewed and only applicable to a man who is a fool in how he runs his marriage. Even the Proverbs 31 woman had a job crafting and selling things in the marketplace and running a vineyard or buying/selling land. Guys today are idiots because they think that allowing their wife to have any income earning ability at all will undermine their dominance in the home. What it really does is make them divorce-proof, making it so much easier for him to stand steel-faced when she threatens to walk out the door, calling her bluff.

But how does this relate to a Jezebel woman who never changes no matter how great of a man you are? Who always nags, lies, and even cheats, despite you doing everything right? Are you telling me, it's STILL your responsibility?

Your house, your responsibility. That doesn't mean you're without recourse. The Lord disciplines those he loves. So do husbands to the wife he loves.

Guys who aren't divorce-proof are going to have a harder time with this. That's why I've written so much on MRP helping guys to get to a frame where they can lead freely without fear of divorce.

what the hell's the point of such a putrid hateful marriage? There's no way in hell marriage is meant to be

like that as you say it is.

First, you're describing it that way, not me. Second, you're talking about a true outlier. Those are rare. 99.9%+ of women aren't the Jezebel you're referencing. If you actually married a Jezebel, let me know and we'll chat. Otherwise, the hypothetical doesn't hold up against the weight of probability.

What's the point of diverting so much time, energy, resources, and management to a marriage that eats away at you and distracts you from your other missions in life? What's the point?

I think you're confusing me with someone who promotes marriage. I encourage guys not to marry. But the pragmatic reality is that they're going to anyway. So, make the best of a bad situation.

then why marry at all and waste your life fixing another woman's mistakes when you can just accomplish your dreams and be happy all the time?

Assuming by "your dreams" you mean "Christ's dreams for you," yeah ... don't marry.

Why subject yourself to a wretched relationship that requires you to babysit a woman and take responsibility for her mistakes, even when her mistakes ruin your life financially or sexually?

Because good managers over their home don't get this result. They get wives who are helpful and contribute substantially toward helping them fulfill their mission and accomplish Christ's dreams for them.

Look, you're WAAAY too hung up on assuming every woman is a Jezebel. They're not. They're hypergamous. This is a huge difference. Hypergamous women are easy to understand and predictable, just like sheep are easy to understand and predictable. It's easy to herd sheep because you know how they're going to respond to basic shepherding skills. You can't turn them into dogs. You can't teach them how to knit. A sheep is going to be a sheep. But that predictability is exactly what makes these relationships so easy once you know the first thing about herding sheep.

Yes, one out of every flock of 10,000 may have that black sheep that refuses to act like a sheep. But you can't create your entire shepherding system around that one.

Confronting the myth that you have to “earn sex” in marriage, and that if your wife deprives you, or worse, cheats on you with another man, it is completely your fault as a man for not being “red pill’d” enough to stop her. This attitude is blue pill’d, and takes away responsibility from women.

2 upvotes · 11 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Before I answer ...

But how does this relate to a Jezebel woman who never changes no matter how great of a man you are? Who always nags, lies, and even cheats, despite you doing everything right?

Are you speaking hypothetically or is this your actual situation? That makes a huge difference in how I respond and in what additional information I would need from you (R2 stuff) to answer.

Edit: Also, if you were a manager in that situation, what would be your solution for dealing with an employee like that who you know you can't fire?

NMMNG thoughts. Stop initiating or initiate often while following MAP.

2 upvotes · 11 September 2019 · /r/askRPC

This is a half way decent field report and belongs on the main sub. You screwed up at various places, you know

where you did, you fixed some of it and saw some progress, and now you're looking to keep improving. Bravo.

Biggest issue here is what [/u/Deep_Strength](#) already said: you're still in her frame. Stop it. Stop worrying about what she says or does or what she asks of you. If you wanted to massage her butt, you should have done it before she asked.

More directly on that point: **STOP trying to change her, manipulate her, or control her.** I used to make posts like this and you remind me of how idiotic I must have seemed to the MRP guys - and people like [u/weakandsensitive](#) would chew me out for it (thank God they did!). AWALT. You can't "fix" your wife. She will always be a woman. What's that Billy Joel song? Yeah - go read the lyrics of that one.

You withdraw your time and affection not to manipulate her into conforming her behavior, but because you've got better crap to do than deal with a sexually denying harpy.

I'm mixed on the idea of monk mode. On the one hand, [/u/rocknrollchuck](#) gives some solid pragmatic advice about always initiating. 1 Cor. 7 says the same thing - if you're going to go monk mode, it's only to be by mutual consent and for a short time. But at the same time, she's already given her consent to withdrawing sexuality by actually withdrawing it. You're right not to go Rambo and force it back all at once. But don't stop initiating - initiate about as often as you were before all this, then as you become more attractive and see her responding, ramp up.

You're really lacking abundance here, though. How many other girls are looking at you? Anyone give you their number recently? You're so hung up on your wife because you don't believe you're the prize. She's the prize you're going to get for all your hard work earning her attraction. Get that attitude out of your head.

FR: The Spell is Broken

2 upvotes · 10 September 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

It's not bad at all ... **IF** the guy is content with never having more than duty sex. If that's where OP is at, then by all means: go for understanding.

But the fact is that [/u/CarelessBowler5](#) stated that his experience with duty sex was less than fulfilling and at the core of his disillusionment. As such, I have to assume he is not okay with duty sex, in which case seeking her "understanding" is certainly not going to get him the type of sex he's looking for.

Self-conscious about things I cannot change immediately.

2 upvotes · 10 September 2019 · [/r/askRPC](#)

Well ... that was unexpected. In that case, as others have said: stop caring so much. So what if others mock you? Does their judgment of you matter? Galatians 1:10 - "Am I now trying to win the approval of human beings, or of God? Or am I trying to please people? If I were still trying to please people, I would not be a servant of Christ."

Memorize that verse.

FR: The Spell is Broken

2 upvotes · 9 September 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Which is it!?

It's a scale. 0 is easiest difficulty, 10 is hardest. A normal single guy might have a difficulty of 4 to pick up the average girl for a quick lay. Marriage bumps that difficulty up to an 8. Being ripped drops it back down to a 5. Having an older wife puts it back up to a 6. Random numbers, but you get the idea. You have certain factors making it easier for your wife to find you attractive than, say, a husband at 25% body fat. But you also have

things making it harder than a husband whose wife is, say, 10 years younger than him and doesn't have her own pre-established life goals.

FR: The Spell is Broken

2 upvotes · 9 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

If you send that to your wife, I'll permaban you from this sub.

... j/k. But seriously. Don't send it to her. Bad idea.

Personal Finance and Peace

2 upvotes · 8 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Makes perfect sense. I'm handling a case right now where the parties have over 60 credit cards! Insane.

I have one. Period. Everything goes there, easy to track, little room for identity theft or credit card fraud and easy recourse when it happens. No complexity.

My wife did open cards eith old navy and target ... and then couldn't keep track of them and they got behind. No more.

That Girl at Work

2 upvotes · 5 September 2019 · /r/askRPC

turn her into an orbiter - have fun with it, but maintain plausible deniability

This right here is my exact thought on the situation.

All these requirements and all she has to offer is used up pussy and chad's kid(s).

2 upvotes · 4 September 2019 · /r/WhereAreAllTheGoodMen

I have the perfect guy for her. He's short, has no money, and is dumb as rocks, but he self-identifies as a 6'4" man with a 6-figure income and an IQ of 180. They'll get along great. How can I hook them up?

Separating the sexes in church

2 upvotes · 3 September 2019 · /r/askRPC

no direct scriptural commandment on this ... scriptural case using logic

This comes down to the knowledge hierarchy:

- Philosophy is the lowest level. It attempts to answer questions and solve problems through the application of logic and reason. It answers the question: *What SHOULD be true?*
- Science is the mid-range. It attempts to answer questions and solve problems through observation and experimentation. It answers the question: *What is OBSERVABLY true?*
- Theology is the highest tier. It attempts to discern truth through the study and application of spiritual revelation from God (i.e. predominantly Scripture). It answers the question: *What is ACTUALLY true?*

Theology doesn't answer every question, and not every unanswered theological question can be tested through science. As such, logical thinking certainly has its place - and a very, very wide open place at that.

But we must always be cautious to recognize that philosophical thinking - even with Scripture as our inspiration -

is still just philosophy. It is not to be given Scriptural weight or authority.

You have some good points to make, but if they aren't backed by Scripture, they're nothing more than human wisdom - which, while valuable, is never something we should build our lives around.

Is it ok to go out to bars a few times/week and socialize?

2 upvotes · 3 September 2019 · /r/askRPC

It's only sin if it's light ;)

I joke ... but I actually had a pastor who made this argument.

How to overcome isolation?

2 upvotes · 3 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

The Church is notoriously bad at fostering genuine relationships between people. About a month ago I made a post on this exact subject:

https://www.reddit.com/r/RPChristians/comments/cjg7pn/more_than_marriage_how_churchianity_has_screwed/

I expect you'll find a lot of useful information there. I made another post about a year and a half ago that takes a more practical "how to" approach than the descriptive nature of the above thread:

https://www.reddit.com/r/marriedredpill/comments/88dtue/social_influence_and_defying_context/

After reading those two, reply here or PM me back if you'd like to chat more about this subject, as it's really one of my strengths and I've helped a lot of guys overcome poor social skills. Hint: 90% of the game is just confidence and learning to say what's on your mind rather than merely thinking about it.

Advice for a young man considering mission

2 upvotes · 29 August 2019 · /r/askRPC

is it a large detriment to your mission to want to marry, despite being content / finding contentment with the current season of being single?

That depends on what you do with the want. I want punch some people in the face. I don't. Wanting to do it doesn't prevent me from making disciples - if anything, it can inspire me to want to get to know them better and potentially disciple them in order to overcome my impression of them. But acting on that want would certainly get in the way if I were to let the desire control me.

Don't let the desire control you and the desire won't affect your mission negatively. As soon as it shifts from "I want this" to "this is an imperative in my life," you've gone too far.

Advice for a young man considering mission

2 upvotes · 29 August 2019 · /r/askRPC

being single in itself is a gift, while others say that it is referring to the ability to stay single for use in ministry by G-d

There are no absolute interpretations of this. My take is simply this: *Treat your single years as a gift and try to stay single for as long as possible, per Matthew 19:11-12 and 1 Cor. 7; but if while remaining single you are on the verge of sin, then feel the freedom to marry.* It's really that simple.

If we had neon signs emanating from our spirit telling us what spiritual gifts we had, then this would all be a different story. But in the absence of certainty over whether or not you have a particular gift, all we can do is

"eagerly desire the greater gifts" by living as if we had them, and if we find we cannot practice them, then to be okay with that and not force it or pretend what is not true.

My mission is simple, minister

The quality of this mission depends on what you mean by "minister." Nowadays this word has become a catch-all for every kind of uplifting activity toward someone. Give money to the poor? You just ministered to them. Share the Gospel? You ministered to a non-Christian. Smiled at someone and brightened their mood? That's a type of ministry.

This word is extremely hollow. Even though the Bible authors use a word we translate as "minister" regularly, it's no shock that Jesus didn't say, "Go minister to all nations," but "Go make disciples of all nations." He meant something very specific. Something he'd just spent 3+ years showing them how to do by doing it with them. They knew exactly what was expected. If that model is what you mean by "minister" then I'm on board with you.

is it morally wrong, or unrealistic to hold that hope that I might find my wife during my mission in a country like this?

Why would it be morally wrong to find a wife among the people you "minister" to? That's actually the exact setting where you should find your wife.

If the emphasis is on the "in a country like this" part, just make sure they're a believer before you go getting yourself involved. That's all.

Is that a distraction to the purpose of the mission?

No, it means you have an insider with unique insights to help you on your mission. Help. ... *helper*. What does the Bible call a man's helper again?

Is it wrong to have what is effectively wife-hunting as a peripheral motivation for moving abroad, so long as my mission takes precedence?

I once made a post exactly on this point of whether or not it's okay to have multiple priorities. My conclusion from that and since then is that there is only one singular priority: make disciples. Everything is subservient to this and only holds value to the degree that it contributes to this.

But that doesn't diminish the authenticity of the relationships we build along the way and the appropriateness of our desire to let these things develop while we stay mission-oriented. Don't let it be a distraction, but if you can marry an asset, then marry her - and it's not a bad thing at some point to realize: "If I really want to make a difference, I'm going to need some help," and then go find that help.

When I tell guys not to look for a wife, it's because 99% of guys aren't looking for a helper on their mission. They're looking for love, sex, commitment, a partner to share their feels with, etc. [/u/helaughsinhidden](#) had an INCREDIBLY good top comment in that thread about this being like you're a secret agent in (ironically to your post) Iran, where you're always loyal to your handler, but if a beautiful woman comes along who has intel that you could use and you marry her because it's the best way to advance your mission - by all means, do it. This is mission-oriented asset-seeking, not "Yeah, I've got a mission, but I really want a wife - can I use making my mission a *higher* priority as an excuse to still be okay with really wanting a wife really, really badly?"

[FR] A Changing Dynamic

2 upvotes · 28 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

It really depends on the context. When you're paying for a meal, you expect to get what you pay for. If I ask for

new shoes and they give me a used pair, is it the *adult* thing to do to keep them because you take what's given to you? No. You insist on getting what you pay for.

When you're with company, though, and they serve you a meal that you're not paying for, but out of their own grace and kindness to invite you into their home - that's a different story. At that point, you suck it up and maintain appreciation for their hospitality, even if you don't have appreciation for the taste of the food. You can be honest with them about it, but depending on how well you know them and your goal for the meeting, it's often more advantageous toward your goals to eat something you don't like than to turn it down and risk offending them ... unless your goal for going was to enjoy the meal itself.

First argument in a while

2 upvotes · 27 August 2019 · /r/askRPC

I am ever more mad

Why were you mad at her in the first place?

- For taking too long to get ready like a girl does? Or would you rather she be a man and get ready like a man?
- Or was it because she hung up on you when she get emotional like a girl does? Or would you rather her be a man and deal with you straight like a man?
- Or is it that she waited at the dealership like a woman? Or would you rather her be a man and take the lead in the whole process like a man does?

Would you like her to grow a dick and screw you like a man too? ;)

I say explain how I have been treating you badly?

I cheated and read the end first. You obviously see where this went awry.

This is the only part I DEER

The previous question actually has the same impact. When you ask her how you've been treating her badly, she interprets that as: "He wants to know my accusations so he can defend against them, explain himself away, make excuses, and rationalize his behavior."

This needed to be nipped in the bud up-front. Obviously not getting angry and emotional is the place to start. But even after that you can recover quickly with some playfulness.

- She throws a tantrum and throws my stuff on the ground on the passenger side and scoots over.
- *Hmm ... are we really doing this? I mean, usually it's swiping stuff off an office desk before we go at it, but I guess a car seat works too.*

When you tell a joke in the midst of her being angry, it infuriates her for a brief second that you're not taking her anger seriously, then she realizes that she likes your positive attitude even in the face of her anger. It's a much better context for conversation in the first place. If you respond in anger, there's no way you're taking her seriously. If you DEER, you're not taking her seriously. But if you can have a positive attitude, she knows you can hear and receive what she's saying, even if you play it off as a joke and pretend you don't take it seriously. Then you be the oak when the comfort tests come: "You know I'm just teasing you, babe. I care about you."

Here's another one:

- "And see you don't even care! You just start acting non chill ant and ignoring me."
- *Well, the real reason is kind of embarrassing. [Your apparent vulnerability here takes her off-guard.] You know how guys say things like, "You're cute when you're angry"? Well, you're giving me a raging boner right now, but now's not the time or place, so I'm trying to calm myself down.*

Situation diffused.

verbal intercourse is optional and to not engage with her emotions

Right. Verbal intercourse is actually a much, much better strategy. But you've got to have the frame for it first. Until then, STFU.

I was angry and it probably appeared in my body language

Right. Go re-read my anatomy of butt-hurt post (late 100s or 200s, I think).

I am clearly still failing tests

You know where you went wrong. Spotting the problem is half the battle.

I read a lot of this not as you failing, but as her frustrated that the power dynamic in the relationship is changing. She needed to blow off some steam. Emotions are high, curing her boredom. She'll calm down, you'll have some great make-up sex, and the kettle will be put on the burner once again.

this is actually the first argument we have had in a while

That's actually concerning to me. You should be teasing out little arguments here and there. Give her small reasons to be mad so it can come out and she never builds up to exploding moments.

EDIT: Also, this is the type of high-quality advice thread that can go on the main sub for other guys to learn from the responses. But it's cool to get some stuff started on this sub too.

was lutheranism cucked from the start?

2 upvotes · 26 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

From the sidebar: We are a subreddit that exists to provide a safe place for Christians to discuss problems, solutions and insights on relationships, sex, and biblical masculinity according to biblical principles.

Brushing up against these principles is not enough, except in rare circumstances that delve into substantive exegesis on an important aspect of Scripture.

If it feels like the thrust of the post is political issues rather than the themes of this sub, it will likely be taken down. A quick way I analyze the quality of these types of posts is two-fold:

1. Is the post trying to persuade toward a political agenda or sanctify the church/raise godly men? The former are automatically removed. The second moves me on to question 2.
2. Is the conversation purely a matter of mental masturbation, or is there a practical application that men today can walk away with and live out in their daily lives?

Most of your posts seem politically motivated, but you have enough language about the impact on the church that I'd be willing to let them slide. However, when it's purely a matter of raising awareness or discussing it for

discussion's own sake, and there is no practical application to be had from the conversation, the post is pointless. We can agree in theory on a million points all we want, but if it doesn't lead to action in some way, it's just mental masturbation.

why aren't synagogues or mosques "seeker sensitive"

2 upvotes · 26 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Your posts are becoming unreasonably frequent. You'd be better off saving up some of your entirely valid and highly interesting questions and putting them together in a single, multi-part post. For the sake of avoiding flooding from a single user, I'm going to remove this one and leave the first two up. This one is less on-topic than the last two. I'll check the other ones in a minute.

Leave and Cleave

2 upvotes · 23 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Mad props on the Barzillai reference! I can't remember the last time someone made a biblical reference and I had no idea what they were talking about ... yet there it is. Interesting. But yes, definitely a rare exception.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (08/21/19)

2 upvotes · 21 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

With women, every interaction affects the sexual dynamic. But yes, she knew I'd be setting up the desktop.

Looking for advice, Need help. +Apology.

2 upvotes · 16 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

she has never actually been approached by many guys (probably due to our sheltered environment)

Right. That's why I said to create profiles on a dating app. Your current environment is obscure enough that it's not an accurate reflection of SMV, though it could certainly be used to your advantage if she perceives her SMV as lower simply because the secluded environment keeps her from seeing how easily she could get better guys than you.

i beat her in looks

Then yes, you are right to lower her SMV to account for this. 90% of a woman's SMV is her looks. 10% is her personality - specifically: how seductive does she behave, and does she use body language to imply she has a high sex drive?

i am scratching my head also, but i do believe it is caused by lack of outside interaction, and the idea of sole reliance on your parents until you become the leader of the (a) house.

How old are you? If you're 18+ then these things are absolutely critical to your SMV. If you're under 18, women will give you a pass on living with your parents because it might not make sense to legally emancipate yet.

So, if you're under 18, it's very possible you may be in the upper-8 range. But from everything you've described here, certainly not a 9, especially given the underlying frame issues I'm seeing.

Here's a relevant post I put up once on calculating your SMV. It's not perfect, but it's as good as I can figure it out to-date: https://www.reddit.com/r/RPChristians/comments/93hrxh/fr_fixing_your_smv/

- **Looks:** Let's assume your looks are as stellar as you think (despite that you haven't been to the gym lately, it seems). That's 3 points

- **Confidence/alphaness/frame: 2**

- Initiative, passing tests, tell her no - Let's assume you get this point
- Not getting butt-hurt or being controlling - I don't sense this from you, another point
 - OYS and intentional about managing your life and affairs (mission and steps thereto): This conversation makes clear you don't get this point.

- **Finances: 1.5** - I'll give you full points for this, even though you're not actually earning any of this yet, so you should be at .5 instead of 1.5

- **Charm, charisma, wit, personality, etc.:** You admit this is a weakness, so let's go with 0. Even most people who think they're charming/charismatic really aren't worth a full point. Nothing in this conversation implies otherwise here.

- **Social status and preselection:** As of right now, you admit you have no social status. 0.

- **1/2 point for morality, ethics, etc.:** My guess is that she will see your interactions with the other girl (lying in bed naked together) as immoral, and thus won't give you the half point for this. 0.

She will likely view you as a 6.5 based on what I've read in your own posts and comments here and on TRP. Don't over-estimate yourself. That will prevent you from knowing where you actually need to improve.

Looking for advice, Need help. +Apology.

2 upvotes · 16 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

i will be far ahead of her

Wait ... you said she's an 8.5 and we know 10s don't actually exist, except by personal taste. So either you're a 10 to her because of her own personal tastes, in which case all your concerns about her aren't warranted in the first place, or you're at best a 9 among men - which is basically model-quality looks, 6-7-figure income, phenomenal charisma, high social status in a meaningful community, etc. And yet you're still living with your parents. Something doesn't add up here. And even a 9 isn't "far ahead."

I don't think you recognize the advantage women have on the SMV scale. On the whole, your capacity to add value to her life is "far ahead" of her capacity to add value to your life. But that's not how SMV is assessed. She's assessing how many other guys she could get who could offer similar or greater value than you do. Chances are, there are tons - and your grandpa's inheritance doesn't count because you as a man did not earn it, at which point it's not part of your SexualMV, just an asset of yours she might want to acquire. So, the question for her is where you rank among men.

The question for you is how she ranks among women. As an alleged-8.5, you believe that she's one of the hottest ones out there, just beneath model-grade looks. How many guys would want to get down her pants?

If more guys want to get into her pants than girls who want to get into your pants, your SMV is lower. If you're batting away more girls than she is batting away guys, your SMV is higher. That's how you have to compare it.

With that in mind: you both put profiles up on a dating app. Who is going to get more right-swipes? You or her?

Yes, the system is rigged in favor of women. Women will almost always perceive their SMV as higher than his, even if it is objectively false, purely because of the validation they can get from other men so easily. And perception is more important than reality. So the fact that you may actually be higher SMV than her doesn't mean squat in a marriage if she doesn't believe it. It only means something to the dozens of other girls who recognize it - and dread leverages their potential recognition of it to force your wife to take notice, which is why it's so powerful a tactic.

Tag: [/u/FuzzyKittenIsFuzzy](#) and [/u/RunawayGrain](#)

Looking for advice, Need help. +Apology.

2 upvotes · 16 August 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

That was intentional.

Looking for advice, Need help. +Apology.

2 upvotes · 16 August 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

You make some good points, most of which are addressed in this post:

https://www.reddit.com/r/RPChristians/comments/85wf8w/is_sex_outside_of_marriage_a_sin_an_official/. But I also think you're misunderstanding the historical context of what was and wasn't acceptable in Hebrew/Jewish society. More to the point, as even the OP recognized in another comment: just because the culture at the time did something didn't mean God condoned it or that it conformed to his expectations in any way. Much of the Old Testament is a historical account, not a theological mandate to do what the people did in every story, or else we would all be obligated to kill our brother as Cain killed Abel.

Another big point to note is that when men were having sex with unmarried women, they either were or became financially responsible for the life and well-being of those women, the same as if married. This validates the view that regardless of the technicalities of civil marriage, God acknowledges a spiritual marriage and the obligations that come with it.

To that end, if a guy wants to create a spiritual marriage with a woman through having sex with her despite not signing a civil marriage certificate, I'm fine with that. But that still comes with the covenants of marriage on a spiritual level that cannot be abandoned. This view is much more consistent with the polygamous nature of men throughout Scripture - and I don't hold anything against Christian polygamists and might even endorse it myself (on further research) for any man who (1) lives in a country where it is legally permitted, and (2) has the ability to make it work financially - even if that comes in the form of having his wives work to help support the household.

Looking for advice, Need help. +Apology.

2 upvotes · 16 August 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I'm pretty sure I agree with everything you wrote. But none of that explains why sex outside of marriage isn't sin.

Your ultimate conclusion was simply: "marriage is no longer needed." I completely agree. Physical marriage was only a road map designed to point us to the spiritual relationship between Christ and the Church. Now that Christ has come and the reality of our spiritual union to him is understood and actualized, physical marriage is no longer necessary.

But by the same logic, sex itself is no longer necessary. So, if a guy gives up marriage, he ought also to give up sex.

The alternative view is, of course, simply to note that God is the one who created marriage, not culture. So, I fully agree that cultural marriage is absolutely null and void. I readily tell guys on this sub that they can be married before God even without filing a marriage certificate with their county courthouse. Screw the civil institution of marriage.

But this doesn't negate the fact that God created spiritual marriage, which transcends cultural definitions of the word "marriage," and I don't think anything at all in your comment addressed this. You were only addressing why cultural marriage is no longer needed - and an appropriate argument it was too.

So if spiritual marriage can be achieved in the absence of a cultural marriage, then how is it formed? Biblically,

long before there were courthouses to file certificates in, this was merely accomplished through a covenant and having sex. The covenant could be implied by conduct. Sex is like signing the contract. So, if you conduct yourselves in a manner that looks like marriage (example: spending lots of time together, planning your time around each other, being physically intimate, etc.) then having sex is just signing the contract implied by that conduct.

More to the point: Jesus says no bad tree produces good fruit. That is, Christ doesn't reproduce with bad trees. Non-Christians are bad trees. Christians are good trees. Jesus only produces fruit through good trees.

This seems pretty darn clear to me that Jesus will not reproduce with someone before they are saved (i.e. before they are his bride). Should we not follow the example of Christ by not reproducing with anyone until they are also first our bride?

Alternatively, there are often times when a person has no clue if or when they're saved. They just start reading, learning, growing, and eventually start sharing what they're reading and learning with others and good fruit is produced. Do you not think at that point that they have already become the bride of Christ by their act of reproducing new spiritual life in others, even though they never had a moment saying any particular vow or covenant (ex. "the prayer")?

Looking for advice, Need help. +Apology.

2 upvotes · 16 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

It comes from 1 Cor. 12:8. Some interpret it as prophetic knowledge. Others interpret it to mean someone is gifted with the ability to understand and remember what they read in Scripture. Many gift inventories often suggest I have this gift, but it really depends on how you interpret the passage.

Warnings for a People Not Listening to God

2 upvotes · 15 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Good word, brother. Excellent qualifier on staying in the Word itself. I should have mentioned that up front!

Opinions: Do you ask a woman out to begin dating?

2 upvotes · 14 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Welcome :)

The Kingdom of God is a Party

2 upvotes · 12 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

That is the rub, indeed. I generally agree with [/u/AlanNoles](#) that we should sift through the mud - take what works and leave the rest behind, as is common advice on RP forums. But this assumes someone is able to discern good advice from bad advice in the first place, and not everyone is gifted with discernment.

I would never want to tell a feminist to treat [/r/marriedredpill](#), for example, as a place to sift through the garbage and find the few valuable gems. They're going to find them. But they will be entirely different gems from the ones you meant. This advice doesn't work for the 99% of Christians who are unversed in the Bible.

Here's a fun little research article on that exact point:

<https://lifewayresearch.com/2017/04/25/lifeway-research-americans-are-fond-of-the-bible-dont-actually-read-it/>

While I'm skeptical in believing that these numbers are way too high, based on my own experience, even assuming this, we're talking less than 10% of believers who have been through the Bible more than once ... and I'd assume you'd have to be through the Bible more than once to have enough of a grasp on it to know when

someone is BSing about Scripture from preaching proper exegesis.

Denominations Question from Newcomers and Those Seeking to Return to the Church

2 upvotes · 12 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

We have steered so far away from the 5 Fold, and Pastor Model which has neglected the way God wants it done

Right. Which is why you see me in my comments/posts now writing like: "if a ~~pastor~~ congregation leader" ... because what we call pastors today are not at all what the Bible intended by that word. We have administrators who preach - and even at that are tainted by incredible egos.

That ego can only truly be offset if there is an apostle as authority over them, an evangelist who gets the credit for the new believers coming in, a teacher who gets the credit for educating the believers, and a prophet who can call out sin and set a vision when appropriate. Only then can a pastor fulfill his function of herding the sheep together down the path and keep them from falling astray. Instead, we have one-stop-shop super-men who feign humility by "delegating" tasks that must be done the ~~pastor's~~ congregation leader's way, rather than the way of the person God gifted at that task in the first place.

Understanding WHY sexual sins are sin.

2 upvotes · 9 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I think you're missing the point. OP isn't making a comment on the physical thing in and of itself and the impact that has on bearing children. He's asking: *If we masturbate as husbands, and we bear Christ's image as a husband to the church, then what does that say about Christ?*

This question has nothing to do with reproduction in itself and everything to do with whether or not we are reflecting Christ's image to the world. That's a concept I can get on board with.

For the record, I don't know what it says about Christ. Evangelism is parallel to spiritual sex here, right? Physical reproductive process and spiritual reproductive process. So masturbation would be like Jesus trying to evangelize himself just for the fun of it. Is that something Jesus would do? If not, then we probably shouldn't masturbate ourselves either.

For the record, OP did address the masturbation comment elsewhere:

https://www.reddit.com/r/TrueChristian/comments/cnoxy0/understanding_why_sexual_sins_are_sin/ewfszpk/

I tend to agree with his view.

Joshua Harris, author of "I Kissed Dating Goodbye" is getting divorced and has fallen away from the faith

2 upvotes · 30 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

You've got a good word from [/u/rocknrollchuck](#), but let me note separately: my wife went through the pseudo-deconstruction process. She had a few years where she would say she wasn't a Christian, didn't care about God or making disciples, etc. I can go way into the causes, but that's not really the point.

When I talk to people about apologetics, like [/u/restless_tradcon](#), this is the type of situation I'm referencing. Someone who has been indoctrinated into the faith by their upbringing or persuaded by logical argument can **VERY** easily be deconstructed away as soon as: (1) they hear a more persuasive argument against it, or (2) an emotional situation occurs that overpowers the sentimentality of their original indoctrination, whether that's an emotional moment created by an incredibly persuasive argument, or the pleasant nostalgia of one's childhood traditions.

Luke 10:27 says, "Love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your strength and with all your mind." Think about those 4 for a second:

- Your strength/body is constantly pulling away from God.
- Your mind's default on its own is to believe the most persuasive argument.
- Your heart on its own is to follow whatever produces the emotions it wants.
- Your soul is eternal and uncompromising.

This is why Paul didn't preach to people's flesh, mind, or emotions. He says in 1 Cor. 2 - "When I came to you, I did not come with eloquence or human wisdom as I proclaimed to you the testimony about God ... My message and my preaching were not with wise and persuasive words, but with a demonstration of the Spirit's power, so that your faith might not rest on human wisdom, but on God's power."

Notice how Paul went for the Spirit in the way he spoke.

What does this mean? That's the real kicker. How to do "demonstrate the Spirit's power" in the way you share Christ with someone?

Most people mistakenly believe this verse is talking about miracles that he performed to prove God to everyone. This is somewhat absurd, as there are plenty of situations where Paul showed he didn't perform miracles on command the way Jesus did. Instead of calming the storm, he was shipwrecked. Instead of healing Epaphroditus when he was ill and dying, he worried over his life. Yes, Paul could perform miracles at times, but that's not what this verse is talking about.

In fact, the passage itself gives the answer: "as I proclaimed to you the testimony about God." He shared his own testimony. The "demonstration of the Spirit's power" is in his testimony - the way that God changed him. Only the Spirit could have done that. Paul was a murderer (or at least helped murderers), and turned around to become one of the people he was trying to have killed. That doesn't happen through persuasion or emotional insight. It happens through the power of the Holy Spirit working through the death and resurrection of Christ.

This is made even more clear in the first paragraph of Romans 1, where Paul talks about the Spirit's power being used to raise Christ from the dead - and that this was the core of the Gospel he preached. Then you can read Acts 22 and see how Paul himself worded his own testimony when he preached it - demonstrating the radical change God had made in his life. This was the demonstration of the Spirit's power in his own life.

Why am I telling you this? Because that's what pulled my wife around.

- I stopped trying to convince her through logical argument. Women don't process information that way anyway.
- I stopped trying to coddle her emotions toward Christ. Yes, women are emotional. But they're also emotionally fickle and it would never produce a stable result.
- I stopped trying to get her behaving Christ-like in the flesh, as that would only ever come off as controlling and judgmental.
- Instead, I started demonstrating changes in my own life - things that God was doing through me that she could not have done and that I wouldn't want to do on my own. Only the Holy Spirit working through me could bring about the transformation that was happening, and I preached this transformation to her, letting her know

the ways God was changing me, and then letting her see those changes as I lived out my life.

She never made a declaration, "I'm a Christian again! You've convinced me. I see that God is real because of what he did in you." But suddenly she took a sincere interest in finding other believers to connect with. She wanted to be a part of a congregation to live alongside. She wanted to pray with the kids and teach them what the Scriptures say. She wanted to engage in spiritual conversation on a variety of subjects.

I can't say for sure what will happen with your wife. Some people simply reject the Holy Spirit or will blaspheme his work. But I do believe Paul's model is the best one. And John thought so too when he wrote Revelation - that the enemy would be overcome "by the blood of the lamb and the word of our testimony." The blood of the lamb is complete. Our testimony is all that remains. Let your testimony be what inspires her rediscovery of Christ and transformation into the Kingdom, if she has not otherwise wandered off too far.

On a separate theological note, I agree with your distaste for saying "she never was." Calvinists define salvation as someone whose destination is eternity in heaven. By that definition, they're right that salvation can't be lost, because you can't be cast out once you're there. But by their definition, they can also never know who is saved and who isn't, so they play word games with saying, "Then they must have never been saved in the first place." As a technical matter under their own definitions, they're correct.

But most other camps of believers (which make up about 65% of all Christians) use more pragmatic definitions of salvation. Perhaps the weakest is the "right standing before God" definition, which would allow a person to slide in and out of "salvation" as often as they callous their hearts and need to repent. My grandma believed this definition and described salvation as a fragile egg in the hands of a strong protector - if we left his hands we would crack, but it takes a lot to get out of his hands in the first place ... but that God actually had the power to put Humpty Dumpty together again. Yes, my grandma wasn't great at analogies, but that was her view.

A more common definition among non-Calvinists is that salvation is the forgiveness of sins. We are saved from those sins which are forgiven. This results in heaven. Once saved, those sins will never be placed back on us again. However, if one were to commit the unforgiveable sin, his forgiveness of other sins doesn't wipe that one clean because that one was never forgiven in the first place. Once someone blasphemes the Holy Spirit (the unforgiveable sin), there is no repentance. This view is consistent with Hebrews 6:4-6 and 2 Peter 2:20, which imply that there is no return once salvation is "lost."

Depending on your definition of "salvation," one can with complete accuracy say that it can both be lost and never lost. Calvinists, with their definition, are right that it can never be lost. Arminians, with their definition, are right that it can be lost. From there, it's a simple matter of deciding who has the better definition. Calvinists go for theological accuracy, whereas Arminians go for utility. The Calvinist view might be correct, but it holds no value if we have no standard for discerning who is or isn't saved. The Arminian view may have some theological loopholes that can't fully be reconciled, but it gives a framework for discernment as to who are true and false believers, and can provide security for someone struggling with their faith. We see Jesus speaking in both terms of theological accuracy and utility at different times, but on soteriological matters, I get the impression that Jesus errs on the side of utility rather than technicality. That's why he can say, "The one who obeys me is the one who loves me," and yet still be consistent with the rest of Scripture that says faith saves a man, not his obedience. Because Jesus is speaking out of utility rather than trying to make a doctrinal teaching on soteriology.

What is this subreddit's general view of E. Michael Jones?

2 upvotes · 30 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Let me preface, I know very little of the guy beyond what a quick Google search showed me. With that being said, as to all general requests about whether anyone fits within the RP sphere or not ...

I have found little to no disagreements between the things he says and what this subreddit preaches

You're going to find this true of a lot of people. Go read Black's Law Dictionary. You will find no disagreements between the things in that book and what this sub preaches. Why? Because they're hardly overlapping content at all - and when they do, it's legal definitions that merely help understand the words used in divorce courts. But I wouldn't recommend anyone go read Black's Law Dictionary.

Instead of looking for disagreements, what's more interesting is looking for overlap.

- We talk a lot about making disciples here, using a model Jesus gave us. Is the preacher talking about those things? From a quick Google search, E. Michael Jones has never actually written on this topic.
- Hypergamy is pretty much the core, underlying concept that makes up all RP discussion. Has he used that word? Does he teach the true nature of women? I did a search with his name and hypergamy and found no references to him even using the word.
- Fitness tests are one of the most common relational struggles that lead either to sexual fulfillment or divorce. Is he preaching on those and how to pass them? Again, no mention online of him talking about fitness tests.

The list could go on.

The point here is that it's easy to find someone who doesn't technically preach against what we talk about here. But that's because nobody is actually willing to talk about half of the stuff we bring up here in the first place. My guess is that if you asked him about his views on these types of things, the blue would come out pretty quick.

Don't confuse a counter-cultural person with a red pill person. There are plenty of counter-cultural thinkers who have genuinely interesting things to say, but who are still blue pill to the core - even ones who recognize basic biblical marriage roles. The red pill is not about being "alt-right" or "counter-cultural" or anything like that. It's about understanding the true nature of intersexual relational dynamics in the modern sexual marketplace - and on RPC we extend that to the spiritually reproductive marketplace as well. If they're talking about anything else, it's not red pill content. That doesn't make it bad content, it just means that it's off-topic and everyone will have a different reaction.

More Than Marriage: How churchianity has screwed up friendships too

2 upvotes · 30 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Right on. Relationships were formed by doing things together.

I think there's also some impact by the main stream's view of what I call "inclusionism" - the compulsion to make everyone feel included and no one left out. The "left the 99 to get the 1" parable being applied wrongly. In this case, it's the desire to make introverts feel included rather than intimidated by teachings on relationships, so they cater all teachings to introverts because the extroverts, at least on the outside, seem like they can handle themselves just fine without preaching that caters to them. The result is everyone being taught to become introverts.

Then we're confused why pew sitters are too scared to talk to new nonchristians.

More Than Marriage: How churchianity has screwed up friendships too

2 upvotes · 30 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Great response. No need to 50/50 split though. You can do both simultaneously. Some of my best spiritual conversations with guys are while we're out playing disc golf or going on a hike.

No Real Man Fallacy

2 upvotes · 29 July 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I fully get what you're saying, but there's still a good bit of content policing that goes on here, especially with anyone who ever gets labeled for concern trolling. Guys you (mods, generally) banned used to come to me for a time, for whatever reason thinking I had any sway here, complaining about being mislabeled as trolls or having their content removed.

When that was happening, I'd most often ignore them because I'm actually all in favor of content policing - particularly after bad content has been proven ineffective (I'll entertain any idea at first), and the world has already proven a heck of a lot to be ineffective. But as appropriate as this may be, it still means that there's some standard that's being held about what types of advice men are allowed to hear here, which puts guardrails around what type of men they're likely to become.

I mean, let's be honest. You say, "literally anything you want so long as you take ownership and it's congruent to YOUR values," but if some guy's values involve pedestalizing his wife's pussy because of some reverse dom fetish he has, and he writes a post about how great his marriage is because he serves her every whim and that every other guy should too ... that crap's getting taken down. It's not going to work for the majority of guys who don't have that kind of fetish. But putting guardrails around what works for the majority also means creating a highway between those guardrails to a particular destination that men who stay within those guardrails will all end up becoming.

So, on a philosophical plane it's easy to say, "We don't dictate what a real man is or isn't," but on a pragmatic level we all know that most people - even alleged "alphas" - are going to feel a compulsion to flow with the majority, and therefore adopt the inevitable result of staying within the guard rails as their ideal of masculinity.

To be clear, I'm not saying MRP needs to change anything about what they're doing or that any of this is wrong. I'm all for it - because the result here are a heck of a lot better than the results of any other sets of guardrails men can find in the world (at least insofar as reaching a secular population).

At the end of the day, if you take away the guardrails and tell men to come up with their own definition of masculinity, the majority will flounder around for a while and default to someone else's view. So, it's better to turn them into a dancing monkey for a time until they're stable enough to figure things out for themselves than just to give them the truth up-front. Incidentally, this is the exact balance Christians deal with on a spiritual level with the pragmatic reality of legalism compared with the theological accuracy of antinomianism - but that's too off-topic to get into.

My advice to those guys is, go out there and recognize pussy is abundant, and it's your choice to hand the keys to YOUR sex life over to someone else

I've noted the same concept on RPC periodically: that a guy can't possibly have a solid frame until he knows with genuine confidence that he could have another girl in his bed in a matter of hours if he wanted. Sexual dependency means a guy either has to abandon his sexuality (and therefore has no business on a red pill forum in the first place, becoming a MGTOW) or never be truly free from the frame of the one he's dependent on.

For me, this did not involve cheating on my wife, but did involve a lot of catch-and-release. At first my reaction was just, "This is cool. Girls are paying attention to me now." Great. But I didn't really internalize it until twice in a month, unsolicited, I had girls at a drive thru writing their number on my receipt based on a 2 minute interaction. That's when things shifted to realizing how easy it could be.

You can't, because you haven't experienced it

Ergo the thrust against mental masturbation. Admittedly, I didn't get that early on, having been more interested in theory than practice, and taking other people's word for it as the pragmatic side without experiencing it for myself. Having been on the other end, I now see the distinction, though it's subtle because it's not particularly

different from what I expected. But I know enough guys where it didn't come so easy that I can see why letting theory turn into expectation (i.e. covert contracts) would be dangerous.

my approach which is "You're free to do it my way, or you're free to fuck off. Your choice."

Right, but when no alternative forum exists to give men comparable hope, the practical reality is they're still going to have the same psychological perception as the first guy who says "No, YOU have to do it MY way."

It's like America saying, "You don't like #metoo? You want to live in a country that supports the feminist agenda? Great. Screw off." And the guy looks at every other country in the world and realizes the places without these problems are so much worse off in a myriad of other ways, so he doesn't take "you're free to fuck off" as a viable option, and therefore is internally compelled to conform to your standard - not because it's his standard or even a good standard, but because all the other options short of becoming a millionaire and buying your own private island and turning it into your own country ... well, they just don't work.

116 - God is a jerk.

2 upvotes · 25 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

it's our duty to explain why God is good

Why is that your duty? All you're doing is trying to help someone else rationalize our God with their definition of good - either by changing their definition of "good" to your own (which even still may or may not be God's) or by changing their view of God to conform to their definition. Both efforts are futile.

It's the "how would you feel if someone did that" point we were taught as kids.

Right. We all have this to some base degree - and it's not taught like you describe; rather, it is a lingering shadow of the way we were made in God's image. We didn't become the opposite of his image - we simply became a broken image. But I'm not sure how that changes the conversation any, other than to say that God has given us a conscience that even through our sinfulness gives us varying degrees of intuition of what God's definition of good might be. All the same, many people's consciences vary drastically to the point where only a few small core concepts survive - and even the example you gave that "we all know killing innocent people, or stealing from our parents is bad no matter your religion" is non-existent in several people. We know this no longer because we are human, but because we have societies that reinforce these basic principles so that we can't help but grow up without learning it. That is why we see extremely different degrees of crime in third world countries where these values are not instilled from birth in their people the same way they are in first world countries.

most people have enough basic humanity to know basic morality

Except for all those people groups we constantly hear about from various missionary groups where things like lying and stealing and killing are just commonplace events.

So. When someone judges God with a faulty world view, usually a good Christian answer is enough to change the Atheist's mind(hopefully) because most people already have a basic level of morals to know what you're talking about.

Correct, but you're still teaching them to rely on their own framework of morality to judge God. You're just hopeful that you can get them to judge him as good within that framework. Even if you're successful, it's still a faulty premise for viewing God's goodness in the first place, and therefore their faith is resting on sand.

As I often tell people: *If a person can be persuaded toward God through scientific evidence or argumentative*

philosophy, that same person will be persuaded away from God as soon as they hear more persuasive scientific evidence or philosophical arguments. Because the secular world relies on science and philosophy and God can defy both science and human philosophies, founding faith on secular sources is very sketchy. The secular world will almost always come up with a better argument to persuade them away.

We can't just throw human logic out the window

Except that's exactly what Paul did. In 1 Cor. 2 he talks about he he didn't try to convince or persuade the Corinthians to Christ, which would have been full of worldly wisdom, which cannot be a foundation for spiritual truth.

The Bible says "be wise as serpents and innocent as doves". To be wise is to use our thinking skills.

Right, but wisdom does not equate to apologetic rationalizations and use of human philosophies.

116 - God is a jerk.

2 upvotes · 25 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

So in that regard, if they use the word "jerk" or "evil", is only out of ignorance and not truth.

I think you're still missing the bigger picture here. You're trying to look at Scripture and classify God's actions as either "good" or "bad" and prove that God is on the "good" side of that line and not the "bad" one. When you do this, you're treating "good" and "bad" as judgments over God - even if he always falls on the "good" side of that judgment.

God doesn't have to prove that he's "good" to anyone's concept of what "good" means. He IS good. Period. If I come up with my own philosophies of what define good and evil and then say God is good because he meets that philosophical standard, what does God care about that? He's not beholden to my philosophies - or any other human's conception of these terms.

Accordingly, the terms "good" and "evil" as used broadly in the world are relativistic categorization systems designed to compare people to a communal understanding of the standards that separate those concepts. God has his own different standard for what differentiates good and evil - one that he created and is not beholden to, and which is much broader than we have yet to understand.

So, instead of justifying God's actions to any human's standards of "good" or "evil" by showing that the things he did in the Bible can be rationalized through apologetic philosophy, it's better just to disassociate the behaviors from stereotypical classification systems in the first place and just embrace God for who he is and live in the model he sets without regard for the social acceptability of living that way.

Words have meaning

I agree that words have meaning. But the word "jerk" does not mean "bad person." **Even Reader's Digest recognizes there are good times to be a jerk**, showing that being a jerk itself is not morally repugnant on a social level.

You're confusing the fact that moral repugnance often causes people to become jerks. But the fact that you can turn paper into ashes doesn't mean you must be able to turn ashes back to paper.

Why? Why change the definition of a word to fit your viewpoint when you can just find a better word?

Because that's not the definition of the word in the first place. Most people that I know don't hear the word jerk and assume the person is evil. They assume he exhibits certain character traits that are commonly found

offensive. This absolutely fits the definition of God and is the common understanding of the word.

Husband had an affair - seeking feedback

2 upvotes · 23 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Are you going to do everything you can to preserve this marriage or separate?

As you alluded to in your first comment here, the marriage is always preserved. It just becomes nonfunctional when people separate. To play semantics, a broken marriage when people stay together is *malfunctional*. Nonfunctional things don't work at all; malfunctioning things work, but not as they should. Then there's *dysfunctional*, which is the component of a system that causes a *malfunction* - in this case, they are likely both dysfunctional (as we're all sinners and broken people), but his particular dysfunction is what proximately caused the relational malfunction. Of course, he could say that her dysfunction is what prompted him to make his dysfunctional choices, and she'll say that his dysfunction in other ways caused her to have her dysfunction that caused him to have this other dysfunction and the cycle of blame goes on down the infinite rabbit hole until we get back to the very first sin.

This was a question during my class. wondering what others thoughts were.

2 upvotes · 13 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Nope. Eschatology is one area I've generally veered away from. So many people have asked me about that issue specifically that I did a one week personal study on it (so not much - maybe 20 hours total, only about 1 hour looking at non scriptural sources) and I concluded from my limited review that partial preterism was the closest to what made sense to me. That's about it.

So, what is mid-Acts dispensationalism?

MRP/TRP says it's my fault if my wife cheats on me. What does RPC say?

2 upvotes · 10 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Right. Fault isn't an either/or, and it really doesn't matter much anyway.

In law we use the "but for" test. "But for X, would Y have happened?" If the answer is no, then X is responsible. But this test can go back infinitely. "But for the sun rising, would my wife have cheated on me? No, because we'd all be dead."

So, the law came up with a concept called "proximate causation," which limits the "but for" test only to those things which are in a certain degree of influence. The most common concept is foresight. We ask: *would an ordinary person reasonably expect that X would cause Y to happen?*

- Would an ordinary person suspect the sun's rising to cause his wife to cheat on him? No. It's not a proximate cause.
- Would an ordinary person suspect that being a fat video game addict with no mission in life would cause his wife to cheat on him? Yes. It's a proximate cause.

Proximate cause = his fault. But at law there can be multiple proximate causes.

- Would an ordinary person suspect that a woman deciding to cheat on her husband would cause her to cheat on her husband? Yes. Her decision is a proximate cause as well.

We could argue that her desire to cheat was prompted by her husband's unattractiveness, and therefore that's the root cause. But we all know that women still cheat on even highly attractive men. AWALT. Celebrities get cheat

on all the time, despite being top-tier attractive. Hypergamy doesn't care.

So, worry less about who's to blame and more about what you're going to do about it.

Tag: [/u/dgd_mobius_centurion](#) - this is more to you.

I'm meeting her dad tomorrow. Any advice?

2 upvotes · 9 July 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Right, because most dads are too weak to tell a girl no to something she wants.

I'm meeting her dad tomorrow. Any advice?

2 upvotes · 9 July 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

This advice only makes sense if "yourself" is a really cool, impressive guy who any dad would want his daughter to marry - or if the dad happens to be even more of a nice guy than you are, so he is too weak to put his foot down to a crappy guy.

Prayer request #2 regarding the University of Florida

2 upvotes · 8 July 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Agreed. General requests for prayer - especially vague ones - violate Rule 4. They're not related to the purpose of this sub and ultimately do not lead to quality discussion. While prayer is great, there are a million other places a person can go to give prayer requests.

Curious about RP Christian denominations

2 upvotes · 8 July 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

There are no perfect denominations. I have been part of countless. Denominations I've been a substantial part of for at least 6 months include (accounting for overlap):

- Catholic (3 years)
- Orthodox (5 years)
- Presbyterian (10 years, and another 1 year later in life)
- Baptist (1 year)
- Non-Denominational (off and on, collectively around 4 years)
- Lutheran (3 years)
- Pentacostal branches (including AoG) (4 years, collectively)
- Methodist (9 months)
- Nazarene (6 years)
- Friends, Quaker offshoot (technically all my life, off-and-on for 16 years)

What I've found in all of this is ...

1. Every branch that doesn't compromise the Gospel seems to have received a clear revelation from God on a particular subject.
2. With regard to their revelation, they seem to get that concept better than anyone else. Nobody understands the

work of the Spirit and the use of the gifts better than the pentacostal branches. Nobody understands God's sovereignty and God's role in salvation better than the Calvinist branches (Presbyterians, Baptists, etc.). Nobody grasps the importance of sanctification quite like the Nazarenes. And so on. (I'm just going off the top of my head here, these statements probably need a lot more refining).

3. Every denomination takes their one great revelation from God and believes it to be so powerful that they interpret all of Scripture through the lens of that revelation. For the Calvinists, everything is interpreted through a sovereignty lens, so when there are passages that talk about man having a choice, they focus their lens even harder rather than admit that theirs isn't the only truth. Same thing with the Catholics and Orthodox, who grasp the value of history and tradition better than anyone. Yet they filter all of their theology through the lens of tradition, which leads them to several bizarre results.
4. Because of 2 and 3, every denomination has something to offer the others, but their lenses preclude them from offering it in a helpful or meaningful way.
5. In reality, it's as though each denomination is akin to a piece of the body of Christ. The pentacostals might be the tongue. The Cathodox are the memory center of the brain. The Nazarenes are the feet. Etc.

If you only ever study from one denomination, you're missing a lot of what Scripture says and digging yourself into one set of human interpretations of Scripture rather than exploring the full array for yourself. Be an Acts 17 Berean - don't believe something just because your denomination tells you it's true. Challenge it against Scripture. The best way to do that is to spend time with those who disagree with your interpretations, coming to different conclusions - not as combatants, but as allies who want to help you grow.

Get a full picture of God by examining the various truths scattered across the whole of his body. Learn to recognize the lenses that taint their ability to interpret the rest of Scripture. Accept that God is big enough that even apparent logical conflicts to our minds might be true of him anyway. Then you'll be well on your path.

Curious about RP Christian denominations

2 upvotes · 8 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Glad to hear you're figuring things out, brother. Let us know if we can help rebuild a foundation on Christ. Too many congregations and denominations try to make logical and philosophy their foundation, calling it "biblical interpretation," when they fail to look at the person of Christ and the model he set for us as the foundation. Watch what he does, not only what he says. Balance that as the foundation of your faith and you'll see things as Christ intended.

Don't Believe The Lie

2 upvotes · 8 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

You've got some good points here. Let me toss out a few things that crossed my mind while I read.

God did not create women to just go with their emotions or lack any discernment from right or wrong

Actually, that's EXACTLY what he did. Before eating from the tree of knowledge of good and evil, Eve lacked the knowledge of good and evil. She could not discern for herself right from wrong. She only knew what was right. She didn't learn what evil was until after she had done it.

Similarly, before she ate the fruit, Genesis 3 gives two reasons why Eve ate this particular fruit: it was pleasing to the eye and it was desirable. That is, she made an emotional impulse decision. The serpent likely knew this about how God created women and targeted Eve because of it.

The time will come to change our ways

It has always been that time. We have always needed to do this. But it won't happen in full or to any appreciable effect until we're in heaven forever. That doesn't mean we don't try now anyway. Sanctification still has value. But the real value of what you're saying won't be reaped until after Judgment Day.

it is a choice. Not nature.

So do you deny that the sinful nature is part of a person's "nature"? That's an interesting theological conclusion that I've never heard before. Please expand on that, unless I'm misunderstanding you.

Is the greatest thing you can do for a person to bring them to salvation?

2 upvotes · 8 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

As an intellectual exercise, yes. As a practical matter, it's impossible to know if someone is saved if you're not discipling them and seeing fruit flow from their lives. So, if you want to know that you have actually helped a person cross the line into the Kingdom, it's not enough merely to get them to say "the prayer." Tons of people say the prayer who aren't actually saved. You've got to keep discipling them beyond that.

Remember the parable of the fig tree. A living tree was growing inside the master's vineyard. The master recognized it as a living tree. But because it lacked fruit, he was ready to chop it down. Don't let your "converts" become the fruitless tree that gets chopped down. As /u/rocknrollchuck said, Judgment Day is the day this will matter most - not the day they said a prayer.

Jekyll and Hyde

2 upvotes · 2 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

What part of the world are you in?

Jekyll and Hyde

2 upvotes · 2 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Just curious: are you referring to "demons" in the sense of sentient beings or are you talking about "evil spirits" in the sense of evil dispositions people have that they haven't been freed from yet?

There's a huge conflict among different camps as to this type of phenomena and I'm curious how you take it. The last guy who talked about this stuff clarified that he didn't mean "sentient demons" as much as the other kind, which is why I always ask.

Jekyll and Hyde

2 upvotes · 2 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Very interesting. I'd be curious to see that - and especially any scriptural examples.

Meta Frame

2 upvotes · 2 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

This is an interesting reply.

the principles that govern attraction are the script

I wouldn't say this. I'd say they're more akin to the laws of nature. When a screenwriter puts together his script, he doesn't write in the script, "In this story, gravity makes things fall to the ground, and the sun is what heats the planet." He doesn't need to say them. They're a given. As difficult as it may be, a script *can be changed*. Laws of nature cannot be changed.

Laws of attraction are about as concrete as the laws of nature. They are just less understood by the general public than the scientific laws because there is virtually no unbiased scientific study done. [u/bluepillprofessor](#) used to talk about this a lot - that most "scientific studies" on attraction and human sexuality are done by Q&A surveys where women are asked questions. But a fundamental concept of RP praxeology is that *women don't know what they're attracted to*. They only know what they want to be attracted to. As a result, these "scientific studies" only reveal what women wish they were attracted to, but those results ultimately get a guy nowhere in the bedroom. Why? Because either the women were clueless about their own biological impulses, or they're flat out lying to make themselves look good or to make womankind look good.

RP is about figuring out what actually works, rather than what women say will work. Men experiment and share their results. This is very crude science, but science nonetheless. While one guy's field report about picking up 5 girls may not feel like much more than an anecdote, when the same strategies are applied over 30+ other guys out there initiating, suddenly we have a sample size sufficient to create a normal distribution and be considered scientifically reliable - and how much more when there are literally thousands of guys on TRP and MRP testing and reporting back.

That's a long way to say that laws of attraction are laws in which the script must operate, not the script itself. While I recognize that I may be tweaking what I said in my original post here (or maybe not, can't remember), the "script" is the way we are conditioned in society to believe we must function within those laws in order to achieve basic results.

In the case of intersexual relational dynamics, the "script" is: (1) meet a girl, (2) ask her out on a date, (3) have more dates, (4) figure out if you like her or not, (5) become exclusive, (6) when you're ready, propose, (7) get married. This is the pattern that everyone just assumes must happen in order to get married.

Highly conservative Christians created an insurgency script: courtship. (1) Find someone you like. (2) Become friends. (3) Hang out with other people a lot, never alone. (4) Propose one day. (5) Get married.

My sidebar posts on *finding the girl you can't keep yourself from banging* is another insurgency script. I'm reshaping the way that men get from single ---> married. I believe I'm taking God's script by using the Bible as my primary source material, whereas neither the dating nor courtship scripts are derived from Scripture (at best, they're influenced by scriptural concepts, and even their greatest proponents will often ignorantly begin with phrases like, "The Bible doesn't actually say much directly on finding a spouse").

how we orient ourselves around those principles is the narrative

Correct. Your narrative is the way you function as the director in your own life. It is your frame. The way you project yourself to the world around you. Society has a narrative it wants you to follow. If you live in society's frame under the social narrative, then you are taught to believe that dating is the best way to find a wife, that sex before marriage is perfectly fine, that women are underprivileged and need the protection of the marriage laws to help level the playing field, etc. These are all stories that are spun to rationalize the dating script we have today, which always ends in a state-endorsed marriage certificate being signed and filed.

Guys who know how to develop their own frame project a contrary narrative. They may still follow the script (i.e. the dating to marriage approach above), but perhaps their narrative is one of being a man in crippling fear of what marriage laws could do to him later (i.e. most MGTOWs and black pill guys), or a guy who wants to champion male supremacy by dominating women he dates (the angry TRPers), or the hopeless romantic who's looking for happily ever after (the BPers). These are all different narratives guys create for themselves. As you say, in a sense, this is how a man orients himself around the laws of attraction - at least as best he knows them.

Thus, one who rearranges his life around the primary mission of getting women to sleep with him, IS living in the feminine frame

Not if that's authentically his goal. The feminine imperative's goal with regard to men isn't to get them to become sex-crazed womanizers. That's actually another insurgency script. It abandons the social compulsion toward marriage by creating its own pattern: (1) hit on a chick, (2) have sex with her, (3) rinse and repeat with the same or different chicks. Marriage never enters this man's script in the first place (or if it does, it's not until this pattern has been vamped for dozens of cycles). The narrative surrounding this script is that such men should be condemned by society. A guy with a strong frame can live this script and yet spin his narrative to cause people to believe he is the exception to the societal narrative - and may even be able to persuade other men to become "exceptions" alongside him. He's not really an exception. He's just proven that a guy can be a womanizer and a cool guy without falling into the stereotypes (negative narrative) that society places around womanizers.

To step back, if the man's goal is to have sex with lots of women, he's not living in the feminine frame. He is trying to use his knowledge of the laws of attraction to accomplish his goals though. He created a new script that didn't involve marriage and wrote it using the same laws that everyone else's script uses. Then a narrative is spun around his script - either by society, which will frame him as an evil jerk, or by himself, which will likely be that he's a cool guy that women want. He projects himself as James Bond, whereas society would condemn him as it did Charlie Sheen. Two different narratives around the same womanizing script.

That's all I've got time for. Hopefully this sets enough of a stage to let you know how I'd interpret or respond to the rest of your comment :p

No Wife / Why Women Don't Need You / Do not marry her...

2 upvotes · 27 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I didn't call you ungodly - your words, not mine. I merely contrasted the double sided nature you present. Note that when you mentioned sleeping with this girl, there was no indication of repentance. You were bragging. And to a girl who got you to start DEERing like crazy.

As for judging sins, when there seems to be no indication of repentance, there's certainly room for judgment. 1 Cor. 5 and all. That's the liberals who pretend Christians should never judge.

Red Pill Church site?

2 upvotes · 23 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I think you mean congregations. Oh, and you mean lots of blue pill, feminized *people* in those congregations.

The Second Kiss of Death

2 upvotes · 20 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

My expectations are hardly that high. But I track with you. Of course, jeans *can* be sexy. Just depends on the type of jeans, how they fit, etc. Same with a tshirt.

The Second Kiss of Death

2 upvotes · 19 June 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I guess I'm not following. I'm living proof that a woman will jump off a cliff if she sees an attractive man doing it. With limited moral exception (my wife's history of extremist piety in our faith and psychological harm from childhood does have lingering effects), my wife will submit to whatever direction I take her, and then rationalize her own reasons for wanting to do so too. I still can't tell if that bit is to make her feel like she's her own woman when she follows me, or if it's her way of internalizing the way I lead her to be self-motivated about it too - but heck, results are results. All the same, this is coming from a guy who was once told, "I'm not attracted to you, and I never have been, even when we were dating and first married," and "ILY, BINILWY," and a host of other similar things just a few short years ago.

Are there a few exceptions to the rule? Sure. But I thought I was the exception - and in my first post here, I was even told by the guys here on MRP that I was the exception. Turns out we were all wrong and AWALT.

Her understanding the "whats and the whys" isn't important, necessarily. She just needs to be motivated to change, then have someone push her to get going.

The Second Kiss of Death

2 upvotes · 19 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Excellent summary/re-interpretation. Try it out for the next 30 days and write a post on how this goes for you.

The word "nice" comes from the root word "nescire" in Latin, which means "to not know"

2 upvotes · 19 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Haha, indeed. Honestly, "patriarchy" has changed definitions so many times that I don't even know what it means anymore. Is it a system of leadership in the home? An estate planning and probate framework? A governmental system? A scheme by men to suppress women's rights? I guess it depends on who you talk to.

I have fallen in love with my step sister and need advice

2 upvotes · 18 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

More to [/u/Torn4christ_24](#) - my comment on fasting is here:

https://www.reddit.com/r/RPChristians/comments/blrqw7/share_your_experiences_with_fasting/emr4wi/

Under the principles in there, OP's cause is certainly worth fasting over - if he is genuinely sincere. If he's trolling or just wants someone to talk about his struggle with, while secretly harboring the desire as a stronghold he has no genuine desire to let go of, fasting will do nothing for him. Sadly, from the comments here, I'm guessing he's in this latter category. I'm unpersuaded that OP actually wants to change his desires.

No doubt, he thinks he does. But this is the power of unfulfilled ONEitis - that you believe you want to move on, but your *emotionalist* nature loves the feelings and attention that the ongoing dilemma brings. You are right to point him to developing a mission because ultimately, if he really does want to move on, this is the only thing that's going to get his head on straight.

On Marriage And Mission

2 upvotes · 13 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

2/2

legal contracts rather than marriage contracts

It's certainly a better option, but it falters in that it only addresses the finances - and not even all of that. The state will **NEVER** give up jurisdiction over the custody of minor children, which includes the financial support of those children. You cannot agree to arbitrate these rights away or to follow church laws instead of state laws over minors. So, if one party wanted, they could still take advantage of the state laws in custody determinations. Fortunately, most states, juvenile cases notwithstanding, have gender-neutralized their custody laws when the child is born as the product of a marriage. The issue you'll run into is that in your proposal, parties aren't actually married by the state, so all custody cases would become juvenile rather than domestic relations cases.

To simplify this, juvenile cases are custody cases involving parties who were not married at the time the children were born (in some states, conceived - yes, using conception is ironic in the face of abortion laws, but it's more about verification of paternity than validating the life of the child). If parties are never legally married - only "3.0" married, then all cases become juvenile cases. Juvenile cases are the primary stronghold of women because the default position of law is that the mother is the custodial parent until the alleged father can prove he actually

is the father. At that point, things start to equalize a bit, but there's still a heavy cultural push in favor of mothers even in juvenile cases, whereas this is somewhat eradicated by domestic courts in larger counties when custody is being decided pursuant to a divorce case. Smaller counties are a different story altogether.

we must recognize that men who opt out of marriage are not necessarily non-committal loafers looking to simply co-habitate

All of this, of course, begs the question: *how far are women willing to let this go?*

Yes, "that's living in their frame," blah, blah, blah. But it's a serious question nonetheless. Would the feminine imperative push to outlaw church-arbitrated marriage contracts? Or perhaps on a less institutional level, a social movement would react and women would simply refuse ever to get married in this 3.0 system that doesn't advantage them. Are the masses of men willing to go "civilized-MGTOW" to make a stand and prove their point, or do they want women so badly that they'll cave?

The thing is, men who properly understand hypergamy realize they're going to get the woman to cave if they're high enough quality. Men actually hold all the power - and we always have. Men have simply failed to recognize their power over female hypergamy, so they've squandered it and allowed women to take the lead. Red pill men, having recognized how to utilize hypergamy for their own purposes, have the ability to take that power and control back. But as long as the majority of the men in America remain blue, this type of shift to Marriage 3.0 will never happen because the weak men will cave before the women will - and they aren't going to be high enough value men to motivate the women to enter into a Marriage 3.0 arrangement in the first place.

So, if your proposal is to work, we've got to red pill all the men first. But by doing that, we're actually taking away the advantage of being a red pill men, making the competition in the sexual marketplace even more fierce. Right now, a red pill man can get pretty much any girl he wants. He is the prize and women will compete for his attention - top 20% and all. But if things flip and we can get 80% of men to be red pill, what does that do to the sexual marketplace? It's a bit of a catch-22 doing what it would take to get your plan mass-applicable.

[u/Bluepillprofessor](#) and [u/Rollo-Tomassi](#), your thoughts would be most welcome on the matter.

Tags in posts don't ping the user, so here's a ping to point them back to your post.

On Marriage And Mission

2 upvotes · 13 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

1/2

How did I miss the marriage 3.0 post?!? Life has been too crazy ... Also, tags in threads don't ping the person, only in comments.

MARRIAGE 3.0 POST

Christian men are effectively LARPing at Marriage 1.0 and are thus afforded no legal protections at all if their wife acts out in rebellion

Very true ... of any man who hasn't followed my advice for guarding against divorce rape. If divorce rape isn't a valid concern (which it shouldn't be for a man who leads appropriately), the authority can be real and not LARPing because she has no weapon against him.

is Marriage 2.0 even marriage at all?

Spot on. It's not - and we've often agreed here that there's a clear distinction between legal and spiritual marriage.

Ship of Theseus

You missed the best part of the exercise: that someone kept all of the original parts that were cast away, mended them, and rebuilt the ship with the original parts. Now who has the original boat? Theseus with his continually upgraded ship that he never left, or the scavenger who took his throwaway pieces and put them back together?

Each time a man says "I do" he is accepting that if his wife divorces him for any reason at all there is a likelihood of him:

If he is not wise in mitigating these risks, that's correct. But again, mitigation options do exist that can minimize all of this. Personally, I know for a fact that I'm divorce proof. Other guys can get there too. The issue is that most guys are not legally-conscious enough to caulk the edges of their ship, leaving room for it to sink if the waves become too big. But which ship is sinking: Theseus' or the scavenger's? ;)

Marriage 3.0 ... held accountable to these vows by the same community

Oh, you mean like when people got married in biblical communities? I think this looks like a marriage 3.0 because we're so used to assuming marriage as a state-sanctioned thing through recent history, but in reality, it'd be more accurate to say:

- Marriage 1.0 - What you call marriage 3.0. Vow before God enforced by a local community.
- Marriage 2.0 - What secular RP calls marriage 1.0. This is when the real marriage 1.0 was shifted to become a governmental institution instead of a community one. To make my point here: **even in the US marriage wasn't a legally recognized entity until 1913** and not until 1929 before all states had gotten on-board. That's right - the first 400+ years that Europeans were living on this continent treated marriage as a primarily private matter unenforced by the state.
- Marriage 3.0 - This is what you and secular RP call marriage 2.0, where the laws are less about what's right and more about "split the baby and move on to the next case."
- Marriage 4.0 - Doesn't exist, but this "next step" you're referring to as Marriage 3.0 is really a return to the true Marriage 1.0, which existed for millennia.

For this to have any effect whatsoever, the church has to become something costly to be excommunicated from

What a wonderful fantasy ;) You can, of course, have the state enforce arbitrated decisions presented to the court. It would just have to be clear in the arbitration agreement (executed when the couple gets married before the church) that the arbitrator is not bound by the state's laws, but the church's judgment and biblical discretion. Due to separation of church and state, the state court enforcing the decision of the church-arbitrator would be prohibited from re-evaluating the church's decision because that would involve the state interpreting church doctrine (a huge no-no in a number of cases, even into recent history), but they would certainly have authority to enforce the arbitrator's decision as-written, regardless of whether it agreed with the conclusion, as that would become a binding contractual arrangement subject to civil sanctions independent of marriage laws.

being banished from them is a costly thing not to be taken lightly. Evangelicals have much to learn from this.

Darn straight! This is one of the reasons I keep pushing the decentralized church model. As long as centralized churches congregations focus on getting people to COME to them (their services, their programs, their community activities, etc.), as you say, leaving one body means squat because another one is already pulling you

in, having no idea why you might have been kicked out of the first one. And if you're kicked out of 10, there's still another place ready to have you.

With a decentralized model, the leadership isn't interested in keeping people in the doors - it's interested in sending them out. As a result, if one of the 80% who aren't all that serious about following Christ is acting out, they have no qualms getting rid of the person because he/she is an unnecessary drain on their resources anyway. This is how most of the early church understood ministry, and it's how the apostles modeled it - and it's even the very definition of the word *ekklesia*, which we translate as church. That word was a military term at the time, referring to "a purposed gathering." It was what they would call the meetings where the generals would meet in a singular tent to discuss strategy before leaving the tent to carry out their purpose on the battlefield. Now we're inviting privates and petty officers to those meetings - not to teach them how to be generals, but because we can show off how big our tent meetings are. And then we wonder why we're not winning ground on the battlefield.

My point is: returning to a decentralized, disciple-making model adds value back to being part of a body. This can ABSOLUTELY happen even in today's churchianity climate, as I've seen it happen with a body near me, where continued participation in that particular body actually matters to people and excommunication is a big deal. Interestingly, it's also a network of house churches congregations and not a mass gathering. The issue is: as soon as you develop a community so tight that people would feel consequences for leaving, you get labeled as a cult.

Prenuptial agreements remove temptation from the women and preemptively defeat the incentive to divorce for monetary gain.

This is the exact same view I've been pushing since I first got my law license. You're not planning for future failure. You're disincentivizing either person from divorce by taking away the personal gains they could achieve by breaking the joint union. In many cases, the prenup is a marriage-saver, not a marriage-breaker.

I believe ~~pastors~~ congregational leaders screw this up because they're so used to the old statistics that men were the cheaters and women were left to take care of the house and kids while their husbands were screwing girls at the hotel. In this situation, a prenup would most likely make it easier for the man to leave his wife and kids to run off with the mistress. In that scenario, prenups certainly would facilitate divorce.

But in modern culture, most divorces are filed by women. I also did a study of over 60 cases (I think 67?) that involved infidelity. I found that about 70% of them involved the woman cheating on the man, not the reverse. None of the ones where the woman cheated involved a prenup. So, in this climate, is a prenup more likely to promote divorce or disincentivize it? The answer seems obvious.

Under Marriage 2.0, as his wealth increases his risk in getting married increases, acting as a disincentive towards marriage

You missed the more common reaction: men who are unconcerned with getting wealthy. A larger crowd than MGTOWs are the men who have decided just to give up on the American dream and put around with their lives. They still want girls, and will often find them, but they let the woman run the show, make the money, etc. so they have more time to play video games. And if she leaves him, what does he get to lose? He'll just hop on Tinder and find another desperate girl longing for attention. These guys aren't finding the highest quality women ... but heck, men aren't hypergamous, so they don't need to find top tier girls. Sex is sex to them, and if they can get a free ride for a while, why not?

Yes, Marriage 2.0 protects these men the same way it protects lazy and sexually disinterested women. As I've often said, we're really in a Marriage 2.2 or perhaps 1.8 (or 3.2/2.8 by my graph above) because things have changed since the 60s. The laws aren't gender-biased anymore. They're biased in favor of lesser-earners. By doing this, they are giving people an incentive to earn less, be lazy, irresponsible, etc. This is what Jordan

Peterson talks about when he says that all the privileges of being a man are being taken away, and then the world is shocked when we get these man-boys who aren't willing to keep bearing the responsibilities of being a man without those privileges.

Perhaps the prenup ... looks something like this

You're assuming the man is always the higher earner. In modern culture that isn't always going to be the case, including within the church. Plus, it's foolish for a man to limit his wife's income-earning capacity. Divorce rape aside, what if the man is injured and no longer able to work? Now you're on SSDI for the rest of your life, which isn't all that great. Not that women must work, but that their income-earning capacity should be cultivated anyway.

As for the specifics of these contracts, that would vary from couple to couple based on what they bring into the arrangement.

Based on what I know of red pill thought it seems like this sub recommending marriage over living as Paul did being single is illogical.

2 upvotes · 11 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Haha, makes sense. I thought you were encouraging MGTOWs to get married :p

The world we live in

2 upvotes · 10 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

There's definitely value in it. But I'm also curious about the biblical imperative here. Certainly the passages about sharing each other's burdens and confessing our sins to one another doesn't necessarily mean between the genders - as I know you've mentioned in other threads that it'd be inappropriate for a man to confess his struggles with pornography and masturbation to a single woman - especially one he might be interested in dating, right? And I think you even allude to this in your comment here.

But what about married people? This is where it gets tricky. Certainly Christ's bride should confess our faults to our groom. But is there a biblical case to be made for Jesus confessing to the church? He's perfect, so we really don't get to see that - but even if he wasn't, is that the model he would have set or not? Are there other biblical passages that give us clues on this point?

Who should disciple women?

2 upvotes · 9 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Fair enough, and I'm glad you can recognize this in yourself! But I would encourage you that beginning to disciple others (at least beginning with men) often IS the way you start getting your house in order. Read some of the stuff I've written on Matthew 12.

Here's one of my posts on the subject. The Matthew 12 bit is about half way in, "the solution" section.

Based on what I know of red pill thought it seems like this sub recommending marriage over living as Paul did being single is illogical.

2 upvotes · 7 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I'll have to ponder that one. I'm often too pro-single to wrap my head around a pro-marriage concept on the fly. While I despise their attitudes (either cry-babies or rage-stagers), I have a great empathy for the behavioral conclusions MGTOWs reach.

My gut reaction on taking advantage of their hard work is that they're incredibly effective at drawing a crowd of men who are dissatisfied with the status quo. I can't draw a crowd of that size on my own. But if they've done the

hard work for me - how can I infiltrate that crowd and "steer the ship," so to say, to derail as many people away from their hateful cry-babying and toward a "responsibility and authority" that is conducive to advancing God's Kingdom in some way? Maybe getting them married is an effective way of doing this - but it also seems like there would be so much resistance that it'd be somewhat self-defeatist.

Or perhaps you were being facetious/sarcastic - I honestly couldn't tell which way you were going with that :p

Based on what I know of red pill thought it seems like this sub recommending marriage over living as Paul did being single is illogical.

2 upvotes · 4 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I think you're right. The question I ask is: how can we take advantage of the hard work they're doing?

I hope this guy can get some advice from this sub

2 upvotes · 4 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Thus the important issue is: What are your lift stats?

I actually laughed out loud at that twist. Definitely the starting point.

I hope this guy can get some advice from this sub

2 upvotes · 4 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

This is key. I once asked a now-red-pilled pastor:

On Judgment day, would you rather tell God:

- Sorry, I didn't make many disciples. My marriage was falling apart. But I did manage to keep my wife from divorcing me!

or

- I did everything I could to fulfill the mission you gave me and many people standing here today are the fruit of my labor. I had a woman who helped me for a while, but she abandoned me. It would have been nice if that worked out.

To the first man, God will almost certainly answer: "You were responsible to my purposes for you. If she left, that would have been her rebellion against me, not yours. How do you answer for your own rebellion?"

To the second man God will almost certainly say, "You couldn't control her actions. I see no fault in you, yet she did not want a man living after me. While you may not have been perfect, ultimately she will account for her own choice, not you."

At what point do incorrect beliefs equal "wandered off into myths"?

2 upvotes · 24 May 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Obviously, these ideas are far from preaching a different gospel, but they also are denying fundamental truths about God's creation and are causing great harm.

A couple people have honed in on this, so let me simplify what I think they're trying to say by saying it's a different gospel.

God is God. We have the option to follow him or not. Some people decide they don't like God because his views don't align with theirs. So, they create their own ideology of what they think their god should really be like - they make a god in their own image. Then they worship that god and say it's the same God of the Bible. In reality, they are following a different god, but use the Bible to say they're worshipping the same God of the Bible.

It's like if my wife were to say she's married to RC and she describes RC as a muscular guy who is 6' tall, blue eyes, and has black hair. Well, the reality is that I have blonde hair. She says, "But remember that one time you had black hair?" and I say, *Yeah, I put on a wig for a play and had it on for all of 2 hours. That wasn't my hair, it was just a way I expressed my appearance for a brief, specific time for a brief, specific purpose.* But she still goes around saying that she's married to a black-haired man. Is she really talking about me at that point? No, her husband does not have black hair. She's talking about some made-up version of me that isn't real. The more deviating characteristics she builds into her perception of me, the less and less she's actually talking about me with others. Instead, she's talking about what she wishes I would be (no, my wife has never actually done this; it's just an illustration). When someone hears of me from her descriptions and finally meets me, are they likely to recognize me? Have they learned who I am at all or are they going to find I'm someone completely different from what they've been picturing all these years?

When we share about Jesus with others, they develop a perception of who he is and they worship that perception. When they meet the real Jesus on Judgment Day are they going to be able to say, "Yep, that's him. That's the guy I loved and worshiped all my life!" Or are they going to say, "Who are you? You're not at all what I imagined," to which he'll respond, *Yeah, because you were never actually worshipping ME in the first place.*

Where is the line between "Oh, sorry, I thought you had black hair" and "Oh, sorry, I never would have recognized you based on the description your wife gave"? I have no clue.

Whoever restrains his words...

2 upvotes · 20 May 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Good post.

restraining your words does not gain you greater information

I greatly disagree with this one. I have often played the strategy of staying silent until I learn what's happening in a room, acquiring knowledge through silent observation, before speaking up to accomplish my goals. This is wonderful in court. It works even better in social situations among people you don't know very well.

All the same, I like the concept - especially [u/OsmiumZulu](#)'s interpretive translation.

As for the last bit, it's absolutely possible to say something wise and insightful with no effort at all.

Whoever restrains his words...

2 upvotes · 20 May 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Props for referencing the Young's Literal. It's not often I see someone else make use of it - though it's one of my favorites for actual study and understanding.

Finding men to do life with

2 upvotes · 7 May 2019 · /r/RPChristians

If you can't find the types of guys you're looking for, raise them up. One of my best friends was a spiritually mature dough boy. I got him going to the gym with me and now he's mostly red pill'd and we share a lot of great conversations. Another guy I know was a very masculine guy already. I shared Christ with him, disciplined him, and now he's off disciplining other guys. We have great conversations about missiology and how to get the Gospel into the nations. And these are just two of the many guys I connect with.

Some people just won't budge. If they're not FAST guys (Faithful, Available, Saved, Teachable), it can take years to see any budging out of them. So, pick another guy and move on.

Not sure how? https://www.reddit.com/r/RPChristians/comments/8vui5/social_influence_and_defying_context/ - that's my explanation about how to build social influence.

See also: https://www.reddit.com/r/RPChristians/comments/awagpe/missional_social_strategy/

Wow Relevant Magazine is so cucked.

2 upvotes · 3 May 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Right on.

1920s were not an evolution of justice, but the beginning of our end. Take women's votes away.

2 upvotes · 2 May 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Yeah ... that's not true in the slightest.

Women Feeling Threatened by Hyper-Sexualized Social Media

2 upvotes · 30 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Thanks for sharing this!

Women Feeling Threatened by Hyper-Sexualized Social Media

2 upvotes · 30 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

This is good to hear. Thanks for sharing!

Women Feeling Threatened by Hyper-Sexualized Social Media

2 upvotes · 30 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

women policing their own hypergamy

Who said it would be a women-led forum? For-women doesn't have to mean led-by-women. I believe [/u/RedPillWonder](#) has stated an intent as a man to spearhead his writing for the female community, for example.

I think if we start seeing more women posting then guys will subconsciously start catering their posts

What you mean is: "Blue pill guys will keep posting from a blue pill mentality," right? A red pill guy isn't going to care whether or not women are posting here. He's going to post truth regardless. The only people who will be affected by a heightened feminine presence will be the blue pill guys - and that will only make it easier to parse out which is which and give appropriate correction.

More interestingly, though, is the fact that God clearly intends biblical men and godly women to co-exist side-by-side. If what you're saying were true as a general rule, heaven could not exist because the men in heaven would subconsciously start catering their speech to the godly women up there, right? Obviously that's not the case - and you could just as easily argue that heaven will be different because we'll all be resurrected. But isn't it one of the compulsions Jesus gives us to bring God's Kingdom to earth? "On earth as it is in heaven," as he prays - and why pray if we're not going to take steps in that direction?

I'd love a place where men and women could interact in a godly manner today on earth the same way we will in heaven - both sides fully understanding and living in light of their God-given imperative. The church is supposed to be that context, but it has historically failed. Should we give up too?

But perhaps this warrants a broader conversation. Bring it up on our next phone call. I'm free tonight.

Tag: [/u/rocknrollchuck](#)

Where can i add some dread?

2 upvotes · 29 April 2019 · [/r/askMRP](#)

You're just existing. Without a mission in life, you're boring. This is why your sex life is "not brilliant." There are a million options for what your mission can be - and many of them can incorporate the things you're already doing. But doing things just because they're things to do ... that's a waste.

In my view, having a mission is the single most foundational point of having a great sex life in marriage. Everything else flows from this.

https://www.reddit.com/r/RPChristians/comments/7vhh4m/210_mission_matters_nothing_else_matters_only/

Raiders of the Lost Covenant

2 upvotes · 22 April 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Good points here. Eschatology is certainly the area of Scripture I have studied the least, so I won't pretend to know more than you on this area. Off the top of my head, I get the impression from Revelation that Christ's return will occur in a pretty darn dark place in humanity's timeline, and that the return to godly national rule will occur after Christ's return - but I'm open to other views on this.

That's not to say that I disagree with your timeline - I just get the impression that we're in 3, not 4, and that 4 won't occur until after the pre-JD unfulfilled aspects of Revelation occur (noting that I've usually referred to myself as a *partial preterist*, not a complete one - and even that only by guesswork).

Ruined a relationship with female disciple

2 upvotes · 21 April 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

have become obsessed with apologetics

As a former master apologist, I empathize greatly with this passion, but this is also the most concerning thing in your entire post. Can you elaborate more on this?

I've realized that this was my first mistake by not having a female friend disciple her instead

Why is that a mistake?

I engaged in it because of my attraction to her and also I suppose because I'm generally a kind person.

Kind person comment aside, your attraction to her should be the very reason you engage in discipling a woman.

we've alternated every time since then.

Good, you're not a money bag to her.

asking if I can invite her to BJJ because she really wants to learn

She could have signed up for any class. She asked you because she's interested in you. This should be obvious, and you even recognize it, but start to rationalize it away.

I got hit with the feeling of missing her

You mean, "I got hit with ONEitis."

So (stupidly), I texted her saying I'm sorry but I don't think we should talk anymore

If you don't want to talk anymore, this isn't stupid. It's blunt honesty, which is appropriate.

she freaks out

Trying to regain your attention, after you've displayed that you're a high value man by rejecting her, which she reads as, "He thinks he can do better; I better pin him down now before I lose him to someone else." Dread.

Because I have no heart balls whatsoever, I stupidly responded "sounds good".

FTFY.

I'm regretting it because now I owe her a proper explanation.

You don't owe her anything.

- "Why did you say those things?"
- *Don't worry about it. That's my business.*

See how easy that is?

I was afraid of ruining the friendship/discipleship

What's your end-goal for the relationship?

What do you guys say about this?

You're missing many other options, the most obvious being:

D) Meet her and act normal, don't explain anything.

This reminds me of the episode of Seinfeld where George quits his job. He regrets quitting. So, he decides to show up to work the next day anyway and pretend like it never happened. Fun stuff. Go watch that episode - not to learn any life lessons or anything, but because Seinfeld is funny.

Lighten up. Figure out what you want to do before you go making decisions. You're sitting in an air port asking which plane you should get on without ever deciding what destination you want to reach. This is the heart of what [/u/WarriorJesus1915](#) was saying.

Post cut rebulking

2 upvotes · 19 April 2019 · [/r/askMRP](#)

I hadn't thought of increasing sleep. Good tip.

Quit being a fucking pussy

2 upvotes · 18 April 2019 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

Good stuff here. Solid foundation.

Struggling with enthusiasm and motivation with my faith

2 upvotes · 15 April 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

How awful would it be if the sincerity of our faith were as fickle as our emotional reactions to it?

3 John 1:4 says, "I have no greater joy than this: to hear that my children are walking in the truth."

I used to be emotionally bipolar about my faith. Now I have a consistent high/fire. I was often told in the church that it's impossible to maintain the fire burning all the time - that every flame is meant to land and every fire is meant to go out, or dim from time to time. I no longer believe this is true.

The solution is simply this: do what God put you here to do and he'll keep throwing jet fuel on whatever sparks or blaze he finds. What did he put you here to do? Make disciples. You start seeing the way your disciples spread the Gospel to others? That's where the emotions come. Try reading the first chapter of Philippians, for example, and marvel at the emotional reaction Paul had at the fact that his disciples were still carrying the Gospel forward to others. It's beautiful. That's how you maintain it - develop spiritual children and see the way they grow and reproduce.

Discussion: Is it okay to masturbate to thoughts of your wife?

2 upvotes · 15 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

That's a long story, but the sin in this verse is adultery. Lust can be adultery. Adultery is still the underlying sin.

This mistake can be significant. For example, some early church fathers concluded that because of this verse it's sinful for a man to lust even after his wife. When we recognize that adultery is the sin in the verse, this issue clears up - it's not adultery if it's your wife.

Discussion: Is it okay to masturbate to thoughts of your wife?

2 upvotes · 15 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Right. I was baiting out that answer. It doesn't say lust is sin. It says lustful intent is adultery in someone's heart.

What is the sin in this verse?

Are Christian women really different?

2 upvotes · 12 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Yeah, that's not the Holy Spirit then.

What's your perspective on tunnel vision within the context of dating?

2 upvotes · 8 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

While ONEitis may not be your problem right now, [my post on ONEitis addresses your questions here](#).

Discussion: Is it okay to masturbate to thoughts of your wife?

2 upvotes · 6 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

1. Good questions. Same analysis applies: is it prompted by faith and does it glorify God or have the impact of decreasing your sexual expression toward your wife?
2. Good questions again. Sometimes scratching my balls is as good as getting off. I don't know where that line is, nor does the bible tell us. That's why I don't think types of physical pleasure is the rubric God uses, but the questions above instead.

not about the physical act at all, but the heart behind it

Completely agreed. The problem is that we use our own metric for deciding legitimate heart motives and not. Isaiah 64:6 says that even the best things are viewed as filthy rags to God. Similarly, Jesus says that loving our family members can disqualify us from being called his disciples and that we should hate them instead. Nuances

aside, how do we go about interpreting these passages other than to conclude that God's standard for what defines a good heart and good motives is different from ours?

So, if I rake my neighbor's yard because I love her, I might feel justified for my good deed, but if it had nothing to do with the fact that God loves her or that it can advance the purpose for which God saved me (i.e. because of my faith) then even that seemingly good motive is repulsive to God.

So, while I agree with you, we must be extremely careful about how we go about assessing the validity of our motives, as common sense morality doesn't cut it in the age of sin.

Masturbation when your wife withholds: Go, or no-go?

2 upvotes · 6 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Interesting. The way you talked, I was expecting the other answer. Good stuff all the same! Thanks for clarifying.

What's so special about Jezebel that she gets her own set of characteristics named after her? Why don't we say all the people addicted to coffee have the spirit of Voltaire? Or all racists have the spirit of Jim Crowe, founder of the kkk?

Masturbation when your wife withholds: Go, or no-go?

2 upvotes · 5 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

It doesn't seem esoteric at all. It's actually a line of theology that I have studied a lot - much of which I agree with. And there are many more spirits I could name than Jezebel's.

I just don't see value in giving more credit to demonic forces than they deserve, so I only call out a spirit for what it is when it's plain what I'm dealing with. Generic behaviors don't warrant naming spirits, and sexual denial coupled with female rebellion is a generic behavior today ... not to mention the Jezebel spirit is usually associated with sexual promiscuity, not sexual aversion.

Discussion: Is it okay to masturbate to thoughts of your wife?

2 upvotes · 5 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Couldn't God have created the male body so that sexual stimulation could only occur through pheromones, which would require a woman's physical presence? Or that ejaculation is only possible through chemicals found in a female vagina?

Isn't it at all telling that God didn't create the world this way?

I honestly don't know ... just questions that imply a different conclusion.

I didn't understand your first question though. Are you asking if the Father/Israel relationship is identical to the Christ/Church relationship?

Masturbation when your wife withholds: Go, or no-go?

2 upvotes · 5 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

"let's have sex" - "No."

She interprets this as a question, even if it's not asked. This is particularly true if you're leaving time for her to respond to your words before initiating further. That response time is where she thinks: "He wants me to tell him whether or not I'm okay with that," which her hamster interprets as an implicit question. My guess is, at least subliminally, that's actually the way you intended it too.

Even when I point out, "hey, this is withholding"

Less talking. While I appreciate the way you're trying to defend and rationalize your approach to sexuality, and you're doing the same stuff that I used to try that I thought would work, this is fundamentally an attraction issue, not a matter of learning how to initiate better.

Initiation only works if the underlying attraction is already there. Talking too much decreases attraction - especially if it comes off as butthurt.

Discussion: Is it okay to masturbate to thoughts of your wife?

2 upvotes · 5 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

That brings up some good lines in the conversation that I forgot to mention. I definitely should have gotten into the issue of how some people can use it as a replacement for intimacy.

I just saw an episode of Curb Your Enthusiasm where Larry's wife tries to initiate sex and he turns her down because he had already masturbated. That would certainly be problematic.

Good thoughts all around.

Masturbation when your wife withholds: Go, or no-go?

2 upvotes · 5 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

My answer was too long for the comment box. I'll make a separate post of it so as not to derail the topic of this conversation in your thread with some of the nuances I bring up.

Materialist Hypergamy in the Church

2 upvotes · 5 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I'm not aware of one, but I'm starting them. Start by reading the book. It's not perfect, but if you can filter out the bad, the good is a type of good you won't find anywhere else. Once you've read it, hit me up again and we'll chat.

Materialist Hypergamy in the Church

2 upvotes · 4 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

"Be realistic, brother. We're doing God's work in this building. Look how many people are showing up to Sunday services because of the way we have stewarded our finances! Look at the capacity our social media marketing team has to reach people all over the internet with the love of Jesus! See how the classes we teach in these rooms are imparting biblical theology to those who didn't know the Bible before! Be realistic about budgeting - when you have this many people who want to know Christ and learn about him from us, that comes with a lot of expenses. We must pay staff to meet with the people, train leaders, run ministries, administrate logistics, etc. We must have a building to accommodate these people and programs. We must have equipment for the worship team to play to help people build an emotional connection with Jesus on Sunday morning. These things aren't cheap."

I've had this conversation dozens of times. I'm with you, brother.

My red pill pastor calculated recently that based on our annual budget and the amount that is specifically allocated toward Sunday services, which he pro-rated for things like our building mortgage, the amount of hours the staff spends preparing for Sunday as compared with other activities, curriculum for kids' ministry, a pro rated cost for the ration of how we use our lighting and sound equipment on Sundays as compared with other times, etc. - he came up with \$17,000 per week. And we're a church of only 750-ish people - not a mega church.

He then suggested: "I wonder what I could accomplish for God's Kingdom if I trimmed away the building, the staff, the stage lights, etc. and allocated \$17,000 every week to people who would take the Gospel into the community - how much more effective I could be."

I, of course, noted that without the building you wouldn't get the same level of funding. You might get 1/10 of that through personal fund-raising. "Even with \$1,700/wk, that's almost \$90,000 in a year. I'm still sure I could do better." I agreed. He was right.

Imagine if every congregation adopted this mentality - and the level of tithing remained the same. Instead of tithes going to centralized leadership cores it was spread out through a network of decentralized hubs, each leading their own ministries where they have been called - people from one end of the church funding those in another, distributing the wealth from every tithe to wherever there was a need ... it almost sounds like the early church.

If a woman is designed to be a helpmate, then is she destined to be married?

2 upvotes · 4 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Good stuff, brother.

Something to mull over: you used the phrase "relationship with God" (or some people say "relationship with Jesus") a couple times. Are you aware of any times in the Bible where it talks about having a personal relationship with Jesus?

I'm not saying it's bad - and there are certainly phrases that imply this as **A** way we can interact with Jesus. But the *relationship* we have with Jesus is never the emphasis of Scripture. That's a concept that was popularized as a soteriological emphasis for the church several decades ago when humanity switched from a duty-model of society into a relational model.

In the early 1900s, for example, it was understood that every man and woman owed a duty to his country. This mentality had been true of most societies throughout time. As our country became more "progressive," we abandoned a corporate social duty and focused more on our feelings and relationships. Instead of owing anything "to crown and country," as some say, we started caring only for those in our immediate social sphere - those with whom we had actual relationships.

Psychologists shifted from a model of practice that focused on the corporate good and integration with society into a model of counseling and understanding human nature that relies primarily on individual relationships - friends, family members, teachers, employers, etc. and making sure that these personalized relationships are healthy.

Even worse, the shift wasn't just about learning how to interact in healthy ways within that relational network: it was more about feeling good and whole despite the pressures created by that relational network. Rather than helping patients learn how to be high-functioning employees, effective parents, and capable spouses, the counselors taught them how to cope with a boss who isn't happy with their performance, children who are disobedient, or the stress of a nagging wife.

As society shifted away from corporate integration model for communities and toward a relational model, the church followed. Instead of recognizing that we have a vital role to play in God's Kingdom and that our duty to our King is our first priority, we were trained to believe that *relating with Jesus* was our highest priority. "Yes, Jesus has things he wants you to do, but you must have a loving relationship with him first." In reality, Jesus says, "The one who has my commands and obeys them is the one who loves me" (John 14:21). In Jesus's view, where is the emphasis? He is saying that one cannot claim to have a relationship with him if they're not living out his purposes. That is the emphasis. That is what defines the relationship.

Yet this is not what the church teaches. We are taught that having a relationship with Jesus is about:

- How he makes you feel
- Not doing anything that would hurt the relationship (i.e. sin)

- How much time you spend with him in prayer
- How many Bible passages you read
- How passionate you are during worship
- How many conversations you have about him with your small group
- How many sermons you listen to, and how deeply you listen

So, when Jesus says, "Go, therefore, and make disciples of all nations," and we sit around praying, singing kumbaya, and reading our chapter a day - what are we to make of this?

That's not to say that any of these things are bad. Certainly having a relationship with Jesus is both possible and good! I encourage all people in this. But when we mistakenly assume that the relationship is the primary goal of our faith, we make a grievous error and become derailed from the things that Jesus actually intends of us. It's a clever ploy of the enemy, getting us to focus so much on how we feel about Jesus and not displeasing him lest we ruin the "relationship" (i.e. sinning) that we forget the things that Jesus and the apostles modeled as the true primary focus of a believer's life: growing God's Kingdom by making disciples of all nations.

Imagine a husband telling his wife the family mission and she says, "That's great honey, but I really just want a relationship with you. Let's focus on the relationship. I love you so much. Don't you love me? Let's spend lots of time together. Let's cuddle in the living room to netflix and ice cream every day. Let's go on vacations and enjoy each other's company wherever we may be. What a lovely relationship! Sure, your mission matters, but our relationship comes first ... and if there's time and we feel like it, we'll address the mission part together. But you're going to have to be the one to lead in that because my primary focus is on enjoying our relationship."

For most men, this is life. This is reality. That's how women think - and as the bride of Christ, that's the mentality the church ends up in too. We're so relational-focused and stuck in the female frame of mind that we have forgotten what it means to be men for Christ. We are no longer Christ's soldiers (2 Timothy 2:3); we're his self-entitled, bratty, nagging wife who just wants to feel good about the *relationship* all the time.

Okay, I'm done rambling ...

If a woman is designed to be a helpmate, then is she destined to be married?

2 upvotes · 4 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I think we're agreed. The only place we may differ is the consummation. For those of us living the mission of Christ, the marriage is already consummated. We're don't have to wait until heaven. We're just in a long distance marriage right now, waiting while our groom prepares a place for us to move into.

Incidentally, look at all the idolatry the church is prone toward in our long distance relationship, the same way a wife is prone to other lovers when she's away on business without her husband. While the husband's spirit may be with her, the absence of his physical, manifest presence leaves room for her to look elsewhere, testing the merit of her faithfulness to her man while she does what he sent her to do. So is the condition of the church.

If a woman is designed to be a helpmate, then is she destined to be married?

2 upvotes · 4 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I think we're agreed. The only place we may differ is the consummation. For those of us living the mission of Christ, the marriage is already consummated. We're don't have to wait until heaven. We're just in a long distance marriage right now, waiting while our groom prepares a place for us to move into.

Incidentally, look at all the idolatry the church is prone toward in our long distance relationship, the same way a wife is prone to other lovers when she's away on business without her husband. While the husband's spirit may be

with her, the absence of his physical, manifest presence leaves room for her to look elsewhere, testing the merit of her faithfulness to her man while she does what he sent her to do. So is the condition of the church.

Are we servants?

2 upvotes · 3 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I'm completely dumbfounded that a day has gone by and nobody has referenced Mark 10:45 yet - "For even the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve."

God is not a servant

Jesus was a servant. Jesus is God. God is a servant.

[/u/Deep_Strength](#) addressed the underlying issue, though. There's a difference between serving and being subservient.

I did and will continue to lay my life down for her and sacrifice

This is what concerns me a bit, though. Jesus didn't sacrifice for trite things. There were countless more people who could have used his healing, his teaching, his provision, etc. who he simply did not sacrifice for. Instead, he withdrew to spend time with his friends. Why? Because his mission mattered more. His ultimate sacrifice on the cross was not merely a sacrifice for our sake - it was the very heart of his mission for being on earth in the first place.

Don't get hung up on "I must sacrifice for my wife." We sacrifice for Christ, as a bride ought to do for her groom, as we are the bride of Christ. The husband sacrifices for his mission, which in turn benefits the bride, the same way Christ's sacrifice on the cross was for his mission, which benefited his bride.

No more talk about willy nilly "I must sacrifice for my wife" garbage.

It's also somewhat ridiculous to act like making her a cup of soup or picking up medicine at the store is somehow a sacrifice. And then we talk about Jesus' sacrifice on the cross, as if somehow we're talking about the same thing. That's not a sacrifice. That's just being a good steward.

In biblical times, women were their husband's property. Not politically correct today, but consider the interpretive framework here. If a man's donkey was sick, would he refuse to provide it medicine and feed it? "I'm not my donkey's servant!" No donkey-owner would consider that serving his donkey. He considers it taking care of his donkey.

Your wife isn't a donkey, but the concept applies: taking care of her isn't some high and mighty form of sacrificial service. It's just common sense. This kind of misunderstanding, as your friend seems to be having, is why the secular subs started calling people autistic. The idiocy makes me literally cringe right now, if that's how people are interpreting what they read here.

Tag: [u/rocknrollchuck](#) [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) - is our content really that mute on common sense matters that we have to have posts like this? Do we need to have a sidebar post on exercising common sense?

3 Year Girlfriend with Sexual Past

2 upvotes · 3 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

This post screams of a blue pill ideology. You might be trying to sprinkle some alpha/red on your life, but if you're doing it to achieve your blue pill goals, there's a more serious problem in you than in her sexual past. Here's the most concerning phrase in the whole post:

My number 1 thing is I just want a happy marriage and never have a divorce.

First off, marriages can't be happy. You can be happy. She can be happy. You can't control her. You can control yourself. But "the marriage" doesn't have feelings. What you really mean to say is: "I want to be happy when I'm married." But let me ask this:

- Are you happy right now?

If you're not happy now, you won't be happy when you get married. Marriage doesn't make people happy. It is not your source of joy.

Second, you can't control whether or not you get divorced, unless you find out before it happens and you imprison or kill her before it happens (don't do that). If she wants a divorce, you can't stop her - and if you maintain these blue pill ideologies, she's going to fantasize about divorce someday, no matter how sweet and godly you think she is now. This is a fact. What you're vetting for isn't someone who isn't like this, but someone who has the ability to control that impulse when it comes. Her degree of self-control here seems to be incredibly lacking.

Let me emphasize: self-control is a spiritual discipline. We are taught to learn self-control after salvation. It is not something that automatically happens when someone is saved or repents. Her past WILL repeat itself unless she develops the art of self-control. The fact that she hasn't had sex with you is not proof that she has developed self control. You're committed to avoiding sex before marriage, so there's nothing for her to control - either you've got it under control or there's just no situation coming up where she'd need to exercise control in the first place. Get her in a relationship with another guy who's pressuring her to have sex, totally alpha, rippling abs, and who she believes she's in love with - will she have sex with him?

Third, why are you so committed to pursuing marriage in the first place? This is a HUGE red flag for me. I say that not just from a broad male perspective, but if I were a woman, that would be a huge red flag for me. You're rightly concerned about her sexual past, but she should really be concerned about your idolization of marriage.

What's your mission? You've given us nothing about that here.

What are your stats? You haven't mentioned them.

How are you doing on maintaining abundance? No indication of any at all here.

How is she demonstrating her attraction to you? I'm not seeing anything here.

This is a recipe for a trainwreck. You're going to end up married to a girl whose primary experience with sex is feeling guilty about it. You're her safe bet. Her beta bux. As long as you maintain this blue pill ideology that marriage is some wonderful thing that you can't wait for, you're going to keep being beta. Sprinkling alpha behaviors on it will not solve the underlying problem.

Should I marry this girl or am I doomed at having a[n un]happy marriage

DO NOT marry her. You are doomed at having an unhappy marriage. But this is not because of her sexual past. As [/u/weakandsensitive](#) said, most girls by age 24 will have had sex already. You need to be looking much younger.

The real reason your marriage will be unhappy is twofold:

1. You're holding on to blue pill ideologies that will never be met. As long as you have these fantasies in your head, your marriage will suck because no wife - no matter how unicorn-like - will ever be able to live up to the fantasy, even if you think your fantasy is "realistic," as many guys often tell me. "I know she won't be perfect. I know we'll have hard times and get into fights. I'm okay with that. I still want to be married and believe that this will make me happy." This is the male hamster's finest. It has never run on that wheel so fast as when it makes up things like this.

2. The fact that your happiness in the relationship is so heavily influenced by her sexual past shows that you're investing too many of your emotions into her. Women are not a good emotional investment. If I put money in the stock market, I'm handing it over to a company in the hope that they will earn more profit with my money than I would. If they screw up, I could really lose out big - years of hard work can be shot down the drain. I want to make sure I invest with finance experts, not financial trainwrecks. Women are emotional trainwrecks. They can't even control their own emotions. Why would you ever invest your emotional growth and stability in them? Express emotions toward them, absolutely. But do not let them have control over your emotional state. That is a bad investment.

Until you drop the fantasy world you're living in and learn to develop your own emotional stability - not self-control over your actions, as she needs, but self-control over your emotions - you are not in a state to be getting married to anyone.

If you can develop that level of emotional self-control, accept your woman for the fact that she's a woman, and come up with an actual reason why you want to get married in the first place - a good reason - then maybe ... just maybe, you'll have a shot at moving past this issue and a chance at being happy.

I can't end without addressing this either:

I feel like the Christlike thing to do is to forgive her

[/u/rocknrollchuck](#) addressed this from a different perspective.

What do you have to forgive? This is something of an absurd statement. Were you married to her when she had sex with these other guys? If not, then she didn't sin against you. Heck, David was married when he had sex with Bathsheba - and she was too, and he murdered her husband (one of his best friends), and this all got their baby killed ... yet in Psalm 51 David says, "Against you Lord, you only have I sinned."

This is **NOT** a forgiveness issue. This is a standards issue.

- You have a standard of wanting your wife to be a virgin.
- She does not meet your standard.

It's that simple. Either you're going to lower your standard because you're so emotionally invested in the relationship that you can't get out; or you're going to change your standard because it's not realistic for most attractive women in their mid-20s; or you're going to maintain your standard and let her go. Do not let your hamster convince you this is anything other than a decision about whether or not to lower your standards.

Women always try to frame these issues as forgiveness issues. Why? Because it's so easy to persuade men that the noble thing to do is to forgive. If they can characterize it as forgiveness, they can pressure you to agree to forgive, then they can trick you into overlooking their faults. It's devious, but it has been going on for a very, very long time. In reality, if she didn't commit any sin against you, it's not your issue to forgive.

I had one guy argue: "You're right, she didn't do anything against me when she was with those guys. But she did lie to me about it by not telling me about it for a long time, pretending she was a virgin. That's the issue that I must forgive." That's fine. But the focus of the conversation has changed at that point. Now she's a woman with a sexual past AND a liar. You can forgive the lie. You can choose if you want to marry a liar or not. But that still doesn't address the sexual past aspect. Forgiving her for lying to you doesn't eradicate her sexual past or mean you must change your standards.

3 Year Girlfriend with Sexual Past

2 upvotes · 3 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

you may risk not finding another Christian woman to marry

That only exists if OP lacks abundance. This is a hard-core scarcity mentality. If OP actually has this risk, he's not in a good place to be getting married in the first place.

3 Year Girlfriend with Sexual Past

2 upvotes · 3 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

How many other "amazing women" do you have in your life? [u/redwall92](#) is hitting the nail on the head in this post.

If a woman is designed to be a helpmate, then is she destined to be married?

2 upvotes · 1 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

No twisted hermeneutics. I don't forbid marriage, and I assume that 99.9% of men will get married - and I've created a sub here that aims help men enjoy and be grateful within their marriages, just as I am also married. I'm not sure of any place I've run afoul of this passage. On the contrary, this passage reaffirms me in everything I'm doing.

You must recognize, though, that the same author wrote 1 Cor. 7. We must take Paul's writing together and not in isolation or presume more than I mean.

If a woman is designed to be a helpmate, then is she destined to be married?

2 upvotes · 1 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

[/u/Deep_Strength](#) gave the best answer here so far, but maybe I can add some clarity.

In a pre-Gospel world (i.e. before Jesus died, before we received the Holy Spirit) women were made for physical marriage to men on earth. In this sense, yes, every woman was designed to be married to a man, with limited exception (and I'm not even sure I could name any - only that I leave room for the possibility).

But this was never the end-game. Physical marriage in the old testament was always meant to be a parallel to the church's spiritual marriage to Christ. The physical marriage was never the actual goal; it was just a tangible example to help us understand the spiritual reality when the time would come for it to be made known. That time was when the Holy Spirit came and began teaching us the true spiritual meanings of everything in the old testament and everything Jesus did during his time on earth.

God's intention that all women be driven toward physical marriage was meant to foreshadow the way that the church was intended to be driven toward Christ - and that all people who would be Christ's bride (even the non-Christians who are not yet part of the church) should feel an innate longing to become a spiritual bride to someone, ideally Christ. This longing for marriage in women is meant to emphasize the way we should long to become one with Christ.

Note that for men this is different. Christ does not need us. He has no compulsion toward us. That is why man was not made for woman - men were not destined to seek marriage the same way women are. This is true because Christ doesn't need the church. He innately wants the church and desires to work through the church whenever possible, but he doesn't need us, just as men are not destined to have an innate need for marriage - only a general desire.

In light of all of that, in a post-Gospel world where the spiritual truth reigns, we no longer have need for physical marriage in this way - whether man or woman. Physical marriage was the road map, spiritual union with Christ is

the destination. You don't need the road map once you arrive at the destination. You can see the destination on the map, but you don't fully get it until you're there - it's only a picture. You can't go inside. You can't walk around on it. It's just a copy, at best, as Hebrews 8-9 says. But once you get there, you do as everyone does: put the map away and enjoy the fact that you've arrived, doing what you meant to do once you got there.

In short, there is no biblical compulsion for women to get married today. As deep noted, 1 Cor. 7 makes that clear. The language encouraging men to avoid marriage is replicated almost word-for-word for women too. This wasn't Paul's effort to be gender neutral, as there was no compulsion toward gender neutrality in that society and he neglects gender neutrality in a lot of other places in Scripture where it would have been appropriate. No, he was calling out women specifically because he recognized the different theological points of origin that men and women live in and wanted to make it clear that this truth - that it's better to remain single - was to be for both theological positions: men's and women's.

All of that said, we are still biologically a product of the original design God gave men and women, which included the way God genetically coded us toward physical marriage. We can't just turn that off voluntarily. So, women will still feel compelled toward marriage, on the whole, even if there is no biblical imperative for them to seek physical marriage anymore.

Open Letter to a Christian Incel

2 upvotes · 28 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

This is an encouragement to read. Your background mirrors mine in so many ways, though my wife is only 1 1/2 months older than me ;)

I'd love to chat some more about why she's still contemplating leaving - whether you want to do that here or privately, or not at all, is up to you.

Open Letter to a Christian Incel

2 upvotes · 28 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Showing off isn't over-compensation. It's attractive.

I completely agree with your assessment. But some guys legit can't grow facial hair (I'm one of them). The biggest improvement guy 1 could make is dressing better. Even for the gym, form fitting clothes over a sleeve-rolled t-shirt would do him well.

But as I wrote in [another comment on this thread](#), neither of them has to be rejected on sight if they have the proper frame.

Rejection on sight is usually a guy stabbing himself in the foot based on what he thinks others must be thinking of them. His failure to continue (or even start!) the conversation only creates or affirms those beliefs he feared they had about him, whereas maintaining frame and learning social tact and conversational skills will actively change first impressions.

Open Letter to a Christian Incel

2 upvotes · 28 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

In addition to what [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) said, rejection on sight is usually the product of a failed fitness test. "Sorry, you're too ugly for me" is probably your worst nightmare to hear. Most guys will shirk away when they hear that. This is a weak frame.

The attractive guy says, "Too ugly for you? I'm too ugly for Hellen Keller. But I'm guessing you like getting a little ugly every now and then."

If you're really not all that ugly, she'll laugh and be intrigued. If she still isn't interested and is bratty, she may

follow-up, "No, seriously. Go away. I'm not interested." To which you respond, "You misspelled interesting ... which is weird because you were talking instead of typing. Either way, I'm interesting enough for both of us."

See how the game works? **THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS REJECTION ON SIGHT.** It doesn't exist. There are only guys who can't maintain a conversation in the face of rejection, which is a reflection of his need for improved frame and conversational skill.

FR & Two questions- admitting where you need to grow to your wife, and "STFU" vs "Butthurt".

2 upvotes · 28 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Dang, this sounds a lot like old me. I remember leading small groups and waiting until an hour beforehand to start preparing, my wife cleaning the house before I even got home from work, and then she'd get upset because she had to take care of the kids while I taught and led the discussion. Ouch.

In this scenario, she wasn't helping with my mission. She was managing distractions, which would have otherwise been an unkempt house, noisy kids, etc. I wanted her involved in the mission itself, not just to be an enabler so I could have my own mission independent of her. The mission was something we were to be united over, not something a trampled over her with, as she would often get so upset: "And I know I have no right to be mad because you're doing great things for God and I'm worry about who takes the kids to the potty." But I didn't want her to be a potty-taker. I wanted her to be helping me do those great things for God. That mission is what was meant to unify us.

Now, down to business.

First, you're compromising too much. You're showing her that if she whines enough, you'll give in and give her your way. If you want to procrastinate, procrastinate. It's unattractive. I'm telling you not to procrastinate. But I'm also saying that if your reason for not procrastinating is to appease your wife, that's a problem.

Second, don't worry about what she thinks of all of this. That's a sure way to get confused in your own motives. Either you want to include her or you don't. Either you want to manage your house or you want to let her run the home. Either you want to be well prepared or you prefer rushing it at the last minute. Those are all judgment calls you must make. A lot of guys will say, "But if I compromise now, she'll see it as weakness," like I alluded to above. Oh well. Don't worry about how she sees it. Just do what you want to do.

A guy once commented about how his wife kept calling him up to have sex and he'd always come running. "Isn't that her training me? Shouldn't I say no sometimes so she doesn't feel like she's completely in control of our sex life?" The answer should be obvious. If you want to have sex, have sex. It doesn't matter what she thinks about it. If she believes she's winning some power struggle over you because you compromised, let her believe that. The important thing isn't how she perceives you, but the fact that you're operating from your own frame. Her perception will come in time.

Simply put: if her complaint has validity and you want to grow in an area of weakness that she exposed to you, then grow in that area. Just make sure you do it because you want to, not because she told you. That's a huge difference. [u/EastThenWest](#) had some great points on this (good stuff, brother!).

Third, you handled the second situation well. At first I was getting hints that you were butthurt without realizing it, but with how things played out I'm willing to give you the benefit of the doubt on that. This is key, though: "I wanted to be quick to forgive so I grabbed her hand and said I forgive her and I love her." You addressed her feels rather than her thoughts. Right move.

I would appreciate your thoughts on how to balance acknowledging where you need to grow

Don't tell her about it. Just do it. Telling her is like a kid saying, "Mommy! Look, I got an A on my test!" when

she's your teacher and the one grading your test. Don't be that kid. She's not your mom.

If she's right, she's right. You don't need to defy her and be less godly just to prove that your wife doesn't control you.

and also practicing some dread and STFU without just acting butthurt or emotional yourself.

I didn't see any dread here, but maybe I'm just missing it. You left for 10 minutes and came right back. Pretty low chances that you were of sleeping with another girl or flirting at a bar in those 10 minutes. A 10 minute activity is also not code for "I have more important things to do with my time," especially when followed by, "Then when I get back I'm going to do exactly what you want me to do."

Remember that butthurt isn't just about displaying negative emotions. It's also found in a failure to display emotion at all - robot mode. Avoiding butthurt only exists by exuding a positive frame. You made a good effort to do this and it was well received. Offering to buy her something she didn't ask for might not be the best way to express dominance, but in Christ there is room for voluntary service - not when people demand your service, but when you do it of your own initiative.

Good post. I love reading these stories and what works/what doesn't.

Launching a business with a rebellious wife

2 upvotes · 23 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Excellent reply.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (03/20/19)

2 upvotes · 21 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Good point. That makes more sense. Just don't get stuck in the past or mistakenly assume that those were the "good old days." The "good old days" mentality ruins many people from the good days yet to come.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (03/20/19)

2 upvotes · 21 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

However isn't it ALSO is a reflection of how my own frame is being perceived by her?

No. My sister is a great example. She once told me, "Sometimes I like to ask my husband questions, even though I know he's going to say no. I don't know why I do it. I guess I just like hearing him say no to me." She doesn't have a negative view of his frame. She tests anyway.

Clearly I should reset and consider what make her think

Nah, as soon as you're in the business of trying to evaluate how she thinks, you're in her frame and heading down the wrong road. Figure out broader aspects of female behavior and psychology, sure. But if you try to hone in on what one particular woman thinks and why, you're going to get lost in limbo.

He posits that marriage will make all of your own flaws also known to someone else that will quickly, not always kindly, make them known to you.

Works real well for the 95%+ of beta guys, right? This statement is just plain false. While it CAN have that impact, most guys go through marriage still clueless of most of their flaws.

To be clearer, this dynamic doesn't point out a man's flaws to him; it points out to him what his wife doesn't like.

There's a huge gap there. Sometimes her distastes are due to actual sins and flaws that he needs to address, but this is not as often the case as her just nit picking him to conform him to her expectations.

when your flaws are made known

Yes, but don't assume your wife always knows what your flaws are or that she's always right when she says something is a flaw. My wife has been wrong about me many, many, many times - and it caused serious psychological harm to me until I started having independent sources in the church telling me, "No, she's wrong about you. I don't see those traits at all. You're not coming off that way to everyone - that's her own hurts, habits, and hangups that are causing her to project those problems onto you."

Not to say she's never helped me discover my flaws. She has. I'm just saying that wives are not the most reliable source of this information and that, in my experience, they're wrong more often than they're right because their expressions of your alleged "flaws" are self-serving as to their own expectations and not grounded in a desire to see you become more godly. While every Christian woman might say that "helping you become a more godly man" is her goal, her idea of a "more godly man" is often very different from God's idea - and usually she comes up with that motive after-the-fact and not before the criticisms start rolling.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (03/20/19)

2 upvotes · 21 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Interesting stuff, but I'm not liking this book so far.

Relive your "magic moments" because the feelings are still there, just dormant.

This is counter-productive, as I reference in 108 (I think. Whichever one is the life cycle of a relationship). You trek forward, not revert backwards. Indiana Jones didn't say to his girl, "Remember that one time we were in India? That was so fun. Let's ignore the Holy Grail and go back to India." India wasn't fun because of India. It was fun because of the quest they were on at the time. There always has to be a future purpose.

Your mate makes you angry by design to teach you to be more christ like. (purpose for fitness tests)

Now, let's not justify bad behavior. Sin is still sin. Disrespect is still disrespect. The fact that God may use someone's sin to teach you a lesson doesn't excuse their behavior and make it God's design that your wife ticks you off sometimes.

Natural dread implemented consistently over time will cause your wife to get out of her comfort zone all on her own.

Yes.

My wife was commenting on her BMI recently, so I suggested she use a body fat calculator. I pulled one up and she was pleased that she was on the low end of normal, moving toward the "fit" category. Plugging my stats in lists me in the "fit" category. This was a bit shocking to her, as she saw herself as in better shape than me because she's thinner than me. She didn't realize the sheer quantity of muscle mass I maintain is where most of my weight comes from, hence giving me better body fat numbers than she assumed. This was a subtle trigger for hypergamy - seeing that her man is in better shape than her and recognizing that even on a purely physical level I stand above most other men, triggering a small degree of dread too ... and most significantly, on a conversation that I didn't start, so it's not like I'm bragging about it.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (03/20/19)

2 upvotes · 21 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

no communion or anything (which I'm used to either weekly or bi-weekly)

Most communion in churches today is a total joke. It's not even biblical communion at all, completely defeating the purposes Jesus intended for communion by trying to mass-produce it. I fully subscribe to [u/ruizbujc's](https://www.reddit.com/r/TrueChristian/comments/82q27t/what_do_you_believe_about_the_eucharist_communion/dvc4uhd/) view: https://www.reddit.com/r/TrueChristian/comments/82q27t/what_do_you_believe_about_the_eucharist_communion/dvc4uhd/

First, I was frustrated and upset that my wife wasn't jumping to come with me

This is somewhat "next level" kind of stuff, but I wouldn't necessarily be worried about whether or not she attends a congregation. After much study and research, I've come to the conclusion that "going to church" is a misnomer in America. The congregations that we see gathering are not, in a biblical sense, "the church" or even part of the biblical church, though there is some overlap. Ironically, the associate pastor at my congregation agrees with me and is trying to persuade the head pastor of the same. Brian Sanders references this a lot in his book *Underground Church*.

He comes to the same conclusion I do, which is that there are three core biblical components of the church: (1) more than one person, (2) a goal of glorifying God (he says "worship," but glorify seems more biblical to me), and (3) a common mission of disciple-making (he only says "common mission," but the disciple-making is inherent in his model anyway).

The most significant point of clarification on these is the question of what it means to make disciples? Looking at Scripture, I use this definition for discipleship: *Purposeful, intentional relationships designed to lead others to live like Christ lived*. Inherent in "living like Christ lived" is the fact that Christ made disciples - so we must also teach our disciples how to make more disciples.

With the above in mind, and my pastor agrees, our local congregation:

- Is more than one person. Check.
- Attempts to glorify God. Check.
- But they are not making disciples. Buzzz.

Not a church. Then my pastor looks at me and says, "What about our meetings?"

- We are more than one person. Check.
- We have a goal of glorifying God. Check.
- We have a common disciple-making mission at the core of why we're meeting together. Check.

He concluded, and I agree: "We are the church. What happens on Sunday mornings or in small groups or at our retreats, service projects, etc. - those are all good things, but they're not the church." This affirmed my long-standing view that "congregations" (note: I try not to call them churches anymore) are, at best, very useful tools for finding people to relate with who can be incorporated as part of your "church."

To that end, the "church" is every believer everywhere (i.e. more than one) who intends to glorify God and make disciples. This view is far more consistent with passages like the parable of the fig tree, where those who aren't bearing fruit (i.e. making disciples) are cut down and thrown into the fire. If you're not a disciple-maker, you're not part of God's Kingdom - not part of "the church." That's not to say that discipleship is what saves us; rather, as most modern theologians would say with "good works" in general, disciple-making is the natural byproduct of

salvation, which is evidenced by the fact that:

- When the Holy Spirit indwells us, we become Christ's witnesses to the world (Acts 1:8)
- When God's Word is planted in us, we yield a harvest 30, 60, or 100 times what was sown (parable of the sower) - and if we don't, we must not be the good soil
- When Jesus talks about indwelling us (John 17), it's in the context of commissioning his disciples to go out into the world to make more disciples as he did, "As you sent me into the world, Father, now I am sending them."

To that end, if you want your wife to be part of "the church," don't get hung up on a local congregation. Get her excited about your mission to make disciples. Start making disciples first. When guys are calling you constantly asking you to lead them, as often happens for me nowadays, she will see the fruit you bear for Christ's Kingdom and want to engage likewise.

As my wife once told me during an argument when I asked her why she's married to me: "Someday we're going to be standing before God on judgment day and he's going to look at you and be impressed [her words, not my theological conclusion] - he's going to say, 'Well done, good and faithful servant.' I want to be the one standing right next to you saying, 'I helped him do it!'" Get your wife there, not to some gathering to sing a few songs and talk about a sermon you probably won't remember 2 weeks later.

Solving a Foundational Problem on This Sub: Enabling Closet Bloops

2 upvotes · 15 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

The only person who mentioned "walking with the Spirit" in that post was [/u/Deep_Strength](#) in one of the comments, and he also said: "However, as Christians we don't care about blue pill or red pill labels. We care about the evangelizing and making disciples. Intersexual behavior including marriage and only sex inside marriage can be a part of this mission, but it doesn't define it"

No matter how you want to slice it, the mission God gave us is to make disciples. "Walking with the Spirit" is not a goal in itself. If someone "walks with the Spirit" and never makes a disciples, either he's lying (because the Spirit will always prompt him to make disciples) or he has wasted his life. Check the parable of the fig tree in Luke for more info on that.

Jesus did not say, "Come follow me, and I will make you even better at following me and we can be really close." He said, "Come follow me and I will make you fishers of men." He had an agenda. Following him was never meant to be just about following - it had a clear purpose that it was leading up to. If we forget or ignore that purpose by refusing to acknowledge the intended outcome of following Jesus (becoming fishers of men), then there's no point to following him in the first place. Further, I'd contend that anyone who does not adopt that intended result is not actually following Jesus anyway.

1 John 2:6 is clear on this point - "Whoever claims to live in him must live as Jesus did." Jesus' life was oriented around making disciples. Can we say we are living as Jesus did if we only adopt a few attributes of the character of Jesus or the teachings of Jesus, but never the mission of Jesus? I wrote a lot more about this in [this post](#).

Also, as noted before, the "mission" component is plainly explained in the sidebar. Read posts 103, 108, 110, 113, 208, 209, 210, and the entire 300 series. Nobody can read the sidebar and still be confused about what I mean by point 2 here.

Am I too little too late?

2 upvotes · 15 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

How do I find decent Christian women as a pastor in an 'older church'?

"I'm a bi-vocational pastor" - you should have a social circle outside your church. Even if you don't, you have the perfect foundation for meeting people. Everyone already expects pastors to introduce themselves to new people. It's kind of a pastor "thing."

What I'm really hearing is that you're focusing your social circles primarily on your own church. This is unhealthy for a church leader. That is, you should be training your people to engage with the outside world for Christ, but if you're not engaging with the outside world, modeling it for them, then how can you ever expect them to follow in doing so?

If you are engaging with the outside world, developing your social circle beyond your church, then what's the problem? Meet girls the same way anyone else will. There's been a lot of conversation on here about how churches aren't necessarily the most likely place to find the ideal marriage candidate anyway - not to say that it's a bad place, but there are other options - and perhaps even better ones. OZ and (I think) RPW have written posts on these in the sidebar.

How do I get over my asexual conditioning when it comes to dealing with women IRL?

Why do you want to be married in the first place?

What's your mission?

How many people have you disciplined who are now discipling others?

Right now, I don't see a compelling reason why you would want to be looking for a wife in the first place. It sounds like you're a busy guy with more important things going on. That, in itself, is going to attract women - as you're noticing - and keep them interested. Just don't stop it. And when you notice you're about to have sex with one of them, stop yourself and think, "Goodness, how'd we get here? We should totally get married."

The thing is, you're trying to mix red pill praxeology with blue pill ideology. You have this dream of getting married someday. Something inside you is compelling you to date and be successful with girls and make one your wife. And you're thinking, "How can I use the knowledge the red pill has to offer to make these goals a reality?" You're still very much in the blue pill in the first place.

Want to know how to be successful with girls after the initial attraction? DNGAF. Don't give a crap about trying to date or marry them. Abandon your blue pill hopes and dreams of getting married to a wonderful wife. There needs to be a post on this. <Scratches Chin>

OYS - Where Progress is Made (03/13/19)

2 upvotes · 14 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Haha, I do from time to time. It's in some of my older OYS posts. I'll go back to it next time ;)

NSFW: How did you and your man calibrate your sexuality?

2 upvotes · 14 March 2019 · /r/RedPillWomen

Humor me: install a porn blocker on his computer. Many women think, "My husband doesn't do that" - especially in the church crowd, like I am. They do. That form of placation can be at the root of a lot of sexual disinterest issues.

As soon as that blocker goes up, either he's going to admit to porn use by confronting you about it (most likely pretending he was trying to look at something safe and it mysteriously triggered) or he's going to hide it and suddenly be interested in having sex with you again - or he'll skip to using his phone.

If he's one of the few who has moved past a porn problem (and yes, guys can - I'm one of them), then it really won't matter anyway.

To be clear, I'm not suggesting this as the most respectful way of handling the situation or the best for relationship-building. But the results would certainly be very interesting to me.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (03/13/19)

2 upvotes · 14 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I am never comfortable putting anything above a 7 to be honest unless I really feel like I did something exceptional

Now, that's not very fair to the rating system ;) I can see being cautious with a perfect 10, just like we all say the true HB10 doesn't actually exist. But most people think they can't be a 10 at evangelism because they're comparing themselves to Billy Graham. This type of relativity has no place in the Kingdom of God. We are not meant to compare ourselves to others as a rubric for our own progress and maturity. That's the whole message of the cornerstone - that it is a stone like any other, and most likely even smaller and less interesting than the more ornate stones that adorn the entryway to the temple. And yet it is integral to the structural integrity of the entire building.

In short, within your own God-given context, you should certainly be able to qualify yourself as a 10 to the degree that you believe you are measuring up to God's intentions for you at any given time. Don't be too hard on yourself here. It's not about doing something exceptional. It's about doing what's expected. That's all. We cannot exceed God's expectations for us - because to do more than he asked is to extend ourselves beyond the bounds of his will, drudging from our own hubris the belief that somehow we know better how to serve God than he can tell us - a mistake I was once guilty of, and for many years.

To that end, if I were consistently memorizing 2 verses every week, I would give myself a 9 or 10 in Scripture memory. If I feel God is calling me to memorize an entire chapter in a week and I only memorize 15 of the 32 verses in that one week, I might give myself a 3 - not because I failed in the area of Scripture memory (most people would be ecstatic to have memorized 15 verses in a single week!), but because I would have substantially failed in my calling. In the reverse, if God told me, like he told Moses in Exodus, "Stop praying and go lead my people," and I spent 15 hours in deep prayer that week, I must rate myself low in prayer. 15 hours in prayer is exceptional. Most people would think to rate themselves an 11 for that type of devotion to prayer in their week. But if it is not uniquely attuned to what God would have me do that week, then I have failed by using prayer as a cop-out against my actual purpose at that time.

Just a few things to think about :) I don't know what God's calling you to at any given moment, and I hope you're better at following his lead than I often am. But don't be hard on yourself because of grand ideas of what you think it means to be a 10. Judge yourself in the context of your role at any given time and go from there.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (03/13/19)

2 upvotes · 13 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Conflicting goals are constantly a struggle for me (aesthetics vs hypertrophy vs strength)

I'm right there with you. I will note that a study from a couple years ago found that strong-looking guys were always preferenced by women in a side-by-side comparison. One of their conclusions was that it's better to be strong and overweight than weak with a low body fat. What trips me up is that "strong" in my mind is very different from "looking strong" or even from what a woman perceives as strong.

I have a fast metabolism.

So lucky. Mine is naturally very, very slow.

STFD

Good goal. While I'm not an advocate for mindfulness in the mainstream sense, since high school I developed a technique that has helped me a lot with maintaining a STFD capacity in the midst of fast-paced activity. Ever watch The Flash on the CW? There are moments where he's running so fast that it seems like time stops for everyone else, even though the world is actually still going on at normal paces. He can literally sit in a chair and have a conversation with himself or read a book in the span of a split second.

When I would play racquetball I'd boggle my eyes around the room really fast as the ball came toward me, rather than looking directly at the ball. My muscle-memory already knows the angles and where to hit, I just need time to process in order to get my body to make the shot. I can't actually increase time, so what I can do is adjust my processing speed. By boggling my eyes around like that, I was over-stimulating my brain with random fast-paced images, forcing it to work overtime to pick up every new angle of the court that I was bouncing between. That heightened stimulation gave me the sensation that time was slowing down. The ball literally felt like it was moving at 2/3 the speed it was actually moving due to the heightened processing speed, making it much easier to focus on the exact way I wanted to hit the ball.

After doing this for a while with rote eye movement, I began to be able to will my brain into hyperactive mode without needing to boggle my eyes around the room, mostly by taking a conscious effort to recognize the various stimuli in the room - the ticking of the clock on the wall, hum of the furnace blowing, birds chirping out the window - things that I'd normally ignore. The additional stimuli would heighten my brain's processing speed, slowing the world down proportionately, and giving me a moment to breathe, think, process, and respond without feeling like I'm reacting off-the-cuff - and yet for everyone else's purposes the same amount of time just went by.

RC pointed out that my E score has been low for a while. I can say confidently, it hasn't been above a 1 or 2 - until this week. I'm pushing myself to speak my faith in my daily life.

Glad to hear you're making strides on this. Interestingly, most people assume that improving evangelism means being more vocal about their faith. While this is certainly one strategy, if you look at the sidebar post on the subject, you'll recognize that it only really affects the proclamational half - and that half is only substantially effective if your newfound vocality is in the context of a preestablished relationship. In fact, it's not even half - proclamation is really the last 20%, as that phase moves much, much faster than the relational phase. Most of my evangelistic efforts today are not about sharing the Gospel; they're about building relationships with new non-believers - like the guy I met at the gym who I invited to watch Captain Marvel with me on Sunday. I haven't shared the Gospel with him yet, but he knows I'm a Christian and we mostly just lift and talk about girls and superhero movies. That's the foundation of evangelism.

- Phase 1: I introduced myself.
- Phase 2: I followed up with him repeatedly at the gym
- Phase 3: I earned a favorable disposition with him
- Phase 4: I'm currently in the phase of making him aware of my spiritual beliefs. His present awareness is relatively limited, but will expand on Sunday when we connect outside the gym for the first time.

how to teach versus press play or lecture. Teaching is my goal ... I'm pumped for this

Glad to hear it. Excited for you, bro.

Breaking the Nice-Guy: Take Ownership, Ask For Help

2 upvotes · 13 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Haha, this is hysterical. My original draft of this post actually had an additional paragraph after the "guys, guys, guys ... whose house is it?" line that said something like:

If your gut reaction is to check deed, you're missing the point. Governmental allocation is not the same as biblical headship and responsibility. Try again.

I took it out because, as with a few other paragraphs that didn't make the cut, I assumed it was too peripheral a point that it might distract from the overall message, so it felt like just extra fluff words that I didn't think anyone would actually get tripped up on anyway.

I do have my house titled in both names, but that's for estate planning purposes. I am an attorney, after all. The legal title doesn't affect biblical headship any more than a certificate of marriage filed with the state or a divorce decree thereto affects the status of my spiritual marriage before God.

Breaking the Nice-Guy: Take Ownership, Ask For Help

2 upvotes · 13 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Right on. Get divorced? It's all on you. Stay together? Still all on you. Might as well buck up and take the responsibility now and spare the divorce headache/heartache.

Breaking the Nice-Guy: Take Ownership, Ask For Help

2 upvotes · 13 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Pretty much.

Breaking the Nice-Guy: Take Ownership, Ask For Help

2 upvotes · 13 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Ah, I missed the sleeping with them part.

Submissive behaviour

2 upvotes · 12 March 2019 · /r/RedPillWomen

Having a statistics background, I'll note that thre math is a bit wonky, but it's certainly interesting to think about. The theory is most likely inspired by what I call the collective dissociative responsibility paradox, based on a true story that occurred in NYC.

Imagine a guy getting beat up in an alley. Several people see it going on out their windows. They observe each other seeing the crime as well. They are all aware that any rational person would call the cops. They also are aware of the fact that there's no point calling the cops a second time after the first person phones in. Result? Everyone assumes someone else already called the cops, so nobody actually calls the cops. Because of the collective assumptions, they each disassociate themselves from personal responsibility.

Imagine a hot girl walking down the street. Several guys have observed her hotness over time. They are aware that other guys observe her too. They are also aware that any rational guy would approach her and want her as a girlfriend/wife. They're also under the belief that there's no point asking her out if she's already in a relationship. Result? Many men assume she's already in a relationship, so most men never ask her out.

Now, there are clearly some bad assumptions in here that most alpha men will ignore - like the fact that you shouldn't ask out a girl who has a boyfriend. Most alpha guys don't care, they'll do it anyway. But it does explain a

lot of crummy beta male behavior.

Breaking the Nice-Guy: Take Ownership, Ask For Help

2 upvotes · 12 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Ain't that the truth. I got you in chat and will reply there.

Breaking the Nice-Guy: Take Ownership, Ask For Help

2 upvotes · 12 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Why's that? They harp on chore play a lot?

Submissive behaviour

2 upvotes · 12 March 2019 · /r/RedPillWomen

Yes! I didn't know it by that name, but I've heard it discussed before. What are your thoughts?

Submissive behaviour

2 upvotes · 12 March 2019 · /r/RedPillWomen

Of course. But that's counsel for the man. She can't change whatever man she ends up with. So, all we can do is focus on her. Or if you're suggesting this as a vetting strategy - that she should only look for men who will give appropriate weight to her opinions, then you're telling a beggar how to be a chooser ;) Once she has options, vetting can start to occur. Gotta get the options first.

Submissive behaviour

2 upvotes · 12 March 2019 · /r/RedPillWomen

I don't know about that. Even shy guys have no problem doing things out of place when all the fear and intimidation is stripped away. I was one of them once.

It's like the risk/skill paradigm. There's certainly a difference between a guy who is unskilled and a guy who is afraid to avoid risks, but the two are always weighed in balance. If there is a massive risk to, say, shooting a basketball from center court, a guy with no skill will always shy away from that shot - and even guys with high skill might, but the most elite would be fine at least trying and not think twice about it. However, if the risk is very low because they're shooting from right next to the basket with no one guarding them, even the most unskilled basketball player will take that shot.

Likewise, even the most shy guy would approach girls if there was no intimidation at all. The increase in intimidation just raises the bar on where the guy must be on his shy/confident scale before he's willing to make the approach. But if we take away the intimidation myth - the false belief that guys should pedestalize women and be emotionally invested in the way she reacts to him - then even the most shy guys would have no problem approaching. And, in fact, those guys do tend to have no problem approaching "safe" women who they believe have few other options.

Plan A or B, MAP, or something different?

2 upvotes · 11 March 2019 · /r/askMRP

Good stuff. I'd caution [/u/dwebsterlight](#) to take the sex-talk a little easy for right now. Too hard too fast can result in triggering Rambo-mode.

My instinct after reading the OP is that instead of leading, he left. In her mind, there are his activities and her activities and they just don't overlap. This is usually caused when a guy makes a lot of changes but forgets to invite his wife along for the ride. He starts going to the gym, but doesn't bring her with him. He starts collecting

stamps, but doesn't ask her to keep an eye out for him. He begins writing a book, but doesn't ask her to be his test reader. He starts something else, but doesn't let her be a part of that something.

When this happens, even an attractive man is going to have trouble keeping his wife on board, and re-initiating is going to be difficult. Studies show that people take a much stronger interest in something if they are part of it from its inception, whereas people joining part-way never truly feel connected to what they've joined. They're supporters of someone else's dream rather than an integral part.

As I often say, a man has to know what his mission first, then he has to assess if that mission is something any woman would ever want to join in on. If it's not, then you've got a crappy mission that will not enhance your sexuality. If it is, but your particular wife isn't one of those women, then you married the wrong woman. Take your lumps for poor vetting. If it is and she, specifically, would be excited about that mission, it's simply a matter of bringing her along for the ride - and doing so in a tactful (my way of saying non-autistic) way.

But if a guy gets too far along in his mission, that's like a marathon runner being 15 miles in and telling his wife to get started. She'll never feel like she can catch up, so she just won't start. At the very best, she'll cheer you on from the sidelines - which is what I found in my own marriage for a long time.

If you want her along, run back and get her. Otherwise, just keep running and recognize that even a world-class athlete couldn't catch-up to someone who had a 15 mile head start, then be satisfied leaving her in the dust or as a sidelined cheerleader who is never actually journeying life alongside you.

If she's not running alongside you, or at least cheering you on, then most game tactics will not work. OP is a case-in-point that missional misalignment can ruin marriages even when the guy is genuinely attractive (giving him the benefit of the doubt). This being the case, I wouldn't dive head-first into sexy talk. A foundation has to be laid first.

Milder levels of kino and "Mmm, you're getting me hard," are probably fine. Something along the lines of, "I've been thinking how bad I want to bend you over on that bouldar and pound you with the mist of that waterfall blowing in our faces" might be a bit much. Either it's going to be played off as a joke, losing alpha points (because, let's face it, if she thinks it's a joke it just reminds her that you're not the type of guy who would ever actually do that), or it's going to sound so out-of-context that it will be received as him playing off his sexual neediness with unrealistic intentions and expectations. Those expectations - especially about a fantastical vision of his sexuality - will place a burden on her that's so unrealistic in the context of their current sex life that she'll feel like she can never live up to the fantasy, so just won't try. Alternatively, even if it's played off as a joke, all she hears is: "Fine, he wants sex. I guess I'll have to make time in my chore-list to get that done in the next month or two."

PSA: Most "RP advice" and "rules" are to stop unattractive men from sabotaging themselves.

2 upvotes · 8 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

So comment on her choice of dress instead

I can see the lemmings now: "He just said I should compliment her attire. I must do that before our dates now, even if i don't really care for it, because then she'll want to have sex with me afterwards."

So much is lost when people ignore context and common sense.

Excellent post, brother.

PSA: Most "RP advice" and "rules" are to stop unattractive men from sabotaging themselves.

2 upvotes · 8 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Right on, brother.

I may have messed up (F/R)

2 upvotes · 7 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Let me tell you - I'm a lawyer. I don't talk myself into holes. Even when the conversation takes a direction that I didn't anticipate, I still come out on top. I can DEER better than my wife any day of the week. I will always win the argument.

But even if you were capable of matching her toe-to-toe or besting her in these moments, like I can, I promise you it's still a loss. Even if you could keep the conversation on your terms and successfully persuade her that you're right and she's wrong - you will still have lost attraction by DEERING.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (03/06/19)

2 upvotes · 6 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

McGee's perspective on biblical manhood seems very "OYS" red pill ... "If I know of a Christian man who tells me his wife is cold to him, I can show you a man who isn't leading his marriage well at all!"

While I don't disagree with the statements of his you're quoting in these sections, I do want to give you a word of caution. /u/Deep_Strength often notes, quite wisely, that one of the great shames of the church is placing ALL of the responsibility on men and not calling out women for their responsibility to respond. Refraining: "If she's not following, you're not leading right" can only go so far. Lots of people don't follow Jesus. Does that mean he isn't leading right?

More to the point: the church is really good at giving lip-service to these ideas, but following through in horrendous ways. When the church attributes a wife's unhappiness to her husband's poor leadership, they usually mean (and follow up in the coming paragraphs) that the husband needs to do a better job leading his wife by serving her, coddling her emotions, providing more money and stuff for her comforts, etc. Don't trust someone just because their framework is correct. I can lay the foundation of a house and build the bones correctly, but when actually putting to together, if I put the bath tub in the living room and try to hook a bed up to the kitchen faucet the place will still end up being a mess.

invited her along but made it clear attendance was optional

Maybe I missed something. Why is this optional?

her believing I don't love her because she doesn't get my time enough

Contrary to liberal ideologies, no two people will ever have the exact same amount of love for each other - or even the exact same kind. If there's going to be a difference, better to err on the side of her seeking your love, and you seeking Christ's love rather than hers. This isn't a terrible thing as long as it doesn't get out of hand.

I passed an "s"/comfort test combo!

Yes, you passed. Good job, brother. Take notes, /u/AlanNoles:

- "we were being silly sarcastic jerks back and forth ... took the opportunity to A&A about how horrible I am and toss it back on her." Rather than arguing against her accusation or caving to it, he makes a joke and stays playful and light-hearted.
- "I told her to get up" - as in him asking her to rise to his level rather than him squatting down to meet her.
- "wrapped my arms around her to pick her up and tickle her" - she wouldn't listen, so he helps her along and maintains a light-hearted tone

- "she squirmed away and I shrugged it off ... 'that's cool' and went back to what I was doing." He doesn't cave and shows he has more important things to do.
- "She shot back" - meaning she realized her manipulative games weren't getting to him, so she's going to make another power play - a final attempt to use her emotions to control him, this time attacking his emotions too: "there are nicer ways you can say that" - trying to play to his guilt and shame.
- "I just ignored" - i.e. STFU. He's not having that kind of disrespect, guilt-tripping, and shaming in his household.
- "A little bit later" - he gives her space and does his own thing, letting her calm down and think rationally.
- "I put my hand on her shoulder with intent ... 'I love you' look, hugged her tight ... She relaxed and was happy the entire rest of the night - it was like *nothing* happened." She's happy because her man is strong and he's offering his strength to her, which is much safer than if she were running the show because she knows she doesn't have that kind of strength - so if she's the "strong one" in the relationship, how bad would that be?
- Also, at no point did he cave into her demands, apologize for something he didn't do wrong, or submit to the emotional pressures she was putting on him.

This needs to be a field report, brother. Good exchange. Post this for the broader community with better analysis. Feel free to use anything I've put here for inspiration - no need to credit me. Make it your own.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (03/06/19)

2 upvotes · 6 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

She ends up hanging up on me. I call her back she doesn't answer.

You screwed up. You didn't repent quickly. She screws up with the disrespect of hanging up on you. You reward her by displaying your commitment and affection through calling her back. Why!?

I say ok and throw it all in the trash because I don't need it either.

Translation: I got butt-hurt and played the martyr card by sacrificing what I wanted to do and she didn't like that I got so butthurt and made her look like the bad guy. But I also want to look good to the guys here, so I'm going to hamster a reason why I did what she wanted me to do for me, even though the only thing that actually changed was her yelling at me.

Sound about right?

she ... slams the door ... I walk in after her

Again: why?! Why would you ever reward such bad behavior by displaying heightened commitment and affection in these moments?

She screeches for me to leave her alone but I just throw the blanket off again and pick her up and hold her in my lap until her hamster starts spewing.

So much internal pressure forcing you to do these things. This is your biggest lesson for the week: learn to walk away from bad behavior. Don't reinforce it. If you coddle her with attention and affection when she acts this way, she'll just keep acting that way. And if you're not giving her that kind of attention when she's good, she's just going to keep being bratty because that's the only way for her to get it.

"You're right, that was poor judgement on my part and I was speaking out of anger."

"Sorry, mommy. Please teach me. Lead me into being a better woman just like you. As a woman, you would never get angry, and I should aspire to be just like you."

"You are right it won't happen again."

"Sorry, mommy. I'll never do it again mommy. You're the boss and I promise I'll listen from now on."

Test passed

WHAT?!?!?!? THE?!?!?!? FLIP?!?!?!?

[/u/rocknrollchuck](#) - how did you miss this one?

This is the exact opposite of passing a test. You proved that you'd beta-up for her if she throws a hissy fit. In no way did you display alpha confidence in any of this.

Brother, I say this not to demean you, and maybe I need a second opinion here - [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) - any thoughts? But this to me sounds like you're just handing her the keys to the kingdom.

Who made the rule that you're not allowed to call out her friends on their sin?

Who made the rule that you must wash your hands before eating brownies?

Who made the rule that you must call her back when she hangs up on you?

Who made the rule that you must follow her into her room and comfort her when she throws a tantrum?

I'm guessing she did - either overtly or by implication through her conduct. Don't walk inside her frame with your tool belt on to fix it up and make it stronger than ever.

Also ...

comfort test

Where was the comfort test? I never saw one. Easy distinction:

- **Fitness Tests:** You ... you ... you ... You shouldn't have done that. You're an idiot. You screwed up. You need to apologize.
- **Comfort Tests:** I ... I ... I ... I'm insecure. I'm lonely. I'm concerned about our marriage. I feel like you don't love me.

She was always focused on changing you, never fixing her own feels. That's a huge difference. Don't tell her what she wants to hear. Tell her what she needs to hear. And don't follow silly rules that you didn't create. If you want to eat a brownie without washing your hands, go eat that brownie. I don't want to hear any, "It's not a big deal" or "It's important to her and I don't really care, so why not go along with it?" speeches. That's the whole inch and mile people talk about.

Video 6 in the Relationship Goals sermon on YouTube and it really hit home for me

I'm skeptical. Elaborate on what this series is about as a whole.

sexual energy and how it only works well in the right container

Sounds like more of the church's standard: "Let's talk about all the ways sex can be harmful and say it's good, but never talk about how to improve a broken sex life."

Still doing devotions with my wife nightly ... Only read bible once this week

Huh? How's it a devotion if you're not reading the Bible?

prayer journal ... may not do bible reading but that's her version of pursuing God

My wife did the same for a while, so I track with you. Take what you can get for now. Just be cautious because it fosters an emotionalism view of the faith - that it's more about how you feel (ergo journaling your feelings) than how you learn, apply, grow, obey, etc.

I want to be clear: this comment isn't meant to insult you. I'm using an exaggerated tone on purpose. I want to call to attention the things that should trigger in your mind and using the same tone that I would for anything else just wouldn't give the emphasis where you need to see it. Much love, brother!

EDIT: Ignore the part where I quoted you saying it was a comfort test. I was confusing your post with [/u/EastThenWest](#), who did mention comfort tests. Oops. That's what I get for reading these on-the-go then replying without fully re-reading.

Married Man Game Part 3: Sexting

2 upvotes · 6 March 2019 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

Nope. Do what works for you.

Married Man Game Part 3: Sexting

2 upvotes · 5 March 2019 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

It's easy for me to track the date: I found this place the day after we got home from the hospital after the birth of my youngest. June of 2017. Reddit isn't good at rounding.

What's your "one-step-closer-to-apocalypse mode"?

Married Man Game Part 3: Sexting

2 upvotes · 5 March 2019 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

Nah, after the first wave of fitness testing from that one post, things have actually been better. After looking at the day she first read this stuff, we've had some of our best sex since she started reading.

Frame is everything.

Travel For Work - Texting game tips?

2 upvotes · 5 March 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Fun - I was just planning on employing texting game today, so this is in good timing. This is probably better done as a "Married Man Game: Part 3" post, so I'll put my response up separately. Suffice it to say, for your purposes, that the traditional RP advice about texting doesn't apply the same way to LDRs, which are discounted almost entirely in a pre-marriage context. If you're forced into a short-term LDR post-marriage, there's certainly viability in texting for more than just logistics.

RPC: a place to stay (or at least return to)

2 upvotes · 4 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

None of that is arrogant.

No, the arrogance is in degrading the utility and value of men maintaining long-term relationships and accountability in a place like this by telling them they ought to leave once they've learned a few things, and yet without having any empathy or regard for their personal circumstances and why they might be here in the first place.

You may try to couch it with phrases like, "I think" or "this is just my view," but everyone intuitively understands this as an effort to persuade them to adopt your own view, which is backed up by the fact that you spend the rest of the time in your posts trying to convince them to do just that.

What if this sub is what's keeping a guy focused on the mission of disciple-making and away from his porn addiction and keeping him from cheating on his wife? Then he reads your post and decides, "That guy is right. I've learned what this place has to teach, so I can move on and not need to come back." Then, without that accountability or continued study and learning, he ends up losing his self-control, cheats on his wife, delves back into porn, and abandons his life of ministry. That's on you.

I have seen this happen, and it's not pretty. I have met 2 guys face-to-face who were doing fine, then they stopped reading and engaging here, and soon after they're back into porn and haven't done much to pursue their God-given mission, and their wife was no longer having sex with them, which contributed to their porn problem. After meeting with me, they get back on track and are moving in a right direction again, after engaging with our community once more. And you're encouraging more guys to take that same risk? It's this total non-consideration that comes off as arrogant - as if you think some pie in the sky "just live by the Holy Spirit" is some magical phrase that will solve everyone's problems.

And then when they have no clue what that means, and trying to live out that advice ends up getting them in trouble, what are you going to do but wash your hands of them and say, "Well, obviously you weren't following the Holy Spirit the right way if you ended up like this"?

This is what [u/OsmiumZulu](#) was trying to teas out in this post, but you don't seem to care enough to give a passing thought to the struggles other men go through. You teach what works for you and suggest it as "advice" and "suggestions" for other men to follow, but like a woman you try to couch your phrases with enough plausible deniability that you can deny any responsibility when your advance leads someone down the garbage shoot: "He didn't have to take my advice. It was only a suggestion, he's ultimately responsible for figuring out what works for him." This is why James says that teachers will be judged more harshly, brother - and that's not a thing I take lightly as I teach here and IRL.

Boyfriend of 2 years having issues with going to work

2 upvotes · 4 March 2019 · /r/RedPillWomen

No, you're not naive. Those are good expressions of his concern for your well-being. I'm glad to hear that he has these things working for him.

At that point, I'm persuaded that maybe he does have some semblance of love for you. So, now, it's less a question of whether he loves you and more a question of how much. Enough to pull you from a puddle and buy you coffee, but not enough to get a stable job and provide for you - somewhere in-between those two. Don't settle for an ounce if you deserve a pound. That's not to say you deserve a pound - I have no idea where you stand in terms of SMV and RMV. I'm just saying to be mindful of these things.

The expressions of "love" that you give are also highly beta in nature. No doubt, many women appreciate beta-type behaviors for long-term companions, so this can be a good thing. But he also seems to lack significant alpha traits, which will make for a poor long-term relationship. Alpha traits include such things as ambition, pursuing

goals, becoming a competent protector and provider, and having the internal fortitude to withstand the emotional (and physical, though I doubt he's actually sick that much) turmoils that are causing him to skip work all the time. Successful relationships require men to have these alpha traits as well - and they're even better off if a guy leans more on his alpha behaviors than his beta ones. As things are, if this were to continue for another 20 years you'll end up resenting him and likely cheating on him (or he you) because neither of you will be happy.

RPC: a place to stay (or at least return to)

2 upvotes · 4 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Your same argument could be made about going to church. It's more important to be in God's Word than meet with other believers, so at some point we should stop meeting together with other believers and just focus on reading the Bible for ourselves, right? And yet God's Word tells us just the opposite: "Let us not give up meeting together, as some are in the habit of doing."

You neglect the fact that, first and foremost, this place is founded on God's Word. The advice we give here is not from secular ideologies that war against blue pill cultural practices - we are preaching an application of the Word, whether we include the citations or not. Pastors do the same thing. They teach God's Word, whether they include a citation for every sentence or not.

What's more interesting is that [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) called you out on a clear lie and instead of OYS ("You're right, I said I was leaving, but I'm still here. I lied.") and moving on, you DEER and deflect.

RPC: a place to stay (or at least return to)

2 upvotes · 4 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Right - but I want to be clear for anyone else who reads this: when you say you are finding "a new way" that is still in the context of being single and not having sex, right? So, while your way may work for your immediate aim, it doesn't have any proven track record for being able to improve a man's ability to attract women or improve a broken sex life in marriage, correct?

And I'm not saying this as an insult, but as a statement of fact to show the limited context in which you are living and that you have yet to mention what the results are of this "new way." I know many men who are perfectly content and even spiritually joyful while rejecting anything to do with the red pill - it's on [r/TrueChristian](#) all the time. But these same men are often single or in dead bedroom marriages, finding joy in Christ to replace their bitterness at a sexless wife. While I applaud their newfound emotional stability through non-RP means (and therefore, as a matter of technicality, unintentionally non biblical means), it still does nothing to actually fix their "forever alone" status or dead bedroom marriage.

RPC: a place to stay (or at least return to)

2 upvotes · 4 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

No one can serve two masters.

Right. But no one is suggesting making sex our master, and we're already agreed not to make the feminine imperative our master either. We're all on the same page on this point.

There is a flaw to think there is a single path - that somehow what I'm saying is either THE way or NOT the way.

This sub has never pretended to be THE only way. You're actually stealing a line from my discipleship book, referenced on the sidebar, which applies to this sub as well: "What I present here is not *THE* way, but *A* way. If God puts you on a better path, go with that path. For everyone else, use this as a default until something better

comes along." In the case of this sub, "better" means you're getting the results out of life that you want - the fruit you bear for the kingdom, the respect your wife gives you, improved satisfaction in one's sex life, etc. Some men are already bearing incredible fruit and just need to figure out the sex stuff. Others are having great sex, but needed help getting respect from their wife. We figure out what the needs are, and if it's in our wheelhouse, we help. That's all.

Missional Social Strategy

2 upvotes · 2 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Beautiful. Not to undermine the very important role of pastors who live in biblical alignment with their role - this is an excellent exhortation.

Starting from Fat

2 upvotes · 1 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

It's really simple, eat less and move more.

I used to have a rule of thumb that I would only eat as many calories in a day as I burned at the gym. I'd use calorie burn apps online to estimate how much I'd burn from lifting and running and carry that number into myfitnesspal.com. The weight sheds off crazy fast with this approach. It's not super healthy, but got the first 60lbs off of me in a relatively short time.

Starting from Fat

2 upvotes · 1 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I started at 285lbs 6'0" with a bench press of less than 135 and body fat in the upper-30s. Within 2 months I was 255 with a bench of 225 and body fat in the mid-20s. A few months later I was 225 with a bench of 285 and 15-17% body fat, fluctuating - and I have hovered around there ever since.

When I cut, I cut hard. 500 calories a day or less. Sometimes I'll fast for 5 days straight with nothing but water and vitamins. So, my weight loss was initially very rapid. I haven't done a cut in some time ... I'm probably over 225 again, actually, but my lifts are all also going up. [/u/warriorjesus1915](#) and I are doing a cut together for the next month or two - I'll probably pace myself in a more healthy way this time, but I expect it'll take another 2 months before noticing differences, whereas the hard cuts gave results in less than a week.

Welcome to the journey, brother.

When i say No the boss Stonewalls me

2 upvotes · 1 March 2019 · /r/askMRP

So, you have a scarcity mentality with your career because you haven't been developing abundance. If you're over-paid for what you do and can't find another similar job in your area that will pay the same, it could be that you're not getting paid \$1k extra for being on call, but that you've already been paid, for example, \$10k extra for nothing and the boss has wised up and decided to put you on call to justify the fact that you're over-compensated for similar jobs in the same area.

Does it suck? Absolutely. But business is business. Either jobs are scarce and you have to take what you can get or you hit the pavement and convince some other chump that you're worth more than what they're offering new employees.

Now, if it were me, I'd do three things in the following order of priority (and they're not mutually exclusive):

1. Start looking for another job.
2. Build relationships with other co-workers to make them loyal to you. I've seen law firms go through this where employee loyalty ultimately trumps whatever the boss wants to do. The risk of losing all of the valuable employees will box in decision-making from the top or, in the case of what happened to my previous boss, the valuable employees will just leave and take all the business with them and the boss will be crippled and have to start something new from the ground up.
3. Accept the burden of being on call all the time for the \$1k raise on the condition that if you end up working extra hours due to the calls you get, you can either:
 - get paid a fixed hourly rate for any instances where you actually work off-hours due to being called. He doesn't risk paying you a bunch of extra money for minimal work and you don't risk doing a bunch of extra work for minimal compensation - you will be paid based on the work you do.
 - If he won't pay you extra, have any off-hour work you do when called converted into PTO that you can take at your discretion.
 - If he won't take that, then suggest that if you're called after-hours, you take those hours out of your next business day or out of your Friday afternoon.

In either of the above two options, you're doing the same amount of work, but still getting the \$1k bonus for the fact that you might have to shift your hours to inconvenient times.

Long story short, you have options. You just have to exercise them and be willing to up your social game within the workplace and broader workforce. This is why social game is so important.

Lastly, you're not trying to get your boss's dick in your butt (are you?), so don't expect him to respond to red pill sexual strategy by falling in love with you. This is business, not sex. Some of the strategies are useful, but the results are very, very different and can be inconsistent. Don't assume that being an alpha high-value man will always equate to your boss backing down and doing what you say.

How do you guys view/approach ghosting?

2 upvotes · 1 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I never quite saw the connection to ghosting, but this is a fantastic story. Glad to hear it!

How do you guys view/approach ghosting?

2 upvotes · 1 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Spot on, dude.

Interesting site...

2 upvotes · 28 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

You're not just checking in to learn a few useful ideas. You're trying to undermine the fabric of what we're trying to do here and recreate it with your own ideas of what you think it *should* mean to be "red pill." Let me quote CS Lewis:

The word gentleman originally meant something recognisable; one who had a coat of arms and some landed property. When you called someone "a gentleman" you were not paying him a compliment, but merely stating a fact. If you said he was not "a gentleman" you were not insulting him, but giving information. There

was no contradiction in saying that John was a liar and a gentleman; any more than there now is in saying that James is a fool and an M.A. But then there came people who said—so rightly, charitably, spiritually, sensitively, so anything but usefully—"Ah, but surely the important thing about a gentleman is not the coat of arms and the land, but the behaviour? Surely he is the true gentleman who behaves as a gentleman should? Surely in that sense Edward is far more truly a gentleman than John?"

They meant well. To be honourable and courteous and brave is of course a far better thing than to have a coat of arms. But it is not the same thing. Worse still, it is not a thing everyone will agree about. To call a man "a gentleman" in this new, refined sense, becomes, in fact, not a way of giving information about him, but a way of praising him: to deny that he is "a gentleman" becomes simply a way of insulting him. When a word ceases to be a term of description and becomes merely a term of praise, it no longer tells you facts about the object: it only tells you about the speaker's attitude to that object. (A "nice" meal only means a meal the speaker likes.)

A gentleman, once it has been spiritualised and refined out of its old coarse, objective sense, means hardly more than a man whom the speaker likes. As a result, gentleman is now a useless word. We had lots of terms of approval already, so it was not needed for that use; on the other hand if anyone (say, in a historical work) wants to use it in its old sense, he cannot do so without explanations. It has been spoiled for that purpose.

He goes on to say that the word "Christian" is being spoiled by what people think the word *should* mean rather than sticking to what it actually means. You are doing the **EXACT** same thing CS Lewis says not to do: trying to define the "red pill" by what you think it *should* mean rather than what it actually means.

Stop it. This type of behavior will not be permitted for much longer, no matter how many new accounts you want to keep creating to do this.

As CS Lewis alludes to, a man can be both "red pill" and Christian just as he can be "red pill" and a vicious, immoral rapist. You saying that people should follow God is fine. But the way you try to tie this to being "red pill" is not fine. You can't say to what degree a man should or should not be "red pill" in any sense that affects his ability to "follow God" or "walk by the Spirit" - these are two independent concepts, just as you cannot say: "A man should only go to classes for a medical degree so far, but at some point he must stop wasting time in those classes talking about medicine and start focusing on wearing shoes." These concepts are not mutually exclusive and they are generally independent. The degree to which a man learns from taking the red pill has no bearing on his capacity to follow God and live by the Spirit or make disciples. If anything, it enables him to do all of these things to a greater degree, as he escapes the hindrances placed on his ability to follow God by the feminine imperative's influence on his life and framework. Why would you fight against this?

Again: stop it.

Tag: [/u/Deep_Strength](#) [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) [/u/RedPillWonder](#)

Interesting site...

2 upvotes · 28 February 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

As redwall said, REAL discipleship is not the purpose of this sub. I wish it were, but it's not. Real discipleship is done in person, doing life with others. This sub is no substitute for that.

Amen. And I've got a plan for that, but I'll address that in mod chat privately, as I won't want to take it public for some time.

What do you Christians think of MGTOW?

2 upvotes · 27 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Right on. Romans 14:23 is still the guiding light for me here. If it's not from faith it's sin. I'm 100% convinced that celibacy is the better route over marriage, all other things being equal. But I'd rather (as does Paul) a God-honoring marriage than a defiant MGTOW who doesn't care for God. That defeats the whole purpose of 1 Cor. 7's and Matthew 19's compulsion to remain single.

What do you Christians think of MGTOW?

2 upvotes · 27 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

He said "**JUST** follow Jesus" - I think he means that if you only follow Jesus and aren't chasing women around (i.e. go MGTOW), then you'll be fine.

Should I be baptised at the beach rather than my local Church?

2 upvotes · 27 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

As /u/rocknrollchuck said, you have freedom in how you want to go about this. Should you be baptized? Absolutely. Does it have to be in front of a local congregation? Not at all. The story of **Philip and the Ethiopian** involves a spontaneous baptism that wasn't in front of a large crowd. This is perfectly fine. As chuck alluded to, when you say:

from my understanding the bible says that baptism is for the remission of our sins and a public declaration of our faith

... the "public declaration" part simply isn't in Scripture. That's a claim that Protestants added to justify de-spiritualization of the sacrament and simplify salvation to a *sola fide* type model ("faith alone"). That is, if faith alone saves and baptism is not necessary, then Protestants had to come up with another reason for why God and Jesus may have commanded it. "Public profession" is the most logical conclusion, even if it's not mandated in Scripture. This is a flaw in Protestant thinking.

To be clear, I don't buy into the view that it's necessary for salvation either. I'm not Catholic or Orthodox, but I do believe that they recognize a spiritual significance to baptism that Protestants miss out on.

In some respects, we talk about marriage as requiring a covenant and sex, where the covenant lays out the terms and intent to create a binding arrangement (in the case of salvation: through faith) and the act of becoming one-flesh is like signing the contract, sealing it closed ... but baptism is more like the ceremony and the public proclamation is akin to a reception. You don't need a ceremony and reception to get married. You can go to the courthouse on your own and it's perfectly legitimate, or you can make a promise to each other before God without a pastor and God still recognize the spiritual marriage that's formed ... but there's still something special about the otherwise unnecessary pomp and circumstance surrounding a wedding day - even if it's just a courthouse wedding with no one else invited. It creates an internal security in the couple: "Yes, we're actually married," even though (at least at one point) the law would have deemed them married even without it (i.e. common law marriage).

I don't know if that clarifies anything or creates a whole mess of confusion, but that's my conclusion: baptism fosters the feeling of bonding security in a new believer's salvation, despite the fact that it is not what actually does the saving; and if public profession is involved (i.e. it's in front of a church), that's like having a public ceremony or reception at a wedding rather than doing it alone at the courthouse.

On a separate note: This line of thinking also re-bolsters my thoughts on the importance of disciple-making as an assurance of salvation tool. It highlights that the reproductive act, being the signature on the contract, is what binds and seals the deal. A contract may technically be valid on the verbal terms alone, even without the signature

of the parties, but it's not secure until that signature appears - a court could rule either way. So, if no one engages in that reproductive effort in their relationship with Christ toward bearing spiritual fruit/offspring (see Malachi 2:15), then their salvation covenant remains unsigned. Is it valid or not? Hard to say. Passages like Matthew 7 and Luke 13:6-9 would seem to imply "not," but other passages lean otherwise.

RMV Checklist: How to know if a woman is good marriage material

2 upvotes · 27 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Not yet. I'm not sure if [u/RedPillWonder](#) plans on addressing that angle or not. I just know I suggested in mod-chat that we address the other side and that pretty much everyone agreed it should be done in a separate post rather than together with assessing female RMV.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (02/20/19)

2 upvotes · 25 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Way to OYS!

It's money she spent, but they are mine to pay

Right. And she spent it because you authorized her to. That's like a CEO giving his CFO the company checkbook saying, "I trust you." It's not the CFO's bill. It's not the CFO's joint bill with the company. It's the company's bill and the CEO is the company. He is the face, the personality, and the person ultimately held responsible. This is the proper mindset - and one I trust you will adapt to very quickly :) After all, you're not one of our very few endorsed contributors for nothing (as of today at least).

why the tiles I installed a couple months ago were cracking so much

Tiles by my front door did this too. Turns out the cement slab under my front door isn't quite even, which contributed to part of our problem, so I have to relay the mortar to balance it better than the first time around.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (02/20/19)

2 upvotes · 25 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

we have 5 kids, she's said she wanted 6 for a while, but for the first time I'm thinking ... maybe not. Going to pray for clarity from the Lord

Clarity is certainly good ... but why the shift from "we have 5 kids" to "she's said she wanted"? Did you not have a plan and intention on this before you started having kids? Obviously it's a bit late to suddenly decide you only want 3. But how much of your (possible?) desire for a 6th is really just a projection of her desire for another?

I also noticed that when you're talking about the kids, you have no problem taking ownership: "my kids." While it may seem trite and could just be habitual communication patterns: "we have unexpected bills" as to your wife, and "we reworked some chores" as to your son. Do you view these as joint-and-equal situations or where you're the head of these things, weighing the input of the other? No assumptions, just bringing up the mentality difference.

Projects include:

Cool. Been 4 days. Which ones are checked off or at least started?

Spinning Plates

2 upvotes · 25 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Here you go.

Here too.

These are both on the sidebar.

A Reply: Yes, the church and Christian writers really say these ridiculous things.

2 upvotes · 24 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Let me just be clear: I have never attended a church that doesn't teach these things - and I've been to a lot. My wife is still emotionally wounded by the fact that the churches she attended growing up taught these things and she can't move past it. We were taught these things in our premarital counseling. Our parents raised us with them. Any pastoral counseling either of us have had to talk through marriage and sexuality issues have taught these things. This is what gets discussed at the small groups either of us have attended.

As originally noted in my post, I'm coming from personal observation and showing through online searching that my experiences in what my wife and I have been taught is taught more broadly too. This was not meant to be a broad scientific point, but another one of many data points.

I have been to exactly one church that said in one sermon that it's okay to want to marry someone you find attractive. While I'm sure many other pastors believe this too, virtually none of them are willing to preach on it.

While I agree that none of this is official doctrine of the church, this kind of teaching is so prevalent in the modern first world church that the comparisons you attempt to draw don't even come close.

Tag: [u/whitified](#)

Hello Men, Opinions on JLP?

2 upvotes · 22 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

government has an answer to the issues today and number two

Right. There are no political solutions to our nation's spiritual problems.

A Reply: Yes, the church and Christian writers really say these ridiculous things.

2 upvotes · 22 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Fair points here. For reference, this is the exact reason why I shared which search terms I used to find the articles I referenced ;)

Something tells me we'd be good friends IRL.

A Reply: Yes, the church and Christian writers really say these ridiculous things.

2 upvotes · 22 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I want to start by saying that I greatly respected your reply to [/u/deep_strength](#) in the other thread. My use of your reply was not to criticize, but expand on the conversation :)

I seriously doubt any of these authors quoted would tell two people who find each other repulsive that they should pursue a romantic relationship just because they're both Christians for example

I completely agree. I think I addressed this in the post, though. While they would not be willing to admit this openly and directly, the way they communicate leaves no other conclusion in most men's minds because it is not tempered with any actual authorization to contemplate looks as a valid part of attraction.

Consider two people in a parallel situation. They are both considered expert zoologists who have both studied

snakes for decades.

- **GUY 1:** "Snakes do not make good pets. Many snakes are deadly and poisonous. They could kill you. Some snakes are capable of swallowing your child whole. If you're ever around a snake, it might snap at you. You shouldn't touch snakes. They're slimy and gross. People will be afraid if you have a snake as a pet in your home and may not want to come over. They likely won't want to be near you when you're holding a snake. Snakes also kill lots of animals. They're known for stealing other species' babies and snatching their eggs right out of the nest."

How will you view snakes after this?

- **GUY 2:** He says all of the same things above, but splices into his speech: "Snakes are also friendly, if you know how to handle them well. I've had lots of friends who have become very fond of my snakes once they overcame their initial fears and I showed how tame my snake was. Snakes are also a valuable part of our ecosystem and are integral to the food chain. If there were no snakes, animal populations would become imbalanced and it would harm all of humanity."

Now how do you feel about snakes? Which man can be trusted to give an accurate representation about the role of snakes in our environment? Which man should aspiring zoologists consider learning from in order to advance their knowledge and understanding of the profession?

We have the physical capability to change what we are attracted to

With extremely finite limitations, yes. But there are boundaries that I cannot intentionally cross no matter how hard I may want to will it into existence. My wife is highly attractive too. I do use the word "hot" to describe her at times, and she appreciates the use of that word. But if she were to gain 300lbs, I don't know that I could will myself into being physically attracted to her, no matter how hard I tried. It doesn't mean I'd cheat on her or stop loving her. But it would certainly affect the relationship and there would be practical ramifications in how this affects our emotional connection as well. I did add a caveat at the end that alludes to this, though I'm not sure if you saw the post before or after that was included.

Is it just me? Are modernist Churches very feminine oriented?

2 upvotes · 22 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I appreciate this comment and the research and experience behind it. I'm reminded of when buddha prophesied to a brahman who wanted to "ordain" a woman: "If women are not allowed into the priesthood, our practices will continue for thousands of years. If they are, our number will be 500 years." Curiously, this was prophesied around 500BC, and the are other Buddhist prophecies about Jesus being the fulfillment of buddhism and putting an end to their ways. I interpret this much the same as the way Judaism still carries on after Christ.

Is it just me? Are modernist Churches very feminine oriented?

2 upvotes · 22 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I have two pastors who have referenced studies. I just don't have them handy. They do exist.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (02/20/19)

2 upvotes · 20 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

MISSION: On track; progress flowing faster than ever before.

LIFTS: Pushing boundaries - almost upped my bench to 295 (I couldn't quite get it down all the way). Raised my 5-rep on squat and deadlift up to 335 from 315, haven't tried to up my 365 max on either yet.

DIET: I've started intentionally sporadic cutting again. Higher weight than I'd like to be, but still pushing for 300

on the bench, so somewhat conflicting goals here.

AESTHETICS: Got a new cologne that I like a lot better. Bought some new clothes that actually fit me and aren't as baggy as some of the older stuff I would default to - also long enough that they still fit when I'm doing overhead presses.

LEADERSHIP: Started having daily quiet times with my kids. Wife observed from the outside for a while. Eventually she joined in. Now she participates. She moved on to start having quiet times with them even on days I'm not there. This is beautiful.

I also started praying together with my wife again - something that had been off-limits for a long time, and the 1000 ft rope is finally reeling in. She surprised me the next morning with lingerie as I was walking out of the shower.

SEX: Best it's ever been. New positions. New times of day. New techniques. Heightened energy. While I don't seek the validation, she openly throws it my way both with her words ("You're so good at this!" "That was amazing!") and in actions (initiating in much stronger ways, trying new things).

SPIRITUALLY:

- AoS: 10
- Quiet Time: 8
- Bible Study: 9
- Scripture Memory: 1
- Prayer: 3
- Evangelism: 8
- Fellowship: 10

AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT:

- Managing my diet more effectively, particularly in relation to my lifting goals
- I need to start taking protein shakes more consistently (I hadn't used them in almost a year and just started again, but not consistently)
- Finding a healthy balance in disciplining my kids between having a stern tone and a positive frame
- Escalating certain relationships from casual acquaintances to useful allies or friends
- Need for continued influence with the lead pastor; I relied too heavily on my red pill pastor, who hasn't been able to cross ministry thresholds on his own

How screwed am I? 12 questions from Beta Bucks

2 upvotes · 19 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Good stuff. While I would appreciate another mod to do a write up on this as well, as extra perspectives are fantastic, biblical love expressed through biblical masculinity is clearly related to a post I've been mulling over for the last 4 weeks that I originally wanted to title "The Kind Alpha" and have changed my mind to "The Christian Alpha." Ove got another one half written that will be posted later today, and I'm going to co author a post with warriorjesus after that ... but perhaps next week :p

Addressing the Blue Pill Hate: Manipulation

2 upvotes · 18 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Depends on how you're defining the red and blue pills, I guess. I'd be curious of your definitions, as I'm not sure how you'd argue against scripture being the ultimate source of the solution.

Michael's Story?

2 upvotes · 13 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

2/2

I'm reading a book right now: *Underground Church*, by Brian Sanders. I'm only a few chapters in, but it's solid stuff and a lot of what I have been preaching for years - over a decade even. In it he talks about his time leading campus ministries and he notes three categories of people who graduated from the student ministry he led:

1. Some would fall away very quickly. As soon as they were out of the fire, the coal died out. They didn't bother looking for other churches or other believers to keep them going. They just got caught up in the world and left Christ behind.
2. Others stay faithful on their own, but reject the church. They realized that the cultural church wasn't living up to the biblical ideals modeled by Jesus and decided that they would just do their own thing. This often led to falling away, but for some it simply meant living a monastic life - trying to be Christlike, but doing so in isolation from any actual purpose. Regardless, they abandoned the vision of building God's Kingdom.
3. The last crowd he references continued with their churches, but did so bitterly, frustrated that their churches weren't living biblically. They still served within those churches and some tried to influence change, but on the whole it was still a very negative experience.

He doesn't reference a fourth crowd who found great churches, plugged in, and flourished with fruit for Christ. Why? Because such perfect churches don't exist and transforming the church (as I am personally finding) is immensely hard work.

Why do people, with few exception, always seem to take a sharp decline in their spiritual maturity and in living out a biblical mission after college? Because college is a bubble and not an accurate predictor of how someone will function in life in the "real world." I put that in quotes because college is the "real world." What happens there matters. It's just not the *adult world*.

What a woman is like in college is not a good predictor of what she will be like in the adult world. That's not to say you should ignore women in college. It's simply to say that you should not trust your vetting strategies to give you accurate results.

Instead of trusting vetting to find a qualified woman, you should trust your leadership to make a woman qualified. Trusting in vetting has value, but it only goes so far because the conclusion depends entirely on the woman and not yourself, and it assumes that women will never change. A wise friend of mine often said, "I've found that women always want to change their man, and men always want their women to stay the same; but in the end neither of them get what they want." That is, it's incredibly hard to change a man once he is rooted in his way, but women are fickle and change their thoughts, behaviors, and mannerisms constantly. This is because women are naturally followers and not leaders. They mold to whoever they are following at any given moment - whether that's their husband, their pastor, their best friend, the author of a book they're reading at any given time, or social media influences.

But your leadership skills are something you can develop. You can hone them and make them more and more effective. As you become more effective and influential as a leader, you develop greater security in your relationships because the woman you're with is more likely to mold to you and your expectations. If you believe

that sex outside of marriage is wrong, and you're a more influential leader in her life than sources that would compel her toward sex outside of marriage, then she will side with you every time. The problem is that most men don't recognize the qualities of a good leader. They start bossing people around and putting processes and systems in place in their relationships and think that this is leading, and are then shocked when their wife cheats on them because she followed her interest in some other guy over her husband's "leadership."

To be clear: I'm not saying not to vet. Absolutely vet. But vetting is only useful as an isolated wife-finding tool if unicorns actually exist. If unicorns don't exist, then you can't vet alone because vetting will never find you what you're looking for. It's like you're looking at hundreds of lumps of clay trying to find one in the shape of a unicorn. Some will look more like a unicorn than others, but at the end of the day they're all still lumps of clay. If you want one that actually resembles of unicorn, you have to mold it into one. That's where developing attractive qualities - most specifically: having a mission and orienting your frame around that mission - are most useful.

That is, you need to know what you want out of life before you can know what you want out of a wife. Once you have your mission in mind, then you know how to vet and how to mold. If I want to carry water from a river to my house, I'm going to want to mold my clay into a vase to help me accomplish my goal. If I want to remember Jesus in my home, then I may want to mold that clay into a cross and hang it on my wall to help me accomplish that goal. If I want to play a game, then I need to mold the clay into game pieces.

Anyway ... I'm out of time. I hope this helps. The long and short of it is this:

1. Don't just try to vet for a high quality woman in college. Vetting is valuable, but not a useful tool in isolation.
2. All women have an innate drive to seek validation, which often expresses itself through sexuality. But some women are better at controlling this instinct than others, which scales with her own spiritual maturity as well as the spiritual maturity of the man who leads her.
3. A sexless pre-marriage relationship is not "beta" if the man has higher priorities in life and therefore the sexlessness is at his choice and not her rejection.

Michael's Story?

2 upvotes · 13 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

My thoughts exactly.

Yes, the Modern Woman would be attracted to Jesus

2 upvotes · 11 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

As a disclaimer, I give no confidence in this assessment at all - I'm doing it more just for the fun of it. About 6 months ago I wrote a post focused on **fixing your SMV**. The goal of the post wasn't to establish a definitive metric for evaluating male SMV; rather, it was designed to point men to work on their weakest areas first. So, if they were horrible leaders in their home, but chose to up their bench from 290 to 300 before working on leadership skills ... that would be idiotic. Nevertheless, what if I did use the suggested rubric for Jesus?

Looks: 3 points.

- 1 point for being a reasonable body size: 1
- 1 point for being muscular (6 pack, bouncing pecs, etc.): we really don't know. Most people agree that Jesus likely had a fit body, but we'll give the doubters some credit here and suggest only .5 - an average build.
- 1 point for having good hygiene, grooming, and fashion sense: I'll give the haters the benefit of the doubt and

say 0 points.

- Points can be lost if you have noticeable physical abnormalities, like an unusual scar or burn marks: I'm not aware of Jesus having anything like this prior to his crucifixion.

Confidence/alphaness/frame: 3 points

- 1 point for showing initiative, passing tests, and having the balls to [say no]: 1
- 1 point for not getting butthurt or being beta-controlling (ex. mate guarding, making rage-demands): 1
- 1 point for being OYS and intentional about managing your life and affairs (mission and steps thereto): 1

1.5 points for your financial position and/or prospects

- We'll just assume 0 points here, unless the woman had enough faith to know that she's never lack for provision while at Jesus' side, as the disciples knew to be true, in which case Jesus would probably gain full points - or somewhere in the middle because no woman would expect to be filthy rich during Jesus' life on earth.

1 point for charm, charisma, wit, personality, etc.

- 1 point there. I don't see Jesus as having a trash personality, and he was certainly charismatic and witty.

1 point for social status and preselection

- Full marks here: 1 point

1/2 point for morality, ethics, and philosophical consistency with one's lifestyle

- 1/2 point

TOTAL: 7

Now, if we have a spiritually mature woman who recognizes that Jesus would never fail to provide, we should add back in something for this, which might bring him to an 8 or 8.5.

I also noted in that post: "Women can re-assign points at their discretion for exceptional features. So, if a guy makes \$500,000/yr he might get 3 points on finances, and they'll just steal the other 1.5 points from somewhere else. Or if the guy is incredibly charismatic, funny, and flirtatious, he might get 2 points and she'll steal the missing point from somewhere else that he's lacking."

Many objectively unattractive celebrities prove this point, as [u/Deep_Strength](#) alluded to. Women will tingle for them despite their ugliness and poor personalities simply because they're famous. That is, they'll look over all of the other low scores and still have the hots for him because a particular feature is off-the-charts for this guy.

Jesus certainly has a few of these. I'd say this would apply to his personality/charisma, fame, and morality/ethics/etc. So maybe he would rise to the level of a perfect 10 - even on a sexual interest level and not merely a spiritual following level.

So, the implication of [u/rocknrollchuck](#)'s comment is that women weren't necessarily drawn to him in a sexual manner. But if we assume women back then had similar sexual attraction frameworks as exist today, then he'd be at least a 7, but more likely higher, and possibly even a 10.

Again: don't read into this too much. I'm just screwing around with a rubric taken out of my own context for using it. But it does show that there may have been more attraction toward Jesus than mere spiritual following.

To [u/Deep_Strength](#) - I just want to add a quick clarification: many of the things you list in the "not (sexually) attractive" section are not things that will decrease someone's attraction; rather, they are things that will increase attraction if present. A guy can still be a 9 or 10 even if he does not exhibit dark triad traits, for example.

A close friend Tells me He thinks my Wife is hot..

2 upvotes · 11 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

[/u/BoiLyon](#) - This is the right answer. Tell him, "Of course my wife's hot" (assuming she is), don't puff up your wife's ego with his comments, and start discipling him to resolving his own issues. It's that simple.

I've had guys hit on my wife before. It's not a big deal. If you have an attractive wife, it's going to happen sooner or later. Amused mastery is key not just in negative contexts, but in positive ones like this too.

My Anger Phase

2 upvotes · 24 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Right. Being mindful of the parable of the great banquet in the process.

Too Little, Too Much

2 upvotes · 23 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I don't know that it addresses that specific angle of things, but [here is a post where I lay out my testimony and RP-imony](#).

Too Little, Too Much

2 upvotes · 23 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I've referenced on here before data results from an ongoing church analytical group that showed that people who had an active lifestyle of evangelism and discipleship had less than a 2% divorce rate within the church. So, if you're a casual Christian who doesn't have a clear mission and isn't leading your wife in that mission, then your 50% probability of divorce might make sense - because neither of you are all that committed to the faith in the first place and you don't see divorce as much bigger of a deal than the rest of the world. But if you follow and apply RPC principles, you'll most likely end up in that 2% category. **Mission matters, nothing else**, brother.

Too Little, Too Much

2 upvotes · 23 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I already do this through periodic phone conversations with some people. I don't mind hosting an AMA sometime, if you think that would help. But like [/u/Deep_Strength](#) said, we have a chat channel. I only check it once every few days, but if I know there's a set time where people will come with questions, it could be useful.

Too Little, Too Much

2 upvotes · 23 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Of course :)

Too Little, Too Much

2 upvotes · 22 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Right. But that still doesn't warrant a man bending his entire life to focus on divorce-avoidance or that he should position his emotions in a manner that divorce would crush him.

Too Little, Too Much

2 upvotes · 22 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

If you want to take exceptional cases as their own context, sure. But most people don't live in exceptional cases. I just addressed this issue with another user [over here](#).

Shit test question

2 upvotes · 21 January 2019 · /r/askMRP

"Just keeping my eyes open for that threesome we talked about."

Recommended church style or denomination ...

2 upvotes · 19 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

A church full of faithful, available, and teachable people who have doctrinal and feminist problems is better than a church of pew sitters who happen to have a right view of marriage and theology. I can mold the first, but can't do squat with the second. Look for a church based on its potential through your influence, not something ready made ... kind of like looking for a girl.

Counterproductive Desire and the Fallacy of Unconditional Love

2 upvotes · 18 January 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

She even told me that I've been finding her more attractive when she's at her worst. faaaahk.....palmtoface.

Complimenting her inappropriately is certainly a problem. A simple way to fix this is if you can, without being overt or cringe-worthy about it, simply comment or make a joke when you find another woman attractive. This lets her know what you find attractive, but without making it personal to her that she's unattractive. As she sees your attention and appreciation of attractiveness focused on other women more than her, she will eventually think then ask, "Why do you always comment about other women and not me?" That's when you address the situation directly. Let her get to that conclusion on her own, though, without needing to tell her. If she figures it out for herself, it means more to her to work through it.

Is My Girlfriend Wife Material? Need Help.

2 upvotes · 17 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Solid. I intended to say a lot of the same things. The one thing I'll add is that OP will one day regret marrying someone older. I did. My wife is 2 months older than me. I now see girls a decade younger than me that I could pull who could easily be molded into great wives. The regret is easily manageable with a strong sense of self and mission, but I know many guys who crack, such as in a midlife crisis.

Logic is Subjective.

2 upvotes · 17 January 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

It reminds me of the saying: *If you say there are two sides to everything, you inherently must agree that there might*

not be two sides to everything.

Logic is Subjective.

2 upvotes · 16 January 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

If logic is subjective, then the logic you used to write this is also subjective, so there's no real point in having written it in the first place because your logic might not apply to anyone else.

Counterproductive Desire and the Fallacy of Unconditional Love

2 upvotes · 14 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

God does "love unconditionally" but we often get caught up in what we think is "unconditional love" versus what God thinks is "unconditional love."

I'd like to see a verse for that. If we define "love" as an emotional disposition toward a people, you may be right. If we define love by a pattern of decision-making and behaviors toward a people, then I stand by what I said. Personally, I believe the emotions are a byproduct of love - the feeling of being "in love" is not actually "love" itself. The real question at this point is: *Does God "love" non-Christians?* The answer depends on your definition, but certainly in all circumstances he withholds the beneficial use of his love for non-Christians. But I agree with your premise - that acts of rebuke and discipline, for example, can be included in love and can, therefore, stretch the bounds of some of what I'm saying.

Don't deny each other sex. I don't think things are mutually exclusive.

Right, hence the suggestion I made: accept, but give terms for your acceptance. "Sounds great. I'll get the whipped cream while you put on some lingerie." The suggestion you gave is great for a one-off if you want to prime her for sex, but it isn't something that's feasible to do every single day, and those bland initiations will still come at some point :p

Stop apologizing so much

2 upvotes · 14 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

https://www.reddit.com/r/RPChristians/comments/6qmr2h/106_what_doesnt_work/?utm_content=title&utm_medium=hot&utm_source=reddit&utm_name=RPChristians

https://www.reddit.com/r/RPChristians/comments/7vpc0c/211_an_anatomy_of_butthurt_and_the_impact_on_frame/

Validation and Interdependency

2 upvotes · 13 January 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

You could expand that into a full post on r/RPChristians.

We've done it, guys. "Traditional Masculinity" is now officially deemed "harmful" by the American Psychological Association. High-five to culture!

2 upvotes · 11 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

And this is a crying shame - that guys over at MRP and TRP blame feminism for all of life's problems and for suppressing masculinity, and suggest that it's men's faults for letting women rise to power ... but then they just throw in the towel and say, "We're too weak to do anything about it, so instead of changing the system we'll just try to maximize what we can do within the system." This seems extremely counter-intuitive to me.

We've done it, guys. "Traditional Masculinity" is now officially deemed "harmful" by the American Psychological Association. High-five to culture!

2 upvotes · 11 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

The intended goal is, no doubt, to eradicate from men any impulses that would challenge liberal ideologies. So, if we tell them that being ambitious, adventurous, risk-takers is dangerous and harmful and that men need to stop being that, then when liberals solidify a substantive enough stronghold in leadership, who is going to take them down?

The unintended consequence is that men will become women. There will just be "seed carrying women" and "egg carrying women."

We've done it, guys. "Traditional Masculinity" is now officially deemed "harmful" by the American Psychological Association. High-five to culture!

2 upvotes · 11 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

That's crazy.

We've done it, guys. "Traditional Masculinity" is now officially deemed "harmful" by the American Psychological Association. High-five to culture!

2 upvotes · 11 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Good call, though based on personal conversation I happen to know he's referencing a revolution a understanding the sexual marketplace within the church.

310 - Leaving a Legacy

2 upvotes · 10 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

This would be easier to discuss next time we chat by phone rather than typing it all.

310 - Leaving a Legacy

2 upvotes · 10 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Where and when did the Church stop intentionally teaching Christians to disciple?

It was a 2-step process between the times of Constantine and Theodosius I in the late 200s/early 300s.

Memorized John 15:2 recently.

That's a good reference too! Recognize that this is all part of Jesus' communion speech (specifically John 13-17) and it'll blow your mind about what Jesus meant when he instituted communion, as compared with the mass-productionalized way we do it today. Communion was always about bonding the body of believers together in fellowship (the Greek word being Koinonia, which the King James translates as "communion") over a common mission of disciple-making, as made obvious through John 13-17. But today we sit isolated in our seats, introspecting by ourselves about our individuality and personal relationship with Christ independent of everyone around us. Not to mention that Acts 2:42 is what all pastors look at to reference the church being the place they were breaking bread ... completely ignoring 2:46, which says the breaking of bread (i.e. communion) happened in people's homes - not over a sterile weekly small group meeting where everyone shares their feelings for an hour and a half, but in a time of bonding over a common mission. I could go on, but you get the idea.

Kinda makes you wonder if we aren't making disciples at some point are we actually even saved? I would lean towards the not being saved, but I guess we'll see someday.

Luke 13's parable of the fig tree is even more explicit on that point. The fig tree is fruitless - not dead, just fruitless. The master wants to cut it down. The vinedresser (i.e. person responsible for that tree) says, "Give me a year to work with him, and then if he's still fruitless, you can cut him down." Nobody cares how strong the wood is, how beautiful the leaves are, etc. Is it bearing fruit? That's the only test.

Then, of course, in Matthew 7 Jesus doesn't say, "Any tree that produces bad fruit will be thrown in the fire." He says, "Any tree that does not produce good fruit." It's not enough to say, "I didn't produce any bad fruit, God!" You have to be able to point to good fruit in your life.

Great comment :)

I unknowingly married a BPD... and I need advice.

2 upvotes · 10 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Glad I could help. Another tid-bit that I was reminded of today with a new client: BPDs like control but don't know how to maintain it. One of their main strategies is to give slivers of hope that are not realistically plausible, but enough to string someone along. If you struggle with a codependency issues, you'll fall for it every time.

In this particular case, my new client is a career beta with a BPD wife. He gives his wife a list of 3 things that she must do to keep him from filing for divorce. I don't recall the first, but the second and third were: (2) go to counseling, (3) make him a priority in her life. At one point he accused her of not including him in her plans for the future and her answer was: "You're right. I don't. So?"

She responds to his list of three things with an immediate no. Then she comes back the next day saying, "I thought about it and decided I was being too harsh. I'm willing to try to live up to the 3 things you listed, but you have to live up to a list of things I want from you too." She then hands him a list 40 long! Some of the items:

- Be more of a leader in the home
- Take charge of planning our vacations
- Quit trying to start this business and get a real job
- Take responsibility for our kids' spiritual growth and development

And the list went on like that. Sound familiar?

Now, objectively, anyone looking at this would know the obvious conclusion: it's never going to work. He gives a list of 3 basic things and she gives a list of 40 specific, yet in many cases major life-changing things in response? That's her way of saying, "This is never going to happen" because she's placing major expectations that he can never live up to. But by framing it in a way that gives him hope - that if he can live up to her 40 things, then maybe it'll work. And he's genuinely tempted by that hope. He said today, "I think I can do most of the things on that list - maybe even all of them. So, we might not need to get divorced if I can make this work." But the reality is that even if he does live up to all of those other things, she has no intention of holding up her end of the bargain. She's just setting up an impossible bargain so that if he fails one of any of the 40, she can blame him for the problem when she fails one of his 3 - and therefore she has an out to keep being herself while still keeping him stuck in the marriage.

The proper solution to this degree of codependency isn't to demand independence through a divorce or separation. It's to refuse to play the game at all. This is done by creating your frame as the foundation of the marriage rather than hers, per my last post. But recognizing another strategy that BPDs use can be helpful all the same.

I certainly wouldn't expect a 7-11 year old to pay their way

That's because they're not intellectually or legally competent to maintain employment. Your wife is both. Her emotional stability does not affect her ability to generate an income. It only affects her desire to do so. By way of example, this new client's wife is the heavier earner. He earns about \$60k and she earns around \$85k. She is very professionally competent and maintains a great network of business contacts, including being personal friends with the CEO of a major national bank. In professional settings, BPDs can still be highly proficient. They just unravel when emotional issues enter the fray, usually unloading it all on their family at home.

hazy trying to figure out what is realistic for me to expect from her or delegate to her and what isn't

Functionally, she should be as competent as any adult. The primary difference is her emotional state. A normal adult can do the dishes without complaining. She may not like it, but she'll do it. A BPD will whine and complain about doing the dishes and how you're not helping around enough and blame everything on you. Remember: she's intellectually as competent as any other adult, so she won't take the same approach to arguments that an 11 year old would. The 11 year old would just wine until you discipline them into doing it. The adult BPD will argue her points in a way that tries to convince you that she's right - but ultimately her emotional gratification is her ultimate desire, not what's best for the family, what's fair to you, or any of those other things that rational adults might contemplate who can get past their emotions.

she feels doing those things isn't significant enough for her so she isn't willing to do them

Just like an 11 year old who doesn't feel like doing the dishes because the mysterious "someone else" can always do them, or because they'll just need done again the next day.

Here's the real deal on that, though: Either (1) she doesn't feel valued or appreciated by you when she does these things, so she stops seeing the value or importance in doing them, or (2) she's emotionally detached from you and doesn't care about your validation of her. The solution is to get her emotional state to depend on you again - not in an unhealthy codependency, but in a godly "she was created to be your helper and will only be satisfied when she lives within her role" kind of way. You do that by establishing the emotional frame within the household per my last comment.

Can I expect / trust my wife to ever be my FO, or do I need to treat her more like that 7-11yr old and just take care of everything myself?

She can absolutely be your first officer. She will just be the crass, unprofessional first officer. You ever watch Breaking Bad? Think of Jesse to Walter White. They had a clear bond. Jesse was his helper. They were on a mission together and stuck through some very hard times. Jesse respected Walter. But he was also a loose cannon who went off his rocker all the time with emotional outbursts and defying instructions ... before ultimately being reigned back in. It's not a perfect example, but it's the first that came to my head. You will never be Kirk and Spock. So, shoot for Walter and Jesse instead.

We are all going to hell

2 upvotes · 29 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Stop trying to tell a football player he's wrong for not throwing the ball in a hoop. Nonchristians aren't playing the same game we are ... at least not consciously. Get them playing the right game first then help them figure out the rules of that game. Trying to make them play by basketball rules while they're still on the football field is a waste of time.

Also, our goal isn't to stop them sinning. It's too get them following Christ. Conquering sin is a byproduct of sanctification, but they can't be sanctified without Jesus anyway. Finding a loving way to tell them they're sinning is not helpful. Getting them in a relationship with Jesus is. It's the Spirit's job to convict unbelievers, not ours.

Once they're saved, only then do we gain the obligation to rebuke - and tactfully at that.

Humility in leadership. Opposites in distinction. Or not?

2 upvotes · 27 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Goodness. Lots of bad content coming out lately. I know you're trying and asking this as a question, so lots of grace here. But your assumptions about humility are way, way, way off - and that's creating the conflict for you.

a humble man would not take leadership, unless asked to

Says who? To steal a line that [u/redpillwonder](#) stole from me: this all depends on the definitions you're using. It seems like you made up your own definition of humility and eisegetically imputed that into your scriptural interpretation of the command to be humble.

As [u/deep_strength](#) noted, humility isn't thinking less of yourself; it's having a right perception of who you are before God and man and living in that. If you know God created you to lead (a family, for example), then it's perfectly humble to take up that position and lead.

The "unless asked to" part is also troubling. You're probably thinking of someone like Moses, who was asked by God in a clear audible voice to lead, and he "humbly" said he didn't think he was the right man for the job. God calls him out on the fact that he wasn't being humble; he was being a coward.

Most people who God calls to leadership don't get the clear audible voice. They are compelled by their internal makeup - by the character God has created in them to want to lead. Don't undermine that.

he simply subjects himself unto the other by doing their will instead.

Where in the world ... or heaven ... or hell ... or the land of ridiculous imaginary ideas did you ever hear this?

Did Jesus sit back and take orders from his disciples? Did Paul let the churches dictate how he witnessed to them? This is nowhere in the bible and is completely eisegetical.

He is seen as an authority, because he is.

And he passed that authority onto us in Matthew 28:19.

Also, we are to meet like Christ, who recognized and exercised leadership and authority over others in appropriate context. Paul did the same and encouraged others: "Follow my example."

What are some RP conservative, fundamental pastors?

2 upvotes · 27 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I haven't seen his marriage stuff, but his discipleship talks are excellent. He's one of the few preachers I would endorse.

Best Man Speech at My Brother's Wedding

2 upvotes · 26 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Two men and two women. The women were both my aunts, who are godly, humble, and submissive women. The two men were randos who essentially said they'd never thought of that before.

Help with over-controlling parents?

2 upvotes · 21 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This sort of question is perfectly appropriate here. There are scant few other places on the internet to get reliable

biblical advice on topics like this. This sub explicitly extends beyond sexual strategy alone and into other aspects of biblical masculinity.

Responsibilities and Privileges

2 upvotes · 20 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That's my point though: the Matthew 18 process will likely fail because the witnesses and the leadership will virtually always side with the woman ... thus there is no enforcement if God doesn't otherwise change her heart. Doesn't that really still leave it at her discretion if there are no practical consequences for her sin? And if it's at her discretion, how is it the man's right and not a privilege of her whims?

To be clear, I think we agree. I'm just exploring an idea through a thought experiment.

Responsibilities and Privileges

2 upvotes · 19 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Someone's been listening to Jordan Peterson ;)

I do like the responsibility/privilege dynamic. In fact, I've included it in my book. So props for being the one to bring it here in a relatively clear manner.

Of course, my gut reaction was the same as chuck's: what do we do with this information once we have it? I do have some ideas, and I read your reply to him. I'd delete your reply to him, replace it with "I'll add it in the post itself," then edit the post to add a new section in the post titled "Application." You've got a great post, but half of it is in the comments, which will lose readers on the part that actually matters.

[FR] The importance of the basics

2 upvotes · 16 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Well said.

Do Looks Matter – The Maroon Pill and The Apex Alpha Predator...

2 upvotes · 12 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians

women guided by the spirit would be attracted to other things

The way God created men and women, per the Bible, doesn't differentiate attraction cues between those "guided by the Spirit" and those who aren't. My point in suggesting that there is no Scriptural foundation for your post wasn't to say that only ungodly women who don't live by Scripture would be this way - it was to say that your entire argument cannot be (and is not) supported by Scripture at all. You are relying solely on observation and logic. That is the issue. Your defense in the edit reiterates that this is your foundation.

I believe women in the modern world truly have a barrier where they will not consider males (especially if they are on social media / dating apps).

As noted in my comment: this is uniquely true for social media and dating apps because looks are all you can really assess in those forums. So, if your only source of meeting a girl is online dating, then the black pill suddenly makes a lot of sense. For anyone who is actually approaching women in real life, this no longer holds true on the same level.

That said, I will acknowledge (and I think I even did in my linked post, I can't remember) that the concepts only apply within general averages, as points can span beyond their given thresholds. Rather than 0 points, the elephant man would get negative points - his looks are so atrocious that even perfect marks in every other area could not

make up for it with regard to raw sexual attraction. That being said, by definition most men reading this sub will not be the obscure outlier.

if this is a high social media or dating app using 7, she will have an inflated ego and will think she is a 9

And this is why I recommend in-person approaches, not using dating websites. All of your information is conflated within a social media framework. Although such apps can be useful, I believe the advice on this sub from the moderators has consistently been that dating apps should be a last resort to in-person approaches. Tag: [u/redpillwonder](#) [/u/Deep_Strength](#) [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) - just in case I'm mistaken on that point.

My point though, it's not the norm. 90% of the time, the guy who is a 4 or 5 won't have all these elements and won't attract these women.

But that's the whole point of the red pill, isn't it? Most guys don't have those extraneous elements, so we teach them to develop those elements in their life. So, while you're right that 90% of guys may not naturally fall into that category, I'd wager that virtually all of the guys who learn from here and apply it in their lives will be within the 10%. We're still the minority (because the world hates the red pill), but there's a consistent strategy for always being in the other 10% that the world (and especially the church) just isn't willing to embrace: become red pill.

Your post only makes sense if we're talking about the general population, not guys who know how to develop a solid frame, have a charming persona, pass fitness tests, etc.

if you ask a girl would you ever date this guy (let's call him a 4 and her an 8) - and she says, "absolutely not, ever."

Once again, the setup assumes the only criteria she has to go on is whatever picture you're showing her. If her only information about him is his looks, obviously the black pill's "looks are the only thing that matters" mantra is going to be rationalized by the conclusion.

But once again: get out of the "all you get to look at is a picture" examples and watch the 4 approach the 8 at the bar with actual game, frame, confidence, etc. and you're going to see a very, very different result.

This entire post is merely a long-winded way to say, "I don't think the red pill is true or that it actually works." Despite what hundreds of thousands of men on TRP have consistently found to be true, even using only a scientific foundation (i.e. observation and swapping notes), you're saying, "I don't buy it. I don't believe that mediocre-looking guy could ever actually get that total hottie." Instead, you're blaming looks and genetic lottery for some made-up cap in SMV - and only looking at one unique type of filter for relational initiation: image-based.

This is an incredibly disingenuous and misleading approach because it mistakenly causes other men to assume that non-picture-based approaches (ex. asking out an existing friend, co-worker, etc.) will follow the same conclusions as a picture-based framework arrives at. This is simply untrue and it is particularly vexing given that my primary proposed plan for finding a wife (as found in the "How to find the woman you can't keep yourself from banging" post on the sidebar) is not picture-based at all. So, if guys follow my advice, they're going to find very different results from what you're presenting - but if your post is not clear about its extremely narrow focus and application, you're going to give guys the wrong idea about when anything you've said actually applies and not.

So, to be very clear: when you say:

Any man reading this should realize #1 looks matter and #2 do the best you can with what you got.

You need to add the tag: "If your only means of finding a woman is a picture-based social media or dating app."

With that stipulation, I'd be far more inclined to entertain a few of the ideas you're presenting.

Is repentance required in order to be saved?

2 upvotes · 11 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians

If someone accepts Jesus Christ as their Lord and Savior

and

but they don't repent

... that's impossible.

Calling someone "Lord" is not the same as them actually being your Lord. In Matthew 7 Jesus says, "Many will say to me on that day, 'Lord, Lord, did we not [do x, y, and z] in your name?' but surely I will say to them, 'I never knew you. Away from me you evildoer.'"

A "Lord" is someone you are submissive to on a macrological level. Your life is oriented around their goals and purposes. While you may maintain autonomy over your personal daily affairs, your entire life purposes are theirs to control. If it helps, think of a knight in King Arthur's Court, who would have called King Arthur their "lord." They lived only do carry out his vision and purposes, but the way they did it was at their discretion.

One of God's visions and purposes for us is to be sanctified. That means to conquer sin in our own lives in order to be more effective at the greater callings he has given us. If someone refuses to give up any particular sin, then they are denying Christ as Lord over their life.

Another way to look at it is this. How many sins does it take to condemn a person to hell? One. Genesis 3 and Romans 6:23 seem to make this clear enough. If you refuse to repent over one sin, but ask for forgiveness of the other 99.9%, even if 99.9% of your sins are forgiven, you still have that one. Right? So where does that leave you, in the end?

Met the church girl for coffee... How to proceed?

2 upvotes · 28 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

God is certainly good. But he's not good because a girl agreed to go out to look at Christmas lights with you. For all you know, she could end up being a crazy psycho woman who divorces you after 5 years of marriage, taking half your stuff. Would God still be good then for the date you got now? Still good: yes. For that reason: not at all.

Keep your mind open, lest you return to blue pill fantasies. Mistakenly assuming that God is orchestrating you going on a date to see Christmas lights is how blue pill fantasies, ONEitis, and idolization all creep in. She's not your soul mate. You don't even know if you're going to marry her. If you really do think God is the one orchestrating this, then you might as well just propose now. If you're not sure if God is orchestrating it or not, be cautious not to give credit to God for what might actually be coming from the enemy. There are still too many questions to have that fuzzy kind of attitude - which is also the source of a lot of unattraction.

Remember, you're the prize. If you have the attitude that you just won the lotto, her attraction toward you will greatly diminish. Either she'll lose interest because of your unattractive attitude toward her or she'll get an inflated sense of her own worth and assume she can pull better than you if a guy like you is so excited to get a date with her. And don't be so arrogant as to assume she can't sniff out that attitude on you because you're so great at hiding it.

I don't mean to beat you up, but you've got a good thing going for you and I don't want to see this blue pill attitude ruin that for you in the long run.

Disturbing Things in This Group

2 upvotes · 26 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Amen.

Worried about never being in a relationship

2 upvotes · 22 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Ah, not the OU by me then.

Soft next and hard next concept

2 upvotes · 20 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This has already been said ([/u/Deep_Strength](#) [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) and [/u/rocknrollchuck](#) all gave great answers), but it was framed as an alternative, not a continuation of the same spectrum. So let me clarify.

For single guys, the concept of *nexting* is a statement of how you'll spend your time. If a girl isn't, to you, worth the time you're investing in her, then you next her as a way of freeing up your time for something more valuable.

A soft next is when you stop initiating with her because you have better things to do, but if she's going to initiate with you, you're leaving that door open because a person or thing has greater value to you when you can reap that value with less effort. So, if she's going to be the one putting in all the effort to get your time and attention, her value rises, but you're perfectly fine walking away from putting in your own effort and spending your time and effort elsewhere instead.

A hard next is when you are confident that the value she adds to your life is so low (maybe even in the negatives) that even if she were to try to initiate with you, you're still better off spending your time and energy elsewhere.

In marriage, we're doing the same thing. A hard next is either divorce or legal separation. This is where you have some certainty that this person will no longer be able to contribute value to your life, even if you didn't have to put in any effort toward the relationship anymore. You simply want out. Biblically, I believe actual divorce is always sin, but that it's a preferable sin if remaining married would otherwise cause worse sin (i.e. the whole "because of the hardness of your heart" thing).

Soft nexting is simply focusing on the next thing in your life that isn't your wife because the effort you spend on your wife isn't justifying the value you reap for that effort. While singles may think that "next" refers to "next girl," I prefer to think of it as "next priority" on the list of things that matter to you. That's all.

From there, it's your responsibility to discern the balance of value and effort you want to maintain in your relationship. I always assess that value in terms of my mission. It's one thing to assess value based on my feelings, in which case I would run my marriage very differently. But my feelings are fickle anyway, and as a Christian I have more important things to do in life than make sure I'm feeling happy in my marriage all the time. So, instead of asking how my wife is adding value to me, I ask how she's adding value to my mission - because my mission is more important to me than my emotions. If the effort I invest in her is not adding any value to that mission, then I focus on my mission without her. If she's ready to join in and reduce the amount of effort I have to spend to get the same value as before - or even better: that she increases her value-add to my mission, even if I have to return to the previous level of effort - then I no longer have to focus on the (soft) "next priority" on my list because I have another means of accomplishing my purpose.

And to be clear, let me refrain the two scenarios for when a wife is behaving poorly that should cause a man to re-engage:

- She requires less effort to get the same value
- She requires the same/more effort, but gives appropriately greater value

Between the two of these, I would preference the second one every time. The first is reducing the profitability of your joint interactions and puts you in placation mode with one another. In essence, she's still not any more on board with your mission than she was before, but she's accepting the fact that your mission is more important than she is, so she readjusts her expectations of you to account for that. She's less interested in following you than in doing the minimum necessary to get what she wants from you.

The second, while requiring more effort from you, is the situation where she actually increases her engagement in your mission. This can increase the bond between the two of you, thereby increasing sexuality as you are more and more on the same page with pursuing the same goal - and it also reorients her mindset in following you.

Sad State of Affairs

2 upvotes · 20 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

The surprise was the portrayal that everything was fine... until it wasn't.

So, I can echo story after story like what you've described, but one of the worst is from my church and not one of my cases.

The husband was something of a bad boy - piercings and tattoos everywhere, fit shape, etc. The wife was your classic goodie good church girl knockout, wearing dresses on Sunday and raising her hands in worship, dancing as she sang. She was appointed director of the children's ministry after impressing everyone with her incredible biblical knowledge and passion for serving in the church. He joined the security and parking teams and usually chummed around with other people in the hallways instead of going to service. They both posted on social media frequently how much they loved each other and weren't shy about their sex life.

Then one day he's calling me asking about divorce. It turns out the goodie girl who knew more theology than 90% of the people here and who was a leader in the church and passionate during service ... had cheated on him. So I meet with him to figure out what's going on. Turns out it wasn't the first time either. It was the 7th (that he knew of). This was just the one where she refused to break it off when he found out.

Moral of the story: church leaders are easy to dupe. They're looking at outward appearances, not the heart. And when they say they're looking at the heart, they're looking at the wrong criteria to assess the heart. That's the danger of emotionalism in the church. Emotions are a horrible indication of spiritual maturity.

To be fair, before I was saved, I had several pastors duped too, thinking I was the most spiritually mature high school student they'd ever met. I was bold with my faith, I knew more theology than they did, and I knew how to put on a passionate show. But none of it was real.

Now I'm dealing with a pastor who just yesterday invited me to join a "preaching team" and he's telling me about the other people he wants on the team. They're all people who have a clear outward appearance of spiritual maturity, and I know for a fact that 1 of them is the real deal. My wife jokes that I have a man-crush on him because of the level of respect I have for that guy. Another is a girl, who is the real deal, but ... girl. The other two I happen to know are not even remotely mature. But one is highly knowledgeable, so the pastor wants to appoint him anyway, despite the fact that the pastor just had to remove him from another team for serious character flaws. The last guy is highly emotional, but is as spiritually illiterate as a box of rocks. I led him in small group for 2 years and after a few months he finally asks: "I hear you using the word 'gospel' a lot. What is that? What does that word mean?" I would also teach basic stuff, like what the parable of the sower meant, and he'd argue with me, "I don't buy it. That explanation doesn't *feel right* to me." Then I'd show him 10 verses down, where Jesus himself explains it and he'd cave. So props to him for being willing to learn, but his discernment is way off. Yet these are the people that the pastor wants to put in charge of all the preaching that gets done at the church - content, who preaches, etc.

Pastors are easily duped. End of story.

Sad State of Affairs

2 upvotes · 20 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Yeah ... that's not biblical. Biblically speaking, we all deserve hell. Anything better than that is simply God's grace. So, the word "deserve" doesn't do much for me. She deserves far, far worse.

Sad State of Affairs

2 upvotes · 20 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Funny ... reading the whole story I'm thinking, "I know this person. I've seen ten of them in the last month." There's one case in particular that I suspect could actually be the people you're talking about - every detail lines up, including her potentially losing her church job if she files.

It would be a mistake to think you couldn't help, though. "I will go before you and will level the mountains; I will break down gates of bronze and cut through bars of iron. I will give you hidden treasures, riches stored in secret places, so that you may know that I am the Lord, the God of Israel, who summons you by name" (Isaiah 45:2-3). With everything I've seen, I've gotten to be a pretty darn good judge of character too - flawless, even. But part of that judging is a recognition that nobody is beyond the Holy Spirit's power.

Now, on a separate matter, I also fully invest in the WISNIFG bill of right #3 - "You have the right to judge if you are responsible for finding solutions to other people's problems." Jesus did this all the time. It's why he focused on the Jews and didn't go off healing every sick person in the entire world - especially among the Gentiles. When the Syrophoenician woman asked for help he almost turned her away, but for her wise answer. I imagine many others were unwise. Jesus let the rich young ruler walk away and didn't follow him around trying to get his heart in the right place. So, I'm fine with not being responsible for others' problems.

The question, then, becomes simply: *If you believe God could change his heart, would you want to be the vehicle God uses to do that?*

Both answers to that question are perfectly legitimate. Maybe you're bearing fruit in so many other ways that you don't have the capacity to take on a job like that. Just don't discount the option simply because he seems like a difficult one. Some of the most fruitful disciple-makers I know were guys I had found and discipled who I never expected much from.

Caught wife wanking off

2 upvotes · 15 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is one of the reasons we've never used a vibrator in the first place. There have been times when I've wanted to get one, though. I've read that using a vibrator too much can make it hard for her to enjoy stimulus from anything else, but I'm not sure if that was just for virgins learning to have orgasms in the first place or if it would still apply and possibly cause regression for people who have been married for over 10 years and orgasms were never a problem.

How should I handle these two disciples?

2 upvotes · 13 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I wasn't recommending he disciple her - only that he work together alongside her to start a discipleship ministry. That will involve some training, but nothing on the level of actual discipleship. I was also assuming at the time that he did have some interest in her. If he doesn't, there's no need to include her unless it helps his mission to do so.

Question on leading someone into becoming quality wife material

2 upvotes · 12 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

What does this look like at this point in time?

I gave a few examples in my comment. The main thing is to engage in things that are outward focused, not focused on you and her. Dinner, movie, walk in the park, etc. are all focused on you and her. Things that are outward focused takes the pressure off, letting you do something valuable beyond just the romance of it all, while still giving you more exposure together to feel things out.

This feels like it goes against everything RP I've read/been taught, but at the same time I can also see that this is a situation where it might be warranted?

It's situation-specific. I wouldn't give this advice to a married man, for example. The goal here isn't to blurt out everything that crosses your mind. It's to set clear boundaries - ones that you might let her cross, but that you will let her know before they are actually crossed.

Avoiding doing this puts you in the position of communicating covertly, which is how women communicate. While this can be received well, it also gives her the wrong impression because her emotions will always lead her further down the path than you're willing to go at this time.

So, as a general rule, I would ordinarily agree with you that remaining covert in your intentions is more attractive, there are situations that warrant decisive boundary-setting instead. This is true in marriage as well, just in different ways.

she aligns with it as much as anyone I've met

Aligning is one thing. In theory, every girl who is godly and pursuing Christ should align with your mission. It's not enough just that you're moving in the same direction. Parallel lines move the same way, but never actually cross. There's got to be an overlap of your efforts at some point, where you're doing these things together and not individually. I learned that lesson the hard way.

Abundance Mentality

2 upvotes · 12 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

[/u/sic_redditr cruiser](#) is doing some good writing on abundance mentality on his instagram. I haven't asked yet, but when he's a few posts in I was going to have him put some of the content up here. Instagram is shorter, so 3 insta posts to one reddit post is probably appropriate, and I've only seen the first two so far. Either way, you can message him for more information on abundance. [/u/BobbyMcKee](#) also had the more general reply that I'd give. Also, there's an entire post (maybe a couple?) on the sidebar to address having an abundance mentality - I think in the 200 series.

Abundance Mentality

2 upvotes · 12 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is the correct answer. Good word, brother.

How should I handle these two disciples?

2 upvotes · 12 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Solid reply.

On being 'Red Pill'...

2 upvotes · 9 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I wrote a post early on this sub's history to cover this exact issue. It's on the sidebar. Here you go:

https://www.reddit.com/r/RPChristians/comments/76wv9u/defining_rp_for_this_sub_and_understanding_the/

How to date "evenly" as a Christian

2 upvotes · 2 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I can appreciate this response. Just recognize that of the statements in your last paragraph, the biological imperative one is the only one that isn't part of a fantasy world that most people concoct without justification and that doesn't measure up to reality.

Hosting a Board Game Party

2 upvotes · 1 November 2018 · /r/RedPillWomen

Cheeses that melt into a cream rather than clumps or stickiness should be doable, but I haven't actually tested it other than with white Queso (which does work quite well). Most other Salsa varieties work just fine, but Pace is my personal favorite for mixing purposes, even if it's not the best for straight salsa-eating.

Boldly sharing the Gospel - is it unloving?

2 upvotes · 30 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Well said. It's like when Jesus told his disciples to pray for workers in the vineyard ... then guess who the first wave of workers ends up being ...

The Consciously Crazy Wife

2 upvotes · 30 October 2018 · /r/askMRP

A symbol of strength and might, but one in which she can rest safely under its branches from any storm that may come by.

The Consciously Crazy Wife

2 upvotes · 29 October 2018 · /r/askMRP

Well said. Teasing and pranks are my primary MO - possibly even too far at times, which works incredibly well quite often. Agreed that this is better than actual argument - I never thought of it as a way for her to release some of that steam before, though. That's a helpful connection.

The Consciously Crazy Wife

2 upvotes · 29 October 2018 · /r/askMRP

I've been a supporter of the [/u/Rian_Stone](#) [+3] idea that you purposely give her things to be angry about. That way, she gets her feelz and it short circuits her need to come up with things to be mad about.

A solid reminder that I'd much forgotten about. Thanks for that.

Or maybe calling your personality manipulative is her own manipulative play?

Absolutely. I had to resist the urge to DEER on that exact point.

Learning from the life of Esau

2 upvotes · 29 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

There's not. Most Bible studies I've been in suffer from one of two key failures in the discussion prompts:

1. They're too rhetorical, so it leaves no room for actual discussion. The answers are obvious and everyone is likely to agree, so conversation never starts.

2. They're too abstract, being so far separated from the material that no answer could ever be evaluated as "good" or "bad" - there are just people's own personal opinions and thoughts.

Better questions are those that relate to the material, but cause people to think very hard about what the material means or how they have been failing to apply it in their own lives.

Questions that presume a preexisting application are also very, very bad and dangerous: "When was a time that you helped someone in need?" All this does is convince people that they're already good at helping people in need. It doesn't convince them that they need to change their behaviors going forward.

The Consciously Crazy Wife

2 upvotes · 29 October 2018 · /r/askMRP

This is good - and I never thought of the gradual-release method of dealing with craziness and emotions. It gives me the mental imagery of a steam engine, which is constantly producing steam, and if it all keeps storing up it'll explode, so it releases it in controlled puffs that provide energy to whatever it is that steam engines do. Or maybe I'm crazy and don't know how steam engines work, but it helps nonetheless.

Open thread

2 upvotes · 27 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

In addition to the links [u/redpillwonder](#) gave, I believe [this post on: "There is no 'Christian version' of anything"](#) really gets to the heart of your question.

RPC is not a Christianized version of the secular red pill with verses to back it up. It takes concepts that are originally found in the Bible, but uses similar lingo as the secular red pill to communicate what the Bible says in terms that Christians who are already associated with the manosphere will be able to understand.

I should also note that the comment of mine that [u/redpillwonder](#) shared is probably something that needs updating, as my views have evolved quite a bit since then, as I continue to study the Bible.

As for spinning plates, which you mentioned in a comment below, there's no question that the sniper mentality of finding a wife is very dangerous and usually leads to awful marriages, whereas the shotgun mentality is far more effective and leads to more stable, godly marriages. Part of that mentality means that you are actively building relationships with multiple women at a time - definitely not sexually, and most likely not romantically, but that you are constantly getting to know different women and keeping your options open until you are confident about someone. Serial monogamous dating is never found or mentioned in the Bible. Polygamy, though I don't endorse it today, is actually the default presumption in romantic relationships in most phases of biblical history. So, a view of relationships that presumes a man must be serially monogamous in his dating life in order to find a wife is based on cultural influences and not a biblical foundation. If you develop serial monogamy as your own personal conviction, then you should abide by it, per Romans 14; but it is also important to recognize that it is an unwise conviction that leads to unnecessary difficulties in married life later on, including an increased risk of divorce.

Losing feelings for my wife

2 upvotes · 26 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Amen. Though it would be more accurate to say that discipleship is the best model for accomplishing the goals of counseling. Counseling itself doesn't really look like discipleship at all.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (10/24/18)

2 upvotes · 26 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

OYS ??? I don't know - I don't keep track.

Instead of giving the repetitive updates on each area, I'll just skip straight to where I've been screwing up lately: golden ratio and bids for attention.

After catching up on some of [u/redpillcoach](#)'s videos last weekend (I was previously only looking at the series playlist - didn't realize there were others not part of the play list), the concept of bids for attention resonated with me. I had assumed I was appropriately employing the golden ratio because of the broader things.

But when I heard about bids for attention, I noticed something I hadn't picked up on before: *I was starting about 80% of our conversations*. Initially I considered this a form of leading. I'm supposed to be the initiator, right? But the question popped in my head: *what am I supposed to be initiating?* I'm to initiate a purpose, plan, path, process, and progress (just winging the alliteration here). But when I initiate all the conversation, it's no longer about leading the family, it is interpreted as me pursuing her. And she often seems disinterested and uninvested in the conversation.

So, this week I've been working on rebalancing the initiation ratio of conversations:

- I used to call her on my way home from the gym to tell her my plans for dinner. Not doing that anymore. I just do it.
- When we had scheduling issues to work out and how to get kids from place to place, I used to call to figure out what was going on. Now it's just a simple text: "I'm getting kids and covering swim lessons" or "You're doing kids today." Done. Logistics only.
- When the kids were down, I used to open every conversation while she sat scrolling social media: "So, how was your day?" Not anymore. If she wants to chat, she can bid for my attention. I do what I have to get done (which lately has been working from home).

Even when she would try to initiate with me, she's lazy and would yell from whatever room she was in, hoping I'd hear her. I used to yell back. Idiotic. That only adds chaos in the house. I stopped yelling back. If she wants my attention, she can come get it. I have better things to do than try to figure out what she's saying through 2 walls or around 3 corners.

I don't know how this is going to pan out yet. But it's certainly more freeing to break the mold of me bidding for her attention all the time. I have noticed initially that after she realizes I'm not initiating like I used to, she's stepping up more often to be that initiator. We're having about 25% less conversations because some of the times that I would have initiated, she doesn't - and she just goes off to do her own thing, which gives me more time to re-purpose toward my own agenda. She's now the one initiating conversations with me and I get 25% of that time back. Win-win.

The 16 Commandments - Part 1

2 upvotes · 25 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Fair points. I agree with your first and third paragraphs. As to the second, there is certainly a point where too much attention reduces interest and affection. There are relational dynamics that people tend to gravitate toward, following a path of least resistance unless a better dynamic is readily available. Part of that means that if a guy is showing too much attention, his attention becomes cheap and loses its value, so instead of accepting it to move toward a higher relational dynamic, it's easier just to get bored of it. I'm working on a post to explain this much better, but didn't have much more than a few minutes to get started today.

Is woman created in God's image let's explore.

2 upvotes · 24 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

It's first degree and second degree. If I look at a bowl of fruit and draw an impeccable picture of it, that picture is in the image of the bowl of fruit. If that same artist then removes the bowl of fruit from the room and looks at his own picture and draws another exactly like it, is the second picture:

- in the image of the original bowl of fruit? or ...
- in the image of another picture?

Obviously it's both.

Catching a cheat... time traveling?

2 upvotes · 24 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Did she cheat on you? Who knows. That's not actually the important question. It breaks your blue-pill fantasy world that you'd have a perfect, loving, faithful wife who would never do such a thing because she's a good church girl. It also breaks your blue pill illusion that your wife is just a cold, frigid harpy who doesn't like sex. She does. Assume it happened. Fantasy broken. Welcome to the red pill.

First thing's first, even if she did cheat on you, there's nothing you can do about it now. Cautious wisdom aside, her sin is ultimately for God to decide what to do with. If you want to divorce her, divorce her. If you want to remain married, forgive her. Those are really your only two options.

Beyond that, look to David. He had sex with another man's wife, then killed that man, and his sin got their child killed. Has your wife done so much to you? Probably not. Nevertheless, was David's sin against Bathsheba for making her an adulteress and killing her child? No. Was it against the child who died? No. Was it against the man whose wife he slept with and who he then killed? No. Psalm 51:4 - "Against you, you only, have I sinned." Why? Because Uriah, Bathsheba, and the baby are not his judges. He's not bound to live up to their expectations. He answers to God, not them. It is God's standard that he violated. Uriah, Bathsheba, and the baby are all under God's protection and provision, and if David violated that, it's God's mess to sort out, not theirs.

Likewise, you have no spiritual claim or hold over your wife. She has a duty to you, but not an inherent one. It exists only because God says it does. Her duty to you *is her duty to God*. If we remove God's frame from the picture, there's no basis for her to owe you anything anymore. Accordingly, her only obligation is to God. So, if she failed in her duty to remain faithful to you, that's for God to figure out. If you want to pretend to ascend above God to judge her for her actions, so be it. But by insisting on the "truth" of the matter, you're not really gaining anything beyond what you would otherwise achieve by assuming she cheated on you.

"Peace of mind" or "sanity" should not depend on the truth, but on living in the right frame. If you're that worked up by her doing what girls do, that's your internal emotional problem, not hers. And it's one that she can't solve by giving you an answer. Let it go or let her go. Those are your options.

As for the biblical viability of divorce in the first place, I have made my views pretty clear on this sub: divorce is always sin, even in the case of sexual immorality - but it is a "permissible" sin in the event that someone would be inclined toward even worse if divorce were not an option. As to the next step, I don't see any "unless she cheated" exception to remarriage after divorce - though the same principle would likely apply: if being forbidden to remarry would cause you to commit even greater sins, then because of the hardness of your heart, the sin of remarriage after divorce is the preferable option.

I want to fix our marriage in a RP way but need to find a way to resolve this ... for my own sanity

Fair enough. Here's my roadmap for you. Decide for yourself if/how you want to implement it or tweak it. But don't just strategize in your head. At some point you actually have to start doing something different. Losing weight is a great start, but ...

1. Stop worrying about whether or not your wife cheated on you. Assume she did. Forgive her, but be cautious about similar opportunities she might have in the future.
2. Discover your mission in life. You haven't given us one. She probably feels like she's in a dead-end marriage that isn't doing anything but accumulating money. If you're Indiana Jones, what's the Lost Ark you're questing for? Or are you content to stick it out as a professor at the university making money instead of being on a meaningful, world-impacting adventure? Your mission is God-given, not something you make for yourself. That's key. That's why I didn't say to "make up" a mission - I said to discover it. There's enough on the sidebar about this.
3. Start bulking now. Weight loss is great, but you're going to have a harder time bulking after it's all gone. As things stand, you could eat a clean 2k calorie diet, lift heavy, bulk your muscles, and still be losing weight all at the same time, as your body starts burning the existing calories in its system to repair your muscles. This requires a good sleep schedule, so make sure you're getting that. But don't wait to bulk up. Just make sure the calories you're consuming are predominantly protein. Steak or chicken with broccoli for dinner most nights is about perfect. I commented to someone else recently that homemade tacos can also be an incredibly healthy way to ingest lots of protein while cutting calories and sticking to healthy foods. Use beef jerky as a snack. The more protein you eat, the less calories you have to consume while still being able to bulk.
4. Adhere to the golden ratio. You sound very needy and clingy. She knows this. Sex is a chore to her. Why? Because she's already getting from you all the relational things she wants. If your attractiveness to her doesn't increase and you just decrease your relational engagement, as long as your level of engagement exceeds her level of attraction toward you, she's simply going to resent you. But if your level of engagement dips below her level of sexual interest in you, one of two things can result: (1) if both levels together are below her divorce threshold, she'll just leave you, or (2) if it's above her relational threshold, she'll become sexually responsive until your level of relational engagement equals her level of sexual attraction for you.
5. Spend the time that you would have been spending with her with God. Learn to rely on God as your source of strength and stability. Devote much of this time not only practicing the 7 basics (the 300 series you haven't gotten to yet), but contemplating how you can fulfill your God-given mission in life.
6. STFU, monk mode, amused mastery, DNGAF. Stop arguing with her over anything. If she wants to argue, let her vent it all out, then you say, "Thanks for the update on how you're feeling about me. I'm off to the gym," or some other activity that shows you're not interested in arguing with her. During this phase, while you're working on improving yourself, stop initiating sex. You'll only be reinforcing her conditioning that sex is disgusting. She has to have some base desire for it and right now it's just not there. In order to survive this monk mode and her tantrums while you STFU, you're going to have to work on your mindset, employing amused mastery not as an active technique, but as an internal perspective. When you can see her whining and screaming in the broader context of your mission (do you actually have one?), you'll realize it's usually quite trivial, so it stops mattering as much. Her emotional investment in such trivial matters will seem humorous, like when a child throws a tantrum over the fact that he didn't get a cookie. It's funny. When you have that mindset, you will be able to radiate your DNGAF attitude that shows her that you're beyond all that - you're becoming your own man, who doesn't rely on her for his sense of wholeness. You can get that from God, as you've already started doing in step 5.

In response to [u/rocknrollchuck](#)'s comment, getting a genetic test after the baby is born is usually only \$150-300. It's not that bad. If possible, do it without telling her. That's just going to be an unnecessary fight and it only reconciles your own peace of mind. It's also gives you a leg-up if she ever tries to threaten to leave you because you'll know the viability of her threat and she won't. If it's yours, you're good. If it's not, then you decide how you want to proceed. If you want to raise the child as your own, do nothing and let the presumption of paternity stand (given that the child was born during a marriage) until divorce may one day rear its head, in which case you pull out the results. If you don't want to raise the child, just file a complaint to disestablish paternity whenever you feel like it. With DNA test results, you don't need an attorney to do this and the court will have to grant the complaint.

Would you date woman who had sex with a Muslim before?

2 upvotes · 23 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Nah, trolls need to learn. Keep it down.

Would you date woman who had sex with a Muslim before?

2 upvotes · 23 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I know [u/redpillwonder](#) removed this thread - but this comment is too funny not to approve so at least OP can read it. Keep an eye on the respectful tone, in general, but I think when responding to a troll this is warranted.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (10/17/18)

2 upvotes · 18 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Life Mission - To glorify God with all my spirit, all my body and all my mind by pursuing discipline, virtue and excellence in all that I am called to.

Sounds cool, but what's the end-goal? How will you know when you've accomplished this mission? Or perhaps another way to put this would be: *What's your vision for accomplishing that mission?*

If you don't know the end-destination or have a clear picture of what your life should look like 50 years from now, your mission is too vague to be of value, even if it's fully of Christian words and cool sounding stuff.

Have Read - Listened to: RM (2x), NMMG (3x), WISNIFG (3x), WOTSM. Read MAP, MMSLP, SGM, Sixteen Commandments of Poon, Book of Pook, Prayer by Keller, Extreme Ownership, Purpose Driven Life,

Reading - The Bible (in one year), The Subtle Art of Not Giving a **** (SAONGAF), listening to Models.

Any attention to the sidebar content here?

Diet

Home-made tacos. As long as you can limit the cheese and stick to hard-shells, it's basically all meat and veggies and one of the most delicious things in existence. Soft shells tend to add more carbs and calories than hard, so you do have to be careful with the tortillas. I tend to over-stuff my hard shells so that I eat less shell and more meat/veggies. Also: make your own salsa.

I asked my wife if she noticed I lost weight. "Not really".

Yeah, you already know what's wrong here.

life mission and how to drill that down to career, family, body, finances and ministry.

So "ministry" is the last of 5 split priorities. I know you probably didn't mean them in a particular order, but it shouldn't be on that list in the first place. It is the clothes line on which all the other things hang.

How does your career contribute to your ministry, or how can you implement your ministry in your career? How do you minister to your family or can you utilize the members of your family to help you minister outside the home so it becomes a team effort? How does getting fit help you minister to others? How can your finances contribute to your ministry? None of these things matter if they're not making a difference for eternity. "Whether you eat or drink, or whatever you do, do it all for the glory of God" (1 Cor. 10:31).

Also downloaded and started reading the the RPC sidebar pdf

Ah, there it is.

Any advice or suggestions on how to handle SF?

Yeah, pick her up and move her. Want doggy? Flip her over, grab her by the waist and hoist her up to your balls. Want cowgirl? Start in missionary, grab her arms, and flip yourself back until she's hoisted up on you. Whatever position you're looking for, as long as you're strong enough you can toss and turn her whichever way you prefer. You might find she actually gets into it more when you're taking charge in the bedroom like that.

we rarerly go out or socialize outside of church

Yeah, fix that right away. Get some friends. It sounds cheesy, but go on play dates. I met with a new guy at my church last week at the park so our kids could play together while we hung out, then I invited him to grab dinner with me afterward. It was chaos, but it was fun. As you meet new people, your social network grows. As your social network grows, your popularity (otherwise notoriety) grows. As you become more popular, you garner more female attention. As you garner more female attention, dread increases.

I have a rule of thumb that I follow about 75% of the time:

- 60+ second convo with one new person every day
- Introduce myself to 1 new person at church every week
- Set up a time to meet someone new over coffee, dinner, lunch, etc. once a week

The 60-second convo is meant to get you used to interacting with strangers and making friends where you never thought you'd find them. The church introduction is part of gaining influence in your spiritual home, as the people who are known in the congregation are the ones who have the most influence over the leadership. The coffee/dinner/lunch times are where you actually solidify some of the new contacts into your social network. The reason it's only 75% is because of that one: sometimes you have to follow-up with people already in your social circle, which can take time away from engaging with new people.

I have thoughts and ideas of getting more involved at church with ministries and maybe even starting some. But, the reality is - I need to own it at home first.

Sure, but don't let that be a cop-out. I've used it as a cop-out. I've seen dozens of men who have too - men who had decent family lives and home ministries, but weren't willing to think bigger until their homes were better. Part of leading your home is modeling ministry for your family, which means going outside the home so that

those in your home can see your lifestyle and know what they're shooting to be like and do down the road through your discipleship of them.

For Women: Getting Your Beta to Man Up

2 upvotes · 17 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

How so?

Beta is always bad: Change my mind

2 upvotes · 12 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I like this. Well said.

On Biblical Justice and Rape

2 upvotes · 10 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Amen - though the law does still inform us, because for some people sanctification isn't automatic.

On Biblical Justice and Rape

2 upvotes · 10 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

We don't follow Jewish law simply because Jewish law says so. It is not a binding standard over non Jews. But it does still hold advisory capacity in that it reveals the character of the God we intend to orient our hearts toward. With that in mind, to answer your first set of questions:

1. God did require it for the benefit of a specific people in a specific time. But the OT law does not transcend all cultures over all time. Am I in sin for having my son circumcised on the day he was born instead of the 8th day? No. The circumstances making the 8th day optimal are no longer a medical concern. The law was made for man, not man for the law.
2. Of course we uphold what Jesus and Paul instruct - but not because the law said so; rather it's because we cannot possibly act in faith when we are knowingly abandoning what Christ taught. Also note that they don't cite the law as the reason for their exhortation - "the law says so, so you'd better do it!" They cite heart issues for refraining that standard.
3. We can't, but God can, which he did through Christ (except maybe on a technical theological level, which is that my standard was true even old testament times). Also, justice is highly context dependent - something even the ancient Hebrews understood and applied before blindly killing disobedient children.

Simply put the idea that the New Covenant invalidates the entirety of the Old Covenant is just not a critically reasoned position

I can't speak for the critics, but I can quote Hebrews 8:13 - "By calling this covenant 'new' he has made the first one obsolete; and what is obsolete and outdated will soon disappear." I'm not sure how you get around that.

some of it was retained (prohibitions against adultery, theft, murder, etc.)

Right. But they weren't retained as the law. The whole point of Jesus bringing these up in the sermon on the mount is to show that these are all really heart issues and not just the law for the law's own sake - and even then he's speaking to Jews in a time when that law was directly over them.

Again, we are not under the law, but that doesn't mean the law is uninformative. I owe no obligation to any old testament Jewish law, but I do owe an obligation to the author of those laws. He has not imposed those laws as a

burden over me, but they do guide my expression of faith through what it reveals of the God I love and serve and how I might reflect his character to the world. This is what it means to be free from the law and free from sin but a slave to righteousness. Paul doesn't say, "You're not under the law ... except those ones. You're still under those ones."

Paul never used the term "Trinity"

Indeed, but he did most certainly distinguish between Father, Son, and Spirit - the first couple verses of romans makes that clear. I'm not married to the word trinity. I am married to the biblical concepts that compel that conclusion. No such compulsion exists in the bible for a tripartate view of the law.

ceremonial ... civil ... moral

Yeah, I fully understand the distinctions, but you still haven't provided a biblical basis for the distinction. By creating one for ourselves, we're developing our own man-made standard for which laws we're going to follow and not. In my book, that's not cool and is dangerously close to liberal theology. Never impute man made philosophies on scripture and theology.

What you do with the civil laws is certainly appropriate, though. You are drawing principles from the law about who God is and letting that be a guide rather than a strict statute to be observed as an authority over us.

I agree with pretty much everything you said on the moral law. As you note: it's not wrong because some verse in Deuteronomy or Leviticus said so. It's wrong because it breaks the image of God that we are meant to reflect to the world, and which our faith compels us to bear. I don't avoid killing people because some verse in Exodus told me not to. I don't do it because I love my God: heart over law.

I hope that makes more sense. I don't think things have to be as complicated as the human-created tripartate law line of theology makes it.

Tag: [u/rocknrollchuck](#)

On Biblical Justice and Rape

2 upvotes · 10 October 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

You successfully avoided the red herring! Good job. Most people answer that Jesus died for us, so John 13:34-35 is about radical sacrificial love. But Jesus says "have loved" in the past tense. He hadn't died yet.

Your answer appropriately gives one sub point nested beneath what I think Jesus actually meant. But notice the subtle, yet extremely relevant difference. In the parable of the good Samaritan Jesus is addressing "who is my neighbor?" in the context of "love your neighbor as yourself."

But "love your neighbor as yourself" is different from "as I have loved you." In John 13 Jesus was talking to the 12. How did he love them?

He disciplined them. He reproduced his character in them and trained them for his mission. He gave them a purpose and role that would have an impact on eternity - something no one else on earth could have done for them. He gave them something to believe in.

Serving them is merely a sub point under this. That is one of the many tools he employed while training them. Their relationship was defined by their status as his disciples, and the mission to spread the good news to all nations was the imperative of that discipleship relationship. But service, kindness, patience, teaching, rebuking, gentleness, etc. - these were all different methods he employed to get the job done and the methods he wanted them to continue to utilize ... you know, as opposed to other methods of spreading a message, like newsletters, brute force, political power, war, mass marketing, etc.

If my interactions with someone are not designed to lead them closer to Christ, am I really loving them through that action? After all, "God is love," so if he's not the goal, is it love? That's why Isaiah 64:6 notes, "Even their good deeds are as filthy rags." That's why Hebrews 11:6 says, "And without faith it is impossible to please God."

I hope that makes some sense. Just some things to think about. If morality is defined not by the law or our behaviors, but the orientation of our hearts, is it the same can be said for love and interpersonal interactions ... bringing us right back on point to one of the main purposes of this sub: how to build right and healthy interpersonal relationships. That's part of why I say marriage is discipleship. If I'm not discipling my wife, I don't truly love her anyway.

Married Man Game Part 2: Teasing

2 upvotes · 8 October 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

While I wouldn't say "just as visually stimulated," I certainly agree that visuals are important. The difference is that for a guy, visuals are about 90% of his evaluation of a woman. For a girl, the visuals might be 30% of her evaluation of a man, the other factors being things like social status, money, charm, confidence, etc.

More to the point, there was actually a psychological test done at one point on this very subject. People were shown various images and there were brain scans measuring how they reacted to those images. Kittens, landscapes, artwork, etc. would all give little blips. Things like a sandwich or a deck of cards gave no blips. A fit, naked woman made the meter ping like crazy - for both men and women. A fit, naked man, on the other hand, only got about the same level of blips for women as the landscape and artwork (and no blips for men, of course). My psychology professor humorously concluded that even straight women found a beautiful woman to be more visually stimulating than a handsome man.

What does living out Matthew 6:33 look like?

2 upvotes · 7 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Then find one of those people and teach them how to do what you know how to do. What you've just shared shows me that you actually are ready to disciple someone in the practice of having a quiet time.

My guess is that if I asked the same questions about some other things, like prayer or fellowship or bible study - when if you're not perfect, you are proficient enough at some of the 7 basics that you'd be able to give me the same answers on those things too. That's all discipleship is at its core: imparting to others what God has imparted to you.

What does living out Matthew 6:33 look like?

2 upvotes · 7 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Do you know anyone who doesn't know how to do that or isn't doing it in their life?

What does living out Matthew 6:33 look like?

2 upvotes · 5 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Do you know how to have a quiet time?

Avoiding awkwardness. We see each other every Sunday.

2 upvotes · 1 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

You sound butthurt. Read the "anatomy of butthurt" post on the sidebar (I think it's in the 100 series).

I know you're not trying to attract her to you any more than she already is. But that's seriously how you probably came off. She thinks you're mad at her for something and you're being a pussy about it. "Just man up and tell me what your problem is!" is what she's thinking.

Whether or not you do is up to you. Don't worry about what she thinks or wants or what she texts or says. You do you. You don't owe her anything other than what you've committed. Be a man of your word. Beyond that, pave your own way and don't let her texts or demands shake you.

Now, if it were me, I'd be trying to preserve my influence in her life. Influence is power. It's how I get stuff done. I can only do so much by myself, but the more people I carry influence with, the wider my breadth of impact on the world becomes.

Conversely, she can start rumors about you that can ruin your influence. That's a risk you might have to take. I'd rather a false rumor be spread about me than for me actually to compromise my position before God by beating off to thoughts of her if I'm around her too much. So, you'll have to figure that out for yourself. Just because I'd be more inclined to talk to her, doesn't mean you should be. I expect my discipline and internal fortitude against ONEitis and sexual sin are stronger than some.

Feminism changing the modern American woman?

2 upvotes · 1 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Christians are in a weird position with respect to the classic red pill phases. On the one hand, we're naturally put off by immoral and obnoxious behaviors. On the other hand, we're meant to accept the world for what it is and find our peace in Christ instead.

Why do you care so much about whether or not women in America today respect men? You can't make them respect you. You can't go back in time to when they allegedly had a higher respect for men. The world is what the world is. The red pill is about accepting it and optimizing your life and influence in the world as it is, not trying to recreate some fantasy that you wish the world would become. You can have that fantasy in heaven. Until then, we live and work in the nitty gritty.

This is all a frame issue. If your emotions are defined by what women think about you, guess whose frame you're living in! Stop caring so much about what women think and just focus on what you've got on your own agenda and none of this will matter anymore. Is it important to be aware of? Absolutely. Is it something to get worked up about? Not a chance.

Avoiding awkwardness. We see each other every Sunday.

2 upvotes · 1 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Let's be real clear: "she's disinterested" because you were "texting heart emojis everyday." You really thought that was attractive? That just shows her how cheap and easy your affection and commitment comes.

She admits "she liked [you] since [you] were 16," but there are probably a couple dozen other guys she's liked in that time-frame too, right? There's a difference between, "I really like Bob" and "I exclusively like Bob." For some reason you have it in your head that she's just been waiting around for you since you were both 16 until you "effed it up."

You saying "I'll see you at 8:30 mass tomorrow" is heard by her as, "I'll keep waiting for you, however long it takes. Just let me know when you're ready and I'm here as your backup option."

You didn't actually comply with Rule 2 here. You haven't indicated what of the sidebar content you've read and not. My guess is you're pretty clueless about hypergamy. This is a basic ASBN ("alpha seed, beta need") dynamic happening. She wants to have her fun with all the exciting people, but she keeps you on the hook for the guy that maybe she'll settle down with one day, if a better beta doesn't come along first who could give her more than you could. That doesn't mean she's riding the CC around town, but it does mean that you're not the fun choice.

READ. THE. SIDEBAR. Go lift. No more cardio garbage. No "sprained wrist" excuse. You can still do squats, use the fly machine, situps, lats, etc. If you're pushing 18%+ body fat, feel free to run a couple miles after your lifts. But right now I'm guessing you're not impressive or imposing enough to catch her attention. If you don't take care of your body now, while you're single and have major flexibility in your time - how much less when you're married and have a family? That's a subconscious thought running through her head. Also, she assumes that if you're not improving your physical shape or taking it seriously (cardio is just maintenance), how can you be trusted to be disciplined and devoted in other areas of life?

Actually ... she's not thinking any of those things. She's not even thinking about you in the first place. That's just the subconscious reaction running through the back of her brain that causes her to tuck her neck in and scrunch her nose to her eyes when you text her.

To that end, if she doesn't give a crap about you, why do you give so many craps about her? Kill the ONEitis. If you don't want to "just be friends" with her, then don't be friends with her. She made her choice. Move on.

Now why the heck would you want to be passive aggressive to her? Has she wronged you in some way? No. She doesn't owe you anything. She doesn't even owe you the truth. She owes it to God and to herself to be an honest, God-fearing woman. But she doesn't owe that to you. So if she wants to lie about her availability so she can spend time with her coworkers, why is that any of your business?

"Because I'm the one she lied to!" I'm sure you'd say. But she doesn't owe you the truth. She hasn't willfully submitted herself to your authority. You're not married.

For that matter, what would happen if you confronted her about it? "I saw you hanging out with your co-workers last night, even though you told me you were going to be busy last night!" How do you think she's going to answer? I'll tell you: *Yeah, I was busy last night. I made plans with my co-workers, so I couldn't hang out with you.* Make sense?

How do I not make it awkward seeing her tomorrow during service?

Go find the hottest girl you can, pay her a ton of money to pretend to be your girlfriend for the day, and then introduce her to your ONEitis. Works every time in the sitcoms, right?

Look, awkwardness is a good thing. I thrive in the awkward. Every time a situation is awkward, that's prime opportunity to show just how alpha you can be. Alpha men don't give two flips about how awkward the room is. They have fun and do what they want to do regardless.

One of my signature moves is intentionally creating awkwardness just so I can cut through it. Awkwardness places people in a natural state of submissiveness. They'll do anything to alleviate the tension. It takes one person to tell them how to do that before they're following his lead.

This works between the sexes too. Go watch some LAHWF - the self-proclaimed "king of awkward." Have fun with it. Create those weird moments, then tell people you're just screwing with them. Enjoy life. Don't be controlled by the tension in the room. Be the one creating it and using it.

TRP Quarantined

2 upvotes · 28 September 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

How about Disney charging double to get into the Magic Kingdom if you wear anything Trump related?

Or when I went to New York last month and a store owner kicked out a group of high school tourists for wearing MAGA hats.

Just processing here ...

Reddit is a private company that controls a PUBLIC SPACE.

In my first amendment and civil rights classes, we talked a lot about this. I know there is substantial case law that if a business holds their doors open to the public, they must comply with certain non-discrimination policies found in the Equal Rights Act. That includes not discriminating on the basis of race, religion, sex, ethnicity, etc.

If a company is private they can discriminate all they want, per the now moot case about the late *Boyscouts of America*, may they rest in peace, which case (as I believe is still good law) allowed them to discriminate against homosexuals having a place of leadership because it was fundamental to their mission, morality, and purposes as an organization to maintain that separation at the time of that case.

So, the question is whether or not reddit is held open to the public because of the ease of access of the public entering its space and the fact that they use the open internet, or if it is a private company because the entire website is hosted on their own servers without public funding and only open to comment by those who sign their user agreement, etc. I don't know the area of law enough to sift that out.

YOu can't ban white males.

Ah, but can you quarantine them? That's what Reddit is hanging their hat on, I'm sure. They're not preventing people from saying whatever they want on TRP (at least not yet). They're simply putting up a warning. It's total garbage, of course, but they're being crafty about it.

You can't ban free speech.

True ... unless you make everyone sign a contract to use your website and they agreed in that contract to limit what kinds of speech they will engage in and not. Right?

To be clear, I'm 100% with you on there needing to be some legal recourse if all goes to hell. I'm just curious if that legal recourse actually exists under our country's current laws? I honestly don't know the answer.

TRP Has Been Quarantined - Meta Thread

2 upvotes · 28 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

So true. I feel like I've heard this before.

TRP Has Been Quarantined - Meta Thread

2 upvotes · 28 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Amen brother. Preach it!

Better Beta Divorce Strategy

2 upvotes · 27 September 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Well, I'm uniquely situated because I'm married to a higher-up with a big-4 accounting firm. We've had conversations about this stuff incessantly. Also, I intentionally build relationships with the forensic accountants who specialize in divorce litigation, so I have their unique knowledge and insights as an invaluable resources at the touch of a few buttons on my phone.

If you wanted to consult with someone, the forensic accountants who regularly practice in your county's domestic relations court are the best place to go. They're going to charge you by the hour, but there's no one who will know better - certainly not a tax preparer or general CPA.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (09/26/18)

2 upvotes · 27 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Just curious how you're assessing some of the 7 basics:

1. AoS: what's holding you back from a 10 here?
2. Quiet time: what you put for bible study is really a qt/devotional. You might be around an 8 purely because it's a group devotional and not much alone time. But group time still counts.
3. Bible study: What you described is more of a devotional. How often are you writing down numerous observations, doing word studies, cross referencing with parallel passages, reading commentaries, researching topics, etc.?
4. Scripture memory: are you going by what you've memorized in the last few weeks or by how much you've accumulated in your lifetime? Also, are your times meditative and contemplative or rote memorization? Scripture memory for me is more emotionally charged than prayer or quiet times, for reference.
5. Fellowship: could you invite others over to spend time with you and your family? Start a small group during lunch break at work with other believers on the job?
6. Evangelism: Nice!
7. Prayer: Sounds more like an 8 or 9.

Better Beta Divorce Strategy

2 upvotes · 26 September 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Good point.

How to Play the Game

2 upvotes · 25 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Thinking you "won" the game shows that you're in the game in the first place. This is the biggest problem, which [u/macmeeler](#) addressed in the original post, so props to him.

Are there any attorneys here? Would a subreddit such as TRP have a case for libel/slander over the negative portrayal of it in American Horror Story?

2 upvotes · 21 September 2018 · /r/askTRP

Not my area of law, but no.

Difficulty accepting my new reality.

2 upvotes · 21 September 2018 · /r/askMRP

Well, after having written about 30% of it I scraped my outline and started over. Much of that previous content will be recycled and modified to be used in the new draft, so it's not a total loss. But I wanted to do a much better job targeting an audience in the book rather than raw information dumping.

Dread levels and having an infant (told to chill tf out)

2 upvotes · 21 September 2018 · /r/askMRP

Does your wife participate in this alongside you or merely enable you?

I'm not downing your chosen career path. I agree it's noble. But as far as missions go, "My career is my mission" is the attitude from most every guy who ends up hiring me. It's exclusionary and doesn't take advantage of a woman's drive to live life alongside a high quality man. It treats her as an enabler to him, not a follower or helper.

Dread levels and having an infant (told to chill tf out)

2 upvotes · 21 September 2018 · /r/askMRP

Because she exists to help you accomplish it. You lead, she follows. Where are you going? If you're going somewhere that she doesn't want to go, why would she follow you there?

I'm not saying you have to change your mission to suit your wife. If she doesn't want to follow, that's her business. But if your mission isn't attractive to any woman ... well, you've got a bigger problem.

Remember the captain/first mate example that gets used a lot. The mission is where the boat is headed. The captain determines the destination. But if the captain decided the bottom of a whirlpool is his destination, what person will ever want to sign up to be his first officer? And suppose the captain chose that mission after she already signed up for the job. Why would she want to bother doing her duties on the ship if the ship's just going to sink anyway?

Or if you set Antarctica as the destination and she loathes the thought of going there, why would she want to stay on board that ship? She's going to hop on a lifeboat and leave you. That's fine if you've got some other first officer ready to hop on board who does want to go to Antarctica or if you're willing to go it alone. But is that what you're really trying to accomplish here?

I joke about her "following you to the ends of the living room," but there really are some women who would follow a high-quality man to the ends of the earth. If you're already that high enough quality of a man, so be it. Make your mission to dive straight into the pits of hell and she might still join you. In the meantime, what are you doing to get her on board with your mission or to set boundaries at the efforts she tries to make to distract you? Gotta have that mission solidified before you can even get there.

You're Not Thinking Big Enough: Part 2

2 upvotes · 21 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Building a deck is a great short-term goal. It's obviously not a mission, but good on you for at least picking something to start with. I actually just rebuilt my deck (with a friend's help) a few months ago. It was a lot of hard work and a lot of lonely hours ripping up the old boards, pulling nails, etc. But we have a beautiful finished product now. I can see what I accomplished with my time.

As you think bigger about your mission, how will you measure your progress? If you have no way to measure progress, then the mission is too vague to have any actual value. Good reply. Now come back by Monday with a post of your own updating the community about what your mission is and how you're going to accomplish it.

Purple Pill and the Christian Red

2 upvotes · 21 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is a good comment and requires more consideration from the mod team. I have seen some excellent posts from non mods too, but I agree with your overall sentiment.

[u/rocknrollchuck](#) [u/redpillwonder](#) [u/osmiumzulu](#) - thoughts?

Purple Pill and the Christian Red

2 upvotes · 20 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I couldn't agree more. I almost went into the early church, which existed predominantly without New Testament Scripture as Scripture, which wasn't canonized until a couple centuries later. In essence, the epistles were "men swapping notes." But I didn't want to belabor the point in an already lengthy post.

Purple Pill and the Christian Red

2 upvotes · 20 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

So in essence, Christ is Red and we are Blue. When the Holy Spirit indwells us, we begin the transition from Blue to Red, from Self to Christlikeness.

To refrain one of my notes, salvation doesn't make a man red. He doesn't become red merely because the Holy Spirit comes on in. People stifle the Holy Spirit all the time. All I was saying was that Christians should inherently understand the need to internalize the red pill because it's a process we already experience on a separate plane with salvation.

Separately, what I was getting at is that a man is purple if he views Christianity as an external measure he's trying to live up to. But what the secular crowd doesn't realize is that for some of us this isn't an external measure; it's a fundamental part of who we are and to abandon it would be to abandon our own frame. So, I'm not applying the red pill in a way that fits into Christianity. I'm applying it in a way that satisfies my own desires and compulsions, just as the secular red crowd does.

You're Not Thinking Big Enough

2 upvotes · 18 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is beautiful. My wife has often done the same for me as well. There have been countless times when she has built relationships with other parents in our neighborhood who I otherwise never could have connected with, despite the fact that I'm the extrovert and she's the introvert. We naturally connect and relate with different types of people, giving me an opportunity to enhance my social network through her efforts. Next thing I know, I'm playing racquetball with the neighbor a couple streets over who I'd never met until just a few days before.

Your story resonates with me.

Field Report: Beginner Moves - this works!

2 upvotes · 17 September 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

The Good

- You're trying new things that you were too chicken to do before
- You're not going Rambo yet, maintaining enough of your old ways to keep the transition smooth instead of all at once
- You're starting to realize that her antics are something to be laughed at, not taken seriously
- You didn't apologize for when you did nothing wrong

The Bad

- You still took her too seriously
- You felt compelled to text her
- You let her responses to you affect how you feel

- You're defining your "RP progress" by how she behaves toward you
- It took you 3 minutes to think of, "I want to have sex with you tonight."
- You came here to share your excitement, looking for validation from us, under the guise of wanting to teach men that telling your wife "I want to have sex tonight" is a good idea ... and assuming that this wasn't somehow implicitly obvious to every man who wants to have sex tonight (although to be fair, I do remember days when this wasn't obvious).

To keep avoiding Rambo mode, pick 1 or 2 things on the "bad" list and work on it this week, then another for the next week. Don't try to fix all at once.

Living in Christ's Frame - Defeating the Anger Stage and Finding Emotional Stability

2 upvotes · 17 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I think you're misunderstanding amused mastery. It's not poking an angry bear because you find it funny or amusing. It's having a transcendent perspective that lets you see things in their proper place, which often results in it being amusing or laughable when we see how worked up some people get about trite things.

This blog covers it nicely:

amused mastery is taking a "big picture" outlook that life is a fun game you've mastered, so you respond to challenges and stress in a confident, relaxed, detached, and amused way.

He uses the example of his daughter spilling oats on the floor shortly before an open house. He could have gotten angry at her. Instead, he recognized that she's just a little girl who made a mistake. It's cute. It's laughable. Sure, it can be annoying too, but why get down about trite things? He's better than that. He sees a bigger picture than oats on the floor.

Jesus does this all the time. His famous "Martha, Martha" speech is one example. Screwing with the nagging pharisees is another. Submitting to Pilate's and Herod's ridicule is another. Dealing with the disciples on the stormy boat is another. And so on ...

With regard to his bride, it's late, but off the top of my head, the letters to the 7 churches in revelation come to mind.

I feel sort of held back

2 upvotes · 17 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

i have to think so much more, especially around woman im really attracted to

I've gotta save something for the book ;)

In all seriousness, though, I'm posting a quick response that should at least start a conversation. Let me know your thoughts and if it targets your point of curiosity.

An introduction

2 upvotes · 17 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I'm glad to hear from you. It sounds like you've got a good head about you and you're moving in a good direction. If you need anything from us, we're here to help. I recommend the OYS threads as a great place to start. I think they get posted on Wednesdays, but you can still use last week's too.

My question: What's your mission? What are you doing or working toward right now that you'll be beaming to

tell God about on Judgment Day?

will there be a difference?

2 upvotes · 13 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That's true. The way non-Christians practice it certainly can lead to sin. That doesn't mean it's that way for everyone.

To be clear, I'm not saying you have to flirt. If it violates your conscience, then surely it's sin. Romans 14:14 is clear enough of that. Just be cautious not to condemn other people for doing something that isn't wrong simply because you have a conviction against it. That's equally sinful.

Living in Christ's Frame - Defeating the Anger Stage and Finding Emotional Stability

2 upvotes · 12 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I like it. That's a good saying.

Field Report- Dropping the Betas, Standing my ground.

2 upvotes · 11 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Nah. "Getting pissy" isn't something nice guys do around others. They internalize it and supplicate. Although it certainly comes from a beta frame, "getting pissy" often means alpha behaviors - trying to show dominance over others, demanding their own way, acting controlling, etc.

Consider how OP describes him:

- "he never wants to do what i want to do" - Okay, so he has his own plans and agendas that he doesn't cave to OP.
- "then 1st guy says lets move seats. I said 'you won't be happy unless its always your way'" - He makes a decision and leads others in carrying it out; OP just didn't like that decision
- "1st guy ... just decided as he does to make plans for everyone that fits him" - He expects others to live in his frame
- "1st guy ignores us" - He DNGAF
- "2nd Guy passive as ever just followed 1st Guy" - Other people follow his lead
- "He had no ride, stuck with 1st Guy to drop him off" - Others look to him as the answer to their problems
- "As we caught up to 1st and 2nd Guy" - He's ahead, they're lagging
- "1st Guy starts being ["passive"] aggressive as he is ordering at the counter ... not even looking at us" - He DNGAF
- "Said see you to 1st guy, he said 'we'll see'" - He DNGAF and displays amused mastery
- "as im dropping 3rd guy off, 1st guy rings the 3rd guys" - He initiates.
- "1st Guy, comes up, sits next to me. at this point i was waiting for his apology ... He acted exactly like he did on the phone with 3rd guy, all nice and hey bro this" - He DNGAF and applied amused mastery; he also initiated and didn't get butthurt over the obvious conflict
- "i can hear 1st Guy screaming my name several times across the church to get my attention" - Again, DNGAF and amused mastery, treating the interaction like a game

I'm not saying 1st Guy actually is alpha. But those are literally every time OP mentioned 1st guy and virtually all of those examples are expressions of alpha traits, so what else can I conclude? Blue pill though he may be, I'm not seeing beta descriptions of supplication or being unreasonably nice, etc.

What I see going on here is that 1st Guy is the AMOG. OP is ticked because he wants to be the AMOG but he hasn't earned people's respect like 1st guy has. OP writes this post as a victim puke about how some other guy is out-alphaing him in church.

Tag: NoFaithInThisSub - since you like more comprehensive break-downs.

Field Report- Dropping the Betas, Standing my ground.

2 upvotes · 11 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Amen.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (09/05/18)

2 upvotes · 11 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

almost all their conversation was text, that's her preferred method. She hates FB and IG messenger

Texting gives you time to think of the perfect response before sending, making it easier to be flirty. Active conversation, whether by phone, in-person, or through chat messaging, makes it more difficult to maintain a certain persona that's different from your actual self. This is significant because it indicates she was actively trying to impress him rather than feeling like she could be herself around him. It tells me she was looking to cheat and not just an "it just happened" kind of thing, as occurs more often when she's vulnerable with another guy.

She is 165 lbs and NOT happy about it

Because you keep shoving food in her face. Stop that.

The BC and SSRIs are mostly being blamed for it

Women will blame anything and everything else whenever they can. Let her blame it, then take away the excuse. You take charge of the birth control - use a condom instead of her being on the pill. I don't care if you don't like condoms. Suck it up. Pull out if you prefer that instead. If you're done having kids, get a vasectomy. Stop making her responsible for the birth control. See above for the SSRI thing. Let her blame the SSRIs, then take them away so she has no more excuses.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (09/05/18)

2 upvotes · 11 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I don't think he was prepared for the research you've obviously done on this. Props.

Field Report- Dropping the Betas, Standing my ground.

2 upvotes · 11 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I think you're very confused about what it means to be alpha. You're calling these guys beta, then describing very alpha behaviors. "Beta" is not a synonym for "I don't like them" or "less alpha than me." If anything, your own account portrays you as having the beta behaviors, also evident in many of your comments here. You get way too invested in what other people think and do. Just because you're a stiff douchebag on the outside doesn't mean you're alpha if you're otherwise gung up on all this on the inside. Other commenters have already hit on this though.

It could be that these men are very blue pill in their ideologies. I think that's what you really mean. But a person can be a blue alpha.

Also, you're taking what I said too far. I didn't mean for you to be tactless and crude in how you chat with her - or even worse: about her, in front of her.

Also, just because you want a girl doesn't mean it's wise to pursue her. My advice was less about getting you to hit on someone and more about exposing inconsistent ideologies you were expressing in your previous post. If you do choose to hit on a girl, taken or not, weigh everything involved and be wise in how you go about it.

I can name countless respectable men who stole their wives from other men (ther best story is Abraham Lincoln). I know it can work. But all these stories involve tact and wisdom.

Field Report- Dropping the Betas, Standing my ground.

2 upvotes · 11 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is an excellent response.

Field Report- Dropping the Betas, Standing my ground.

2 upvotes · 11 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That's not quite how frame works. It's not about getting your way all the time. It's about not being manipulated or pressured to go someone else's way against your intentions. That said, sometimes (often?) it's wise or beneficial to do what others want or suggest. One great reason for this is to put on the character of Christ - presumably something you should want to do.

Jesus knew how to butt heads. But more often he served people. He didn't do it out of weakness or obligation, but out of desire and strength. This is what it means to be a Christian and how we should model our lives after Jesus.

I think you would do well to learn to be more of a servant. "For even the son of man did not come to be served, but to serve."

Introduction and Backstory

2 upvotes · 7 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I think [u/rocknrollchuck](#) already did. At least he suggested it. Not sure if it happened or not.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (09/05/18)

2 upvotes · 6 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Are you sure you are able to successfully take this on with all the other things you have going on right now? Seems like your plate is awfully full at the moment.

After next week I'll be done with my trials, so my personal schedule clears up, despite having the increased obligations with the kids. As long as child care is covered, it's a worthwhile investment for me.

NoFITS September Update

2 upvotes · 6 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

not to DEER (is that correct terminology usage?) is that

That's actually exactly what you were doing: rationalizing your behavior. But you redeemed it by owning it at the end ;)

"out of respect" is just a figure of speech really. I have manners towards him

Ah, but who says it's "good manners" not to hit on another guy's girl? Where is that written? Does the Bible say this? Obviously if they were married, that would be different. But if there's no ring, she's fair game.

Nevertheless, if you're genuinely not interested, that makes more sense and should have been your up-front statement on the matter.

Ok i will read Rational Male, then Married Man SLP, then The Way of the SM, then maybe after some practice, i will be a bit more alpha. Does the recommended reading path look suitable?

It can be. Rational Male is more the "why" behind what you do. MMSLP is the "how to do it" part, so you might want to bump that up first. But again, it's geared more toward married men, so might not be directly on-point for you anyway. I just know it has a whole section on covering alpha and beta behaviors and the distinction between them. That said, it doesn't go into *being* alpha, it only addresses *behaviors* of alpha men or that can give an appearance of alphaness. At some point the outward appearance needs to be internalized.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (09/05/18)

2 upvotes · 5 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Props on the lifts! I still have you on the bench, but your squats and deadlifts have flown past me. Quite impressive.

I did look at porn last week. Pretty disappointed in myself.

If it helps, I like what Brother Lawrence once said: "That when he had failed in his duty, he only confessed his fault, saying to GOD, 'I shall never do otherwise, if You leave me to myself; 'tis You must hinder my falling, and mend what is amiss.' That after this, he gave himself no further uneasiness about it."

Often times the self-battery we inflict over our sin does more to keep us in the sin than it does to help. Logically one would expect that impressing greater guilt on ourselves for our failures would be a better motivator to keep us from repeating the problem. Theologically, we know this is a wrong approach and that Jesus is the only answer and that he doesn't condemn us, so neither should we condemn ourselves.

She hasn't ever really dated in her life, she tells me, so the fact that she's doing all this with me means it's kind of serious for her.

It's also an indication of how quickly she'll drop her boundaries. Be cautious there. It's not a red flag, but it is a yellow flag to keep an eye on.

Better not mess this up.

Kick that attitude. That's going to put undue pressures on you that could affect your behaviors. If you mess it up, oh well. She's not a unicorn. Life won't be over if you lose her. Maintain an abundance mentality and don't treat her like she's a scarce commodity. I think you already know this, but it's worth repeating anyway.

girl from nearby Christian University who's an airheaded stunner with strong faith and is head over heels for me. Checks a lot of the waifu boxes.

I'm intrigued. What's the deal there?

This is the most challenging semester I've faced and I find that it's hard to get the ball rolling with studying.

Spending time with girls is good, but having 5-10 "other plates" might be too much. Don't get so obsessed with romanticism that it becomes a distraction from your independent pursuits. Otherwise you're living outside of your own frame. It's not any one person's frame you're in; it's more like an ideology's frame.

I find myself longing for her ... separation anxiety ... remind myself ... that she's lucky to be dating me

Dang, that's a lot in so few words. Longing for a woman is a good thing. Separation anxiety obviously isn't. From our past phone conversations, I know that you can have a tendency toward co-dependence. Keep that in check as much as possible. That said, your self-reminder is right on point and can be a good way to orient yourself toward stability.

the other girl who is pressing me constantly, wondering what I'm doing, flattering me, and adorning her texts with emojis out the wazoo

Interesting. These are some yellow flags. It tells me that she has little restraint. So, if you're Chad 1.0, how much restraint will she have when she gets bored of you and meets Chad 2.0? Highly emotional women without restraint are more inclined toward branch-swinging. [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) once had a post on the dangers of having "the hot wife" - maybe go back and look that up. OZ, perhaps it's time for a sequel to that? It has been a while.

If things get more serious with any of these girls I'm sure the tests will come though

Indeed. You're still in school right now. Once joint responsibility enters the picture (which really doesn't trigger until after marriage), it's a whole new game, hence "RP on hard mode." There's also an element of NRE going on that will make things more difficult as that fades. This is why vetting is so important. Even if the yellow flags don't turn out to be an issue, it's worth contemplating them all the same.

Spiritual

I'd like some more elaboration on this. Is there any way we can help you in this area?

Long Distance Relationships

2 upvotes · 4 September 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I was in an LDR with my wife for over a year while we were dating. I think [/u/Deep_Strength](#) (our new mod!) has said he was also in an LDR with his wife for a time. So yes, it's doable.

That doesn't mean it's recommended. You mentioned some good reasons: frame, instability, being used.

My biggest reason for advising against it is that it fosters ONEitis. Both people end up in a scenario where they can only fantasize about what it would be like to be *with* the other person. That fantasy world creates an emotional attachment to *what you think she will be like* rather than *what she is actually like*. That's the real danger.

Having periodic in-person visits actually doesn't help the problem. It makes it worse. These visits are usually highly charged. For one, you usually want to make the most of each visit, so you plan all kinds of fun things to do and don't learn what it's like just to live life alongside one another. Second, it gives a short dose of emotions as a drug - enough to keep you wanting more, but not enough to move past it and see things for how they really are. As a result, the short visits inflame the ONEitis rather than giving an opportunity to move past it. Third, it sets a false precedent for what life would be like with the person, exacerbating the fantasy land problem. Fourth, most people in LDRs are that way because one or the other is in school, which leaves plenty of room for a relatively immature concept of what married life will be like in a post-education working adult life, which changes a lot of things. That's not to say kids in school/college shouldn't date and get to know women or even that they shouldn't marry; it simply means that becoming committed during that time-frame involves a lot more of the "unknown"

than they tend to realize, making them commit to a phantom or fantasy rather than a known quantity/context.

Again, LDRs are certainly doable, but the reasons they're unwise aren't just because of the one-sided nature of the relationship (after all, plugged in men enjoy the emotional hoopla of it all almost as much as the women do), but because of the inaccurate representation it gives about the couple's future prospects, leading to a tendency toward unwise decision-making patterns.

Social Influence and Defying Context

2 upvotes · 31 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This makes no comprehensible sense at all.

I'm still single ... just married [MRP Draft]

2 upvotes · 31 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Good question. In addressing relationships I always like to look to God as the example. Do we get all of him? Do we know everything God ever thinks or does? Of course not. Our heads would explode. At best, the bits and pieces we get to see of God are mere shadows of his actual brilliance. A man should be the same way - always making his wife want more, just as we always want more of God.

But that doesn't mean we're without the ability to have emotional and intimate connections with all three persons of God. Indeed, God meets us in very intimate ways, including in heart-to-heart moments. These moments just aren't about him revealing himself to us; they're about him speaking into our needs in that moment.

When a husband tries to fabricate a heart-to-heart moment by self-revealing things without an appropriate context to do so, not only does it come off as contrived, but it fails to emulate the way that God reserves those moments for situations when we need it. He doesn't prompt a new revelation to someone just because he feels compelled to do so - it's always looking out for our good, our sanctification, and our reassurance. It's God's way of expressing how to pass a comfort test. But then, if we try to abuse his goodness by becoming demanding (i.e. a fitness test), we see God portray a different aspect of himself. "I'll comfort you when you're down, but don't expect me to pander to you when you're acting like a harpy," is the attitude I sense.

What parts of yourself are you keeping reserved

Usually when people ask this question they're mistakenly thinking that a "part of yourself" is your past. What runs through their head is, "So, should I tell her about what I did when I was 16 that got me arrested or not? Or should I bring up the way the kids used to make fun of me on the playground and how that hurt me?" This all stems from a mistaken assumption that your past defines you or makes up your identity. It doesn't.

Simply put, I'm not who I was as a kid, before Christ, or even yesterday. If I'm constantly improving (as I believe I am), then I am a new and better person every day, subject to the standard stock market paradigm (ups and downs, but overall moving upward). I'm not my future either. I might become that, but I can't say for sure because I don't have a magical crystal ball. I am who I am today. The part of "myself" that I keep reserved is simply anything and everything that my wife doesn't need to know to: (1) fulfill her role as my helper, (2) trust in me as her leader, and (3) experience the comfort and provision that I have to offer her. If it falls in one of those three categories, I'll self-disclose in contextually appropriate times and ways. If it's outside of those three, I STFU and do what I'm going to do. If she wants to know what I'm doing or why I'm doing it, she can ask. And if she asks, I can decide at that point whether she needs to know for any of the above reasons. But trying to foster a heart-to-heart moment through proactive self-disclosure is a display of low value and can have the exact opposite effect of what you're intending.

how do you have intimate heart-to-heart conversations while still having some part of yourself locked up?

By staying in context. If our heart-to-heart conversation is about a difficulty parenting one of our kids, I don't need to go blabbing about how some girl at the gym was eyeing me down. That just doesn't make any sense. Likewise, if she sees a girl eyeing me down and brings up her insecurities about it, I stay on topic and pass the comfort test rather than blabbing about my inner-most thoughts on what god spoke to me in my quiet time that morning. That makes no sense. Stay on context. Have heart-to-heart conversations about the topic at hand, but don't think to yourself, "I feel really close to her right now, I just want to share everything!" That's dangerous.

Are you just keeping secrets for the sake of giving her something to chase?

No. But as a practical matter, it's not realistic for me to tell my wife everything. There's only so much time in the day. So, I have two options: (1) I can be absent-minded and just disclose whatever is on my mind without discretion on the premise that somehow this is "being open and honest" with my wife, or (2) I can be strategic and intentional about what I disclose and talk about with my wife in order to lead our conversations down paths that are beneficial for the family. Between the two, which sounds like the more effective husband: the one who is "being open and honest" all the time just because "that's what married people are supposed to do" ... or the one who is being intentional about leading conversations?

Is it "my deepest darkest desires" type secrets?

It can be, but doesn't have to be.

How important is a woman's sexual past to you?

2 upvotes · 31 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Look to Jesus. Does he demand purity in the relationship? Yes. Does he expect it in light of the present "landscape" (as [u/osmiumzulu](#) put it) of a post-fall world? Nope. That's why he sanctified us, just as a husband is called to sanctify his wife.

Mark my words: there are no perfect women. If she's a virgin, that's great, but it also means you're sacrificing somewhere else. Decide which is more important to you. My wife and I were both virgins. If I had to do it again, I'd make the same standard (except in the case of a widow). If I were 50+ and no longer pulling 20s looking to marry me, I'm sure I'd be open to change on that.

I'm still single ... just married [MRP Draft]

2 upvotes · 29 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Well said.

Reviving the "right of passage" culture through Monk Mode

2 upvotes · 28 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I like this. I do want to note up-front, though, that "monk mode" has a fairly specific definition in RP terminology, although it seems to be applied in two phases:

- Phase 1: Cutting off all efforts to pick up women/sex up your wife so you can focus exclusively on self-improvement without feeling butthurt or getting ONEitis.
- Phase 2: Adding back in efforts to pick up women/sex up your wife, but with no expectation of actually closing - the goal is simply to practice things that couldn't be practiced in phase 1, like kino, flirting, etc.

What you're proposing is close-ish to phase 1 in concept ... you're just taking it much further than the term originally implies. Either way, this sounds like it could be truly beneficial for a lot of single guys. I wouldn't recommend some of this for those in established families, like moving to another city or not communicating with

your family.

Ready to get engaged (in light of past PMO)

2 upvotes · 27 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Is that what you're getting at? Assigning credit where it's due and taking responsibility more directly?

That's valuable too, and your rephrase is more on the right track. I don't disagree with anything you said there. But what I'm really getting at is not being controlled by a non-existent meta concept, like "the relationship."

I don't think it would be right at this point for me to call things off as casually as you might after a couple dates.

Why not? Because the answer to that goes more into what I was talking about. Good thing you already elaborated.

So we're unofficially engaged and my original question was whether I'm ready to make it official.

Gotcha, so you feel a sense of obligation to her because you talked about maybe getting engaged sometime soon. You're not even engaged yet, but the fact that she knows you thought about getting engaged is now changing and affecting your behaviors.

dropping my GF at this point because I meet (or know I can probably someday meet) someone a point more attractive seems very selfish of me and dehumanizing to her

I like [u/OsmiumZulu](#)'s example in one of his sidebar posts: Imagine you only ever got to pick one house to live in for the rest of your life. You have thoughts and expectations on how big you want your family to be, how much square footage the house has, how easy you want to have bathroom access, how big of a bed you can fit in your room, a place kids can play, etc. and you find a house that has most or all these amenities by the time you're in your mid-20s. You're aware there are tons of better options that would cost a bit more, but would do a much better job meeting all of your long-term needs and expectations ... you'd just have to save up for a little longer. Maybe by the time you're 30 you can afford a newer model that's larger and would more appropriately meet all of your needs with extra amenities that you wouldn't even know you needed until you moved in.

Well, you already told the owner of the first house, "I'm interested, and I might even put an offer in pretty soon," but you never actually did make an offer. After all, it's a big decision and once you buy this house you'll never be allowed to look at or live in another house again for the rest of your life.

What you're telling me is that you're going to stop your search because the existing owner got their hopes up about you saying you might put in an offer soon. You also haven't communicated what the offer was that you intended to put in. Have you given her a list of your expectations for the marriage so she knows in advance whether or not she even wants to sell to you in the first place? She might have a different set of expectations and you're both just assuming that whatever the offer will be, it'll be good ... until your offer actually comes in and she realizes, "Oh, he wants me to fix the deck and replace the hot water heater? And he's only wanting to pay 80% of the list price?"

WISNIFG's bill of assertive rights No. 4 - You have the right to change your mind.

If you're not absolutely sure about this, (1) get yourself in a mental state where you're not hooked on her first, then process your decision under sober judgment, then (2) when you do make your proposal, be extremely upfront and honest with her about the concerns you have that would give you pause about marrying her. If it's her looks, let her know. "But that's mean!" No, it's called being honest. Don't let social stigma about what's mean or not dupe you into making a mistake on something that you can't take back later. I mean, Jesus called part of his

bride "luke warm" and said he'd spit them out of his mouth. He called people a brood of vipers. Paul cussed at people. He told others to emasculate themselves. There's room for blunt honesty. If she doesn't know what you're really expecting out of the home in advance, that's like buying a home without a home inspector telling you what needs worked on and whether or not it's something that could actually ever be improved - or maybe there's some city ordinance that prevents you from ever building an expansion on the home, so you're stuck with what you bought at first ... and 18 years later when you've got 4 kids that are all teenagers you're now regretting it.

You get one chance. After salvation, this is literally the most important decision you'll make in your life. Are you really going to be so flippant as to say, "Well, she's expecting it, so I really don't feel right backing out now unless something really bad comes up that I didn't know about before."

It would be a "I read on the internet that the grass is greener somewhere else, so bye."

No, it's: "I feel like if I proposed anytime soon it would be because of some internal pressure. If I ever propose to someone, I want it to be a free choice, and not something I *have to do*. I know you're not the one who put that pressure on me - I did by saying I might propose, and then I'm the one who is hung up on how you might feel if I changed my mind, but that's not a healthy place for me to live in or to get engaged in. I need to know that you're not expecting a proposal and that we might very well break up someday - and that I have the freedom to do that, or else I can't ever propose from a place of confidence and stability."

And then, once you've got that down, you've laid the foundation for retracting what you said and breaking up - if that's what you decide to do. You've also left the door open for staying together - if that's what you decide to do. But at this point you're now your own man. You're not being controlled by some meta pressure that doesn't actually exist anywhere than in your own mind.

I'm sure you're not suggesting relationships should be without emotion, caring about each other, or enjoying each other's company.

Not at all - those are all good things.

Are you saying I shouldn't miss her at all, or just not too much (on some kind of spectrum)?

No. What I'm saying is that an emotional investment in the relationship that makes you feel compelled to be around her all the time and that would cause you emotional distress in her absence is unhealthy and precludes you from having sober judgment about the relationship. That emotional connection will wear off, statistically, between 6-24 months after the wedding day. That's when it will finally settle in that you're married for life and there's no going back and you're stuck with someone who you no longer feel emotionally compelled toward. Can you be okay with that? Do you actually like - even love - her enough to want to be with her for the rest of your life, even if you never felt emotionally toward her again the same as you feel today?

By God, I hope you will feel that emotion again periodically throughout your marriage. I know I do. But many people don't, just like many people never feel an emotional connection to God - yet we still have a choice on whether we abandon him or continue living right by him. Can you have the same devotion to the girl you marry? If the emotions are what's holding the relationship together right now, what will happen when they fade? If you haven't experienced the relationship without that emotional connection, then how do you know whether you'll be okay without them? That's all I'm saying. Emotions are good when they're good, but they're not a wise basis for decision-making, as emotions are often deceptive.

on some kind of spectrum

Not quite. If you could have an emotional connection indefinitely, that would be ideal. It's just unrealistic. Right now, even when you're furiously mad at her (and I hope you've experienced that by now!), you still have an

emotional imperative toward her compelling you to resolve the issue rather than walk away. I'm saying you need to get rid of all of that pressure and embrace: "If I don't want to be here, I'm just going to leave" - and then, with that confidence and stability in mind, make the decision about whether or not you want to stay or leave, uninfluenced by internal emotional pressures.

It's not about ridding yourself of the emotions. It's about not being dependent on your emotions - that you can see past them and do what you want to do, even if it defies your emotional connectivity to her.

But if I don't miss her at all, how can I say I care about her, etc?

Subtle, but important distinction: Do you want to care *about* her, or do you want to care *for* her? Caring *about* someone means nothing. Caring *for* them means everything. I can stop caring *about* someone/thing in a heartbeat and never look back. That's an emotionally-driven concept. Caring *for* someone is more aligned with the biblical concepts of love as a behavioral disposition toward someone and not an emotion.

fulfillment and purpose is in Christ, then what value is there in having a wife?

That's an excellent question, which I believe is why Paul wrote 1 Cor. 7. His answer in that chapter: because if you don't get married, you'd end up having sex outside of marriage, which is a hindrance to living out your purpose in Christ. Remember that marrying for "love" was a predominantly foreign concept throughout virtually all of history, including biblical times.

if I get any emotional fulfillment from sex or if I feel loved through it, now I'm depending on my wife for fulfillment and I need to get back in my frame where I remember all my needs are met in Christ

No, you can certainly enjoy those things without having a co-dependence on them. The Bible is rife with passages about enjoying the good things God's given us. Embrace that openly - but like Ecclesiastes says, there will always be good and bad times and the distinction between the two should not phase your sense of wholeness and satisfaction in life with Christ.

I hope this helps provide some clarity. I don't mean to sound harsh, I just want to make sure you're acting in sober judgment.

Frame?

2 upvotes · 27 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Yeah, this is definitely on the sidebar. But frame isn't necessarily related to confidence. A man who has a strong frame has confidence, but a man without frame can be either confident or not. Confidence isn't what creates frame; it's a byproduct of having frame.

As OZ said, "Frame" is a man's point of origin. It's about who gets to decide how you think, feel, make decisions, etc.

- For some people, they live in society's frame. To a degree, this is unavoidable. You can't just will a million dollars into existence - there's a game that has to be played. But some people let it affect them on a deeper level so that their entire lives are ruled by societal expectations over them.
- For others, it's their wife/girlfriend. They let their internal sense of self-worth, decision-making processes, etc. be affected by what their SO thinks of them.
- For others, it's their ideologies. They hold certain philosophies about life that they refuse to break, despite the fact that those philosophies are holding them back from achieving their goals.

In the case of Christians, we hold theology as a foundation for our frame. Where secular RP embraces a man maintaining his own point of origin, we must maintain Christ's point of origin as a reference, and then develop our own sense of self within Christ's framework. This adds a layer of complexity, making frame more difficult in a Christian world view - but it's also far more powerful, as we literally are living out of infinite power when we exist within God's frame. So, between my own finite frame as a human, however strong I may make that, God's will always trumps it and that's where I must live. It's a glorious thing that God gives us individual identities beyond the communal identity we're given within his frame, as that then gives us the ability to continue applying an individual source of strength that uplifts the community and gives a foundation for attraction on an individual level.

Married Man With Girl Friends

2 upvotes · 26 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Okay, I have more time :p

NI is Negative Inquiry. When someone makes a negative statement toward you, it's the tactic of responding with a challenge to the merit of their negativity. So, if your wife says, "You never listen to me!" you respond, "What is wrong about me not listening to you?"

In virtually all cases, the wife will bring up blue pill concepts of "this is what married people are supposed to do" - but who gets to decide what is "supposed" to happen in the first place? The Bible, of course. So, you trail a line of questions to discern if there's anything actually unbiblical about your behaviors. Does the Bible command husbands to listen to their wives? I can't think of a verse that says so. So, is it actually "bad"? Well, maybe it is, maybe it isn't. The point isn't to prove that what you're doing is right - it's to get her thinking more rationally about her accusation in the first place.

But the real goal of NI is much, much deeper. With each response, a follow-up NI can take place until one of three things happens:

- You reach an actual conclusion on whether what you did is evil or not.
- She realizes that her accusation was really only about her personal preference and not anything inappropriate on a moral or biblical level.
- She converts the fitness test into a comfort test by opening up about one of her own insecurities that caused her to make the accusation in the first place ... at which point you employ amused mastery and other comfort-test passing measures.

Fogging is deflecting accusations by agreeing with the statement itself. It doesn't mean you agree to the substance of the accusation. So, if she says, "You're an idiot!" even though you know you're quite competent, you don't agree to being an idiot. You simply say, "I agree that you think I'm an idiot." She can't argue against someone who's only agreeing with her.

Ready to get engaged (in light of past PMO)

2 upvotes · 26 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I believe the nature of a couple's relationship is about as important as the people in it.

And there's the confirmation of the blue, right out of the gate - assuming that "the relationship" has merit in itself as if it's a distinct entity. The concept of "the relationship" is a psychological tool that subjects people to manipulation and control. We talk about "the relationship" or "my marriage" as if it has its own thoughts, feelings, needs, and desires. Consider phrases like:

- My marriage needs improvement
- Our relationship is going great
- What's going on in your marriage?

It's like "the marriage" is a psychological dog you keep in your pantry that you try to feed from time to time, and when it's not getting enough exercise it starts hounding you until you take it on a walk. "The marriage" doesn't exist, nor is there any biblical reference to "the marriage" as being a separate entity from the people within it. All of the biblical passages I can remember talk about how the people within the marriage should act toward each other, and never that there's some "higher existence" that is metaphysically created when these two people decide to place their bodies alongside each other for life. Remove that philosophical concept from your brain and you'll be on a much better track to success in the way you interact with the woman who will one day be your wife.

In each of the above phrases, people are really saying: "My wife and I are not happy together" or "My girlfriend and I are very happy together" or "How are you and your wife feeling about how you treat each other?" It's painfully obvious when you look at it that this is what's really going on. Yet disassociating the "marriage" from the people in the marriage is the norm, and it gives society or even a person's spouse to manipulate you. Instead of "This is what a biblical marriage should look like," we should be saying, "This is how my wife and I should interact with each other, according to the Bible." Notice how these concepts are seemingly identical? But one personalizes the sentiment and the other creates a standard that transcends the individuals. And whoever gets to define that standard is the one who gets to manipulate the other. Because the church is usually the one who defines that standard, and the church is controlled by the feminine imperative, that means that treating "the marriage" as a disassociated metaphysical concept having its own existence puts the husband in a position of being manipulated by his wife and the church based on social expectations about what "marriage" as a concept should look like rather than looking at what the Bible instructs the people within the marriage to do. Tag: [/u/Deep_Strength](#), as I believe this is something that might be worth processing a bit for your book, as you brush against it from time to time without hitting the issue head-on.

merits ... drawbacks

Cool, you created a pro/con list. Those can be helpful from time to time. But if you're on the fence about a woman to the point where you have to create the list to tip you in one direction in the first place ... tells me it's too big of a gamble to be worth staking the rest of your life on the girl. If you were to put those lists on a scale, you should find a bowling ball on the "pro" side and a cracker on the "con" side ... but then you'd never have to make the list in the first place. The pro/con list will help you discern which of two options is more wise than the other - but **ONLY** in a vacuum. That is, if she was the only person who would be a good candidate for marriage in your entire life, then it would make sense to evaluate whether or not it's wise to bind yourself to her that way. But as soon as you account for the fact that there are literally millions of girls in the world who you could create a pro/con list over, suddenly the options change. Even if you were to narrow it down to the women you think you could pull into a relationship, imagine each such hypothetical woman having a pro/con scale. Maybe there are 3 dozen total. Of them, suppose 12 would have the scale tip in favor of marriage. Now, among those dozen women, imagine ranking each of them in order of how heavily the scale tips toward marriage. Assuming your current girl does tip toward the "pro" side (which even that still seems to be in question, but we'll roll with that assumption anyway), where do you think she falls on this new list? Is she someone who barely tips into the "Yeah, I suppose she's a wise choice for a bride" side? Or is she on the top of the list where you're thinking, "OMG! I totally need to lock this girl down right now"? Obviously this requires some presumptuous thinking about your prospects with other women, but if you're only just recently starting your path to improvement, it's highly likely that you're on the low-end of what you could pull down the road. Don't get married early, improve yourself, and then brood on the fact that you could now be getting way better. I think my wife's pretty hot, but I've still had those days and I

wouldn't wish it on anyone.

I'm infatuated with her (just bein' honest)

I.E. - You have ONEitis. This is a condition known to affect a man's ability to assess his own situation.

Is it really worth the loss of innocence to add a point or two to that?

That's ultimately your call. I can't advise you on how to balance that without actually being you. But what this does make me curious about: what loss of innocence? Just because you have a strong emotional connection? Or have you had sex with each other (I can't remember)? If it's just the former, this is a prime example of the problem with viewing "the relationship" as its own metaphysical entity. You're viewing "what you have together" as something disassociated from the real bottom line in the situation: you both have strong emotions toward each other. Sure, breaking that emotional bond might have some psychological ramifications on each of you if you each have a very weak frame ... but that's probably because both of your frames are controlled by "the relationship" in the first place. This assumption of having been in a "serious relationship" somehow having a hold over you in the future is somewhat absurd once you've started living in your own frame for a week.

She said that seems like a lot. I asked her "when we're making out, does sex come to mind?" "Yeah" "So you might not think about sex all the time, but it's my job to inspire you"

I like this. Keep that attitude! If you keep improving your attractiveness throughout the marriage (stagnancy, even without a decline, always results in failure), you may not have much to worry about. Unfortunately, the overwhelming majority of marriages don't involve both parties continually improving themselves after the marriage.

Faithful

Sorry, I can see how that word could be confusing in this context. It's not about being sexually faithful to you. It's "faithful" in the sense that we are faithful to God. When you give her an instruction, how diligent is she about living it out? Or have you not yet felt comfortable giving her tasks and instructions? For example, have you ever had her over and asked her to vacuum your floor? Have you ever asked her to drive to the store to get you something? Most guys tend to think, "No way, I should be the one serving her like that," and then end up becoming their wife's helper instead of her being his. That's, again, part of the problem with looking to "the marriage/relationship," as defined by the church, to discern how you should behave with your SO.

I just kinda agreed, not very leaderlike of me, I suppose

Nah, you're fine. A good leader listens to the counsel of those he trusts. It would have been bad if you weren't crossing any actual boundaries and she was just having a moment of prude-ness and you caved.

If we were dating in person, that's close to the frequency I'd be shooting for. Are you saying I should focus on developing myself/my activities more? (I do need to do that.)

So here's the thing: I had a somewhat hidden agenda in my questions. I was less interested in how good these areas were going for you - and it sounds like you have a lot of positives to report. I was more interested in your attitude about these concepts, as that evidences your degree to which you're living in an ideological fantasy land. Virtually all of your responses affirmed that your idealism about her and the prospect of marriage is very high.

My concern with you being on Facetime so much with her isn't about you needing independent hobbies (though that's certainly true too). I'm concerned that you're developing a pseudo-co-dependence on the relationship. I don't say this as anything unique to you. Most couples do during the dating/engagement phases. But this is also

what lays the groundwork for all the stress and disappointment guys experience after the wedding. If you had to separate from her for a month, how badly would you miss her? Blue pill idealism would scream: "I should miss my wife a lot!" That's a very dangerous attitude.

I've asked all the important questions I can think of. I know asking isn't the most reliable, but where applicable she's shown herself honest.

Here's another crucial point: I comment on *your* impulsivity and *your* long-term thinking ... and you respond with comments about *her*, *her*, *her*. You define the reasonableness of your emotional investment and forward-planning by who she is and how she responds to you. I want you to look at yourself, independent of who she is and how she reacts to you, and evaluate not whether there's more you could do to vet her, but if there's more you can do to stabilize and ground yourself before making a big decision.

I do need to work on myself as first priority.

The red pill is more about seeing the truth. Improvement is merely a byproduct of proper perspective.

Married Man With Girl Friends

2 upvotes · 25 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Have you read WISNIFG yet? That needs to be next on your list if you haven't. Will supplement when I have time.

Question on femdom fantasies.

2 upvotes · 24 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Yeah, fun probably wasn't the right word. But I do enjoy processing unusual questions that have never crossed my mind before. This response is quite helpful and I'll likely incorporate some of it in my ultimate answer.

Married Man With Girl Friends

2 upvotes · 24 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Haha, I actually laughed out loud at this. I like it.

Need Guidance For a Kid in a Jam.

2 upvotes · 24 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Gotcha. But making her pay that price also means condemning him to never having sex again for the rest of his life. Is he willing to pay that price to teach her a "lesson" that she'll likely never pick up because she could easily find someone else to give her the provisions that he'd be denying her? Who is the one really being screwed in that arrangement?

Now, I get it. You feel for your friend and don't want him having sex with a whore who is using him. But for all I know, by the time that happens maybe he'd have bulked up and started living in his own frame and he'd be a big enough boy to make that decision from a place of strength rather than a place of weakness.

Once he's the prize, it's not about her using him; it's him using her to express a sexuality that (within your theological framework) he would never be able to express with anyone else without sin. So why condemn him to a life of sexlessness when he has the ability to have sex with someone without sin? On principle? Let him make that evaluation for himself.

Like I say, if he were a nonchristian or you were teaching him that he could rightly remarry, then your advice is spot on. But a man's sexuality is often too important to him that I don't think I could personally ask him to close the door on it forever just to teach someone a lesson she'll likely never learn anyway. That's a decision he needs

to figure out for himself.

Need Guidance For a Kid in a Jam.

2 upvotes · 24 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

First thing's first: the 400 series is here for a reason. I know I've simplified it to 5 posts, but I usually spend a solid 3 months of weekly meetings with guys to work through the content in a meaningful way. Read, study, and get him on board with looking to the Gospel to help him lick his wounds.

Second, don't refer him to a counselor. I work with psychologists and counselors all the time. If he needs medication just to get him down to earth for a while, then get him to a psychiatrist. But at the end of the day, a counselor is going to give him a psychological cure to a spiritual problem. That's not to say some mental health problems aren't real; rather, it's to say that in the fact pattern you've given, it sounds like his problems are things that the Bible readily addresses and it would be a shame if he were placated with secular methodologies, which even the Christian counselors employ.

Third ...

I'll be advising him that she might attempt a comeback when she's done with her fun, and that, in my opinion, he should reject her.

You would be spot-on if you were also advising him to find another wife. Given your theological view on that subject (and mine as well), then making a Display of High Value (DHV) doesn't really have much of a purpose if you're not trying to attract any women with that display.

That's not to say the advice is wrong - merely that the rationale behind it is inconsistent with your theology, unless you believe his pride and self-respect should be higher priorities to him than his sexuality. I can see how for some people that would, in fact, be a tough call.

As for "biblical resources" on the subject:

- Deuteronomy 24:1-4 seems pretty on point, but that's also Jewish law from a time long ago that Paul says we're not bound to follow. So, take it with a grain of salt. Jeremiah 3:1 kind of falls in this camp as well, but on a more philosophical ground.
- 1 Cor. 7:10-11 says that divorced people "should remain unmarried or else be reconciled."
- The entire book of Hosea is pretty much what your friend is going through. Have him read that book. He married a prostitute, she was literally a whore accepting money for sex from other men. Yet God had plans for them to be together all the same - so not every OT example follows the Deuteronomy 24/Jeremiah 3:1 path. I will note, though, that although the other OT passages are suspect as part of Jewish law and tradition which was fulfilled in Christ and is no longer a part of the new covenant (though perhaps still valuable for what it teaches us of God's intentions), Hosea is also a one-of-a-kind story that we can't really take to be a normative expectation for anyone's life.

Finally, it's also worth noting that God makes concessions due to the inevitability of sin in a fallen world. That is, sin is still sin, but when such sin-sin scenarios are present and unavoidable, God encourages the option that does the least harm to his glory and image on the earth. That is why Moses permitted divorce in the first place - not because there were cases where it wasn't sin, but because their hearts were hard and they may have done even worse if they had not been given that opportunity.

So, if your buddy is likely to either sin by remarrying into a godly relationship or by having sex with several girls outside of marriage because he is weak while trying to remain faithful to his conviction that it would be sin for him to remarry, which one do you think does greater harm to God's Kingdom? Call it what it is, but exercise

wisdom in the midst of being in a broken world.

Need Guidance For a Kid in a Jam.

2 upvotes · 24 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Just for the counter-point:

John Piper does the best exegesis I've seen on the topic (not to say I agree with much of what he puts out - quite little, actually, but this one's solid): <https://www.desiringgod.org/articles/divorce-and-remarriage-a-position-paper>

My view, as written recently:

https://www.reddit.com/r/RPChristians/comments/97ve15/qa_on_divorce_and_remarriage/

Pastor's role

2 upvotes · 23 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I've seen these stats before. First, the numbers only account for American churches and not all the abuse by Catholics overseas. Second, even at that the numbers pan out.

- Protestants: 260 cases/yr, 280,000 churches, 150 million people, 500,000+ pastors. That's an average of .09% of churches or .00017% of protestants, .052% of pastors.
- Catholics: 228 cases/yr, 17,651 churches, 70.4 million people, 37,500 priests. That's an average of 1.3% of Catholic churches or .00032% of Catholic people, .61% of priests.

That's over 10x more likely for a minor to be molested by a priest than a protestant pastor.

Tag: [u/rocknrollchuck](#)

Pastor's role

2 upvotes · 22 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Hmm ... perhaps we have a very different perspective on the state of the church today. I would hardly call it "vaunted," and I believe that "tradition" is what gave way to most of the feminization of the church, as it gave people an excuse to look to cultural sources rather than what the Bible says when determining what modern church culture should look like.

Pastor's role

2 upvotes · 22 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Well said.

What is love?

2 upvotes · 22 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I agree with most everything you've written here, so perhaps we're not as far off as we may have first thought. The only two points that I see where we may still differ:

The Bible, despite a closed canon, continues to evolve as new translators pick up the pen ... that translation is part of the inspiration of God.

I do not believe that any modern English translation is "inspired" in the sense of "infallible." It is "inspired" in the sense that God likely motivated someone to write it for a specific audience with a specific purpose, but that the text itself is "fallible" with regard to technical accuracy.

An understanding of the culture of origin is valid in deciphering meaning.

While I agree fully with the concept, I would not hold such an *interpretation* to be inspired or infallible. More to the point: which culture? Was Jesus inspired and infallible when preaching the sermon on the mount? Should we apply Hebrew culture to our interpretation of that sermon or Greek culture because the apostles may have written it in Greek first rather than in Hebrew or Aramaic?

Or to be clearer, when trying to understand what Matthew wanted to communicate to his Greek-reading audience, it may be valid to look at why he may have used certain Greek words. But to understand what Jesus meant to the people sitting on the hill listening to him speak, we must look to the Hebrew culture and how they would have understood things. Right?

Septuagint

Just to be clear, it sounds like our views on this are almost identical: it is not "inspired" in an "infallible" sense, which would be a designation reserved for the original Hebrew, but it is deserving of the utmost respect when it comes to being used as an interpretive tool - and it is one that I have often used myself on this sub.

Pastor's role

2 upvotes · 22 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

two different levels of inspiration

You're distinguishing between universal and individual revelation. That's a very appropriate distinction to make in this conversation. However, I do believe that universal inspiration exists outside the biblical canon, and I think you do too. Those who hold that "tradition" is a product of the Holy Spirit inherently hold that it is "inspired" to such a degree that all of church dogma and doctrine should account for the tradition of the church. I would suggest that it exists in other areas as well, outside the tradition of the church throughout history.

were the early church councils mistaken in excluding certain inspired books, the very word of God, from the cannon?

Maybe, maybe not. I'm less concerned with whether a bunch of old dead guys made mistakes and more concerned with whether we are making mistakes today. The principle of "near unanimous consent," as I often call it, is a powerful test that affirms a lot of what all those old dead guys said. It doesn't mean they created an exhaustive list of whole inspired texts; only that virtually everyone can agree that, at a bare minimum, those 66 that they selected were/are inspired.

I'd wager there are countless other wholly inspired books out there as well, but it isn't particularly necessary that they all be included in the canon. Perhaps they have duplicitous information, or their substance, while inspired, would have re-shaped the focus of Christianity if they had been included, thereby derailing God's intended path for the church. Or it could be that many texts are partially inspired - that is, that God inspired someone to write something very important, but the person then mixed in God's inspiration with their own thoughts on another page.

did those councils get some of the books in the bible wrong?

This is where the "near unanimous consent" principle comes into play. If someone wants to conclude that one of the 66 books is *not* inspired, then he must also argue that God is generally hands-off when it comes to guiding his people. Many people do, in fact, argue this exact point, most notably those who subscribe to strict Reformed theology. Of course, that same camp actively professes the office of the papacy to be the anti-Christ, so that's not

much of a surprise (and no, I'm not a Calvinist ... or Arminian, for that matter).

Did they ...? If so, how do you know?

The test Jesus gave: "By their fruit you will recognize them." I see the fruit of the 66 books in my own life and in the lives of countless others - and I don't mean merely the "good works" that they prompt, but the type of fruit Jesus references in his parables: when the Gospel springs up in someone, bearing new seed that falls into nearby ground. That is, what disciples are made because of these other texts? Or are there any texts that are bearing bad fruit? That are actively turning people away from Christ?

Now, I know this can seem quite circular: I'm applying a standard in Matthew 7 to prove that Matthew 7 is inspired. First, any conversation about the faith must involve just that: faith. To put our faith in the councils of men seems off to me. To put our "faith" in logic and philosophy also seems off, which is what most of "tradition" appears to be to me. Instead our faith should be in God himself, which can break the cycle of cyclical reasoning. But more specifically, the cyclical reasoning argument only really applies if the Holy Spirit only existed as an active presence on the earth when Matthew 7 was written. But because the Spirit exists in us today and is active in the world today, we have a present reason for trusting in the Scriptures that doesn't involve putting our faith in an ancient council.

Further, were the early councils mistaken in distinguishing true Christian belief (matters of christology) from that of Arians or Gnostics?

My point here is that it doesn't matter what the councils said in the first place. From a historical perspective, it's useful to know how the church got here from where it was, so it does matter in that sense. But on specific issues, like early doctrine, christology, biblical canon, and whatnot, when you ask if they were "mistaken" it sounds to me to be no different than asking if John Piper was mistaken in one of his books published today. No doubt, when he writes his books he also has a council of wise leaders in the church who advise him, provide feedback, who help him discern the Scriptures and generate the content. Or imagine any other book that was written by multiple authors. Or perhaps more germane is the example of biblical translations, like the NIV or the ESV, which were the products of large groups of people working together.

The questions you're asking only actually make sense if we assume that those ancient councils actually had some inherent authority to decide the matters that were before them. Take away this assumption and the whole thing really seems quite silly. I'm not saying it's a wrong assumption, of course. I'm merely saying that of the various positions, this seems a very unlikely one to me - and a position that only becomes prominent if someone has a preconceived notion about church tradition, apostolic success, and the like.

To go back to the original question: *were they mistaken?* Maybe, maybe not. On most things, I'd wager they were spot on. But I'm not so confident in the allegations that they were Spirit-inspired on a universal level that I would say they got everything right, especially when we see the intense conflicts even within those councils over various things, and the ways that some of the conclusions served to gain incredible political advantage to the people in the councils. Mix this with the fact that many of the "traditions" - even as to the sacraments themselves - are practiced in ways that are in direct conflict with the teachings found in Scripture, it creates a clear contrast between Scripture and tradition on many points. But again, that's just from my perspective. I'm sure the Catholic community has many intelligible ways to defend their version of practicing the sacraments.

maybe I'm not discussing this topic with a Nicean Christian

To be clear, I affirm everything in the Nicene Creed. That said, I do not hold the Nicene Creed as having any special weight or authority. I see it as no different than a John Piper or John McArthur book that succinctly summarizes what is otherwise authoritative through Scripture. The book's summary is not inspired, but to the degree that they are referencing truths found in an inspired text, it is 100% true all the same.

For example, if I said to you, "God wants you to love your neighbor," my exact phrasing there may not be inspired. What is inspired is the biblical text that I'm referencing - and you know that my words are true, even if they hold no divine authority apart from the source from which I reached my conclusion about what God wants you to do. In the same way, the Nicene Creed doesn't have any actual authority in and of itself as an inspired word of God, otherwise it would be called Scripture - but it is all true because of the source material from which it was derived.

To that end, it's not a question of whether or not you're conversing with a Nicean Christian, which one could rationally say I am; rather, it is a question of whether or not you're conversing with someone who believes that tradition is authoritative in itself, which you could rationally conclude I am not.

Pastor's role

2 upvotes · 21 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Correct. At best, one could argue that canonization of the bible is a product of tradition, not the bible itself.

Pastor's role

2 upvotes · 21 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I've heard that argument and don't buy it. But I'm okay with the fact that others do.

Sex Addicted v. Sex Starved [MRP Draft]

2 upvotes · 21 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I like this. Thanks for sharing.

Man's Folly

2 upvotes · 20 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That's a tough story to read. You should expand on it and write a field report post showing all you've learned from your upbringing.

The Dangers of Pathologizing Manhood

2 upvotes · 20 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Exciting! Welcome to the club. I found that 4 isn't any harder than 3. Hopefully you'll have similar results.

Question about trying to love and be there for females

2 upvotes · 20 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is what I would have said anyway. Good answer.

To [/u/hello_im_phil](#), sending her messages like that is a Display of Low Value (DLV). It makes her think you're still pawing over her and placing her on a pedestal and that whenever she's ready to come around, you'll be there waiting for her. You've got to move on.

Also props to [/u/lab_of_the_sea_2021](#) - the whole "if it doesn't work when you're here, it won't work at a distance" concept is very apt.

Also, [/u/FuzzyKittenIsFuzzy](#) - solid point picking up on the co-dependency issue. Don't encourage her to be co-dependent on you, Phil, unless you want to undermine your decision not to move forward with her in the foreseeable future.

Kicking Porn For Good

2 upvotes · 17 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I knew I liked that guy. Great video. He echoes through secular rhetoric the same conclusion I reached: that the answer is a man's mission.

Advice for a girl

2 upvotes · 17 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Yeah, on further reflection, there are extremely rare examples, like Jacob, but that's because God had an agreement (covenant) with his dad and grandpa. But when I did the full bible-length study the ratio of verses comparing us pursuing God to God pursuing us ... it was at least 20 to 1. Either way, I'm glad this can help. The sidebar post "pursuit, seduce, initiate" goes into this too.

Question on priorities.

2 upvotes · 16 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Well said.

Advice for a girl

2 upvotes · 14 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Correct. This is a good answer. Most of the stuff on RPW is about how the woman can remain in her own frame while still adding value to her man. It says nothing about entering into her man's frame so that he can be the one to lead her in how he receives value.

To be clear, not everything on that sub is bad. There's a lot of good content, as [u/CoachDad9](#) has referenced. But there's a lot of bad content too. The same could be said for TRP, MRP, RPC, TC, and pretty much every sub in existence.

What I'm more concerned about is not whether or not good, practical advice can be found there (I could probably go on a subreddit for Nazi sympathizers and still find some good, practical advice here and there), but whether or not the advice leads someone to glorify God through their lifestyle choices. To that end, RPW may have a lot of content that increases a woman's general value to mankind, but it will not have as much content about how to exit her frame to understanding her husband's perception of her value, nor will it encourage her to leave her secular practices in order to pursue God's perception of her value.

To that end, I have repeatedly seen comments over there telling girls that it's okay to have sex in the first date, suggesting that a high n-count really isn't all that bad, encouraging women to live with their man before marriage to see what it's like, etc. These are ungodly practices and I wouldn't want a woman taking that kind of advice if she is in Christ.

Wear a black arm band to church in August 2020

2 upvotes · 14 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is my gut reaction too. I don't see Jesus doing anything to change a political structure, nor does his inaction on a political level amount to an endorsement of the political structure at that time. Likewise, Paul and the apostles lived in the days of Caesar Nero, who made it a distinct political agenda to kill all Christians, and yet this is the political climate where Paul wrote Romans 13.

In short, I believe the biblical attitude is merely to say: *Culture's going to do what culture's going to do. Let's not let the church get mixed up in it. Let's keep pulling people into the church.*

"Three reasons why Christian parents are raising slutty girls and beta males"

2 upvotes · 14 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Haha, I follow now.

What has the church done to women?

2 upvotes · 13 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

You mean after all its catering to women and the church is still pushing women away too? Who knew ...

For real though, where the church gets it wrong is in assuming that biblical headship will push women away. The church doesn't realize that when men are men and lead the way God designed, the women are happier and flock to the church in droves: (1) to get all these great guys, and (2) because they follow where the men lead.

How do you reconcile TRP with Christian values?

2 upvotes · 12 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

As far as descriptive theory goes, I can't think of any discrepancies off the top of my head. That's not to say they don't exist, I just can't think of one. Maybe there aren't any. Who knows. If anything, I'd say that the secular model is incomplete.

406 - You are "not guilty" so stop feeling guilty

2 upvotes · 12 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I like this. A better way to word it, though, isn't that we "sometimes still sit in the cell with the chains wrapped around our bodies calling out to Christ" - it's that the chains are literally gone but we keep our eyes closed and don't believe it and keep acting like they're still there.

For Singles: Finding the Girl You Can't Keep Yourself From Banging - PART 2!

2 upvotes · 11 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Great question, squizzo. Two things on that point:

1. Ask God for bigger things. Once you master personal discipleship in your own relationships, start a church wide initiative that includes the ladies. Work toward revamping your church's small group system to point people toward discipleship, and meet women as you train the small group leaders and coed groups. Go outside your church to look for men and meet women along the way.
2. You probably have a limited view of what discipleship really is, which is understandable given the way the church views it. The church usually promotes discipleship either as a group initiative, or if they're wise enough to move into their one on one, it's a weekly meeting time where one guy teaches another and talks about life issues.

When I disciple a guy he shares my life. If I'm going to the grocery store, I call him up and ask him if he needs anything and to go with me. If I'm going to a social event, he goes with me. If I'm going to dinner with the family, I invite him to join.

Very quickly, he starts doing the same for me, introducing me to everyone in his circle of friends. Then his friends usually like me and want to hang with us some more, giving me an opportunity to encourage my guy to witness to those people God I can observe him in action and give feedback. And as those people are drawn to me and my guy, they bring their friends for stuff in the future and my social circle keeps growing.

But all of this comes from a life on life view of discipleship, not the knock off version of 1.5 hours per week that the church calls life on life. Jesus didn't do 1.5 hours a week. He shared his entire life. I do set some boundaries, but not many. I even let guys watch during times my wife is having one of her episodes against me so he can watch me pass tests and handle conflict. I even had a time last year where a guy invited me over and I sat through

a very raw and nasty argument he had with his wife to give him feedback. Nothing is off limits except when, like Jesus, I just need to get away.

406 - You are "not guilty" so stop feeling guilty

2 upvotes · 10 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Good question. Look a couple verses earlier - "Don't you know that friendship with the world means enmity against God? ... he jealously longs for the spirit he has caused to dwell in us ... God opposes the proud but shows favor to the humble." The context is contrasting the troubles of the world with the life that God calls us to.

Now compare that language of the world being enemies to God with Philippians 3:18 - "For many, of whom I have often told you and now tell you again even with tears, walk as enemies of the cross of Christ." It appears that Paul's words in James 4 and Philippians 3:18 are something that he spoke of repeatedly: that the world is an enemy of Christ, and that he had great turmoil and sorrow over this.

So, when he's talking in verse 8 about "wash your hands, you sinners, and purify your hearts, you double-minded," I get that he's refraining what he started talking about in the previous verses: trying to get non-believers into a relationship with God in the first place, which is why verse 8 starts, "Come near to God and he will come near to you," implying he's talking to people who don't already have a relationship with God.

To that end, my original post highlights that godly sorrow is for the non-Christian, and thus the "Grive, mourn and wail" part supplements verse 8's compulsion for non-Christians to seek Christ quite well. But even from another angle, for the believer there is basis for grieving, mourning and wailing - not over our own sin, which God has forgotten and "remembers no more," but over those who "live as enemies of the cross of Christ."

How do you remain or accept being Christian? And it turned into a ramble warning

2 upvotes · 10 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

How does one reconcile having faith in something in and of itself?

In the reverse, I don't see how anyone finds any value in life by having faith in nothing bigger than himself. On a philosophical level, I believe every man needs something beyond himself - be it God, his favorite sports team, the concept of "marriage" or whatever. Many of these things are inherently destructive and cause a man to leave his own frame. But if such a thing is actually true and the man is merely embracing reality and orienting his frame to include that knowledge, then he is not doing himself harm, but a much greater benefit.

And if it is this way, why would I choose one thing (i.e., book, or gods, or path towards self-actualization) over another?

Because we don't have the option not to choose. Jesus said, "Anyone who is not for me is against me." So, you either choose to believe in Jesus or you choose any other path. Ambiguity or agnosticism is defined in Christianity as a choice against Jesus, not a refusal to choose at all.

Should not my only concern be both immediate and long-term, temporal pleasure?

Rather than asking what "should" be the case, which is ultimately a philosophical conversation, I prefer to stick with what "is" the case - one that can be addressed through theology and praxeology. Every man has his own interests and systems of prioritization, so the "should" questions aren't always going to reach the same conclusions, although some things are grand enough that it would be almost impossible not to have a unanimous consensus. To that end, if hell is real and as bad as the Bible says it is, is there any legitimate basis for a man to want to prioritize his temporal desires in the present at the expense of spending eternity in such a place? It's easy to say a man "should" prefer to avoid hell, even at the expense of his present gratification. But many men are

simply okay with accepting that risk.

God gave us free will for a reason. That free will lets us determine our own point of origin and prioritization. It lets us decide if our pleasures in the present life is worth sacrificing eternity over - and God is the one who saw fit to give us that choice, so I dare not question him and tell other men what they "should" want.

Instead, I care about what they do want and what is presently true about a man and the universe he lives in. To that end, a man must know the truth - the realities of heaven and hell, good and evil, the Gospel, and all other relevant factors that may affect his decision-making processes. What he does with that information is up to him.

Romans 2 says, "So that you may be proved right when you speak and justified when you judge." Every time a non-Christian is presented with additional evidence, testimony, or a call to follow Christ, evidence is heaped upon that man which will be presented at judgment day. A judge who must discern between a "he said/she said" case might not be confident in his judgment, and others certainly won't be either. But if there is a mountain of evidence against the offending party, then the judge and all of those around him can have great confidence that his decision was just and proved right. This is the obligation of the Christian. The obligation of each man is to decide how he wants to be judged and the probability/risk assessment of the chance that he may be right/wrong about what information presented to him he accepts as true and false.

And more than why, how on earth do you even have the confidence to believe in what you are believing?
Was it not also taught by man?

Imagine a time-traveler opens a portal in your house. You watch him walk through it. He takes you through it as well. You see the future. You come back. He spends a week with you talking all about time-travel and his adventures. Then he leaves back through that portal.

Now imagine your neighbor witnessed none of this and you're telling him all about it. He believes you. After he believes, the time-traveler also appears to him and tells him all about his adventures in time.

Your neighbor then goes and tells someone else about the story you told him and about his own experience with the time-traveler. That third person then raises the questions you asked: "Isn't this all just stemming from what your neighbor told you? Couldn't your personal experiences just be hallucinations?" To the two who actually met the time-traveler, these accusations would seem absurd. But to the one who doesn't believe time-travel is even possible in the first place, the possibility of them telling the truth would seem absurd.

Kicking Porn For Good

2 upvotes · 9 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That's awesome! Glad to help :)

Kicking Porn For Good

2 upvotes · 9 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

We don't smother guilt with a pillow. We smother it with the Gospel. I've heard your take before, and it makes philosophical sense, but there's no scriptural basis for the Spirit utilizing guilt. There is substantial basis for the enemy doing that. I think the reason is that guilt only lends itself to temporary and shallow victories. It's a shaky foundation. The Gospel is a strong foundation.

I am very encouraged by your story though! Alcohol dependency is a nasty beast to kill for many people. Yay for pressing forward!

Sex Addicted v. Sex Starved

2 upvotes · 9 August 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

That was in another post on RPC. If you want to peg, go peg. My point there was merely that pegging doesn't create a one flesh connection. I'm not sure why any guy would want to do that in the first place, but to each their own.

How do you learn to truly let go of someone?

2 upvotes · 9 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Is it vain to give positive feedback to a comment that encourages people to read my stuff? Screw it - your biblical references are what make this worthwhile. Noice.

Sexual Addiction v. Sexual Starvation

2 upvotes · 9 August 2018 · /r/TheRedPill

It's an internal issue, not external. Imagine jacking it to porn is like eating a potato chip. Your body is really craving steak, potatoes and broccoli. How many potato chips does a guy have to eat before he's a steak and potatoes addict? Can't say because he isn't eating steak and potatoes anyway. What about a food addict in general? No clue. How bad are those potato chips screwing up his life?

Introduction/Accountability

2 upvotes · 8 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

but mostly focusing on the Bible for now

Praise God for that, brother. If your mind is free from cultural influences, you'll find quickly that any of the stuff here is found there first anyway.

we should be out of debt (other than student loans and mortgage) within 3 years

This is wonderful. Cut this shorter if at all possible. Once you start dieting, you might find there's an extra \$100-200 or more (depending on how much you eat out) in your monthly budget to apply to these other debts, saving you a ton on interest and potentially cutting 6 months to a year off your goal.

Now I have this post I can look back at and see where I was on 8-8-2018 and make sure I am continually improving.

This is an admirable thing.

didn't end up actually having sex on our wedding night

Me either. I feel you on that.

There were several months in our marriage where we didn't have sex at all just because she didn't feel like it or was too tired.

Been there, done that. Do you see your language about how she's the one making these decisions in your marriage?

It got to the point where she turned me down so much for sex that I stopped asking, and she didn't ask, so I know we had a couple of 6 month gaps between having sex.

Ergo my testimony about my 18 month gap! which I just posted about yesterday.

she is the one in the worst shape but only a little worse than me

When researching for my post on sexual addiction v. starvation I looked into some stats on food addiction and found that 3x as many women are addicted to food than men. I'm not surprised by your conclusion at all.

We can't lock our door at night because our daughter has a full blown freakout if she gets scared in the middle of the night and the door is locked.

Sounds like you're in your daughter's frame.

"But my wife would never stand for our daughter's middle of the night outbursts!"

Then you're in her frame.

What do you want to do?

However there is definite progress in the sex department and also just affection in general.

That's nice. But get yourself under 25% as your next big mile-marker and you'll see even larger improvement. When you're under 20% she'll start trying to lose weight too (or not, whatever). Then shoot for 15%, then 12%, then 10% if possible. Try to do each of these in 3-6 month intervals. It's more than doable if one is dedicated (preaching to myself here too - trying to go from 16% to 12%).

My testimony and RP-imony

2 upvotes · 8 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Glad to hear it helped. For the "figured out the Bible" complex, spend 6 months on [r/TrueChristian](#) and reply to at least 3 posts a day - but only when you have actual Scripture to back up your points. I found very quickly when attempting this that I didn't know as much as I thought I did, but that through hours upon hours of research to get to the point where I can do that at will now, the exercise was well worth it.

How do you learn to truly let go of someone?

2 upvotes · 8 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Aaah, that makes a lot more sense now. To that end, I wrote [115 - Dealing with ONEitis](#).

Sex Addicted v. Sex Starved [MRP Draft]

2 upvotes · 8 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Thanks for the background. Your husband sounds a lot like me. I'm glad things are moving in a good direction for you two! I would have been excited if my wife actually did any research like you've done to help resolve your issues. For my own sake, though, I appreciate the value in learning to lead independent of her pursuits, which are an added bonus on the rare times that she does proactively make some progress on her own.

How do you learn to truly let go of someone?

2 upvotes · 8 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That's what I figured you meant. I agree.

Sex Addicted v. Sex Starved

2 upvotes · 8 August 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Fair enough. For what it's worth, biases aside, I consider you a comrade who merely has a different point of origin from my own. I've always respected your feedback more than most.

Forget about respecting your wife. Respect yourself.

2 upvotes · 8 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Amen.

Forget about respecting your wife. Respect yourself.

2 upvotes · 8 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That's a solid FR right there. Of course, prioritizing your own respectability in the face of your wife's disrespect isn't the same as disrespecting her. Not to say this was your intent, but after all, it's to my glory if other people are jealous of my wife, so why would I want to undermine her to those around us? I see another Christ/Church parallel in there somewhere ;)

My testimony and RP-imony

2 upvotes · 7 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That's a decent write up. My wife is past the "it's sin" part and onto "it's gross."

The first time I gave her oral she passively tried to set a boundary, "That felt great. I don't know how you do that. I don't think I could ever do what you just did." I asked, *You mean lick out a woman?* "Uh huh." *Then I guess it's a good thing you're not a guy.*

Is my wife pregnant by another man (I need some advice)

2 upvotes · 6 August 2018 · /r/askMRP

What is your question? It sounds like you wanted to vent. Fine. But at least be honest about it. Don't hide a vent session in disguise as a request for advice - especially when the answers are plain obvious and you know it.

Introduction

2 upvotes · 6 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

The macro tracking is good start, mentioned by someone else. I'm also looking at Paleo and insulin sensitivity

Try the Whole30 diet. It only lasts for 30 days, so it's not a long-term commitment. But it does cut everything out of your diet that could potentially be causing inflammation. The plan is that after the 30 days are over, your body is "pure" and you can gradually start adding foods back to see the effect that it has on your body. In the meantime, every time I've done the Whole30 while working out, I end up losing about 20lbs.

What should i read again to get that started.

NMMNG. A proactive way to practice being alpha is simply to engage in no-context conversations. I have a post in my submission history about that. I may be titled about social networking or something like that.

It's around the prophetic.

Yeah, you're still not giving any actual information. You're like a kid saying, "I've got something really cool in my hand!" And someone asks what it is and you say, "It's totally awesome. It's amazing. I really like it. It's so cool." Then the guy asks what it is again and you say, "I just told you - it's awesome, amazing, cool, and I like it."

How do you reconcile TRP with Christian values?

2 upvotes · 5 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Yep. That's why I put that in there. You'll also notice that there are a lot more people following rule 2 since it was

posted, and I have certainly removed non compliant posts and only reapproved them after they added the relevant content.

Life advice and direction needed.

2 upvotes · 3 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

We'll simply have to agree to disagree. This is not worth the time to explain any further. Thanks for the stimulating conversation.

Life advice and direction needed.

2 upvotes · 3 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Again, read 209. I break it down into vision, mission, and calling. The vision is the end destination that God has in mind, which we must all adopt collectively. Our mission is the plan God created for getting from today to the fulfillment of that vision, which is also a communal plan given to all believers.

Our calling is the individual context Christ gives us for living it out, which is unique to all of us based on our spiritual gifts, talents, the life circumstances he placed us in, etc. - and even that does come from God, but because one's specific calling is unique to every person, I give significant room for flexibility on that point. A doctor might make disciples of his residents, whereas a teacher might make disciples of his students, or another man of his neighbors. And the way he makes disciples might focus on intentional times of teaching, or it might be on encouragement, or it might be on training or coaching, or it might be through a focus on serving together. Those are the places where it's individualized for our own life circumstances, but the mission as a whole is common to all.

Life advice and direction needed.

2 upvotes · 3 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Matthew 28:19-20 - "Go therefore and make disciples of all nations." I just fleshed this out in greater detail in a reply to OP's reply to my comment. I also edited 209 on the sidebar to reflect my increasing fervor on this issue. So ... uum, yeah, when you say:

I'm under the impression that the Bible says to go forth and preach the gospel

You're agreeing with me, not disagreeing ;) That is the very mission that is assigned to us.

Life advice and direction needed.

2 upvotes · 3 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I've found this to be repetitively true in life: *God won't tell you in prayer what he's already told you in His Word.*

It's no wonder your prayer for a mission isn't being answered - because you've ignored what his word says about it: "Go therefore and make disciples of all nations."

Can you imagine God asking you on judgment day, "What did you do with your life?"

- "I made some money and supported a family."
- "I made disciples who follow you and will be entering your Kingdom."

Which answer do you think God wants to hear? Which one do you think matters more to him at the end of the day? Even the non-Christians do the first one, and their families are going to hell, despite the fact that they were good providers. Your mission has to extend beyond this and it must be the one prescribed by God.

I used to give a lot more leeway on this sub about this. I would say things like in 209 - "In my view, the vision

must always incorporate the 3 Greats in some way: Love God, Love Others, Make Disciples. But I'm not going to hold everyone to that." I've changed my mind since then. I now believe it is a full spiritual imperative that all men incorporate discipleship, and the three greats at large, in their mission. It doesn't have to be the entirety of it, but I do believe that if it's not there, that's sin. Period. In fact, I'm editing 209 to read this way because I am so convinced of this by Scripture.

Mental Point of Origin and Philippians 2

2 upvotes · 3 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Okay, enough being repetitive on that point. If we understand that our identity is one with Christ because of his indwelling presence in us and the new creation he has made us to be after his own image, then what does that have to say about our "point of origin"?

Is making yourself your mental point of origin considered selfish ambition?

If you haven't adopted Christ's identity, then the answer is yes, because your "self" or your "point of origin" is your flesh, which is not "one" in anything apart from Christ.

If, however, we understand our identity in the communal sense that God intended, then Paul's words in Ephesians 5:28-30 lead to a different conclusion: "He who loves his wife loves himself. For no one ever hated his own flesh, but nourishes and cherishes it, just as Christ does the church, because we are members of his body."

In other words, if our "point of origin" is the oneness identity that God gives us in his self, with our spouse, and within the church, then there is no room for selfish ambition in the first place. What we do to each other we do to ourselves. It would be like the hand punching the nose and the foot stamping on the hand. Nobody is better off when this happens. We have only damaged ourselves when we damage the other parts of our body.

Is counting others (your wife) more significant than yourself the same as making her your mental point of origin?

No, because Christ is the head, therefore he is our mental point of origin if our identity is found in him.

Is counting others more significant than self the same as "putting the concerns of others before your own"?

You quoted Philippians 2:3-5, but you left off verses 1-2, which set the context for the passage you quoted. Here's what they say: "So if there is any encouragement in Christ, any comfort from love, any participation in the Spirit, any affection and sympathy, complete my joy by being of the same mind, having the same love, being in full accord and of one mind." Then he goes into what you say. He's describing their oneness and unity - the fact that they are all part of the same body with a common identity in Christ.

In other words, he's saying, "Before doing what's best for the mouth, think about what's best for the stomach too." In this way, each part of the body receives its support not from its own efforts, but from the support of the rest of the body as well.

The problem predominantly comes in the form of application, as the Church is so broken that it's virtually impossible to conceptualize this in practice today. Everyone is taught a form of hyper-individualism that if one were to live and apply what the Bible actually preaches on identity-oneness, those people would be ravaged for all they had and taken advantage of. This is why the Bible has several passages that also talk about people managing their own households well, and providing for the members of their own household - because on an individual familial basis a husband who leads rightly can let this oneness play out in his own home, but as a practical matter the body of Christ as a whole cannot express it fully today, and thus appropriate boundaries and safeguards need to be put in place as we work toward maturity, which further stretches our boundaries over time to gradually incorporate that common identity.

I have this with some guys outside of my household. If they were my neighbors, we would have a singular joint fence around both of our properties rather than around each of our own homes - because we have that oneness bond. And that number has increased in my own life over time. And I believe it can be this way with everyone in the church. But not until the church has turned back to Christ and recognized Him as the head of the body. Right now everyone believes they are the head and everyone else should be their hands and feet.

How can a Christian follow this advice in light of Philippians 2?

By recognizing that *Christ is our point of origin* and not our flesh. I am Christ, in my spirit. Christ's will is my will. His point of origin is my point of origin. If I have really adopted this, then my brother in Christ is me also, if Christ is also his point of origin. So, as I help him, I help myself, and vice versa. To that end, non-Christians are not me. I do not put the needs of the non-Christian above myself (which includes Christ and those who are also in Christ), thereby supporting or enabling their sin. I put my own needs and desires above theirs, which if I am one with Christ, then my needs and desires are for the betterment and expansion of Christ's body.

So, if Christ is the head and I am his bride, then it is my duty to enter his spiritual frame and adopt it as my own. From there, my frame is identical as everyone else who has also entered Christ's frame and adopted it as their own. So, it is our job, then, to bring others into that frame and to adopt that identity. This is my desire, which I receive from adopting the desires of Christ. I then must contemplate and process the most effective way of accomplishing my desire in this regard - and that certainly includes application on Philippians 2:3-5.

What makes some of this confusing is that we, as men, function in a dual capacity. We play the role of bride to Christ, but we also play the role of men to the world. So, in one sense we must be the submissive toward Christ, but in another sense we must be the dominant toward the world. I think a lot of guys have a hard time getting past that and assume that they are only to be the dominant and forget what it means to be the bride of Christ, adopting our groom's frame.

I see that the text says "also to the interest of others" assuming you will look to your own interests first.

It doesn't assume we look to our own interests first. Verse 2 tells us what Paul is assuming: that we have "the same mind, having the same love, being in full accord and of one mind" - that is, that our interests would be the same as others. That is why he also says, "Have this mind among [communal] yourselves, which is yours in Christ Jesus" - because our mind is from Christ Jesus, which we all adopt.

Would that be how you explain mental point of origin to someone who would disagree with Rollo's iron rule of frame?

Simply put, I'd explain it that Christ is our mental point of origin. Anyone who is in Christ has the same mental point of origin. Christ's interests for his own body are parallel to my own body. Sometimes I need to eat and focus on the needs of my stomach; sometimes I need to hump my wife and focus on the needs of my penis; sometimes I need to lift weights and focus on the needs of my muscles, etc. When I'm at the gym and hungry, my stomach must rightly subside itself to the needs of my pecs and quads, etc. When I'm eating, I might be horny, but my penis must subside itself to the needs of my stomach, which supplies the energy to my muscles, which empower me to have better sex for my penis, etc. See how it's all interconnected?

So no, we don't disagree with Rollo's iron rule of frame. We embrace it in the context of our dual role as a bride who adopts Christ's point of origin and frame to him, then reflects it as our own point of origin and fame to the rest of the world, without apology and without bending or breaking.

Mental Point of Origin and Philippians 2

2 upvotes · 3 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

1/2

This is an excellent question - and one I'm actually excited to answer! I've contemplated this issue since long before I even knew of RP or read any of /u/Rollo-Tomassi's stuff. The conclusion is actually a little weird if the Bible is true ... because Rollo's content is 100% right, but not necessarily in the way one would expect.

That said, I should note that you're comparing Rollo's *DEscription* of how the world operates with a *PREscription* that the Bible compels us to follow. Rollo has not suggested we defy the Bible. He's merely explaining how things work. You are drawing your own conclusions about what that understanding should compel you to do. But when you understand what the Bible has to say about frame, identity, and interpersonal interactions, we see that the Bible's prescription is fully aligned with Rollo's description.

Individual Identity in Christ

The issue stems from the concept of "identity." Who are you? Who are they? Any fans of *The Walking Dead* will know right away the phrase, "I am Negan." Negan is a community leader, but he develops a sense of oneness in his community to the point that they all self-identify with him and the "spirit" of his leadership. Unfortunately, the show does little more than display this as a symbol of loyalty.

But in the Bible, when Jesus says things like this, we see something very different at play: "Anyone who has seen me has seen the Father ... Don't you believe that I am in the Father, and that the Father is in me?" Jesus is saying that his very identity is defined by his Father.

Now we also know this is true for us. 2 Cor. 5:17 says that when we are saved we become a "new creation; the old has gone, the new has come." We are no longer ourselves. Our old self in the flesh remains only as an outward shell, whereas the fruit beneath is new and pleasing. In this regard, we don't define ourselves by our flesh, but by Christ in us. This is where our identity is found - and it is a oneness bond. That is why Ephesians 4:22-24 says that we are "to put off your old self ... and to be renewed in the spirit of your minds, and to put on the new self, created after the likeness of God in true righteousness and holiness." It is also why Paul says separately in Romans 7:25 that he is still a "slave to sin" in his flesh, but a "slave to God" in his mind. Yet our identity is found through Christ in us, not in our flesh, which is why he says a few verses earlier that when he sins, "It is no longer I who do it, but it is sin living in me" - because his identity isn't derived from his sin, but from Christ living in him.

Marital Identity

We also know that the Bible references humans as being "one" in being this way too. Genesis 2 says that a husband and wife will become "one flesh." Malachi 2:15 extends this on a spiritual level by saying, "And why did the Lord God make them one, with a portion of his Spirit in their union?" See also 1 Cor. 6 and 2 Cor. 6 regarding the spiritual oneness that can be formed through sex. When practiced biblically, a husband and wife share a common identity on a spiritual level the same way that we share a common identity on a spiritual level with our spiritual groom: Christ, as we are his bride, the Church.

From there, the Bible even talks about this oneness between husbands and wives in more practical terms. In Ephesians 5, for example, Paul says something weird: "Husbands ought to love their wives as their own bodies. He who loves his wife loves himself. Indeed, no one ever hated his own body, but he nourishes and cherishes it, just as Christ does the church. For we are members of His body." This isn't just an intangible oneness that has no practical value. The new identity is created when a man leaves his father and mother to start a new life with his wife (per Genesis 2) means that when we are married we are no longer who we were before we were married - there is an actual identity change that takes place. This isn't merely a new situational circumstance that the world generally understands it to be.

Communal Identity

But this goes even further. Jesus prays in John 17:22-23 "that they may be one even as we are one, I in them and

you in me, that they may become perfectly one, so that the world may know that you sent me and loved them even as you loved me." This prayer actually takes it to another level: it's not just that our individual identity is found in Christ, or even our marital identity, but that we also have a communal identity among the body of believers.

This is why Paul says in Ephesians 5:32, after the above bit on a husband viewing his wife as his own body, "For we are members of His body ... This is a profound mystery, but I am talking about Christ and the church." He speaks of this "body of Christ" concept in 1 Cor. 12 and Romans 12 as if we all share a common identity defined by Christ, who is the head (Colossians 1:18).

That is also why Jesus' prayer in John 17 isn't just that they be one with Christ, but that they be one with each other - and to recognize the significance of this oneness that God intended us to have, not only in our purpose, but in our very identity, being united in Christ, as Christ is in all of us. Ideally, we should all be able to proclaim as Jesus did, "Anyone who has seen me has seen the Father ... and that the Father is in me," just as the Father is in all of those who belong to his Church.

Instead of saying, "I am Negan," in the shallow sense of loyalty, we say, "I am a Christian" - literally a "little Christ", as that is the core of our identity. We are defined by Christ in us, for we are his groom and we are collectively his singular bride with one identity.

Tag: [/u/Deep_Strength](#) and [u/palmorwrist](#) - as this with part 2 would serve as a reply to your comments

[FR] Fixing your SMV

2 upvotes · 1 August 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I agree with virtually everything you've said ... if we look at this post in isolation, abandoned from the greater context of everything else I've said on this sub and my ultimate purpose for the men here. I think you and I probably have a very similar end game in mind. We simply have different perspectives on how Jesus and the apostles modeled reaching that end game - and much of that is likely due to a difference in our target audience. May I ask how long you have been engaged substantially with the red pill community?

As for the individual points, I'm sure you're right that some of the verses I referenced are in a different context, though not so far removed as to warrant the application I suggest.

More to the point:

- How do you suggest men glorify God with their bodies through failing to take care of them?
- How do you suggest men honor God through maintaining a spirit of timidity or failing to learn to act boldly or failing to lead in their marriages?
- How do you suggest men honor God with their finances without working on earning them in the first place or without regard for being a viable provider for a family?
- How do you suggest glorifying God in the way we interact with others if we choose not to develop a personality and character that earns the respect of outsiders?
- How do you suggest we glorify God in our relationships with others if we are not working on building those relationships?
- How do you suggest we glorify God through immoral and unethical behaviors?

You criticize what I am suggesting men work on, but fail to address how a neglect of any of these areas would be any more godly than an improvement in them. Or are you suggesting that God doesn't have anything to say about

these aspects of our lives in the first place? Or that he doesn't care?

Church Discipline

2 upvotes · 31 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is a gem.

Starting a RPC men's group

2 upvotes · 30 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Thanks. I'm certainly expecting that. I appreciate the insightful reminder to keep an intentional eye out for this.

The usual reply to "See, you do it too!" is, "Yeah, and when you've got what I've got going, you'll be allowed as well. But for now, get back to the gym." An in-shape person can eat 2,000+ calories a day because they don't need to lose weight. A fat tub of lard doesn't get that right until he's at his fitness goal.

Trying to create a "Look"

2 upvotes · 30 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

What message, as a Christian man, should I be broadcasting?

1 Thess. 4:12 - "so that your daily life may win the respect of outsiders and so that you will not be dependent on anybody." Our attire should be that which outsiders would respect us in.

If I went around wearing gym shorts and a t-shirt, most people might not think much of it, but they certainly won't be increasing in respect for me because of it (except in rare cases). And if it's not going to cause an outsider to increase in respect for me, why would I think it'd cause my wife to increase in respect for me?

Trying to create a "Look"

2 upvotes · 26 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Having a "look" sucks. It was one of the RP concepts I waited longest to address. I still slack on it occasionally. I like going commando in my gym shorts too much, though I often lounge in a polo atop them.

Nevertheless, swapping the gym shorts for even khaki shorts resulted in a noticeable improvement in my wife's apparel and attitude toward me. Call me a sellout if you want, but the results are worth it.

Wife saw me reading r/askmrp last night and wanted to see what it was

2 upvotes · 18 July 2018 · /r/askMRP

As cholomite noted, your first big mistake was being evasive. Honesty is the better choice. If you honestly don't care about her interest in what you're reading, then be honest and tell her that. Or just be honest about what it is. Most girls don't actually care enough to look deeper into it on their own anyway.

Now, if I just feel like teasing her, I've said a couple times, "Just texting my girlfriend." She knows it's a joke, but the suggestion that this thought even crosses my mind registers a degree of dread.

My wife knows that I've been a fairly well respected redditor for years. So it's easy just to say, "I'm just making a reddit comment." Most of the time I can tie it to faith, since most of my activity is on [r/RPChristians](#), then can branch off on a related theological point and engage her in the conversation. Or even if it's a secular RP sub I'll just say, "Some guy's screwing up his marriage and I'm trying to help him out."

As soon as you act secretive, you screw it all up.

How do you respond to threats from your wife?

2 upvotes · 16 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

2/2

to her it feels like <blah, blah, blah> ... So what am I supposed to do in those situations ...?

Stop caring about what she feels like. Let her get mad. Let her throw a hissy fit. Let her yell at you. Let her pass out.

This probably deserves an FR in itself, but I just got into it with my wife a couple days ago. She's been sexually responsive, but doesn't always have the best attitude when I initiate (yes, I still need to be making progress, just like everyone else). I had initiated and she gave me crap about being tired and she started whining and whatnot. I said, "Cool, I'm going to do some writing, then," and I kissed her on the forehead and left for my basement to work on one of my books. She comes down all apologetic and says, "I'm sorry. I was being a brat. I guess if you really want sex right now I can deal with it." I said, "Don't worry babe. I don't want sex right now. We're good. Go get some sleep and we'll have sex tomorrow." Then she starts complaining about how she's offering me sex and I'm turning her down and that I wanted it 5 minutes ago, so I must still want it now. So, I said with a smile that her attitude turned me off, and that I'd rather work on my book instead. I then set a clear boundary that I'm not going to have sex with her when she has a bad attitude and I'm not going to pressure her into feeling like she has to give duty sex just because I initiated.

Here's where it gets interesting. She interprets this that I expect her to walk around the house wearing lingerie and makeup all day, waiting for her to pounce on me as soon as the kids are in bed. So, in one monologue she starts yelling and screaming about how ridiculous my expectations are. She punches a wall at one point. She talks about how she should have just become a nun because she'll "never be that horny college slut that you want me to be." I just sit with an "interested, yet perplexed" look on my face throughout all of this. When she's done, I simply say, "I understand that's how you feel [fogging]. Here's what's going to happen from here. I'm still going to initiate sex whenever I feel like it. If your response turns me off, we're not going to have sex and I'll go do something else. If your response doesn't turn me off, then I'm going to keep escalating until we have sex. It's that simple."

In all of this, I stuck to my desired outcome and did not mold it to her. I did not let her emotions change my attitude or make me angry or upset or turn into some cold, emotionless robot with a dead look in my eyes (I used to do that a lot). I maintained having a personality and a positive attitude. This is actually more nuanced than people think. Go on youtube, search LAHWF and watch several of his videos. He's usually dry and monotonous in his awkward approaches to people. Then he made [this video](#), where he's intentionally maintaining "personality" in a conversation. That's what you have to do to maintain frame in these types of situations.

As to your situation specifically, what's the big deal if she passes out? As far as I'm aware, a vasovagal response isn't lethal or anything you need to be hospitalized for. It's literally just fainting and coming back around in a few seconds/minutes. She wants you to treat it like a life-and-death thing that can never be triggered. Screw that. Tell her, "I have a joint problem that responds to stress. Every time you whine my joints start aching. So, you'd better never say anything that upsets me or else my joint might tingle." I get that in her mind a vasovagal response is a bigger deal than a joint ache, but it still conveys the same concept: there's a low-risk, undesirable result that can occur from certain stimuli and you're telling the other person that they need to cater their actions to your condition so that you don't have to experience that undesirable result. You're a big boy. You can decide for yourself when your interest at any given time outweighs her interest in avoiding a vasovagal response and the probability that it will actually be triggered.

excuses to threaten divorce ... So how do I respond?

As /u/Deep_Strength said, call her bluff. Don't respond to threats.

But how do I RESPOND in the moment?

Fog, NI, AA, AM ... the usual.

I can't dismiss because there IS some validity

Stop saying that. Just because a condition is valid doesn't mean it's serious. Let me make this a bullet point, because I googled it just to be sure, rather than going off of memory.

- **It is generally not considered to be a dangerous event, nor a sign of a more serious cardiac condition.**

I have a weird condition: taco seasoning makes one of my lower back molars tingle a little bit. How legit would it be for someone to say, "I better not use taco seasoning when I make tacos because he has a legitimate condition - his tooth might tingle"? Legitimate $\neq$ serious. Don't let her use a non-serious condition to manipulate you.

Now that doesn't mean you go around intentionally triggering this response. Be sensitive, of course. But as soon as she uses it as a manipulation tool, she's crossed a line and you need to reinforce that boundary.

Plus since she only says these things while threatening divorce, telling me she despises me and can't stand me... So me saying "Whatever you want, whatever it takes to fix this" Is just being beta, giving in to bad behaviour and reinforcing a pattern.

Absolutely. Don't do that. Even if your ultimate decision is aligned with her desires (for example, if she's actually right and it took that argument for you to realize it), you don't phrase it in terms of her desires ("You're right"); rather, you phrase it as a conclusive action-step: "Here's what we're going to do ..."

How do you respond to threats from your wife?

2 upvotes · 16 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

1/2

feeling like I know a LOT about God, but don't really experience him in the way the bible seems to say I should

Expand on what you think the Bible says about how you should experience God. This statement intrigues me and is often rooted in a false perception based on how other Christians think you should experience God or how they act like they experience God, not necessarily what the Bible actually says. Search my comment history for the word "emotionalism" and you might find more of what I'm talking about.

as due her not having a clear purpose / mission in life

That is a reflection of you, my friend. Your wife is to adopt your mission/purpose, not have one of her own. If she doesn't have a mission it's because you don't or you haven't invited her to participate in your mission. What is your mission? If it's your career, that's a solid example of why I say your career can't be your mission. It's really darn hard to invite your wife to participate in that in a meaningful rather than obligatory way.

****Her issues:**

As /u/RedPillCoach said, these are all projections. She probably has histrionic and narcissistic tendencies, which would explain a lot of what you're describing. One clear trait of a narcissist is that they accuse other people of having the flaws that they themselves have, as this detracts attention away from their flaws and makes it look like you're being a child if you say, "No I'm not, you are!" It's actually an effective strategy most of the time, which is why narcissists use it so often.

How do I approach?

Pushing a woman isn't a problem. You **SHOULD** be doing this. *How* you push her, though - that's the tricky part. But I've already written that up and would have you re-read [208 - Leadership Part 2](#), which might be more helpful now that you know a clear context in which you can apply it.

BUT - Sometimes it feels like not instantly agreeing with her on an issue in her mind makes me an evil person.

Negative Inquiry, my friend. This is your best friend with a wife like this. As I've said many times before, if used correctly it will always lead to one of three conclusions: (1) she admits her issue was only a matter of personal preference and that you did nothing wrong, (2) she recognizes that she's wrong and there was nothing morally objectionable or sinful about what you did/said/whatever, or (3) she reveals a deeper motivating for getting so worked up about the issue, which is almost always a comfort test and can be passed accordingly with lots of room for actual inner-heart-change in the process.

And she went off that I was a sick person who has serious issues etc. Again - I told her I AGREE with her that its wrong, I never said I felt otherwise

In other words, you broke frame. You need to put WISNIFG next on your list because it sounds like you're trying to fog, but you're doing it wrong. That book will also explain negative inquiry better.

She didn't care, she was outraged that my first reaction wasn't to immediately condemn the action, but to question the validity of the article

No, no, no, no, no. You've got this all wrong. Her outrage had nothing to do with the article. It was outrage that you didn't agree with her opinion. She wants you to be one of her girlfriends who's all, "uh huh, darn straight ... you got that right, gurl" whenever she speaks. You're right for not caving, but you're also breaking frame when you do. That's your biggest problem here - a frame issue.

Specifically, she has her own frame. She's trying to use her frame to break yours. You're trying to maintain your frame without hurting her frame. That's why you say what you want, but then you cushion it with, "I am agreeing with you" as an attempt at tactfully mitigating the fact that you're not fully adopting her frame. In reality, you should be ignoring her frame altogether, not reinforcing it. The more you reinforce her frame with crap like that, the stronger she feels her frame is, the more she's going to challenge your frame.

btw I'm not American, and am not a supporter of Trump either. I just don't like jumping to conclusions from articles that may very well be omitting facts.

Okay, now why'd you have to go and say that at all? Now it sounds like you're trying to cater to our frame too, whatever you think that might be. You don't need to justify your views on politics to us unless we challenge you on it.

Vasovagal syncope

My wife has this to known triggers too. The triggers aren't random. They always have a common link, like you noted (stress, fear, etc.). But people can experience those triggers from unexpected stimuli. For my wife, the only real consistent trigger for her is having her blood drawn.

I'm a Christian. I'm a "jerk." Deal with it.

2 upvotes · 13 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

As I literally just shut down my computer ...

Expanding on a question asked in another post.

2 upvotes · 13 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is brilliant! It's almost like something Jesus would have said. Oh yeah ... not to steal your thunder, but he did. In the parable of the Great Banquet (Luke 14:15-24) Jesus talks of a rich man who invites all of his other rich friends to a banquet. None of them come because they have their other rich-people things to do. So, he sends his servants out to "bring in the poor, the crippled, the blind and the lame."

Even after that there was still room, so he has his servants *COMPEL* those on the "roads and country lanes" to "come in, so that my house will be full." But "not one of those who were invited will get a taste of my banquet."

So, as you say, it's not surprising that we get the average and the below-average in the faith more than the above-average. Jesus said this is how it would be.

- BUT!!! Jesus also compels us to a higher standard once we're in. We are to become the "above average" if we were not already that way when we joined.

This is true not only with how we care for ourselves, through good stewardship of our bodies (the female side, as you indicated), but also in how we earn and manage our finances (the male side you mentioned). Ecc. 2:26 also comes to mind: "To the person who pleases him, God gives wisdom, knowledge and happiness, but to the sinner he gives the task of gathering and storing up wealth to hand it over to the one who pleases God."

Are those average dudes and gals sitting in the pews every Sunday truly saved or are they there because the church is where they fit in?

Salvation isn't decided based on how you compare to the average on the SMP. It's based on faith. The context of this conversation doesn't give any information to discuss whether someone is saved or not. That said, I think what you're getting at is a suggestion that some people join church not because they believe in Jesus, but because they need a place to belong. Yes, that's true. But no, we cannot make a sweeping generalization that any relative proportion of average people are there for this reason or not.

Small Intro

2 upvotes · 13 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

To their detriment, many people downplay the importance of an intellectual understanding of scripture and elevate feeling their faith

Philippians 1:9 is a great reference for this: "And this is my prayer: that your love may abound more and more in knowledge and depth of insight."

If people want to rave about how much they "love" (feelings) God and that our "love" (feelings) for him trumps everything else, just ask them where their love for God comes from or if their love comes from knowledge and depth of insight. Puts them in their place every time.

You can also take a more roundabout way with Hebrews 11:6 - without faith it is impossible to please God. Romans 14:23 also says anything that doesn't come from faith is sin. Where does this faith come from? How strongly we *feel* about Jesus? No. Romans 10:17 says that faith comes from hearing God's word. So, all that feeling-love (as opposed to biblical love) is worthless if we don't know God's word as the foundation of our faith because we can't please God otherwise.

Matthew 7:24-27 also adds obedience to the mix, calling it the strength of our foundation. So, God's word is our foundation, but if we don't obey it, it's a worthless foundation. We never see emotions come into any of these conversations by Jesus and Paul.

Biblical textual analysis of why Adam had headship before the fall

2 upvotes · 13 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I think Genesis 3:6 is pretty clear that Adam was there when Eve was decided and ate the fruit.

TheRedPill is Feminist

2 upvotes · 12 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Consider Emperor Constantine, I think everyone agrees he converted his Empire to Christianity for political reasons

I think he merely legalized and encouraged it, but Theodosius I was the one who enforced it as a mandated practice.

Still, look how far he spread Christianity? You and I probably would not be Christians today if not for him.

I can't say what would or wouldn't have happened, though I'm confident that those who God foreknew would choose him would be predestined to choose him no matter which version of history God ultimately went with, including an alternate history where Constantine and Theodosius I didn't "Christianize" everything.

More to the point, virtually every person I've ever heard preach on the subject (including my church's new pastor in a conversation just yesterday) acknowledge that these two men did more harm to the church than virtually anyone else in history, including Caesar Nero.

You talk about "many 'fake', 'believe-cos-it's-cool-now' Christians" as compared to the other real believers who were made, and we simply can't assess that comparison. But I can say quite definitively that Jesus' design for the church and the way that it was meant to grow by the model he gave us was crushed and crippled by these political movements. Because of this, we will forever struggle to have to distinguish between the faithful and the frauds. This will always skew any data we ever get and will also prevent us from witnessing to many people who need the Gospel because we assume they already have it. It also gives license for people to self-identify in one way and rise to power and authority within the church only to promote sinful views, like feminism, even though their faith was never genuine - because it's socially advantageous to be part of the church, even still in today's culture. You're not going to find that garbage in the church in China or North Korea or many middle-eastern countries.

I think what [/u/rocknrollchuck](#) is talking about, though, is that Jesus came to build a spiritual kingdom, not a physical one. So, when you compare feminism's rise to power to how the church should do it, you're talking on two different wavelengths. The church isn't meant to take over politics like feminism sought to do. It's meant to accomplish a similar goal on the spiritual battlefield rather than a physical one.

TheRedPill is Feminist

2 upvotes · 12 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Interesting read ... but do you have to write like an 1850s philosopher? I'm pretty sure you don't speak that way.

Anyway, I don't think even the secular crowd would disagree with anything you're saying. They're not anti-feminist. They're anti delusion caused by feminism. One of their main concepts is, "We're not here to change the system; we're here to figure out how to use the system to our advantage."

To that end, I don't see Jesus or the apostles pushing for political or social revolution. Jesus also told us that as we

approach end times the world would degrade, so I'm not hopeful that we could ever be widely successful in the goal you're proposing, and even if we were it would only be a temporary win.

Obviously that doesn't mean we shouldn't try. But it does also mean it should not be our highest priority. There are more important reasons God has us on the earth than to try to prevent his prophecies of the degradation of society from coming true ... at least on a mass scale.

I don't think we are meant to change society. I think we are meant to start a new society altogether - something the world will look at and want to join. You can't stop a sinner from their sin, but Christ can pull them out of it into something new entirely. That's the church ... or at least what it was meant to be.

NEW RULE - READ BEFORE POSTING

2 upvotes · 10 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is good feedback. I'll post my testimony soon. Thanks for this! Hopefully more will follow.

RP Christians Sidebar "Handbook" (Download Links)

2 upvotes · 10 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Done - it's on the sidebar

Is it weird to hit up a girl you know on instagram?

2 upvotes · 10 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Hah! I like it.

I feel like girls might see me as a player?

2 upvotes · 10 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Well, if you're not trying to get laid, why are you trying to get married in the first place? So yeah, getting laid is an important part of marriage. Without it, you'd be better off just having a close female friend.

Sure, some girls aren't receptive to this, but the types of girls you want aren't the ones who are prudes. When you say "those are the girls that I WANT" it's either because you have a fetish for prude, asexual women or you're just mistaking "spiritually mature women" for "women who aren't sexual or tempted by sexual men."

I've talked a lot about dating in [this post](#). My main conclusion is that if you want a spiritually mature woman, you shouldn't be looking at all. You should just be living for God and meeting someone who's following alongside your mission. The fact that you're looking at all inherently lowers the standard of who you're going to find. The true spiritually mature woman is often made by her man, not found by him. But if you would rather find a pre-made spiritually mature woman, then the advice in my above-referenced post is how you're going to do it.

I feel like girls might see me as a player?

2 upvotes · 10 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

These are good things to process and it's a difficult issue to address.

Maybe some harshness is in order if you're going to tolerate the single guys that have no clue what a side-bar is and basically feel like they've dated any girl for which they've held a door.

I hear you. OZ was just commenting in mod-chat yesterday about how proud he was when another guy you called out posted some garbage and the community here reamed him for it and set him straight. He said it's nice to see people here taking ownership of the sub and somewhat self-policing. I agree.

Do the mods here think these LV posts are worth the work?

I can only speak for myself, but you'll note that I don't respond to all of them. If it's not worth the work, I don't respond. If there is something significant to be said that hasn't already been said, then I chime in. But worth is decided by each person. Personally, I walk away from many sermons on Sunday morning thinking, "That was total garbage and a waste of my time," but the person next to me is crying and praising God because that's exactly what he needed to hear. So, I stop evaluating things based on its worth to me and contemplate its value to others. To that end ...

do the mods here think these types of posts are LV?

Again, I can only speak for myself, but the question here depends on how we assign "value" to a post. Certainly if someone is trolling there's no real value to anyone, and I've removed some of those posts. But if the person asking the question has a legitimate question, there may be value in it, although I love [/u/OsmiumZulu](#)'s copy pasta asking for stats, what sidebar material they've read, etc. - and I've taken to doing the same myself on a number of posts. This forces the poster to make it a higher quality.

But here's the thing: most people coming in here aren't going to know how to discern a high-quality post from a low-quality one. They won't know what's expected until someone tells them. So, they're going to ask their question and look for an answer, just as happens everywhere else in life and reddit. So, we can't really fault them when we're the ones who haven't given any posting criteria - and perhaps that is an issue that does need rectified.

Beyond that, I will also note that LV posts can still have two peripheral sources of value: (1) because at certain junctions even low value activity is better than no activity at all; and (2) even if the poster isn't taking things seriously, sometimes stupid and silly questions evoke good conversation that is beneficial to everyone else who reads it, which is why it is often said of reddit that the real heart and value is in the comments, not the posts themselves.

All the same, these are good things to be discussing and I'll certainly be chatting with the other mods about the things you're bringing up!

Sex god method... RPC Perspective?

2 upvotes · 8 July 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

SGM was mostly good content but focused on girls whose salvation is seriously in question. Genuine Christian women will likely have some different reactions to some things on an emotional level, but biologically they'll likely still be responsive to all that stuff ... Romans 7:25 affirming that while our minds are renewed, our bodies remain unchanged.

Romans 14:14 (among many other passages) also makes clear that sin is found in our hearts, not in the actions themselves. So, I ask: *What is the reason you're doing this?* and *What is her motive for liking it?* and *Is that a motive you should be fueling or stifling?*

I've never said a cuss word in my life. That's a personal conviction of mine, although I am firmly convinced it is not sinful to do so for many purposes. But I have been seriously convicted lately that I *should* learn to use some words in a right context to break any subliminal prose I may have over my "I've never said ..." record.

More to the point, if you're telling your wife stuff in bed that affirms the bond you have (ex. "Your pussy is mine" or "You're MY slut") and she receives it well, I can't see how that's wrong.

But if you're doing something just to make it feel naughty because sin is sexy ... even if it's not technically sin, it becomes sin by deriving pleasure from doing something on the basis that it feels wrong.

But if it's sexy not because you feel like you're doing something wrong, but because it's exciting to stretch boundaries and try new things that you may have previously thought were wrong, that's a good thing.

Reworking the Sidebar

2 upvotes · 7 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I have no objection.

Reworking the Sidebar

2 upvotes · 7 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That's a decent suggestion. I've started a book that would do essentially that. I'm just slow on writing it.

Happy Belated 4th, men. Here's my bi-monthly example of what NOT to do. Link in comments.

2 upvotes · 5 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I think they're helpful when accompanied by an analysis of why it was wrong and what should have been done instead. Without that analysis there are too many alternatives or suggestions that aren't helpful that people might reach on their own. And if you're relying on other people in the comments to do the analysis for you ... well, that's just lazy :p

Happy Belated 4th, men. Here's my bi-monthly example of what NOT to do. Link in comments.

2 upvotes · 5 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Fair enough

Apparently there's a sidebar

2 upvotes · 4 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Thanks. Glad I can be of help. I've just studied a lot throughout the years and read the bible daily.

I'm fairly new to redpill, but with my Christian beliefs I don't fully trust redpill.

2 upvotes · 3 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

To be clear, there are many endorsed contributors who will prescribe certain behaviors and complain that a man is not truly "red pill" if he doesn't accept those behaviors. It's not everyone, but it is a majority of ECs on MRP, for example.

Dealing with ONEitis

2 upvotes · 3 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Agreed

Are Christian events a bad date idea...why?

2 upvotes · 3 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is an important question.

There are no women watching

2 upvotes · 3 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is a wonderful message on an otherwise disheartening reality.

There are no women watching

2 upvotes · 3 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Men are the creators of culture, women aren't.

This was true until men empowered women to be culture-creators. I'm not even saying that's a bad thing. Women have a lot to offer culture. From Jane Austin to J. K. Rowling, I'd be grieved if we lost many of their contributions. But I think what you're getting at is social structure, where it's a lot more dangerous - and indeed cultural influence lends itself toward a strong influence over social hierarchies.

This is simply untrue. Sure, many women won't obey their adult live in roommate man child, but a husband who owns his life and fulfills his role as a man? Many, if not most, will obey. My wife, and many other women I know, are keen to listen to and obey strong men. Not only have I seen this play out first hand among Christian women, but I know many secular women who desire the guidance of a strong man to run their life and call out their crappy behavior.

This is what I came here to say - and you worded it much more efficiently than I would have. If this were not true, secular RP wouldn't exist - it would have reached a different conclusion of what attracts women to men.

Pastors, husbands, and godly older women ought to call women out for their sin. We don't see that from the pulpit much today because most pastors are weak, which is a separate sin that men in the church need to address. Finally, Jesus wasn't obligated to fix our mess but chose to do so anyways. We ought to meditate on this and find it to be instructive.

Perfectly put. It's sad that pastors will repent of so many sins, but not the ones that keep butts in their seats.

Phil's June Update

2 upvotes · 3 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I'm sorry you got down-voted. I actually agree with you and put you back in the positive ;) Service in the church is great and should be encouraged, but it is rarely a solution. It is often a placation to actual spiritual maturation and sanctification. People think, "As long as I put in my hours of service, God and his people should love me more" or something like that.

I like to refer to Dawson Trotman's line in his famous sermon: **Born to Reproduce** (my favorite sermon of all time):

If I were the minister of a church and had deacons or elders to pass the plate and choir members to sing, I would say, "Thank God for your help. We need you. Praise the Lord for these extra things that you do," but I would keep pressing home the big job— "Be fruitful and multiply." All these other things are incidental to the supreme task of winning a man or woman to Jesus Christ and then helping him or her to go on.

That said, if your conclusion is to abandon the church entirely, that's a more troubling concern.

Should I be approaching random girls? If so, where?

2 upvotes · 28 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

if you don't get used to thinking, "hey, she's pretty. I want to know her name," and then going over and introducing yourself, how are you EVER going to meet a girl? From my experience, the good ones will not open you.

Not to mention that if it's wrong for you to do it, why do you (general) seem to think it's okay for a woman to cold-approach you?

See how easy it is to get duped into thinking that women should have special societal privileges, but that men should be stifled?

There is no "Christian version" of anything

2 upvotes · 24 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

To a secular worldview, sure.

Desiring God Says Feminism Wants to Silence "Real Men"

2 upvotes · 20 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That's a good point. I call this "modeling." It's a significant part of any form of leadership and influence, if we want to have any kind of impact on our world.

What I will note, though, is that the mission of disciple-making is not merely a "your thing, my thing" issue. It is, in fact, a biblical calling over all people. The way we carry it out is what differs from person to person.

Some people are gifted at hospitality and may have people in their home to share Christ with them. Others might be gifted at teaching, and will have intense and deep conversations about the Bible. Others are gifted with prophecy and will call out those they love on their sin and help them walk along the narrow path. Still more might be gifted at mercy, in which they'll build disciples by sharing others' burdens as the foundation of the relationship.

There is no spiritual gift of "discipleship," which some would assume as an excuse to not do it - by claiming they don't have the gift. But even if it was (like evangelism, for example), that does not mean everyone without the gift is excused. Someone who is not gifted at hospitality, for example, cannot claim he has no obligation to be hospitable to others when they visit. Someone who isn't gifted at mercy cannot argue that he has no obligation to be merciful toward others. It simply means that some are uniquely talented. So, the fact that someone is a gifted evangelist means he's really good at it, not that people who are less good at it should just give up and do something else.

Whatever a person's spiritual gift or life circumstance is, that only creates the context. But the mission of disciple-making is clear in Scripture as a call over all Christians.

Aaaquad introduction, stats, and brief RP journey 6.18.2018

2 upvotes · 19 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is a wonderful field report. Thanks for sharing this! Now let's get down to business:

Stats

Not a bad place. I was worse off when I started my journey.

Lifts.

Set higher goals for yourself. With SL5x5, you should be able to increase your bench by 10lbs every week or two, which will get you to your year-end goals in the next couple months. This works until you're around 250, when it starts slowing down a lot.

Similarly, I've found with leg lifts, using proper form you can get quick gains at a rate of about 20lbs every week or two until you're around 350.

Just today I uploaded a new and improved 203, written by /u/RPChristof. This should help you quite a bit as well. It doesn't delve into the SL5x5 as much as my old post did, but it's far more comprehensive on the whole, and the SL5x5 website is on the sidebar anyway, so my breakdown probably wasn't all that necessary in the first place. After reading his comment, I started a new routine today, finally leaving SL5x5 after almost a year of it.

RP Background

A few things of concern in here, which ultimately boil down to a question: What boundaries do you have for pre-marriage physical relationships? Follow-up: Do you have a biblical basis for those boundaries?

Relationships

The way you write tells me you have a confidence issue. What have you been doing to cultivate abundance in your social status?

Work

This sounds like you're in an engineering program? I don't really know. Regardless of your present motivation issues, your actions still seem to be moving in the right direction. Finish your degree. You don't have to be top of your class, but shoot for it if you want to. Ultimately money isn't the end-goal of life anyway, but with a PhD, you'll likely never be found lacking too much either.

Spiritual

This is wonderful to hear, and I'm glad the 300-series has been helpful to you. It's really the one I want to develop most in the future, as I talk a lot about discipleship but haven't actually posted much on how to do it - only the follow-up process.

With regard to the knowledge-to-heart transition, I might be able to help there, as I used to have a significant struggle with this for a long time. More on that to come, if you want to delve further into detail on that. In the meantime, I like CS Lewis' 'fake it til you make it' approach when he says something like, "If you find that you know what is right, but your heart is not in it, just do it anyway and you should find your heart will soon follow."

Mission

This is beautiful to read. With regard to fitting your vocation in, I usually teach that there are three primary realms to consider:

- Where you work (vocation/co-workers)
- Where you live (neighbors/community)
- Where you play (hobbies/friends)

It's easy to assume your vocation must fit in, but it's essential that you not try to address all 3 at the same time. I typically suggest picking one as a primary ministry - wherever you see God most moving. Pick one as an "on-deck," where you're priming relationships for when your primary ministry dies down, which is inevitable over time. And reserve the third as your "save haven," where you can exercise a positional and temporal sabbath.

For example, I have had times where work was my "safe haven." I was always ministry-minded, but didn't put any pressure on myself to expand existing relationships or build new ones. Instead, I applied that pressure on myself in my community and I primed relationships at the gym so that if my neighbors move away (which will happen with a couple in a week) or things just generally die down (like during most winters), then I can focus more on connecting with some guys at the gym or playing racquetball more to build some relationships, or perhaps connecting with other writers or guitar players, etc.

Now, at other points I've also had my home as my "safe haven," with my work as my primary and my hobbies as "on deck." Pretty much any combination, I've done it. But what has consistently failed is when I've tried to do all of them at once.

Misc.

I look forward to your next progress report!

Was hit hard with some realizations, need input

2 upvotes · 18 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I didn't say that's how we should think of our spouses. You have to remember we're talking in context to a guy who says he has a fiery libido for some girls, but wants to pursue a relationship with someone who he isn't sexually attracted to. That means he'll end up being disappointed with sex in the relationship, which is a significant concern and can cause serious temptation to adultery.

Was hit hard with some realizations, need input

2 upvotes · 17 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Isn't she a nonchristian?

Was hit hard with some realizations, need input

2 upvotes · 17 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

You think you're something special because you want her for more than just her body. This is the same story as every beta sad sap in any teenage movie ever made. You think this should give you some credit with the girl or with God, but it doesn't. It's a very beta attitude. It's unattractive - sometimes even repulsive to women. A woman might someday marry a guy like that for his betas provisions, but she'll likely never be excited about having sex with him.

Of course, if you're being genuine maybe you'll be happy to marry her even is she never wants sex with you. You'll end up wanting sex with someone else though and become embittered with your wife when she doesn't end up attracting you sexually the same way the other girls do.

I think it was [u/OsmiumZulu](#) who recently said that most other things you can get from a woman can be outsourced, but as a christian you can't do that with sex.

EC on TRP explains why making sex your god fails

2 upvotes · 15 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Absolutely.

EC on TRP explains why making sex your god fails

2 upvotes · 15 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Interesting and good read. I agree with a lot of that too. The way I see it, looks make up at least 3 points of a guy's SMV. A male model gets all 3. A good looking guy gets 2.7. Maybe he's balding and only gets 2.5. Unless the elephant man works at the desk next to her, a true 0 doesn't exist.

So, an ugly guy might still get half a point for trying and 1.5-2 if he's got a great body. For many men those couple points are enough to jump them from 6 to 7 so they can start pulling 6s. They see the change and effect based on that criteria alone and the black pill is born.

Now I'd say "alphaness" is worth at least another 3 points. This one is far more disparate. 0s actually exist in mass droves. So when a guy gets up to a 3, that's a huge bump from what he likely was before.

The fact that increasing the alpha seems to give a bigger boost than improving looks isn't necessarily because it's more important. It's because there's a wide disparity between a man's natural condition and his improved state. If a man improves his alpha enough he may not need to change from his natural state of appearance at all.

RPC approach to dealing with Body Dysmorphia and other psychological insecurities?

2 upvotes · 14 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This whole post reminds me of the book *You are Special* by Max Lucado. OP, go read that book. It's a kids' book, but maybe the simplified recitation of the type of attitude you need to adopt can help :)

She wants God not you

2 upvotes · 11 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

But God also created women with a need for a husband. This is part of God's design even while she was sinless - not something God intends to undermine.

She wants God not you

2 upvotes · 11 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Or ... many girls want a guy just like their daddy. But yes, your point is certainly an interesting thought exercise. If God is the true alpha who also gives all the beta provisions, it makes sense that women would desire him most of all. But women also want what can appease their senses. In this world God will only fulfill for them on a spiritual level what a husband can on a physical level. So, while you may be right, it does not diminish their imperative to find a husband and be with him too.

[FR] Calculate your "cost per fuck"

2 upvotes · 8 June 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Yes, it's the retirement account that does it.

[FR] Calculate your "cost per fuck"

2 upvotes · 8 June 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Since nobody else wants to and I have no good excuse not to, I ran the calculation using all my fancy divorce software. Result: -\$192. That's right: she pays me.

Wait ... so does that mean I should have less sex with my wife so my per sex value improves even more? That's why math doesn't always make sense.

Body fat % for Visible abs?

2 upvotes · 8 June 2018 · /r/askMRP

In the past I've managed that for 6 months. This must recent time (last summer) was only 3. I've also done it with a month on, month off timing but that doesn't work as well because my body never adapts, so it just sucks the whole time.

27/m virgin, want to lose it

2 upvotes · 7 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

It's one of the founding principles behind how I parent my kids. It's also inherent in my personal makeup. Whenever my wife wants me to do something or let her do something I often ask, "Why?" She gets so mad, thinking I'm challenging her and implying she's being stupid. Obviously it has nothing to do with her being stupid - but I can't make an informed decision if I don't know *why* she wants what she does, and I'm not going to just rubber stamp everything she wants just because she says so.

lol's from women at church

2 upvotes · 4 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

when Christians enter into marriage they should not be playing games anymore

Game = charm, wit, charisma, etc. This isn't the same as "playing games." In the dating realm it might come off as "playing games" because most men don't have it naturally, so it's a facade they have to put on. To that end, I don't ever advise men just to put on a show; rather, it's a "fake it til you make it" concept - that we must live as who we want to be until we actually become it.

C. S. Lewis said something to the effect, "If you find that your heart is not where you want it to be, live as if it is anyway and you should find that your heart will soon follow after your actions." In the present context, if I want to be a man who can charm and seduce my wife, even if I didn't have that naturally, it might make sense to practice it for a while until it becomes second-nature and a natural part of my marriage.

Speaking from 10 years of experience in marriage, I can tell you that the best things for our marriage, intimacy, and sex life have ALWAYS been when I have been open and honest

I have been married for 10 years as well. I agree with your assessment here ... except when your "open and honest" behavior comes off as validation-seeking. If you go to your wife for validation instead of God, you will lose her respect in the long-run.

Any wimp can hide from his wife; it takes a confident man to reveal his true self

Agreed again. This is one of the core concepts of NMMNG. But, as you seem to include, the way you reveal this cannot be in a "kiss my booboo and make me feel better" and "please tell me you still love me!" way.

relationship is based on game and not genuine connection

Unless that "game" - that charm, wit, flirtation, etc. - is all a natural part of the way I interact with my wife. To repress those aspects of how I want to connect with my wife is what would be inauthentic at that point.

rebuild the relationship based on Godly things rather than manipulation.

Where is there manipulation? And who's to say that all forms of manipulation are bad?

use that knowledge in a genuine and loving way rather than one that seeks to manipulate your wife into finding you attractive.

This is my thought exactly. I think the core difference we have is in how we understand and define "game." I get the impression you view it as a "facade" used to trick your wife into thinking you're something you're not. Virtually all of the manosphere uses it to reference certain characteristics about oneself that when expressed usually comes off as indicating sexual interest. To that end, if I were to suppress these traits of myself, I would be deceiving my wife by failing to communicate my sexual interest. Or if I were to employ non-"game" tactics of expressing my sexual interest, it would be dry and boring, like a robot sitting next to her making a monotone pronouncement: "I. Would. Like. To. Have. Sex. Today." That's an easy way to kill a bedroom.

My guess is that you employ a lot of "game" on your wife without calling it that. Have you ever hugged her from behind and slid your hand up her shirt to feel her abs? Have you ever lit some candles in the bedroom and waited for her to walk in? Have you ever rubbed her leg while watching Netflix, then kissed her cheek and said, "Shall we?" If you've done any of these things, you've employed game. If you haven't ... dear goodness, I feel bad for your wife :p

lol's from women at church

2 upvotes · 4 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

In conjunction with my reply to [/u/rocknrollchuck](#) - this is the other half of what I would have said, so you spared me the trouble :) After reading OP's ([/u/palmorwrist](#)) post, my gut reaction was to think: "I bet these women don't even realize what they're doing." It's not just that they're not trying to have an affair, as the original post suggests - it's that they don't even realize their own subconscious behavioral cues in the first place.

What I don't agree with is your next comment: "Just ask your wife ... If she thinks your method of communication with other wives is flirting then eliminate it."

This is, in essence, allowing her to define sin for him. It gives her too much power/control over his behaviors, which can be very detrimental to the relationship and is very likely to lead to a decrease in their sexuality within the marriage, which will only make OP want to re-engage with these other women all the more, making the self-control issue much harder to correct. Instead of surmounting a small hill, he'd be turning it into a mountain before he even got started on his way up.

The better option is to improve his character to develop self-control in the face of his present situation. The only exception I would give is if he is recklessly leading these women on, in which case he needs to back down. His post and comments make it clear he's not intentionally leading them on, but sometimes we are reckless with our conduct, not considering the probable impact it has on other people. That said, nothing in this post makes me think that any woman is actually lusting over him; rather, I get the impression that their subconscious attraction triggers have been tripped and that's about it. All's well and he'd be better to improve his self-control rather than improving his wife's husband-control.

What is the problem with porn?

2 upvotes · 4 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is one of the reasons why I said his sentiment is close, but not quite. The other obvious reason being that some people stay interested in sin even after they've had their time enjoying it for long enough.

Men with high testosterone, less likely to be in church

2 upvotes · 1 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Well ... RP does too. If your marriage sucks, it's because you, the man, have failed to lead it properly. Right? ;)

What is the problem with porn?

2 upvotes · 1 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That makes more sense.

#MeToo church edition: Major Evangelical leader, Paige Patterson "removed" as Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary President

2 upvotes · 29 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

"But it's our favorite dress! And we've been wearing it for so many years that we just can't imagine putting on another one" ... right? That's how they'll respond. It doesn't matter what holes are in it or the fact that it smells like a trash heap. Oh well.

#MeToo church edition: Major Evangelical leader, Paige Patterson "removed" as Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary President

2 upvotes · 29 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That was never Christ's bride in the first place. It was just a new dress she wore for a while.

#MeToo church edition: Major Evangelical leader, Paige Patterson "removed" as Southwestern

Baptist Theological Seminary President

2 upvotes · 29 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

On a philosophical level I want to agree with you. But I don't see God letting his bride die so he can marry someone else. I see him redeeming and reconciling her - transforming her back to what she once was. That involves work from within, just as a wife who has gone astray needs an internal readjustment before she can be right with her husband again.

How to go about Handling Test From Others?

2 upvotes · 29 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I get that normally I should just let it go but it is not the reaction I feel within and so I am asking for guidance. Any ideas?

This is the key. You know to "turn the other cheek," but it still bothers you internally because you haven't mastered the Galatians 1:10 concept, "For am I now seeking the approval of man, or of God? Or am I trying to please man? If I were still trying to please man, I would not be a servant of Christ."

Now, I'd guess that internally you're not living just to impress these buffoons. But you do still care what they think of you. In other words, you have your actions rightly oriented, but your internal emotional state hasn't caught up yet.

How do you get it to catch up? The best advice I can give is to rightly orient yourself on a mission for Christ. When you are going in a certain direction and you can see that your life choices are making progress toward your goals, you stop caring what other people think or say because you're already making progress in the things that do matter to you.

Conversely, if you don't have a mission and are just trying to improve your life, then what other people think will matter greatly. You have no orientation, so what others think of you will define which way your life is oriented. Don't let other people set the frame. Set it yourself and go. That's how you'll develop a strong frame and it's how you'll have a concrete internal emotional state that is unshaken by these things. This is a frame issue, not a matter of mastering test-passing techniques.

To be clear, tests are things women throw out that have attraction cues. These men aren't testing you. They're not trying to be more attracted to you. They're just being men. Sure, you could AMOG them into backing down, but that's your choice and I'm not sure how alpha you are generally anyway.

[Discussion] Love After MRP

2 upvotes · 22 May 2018 · /r/askMRP

If it matters, my preferred balance looks something like:

- passion: 8
- companionship: 8
- commitment: 5

To evaluate my wife toward me:

- passion: 6
- companionship: 9
- commitment: 9

I know these numbers are relative and subjective, but subjective impressions and evaluations matter on an individual level. It also looks like I get more love from her than I give, but that's also because I bring more to the table. There are other aspects to love that I didn't mention in my original breakdown for various reasons, but earning an income, maintaining the calendar, parenting the kids, etc. - all those things are forms of love too, if we accept my underlying contention that love is more about what we do than how we feel or what we say (though those things matter too). Accordingly, if we added that stuff to the balance, I'd outweigh her by a few points, bringing a closer balance.

The key here is that on the points that matter to me, I'm getting from her what I want in abundance of what I want. But on the points that matter to her, I bring more to the table. To that end, it's not about who loves who more or if one loves the other enough. In the context of an LTR/marriage it's about ensuring the balance is uniquely suited to the situation.

For men who actually have their lives figured out, giving her what she wants from a relationship will be second nature and require no additional effort because he just has to keep on being his awesome self the same as before the relationship. As a result, it's her who usually ends up making up the difference in trying to meet his standards - but this is natural for most women, as it is their pattern to mold to their man anyway.

Advice. Legal next moves. Etc.

2 upvotes · 22 May 2018 · /r/askMRP

About 1/3 of my cases involve family members helping pay my bill. It's very common.

Appearing butthurt when I'm not

2 upvotes · 15 May 2018 · /r/askMRP

I'd question your escalation tactics. If she's going to say no, she would have let you know somewhere in the "kino'd all day, flirted, instigated, isolated" phase. If you do it right, *THAT* is your initiation. You go 90, she goes 10.

I used to think initiating sex meant carrying her off to the bedroom or sticking my hand down her pants or starting to pull clothes off or something. Now it's a lot more obvious that well-played kino is the initiation. Her response to your kino should be what you formerly used to think of as initiation. Or let me put this another way: the way beta men see initiating sex is really what the women should be doing in response to your kino. Don't do your 90% and then also her 10%. Let her do the last 10%. Let her be the one to start undressing or walking you up to the bedroom.

When you're chilling to netflix and you're rubbing her inner-thigh and she grabs your hand and puts it down her waist-line, that's her responding to your initiation. That's her 10%. If she's not doing that or giving affirmative signals back, she's not interested. Sure, you can still be more bold about it, but if you hit a brick wall with kino, don't be surprised if you hit a brick wall with something bolder too. The only question at that point is if your "bolder" approach is strong enough to knock that wall down - and I don't mean forceful; I mean powerful. There's a difference.

As for not acting butt-hurt, it's all about frame and attitude. It's often been said that your frame is the best version of you as you want the world to see you at any given time. If you're acting that way in one moment, then after a denial you're acting anything less than that, it's obvious to her that her actions had an effect on your mood. It's that simple.

To be clearer: butt-hurt doesn't mean your attitude changes from 10 down to 2. It could be 10 dropping to 9. Any indication that her actions affected your attitude is a foothold of power that she has in your life - and she knows it.

From there, most men have the gut reaction to say, "Oh, well after a rejection I feel like dropping from 10 to 8, but I'll keep acting 10 to show I'm not butt-hurt because I'm not." In reality, the fact that you'd drop at all *is butt-hurt*. Don't lie to yourself. Even if you're still in a good mood, a lesser good mood is still evidence of her hold over you. If you need to fake a 10 in those moments until you actually make it, go for it. But don't lie to yourself and say you're OI and not butt-hurt when you are.

Screening for a Wife: Methods (Part II)

2 upvotes · 15 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is some grade-A advice here.

Screening for a Wife: Methods (Part II)

2 upvotes · 15 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Excellent post! I'm reminded of the three things to look for in a potential disciple: faithful, available, and teachable. If you can get all three in one person you can mold them to become anything. This is true for prospective wives. And to be clear, "faithful" doesn't mean sexually pure (though that's good too); it means that they will apply what they learn from you rather than tossing another brick in their knowledge pile.

Some of the conversational techniques here are really fun to employ and can have a lot of value even for married men.

Is texting really only for logistics?

2 upvotes · 14 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

When I was in the 18-26 age range, it was all about IM. I had countless important and in-depth conversations over IM with my wife (and other women) that I now realize was more harmful than it was helpful. You'll hear advice saying that it's okay as long as you're tactful about how you handle it. I'd be weary.

Here's the thing: as I have often said here, women are creatures of desire. But they very rarely desire what's in front of them. Their desires are often oriented toward that which they fantasize about.

- You're dating, she desire marriage.
- You get married, she desires kids.
- You get kids, she desires a bigger house.
- You get a bigger house, she desires more kids.
- You get more kids, she desires a bigger car.
- You get the bigger car, she desires a bigger and better man.

Why? Because she realizes that you meeting all of her desires isn't curing the emptiness that she feels. That's why RP tells men to stop supplicating to women and start living for themselves. Instead of meeting their desires, make them adopt your desires. That's where true power in the relationship lies. And because you're the one setting the pace of the desires and where to go next, she never loses interest in you as long as you don't become stagnant.

Back to texting ... when you have conversations about texting, she doesn't see what's in front of her. She sees what her fantasy world creates. This can work for you or against you. If she's not attracted to you, you're the villain in her story and she'll read everything in a negative way. You try to text her a funny joke and she sees that childish goof-ball who needs to grow up. But if you are attractive to her, you can text her the exact same joke and

all of a sudden you're funny and flirtatious.

To that end, attraction cannot be built on texting or IMs alone. At a best case scenario, you'll cause her to become attracted to her fantasy version of you, then be disappointed by the real thing when you don't measure up to the hype she created in her head. At a worst case, she'll find you creepy or sissy for opting to use a long distance medium over an actual phone call or in-person meet-up.

Now, I agree with what [/u/5beams5](#) said - that if you're just dating and not meeting up every other day, there probably should be some kind of long-distance medium to keep the plate spinning. Text can work fine with that. But as has been noted elsewhere, less is more. Don't let her create a fantasy version of who she thinks you are based on your text messaging skills - for better or worse. Let her figure out who you really are. That will breed long-term success.

Should Christian singles implement kino or should they wait until marriage for kino?

2 upvotes · 14 May 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

As [/u/Whitified](#) said, you're going to have trouble getting a woman to fall head-over-heels for you without some form of kino. You might still get married, but kino speeds up the process. You've read a lot of what I've written about the importance of avoiding marriage in favor of your mission, so I won't re-hash that here. But when you do get to a point where you're horny for a particular woman and she's showing interest back, if you want to ramp up that marriage date to get the ball moving rather than having a protracted engagement, kino is certainly a way to do that.

Without kino she might want to take it slow, make sure things are a good fit, etc. - which are all code for, "I need to throw some more tests his way and see whether he's going to be a good beta provider." Add in kino and instead of the BB you become the AF and she'll have no problem speeding up the process. Note the clear distinction there: for the beta bucks she wants to take her time before sleeping with him, making sure there are no better options first; but for the AF she knows what she wants, and if she's committed to her faith she'll know that marriage needs to happen first, so she'll fly past all that "be slow and see if this is a good fit" garbage.

To that end, introducing kino under a modern cultural dating model is incredibly dangerous and leads to marriage that will almost certainly fail because sex becomes the foundation of the marriage. This is bad. In my profession, I make the most money off of those types of couples. But if one is following my model of finding a wife, they have a foundation on Christ and the mission he put them here to fulfill - something that by the point of sexual attraction should already be a mutual pursuit. They're already spiritually mature enough and have their lives oriented correctly so that even if they got married after only a month or two, they should be fine, and thus there's no harm in kino - if anything, it should be encouraged.

As for the technicalities of what's okay and what's not, what [/u/BayAreaRPChristian](#) said is solid, although I would conceptualize it somewhat differently when it comes to kino technique. Nevertheless, the general categories of what's okay inside and outside of marriage make sense to me.

Thoughts on "Intended for Pleasure" by Ed Wheat?

2 upvotes · 14 May 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

My wife's doctor recommended the same thing. She didn't do it. I wish she had. Unfortunately, I do not have another book recommendation.

How to approach sex in the first weeks of marriage

2 upvotes · 8 May 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

No matter how awesome of a guy you might be, you're going to be rejected by your wife at some point. You want sex, she doesn't. It might be for good reason, it might not be. Most guys get butt-hurt when they get that rejection. They take it personally or whine like a little baby because they didn't get their way, or they just go ice cold and

walk away. In my 211 post on "An Anatomy of Butthurt" I addressed a lot of this, demonstrating that the better frame is for the man to maintain his positive attitude even through rejection. Stoicism is not about being cold and robotic to deal with pain - it's about experiencing pain without letting it affect you. If you were cold and robotic before the pain came on, then I suppose stoicism would mean staying that way through the pain, but a cold, robotic frame is also a sucky one that no woman wants to live in. If one's frame is full of wit, charm, charisma, humor, strength, passion, etc. then one should be able to continue exhibiting all of those qualities even through the pain of rejection, the pain of a nagging wife, the pain of a wife who hurls insults and acts like a harpy, etc.

What "speed" for "escalating" would you recommend?

My wife and I have a joke about this that makes it very easy. When I was in high school there was a guy who invited the slutty girl over to study Spanish. She goes up to his room, they open the book, and before reading a word he just says, "So, are we going to do it or what?" Then they had sex. There was no escalation, no build, no kino ... nothing. Just a really bad not-even-a-pick-up-line. So, sometimes I'll just do a cold lead with my wife by using this line. She laughs, we have sex.

Other times I start my game far earlier. I tease her early on with pseudo-mean/pseudo-flirty text messages throughout the work day. When we get home, I approach from behind and wrap my arms around her, maybe slipping a hand up her shirt and on her belly to get her feeling some skin. After dinner I'll pat her butt to as a "get to work" cleaning up the dishes while I get the kids ready for bed and put them down. After that I'll sit on the couch and she'll cuddle up to me. I rub her back, she cuddles closer, and it builds from there.

These are two highly polar extremes - and both work. There is no right "speed" that fits all situations. If my wife's in a bad mood, she needs more escalation and amused mastery. If she's in a good mood, all I've got to do is say, "So, are we going to do it or what?"

Also: Physical and/or also verbal?

All of the above. As noted, it's really situation dependent. But if you're in the long-game because she's in a bad attitude, generally start with verbal before physical.

What parts of "Game" should a RP Christian utilize? Which ones should we not utilize?

2 upvotes · 7 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That's fair. It also depends on one's theology of marriage after divorce, which is a disputable matter under Romans 14. If one allows for such remarriage then there is usually no adultery concern.

How does a RPC deal with hookup culture?

2 upvotes · 7 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Putting up a Christmas tree also has pagan roots ... that doesn't make it sinful. There's a book titled *Pagan Christianity* that goes into all of the pagan origins of virtually everything the church does - especially in the Catholic and Orthodox branches, where there's a lot of pomp and circumstance and ritualism. That doesn't mean it's sinful. It simply means it's been reconciled and redeemed to God.

To that end, for all we know Adam ate out Eve while she gave him a bj. How do we know the Egyptians didn't learn it from them? My guess is that the sinfulness of pre-Noah mankind included all kinds of sexual things that predated Egyptian culture, so I'm highly skeptical that oral sex originated with the Egyptians and no one before them had ever done it (not to say that this means oral sex is part of that sinfulness).

Many people also reference the clear allusions to oral sex in Song of Solomon. Long story short, in the context of marriage it's not sin. That said, this has been a boundary I still haven't gotten my wife to cross ... that will, I hope, come in time.

How does a RPC deal with hookup culture?

2 upvotes · 7 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is the exact reply I would have given. The push for purity is only harmful if it is led and initiated by the woman. If it is initiated by the man, it is not "playing into the feminine imperative" - it is a man exercising appropriate leadership and demonstrating that sex cannot be utilized as a weapon against him, that he has sufficient control and restraint over his own body.

It also takes the pressure off the woman to have to be the one to exercise restraint, which is healthy in the long-term. If a woman is godly, she will refrain from sex before marriage. Period. The harder a man pushes her to violate that boundary, the more accustomed she becomes to putting up her defenses around her sexuality and the stronger those defenses become. That pattern will continue into marriage, greatly stifling the woman's sexuality. As such, if the man takes responsibility for the purity of the relationship and alleviates her burden and she has good reason to trust him in this, that is far more likely to lead to an open, healthy sex-life after marriage.

Also, re: Joshua Harris ... I actually put that book on the sidebar when I first created this sub ;)

Tag: [/u/RedPlanetMan](#) - I'll let this operate as my reply instead of doing a separate comment

Regulating Sexual Desire

2 upvotes · 7 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

There is some other good advice here on the distinction between why secular RP says to wait and the actual orientation of the Christian life, so I won't re-hash that here. The real reason I recommend guys wait until later in life is two-fold:

1. Guys tend to hit their peak SMV at around the age of 35, so it makes sense to wait until at least 30 so you're a lot closer to that optimization. At this point, lots more options open up. Sure, statistically, you might age yourself out of some women. But on the whole you will have a lot more options open to you and it's certainly not uncommon for people to marry 5-15 years younger (my grandparents: 17 years apart; my in-laws: 13 years apart; my wife's grandparents: 12 years apart; a couple friends: 9 years apart; a missionary couple I know: 8 years apart).
2. When women marry a guy in his 20s she's marrying him for what she thinks he could become, not for who he is. This is very dangerous because it has an incredible bolstering effect on her frame and she will often find herself disappointed if she sees the man's actual direction in life take a different path from the one she had in her mind. If the guy waits until his 30s she can hardly make this mistake - she sees that he is well established and knows exactly what she's getting, making it much easier for the man to maintain frame and set his course in life for her to follow, rather than her demanding that he go down the path she expected him to follow.
3. Biblically, people shouldn't even making "getting married" a priority in the first place - not now or at any age. Marriage should be something that happens as a natural byproduct of two people living on mission for Christ alongside one another in a context where a "burning passion" eventually occurs. Paul frequently references in the Scriptures several women who "labored at his side" - and that was in a culture that heavily opposed women having any actual role other than sitting in their houses tending to a man's needs. I've written more on this elsewhere here, so I won't refrain.

My point here is that you shouldn't wait to get married just because the red pill tells you to wait. Their rationale is a secular one. But there is still great wisdom in waiting anyway, if you choose to do so.

As for dealing with sexual urges between now and then, there's some good advice around here from [/u/akohlan198](#) and [/u/Deep_Strength](#), but I'd add pursuing a mission in life. This is how you're going to happen across that woman anyway. I did a much larger write-up on this in [this post from a month ago](#). Simply put, the best way to keep sin out is not to try to avoid sin; it's to re-orient yourself toward the things God wants you doing.

Those aren't general characteristics to employ; it's an actual mission he put you on. If you're not living on that mission, then you'll be living for something else - and anything else other than the mission God has set you apart for is sin. So, if you're not going to live on that mission, whether your sin is premarital sex or even spiritual apathy, it doesn't really matter ... you're just swapping one sin for another.

To be clearer, if you refuse to live on the mission God called you to live on, but you also want to refrain from sexual sins, what you're really suggesting is: "Guys, I want to live a life of sin and rejection of God's mission for me, but I don't want that to be sexual sin because the church will shame me real bad for doing that, so can you help me get rid of that sin and find another sinful way of living instead ... maybe a sinful lifestyle that the church will actually be okay with?" That's how those types of conversations always feel to me.

Regulating Sexual Desire

2 upvotes · 7 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Indeed. Both the RP and Bible's positions, as best I can tell, are to avoid marriage at all cost. The Bible's only exception in a post-Gospel world is if you're mutually burning with passion with someone else to the point where you would otherwise sin through premarital sex - and even that is contingent on the other person being someone who will live by the leader-helper dynamic established in Genesis. That's why Paul in one place gives the "burning with passion" excuse, but in another place also says, "But don't marry a non-believer." Paul inherently assumes all believers are living on mission for Christ, which is evident through much of his writings. This assumption was rational in his day, but it has become lost today as so few people actually live this way. So, when Paul gave the excuse for two Christians to marry, it was with the assumption that the husband and wife were both believers and that the husband would be following after his pattern of disciple-making (see Philippians 3:17, Titus 2:7 in the context of Titus being discipled by Paul and commissioned as a disciple-maker, 1 Cor. 11:1-3, 1 Thess. 1:6-7, etc.) and the wife would help him.

Regulating Sexual Desire

2 upvotes · 7 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Solid comment, but a few things to note:

The Scriptures in 1 Corinthians 7 recommend you marry if you burn.

That's mutually with another person, not necessarily just because someone by themselves happens to want sex a lot.

Being older does not necessarily mean your chances are better either

Very, very true. But as a matter of practical observation, an older guy dating younger women is often far more likely to garner their respect and a submissive attitude up-front. There's a sense that the man is pre-established and the woman is joining him, rather than same-age couples who both have pseudo-established lives that they are trying to "blend together," which leads to different conclusions. That's not to say it can't be done right, but it does make things easier if you marry younger.

As far as sex drive goes, what /u/akohlan198 said is good

Those are good, but I'd add pursuing a mission to the list. I'll never drop this prerequisite. Finding a virtuous woman is not enough. Having a solid mission will give context for knowing whether her virtues can easily be oriented toward the man's purpose in life or if they're simply pleasant character traits that she will only exercise at her own discretion and, thus, they become more a point of frustration than of beauty.

On this I speak from experience. I married a virtuous woman - someone that many other Christian men

commended me for doing, seeing her character and highly praising her for her godliness. But after we were married it became apparent that she would not orient her exercise of those virtues consistently with my mission to make disciples. She was willing to be hospitable, but quickly despised when I brought men I was discipling into the home. She was humble and meek, but acted arrogant and condescending when I would take 2 hours off of work (and therefore made a little less money that day) to meet with a new Christian who wanted to read the Bible together. She was very generous, but fought me when I wanted to orient our giving toward people who I knew to be active disciple-makers. Name any virtue that you think a woman should have and she had it ... except when it came to my mission, in which case those virtues went straight out the window.

This is what led to some of my beta days. After the first couple years of marriage I caved. I wanted my "virtuous wife" back, so I started orienting my life around the things she wanted - and she did become "virtuous" again - because she was able to exercise those virtues in a way consistent with her own life pursuits. But with those virtues she also became pious and prude ... frigid even.

Now, this is incredibly frustrating because from the outside she looks like the model of a godly woman. The church doesn't care about the mission of disciple-making (which has always been my mission), so they didn't care that her exercise of the virtues was conditional on pursuing worldly goals as our life mission. All they cared about was that I should do whatever it takes to lead my wife into godliness. When I would pull away and start pursuing my mission again, the church would tell me that I was the one in the wrong because I was putting my mission to God above my relationship with my wife ... like WTF?!?!?

Anyway ... my point is simply that virtues alone are not enough. The exercise of those virtues must also be compatible with the mission. I eventually got my wife on board. But I don't want to see other guys go through that same struggle I did just because they found a wife who otherwise seems very hot, godly, and virtuous. Mission matters.

Tag: [/u/ElectricalAutumn](#)

Learn to pick your battles

2 upvotes · 7 May 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Ah, I love these moments now. See my wedding post, for example. It's fun to notice all the ways your perception is much clearer now.

What you missed here is the opportunity to engage in a theological conversation with a brother that can pull some of the wool off of his eyes too. He's reading the second half of Psalm 37:4 and assuming that the first half is an unrelated condition.

- An unrelated condition is something like, "If you give me \$20 I will give you a pair of pants." There is nothing uniquely intertwined between \$20 and a pair of pants other than the value ascribed to them. This is called bartering/negotiating. One person wants one thing, someone else wants something different and unrelated, so they swap.
- A related condition is more like, "If you get me the broken vacuum and a screwdriver, I'll give you back a working vacuum ... and then you can use it on the floors." All parts of the transaction here are clearly tied together. This is not bartering. It is productive interaction.

Now, how often does God *EVER* interact with us on the barter system? How many times have you seen God say, "I need this, you need that, so let's trade"? It doesn't happen because God doesn't need anything from us, much less our delight in him. He is perfectly content in himself - and that is something that most Christians, even blue pillers, can accept: that God doesn't negotiate with us, just as a man should not negotiate with his wife/girlfriend.

Instead, God's words in Psalm 37:4 are much more aligned with a related condition: "Make me your heart's desire

and I'll give myself to you." This works on a number of levels.

- Theologically we know that our greatest gift from God is God himself. The whole point of Jesus dying and rising, which is the central event in all of time, was to put us back in a position where we could be reconciled with God once again - that we could receive once more the relationship he always wanted with us.
- We also know as a theological fact that anything we desire more than God is a form of idolatry and is, therefore, sinful.
- We know that our hearts have many desires that are absolutely sinful and that God should not grant, even if we do delight ourselves in him, so obviously he doesn't mean "all desires," and thus he must be referencing a specific one.
- This view of the verse appropriately places God himself as the focal point of our lives - both in the sense of giving him our desire and getting him back in return for our desiring him.
- Most women (despite what we otherwise know from RP) will verbalize, "I don't want your money or your stuff or blah blah ... I want *YOU*." That relational connection is a large part of what drives them, which is why women who do have rich husbands who can fulfill all of their other desires still find that their wives are unsatisfied. Why? Because they don't have the relational connection with their husband that they crave. This verse, if interpreted correctly, corroborates this principle by suggesting that the solution to relationship problems is not getting stuff from God in exchange for our desire; rather it is by getting God himself, which is who we should desire above all that other stuff.
- As a practical matter, when women express intense desire for their husbands, what is the husband's God-given reaction: (1) "Thanks for acting all sexy today and putting on lingerie. Instead of sex, let me take you out on a date, buy you flowers and candy, and write you a poem," or (2) "Heck yeah, girl - let's get it on!"? In option 1 he gives her stuff. In option 2 he gives her himself. If God has wired husbands to respond this way to their wives' desire for him, why would we assume, "Oh, but that's unique to human husbands; God as our spiritual husband wants to be totally different - he would rather give us all the other stuff we desire rather than himself." That's just idiotic.
- In light of the above, the husband who is desired and readily gives himself to his wife also naturally wants to express his generosity and kindness toward his wife in other ways. But this is not as a substitute. Imagine if we delight ourselves in God and he tries to give himself to us and we say, "Oh, sorry God, I was really just doing that because I thought that's how I would get all the other desires of my heart. I don't really want you that way right now." Now imagine a wife getting all sexy in lingerie and grinding on her husband as he walks in the door and he tries to take her up to the bedroom and she says, "Oh, I don't know where you got that idea from. I don't want sex. I was just trying to do something to convince you to clean out the garage and buy me a smoothie." How's that going to make a guy feel? How's that going to make God feel? So how are we going to interpret Psalm 37:4 this way when it offends our very senses in practice ... yet at a purely philosophical level we want to believe it because it feeds into the prosperity theology that everyone deep down wishes were true.

Anyway ... that's what I think about that whole exchange. There's a great theological conversation just waiting to happen - one that could lead to his being red pill'd if he accepts the truth of what God is trying to communicate here.

Being Double-Minded

2 upvotes · 4 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Excellent comment here!

belief is head knowledge of a truth, while trust is firm reliance on the integrity, ability, or character of a person or thing. Faith is belief and trust working together

To be clear, even when the Bible uses the word we translate as "believe" - that word is a combination of intellectual assent and trust. So, "believe in Jesus" in the Bible means more than that word "believe" would mean to us today :)

Here's an example: imagine a man stretches a tightrope across the Grand Canyon. He walks across it to the other side, and then back again. Then he gets a wheelbarrow

Charles Blondin was his name, and it was Niagara Falls :)

[u/RedPlanetMan](#), I'm curious: have you given up drugs, or are you still using them? This would certainly be a factor either way.

I had this exact same curiosity and meant to ask, but got distracted by work half way through my comment and forgot to add it in when I got back.

Being Double-Minded

2 upvotes · 4 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Here's what I see, take it or leave it, like it or not.

You were on drugs and had a few bad trips. You became **legitimately empty**. You longed for some kind of legitimate fullness because you realized the things of this world couldn't satisfy you. Then your story just kind of ends.

I don't know if you're a Christian, what your mission is, how much you lift, body fat, relationship history, or even what you're looking for.

Simply put, you still seem pretty aimless, but optimistic. Emotionally, you've come out of a bad place - and that's great. But do you really know where you're going? Because if you don't, you're going to return. Take Matthew 12 to heart:

43 "When an impure spirit comes out of a person, it goes through arid places seeking rest and does not find it. 44 Then it says, 'I will return to the house I left.' When it arrives, it finds the house unoccupied, swept clean and put in order. 45 Then it goes and takes with it seven other spirits more wicked than itself, and they go in and live there. And the final condition of that person is worse than the first.

I'd love some biblical feedback.

2 upvotes · 2 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

SECULAR

Men have spontaneous desire. We can just want sex at the drop of a hat based on general triggers that doesn't require anyone proposing sex to us, though that's welcome too. Women have responsive desire. They do desire sex, but their desire does not trigger until someone initiates with them.

This really functions more like a scale where women are 95% responsive and 5% spontaneous. Men are generally closer to 80% spontaneous. If we want sex in a manner that suits the frequency of our desire it doesn't make sense to keep waiting for her 5% to trigger. So, we must activate her responsive desire by initiating.

BIBLICAL

In distinguishing the secular from the biblical I'm not saying the secular is wrong. It is praxeological reality. Rather I'm saying that there is a biblical foundation for why God ingrained these praxeological impulses in us this way to begin with. That biblical foundation on marital relationships will usually be found in the parallel Christ is trying to establish in his relationship with the church.

How often do you have the spontaneous desire on your own to evangelize to someone? That's usually pretty rare. But when you feel the Spirit on you for whatever reason, all of a sudden you can barely hold it back, right? That's because physical reproductive acts parallel spiritually reproductive ones ... i.e. evangelism = sex. God is our groom, we his bride.

We know theologically that God is always the initiator of anything good we do. It does not come from us. Our job is to respond to his calling and prompting on our lives. We are responsive beings in our relationship with him. God wants it this way for a variety of reasons, so he created men and women to function this way in physical marriage as well to help us better understand how to relate with him in our spiritual marriage to him.

Homily on Ephesians 5:22-33 by St. John Chrysostom (On Marriage and Family Life)

2 upvotes · 2 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

2/2

How do you define "falsities" in this context?

Falsity here is a reference to something that is untrue. From what you say after, something could certainly be "pure" in motive yet still untrue. I don't suppose you are arguing that every Orthodox priest who ever preached from the pulpit has only ever spoken truth and has never had anything false come out of his mouth during a service. So, while I acknowledge the purity from which they preach (although even at that I'm sure some preached from false motives, which Paul in Philippians 1 says we should still rejoice at), I also believe there are "falsities" mixed in, despite their good intentions.

At the end of the day, I trust 2000 years of tradition that has been preserved quite well, from my research, and still have to stick to my guns that scripture came from tradition.

I fully understand this position. But I also have trouble reconciling that with the Gospel being living and active, implying that it is not static, as tradition often tries to make it. There is no room with putting off the old ways and adopting new ways as the world changes, which Protestantism readily embraces and is highly consistent with Paul's philosophy of ministry in 1 Cor. 9 - again, not to say that I agree with all things Protestant either.

1 Cor. 15:3, 11

This isn't referencing a tradition of special robes and incense burning from a chain or pictures on a wall. This is a reference to the tradition of what was taught about the Gospel. That is a tradition I can readily get behind.

1 Cor. 11:2

Yes, it uses the word "traditions" and says they were handed down, but you can't remove the context of 11:1, where Paul makes it clear that he's talking about his way of life that was set as a model for them, as affirmed in Philippians 3:17, "Join together in following my example, brothers, and just as you have us as a model, keep your eyes on those who live as we do." Notice the stark similarity between this and 1 Cor. 11:1-2? It tells me that what Paul said in 1 Cor. was meant to be interpreted the same way as what he said in Philippians 3:17 - that the "traditions" referenced in 1 Cor. 11 relate to their model of how they lived their lives broadly and the mission of discipleship that they had imparted with that model, just as he just spoke in the previous chapter about the guys he had been discipling and was sending to them to disciple them as well. That is the tradition the 1 Cor. 11

passage references.

The first Christians "devoted themselves to the apostles' teaching" (Acts 2:42) long before there was a New Testament

No, the apostles teachings were, themselves, the new testament. They were simply recorded on paper later and ultimately canonized even later than that.

From the very beginning, the fullness of Christian teaching was found in the Church as the living embodiment of Christ, not in a book.

More accurately: it was not found in the church; it was found in the Spirit speaking through men who shared the message with one another through discipleship, which is the mission and tradition of the church.

Another point of intrigue: if the Orthodox church uses this passage to claim the apostles teachings other than Scripture as part of tradition, then what are those teachings? What non-Scriptural sources do we have of the preservation of those teachings? And if there are none and that "tradition" was lost, then does it mean it shouldn't have been considered Spirit-inspired tradition in the first place? Or did the Spirit fail us by allowing inspired tradition to be lost? This logic just raises too many questions.

But these verses merely condemn erroneous human traditions, not truths which were handed down orally and entrusted to the Church by the apostles.

So this raises another thing I was about to type anyway: who decides which church teachings are part of "tradition" and not? Surely there are several bad teachings that were going around, for the apostles condemned many for false preaching. So if people within the church were teaching false things, and therefore the apostles had to write letters rebuking those churches for doing it wrong, then the church itself is not the determining factor over which tradition is preserved or not. Content from within the church is both good and bad. So, what other factor discerns which tradition is preserved if not the church? The Spirit, as outlined above.

I get the distinction between human tradition and apostolic tradition, but in my research on the matter it seems very difficult to prove much of anything outside the use of Scripture, which makes those traditions a product of Scripture anyway creating a nice little circle if the canonization of Scripture is also viewed as a product of tradition (for which there is much greater historical support than most of the apostolic traditions). I have yet to see a historical source that referenced Peter or Paul wearing green robes and swinging incense from a chain. But I'm willing to stand corrected there.

Homily on Ephesians 5:22-33 by St. John Chrysostom (On Marriage and Family Life)

2 upvotes · 2 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

1/2

However, the OT, if that is what you are mentioning

Yes, that's what I was mentioning.

I've found the "original mission" to be closest in the Orthodox faith to that of the apostles from my inquiry and study/research

I'd be interested in seeing how you reached that conclusion. I don't see much about any apostles saying much about a particular branch of the faith other than that we're all believers and should view ourselves as in fellowship with one another. Orthodoxy seems to draw a clear line and says, "Sorry Paul, but we don't agree with you. We're

the one true church and if anyone is outside our bounds, we're going to draw a hard line and not embrace this whole unity thing." I've had many Orthodox people even tell me that it is their belief based on what their priest teaches that anyone who does not identify with the EO church is not part of the "C" church and thus will go to hell. Then again, I've heard a few (lesser number) other people say that the authorities who established that line of thinking were overruled at some point and the EO church no longer thinks that way, or something weird like that.

How is this "deferring spiritual leadership away from the man and toward the church"?

If I understand 1 Cor. 14:35 correctly, the husband should be responsible for the spiritual instruction of his wife, not the church. She is not meant to engage with the church directly (only passively); rather, she is to find direct spiritual leadership from her husband. The husband should be utilizing the church as a resource for discerning God's will, but 1 Cor. 11:3 also makes it clear that the church is not man's authority, Christ is. So, as I see it, the flow goes something like this:

1. God is the head of Christ.
2. Christ is the head of man. Man isn't always the best at discerning Christ's will, so Christ gave us his spirit and his church as the two primary ways of discerning his headship. The church speaks through Scripture and tradition - not as equals, but both with divine inspiration nonetheless (although not all aspects of tradition are divinely inspired/infallible). The Spirit speaks through transformation and sovereignty, as I have said before: "The Spirit rarely tells us God's will; rather he turns us into the type of people who don't have to ask in the first place" and "even if we are not confident of which choice Christ prefers, if our spirit is oriented appropriately toward obedience we can trust God's sovereignty to have the Spirit guide our actions in obedience all the same."
3. Man, after submitting to God's will, then becomes the authority over his wife to lead her in all matters.

This flow in 1 Cor. 11:3 is contrary to the more popular view the church espouses today, which is that the wife's connection is directly to Christ and not through her husband, and therefore women should be able to participate in church as much as men (although some branches will still deny them positions of leadership). But that view ignores many biblical examples, such as Exodus 4, where Moses tells God to use Aaron instead and God says, "That's fine, but I won't speak to Aaron directly. I'm going to appoint you to do that. So, I'll speak to you, and you will speak to him" and to use an exact quote: "It will be as if he were your mouth and as if you were God to him." Modern Christianity says, "The Bible must be wrong there because spiritual philosophy tells us that God should want to have a direct relationship with all of us, not this silly spiritual lineage concept." [To be clear, when I talk about rejecting apostolic success, I mean in the way the Orthodox church applies it, not that I reject it altogether as most protestants do.]

Do you mind if I ask who your authority is then?

Christ.

Or, who guides you in reading the scriptures so that one's own interpretations don't get in the way of "Truth"?

My thoughts on "Truth" notwithstanding (per my last reply), see above re: the balance between Church and Spirit, which break down ... Church: Scripture and tradition; Spirit: transformation and sovereignty. Of these 4, Scripture is the highest, but that does not diminish the authority of the others. In my view, Scripture is not authoritative because tradition tells us it is (which is an Orthodox view); rather, it is authoritative because the Spirit affirms it to each person individually as they engage with the Scriptures, as evidenced by the way it transforms their life toward Christ.

A good example on this would be where Orthodox tradition has one particular canon that it acknowledges, whereas Protestants have a smaller canon. I know the Spirit has affirmed the 66 books of the Protestant canon to me personally through their impact on my life. I have read the additional books that the Catholics and Orthodox also include, but I have not received such similar affirmation. Nevertheless, I am open to the idea that the Spirit may just want me focusing on the 66 for now and simply doesn't want me focusing on the others yet - and he might have his reasons for that, and I might get affirmation of the other books later. In this sense, it is clear that my acceptance of Scripture is not because tradition produced it, but because the Spirit affirms it. The tradition of the church over time is certainly an influencing factor on that, and thus I look to the disagreements among Christians/within the Church as a resources to help me discern which books I should be testing in the Spirit, and thus the church still plays a major role, but the affirmation of the Spirit Himself is a higher authority to me than my faith that some dead guys from 1700 years ago got it right.

"how do you know that the Spirit is speaking though your Church?"

The same way Jesus told us to test the spirits in anyone: "By their fruit you will recognize them." But in my view it is not "church" or "denomination" specific - it is message-specific. A church may preach a Spirit-filled/inspired message one week and then the next week the Spirit says, "I really wish you hadn't said that." That's why there are very fruitful churches who also preach blue pill nonsense. It's why pastors can preach the Gospel one week and pop psychology lessons the next.

That is why we must do as the Bereans did, per our prior conversation, and test everything against Scripture first. After that, I test it against the Spirit through prayer and what application of the message would make me become - if it would cause me to bear more fruit or less (i.e. the transformation component of the Spirit) - and against the present and historical teachings of the broader church (i.e. get feedback from other godly people) ... and if all else fails, I resign myself to God that I have done all I can to seek his will and it is then in his power to ensure I follow the right path, even if I have no absolute certainty on the matter, and thus I can walk confidently even without certainty.

A Meditation for Weightlifters

2 upvotes · 1 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Thanks for sharing this. Motivation for lifting is always welcome!

My Story

2 upvotes · 28 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I wrote about this in my post on denominational life cycles.

1. Visionary
2. Growth
3. Organization
4. Institutionalization
5. Death/change

That institutionalization concept is what you're describing, when a church becomes more interested in the organization itself than the vision that started it.

Setting expectations for fat loss and muscle gain

2 upvotes · 27 April 2018 · /r/askMRP

Cool. Using gloves might help too. Our gym just got new equipment and the new gripping on their bars is a whole line of metallic diamonds points that dig into your hands. It's quite painful and makes a tight grip almost impossible and may even draw blood. Some people are asking them to file it down. It's pretty frustrating, especially for deadlifts and squats.

Why I am anti-game and pro godly masculinity

2 upvotes · 27 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Since we're talking about feminism and idolatry of romantic love, the problem is always brain cancer.

In a large number of cases, I agree. But I do believe there are several women who have not bought into feminism and idolatry of romantic love who still aren't attracted to their husbands. To that end, that one cancerous source is not at the root of their sexual dysfunction - an unattractive husband is.

Or to be more clear: if the only reason for a deadbedroom in a marriage is that the husband is a fat slob and it has nothing to do with feminism or whatnot, then the "cure" to that specific problem is the husband making himself more attractive. But I do agree that feminist ideologies are present in a majority of relationships, so I can see why you'd assume we're only talking about those types of relationships. That word "*always*" just throws me off there because "feminism and idolatry of romantic love" are not *always* present.

I mention this because my particular case was one of those situations. My wife started with idealized notions of extreme romanticism and assumed when we were married that her bubbly feelings would last forever after marriage. 2-years post-marriage that started to fade and she accepted the hard realities that movie romanticism and feminist ideologies were a farce. Today she fully embraces this. But we still had a dead bedroom for a long time. Why? Because I was an unattractive fat slob.

The solution for me was not to rebuke her for having feminist ideologies that she had abandoned years ago. It was to make myself more attractive. Once I did that, our sexuality was restored. It was literally that simple. Those attraction triggers I had improved had massive overlaps between what you would call "game" and "biblical marriage." But eradicating something that was already gone was no the cure to my particular situation, and I suspect that may also be the case for a large minority of other men on this sub.

Many Christian men who encounter the manosphere think that "Advil" will cure their "brain cancer."

I agree that if feminism and romantic ideologies are the core of the problem (ergo cancer), no amount of game or advil will cure it. The only place where I think we differ here is that I disagree with the contention that all sexual dysfunctions in a marriage stem from this particular type of cancer.

I've received many e-mails from Christian men who encountered the manosphere who were seduced into committing fornication

These are the exact types of men that caused me to create this sub in the first place. They are also the reason why I believe we must find common ground with the manosphere wherever possible (which is easy to do) because that common ground is going to make the transition much easier. A lot of that common ground can be found in the lingo. For example, where the word "dread" gets a lot of heat, I've joked on here before that it could really be called "intentional triggering of preselection tendencies" for a much more innocuous phrase ... but you're going to put so many people off by changing terminology like that, you'd lose much of your potential influence.

Their idol is "game" as their focus is on being as sexually attractive to their wife as possible or passing her hypergamous tests.

Right. So we have a few options on how to help these guys.

1. We can give them a stern rebuke and hope they listen, which is the "sharp contrast" model. But in my experience this tends to be very ineffective, especially when the men are seeing their individual goals met as a result of their idolatry, nevermind that they're mispalced goals to begin with.
2. We can accept that their idolatry is not easily changed, so we reorient their focus in how they practice it. For example, if they are hung up on sexual fulfillment, we demonstrate that the way to achieve their goal is by doing the things God is calling them to do anyway, reorienting them away from secular practices of achieving that goal into biblical ones, giving them an opportunity to reconcile their faith with their otherwise idolatrous purposes. This is less than ideal, but it at least gets their behavior on track on the hope that, as CS Lewis suggests, their heart will soon follow.
3. We reorient their purpose altogether, setting their hearts and minds in the right direction and let them know, "Don't worry, all that other stuff you wanted will be met too, but it can't be fully satisfying until you abandon it as an idolatrous goal first and commit yourself to God and his mission for you." This is the strategy that I attempt to utilize in this sub, and it's based predominantly on Matthew 6:33 and the litany of parallel passages that lead to the same conclusion.

Does that make it more clear?

Yes, and hopefully this reply should clear up stuff on my end too :)

I assume you are talking about biblical marriage here as the cure for rebellion and curing sexual dysfunction. The answer is yes.

Well, not all issues of sexual dysfunction are tied to rebellion, as noted above. Even if the wife is fully submissive, if she's not attracted to her husband she might find herself in a pattern of duty sex, whereby she readily submits her body to him, but she's just not that into it so he doesn't enjoy it much either.

That being said, what's the evidence that your proposal actually does solve dead bedrooms?

Why I am anti-game and pro godly masculinity

2 upvotes · 27 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Throwing pretty much everything under the umbrella of game gives it very little meaning because it's so broad.

I agree. But that is how I've seen the term used over the last year+, which is why we hear about beta game, alpha game, blue pill game, hard core game, married man game, single man game, and all kinds of things that go beyond the standard red pill prescriptions.

The goal of Christians is to put God first and whatever He created us to do here for second, third, fourth, and so on.

I'm more aligned with [/u/rocknrollchuck](#) on something like this - that we're not meant to set priorities in a hierarchy; rather, we're meant to set one priority and let that be that. God's mission for us is our priority and it is the way we "put God first." To say we have a secondary priority is to split our attention and steal away from our devotion to God, which is what Paul references in 1 Cor. 7. He is speaking not on a "technical possibility" level, but on a practical level that most men will forsake their duty to God, in whole or in part, once they're married in

order to please their wives.

But this is also why he gives the command: "From now on let those with wives live as if they had none." This is his way of saying, "Don't make them a secondary priority - just make God your only priority and let that be that." Of course, if our obligation is to make disciples of those God has placed in our lives, it makes sense that this should include making disciples of our wife and children, and therefore they fit within our obligation to God, but not as a separate obligation for their own sake. There is no "I love God first, then my family." It is "I love God and I love my family as an expression of my love to God."

This is what Jesus means when he says, "If anyone does not hate his father and mother and brother and sister, his wife and children, and even his own life - he cannot be my disciple." Most people try to go through mental gymnastics to explain away what he's saying as some form of "in comparison to how much you love God" - but that's not what Jesus said and he easily could have added that clarification. Instead, we also see him saying, "You who do the will of my Father are my mother and brother." This leaves us with the implication that Jesus placed no inherent value in blood connection; rather the spiritual connection we have to others is what defines the relationship. So, if left to the relationships themselves without any spiritual connection, I believe we should literally hate the worldly pressures toward our blood relatives, which distracts us away from God. Instead, we should love those with whom we share a spiritual bond. As husbands and fathers, our job is to cultivate that spiritual bond with our wife and children so that it has value through Christ. But we are not to give it an inherent value or worth of its own accord apart from Christ.

I'm not sure if that makes much sense, but it's how I read the Scriptures and understand the lop-sided balance between our devotion to God and our connection to our earthly families.

The end result is inferior for Christians compared to biblical marriage.

I'm confused ... end result of what? Following red pill game to the exclusion of non-overlapping aspects of biblical marriage? If so, I agree. But we must also acknowledge that biblical marriage does have significant overlap with red pill game.

If you are mentoring "blue" or "purple" men and bring up "game" you basically lose all credibility and their minds become closed off.

I don't know about that. MRP's sidebar, for example, references Rollo's book and blog, which has a lot of content describing "blue pill game" and "beta game" and yet people take him quite seriously. We just acknowledge that it's ineffective and counterproductive game. But it is "game" nonetheless.

This is why I think it's a good idea for Christians eschew any relation with the secular manosphere completely including "game" and other red pill terminology, whether they are broadly or narrowly defined.

I agree with you on paper, but not in practice. Ideally you're right, Christians should have their own model entirely separate and distinct from "the red pill" at all and its own terminology because there are enough differences that despite the significant overlap it could rightly be called its own thing, and we should not be copying from the secular when the actuality is that the secular manosphere is actually getting all their findings and conclusions from the way God created the world, and therefore from us.

But as a more practical matter, if we don't find some common ground with which to minister to people, it will be an "us v. them" mentality, which makes it so much harder for people to cross from one side to the other. So, as with Paul in Acts 17 and 1 Cor. 9, if we can find some common ground and work with people on terminology that they know and understand in order to reach and save them, I believe we should and we are right to do so.

As I have stated before, my purpose in creating this sub was not to create a Christian version of RP. Rather, I saw many, many Christian men who would otherwise be led astray by secular RP into sin and rejection of God and

accredited it to the fact that they had nowhere to go to address their issues in a Christian world-view that was willing to identify with them on the world-view they were coming from. That is, they were already neck-deep in secular RP views and terminology and there needed to be an opportunity for reorientation that did not require a sudden, drastic change from "secular RP" to "biblical masculinity." When there's already so much overlap anyway, why force it to be more diverse than it is? Why not utilize the similarities, preserve some of the language, and make the flow of communication much easier and allow them to find Christ and biblical masculinity through a more natural progression? That makes more sense to me than forcing a stark contrast, and this also seems more aligned with Paul's method of reaching those outside the church.

I think you're tunneling onto "rebuke and correct" too much here. Lots of meat in Eph 5

I agree. But to be fair, that was all I really saw in the original post. The other things you reference here weren't mentioned in the original post as part of the "cure." Of course, and I assume you agree, it must transcend just Ephesians 5 and must embrace all ways that Christ interacts with his bride.

As I'm sure you'll notice from my never-ending refrain on this sub, the primary trait between Christ and the church actually has very little to do with sanctifying and providing and cherishing, etc. - it's that he has a mission that transcends himself and he calls his bride, the church, to participate in that mission. That's why Paul gives the clearest possible picture of discipleship in 1 Cor. 11:1-2 and then immediately afterward in verse 3 says the bit about, "But I want you to understand that the head of every man is Christ, the head of a wife is her husband, and the head of Christ is God."

That is, Jesus voluntarily acknowledged that everything He did was not of his own accord, but as his Father commanded. This primarily consisted of two things: (1) Jesus dying and rising so that people could be reconciled to God; and (2) Jesus discipling his followers as his #1 purpose on earth toward bringing the Gospel to all people. To that end, the Father is the head of Christ and shared His purpose and mission of discipleship with Jesus as Jesus's primary purpose for living. Likewise, Jesus is the head of the church and shared His purpose and mission of discipleship with the church as our primary purpose for existing. In the same way, a husband is the head of his wife and should share his purpose and mission of discipleship (which he gets from Christ as an active part of the church) with his wife as her primary purpose for existing.

I say this simply to reiterate that we cannot possibly talk about "biblical masculinity" or "biblical marriage" if we are neglecting the most important aspect that Christ models for us in his relationship with the church, which is that we must adopt the ministry of discipleship as our primary purpose and calling. Without that all else is lost and futile. All of the other things from Ephesians 5 become just as much a bandaid or "aspirin" as you otherwise accuse (and probably rightfully so) most game methodologies of being.

Why I am anti-game and pro godly masculinity

2 upvotes · 26 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I see the distinction much clearer now. Here's how I (and what I believe most of the manosphere) understand it:

- **GAME** is anything a man does that impacts his attractiveness to a woman. I might even add the requirement that he intends it for that purpose. So, if he lifts weights to be strong enough to win a boxing tournament but has no actual woman in mind to attract, is that game by virtue of the fact that it does have the unintended byproduct of attracting women? Meh, I don't really care, but maybe.
- **METHODS** are the intentional or subliminal tactics we employ within the umbrella of game. There could be a whole flow chart beneath this, but let's break it down into two primary categories:
 - **INEFFECTIVE GAME METHODS** are all the blue pill strategies, like white knighting, chivalry, choreplay, idolizing, flattery, etc.
 - **EFFECTIVE GAME METHODS** are the things you listed, like AA, AM, dread, etc. But there are also

countless others, like building a good physique, having a good job, demonstrating leadership skills, having an important mission, etc. On their own, these things do not originate from game, but they are certainly a part of game.

You're trying to categorize things as mutually exclusive which actually overlap substantially. Take "murdering people" as an example. Cain first did this in the OT before there was ever a law against it. But now there is a law against it. It wouldn't make any sense to say, "Murdering people is not 'against the law.'" It's a human action that wasn't created by the law. I suppose some would say that it falls under some definitions of 'against the law,' which is true, but it does not originate from there, which means they are immune from the 'against the law' I am referring to." That sounds about as bizarre to me as you saying "Masculine traits are not 'game.'" Of course they are. Murdering people falls under both categories of human action and being against the law. Masculine traits fall under both categories of 'created by God' and 'game.'

Trying to redefine game to suit your point only adds confusion. It's the same tactics that liberals employed when they changed the definition of "intolerant" to be based on one's political opinions rather than their behavioral conduct toward others ([Merriam-Webster's website being a great example](#)). By changing the definition, they all of a sudden sound really catchy and trigger emotional reactions to their cause by calling everyone "intolerant" who doesn't agree with their position, when in reality the people on the other end are saying, "But we're not like that at all. We are tolerant under the true definition - they just changed the meaning to get you all riled up."

I feel like you're somewhat doing the same thing with game - by taking game methods and assuming that the methods themselves are the entirety of game. It is true that there are many bad and unhelpful methods - especially of the blue pill variety. There are also some that are not part of the cure. But there are others that are part of the cure. Rebuking one's wife, for example, is what you put as part of your "cure" - but it's also rightly part of "game" if it's a tactic a man employs that has the effect of increasing his wife's attraction to him - especially if he also intended it for that purpose. And anyone who reads your post and thereby starts employing "godly masculinity" in the hope of attracting his wife to him is automatically employing it for that purpose, as they're no longer doing it for God's own sake alone, and thus it most certainly is game. But it's not one of the methods you listed.

The fight here is not against game, but against the philosophies that create the foundation for certain methodologies of employing game. That's where I think the ultimate disconnect is between what I see and what you wrote.

Tag: [/u/rocknrollchuck](#)

Why I am anti-game and pro godly masculinity

2 upvotes · 26 April 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

So, you've got some good stuff here, and there's a lot to address, but my biggest question: how are you defining game? From the way you use the term, I get the impression you mean something different from how many endorsed people in the manosphere use the term. All the same, are you suggesting ... ?

- Game is sinful and should never be employed
- Game is not sinful, but you shouldn't use it because it's not "the cure"
- Game is not sinful and you're free to use it if you want, just don't ignore "the cure" in exchange for game

As you note, game might be a pain-killer, but sometimes all you have is a headache that doesn't require brain surgery. And even if you do require brain surgery, sometimes you need those pain killers until it's time for the actual surgery. Of course, I don't know that I like the analogy in the first place, given that I do believe game is something that should be upkept with some consistency, whereas I don't think people should addict themselves to

pain killers :p But that's with how I understand and define game, ergo my original question.

Why I am anti-game and pro godly masculinity

2 upvotes · 26 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Agreed. It is part of blue pill ideology to think that a wife should just be attracted to her husband "for who he is."

For Singles: Finding the Girl You Can't Keep Yourself From Banging

2 upvotes · 26 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

For lack of a better way to say it, how does this work?

You pursue your mission. People are going to flock to you as you do so. One of those people will be a woman you'll desperately want to have sex with, and she with you. You decide to get married to legitimize the sexuality.

It seems to me that this proposal jumps directly from an acquaintanceship / friendship directly to consideration of marriage.

It certainly seems that way on paper, but as sexual tension naturally increases between you and other women you'll find yourself in that phase where people say, "They're not official, but they're pretty much together." This is exactly where you want to be - because you have no obligation to her, only to God. It's a lot easier to make your mission first. It's a lot easier to avoid oneitis and new relationship ecstasy, etc. This is also what even secular RP preaches: don't make relationship commitments of exclusivity, per the sniper method. Always keep things open.

how this can happen if you skip the phase in which sexual attraction is built, i.e. dating or courtship

You have to remember that dating/courtship is a relatively new phenomenon, compared to the rest of human history. So I wouldn't immediately jump into the assumption that this is a biblical ideal that everyone should strive to go through before marrying someone. Modern dating/courtship is a highly feminized social construct that really does very little to advance the man's interests, but still provides (albeit to a lesser degree) relational security for women.

In order to get that relational security, the secular world has allowed women to utilize sexuality as leverage to get that relational security, saying that they will only have sex with a man who they have an exclusive relationship with (which mostly stems from anti-slut defense over anything else). In a Christian worldview where sex before marriage is off the table already, then there is really no leverage women have to pull the man into that type of temporal relational security, so I'm not sure why a man would do it. Specifically, it communicates three things to a woman: (1) acquiescence to relational social constructs, (2) an intentional pursuit of the relationship as an ideal, and (3) that the man's commitment to his mission can be tempered and balanced with other agendas. That said, I accept that most men will enter into exclusive relationships to pursue marriage anyway simply because they still see marriage as an independent goal worth pursuing, which runs contrary to my (and most of even secular RP's) view of things.

To get back to the heart of the matter, as you live on your mission to God you're inevitably going to find lots of women who you're sexually attracted to. You should do your best to avoid it, but it's going to be inevitable eventually, which is why I say that even under my model 99+% of men will still end up married. When that sexual attraction starts to build naturally, you won't be able to help yourself from being around this girl - but you shouldn't create some dating commitment of exclusivity to her either. You just continue your mission, but spend time wherever it happens. When the sexual tension is at its apparent peak, you "get married" - but by then she'll well understand the context of your mission and the prioritization that happens with it, as well as your expectations for her role in that mission. It wouldn't be a traditional marriage by any means, but traditional

marriage is mostly a product of feminization and product marketing anyway. Ideally, your marriage should look exactly like what you had before you were married, except you're allowed to have sex and you live together to save on expenses.

Notice that most dead bedrooms and manifestations of blue pill curses happen because people start changing how they view each other and the world after marriage. It jumps from "him and her" to "we and us." It's no longer "his house" ... it's "our house, and we must allocate responsibilities." Even most people in the secular RP world screw this up. At a theory level a scant few of them seem to understand this, but I still see lots of talk even among endorsed contributors about allocation of responsibilities in the home, as if it's a joint effort. They're still assuming that marriage changes things - but that change is precisely what ruins most relationships. You marry someone because you liked who they were and how they lived before you married them, so why just start up and changing things immediately after marriage? If it isn't broke, don't fix it. This, of course, is much more difficult when you're marrying young.

Back to the point: by utilizing dating/courtship, you're communicating to the woman that you are willing to work within widespread social constructs. This will then, of course, communicate that you're also willing to work within the modern social understanding of marriage. Even if you try to explain otherwise, she will not be able to understand or receive it because she sees the pattern: meet a man, start dating, relationship builds, get engaged, get married ... and the continuation of that pattern will be implicit in the subtext of all of her thoughts. She cannot escape it no matter how many times you explain to her otherwise. The only real way to break her expectation of a traditional marriage is to break the expectation of traditional pre-marriage social constructs as well, which means not entering into exclusive dating relationships and demonstrating the pattern and prioritization of your life to her before marriage, after which the proposal will make much more sense in the framework you have already established. This is also a far more honest approach to relationships. She knows exactly what she's getting into before she says "I do." And if you have abundance, you'll be fine even if she says, "I don't." But as a practical matter, the sexual tension wouldn't have built to the point that you'd even be contemplating marriage if she was in an "I don't" mentality, so even that risk is very low.

I'd also stray away from a big, fancy wedding ceremony. Practical considerations aside, this would undermine everything else a man is striving to achieve. A post-wedding celebration would be fine, and I've known several people to do this. Sexual tension built, they got married at the courthouse on their own, then they told everyone about their marriage and decided to have a party with cake, dancing, etc. to let their families meet the new spouse. Of course, you don't have to have the celebration part, as that's totally up to you and how much respect you want to give the family members who would expect it and want to meet your bride. I'm simply saying there's room for it, but not as the wedding ceremony itself, which can be dangerous.

I'm not sure if this is what you were looking for, but I hope it helps.

Tag: [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) and [/u/rocknrollchuck](#) for feedback/a second opinion, as I know most of this is pretty "out there" for most people.

What parts of “Game” should a RP Christian utilize? Which ones should we not utilize?

2 upvotes · 20 April 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

If she's not your wife, she's set aside for someone else.

What parts of “Game” should a RP Christian utilize? Which ones should we not utilize?

2 upvotes · 20 April 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Sorry, I meant "single christian." I fixed it.

Passive game is most of the stuff OZ talks about and what fills most of the sidebar:

- being physically fit

- being spiritually mature
- having a solid mission
- having a good job/career path
- OYS
- solid frame
- etc.

What parts of “Game” should a RP Christian utilize? Which ones should we not utilize?

2 upvotes · 20 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

For an unmarried Christian, yes, passive game is the ideal. Once you're married, passive game becomes the foundation, but active game is where the magic happens. So, for example, where the single Christian should not be utilizing keno, the married Christian man should and that's what will likely trigger sex.

What parts of “Game” should a RP Christian utilize? Which ones should we not utilize?

2 upvotes · 20 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

To be clear, the point of dread game has nothing to do with intentionally causing the other person to feel dread (which often comes off as petty and can rarely be done right intentionally). The point is to be so great that dread naturally trickles in even without you doing anything to prompt it, other than being a high quality man. It's not about manipulating her; it's about acknowledging the passive effect of your self-improvement on her.

Phil's April Update

2 upvotes · 20 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

What is it about this woman that makes her different from every other woman in the world? Give me very specific examples - at least 5 traits that no other woman you've met has.

Let me also ask this: other than emotions (which I promise will fade), what value does her presence in your life add that you can't get anywhere else?

Phil's April Update

2 upvotes · 20 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That's a good word.

I need this, fam

2 upvotes · 10 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Haha, I thought it was humorous enough :p I wouldn't want the sub filled with crap posts like this, but one every now and then isn't so bad.

1. “How does God feel about it?”, or Feminine morality in dystopia

2 upvotes · 9 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That's what they all say.

There might be a reason so many people are saying it ;)

The only non sinful action possible with CP is if you are an investigator required to prosecute the ones involved in it

To be clear, you really mean: "The only use that doesn't violate my own personal moral standard." My guess is you haven't searched the Bible to discern whether or not God would have other non-sinful uses.

Nevertheless, this is the example I had in mind. But even then, the one who views it purely for investigatory purposes is still doing so in sin. That is, it's still sin for any non-Christian no matter what good they're otherwise trying to accomplish. Romans 14:23, Isaiah 64:6, Hebrews 11:6 all say the same thing: if it's not done for God's purposes, then it's evil, even if it otherwise appeases human concepts of morality.

and you are telling me then... when you use pirated material you don't and have not felt a pang of guilt before during and after and ignored it because.... you wanted (needed) it?

Guilt, no. Desire not to get caught, sure. The two aren't the same. To be clear, I don't pirate much (if ever) anymore because I can actually now afford stuff. But back when I did, I did not have a sense of doing wrong anymore than driving 5 miles an hour over the speed limit or when cutting through someone else's back yard.

Is it a technical legal violation? Yes. But the law only applies to the degree that anyone cares to enforce it. Many laws exist as a matter of technicality, but are not enforced. In the American legal system, for example, it's widely accepted that the law is a three-branch process.

- The legislature writes the statute to dictate the bounds of the law.
- The judiciary interprets it and decides whether or not a person, under a specific set of facts, should be punished by that law.
- The executive enforces the law and determines who to submit to the judiciary.

So, if a state statute says "No one shall drive faster than 70mph on a freeway," that's the legislature issuing a boundary. But if the police refuse to enforce that against someone traveling 75mph, or the judge refuses to convict someone for it ... 2/3 of the legal system has determined that no public offense has taken place that warrants penalty and the legislature is overruled. This same thing applies in countless other situations.

To refrain: secular governments do not dictate sin and morality. They dictate civil protection. To that end, the law sets general standards, but acknowledges that every situation is unique, and therefore does not apply a black line to every case. If no one cares to enforce a law, and that law wasn't a God-given dictation of morality in the first place, then there is no sin in breaking it.

On the topic of piracy in specific there was an interesting article I read several years back: one of the major record labels that actually encouraged internet piracy, including their own content. They had several of their bands put statements on their website saying, essentially, "We're not going to change the law, but we're not going to enforce it or press charges either." Why? Because selling CDs wasn't where they were making their money anyway. They got their money through ads, selling song rights for use in commercials and movies, tours and concerts, etc. Their profits actually increased significantly after encouraging piracy. Of course, they didn't offer their content for free - they still wanted to collect from those who wanted to toss money their way.

The point is: it's never as simple as "the legislature said so, therefore it must be a sin." Biblical morality and civil boundaries are not the same, and our biblical obligation to our civil boundaries is to respect our governing authorities, not to submit to every order issued from on high. Remember that Paul was writing Romans 13 during the time of Nero when the orders from the top were that all Christians were to be executed - a civil law that Paul certainly felt no guilt in ignoring.

What Do I Do? My Wife Is Openly Unattracted To Me + Interested In Other Men / Past Relationships

2 upvotes · 8 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

The only thing I'd add to what [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) and [/u/rocknrollchuck](#) said is this: OP - what's your mission?

She probably doesn't respect you because she doesn't see eternal value to what you're doing. She wants to be married to a man she can be proud of - someone she can stand next to on judgment day with a bright and shiny smile and say to God, "I helped him do it." You don't have that respect, you won't have her desire.

Looks, leadership, being alpha, etc. are all incredibly important and probably top priority for single guys. But I fully believe they soon become a VERY close second after marriage. Women never stop asking the question, "Where is this going?" Women are never satisfied and never will be. No matter what you give them they will always say, "Awesome! Next I want ..."

When they're single they only have marriage on their minds. Then they want a house. Then kids. Then a bigger house. Then more kids and a minivan. Then to vacation in certain places. Then to redecorate the house. Etc. They're shortsighted, only seeing the next step ahead.

You have to be the visionary. You have to be the one to say, "Our lives will be oriented around this one thing. We might get the house and kids and minivan along the way ... we might not. But come what may, our lives will matter to eternity." That's a powerful attitude. It also lets her know you aren't going to be bogged down by her shortsightedness. You're not going to let her wants and feelings call the shots. You're setting the agenda and it's a better agenda than the garbage she probably has in mind.

This is attractive. This shows her that there's more to you than the billions of betas and dime-a-dozen alpha-players out there. It proves you have something that's rare that she'll likely never find again.

Then you actually have to live it out. And if you can be alpha about it too ... that's the icing on the cake.

So I ask: how are you going to make heaven a better place? Clothe the homeless, feed starving children, fund cancer research ... that's all great for improving a dying planet and populace, but what is going to be your impact on eternity. Or more accurately: *who* will you impact for eternity? Then show, don't tell.

Where is the sweet spot between being an impressive man while also “not trying to impress others” per Philipians 2:3?

2 upvotes · 6 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

As [/u/rocknrollchuck](#) said, there was no point in Jesus' life where he ceased to be confident. Pride is the opposition to humility, not confidence.

The beauty is that an alpha should ideally exude both by nature. For one, he doesn't care to impress people, so his motive should never be one of trying to hype himself up. He is who he is and he's okay with that - OYS and all, accepting his flaws and waving them for the world to see, as Paul suggests in 2 Cor. 12 ("I will boast all the more gladly about my weaknesses").

On the other hand, in part because he doesn't care what others think, he's free to know himself truly - independent of covert motives of people-pleasing and whatnot. By virtue of knowing himself, he can have all the confidence in the world as to the accuracy of his own bounds and limits and never feel the need to buckle or break them in order to appease others.

The truly difficult balance is not between confidence and humility, but between (confidence + humility) and identifying with others to whom we are meant to minister, but whose lifestyles are not naturally within our bounds. 1 Cor. 9 makes it clear that there must be some adaptability on our part, so we can't just completely ignore what others think of us if we want to be effective ministers. We must care what they think - but not as a judgment on ourselves; only to the degree that what they think affects our ability to share Christ with them. That's

the difficult balance to maintain.

1. "How does God feel about it?", or Feminine morality in dystopia

2 upvotes · 6 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

The biggest frustration I have is that you accuse everyone who disagrees with you of being legalists while you're the one looking to the "ins and outs" of the law to try to justify your behaviors. At the end of the day, I don't care if you pirate or not. You're the one who has to answer to God in the end, not me. I've done my due diligence in warning you - not about pirating, but about the orientation of your heart. I don't care if you want to call it entertainment or culture or self improvement. None of those labels change anything. They're just things you tell yourself to make you feel better. Go for it. As you say, just let it rest.

1. "How does God feel about it?", or Feminine morality in dystopia

2 upvotes · 5 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is an excellent conclusion, and I hope OP takes your advice. As I noted elsewhere, based on my last interaction when OP brought this topic up, it's clear he's not interested in the orientation of his life. You cannot be oriented toward both the world and God at the same time. Instead, we are to, as Paul says, "reconcile the things of this world" to be used for God's purposes. That can include video games, TV, movies, books, etc. But those things can only be included if they are being consumed for the purpose of advancing a calling God gave us.

As I have often said before, I like watching TV. I don't get to do as much of it as I used to, but I've seen enough TV in my day that I can walk up to anyone on the street, ask them if they've seen any good shows lately, and be able to hold a conversation with them about whatever they bring up. I could then leverage that conversation and relationship for the advancement of the Gospel in their lives. Some of the shows I watched back in the day were pirated. Long explanations aside, much of that content was redeemed in future relationships I built with non-believers or people I was discipling. I don't believe there was any sin there because of the purpose for which I was doing it, despite the fact that I was entertained as a secondary function.

Another point worth noting: during the time that I was doing this, I was already fairly maximized in my capacity to make disciples and continue my own journey of spiritual growth. It's not like I was watching all that TV as a substitute to evangelism, discipleship, quiet times, Scripture memory, prayer, Bible study, fellowship, etc. I was doing all of those things and only consumed TV shows after my higher priorities were met, and in a manner that supplemented what I was already doing. So, when I found out that Chad and his wife were really into Walking Dead, I made that the focus of my TV-watching. I was discipling Chad and he and his wife were both in my small group. That show created a great relational context for me to connect with them and minister to them.

But OP's stated purpose is his own self-amusement and entertainment. He just wants to kick his boredom to the curb and has provided no information on how many guys he's discipling, how many people he has shared his faith with in the past month, how many verses he's memorized in the past month, how many days he's had a quiet time, how many hours in prayer, how much time he's spent in in-depth Bible study, etc. The implication, then, is that he is looking to justify his piracy under the law because he knows he is not in a position to redeem it for some other godly purpose. I hope I'm wrong in this assumption, but nothing in any content OP has ever posted would imply otherwise.

That is why I think OP's post is a bunch of BS, regardless of the technicalities either way. Simply put, his heart is in the wrong place. Per Romans 14:23, if it's not coming from faith, it's sin, even if it is legal under some weird technical justification of whatever passages he wants to look at.

Competency and Good Looks of an Idealized Alpha, Character of a Biblical Alpha

2 upvotes · 3 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Let's be clear: alpha and godly are not the same thing. They often overlap, but are two separate spectrums. A guy

can be truly alpha and not godly at all. He can also be truly godly and not alpha at all (depending on life context). Ideally a man should be both alpha and godly, particularly if he is to be married.

I'm not a fan of the "a true alpha acts in such and such godly way" sentiment. We can say this definitively of a godly man, but it means something different to be an alpha man. As CS Lewis would say, "We already have a word for godly: godly." So let's not start confusing terms.

Now, all of that being said, it does seem that you are acting in godliness with respect to caring for your widowed loved one (circumstance dependent, of course). But nothing in this post implies alpha. It sounds like you're trying to rationalize your isolation and still feel like a "man" (whatever that means to you).

In reality, don't give a squat what we think or whether or not people see you as a "real man." Don't rationalize or justify your life. Doing so proves the opposite of your claim. You want to stay single and take care of your mother in law? Go for it. You don't need our stamp of approval. You want to ditch her and go find a girl? That's none of our business.

Being alpha doesn't mean you prove your alphaness to other dudes, which only really serves to limit or control your choices to that which you think will cause other guys to perceive you as alpha. The real alpha doesn't care if other men think he is beta ... something that's really hard to figure out from the secular RP subs who will say DNGAF then ridicule you and attempt to get you to GAF about their opinions.

Long story short, you're doing some good things here, but you also seem to be missing the point and confusing terms. I hope this reply helps straighten things out a bit for you :) Sorry if it comes off as unnecessarily harsh ... my mental filter is garbage when on mobile.

Steven Anderson on women's roles according to the bible.

2 upvotes · 1 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

No, they're not irrelevant. I'm not sure where you got that from. They just warrant a lot more leniency.

Is there anything we as young men we can do to slowly dispel a Jezebel spirit with RP principles?

2 upvotes · 29 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

And yes, if she did it to him she would do it to you eventually as well. Good call.

More to OP: This makes sense on one level. But from a different angle, if he waits patiently for the relationship to end, and only then makes his move, she might still be the type who would branch swing when another guy shows initiative - only under this plan he has no way of knowing or expecting it because he didn't take the opportunity to test it for himself. Perhaps the better option would have been to test it while she was still with the other guy, then turn her down if she went for it ... and if she didn't go for it and she wanted to resolve things with the other guy first, then all the better.

Is there anything we as young men we can do to slowly dispel a Jezebel spirit with RP principles?

2 upvotes · 29 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Nonetheless come Monday, we will need to greet each other and then sit in silence until the day is over, and then repeat until the semester is over, I imagine we won't be actively trying to sit together in the future.

Wait, wait, wait ... why do you "need" to greet her?

Because social conventions demand that I act a certain way around people in certain contexts

Screw that. You don't "need" to do anything. You don't want to greet her? Don't. If you do want to, do it. The compulsion that you "need" to do something because some social nicety forces you to is a display of weakness.

even if it is lingering oneitis

It is. This is exactly what you're describing.

Just assigned seating is the problem.

No, assigned seating is your barbell. It's like you're a kid and your mommy dropped you off at the gym. You think to yourself, "There are so many weights around. This makes me feel uncomfortable. I know if I just sit here doing nothing for long enough, my mommy will pick me up again and the problem will just go away."

Instead, you've got a unique opportunity to learn how to deal with your feelings. Not many people are forced into it. Some people like to run and cower by just "next/ghost her and move on." Here you actually have to spend time in an awkward situation. That's a beautiful thing.

How are you going to handle it? Are you going to confront her? Are you going to develop an internal peace so that it doesn't feel awkward anymore? Are you going to utilize the awkwardness back at her for some purpose? I don't know. There are lots of options here. But "just wait and hope it goes away" is the weakest one.

I know that we will never be an item

Kick that attitude out of your head. Don't be a defeatist. If you want her, go get her. If you don't, don't. If she's not a Christian, certainly don't. But don't let your assumptions about what *might* or *might not* be true affect your decisions. That's weak and unattractive. I did that for most of my life. I was an over-analyzer. I assessed probabilities and statistics and only took chances worth betting on, including with relationships. That was idiotic. Don't be like I was. Be Han Solo - "Never tell me the odds!"

In fact, maybe the best thing you can do is just cold approach her. Ask her on a proper date. Let yourself get rejected ... or not. Worst case scenario, you get complete closure and practice the art of hearing "no" and moving on. Best case scenario, she gets attracted at the fact that you grew a spine.

For what it's worth, it seems like the reason she lost interest in you is that she probably found another guy. She had you on the hook, you didn't bite, so she moved on and got bitter at you because she wanted you first. Don't let "I think she has a boyfriend" be an excuse, though. If there's no ring on her finger, she's fair game.

I am certain there should be some Christian principles/virtues that could be relied on to mend a bad situation into something that won't look as bad once the scarring is permanent sometime in the future

First off: *why would there be scarring?!?!?* That just makes no sense to me. Why are you so hung up on this girl that letting her walk away is going to leave some immortal wound on your soul?

Second: The biblical principles about mending relationships only apply to those who you're actually in relationship with - and who also are brothers/sisters in Christ. If she's a non-Christian, just drop her like a rock and practice internal peace when you're around her. If she is a Christian, but she's not part of your social circle, then who cares? Matthew 18 doesn't really apply to you there. If she is still a significant part of your social circle (which you've already said she's not) or was to a degree that you would have had a Matthew 18 obligation, then just confront the issue head on. Tell her what's bothering you, try to make peace, and move on with wherever the chips fall.

I know it sounds all complicated

Just the opposite: it sounds incredibly simple. You got ONEitis, she lost interest, you're feeling scorned. Any other complication is in your head. There are only three courses of action: (1) confront her about what's going on, (2) master the art of internal peace in the face of awkwardness and conflict, or (3) whine and cry about it.

Personally, I think #1 is going to be the most beneficial, long-term. Every time you learn to face a difficult situation head-on you toughen up a bit inside and it becomes easier and easier as time goes on. This will benefit you relationally, in your career, with your family, sexually when you're married, etc.

Bible commentaries: What can you recommend?

2 upvotes · 29 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Also, it's not a Bible commentary.

"Why Orthodox Men Love Church" - I thought this article applied to some red pill principles and thought I'd share my/this perspective with everyone.

2 upvotes · 28 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

The large chunk of text you quoted is total garbage. It wrongly assumes that protestants forbid the use of "icons." I know countless protestants pictures and statutes and whatnot of Jesus in their homes. This isn't forbidden. What is forbidden as *idolatry* (not *iconoclasm* - I don't even know how that enters into the conversation) is worshipping the image *as if the image has some spiritual connection to the person depicted.

If a church has a statue of Jesus at the altar, I have no problem with that. If someone thinks that *the statue itself* has some mystical property that makes it easier to connect with Jesus, or more likely that your prayer will be heard, or some other thing that implies a belief that the physical material standing in front of them is somehow divine or intimately interwoven with the divine - that is the problem. That is idolatry.

Iconoclasm, the heresy which teaches against the use of icons, is thus precisely a denial of the Incarnation

This is just laughable. Seriously, what a joke. So, if I refuse to pray to a statue I'm suddenly denying that Jesus came to earth in the flesh? Whoever the author was that wrote that blog excerpt has no intellectual integrity.

2000 years of Christian history supports the use and veneration of images

Absolutely.

as part of Christian worship of the Holy Trinity

Nope. Now we're confusing the icon for the trinity again. Let's not do that. The icons are a symbol and reminder of the trinity. They are not the trinity themselves, otherwise what are we to do when our house becomes cluttered with all these icons? If my reverence for God is tied to my treatment of an icon, I could never throw away a picture of Jesus because that would somehow be disrespecting God himself. That's absurd. Or what if I draw a cross on the chalk board? Now I'm disrespecting the cross if I erase it, thereby defiling the icon.

If the icon is not mystical in itself, as the author claims, then our worship of God is independent of anything to do with the icon itself. However, if the icon can help us remember God in a manner that enhances our ability to love, appreciate, thank, etc. God - then the icon has value. But the icon's value is not for its own sake; it has value only to the degree of the independent worship of God that it generates.

As I often say, there is a map and there is a destination. The icon can sometimes function as a map to help us reach the destination: connecting with God or worshiping God. Once you're at the destination, the map is pretty much worthless and can be thrown away if you don't think you'll need it anymore.

To that end, I have grown in my reverence for Christ through artistic renderings, icons, pictures, etc. But at the

same time, I have no regard for the objects themselves, except to the degree that they may contribute to that purpose. At the end of the day, they are still just objects.

To make the assumption that *every person* must somehow have this mystical connection to God through use of icons is simply over-generalizing. I won't stop someone from pursuing that path if it is beneficial to them. So, I welcome the Orthodox to continue using icons as they do, if they find it beneficial. But as soon as they equate our treatment and emotional disposition toward an icon as the equivalent of our treatment and emotional disposition of God, a clear boundary is crossed.

this is what keeps me from seeing the Orthodox faith as a viable option for me

Meh, the icon thing isn't as big a deal to me. Again, I see validity in their use, just as long as it's not mandated and there's a rational (even if misguided) theology behind it.

There are more serious concerns with the Orthodox church, mostly revolving around their views of ecclesiology, which border on the heretical (though I won't quite go that far).

marriage prep: confront her with my past sexual sins?

2 upvotes · 28 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Agreed in full :)

marriage prep: confront her with my past sexual sins?

2 upvotes · 28 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Yeah, my experience is that maybe 1% of Christians instinctively pray about situations and seek guidance from the Spirit and the other 99% tend to seek guidance from other Christians to tell them what their conscience or biblical interpretation should be without regard for what it actually is.

Humility - the “mother of all virtues,” and pride, “the cause of all sin.”

2 upvotes · 23 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Amen :)

Pastor injects Feminism at Wedding Ceremony

2 upvotes · 23 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Well, let's be honest ... the whole wedding ceremony concept is a pretty feminist process in the first place. Most men would be fine without all the ado. It predominantly serves to fulfill the woman's sense of hyper-romanticism about marriage rather than accepting the hard reality of life after the fact of marriage, which is nowhere near as fantasy-driven as the ceremony and ideology in her mind would otherwise cause her to believe. That's not to say weddings are bad. They certainly *can have value*, but they are often not utilized appropriately to add positive value to a couple's post-marriage life.

Pastor injects Feminism at Wedding Ceremony

2 upvotes · 23 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is more of what I mean when I talk about the difference between philosophy and theology. Theologically, there is no explanation for why God utilized the rib. We just know he did. So, it is a theological fact that the rib was utilized to create woman. Any speculation on why he used the rib (ex. "It's close to the heart," as many pastors suggest) or why he didn't use some other part (as in your story) is purely philosophical argument.

Philosophy will always follow the wisdom of the world. Right now that worldly wisdom is feminist, so it makes sense that these philosophical musings from Scripture are going to follow a feminist train of thought.

This is the danger in confusing philosophy with theology.

Humility - the "mother of all virtues," and pride, "the cause of all sin."

2 upvotes · 23 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I see where you're coming from. I do agree that humility is incredibly important and that many other virtues are rendered moot if expressed without humility, and thus humility is a foundation of many of the virtues.

I still don't buy into the "mother of all virtues" concept, but that's more due to a fundamental difference with some of the texts you quoted and also that I do believe *humility* and *poor in spirit* are two very different things.

- **Humility** has to do with having an accurate self-perception with regard to where one stands before God and other humans. I can say quite appropriately: "You probably don't know a better racquetball player than me." I can make this statement in perfect humility because, guess-work aside, it's probably true and I have every reason to believe in the veracity of the statement - *and because* even if I did get beaten by someone else you know, I would gladly accept my new understanding.
- Being **poor in spirit** relates more directly to the condition of a person's spiritual state at any given time. Someone who feels backed into a corner and has nowhere else to turn to is the one who is poor in spirit. The Matthew 5:3 word for "poor" is not *penes* or *penechros*, which are words to describe a condition of physical poverty; rather, it is *ptochos*, which more literally translates as "to crouch or cower as one helpless." It can be used when someone who is financially destitute has that feeling, but often-times the financially destitute still maintain an inappropriate sense of confidence in their situation and do not have that sense of helplessness about them. In the reverse, the same concept is applied (but using a Hebrew word) in Psalm 34:6 when David, a king, describes himself saying, "This poor man cried out, and the Lord heard him, and saved him out of all his troubles." The concept here is the same as the *poor in spirit* notion in the beatitudes: that there is some trouble and sense of helplessness. This does not necessitate a humility, although the two certainly often overlap.

All that said, I'd wager, like you said, that we agree with each other on a lot more than we disagree on this point. So, I appreciate your sharing these resources, as they were very interesting and gave good food for thought :) Even if I don't agree with everything coming from them, there's always something valuable that comes out when people work diligently to divide the Word of God :D

Humility - the "mother of all virtues," and pride, "the cause of all sin."

2 upvotes · 22 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is a perfect example of where philosophy disguised as theology leads to incorrect answers. The author calls humility the "mother of all virtues" and then references several passages that say humility is a good thing. He very marginally makes an argument for why other virtues are derived from humility, but doesn't ever actually make his case - he just kind of says it. At best, he's using conventional thinking to amp up humility as the highest virtue.

That's what this man says. What does God say? "And now these three remain: faith, hope, and love, but the greatest of these is love" (1 Cor. 13:13). What does Jesus say? The greatest commands are to **love** God and **love** others (Matthew 22:36-40). Where is our core identity found? In Christ (Galatians 3:27-28). And how will the world know we are in Christ? By the way we love one another (John 13:34-35).

So, while I greatly appreciate the value of humility, let's not confuse this author's exaggerated speak about the virtue for what the Bible actually says. Humility is not the "mother of all virtues." If anything could claim that title, it is love. This is what the Bible says. But gimmicky titles like "mother of all virtues" certainly does sound catchy and gets readers, I'm sure. But let's never put man's philosophy over God's theology.

As for humility in its proper context - not as the "mother of all virtues," but as a very important virtue - the author is correct in his description. It's not about degrading yourself or devoiding any confidence from your life. It's about understanding who you are in your own proper context and living out of that.

One thing I do believe is that self-confidence should be eradicated from our lives entirely. This sounds counter-intuitive up-front, especially to an RP audience, but hear me out.

Philippians 3 is very, very telling. Paul starts out talking about non-believers who demanded physical/worldly symbols to outwardly demonstrate one's faith - specifically the Jews claiming to be Christians who were demanding Gentiles to be circumcised. Paul then contrasts this with the genuine believers saying, "it is we who ... put no confidence in the flesh - though I myself have reasons for such confidence." He then lists a litany of reasons why he is better than everyone else. In modern RP lingo it would go something like: "I bench over 400lbs, girls literally faint when I walk into the room, I'm totally OI, DNGAF, OYS more than any other guy you've ever met, etc. - and it's all true; I'm not just boasting here."

Then he says, "But whatever was to my gain I now consider a loss for the sake of Christ. What is more, I consider **everything a loss** *because of the surpassing greatness of knowing Christ Jesus my Lord*, for whose sake I have lost all things. I consider them garbage, that I may gain Christ and be found in him." In other words, "All that stuff that the other guys boast about - that can be good stuff, but my confidence isn't from those things, and they're garbage in and of themselves."

Instead, we see that his confidence is in Christ and that his inner contentment in life is (per chapter 4) found in that "I can do all things through Him who gives me strength." Secular RP says that men maintain their confidence and inner-peace/stoicism/frame/whatever you want to call it because they know they are awesome and they are the prize ... because of all the physical things they can point to about their great qualities. Christian RP says we pursue those things, but don't rely on them as our source of inner-strength; rather, we rely on Christ.

For this reason, our confidence should not be in ourselves, nor should we believe we are "the prize" simply because we are strong, charming, intelligent, hard-working, etc. We are the prize because we have Christ in us and He works through us to do things that actually matter - and this compels us to strive to be strong, charming, intelligent, hard-working, etc. as peripheral traits, not the core traits of our identity themselves.

Or to be more clear: we are not to have self-confidence; we are to have Christ-confidence. But if we are in Christ, our identity is in Christ, and therefore our confidence in Christ is rightly attributed to our *self*-esteem - not for the outward things we display, but because of who is in us and what he compels us to do. That is where humility is found.

Update to an update

2 upvotes · 20 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

So she has a mission in life, albeit a short-sighted one. You haven't expressed a mission yet. Her mission is more important to her than you are. Since you don't have a clearly articulated mission, you don't know what boundaries you should set or maintain. Her mission makes sense to you, so you can't figure out if supporting her in her mission is a good role for you.

It's not. Entering into or pursuing a relationship with a woman whose actions clearly express that her mission is more important to her than your mission is a clear recipe for failure. Note that I said *your mission* and not *you personally*. You've gotta figure out that mission thing. Your mission is what should attract women to you, and it's what should drive the boundaries you set in the relationship. It's also what will create your frame and how you invite others into your frame.

If you do have a clear mission, there's only one question: *Is she living in a way that is supportive and advantageous*

to your mission? If the answer is no, then leave her and move on. It's literally that simple.

Also, listen to everything everyone else here has said. You're being given some good advice.

Open thread idea

2 upvotes · 20 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Agreed.

Open thread idea

2 upvotes · 20 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I trained in boxing at one point. It wasn't something I was overly intense about at the time, but it will definitely kick your butt into shape. For raw strength training and brawling capacity it's definitely my recommendation. Other forms will focus more on toning, speed, and flexibility at the expense of strength. Of course, for sexual strategy toning is probably more important than anything else anyway.

Pursuing a Godly Woman - Advice Needed

2 upvotes · 20 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I agree with [u/OsmiumZulu](#) - everything he's written in this thread, for that matter.

You're looking for OT God to talk to you, when he spoke verbally through the Father. Then Jesus came and spoke through actions and modeling God's will. Today the Holy Spirit shows God's will by becoming one with us, transforming us.

As I often say of late: *The Spirit doesn't tell you God's will; he transforms you into the type of person who doesn't have to ask in the first place.*

The Church converting to paganism

2 upvotes · 15 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

The economic aspects of the early church were based on the fact that they were under political persecution unto death. Many of them couldn't hold typical jobs or engage in the public marketplace for fear of being hunted or killed, so they engaged in communes with one another as a base means of survival and avoiding the implication that they presented a serious harm/threat to the government. In essence, as long as they were keeping to themselves, Nero was less likely to amp up his efforts to kill them all off.

A Guide to Manipulation - Part 2: The Tactics

2 upvotes · 15 March 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Gotcha. Agreed.

The Church converting to paganism

2 upvotes · 15 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Good read. I've only recently started listening to Peterson, but from what I can tell he thinks on the same wavelength I do, as with many of us here, albeit still purple in many respects.

All the same, I applaud your efforts to reach people with a non watered down understanding of the bible. Just be cautious not to make the mistake Peterson is warning about: focusing your efforts on an anti feminist ideology in the church rather than the bible itself. I'm very cautious NOT to do that with this sub, as the tendency of most red pill people is to make the red pill itself an idol.

Dalrock's blog is a great example of this (as opposed to his personal ministry, which I know nothing about). He

says really good and valuable things on his blog. I encourage men to read what he has to say and put his blog on the sidebar for that purpose. But at the end of the day, his focus is not on the faith itself, but on an ideology - and he uses his faith as a context for talking about that ideology rather than using the ideology to advance the purposes of his faith, or just focusing on the faith in the absence of an ideological agenda at all.

I'm not saying what he's doing is bad by any means. That type of niche blogging is necessary so that the appropriate weight of one topic is not lost in the balance with everything else. But it's still pushing an ideology (albeit a good one) by leeching/being a parasite off of Christianity.

In an online blog format, this is perfectly fine. But as a focal intent of a personal ministry, as Peterson says, don't let the ideology become a parasite that leeches away from the whole of what the bible teaches; rather, treat it more like a leech that you intentionally put on dead skin to eat away the dead bits and let healthy skin grow in its place ... while still making use of all the rest of the body that wasn't decaying in the first place.

What are your positions on...

2 upvotes · 15 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

1 Timothy 2 is another very similar passage from a different author that reaches the same conclusion. But I tend to agree with your interpretation all the same. But it's not just the rich they're referencing. They're talking about the way the prostitutes doll themselves up or, as OZ recently noted, the priestess of Artemis (who I believe also engaged in sexual rituals and forms of religious prostitution).

For Singles: Finding the Girl You Can't Keep Yourself From Banging

2 upvotes · 14 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Haha ... I hear you. Just be cautious, though. The aspects of your mission that should allure women to you are things that should naturally expand your social network and that women would understand to be fruitful for God's kingdom.

So, if your mission is to "take the ... Church head on" as your adversary, that will fulfill neither of these purposes. In many ways I felt like that's what I was doing too, but tact means everything. Phrase it that your mission is not against the church, but to redirect the church.

Imagine a hockey puck gliding along the wall, behind the goal, and back toward the half of the court where it came from. Now imagine smacking it straight against the wall "head on." Which one seems more graceful? Which will maintain the most momentum once the puck is moving the right direction again?

Keep that imagery in mind when deciding how to pursue your mission. Pastors can get on board a lot easier if you come alongside them in a redirective fashion, which will work to increase your social network and maintain the apparent integrity of your mission to outsiders. Smacking head on just made me look like a defiant idiot when I used to employ that method.

As [u/Whitified](#) once noted, women often associate tact with charm and charisma. Good tact is attractive. Bad tact is not.

A Guide to Manipulation - Part 1: Are You Being Manipulated?

2 upvotes · 13 March 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Ah, I see the disconnect here. My point is obviously not to blame manipulation, as if that would do any good. It's to pull men out of the manipulation. Lift, diet, sidebar, etc. are the practical steps to do that.

The point isn't to blame the quicksand for trying to kill you. It's to understand that you're in quicksand so that you know how to escape, as compared to if you were stuck in the mud or the ocean.

The other point of the post isn't just about the man's condition, but in acknowledging the woman's actual

affirmative desire for some of these conditions in her own life.

Girl problems

2 upvotes · 6 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I understand and agree as to the concepts. Thanks.

Girl problems

2 upvotes · 6 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I look forward to hearing it.

But the point is that the man *should* do what he wants - that's how he maintains his frame. I agree entirely that if he's doing it because he thinks *she deserves* an answer or something along those lines, he's breaking frame. But sometimes there's a psychological need, even in the man's case, to create definitive closure, which can be productive for his frame ... so I don't like cutting off the option entirely, and thereby defer to whatever the man himself wants to do in the situation.

Rollo Tomassi – Interviews and Video

2 upvotes · 6 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Exciting info. Thanks for the update on this. Audio/video are always easier ways to ingest information throughout the workday and at the gym.

Piracy: Pharisaism or Libertarianism?

2 upvotes · 6 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

You guys are basically suggesting that I sacrifice my cultural diet on the altar of petty legalism. Aren't you?

No, I'm suggesting that if you're not willing to sacrifice your cultural diet at all in the pursuit of obedience, then you're in a sinful state such that no matter what the answer is, there's no point.

Take the example of eating pork. Imagine me saying, "I don't care what the actual answer is, I'm going to eat it anyway. But if you can all help me find a biblical justification for it so I don't have to feel guilty when I do it, that'd be great." Now, we know that biblically all meats are "clean" now, so there's no sin in eating pork. But when I maintain that attitude, whether I eat pork or not, I'm still sinning, even though the actual eating of the pork might not be sinful. My heart is totally in the wrong place. I'm not looking to honor God; I'm looking to justify my actions. That's what's wrong.

As I've said before, there are some contexts in which piracy may not be sinful, but if your attitude is, "Screw what God wants. I'm going to do it anyway. I just want you to help take away my guilt" ... there's nothing that can be done to help you. The reason it's trolling is because you ask up-front if it's sinful as if it's a legitimate question you're wrestling with, but then you blatantly reject any suggestion that it is sinful and say that you've already made up your mind on the subject. That's trolling.

If your attitude was: "I just want to obey God. If God doesn't want me to do it, then I'll stop and never do it again. But I'd really like to know, because that's a hard command to follow" ... that type of attitude I can get behind and would warrant sharing appropriate contexts for when pirating would not be "sinful."

Piracy: Pharisaism or Libertarianism?

2 upvotes · 6 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

If you torrent something and keep seeding it after your download, you are still redistributing it to others who otherwise may have paid if it was not available online.

Plus, this argument fails to see the *en masse* effect. If only one or two people download it who otherwise never would have bought it, then the company has not lost anything. But as hundreds or thousands of people do so, the ability to gain access to this content becomes more readily available to the degree that others who would have paid are now opting to get it for free instead, and even though you're not one of them your participation in the grand scheme has contributed to that problem, even if you're not seeding it yourself. You have still demonstrated to someone somewhere that there is a large market for this stuff and websites that get paid by advertisement are happy to let leechers-only people join because they still get their advertising dollars from you for having clicked on their page in the first place. That is, you are contributing to keeping alive an illegal website, thereby offering passive assistance to those who actually are depriving the content-creator of the money that otherwise would have been paid if that website/torrent/whatever did not exist.

Long story short, you're still trying to justify a decision you've already made up in your mind. You're trolling at this point. As I've noted elsewhere, there are certainly contexts in which piracy may not be "sinful," but the way you're approaching this is so off-base that I can't support it and I'm inclined to agree with [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) that this topic as a whole is off-point for this sub to a degree that maybe this whole thread needs removed.

How to approach "proposing"?

2 upvotes · 6 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

You should have talked about these things in depth ... *many* marriage related topics ... conversations ... chats that somehow turned into a 2-3 hour conversation

Nah, bro. Your main point is spot on: that if he has to ask, he's not ready for marriage (and it's even less likely she is!). But he shouldn't be getting this information from what she says. He should be looking at how she behaves. The way she acts while dating will only degrade post-marriage. So, if she's not following his lead now, it doesn't matter how many conversations they've had - she's not going to follow him during the marriage without some serious "the power of Christ compels you!" transformation in her heart. *Acta non verba*. Let's never forget that. Look at what she does, not what she says. You're usually the first to bust that out even.

Other than that, all of your other topics of consideration are spot on. To that end, I'd even adopt [/u/rocknrollchuck](#)'s recommendation of setting clear boundaries up-front and seeing how she responds. Although it's still verbage from OP to her, it gives her an opportunity to react so he can gauge her actions in response to those topics. Asking her for her opinions on them directly like this makes it seem like too much of a mutual decision rather than a leader asking for valuable insights from his helper. Of course, I'll assume you meant for him to employ tact in these conversations all the same.

How to approach "proposing"?

2 upvotes · 6 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

It's great that you want to get married but you have not done your homework on her if you have to ask her if she will respect you after marriage and will comply to male leadership.

Amen to that. Great response overall.

How to approach "proposing"?

2 upvotes · 6 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Definitely not the first option, unless your frame is a cold robotic dictator. Personally, I reject the heartless frame and like to be fun and upbeat. If your frame is fun and upbeat, your proposal should be as well. Whatever your frame is, stick with that and follow through.

I get the impression you're trying to teach her a lesson. You want to control her. You can't. Besides, women change their minds all the time, so she might answer the right things today and decide differently tomorrow. *Acta non verba*.

Go have fun with it, but above all: do what you want. If you want to make a big extravaganza about it, go do that. If you want to just ask her on the couch after a tv show, do that. But undercutting what you want to do just to sound and feel macho is neither RP nor in your own frame.

Girl problems

2 upvotes · 6 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

The ONEitis is strong with this one.

What were Christ's "boundaries"?

2 upvotes · 6 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

what they personally feel are right

I'd clarify: what the Holy Spirit leads them to believe is right. Of course, as I have often said on my more public blogging forum, *The Holy Spirit rarely tells us directly what God desires of us; he's more in the business of transforming us into the type of people who don't need to ask in the first place.*

it really seems to be him taking authority instead of ...

Correct.

setting a boundary

I'm not sure what that would be other than that he won't be distracted from his mission, even by those he loves. This is for us to dokie also and is the heart of 1 Cor. 7 saying, "From now on let those with wives live as though they had none" and Jesus also saying, "If anyone does not hate his mother and brothers, wife, children and even himself he can't be my disciple" ... aka: my mission must come first.

bearing fruit

The concept I was getting at was Jesus seeing a clear boundary for us: were either good fruit bearing soil/plants or we're cut down and thrown out. That's how he engages with his bride, as should we, though he is not without patience in the process.

Likewise, as husbands we are right to set clear expectations on our wives and enforce consequences with that same measure of grace, mercy, and patience.

So, I can't choose your boundaries for you, but I can look at these types of passages and tell you principles in how to select those boundaries and enforce them.

How would one approach this text and hold frame in a beneficial way coming from a Christian perspective?

2 upvotes · 5 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

It seems like looking at talking to women in this way portrays more confidence because you aren't expecting anything in return (needy/nice guy-esque) and just being totally honest within one's frame. Is that what you are saying here?

That's exactly what I'm saying. I interact the same way with my wife, although the context is obviously very different. I don't have some inherent expectation or demand of her sexual interest in me, as if I could negotiate or demand desire in the first place. I interact with her as someone who lives closely alongside me for the purpose of helping me in a mission, and I utilize the relationship for that purpose. And on days that we're "burning with passion" then we have sex. On days when we're not, we don't. Adopting this attitude has increased marital sexuality rather than decreased it, contrary to blue pill thinking. In essence, it's the DNGAF/OI/mission-oriented mentality that attracts her to me in the first place.

What do you mean by this?

The Old Testament clearly gives an imperative toward marriage. This is evident from Genesis and lasts through the time of the prophets. If someone was not married or producing physical offspring, including a male heir, that was disgraceful. That imperative exists and cannot be denied.

However, in a post-Gospel world we know that the imperative toward physical offspring is redirected toward spiritual offspring. As Paul says in Romans 9, it's not those of the "blood" of Abraham, but those children of the "promise" that matter.

So, where God told us to become one flesh with one another as husband and wife to produce physical offspring, we now no longer have a physical imperative toward this because our new command is to become one with Christ as his bride for the purpose of producing spiritual offspring (through evangelism) and raising those offspring (discipleship) until they're old enough to reproduce and raise offspring themselves (generational ministry). That is, God established the generational family structure of the Old Testament as a foreshadowing of the type of spiritual ministry he would utilize through us as the church in a post-Gospel world.

It sounds like the conclusion I'm reading is that "marriage is most likely if I'm open to it (and I most likely will get married), but that isn't, and shouldn't, be the goal". I should focus on coming into the frame of Christ, and in turn, make disciples through that calling by becoming more like Christ and going out in the world in all humility and developing my frame and mission/vision.

Correct.

What were Christ's "boundaries"?

2 upvotes · 5 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This does make more sense. Christ's boundaries were always very clearly articulated and came with an on/off switch. "If you want to follow me or be my disciple, you must ___. *If you don't do* ___, you can't follow me or be my disciple."

Likewise, as men we must do the same: "If you want to be my wife and follow me, then you must ___. *If you don't do* ___, you can't be my wife or (if you're already married) reap the benefits of being my wife."

To be clear, there are many who self-identify as "Christ's disciples" or "followers of Jesus" or whatever, but they're not going to get those benefits on judgment day if they don't meet the criteria laid out by Christ and most potently expressed through the Gospel (see Matthew 7, for example, with the whole "I never knew you" bit).

To that end, although I may have made a spiritual covenant with someone and become one flesh with someone, if she wants to *continue reaping the benefits* of our union from me, she better keep being fruitful in the relationship as well. If not, she falls in the numerous passages where Jesus talks about an unfruitful tree ... and that's not pretty. Of course, divorce laws work against a guy here, but that's the gist of it.

Now, the way you do that without getting yourself caught in a divorce is by adopting such traits as humility, kindness, patience, etc. As with the parable of the fig tree, the owner was going to cut it down and throw it in the

fire until the gardener said, "Hold up, be patient with this tree. Let me fertilize it and water it and try to get it to grow some fruit before you cut it down." The owner agreed. Likewise, we should give our wives time to come around to following our lead, ergo the 1,000 foot rope.

From there, the implication I get from the passage on Abraham pleading for Sodom (Genesis 18) is that if the fig tree were to have even born only one healthy fruit, then the master would have let it live, just as if Sodom had even only 10 righteous people (and presumably this would have continued to just 1) God would have spared it. So, even if you don't have a super beautiful, highly fruitful tree of a wife, if she is producing good fruit and not only bad, then you've got to take what you get.

But at the same time, 1 Cor. 3 also says that some people will be saved, "but only as one escaping through the flames" and that all of their fruitless stuff will be burned away. I take this to mean that if a wife has very little fruit to show for herself toward the marriage and her contribution in the man's mission, then the man should remain married (because she does have fruit), but he doesn't need to be showering her with lavish blessings either ... her role in the marriage should meet however one defines "escaping through the flames," which doesn't sound all that pretty.

Hopefully that's a little closer to what you intended.

Wife and I fight when I am ill.

2 upvotes · 2 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I agree completely. I think where it got confusing was when OP was comparing his wife to his mother and suggesting he wanted his wife to care for him the same way his mother did. That would be inappropriate. But her more general lack of care altogether is also inappropriate.

Of course, as you appropriately note: he can't force her to provide his expected level of care. So, to some extent, he's just got to man up and deal with it for now until he can learn to lead his wife into a place where she more naturally has that loving, submissive inclination toward him, which she presently lacks. She's not magically going to get there on her own. He's going to have to lead her into it.

Wife and I fight when I am ill.

2 upvotes · 2 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I've dealt with the same thing from my wife. When she's sick, the whole world must stop to attend to her every need. When I'm sick it's, "Aw, I'm sorry you're feeling bad. Can you do the dishes and vacuum the floor?" Or at least that's how it used to be.

Here's the deal: you're not wrong in wanting to be cared for. This is a perfectly appropriate feeling. Yeah, there are clear mommy issues tied into this, and I'll get to that. But the fact of what you want and what you actually get rarely align. You are also right in other posts to expect your wife to submit to you and respect your leadership, but she doesn't do it, right? You're also right to expect that she should have sex with you when you want it, right? After all, biblically we're called not to deprive one another and that her body belongs to you as much as yours to her - and this in a sexual context, right? But she doesn't live that out, does she?

We're all sinners. We all have expectations both biblically and pragmatically that simply will never be satisfied. On the 404 circles illustration, you're looking to be illegitimately satisfied through your wife. Is it any wonder that you then find yourself illegitimately empty when she fails you?

Does she have an obligation to help you and support you through your time of sickness? Absolutely. But the harsh reality is that she's human and will fail you. You must accept that, embrace it, and not let it shake you. The fact that this does shake you - that you are upset by her failure to do her job - is where you have lost frame. Your emotional state is dependent on her actions. So, although I don't condone the way [/u/TheGlassStone](#) was trolling/stalking you, that's what he meant when he said you were in her frame. Because her actions decide your

emotions.

Now, as [/u/BirdManBrrrr](#) said, there are many different hats you're trying to put on her. Despite what the feminists may say, no woman can "do it all." God bless the ones who try! Most of them just don't.

You want her to be a submissive wife, passionate lover, nurse to her patients, mother to your children, nurse and mother to you, etc. and all of these roles just don't compute.

Different roles require different characteristics. Some women are surprisingly versatile and can change their character traits to suit many different relationships. But trying to get a woman to express two conflicting character traits in one relational context is difficult and won't likely happen.

Specifically, if you want your wife to treat you like your mommy treated you, ask yourself: how often did your mommy get horny at the thought of having sex with you? How often does your wife get horny taking care of your son when he's sick? How often does she get horny over the patients at the hospital? My guess is that if it happens, it's during times/phases when they're not showing significant external symptoms of illness - they don't need her to play mommy/nurse to them.

Now, you're probably thinking, "But I don't want to have sex with her when I'm sick like this - I just want her affection while I get better." Righto. But she can't separate the immediate temporal context from the long-term relational impact. In her mind, you are you. There isn't "sick BornRedy and not-sick BornRedy" ... there's only BornRedy. If she has to view and treat you as a sick child today, a month from now she's going to remember that emotional context of how she related to you and feel like she's having sex with a little boy. That's why [/u/BluepillProfessor](#) recommends taking things very slowly - because women cannot immediately change their relational context for interacting with people. They remember the feelings they had in the past and it takes time for their hearts and brains to rewire into the new order.

To be clear: they can't change their characteristics and internal emotional frame of reference very quickly when hopping from context to context with the same person. However, they *can change their characteristics and emotional frame of reference* when the contextual change is from one person to another person. So, if she's playing mommy to you, that doesn't stop her from playing sex bunny to someone else.

And when you took your hiatus from applying red pill principles in your home (per one of your previous posts), you imprinted in her mind, "Okay, that was just a phase. It won't last, so I don't really need to adapt. I just need to wait it out until he's back to his old ways again." This further validates in her mind that there is no need to even bother trying to change her characteristics and emotional frame of reference with you - because she thinks she'll just end up changing back anyway.

Long story short: don't expect her to wear multiple hats in her relationship with you. You can expect multiple hats in life generally, as she will have to wear one hat to your kids, another to her patients, another with you, etc. But when she relates with you, she's either your wife or your nurse or your mom or your counselor or your boss or your whatever. Pick one role and run with it. I suggest wife.

Now, you're probably thinking, "But shouldn't a *WIFE* be nurturing and affectionate to her husband when he's sick?" Ideally, yeah. That'd be great. But again, that's bluepill thinking. It's imputing a fantasy world into your expectations rather than living in the pragmatic reality of how she has always behaved in your marriage. The goal of red pill thinking is not to get people to meet our fantasized expectations. It's to learn how people actually function in the real world and make the most of that operating system to suit our own purposes (which in a Christian context should be God's purposes).

Since I know you're computer competent, imagine you're on your computer and you want to play a video game.

So, you spool up your windows operating system and start playing. Then you decide you want to record some audio and integrate a few things with your phone, so you uninstall windows and jerry rig an apple operating system, even though the components really aren't supposed to work that way and you have to do some weird hack to get it done. After you're finished with that you decide to do some programming, so you reformat the hard drive into a Linux operating system. When you're done with your programming project, you have some extra time, so you decide to reformat the hard drive back to windows to play your video game again.

What's going to happen here? (1) You're probably going to fry your computer pretty quickly. (2) All of your efforts are going to be run inefficiently. (3) You're going to find a lot of data corruption and lose lots of important files that prevent your computer from functioning appropriately in any of the operating systems, much less all 3. (4) If your computer had emotions it would hate you.

Your wife has many different operating systems. When you married her, you probably had some idealistic blue pill fantasy phrase like: "I love you just the way you are, and even if you never changed I'd want to be with you forever." Now you see the harsh reality that this simply wasn't true. You did expect her to change and she didn't. Or maybe it's the flip - you wanted her to stay that way forever, but *she ended up changing* because life changes and she can't be that cute college girl anymore who only had to worry about showing up to class and taking tests.

In all honesty, if you want her to be that person again, you can make it happen. You just have to remove all responsibilities from her life to the point where her present matches what things were like in the past. This means you doing 100% of the financial provision, doing all of the housework except for a portion of the house approximately equivalent in size to her college dorm room, you doing all of your and the kids' laundry, you managing all the finances, you giving her the emotional security and stability that her parents gave her such that if things go south, she knows it's all still going to be fine, etc., etc., etc. But that's just not realistic. I actually tried that with my wife for a time. It was awful. Her behavior shaped up, but I hated my life. On the [108 Life Path of a Relationship](#), that was backtracking rather than moving forward.

Pick one operating system and let her run on that. Windows is probably not the best operating system to be running for audio recording, phone integration and synchronization purposes. But you know what? Rough around the edges or not, you can still get the job done. Windows may not be the optimal operating system for computer programming and coding. But you know what? It's still good enough to get the job done. When it comes to just having fun and enjoying your time on the computer - yeah, it's the best.

Just like installing an Apple OS on a PC hard drive isn't supposed to work, there are some characteristics and emotional frames of reference that your wife should really not be having with you. Being your "mommy" is one of those. She can jerry rig some kind of an emotional hack to make it work, but it's not generally a good idea. That's why PCs can run some old emulators that are very low-maintenance just fine, but try running a PS4 game on your PC through an emulator. It might work, but there are going to be so many bugs and flaws and problems that it's just not worth it.

Anyway, I'm just rambling at this point and have to get back to work.

Husband pastor & quite time

2 upvotes · 2 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Define "home."

Everything that falls within the purview of the family. Responsibility for the home can be anything from fixing the deck to doing the dishes to providing income to put food on the table or teaching children how to be godly, productive adults.

... and other scholars I've read disagree, at least as it applies to the physical house

So, if the "physical house" has a leaky pipe or worn out shingles or broken boards on the deck, that's the wife's responsibility, right? Or is there a verse somewhere that says, "The husband shall do these things around the house: __, __, __ and the wife shall do these things: __, __, __"?

See what I'm saying? I can see some support for the notion that all of the housework is the wife's domain. That's why I acknowledge it's a legitimate position. But if you're going to make that leap, and there is no verse that says "except these responsibilities," then you've got to be willing to put the *WHOLE* burden on her. To be fair, my mom was that kind of wife. She was a stay at home and did all of the housework, including ripping out floor boards, redoing dry wall, fixing leaky pipes, cementing the back patio, etc. If that's the extreme you want to take it, my mom was a great example of this and I can really get behind that, even though I still don't think it's a biblical mandate. But if you're going to say that the home is the wife's domain, then start allocating home responsibilities to the man also, I think you'll have a much harder biblical case to make there. I'm more comfortable, biblically, with the position that the man is ultimately responsible for everything within the family, including the care of the house, and any conclusion that the housework itself is the wife's responsibility is only derivative of a cultural context that husbands chose for millennia to utilize their authority in the home to place that kind of housework in the wife's domain - not that there is a biblical mandate that they must make that her domain.

Are you a literalist? Are you in the non-literal "principles/intent" camp? Something else?

Fair question, I'm sure I wasn't clear. I believe that the intention of the author when he wrote the words on the page are what the Spirit inspired, and that the words themselves were also inspired by the Spirit to give adequate context to understand the author's intention at any given time.

When I said I was a literalist, I referenced two specific examples of cases where people (even hyper-literalists) try to explain away what Jesus said by saying, "He was just speaking in hyperbole when he told us to (1) gouge out our eyes and cut off our hands and (2) hate our mother and brothers and spouse and kids." If you look at the context of what Jesus is saying in both passages (and there are many more), you'll know that he meant exactly what he said - he was not speaking in hyperbole or facetiously. Likewise, using Titus 2:3-5 is another example where a *literal interpretation* leads to the conclusion that older women should teach younger women certain things, which includes how to work at home.

This is a great idea and something you promoted early on in this sub's creation - that this is a skill all women should have. But it goes beyond a literal interpretation of that passage to imply a command that younger women *must* work at home. The literal interpretation is simply that this is a skill they should be taught. In that sense, this is another case in that 95% where I believe authorial intent and the literal interpretation align. It becomes "hyper-literalist" when people exaggerate (i.e. "make hyper") the implication of the passage into a command that was never meant to be given: that younger women *must* work in the home.

The words/phrasing show it's clear a contrast is being made between things, and not commands for women to not braid their hair, etc.

How so? "Women should adorn themselves in respectable apparel, with modesty and self-control, not with braided hair and gold or pearls or costly attire." That seems pretty straight forward to me.

The way you get around it is with the next verse: "but with what is proper for women who profess godliness - with good works." Okay, so that's what Paul is really after: a woman who dresses in a way that professes godliness, not literally prohibiting them from braiding their hair.

... just like Titus 2 says "that the word of God may not be reviled," right? In one you're looking at the authorial intent in the command, yet the other is to be taken literally? That's a theological inconsistency.

we certainly give heavy credence to why God wants something as well as to what the commands are

Yeah, maybe I didn't communicate my point well there. The issue is which dominates: God's intent, or the technical letter of the law. A hyper-literalist will care about why God issued the law, but they don't allow that "why" to influence their interpretation of the command; rather, the command influences their interpretation of who God is in the first place. The WBC is a great example of all of this. They look to literal interpretations of biblical passages in very dangerous ways. They care deeply about why God gave those commands, but they don't let God's intent in giving the command control their expression of obedience; rather, they re-shape their view of God to fit the commands he gave, and you get a grossly distorted image of the faith when that happens.

And the reason fits just as well with a literal interpretation. That if one doesn't do those things, then the word of God is reviled, because they're not doing things God commanded.

But you're going beyond a literal reading of the passage to impute that as a command that was never given. It was simply a skill to be taught. Whether or not that skill is ever put to use is a different question - but all women should *be able to fulfill that role* in case their husbands call them to it.

I do think a woman can work outside the home and it's perfectly fine as long as she doesn't neglect her duties at home.

Yeah, I remembered you saying that. But you're still imputing some "duties at home" on the woman that somehow transcends her husband's authority. I simply don't see this command in Scripture that the husband must assign the wife duties at home or that the wife must accept such duties even if her husband doesn't assign it to her. I see that in culture; but I hate cultural theology - that our interpretation of God's will is somehow defined by culture. So, arguing about what some past culture did only works on a theological level if God specifically adopted that cultural practice and said, "Yes, this is exactly how it should be done."

If one only takes principles from passages and not what God says, you can make scripture mean almost anything.

I think you're confusing liberal theology in there. There are virtually always enough textual cues that point toward the author's intent that there's little room for debate/interpretation. But there are countless passages where a direct, literal interpretation that doesn't account for intent causes massive problems. The WBC is a great example of this. I also knew a guy who tried to kiss me - and every Christian - every time we met because a literal reading of Romans 16:16, devoid of Paul's intentions, told him he should "greet one another with a holy kiss." That's the danger of hyper-literalism that excludes authorial intent. Perhaps better terminology would be "interpretational literalism" and "applicational literalism," where I have been calling the latter "hyper-literalists."

My flavor of "interpretational literalism" would look at Romans 16:16 and say that Paul is literally talking to a church; he's addressing specific people; and he literally wants *those people to whom he's writing* to greet one another with a holy kiss. Any implication that he also intends us today to greet one another with a holy kiss leaves the realm of "interpretational literalism" and enters "applicational literalism." In the same way, Titus 2 and 1 Timothy 2 give room for applicational literalism to run its course, but interpretational literalism still seems to make more sense to me - that Paul meant what he said *in the context in which he said it*. Trying to extrapolate a passage beyond the context in which it was spoken is dangerous work.

when Jesus said "I am the door" we don't think he was a literal door on a house

That's just inconsistent theology, though. You're picking and choosing which verses to apply literalism to and which you're going to reject literalism and go with a metaphorical interpretation. So what you're saying is not "literalists are cool with this." You're saying, "I'm cool with it because I'm not always a literalist - I'm only a

literalist when I feel like being one." That is, you're applying authorial intent and interpretational literalism most of the time, but for some passages applying inconsistent theology to switch to applicational literalism.

Of course, one who follows authorial intent and interpretational literalism would agree that (1) Jesus literally said these things, and (2) in the spiritual realm Jesus literally functions like a door through whom all must pass to reach the Father.

Husband pastor & quite time

2 upvotes · 2 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

"Much anger in him, there is ... When you look at the dark side, careful you must be ... for the dark side looks back."

Husband pastor & quite time

2 upvotes · 1 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

First: pray for them

Second: treat them like non-Christian, as opposed to Christians with bad theology. We rebuke and reprimand Christians who live sinful lives based on bad theology. But we don't rebuke non-Christians for their sin. That'd be like trying to dry up the ocean one bucket at a time ... and dumping it on the beach no less, where it will just roll right on back in.

Third: as with non-Christians, avoid theological discussions. If they want to debate some weird passage, it's not because they want to learn. It's because they want to trap you. Nevermind that they can't, just don't humor them at all.

Fourth: center all conversations around the gospel. This is much easier than with blatant non-Christians because the spiritually deceived already think they've accepted the gospel, thus freely embrace talking about it. This is the one theological area worth discussing with them because liberal theology is inherently derived from a misunderstanding of the Gospel or a refusal to accept and internalize the Gospel in one's own life.

Fifth: most importantly: disciple them. Show them through your life model intentionally exposed to them all that true faith has to offer, then invite them to join you in living out that model, even as you mature and refine your model of living.

TLDR: withdrawing time & attention, the last ditch, roommate, not wife

2 upvotes · 1 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Sorry, just saw this in the mod-queue, which I admittedly don't check very often :/

The author has made it a habit to not go to sleep until he has asked his wife 3 questions every night while sitting up right in a chair in their bedroom before going to sleep: What have you been dealing with? How are you feeling? and How may I help you?

Be cautious with the frame issue here. This positions the husband as being subservient and submissive to his wife. Servant leading is one thing, but letting her emotions dominate the direction of the marriage to a degree that it must be brought up every single day ... that's super dangerous.

Husband pastor & quite time

2 upvotes · 1 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

To be fair to [/u/RedPillWonder](#), it's more nuanced than I made it sound and he probably agrees with the "One of her **roles** is housework" bit more than I would. I get the impression that he and a few other people here believe that a man **MUST** assign the role of housework to the wife or he is in sin. Alternatively, if her husband instructs

her away from housework and she listens, they may assume she is in sin for listening to her husband and abandoning her allegedly God-given duties in the home. I do not believe that this is a biblical mandate.

I believe a man can choose not to have his wife be a homemaker, and that this is perfectly legitimate. If he makes that choice, his wife is still right before her husband and God when she follows the lead of her husband in doing something other than homemaking. After all, the responsibility for the care of the home still falls under the husband's headship. It's not a unique domain given by God to women. In my view, this is the difference between legalist applications of the law (i.e. the letter of what must be done on earth) as compared with principles derived from the law, which we must incorporate in our model of living (i.e. the heart behind what God actually means when he tells us something).

In that context, the biblical passages that delegate homemaking responsibilities to the wife are not to be read as literal commands that transcend time, space, and human culture any more than the command for women to wear head coverings or that women shouldn't braid their hair or wear jewelry or expensive clothes. How many churches "permit a woman to speak" during worship? And let's not forget the command even on men to "greet one another with a holy kiss" (Romans 16:16) and how few of us follow this either. There are all kinds of new testament passages that we ignore on the grounds that "God didn't intend that to be applied in a literal way; we have to look to the heart behind why he said it and fulfill that as well." But when it comes to some other things, if it suits their own interests some people are quick to break the theological pattern that they've been applying for all those other verses.

I'm not okay with theological inconsistencies or the "pick and choose" method of which commands we follow and don't. It's either all literal or it's all on principle and context. Of course, 95% of the time principle and context are going to lead back to the same literal application as before anyway. This is why I believe many people get trapped in hyper-literalist thinking - because it does line up a majority of the time. The principle behind why we're not supposed to lie will lead to the same conclusion today as it did a couple millenia ago. But the principle behind why women should not braid their hair might not. A hyper-literalist cannot reconcile these two without going Mennonite/Amish in many ways. Where a hyper-literalist might be able to reconcile 95% of the commands with his own modern non-Mennonite/Amish lifestyle, the one who functions on the intent of the author rather than the technicality of his words will be able to reconcile 100% of the biblical commands with practical reality.

Now, this is still vastly distinct from liberal theology, which suggests that even the author's intent should be abandoned when culture changes beyond the scope the author would have expected. So, when Paul preaches against homosexuality in Romans, for example, he has principles in his mind as to why he believes this is condemnable behavior, and those principles still apply today, whereas the liberal theologian would throw those principles out the window and argue, "If Paul was alive today he wouldn't have said that over our culture." When it comes to something like women wearing braided hair ...

- The hyper-literalist must condemn all women who braid their hair and rebuke them and ask them to repent. They don't give any regard for "why" God doesn't want women to braid their hair; they just do what they're told.
- The one who functions on authorial intent (as I do) would recognize that Paul is saying not to dress and act like a prostitute or a stuck up snob, and suggest instead that God doesn't actually care about the position of the strands of hair on a woman's head.
- The liberal theologian would say, "Paul didn't know that women would braid their hair all the time today, and if he knew what society would be like today he would have said something very different, so we can just ignore what he said back then for that culture."

EDIT:

In my view, the same applies to Titus 2's statement that older women should teach younger women to be homemakers.

- The hyper-literalist must condemn all women who aren't homemakers and rebuke them and ask them to repent. They don't give any regard for "why" God wants them being homemakers; they just do what they're told.
- The one who functions on authorial intent (as I do) would recognize that Paul tells us his reason: "so that the Word of God may not be reviled." As long as our lifestyle is not causing the Word of God to be reviled, we have fulfilled Paul's intention. A woman who is shrewish or disrespectful to her husband would certainly cause the Word of God to be reviled. But I don't see how anyone would hate God's Word if they see a woman holding a full-time job instead of being home 100% of the time.
 - Another noteworthy point is simply to ask: "What Word of God would be reviled by a woman not being a homemaker?" In that culture, women were virtually prohibited from having full-time jobs anyway, so Paul clearly isn't suggesting women shouldn't have full-time jobs, as that thought probably would not have crossed his mind in the first place. Instead, it was culturally accepted that women were supposed to be homemakers. If a woman was not fulfilling her homemaking duties, it meant that she was lazy and not a helper to her husband. If her husband allowed this, then God's commands about working diligently or his establishment of the woman as her husband's helper would be reviled, among other things. So, we must consider which commands would be reviled and make sure those are not reviled in our lifestyle today. But just as it's possible for a woman to braid her hair today and not look like a prostitute or a rich snob, so also is it possible for a woman to have a full-time job and still live diligently to the work which her husband has assigned her and as a helper to her husband and in submissiveness to his authority *so that the Word of God along those lines and others is not reviled.*
- The liberal theologian would say, "Paul didn't know that someday it would be okay for women to work en masse and full-time. If he had known that, he never would have written this over our culture, so we can just ignore that passage."

309 - The discipleship process

2 upvotes · 1 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I would love to read that!

Consider it done.

I'm a huge fan of Ray Comfort's "Using the Ten Commandments to bring the knowledge of sin" method

That's fair, and it's highly effective for some people. But it only works if the person (1) already believes in God, (2) already agrees with the Bible's definition of sin and morality, (3) already agrees that there are eternal consequences for failing to address our sin, and (4) already agrees that other religions' methods of addressing human sin are inadequate.

Some people, especially those non-Christians who were raised in the church, meet all of those criteria. This is particularly true for the generation between the ages of 35-65 today, given the cultural climate that their parents would have raised them in. For those under that age range, fewer and fewer are being raised in the church or with any real pressure to learn and understand biblical concepts even within the church.

So, it's getting a lot harder with younger audiences to find people who meet those 4 conditions that make them ripe for the Ray Comfort model to work. That's not to say it's altogether ineffective, as there are still a lot of people who do respond to this. But I do believe there are other models that are more effective for a younger

audience. More on that to come.

We must not excuse ourselves, but force ourselves to the irksome task until it becomes easy

Hmm ... now I'm going to have to do a post on the box illustration.

Husband pastor & quite time

2 upvotes · 1 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

To be clear, I think the main area of disagreement is in my belief that the wife's primary responsibility is to her husband, not to her home. I agree that if a husband leads his wife into a context where she is the one primarily responsible for the housework, that's great. But ultimately, I also believe that the responsibility for the housework still rests squarely on the husband and he cannot defer to God or anyone else, "Hey, it's my wife's fault for not getting it done." It's not like God gave the husband authority over the home and then said, "except for the housework - I'm making her do that."

309 - The discipleship process

2 upvotes · 1 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

during times of disagreement

Indeed. I literally just put up a post on this :)

It is my responsibility during those times to make the godly decision and stick to it, regardless of whether she agrees or not.

Right on.

The main danger with relationship evangelism is that ... the longer we wait the more difficult it can become to share it with them down the line

This is a good point. I often overlook this because I don't experience that fear of rejection that many people do. I appreciate and value my close relationships with people, but I don't depend on them. It goes back to the circles illustration in 404 - if my satisfaction is in Christ and not in the things of this world, then I'm perfectly content to lose the things of this world for the sake of gaining Christ and doing what he called me to do, which is to make disciples (Philippians 3:8 is reminiscent here).

In short, I'd suggest that your premise here is a good one for someone who had not yet learned to find their satisfaction in Christ alone - who still has some internal compulsion to value certain things of this world to a degree that it hinders one's mission.

I find that the reason most Christians don't share it is because they don't know what to say.

This is a good point. Maybe I should do a post not just on the systematic process behind evangelism, but on the more practical concerns of living it out. Thanks for the feedback!

309 - The discipleship process

2 upvotes · 1 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Excellent question. First off: "worker at home" or "worker at an office" or whatever are only contexts, not the mission itself. Your wife's mission is not to be a "worker at home" any more than it's your mission to "make money." The mission is to make disciples. The rest of the details are just the context for how you do so. So,

asking "how does my wife get involved while she's working at home?" is the same as asking, "how do I do this when I have a day job?"

Discipleship is predominantly about modeling. It's you living the Christ-like life in such a way that others can follow in your example, and then intentionally building relationships that call others to follow in your example. Part of that for you is going to be modeling to the guys you're discipling that you're faithful and diligent with your employer. They won't see you at your job, but they will understand that you're working and you'll be able to tell them how your work day has gone and things that you've done to demonstrate diligence, per Colossians 3:23, Psalm 90:17, Proverbs 13:4, etc.

From your wife's perspective, this is true for her too. If she happens to be a housewife, this is actually easier than the working husband's ability to incorporate discipleship into one's daily routine. In my job, I take breaks for lunch to meet with men I'm discipling and we talk about our careers as part of the relational and modeling component, but I can't very well have them sit in the courtroom and watch me go at it. A housewife, on the other hand, actually can do this. When my wife was on maternity leave for the last 6 months (she just started working again in February) she would invite other women over to the house with her to spend time together while she took care of the kids, washed the dishes, cleaned the house, etc. Sometimes the girls would help her do these things, and other times they'd sit at a table and just chat with her while she did it. But she was modeling to these women how to be good homemakers. She was also talking to them about Jesus and imparting to them the importance of spending time in the word, praying, memorizing Scripture, sharing one's faith, etc. (i.e. the 7 basics).

Now, this alone is really each of us living the mission for discipleship in parallel, rather than working together on a common mission. What binds it together is when she and I work together to set up intentional strategies for helping the people we're ministering to move forward in their relationship with Christ. To that end, she'll tell me about the women she's working with and I will lead her on how to help them take the next step. She then takes her unique knowledge of how women think and act and utilizes that to find an optimal way to communicate what I've laid out so that the women can actually receive it rightly. Although this sounds highly analytical, it's really a natural and organic process when put in practice.

From there, we also have couples in our church and community who I tell my wife, "I'd really like for us to build a relationship with them and help them move forward," so then I invite them to dinner or have my wife initiate with the woman of the relationship, if she already has the stronger relational context for initiating. To that end, when my wife simply makes friends of other women in the church, that's a help to me because it gives a door for me to reach those women's husbands as well, leveraging my wife's social inclinations to make my job of connecting with those men easier - and all the better if she's discipling those same women as well, putting us in a discipleship context together within the same family.

Let me know if any of this is confusing. But suffice it to say that there are countless ways that a wife can help a man in his mission of disciple-making. Not the least of these, which I hadn't mentioned yet, is helping me see blind spots when I'm communicating with someone. So, for example, when I was discipling my pastor last year, he went off on sabbatical for a few months saying he was shutting off his phone, social media, etc. to make it a true vacation. I followed suit and left him alone, but my wife appropriately noticed afterward that this had hurt him because my relationship with him was above and beyond what he had with the rest of the church, so that "don't contact me" line wasn't meant for me specifically. I had to address that with him and apologize, which helped heal a wound that I wouldn't have noticed was festering had it not been for my wife's relational insightfulness during one of our planning/strategy sessions (which again, are really quite organic in practice, usually starting off with something like, "Hey, how'd your meeting with so and so go?").

Husband pastor & quite time

2 upvotes · 27 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Sorry, I haven't been on since you posted this. You used a short-link. By default all of reddit has short-linked posts and sometimes comments removed automatically (i.e. it wasn't even this sub's auto-moderator that did it).

So, in the future, utilize the full link and you'll be fine. I do think, for reference, that even doing the whole "[] ()" format for putting text on the link doesn't even work - you have to use full links.

Asking wife's consent?

2 upvotes · 15 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

MRP = [r/marriedredpill](#) ... it's a secular red pill sub.

I think you're stretching things beyond logic, trying to force things into one box. It's like if I said "men are strong" and your responses are: "oh, so a man can never touch a baby because he's so strong he'd kill it." That's the type of logic you're using when you jump from "employment doesn't matter" to the conclusion that this is somehow in conflict with Eve having kids and raising them. "She has a job ... I guess kids are out of the question now." What?!? That conceptual leap just makes no sense to me.

You're trying to compare a society where the overwhelming majority of income-generating jobs available were things that women were not physically capable of doing (or at least were categorically worse than men at doing) to a society where the job requirements are generally on par for both genders. Can a woman work a desk job as a CEO, salesperson, dentist, etc.? We don't know - those positions didn't exist back then as we know them today. What we do know is that the jobs that did exist were difficult for women to fulfill and God did not object - he didn't say, "Men, you have to let women do it too." He also didn't say, "Only men shall work, no matter what the job is." So, you're confusing culture with "God said ____." He didn't say anything. Don't put words in God's mouth that aren't there.

If you want to make a philosophical leap, drawing from the fact that woman-friendly jobs didn't exist during biblical times and that God didn't object and make your conclusion based on that alone, that's fine. But be extremely careful when trying to communicate a philosophical leap as a theological conclusion.

Misogyny is a sin?!! <https://www.russellmoore.com/2018/02/12/teach-boys-respect-women/>

2 upvotes · 14 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Aye; and there's the rub, eh?

Sure, but there are some crimes that imply a hardened heart and others that don't. For example, wanton and intentional murder is pretty clear, for the most part. Stealing from a grocery store ... not so much. From there it's just a matter of repetition: "I've given you grace 3 times now and you've failed each time, so take your sentence." In the meantime, "grace" should always be accompanied by an order of restitution, which is also a biblical concept (see Zaccheus, for example).

how do you define 'wicked'?

I know this needs a lot more explanation, but ... biblically.

Is he wicked, or is he ill and in need of treatment?

Both. Wickedness got him addicted to drugs in the first place.

What if the act itself is more questionable -- for instance, as the OP alluded to, homosexuality? What if you have a loving couple whose life appears to bear good fruit, but they happen to be of the same sex? Do you vote them off the island?

I'm not sure how that's questionable. Unrepentant sin is unrepentant sin. I'm still not sure how you're defining "good fruit," but my guess is that if they're bringing people into a theology of, "You can ignore what the Bible says, just believe in Jesus," then it's not good fruit. If they got married as homosexuals while non-Christians and only afterward found Christ and have repented of their sin and are no longer engaging in intentional homosexual sex or encouraging other people to adopt a "pick and choose" theology, then yeah, they're probably fine ... and I'd say they're even okay to live together as long as they're clear with each other and others who may observe them that there is no longer sexual engagement between the two of them and their bond is merely one of loving affection and mutual support, which I would encourage all believers to have - same sex or not, including two men who are roommates. The term "romantic affection" is really often just code for sexual desire toward someone else. It can also be just a categorization of different other types of desire or affection, but I don't typically think of itself as a thing of its own.

I get that some of this seems gray, and I do believe that gray areas exist. But there are lot fewer of them in the Bible than people would like to admit. Instead, we like to create gray areas as a justification for our behaviors. As long as we can say "there's no way to know for sure," we can feel confident in doing it because it's not definitively wrong. In reality, the Bible says the opposite - that we are "slaves to righteousness" and that all things are "wrong" unless definitively redeemed as "right." And that concept of redemption (and also reconciliation) is powerful enough to cover lots of things, so it's not like we're in some tight little box either.

Asking wife's consent?

2 upvotes · 14 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Leadership is his role. What tasks you are fulfilling - be it through employment or around the house - are your context. The roles are not interchangeable. The context in which we fulfill those roles is.

Misogyny is a sin?!! <https://www.russellmoore.com/2018/02/12/teach-boys-respect-women/>

2 upvotes · 14 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

There's some truth to what she said, but it also leads down a somewhat dangerous theological path if we follow down that road too far. To be clear, and I'll tag her so she can correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe [/u/Willow-girl](#) has said in the past that she is not a Christian, but does have an appreciation for certain aspects of our faith (sorry if I'm mistaken on this).

The good in what she's saying is that our obligation is to do right by God in our own lives and that this should be unshaken by someone else's failure to live up to their calling. Ultimately we are not the judges of their salvation, so it's not for us to try to condemn people for believing mistaken theology or for engaging in sin and refusing to repent. We can't control someone else - so you do you and let them do them.

She also appropriately acknowledges that the fruit of a person's life is what matters, although I would clarify that Jesus had a very specific intent in saying this: that our fruit is the disciples who are following Jesus because of our lives. Things like being "good, patient, kind, loving," etc. are nice, but they're not the fruit Jesus referenced in Matthew 7. In fact, in the very next passage after the "by their fruit you will recognize them" Jesus cites people who were doing many great things for the kingdom - prophesying, casting out demons, performing miracles, etc., but Jesus says, "I never knew you." Our works are not the "fruit" we are to look for from our lives. But immediately before both of those passages Jesus talks about people walking down the narrow v. wide roads to heaven and hell respectively. Which path you're leading people down is your fruit. If you lead someone down the wide road to hell, you are bearing bad fruit. If you are leading someone down the narrow path to heaven, you are bearing good fruit. It's that simple.

The danger is the implication that people doing "good things" is how we should discern the authenticity of their faith. Non-Christians can fake good all the time. There are countless non-Christians who seem like perfectly wonderful people. But the Bible is clear: "Anything that does not come from faith is sin" (Romans 14:23) and

"without faith it is impossible to please God" (Hebrews 11:6).

If we assume that these people are our brothers in Christ simply because they make a verbal profession and have good fruit, yet refuse to repent of otherwise obvious sin, we may miss a critical opportunity to bring someone onto the narrow path who otherwise would have headed for destruction.

We also risk giving such people too much influence in our own lives, potentially leading our own path astray.

And by tacit approval of their sin, or otherwise simply turning a blind eye because they're otherwise good people, and allowing them into church culture, their ideologies (particularly if there are others in the church as well) start to permeate and the church becomes less about preaching truth and more about being culturally sensitive, and ultimately converted away from truth toward culture. This is not a hypothetical threat - it is an actual one that has happened already on a mass scale. This is why Paul says in 1 Cor. 5 that if someone is in unrepentant sin, we have an obligation to cast them out of our community until they either (1) stop identifying themselves as Christian, or (2) repent of their sin.

Is woman created in God's image? Let's explore.

2 upvotes · 14 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Gotcha. I've heard that argument before. It's a decent one.

308 - Prayer

2 upvotes · 13 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

The best help is to read the Psalms. Put yourself in David's shoes and contemplate why David would have been so passionate about how adoration for God and His Word. Then, consider if David was in your shoes what types of Psalms he would have written and then be the one to write those Psalms - lift those up as your adoration to God.

Adoration is not about emotionally bursting with joy toward God. I actually just made a facebook post yesterday on that very concept: that Christianity is not about emotional experiences. Instead, adoration can be a resolute acknowledgment. Imagine a knight kneeling at the throne and saying, "You are my Lord and King. Long live the king! His greatness shall reign throughout the kingdom!" I don't imagine this knight skipping down the courtyard in jubilation while saying this. But it is masculine adoration all the same. And if you happen to get the emotional jubilation while adoring God, go for that too.

Misogyny is a sin?!! <https://www.russellmoore.com/2018/02/12/teach-boys-respect-women/>

2 upvotes · 13 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

These are good points. I've always taken the position that God's "changing his mind" was a statement framed that way for our benefit, not as a theological fact of God existing in a temporal stream, which would make God subject to time, which would mean that there are things or concepts which transcend God.

I often reference this concept when discussing prayer with people. Specifically, I ask people to muse on the concept of praying that God would change the past. If he does, we would have no memory of ever having prayed it, so for all we know our prayer to change the past was answered and our memory was simply adjusted to account for the fact that in the present timeline we never would have had to pray for that in the first place. If he doesn't answer the prayer, that accounts for why we remember praying it in the first place, but does not prove that God does not answer those prayers.

The reason I bring that up is because if God is both timeless and omniscient, as I believe he is, then before time began, God knew everything that ever would be, including every possible variation of how free choice would play out, including every prayer that would or would not have been said under any and every circumstance. When we do not pray, God would not have pre-creation accounted for what we would have said if we had asked, hence James saying "you do not have because you do not ask." But in every possible version of reality, God knew what

we actually would pray and incorporated those prayers when setting his actual divine plan into motion.

To that end, God's understanding of what would unfold throughout eternity has been unchanging since creation and will remain unchanged throughout eternity in heaven. But at the same time, that understanding was affected by our prayers and our choices. In this, we can rest confidently in both God's sovereign predetermination of history, knowing that he knows and has determined everything that ever was and will be, but also that our individual expressions and freedoms are valid and genuine and that God "changed" his plan to account for the variables we created and proposed.

So, when God says in Scripture that he changed his mind, I read that more as him saying, "When I set eternity into motion, I knew you would say/do this and I adjusted my plan to account for your actions/requests."

And this kind of example is exactly why I say that maybe we don't (or can't) understand it fully.

My point in all of that was more to show the feminized inconsistency that Christians tend to want to explain away Satan and sin, but refuse to apply consistent logic when the same reasoning would imply that Eve was an afterthought and Adam was God's primary creation of humanity.

What is the actual danger?

2 upvotes · 13 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

You're seriously trying to twist around what I'm saying just to pick a fight here.

So, they didn't have the gospel, but now they have it? (Catholics and Orthodox)

They had it. They weren't preaching it and/or modeling it because they had political gain. When that political gain started to diminish, including through the reformation, which took away a lot of the church's power, the Catholic church responded to the reformation. Over time, at the risk of losing everyone to Protestantism, the Catholic church returned to preaching the Gospel as found in Scripture (although they still have a lot of other fluff that they mix in with it).

With the exceptions of a few denominations, Protestants have, in general, completely abandoned 1800 years of tradition.

This is simply not true, although I suspect it's just a definitional difference in the word "abandoned." We don't consciously draw from those sources, but everyone down the line from Luther onward has been influenced by the tradition of the church. So, I don't consider it "abandoned" as if that 1800 year history just vanished. It's still there, it's just not something studied as authoritative.

95% can't name one Chriistian author born before 1800AD.

But the authors they can name are usually in the 5% who can. As such, the authors that people read today (Tim Keller, Andy Stanley, John Piper, etc.) are drawing from their understanding of Scripture and church tradition when communicating what they write in their books. Often times those authors will even cite the historical church figures directly.

That's like the number 1 excuse Christians give to not get involved in legal/political matters.

It's not an excuse to avoid getting involved. It's a statement of prioritization. Besides, even if it is an excuse, it's a good one.

Yet the same Christians all protested when the World tried to legalize gay marriage.

Actually, only an extremely small number protested. Many churches simply noted that it was a bad decision, but continued about their business. What you're probably misinterpreting as "protest" is the church reacting to their congregations by saying, "Just so you all know, the SCOTUS just made this decision, but that's not aligned with what the Bible says, so we're still going to go with what the Bible says." That's clarification, not protest. Only extremely few churches were holding picket signs or encouraging their members to call their representatives. Most churches understand that the government is going to do what it's going to do.

When people see that Christian monogamous society produces the best fruit (in contrast to the fruit of this secular society, or the fruit of Islamic Shariah law), would they not respect the Christian deity more?

I doubt it. I want to say yes, but the secular world often says, "You had your chance and you blew it, now it's our turn" - referencing all the corruption in the church during a patriarchal society when the church had immense political power. Sadly, I suspect that if the church had similar power again, the sinfulness of the men at the top would probably ruin it again.

The Power of RPC

2 upvotes · 12 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Now who's misquoting Scripture in jest! ;)

What is the actual danger?

2 upvotes · 12 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

REALLY? So you think corruption and indulgences (greed) is worst than female pastors, seperation of Church and State, secularism, LGBT agenda and all other forms of sexual perversion? Or a church that promotes promiscuity, using gender-neutral terms to describe God, etc?

Absolutely. All the problems in the "church" that you point to today are blessings, not curses. The fall of the church started in the early 300s when Theodosius I mandated that all people convert to Christianity. Since then, for as long as the church was under one banner and ruled by tradition there was never any way to distinguish between a true and a false believer - particularly among leadership. The ship was being steered straight to hell and it was far harder for anyone to be saved in those days because it was so rare for the genuine Gospel to be preached without someone trying to come in and manipulate it for their own political advantage.

Now, today we also have people manipulating God's Word for political advantage. But under a *sola scriptura* theology, we now have a means of filtering the truth from those who would manipulate it. We have the freedom and ability to tell other believers, "That's not what the Bible really says," whereas before the reformation there was no authority or ability to challenge the system when it was leading people down a false path. Moreover, when the Gospel was perverted for those many centuries this presented a true barrier to salvation - much like for many of the people who attend Joel Osteen's church today. It's almost impossible to come to saving faith when your primary goal is to utilize faith as a tool for your own selfish gain. The Gospel is lost in a church like that. But today alternatives exist, and that wasn't the case pre-reformation. If Joel Osteen was your leader back then, everybody was subject to his teachings. As such, the corruption permeated everywhere.

Then there are the other aspects of our conversation - that although many of these things are bad, they're not necessarily salvation-negating. If a church teaches the true Gospel, but also maintains a feminist culture, people can still be saved in such a place. I don't know that I can say that of the church throughout most of its AD history.

And the net society result, is that instead of a Christian society with some non-believers, we now have secular societies with some Christian believers?

True, but we always knew things were going to move in that direction anyway. That's not the fault of the reformation for taking things there - that's the fulfillment of prophecy. I do agree, however, that we do still have an obligation to keep trying to set it straight, even if we know we will ultimately fail.

re-consider our definition of "Church"

Yeah, as should be obvious by now, I don't adopt the mainstream definition.

It definitely doesn't mean we look at a completely dead walking-zombie church and convince ourselves that it's better than the past.

I see the historical church from Theodosius I through the reformation as the "dead walking-zombie" church trying to bite and infect anything it can get its hands on. I see the church today as having many dead and zombie-like parts, but that there are some parts that have been genuinely regenerated. It's like it was a zombie and a cure was implemented ... but the cure is slow to work and the virus is fighting back as culture develops new strains that the cure wasn't designed to protect against.

The Power of RPC

2 upvotes · 12 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is a solid post. I loved every minute of reading it :) Of particular note:

Man embraces masculinity, women try to shake him and train him to worship femininity instead, man embraces masculinity, women embrace masculinity.

This is a solid flow chart that summarizes most red pill relationships in the first place. Excellent job making a broad concept very succinct.

What also strikes me out of this is the way that women have weaponized not only sexuality, but also the Bible itself in their effort to subjugate men and cripple the church. No other tool has been wielded so strongly as humility.

As I've written before, when I met my wife I was a natural alpha. I wasn't particularly interested in women. I was a man on a mission and I had great confidence in my ability to carry out that mission. I placed that mission above her and she knew it.

After marriage, things started changing. My testimony involves someone calling me out for pride. It was a sin I struggled with for my entire life through college. It was still in me when my wife first met me (before we were dating). The very first time her parents saw me they commented on my pride. So, what did my wife do to get me to behave the way she wanted me to? She went to pride.

As I would lead small groups in church or engage with pastors or teach classes - no matter what I did, her commentary afterward was always: "You're so prideful. No one will listen to you if they don't respect you. You need humility." Normally this would be great advice. But when she's the only person in my entire life telling me this and literally dozens of people commented on how impressed they were that I had such great biblical knowledge and yet somehow was humble about it, I'm inclined to believe she was the wrong one.\

But as I had been beta-ized over time, I bought into the lie that most men in the church are taught: "One of the best ways your wife can help you is by making you aware of your sin. She knows you better than anyone else. Listen to her when she tries to convict you." There were countless other men I've known over time who have commented on their wives always seeming to know exactly what sin they need to work on next - and they said this *as if it was divine*. Obviously the red pill man will look at it often note that this is not from God; rather, it's a simple case of "My husband isn't good enough for me, so I'm just going to keep nagging him about all of his

faults until he changes to become the man that *I want him to be.*"

I played into the exaggerated-humility game for quite some time - a couple years, in fact. It was during those 2 years that I had my 18 month dead bedroom and had the least impact on my mission of disciple-making than at any other point in my life since being saved.

Now I accept that not only can a woman weaponize the Bible and concepts that ring true with a character of godliness for their advantage - *but that they will do so whenever it advantages them.* To her credit, my wife genuinely believed she was helping me become a more godly man by asking me to be more humble. But that's only because she was looking at beta men in leadership positions and assuming that they were more godly than a confident man on a mission for Christ who had never sought lofty titles.

Are we to be humble? Yes. Does that mean we should abandon confidence to amplify our humility? Absolutely not. This post does not come off as arrogant - it seethes confidence through the cracks. Thank you, brother.

Secret Phone - Part 2

2 upvotes · 10 February 2018 · /r/askMRP

Red pill wasn't working. She went into crisis mode, which amped up her sexuality, then when she felt safe around you again she started to slide back. You need more time to work on your frame. You also need to stop caring what she thinks. Don't screw around with games about how you found her phone. Own up to it. Tell her you don't trust her, that you snooped, she got busted, and you're not screwing around with her until she gets tested ... if at all.

How Institutions Die

2 upvotes · 10 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Ah, I follow. My last church was actually entirely lay led. I was an honorary elder and helped implement a policy whereby the congregation was encouraged to subtract from their ordinary tithe (or in some people's cases all of it) and redirect it toward personal ministry, like taking their co-workers out to lunch, paying for their neighbor's car to get fixed, etc. It was a stellar success and we saw an immediate massive boom in reports of people sharing the gospel who were otherwise pew sitters and several people being saved and ultimately joining the church.

I'm fully persuaded that the pressure churches place on tithing and maintaining the institutional structure is misguided and doing a disservice to the purpose of the church. Further, with the exception of a few select individuals, most of the early church modeled a grass roots movement that would be better off even today meeting in homes through patterned discipleship rather than placing the emphasis on weekly services in a large flashy building that required substantial financial commitment to upkeep.

How Institutions Die

2 upvotes · 9 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

What you're saying only makes sense if there is no Holy Spirit guaranteeing its survival. As Gamaliel said in Acts 5 (I think), "If this is of men, it will die; if it's of God it will survive and do we really want to stand against God?"

But I believe the institutionalized church has made the same mistake Israel did - and I will be more candid in my comments here than I was in the post itself. Institutionalization is just as much sin as when Israel demanded God dethrone himself and give them a king instead (1 Samuel 9, I believe).

It's the church saying, "Sorry God, but we don't trust you because there's just too much pressure from the world ... so we're going to do what the world has proven works and trust in that strategy for running things instead."

That's a pretty unhealthy attitude. It's also the attitude that got the church into all this blue pill feminized nonsense.

I'd wager that if the church remained a grass-roots organization founded on discipleship, it would far closer

reflect what Christ intended than it does today with all the politicization, bureaucracy, seminaries, etc. It's just the church following the pattern of the world rather than the pattern of discipleship Jesus gave us.

What is the actual danger?

2 upvotes · 9 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I get it, but as he already said, that's a really weak argument unless you're suggesting that feminism negates salvation. If it doesn't, then souls are still being saved, even if it's in a feminist context. The greater concern is the impact that this beta-targeting has on the mission of discipleship. That's what I'm more worried about. Fighting feminism for its own sake is only a sub-par goal if it's not connected to an eternal purpose that advances God's Kingdom in heaven.

The Feminine Imperative has replaced the Holy Spirit

2 upvotes · 9 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Someone I respect once said he saw no problem with a female pastor as long as there was a male head over her. His rationale was that she would only be a voice through which the message he wanted taught would be communicated, and therefore the teaching originates with him and he is responsible, not her, as she is merely a tool being used by the head pastor to recite things for him.

What are your thoughts on this view? I'm guessing you already know my position, but the concept still intrigues me all the same.

To add a bit more, he questioned me deeper:

1. Would it be okay if a man wrote a script to a teaching video that involved a woman as one of the characters?
2. What if instead of a video it was live performance in front of everyone ... can the girl participate then?
3. What if instead of a teaching skit he just wrote out a transcript of the sermon he wanted to deliver and had her read it word for word in front of everyone?
4. What if instead of word for word he gave her all of the main talking points and she agreed not to deviate from the teaching he laid out, but she had freedom to pick which words to use to relay those lessons?
5. What if he gave her a concept and said, "Here's what I want to teach them, now you figure out how to communicate it, then do it?"

I thought I knew where this pattern was going - to try to get me to admit something by easing me into it ... but his real point was to ask: how are you drawing the line? What verse says that one of these is okay and the other isn't? Or are you doing like the Pharisees did by making up your own arbitrary line and imposing it on others?

The Feminine Imperative has replaced the Holy Spirit

2 upvotes · 9 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Good stuff ... But I will note an offset to the Matthew 7 "I never knew you" vibe you're going for here: Philippians 1 ... "It is true that some preach Christ out of envy ... [they] preach Christ out of selfish ambition, not sincerely ... But what does it matter? The important thing is that in every way Christ is preached, whether from false motives or true. And because of this I rejoice."

I'm not saying she is preaching Christ. She might be preaching a false gospel entirely. I don't know. But I'm not quick to condemn ministries that Paul may have rejoiced at.

The Feminine Imperative has replaced the Holy Spirit

2 upvotes · 9 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Good ol Charles Blondin.

The Feminine Imperative has replaced the Holy Spirit

2 upvotes · 8 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I've used a similar definition, but without the "until death" part. I do believe that people can callous their hearts during life to a degree that repentance becomes impossible for them or, as in the case of Pharaoh (who hardened his own heart several times first) where God finally seals his hardness.

Does theology triumph over biology?

2 upvotes · 8 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Without any context, I interpret it as a statement that Theology > Science, which is the core of my theology/praxeology/philosophy post from last week. In a recent article I wrote elsewhere, I changed "praxeology" to "science" more generally (as I presume a praxeology is a subset of science that focuses on human behavior).

To that end, whatever science may say about how the world operates - even on matters of sexuality - if the Bible says otherwise, then we go with what the Bible says. Why? Because science comes with the presupposition that all things must fit into a scientific framework, which we know biblically is not true (i.e. that God can and does operate outside of science). Also, because science is experimenting on a fallen world, and thus cannot dictate matters of morality.

For example, if science comes out and finds a genetic code that proves homosexuality is a genetic condition, do we suddenly say, "Okay, science just proved it, so it must not be sin!"? No. We understand that the fall of man affected every aspect of life, including human biology. Just as psychological issues can cause physical consequences and physical conditions can cause psychological issues, so also can spiritual issues affect a person's physical body and their psychology, and in the same way psychology and our physical bodies can affect our spirit. They're all interconnected.

So, when science studies biology, it is studying something that is different from God's intended design, which we can otherwise discern through theology. If science determines that humans are inherently sexual creatures, theology agrees and that's what matters. If science determines that homosexuality is a biological issue, theology would say, "That's fine, but acting on those impulses is still sin."

Of course, if you gave more context, maybe Piper is really trying to say something more detrimental to masculinity.

Why the Church is Dead

2 upvotes · 8 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

group therapy sessions....

Or the polarized opposite: highly rigid, over-structuralized curriculum-oriented sessions that defy any actual unity or bonding. Churches follow both extremes, rarely finding a proper balance. That's the subject of an eventual 300 post. I've just been too lazy to go there.

Why the Church is Dead

2 upvotes · 8 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

As I wrote to ReddJive, there are two aspects to this:

1. Abandoning the institutionalized church doesn't violate Hebrews 10:24-25 if you continue to maintain a relational network with other believers, who become your *koinonia* that fits into the larger *ekklesia*.
2. But we should still participate in an institutionalized congregation because it's a tool that we can use for the greater purposes God has given us.

I have no problem saying, "I use my church. It's little more than a tool to me." I'd tell my pastor that to his face (and probably will when I meet with him next week). When the institutionalized church has abandoned God's purposes (discipleship) in exchange for programs and cookie-cutter processes, then I have no choice but to reject their underlying motives as having any value and must, instead, utilize the resources they have available to advance what I believe God has truly called us toward. A lot of this involves going "under cover" to earn the influence necessary to enact a lasting change - whether on an institutional level (i.e. the leadership adopts a new direction) or an individual level (i.e. leading specific people in the church down the right path).

The most valuable resource that institutionalized congregations offer us is its skill in amassing people. If I tried to go out on the streets today and get people to follow what I have to teach, I'd probably fall flat on my face. Either that or it would take significant time (probably a decade) to reach more than a couple hundred people. But if I enter an institution that already has 500+ people (as my church does), they have already done the leg work for me of getting those people together who want to learn and are interested in hearing the truth of what the Bible preaches. The next step is simply for me to earn enough influence within that crowd of people to start reorienting the directive.

From there, my view tends to differ from that of /u/Whitified and my pseudo-affiliated organization: The Navigators. They believe that the best way to change the culture is to earn influence with the leaders, steering the ship from the top down. I believe that Jesus modeled a different path, earning influence among the people, directing the people to the point where the leaders have no choice but to follow.

Why do I take this approach? Mainly because it's what Jesus did. But also because the leaders are the ones who have a motive to appease the feminist imperative in the first place. They stand to benefit from the cultural reputation boost in being an "open-minded" church. That's how they get people in the door and warming the seats. But the people themselves are far better off if they reject this imperative and live as God intended. So ... should we attempt to "convert" the people who stand to lose a lot if they convert, or should we "convert" the people who stand to gain from such conversion?

It's the same with the Pharisees. If the Pharisees converted to doing things Christ's way, they would have lost all of their power and influence in the culture. But the people themselves had nothing to lose. So, Jesus skipped the Pharisees, accepting that he could never change them all en masse (with few limited exceptions, like Nicodemus), and went instead to the people.

But to be clear, I reject online forums as a legitimate means of satisfying Hebrews 10:24-26. I just haven't fully fleshed out my reasons yet.

Why the Church is Dead

2 upvotes · 8 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I think it is important to make this critical distinction.

Hah ... after just writing a couple other comments refraining this idea, I see you already beat me to it. Word

studies on *koinonia* and *ekklesia* (both words for "church" or "fellowship of believers" in the NT) should be very illuminating on the subject.

It's also worth noting that our modern word "church" was not derived from either *ekklesia* or *koinonia*; rather, it came from the old english *circe* (pronounced kirke; also *kirk* in Scotland and *kirche* in Germany). These words all pertain to a place of worship as opposed to the people.

The Greek *ekklesia* was a military term for "a purposed gathering," like when officers would meet together to strategize a plan for battle. It was adopted by the Jews when developing the synagogue structure of secret meetings meant to preserve the old testament Scripture while in Babylonian captivity. It had nothing to do with an institution and everything to do with the purpose for why people were getting together. A "meeting" was not an *ekklesia*. A strategy session was. Today, the church has no purpose.

More to the point, *koinonia* is often translated as "fellowship," but has a much, much deeper context, per my 103 post. It literally references a "one in spirit" bond. Once again, a Sunday meeting does not foster this. Most churches try to institute small groups to facilitate this, but as long as the focus is on the curriculum/program, it will not meet the requirements of a (1) "one in spirit" bond (*koinonia*) because the unity of spirit is not being fostered, or (2) a "purposed gathering" (*ekklesia*) because in the absence of a unified spirit, content cannot be redirected toward a common purpose.

So, where the institutionalized church would argue back that small groups are meant to satisfy the *ekklesia* and *koinonia* functions of the church, I have yet to see one that actually does. This is predominantly because to allow such sentiments to foster among the people would be to deprive the institution of its power.

Why the Church is Dead

2 upvotes · 8 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

No, this sub continues to reference sex before marriage as sin. None of us take the viewpoint that it's an unforgiveable sin that condemns a person to hell with no chance for repentance ... but it is sin, nonetheless.

What Rollo was referencing, I believe, is simply the fact that this is what the church teaches and that this teaching has had a negative impact on masculinity. But that negative impact is not by virtue of God's design. That is, it's not the law against premarital sex that causes men to become beta. It is the cultural condition that causes men to believe that they must become beta in order to get married in order to have legitimate, non-sinful sex.

If culture functioned as God intended it, and as it actually did function for roughly 5,800 years, a man would not need to become beta to get married and have sex. Again, it's not the biblical concept that is at the core of the problem - it's the feminized culture.

An anatomy of butthurt and the impact on frame

2 upvotes · 7 February 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I didn't see starting the car on this list. I'm not playing dumb. I'm simply getting at the conclusion that there is no universal list. My wife gets a kick out of using a chainsaw and I love cooking. Are you suggesting I forbid her from doing yard work that I hate doing so that she can cook which she hates doing ... just to appease your arbitrary list? Screw that.

An anatomy of butthurt and the impact on frame

2 upvotes · 7 February 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I never saw autistic as being a reference to someone's emotional state ... more an inability to comprehend and apply basic social concepts.

An anatomy of butthurt and the impact on frame

2 upvotes · 7 February 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Where's your list on which jobs are a man's job and which are a woman's? I'd love to read it.

TLDR: withdrawing time & attention, the last ditch, roommate, not wife

2 upvotes · 6 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

It sounds like you've gone through Matthew 18 already and she's rejected repentance as an option. So, you're to treat her as an unbeliever. If she leaves you, 1 Cor. 7 gives you the freedom to let her go.

Until then, you also are compelled by 1 Cor. 7 to live as if you had no wife. Go read 110 and my post from yesterday on Mission (210 I think). Just ignore her and do what God put you here for. After all, now that you appropriately realize your marriage isn't your purpose in life, it's time to get going on what you were really here for all along anyway.

In pursuing your mission, you should be allocating all of your resources toward matters that advance that mission. As you've appropriately done, cut her off because she's holding you back - but even more. You've lopped off some basic luxuries she wanted to spend money on, but now you're going to take it even further. Buy steaks to make for yourself and the kids, but leave broccoli and carrots in the fridge for her. Buy a separate fridge and padlock it if you have to. Take the keys to her car and tell her she can save up for her own car and ride a bike to work in the meantime. If her work is too far, too bad ... she can get another job in biking distance. You're not doing her any favors anymore to help her get her life in gear. It's on her head now. Seriously cut her off.

To be clear, this is Romans 1. It's God cutting off his blessings so that his people who have rejected him as a groom can wallow in the consequences of their own sinfulness. I'd like to say that this eventually kicks people into gear - to shape up and start following God when they realize how bad it gets. But the fact is that most people end up in the "depraved mind" category. Whether you want to say they "lost their salvation" or were never saved to begin with, I don't care. The bottom line is that they're not part of Christ's bride at that point. They have walked away. If she gets to that point, so be it.

Self-Righteousness, Pietism and RP

2 upvotes · 6 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

And therein lies the first rule: she needs you less, so she has all the power. The thing is ... you actually need her much less, you just don't realize it yet.

To be clear, my wife was the same way. She also never had a single sexual fantasy and was totally non sexual until she married me at 23. My wife had serious psychological hangups about sex due to butt tons of negative conditioning growing up. But it does get better. There is hope.

Self-Righteousness, Pietism and RP

2 upvotes · 5 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

My usual MO would have been to give her my phone let her look at the pictures, and explain who each person is and how there's nothing going on and that she has nothing to worry about.

This is actually brilliant with one quick modification. Instead of explaining how there's nothing going on you explain how you're screwing each one of them.

"That's Cindy. I banged her on the copy machine last week. Oh, and that one's Kristen. I had trouble getting in her panties, but once she opened up she was like an animal. And this one's Linda, but she's too prude to do it anywhere other than in our bed, so I've only been with her a couple times."

She'll know you're teasing her. If you really were cheating you obviously wouldn't be telling her all about it. And

although she'll think it's sinful teasing it will (1) communicate how dull she really is in the sack, (2) communicate what you think would be fun, and (3) trigger healthy dread that's rooted in an appreciation of your social environment and not in smoke and shadows that you were trying to concoct.

I just dug in didn't know much of what else to do besides get out of her frame and hold my position.

Ah, but that's the thing ... supplicating is only one way to get in a woman's frame. Getting butt-hurt is the other. It shows her that she has the power to cause an emotional reaction out of you.

Remember this: women crave emotional control over their man. This is their curse. Any emotion is better than no emotion. Supplicating is good emotion. It gives her all the warm, fuzzy feels that you're committed to her and will keep providing those beta comforts undisturbed. But if you're not going to supplicate, then getting angry/frustrated/mad/visibly upset/etc. is the next best thing - because it shows that she can still get a rise out of you, and that's still a form of power.

If you just sit there and laugh off her antics with one joke after the next, then she will know she can't control you. That's how you stay out of her frame and maintain your own. When she realizes how much fun you're having in life and how miserable she is when she can't control you ... that's when she finally comes around to the conclusion: "Maybe doing things his way will be more fun, and I can have as much fun as he seems to be having."

Now, you're probably thinking: "But my wife doesn't want to have fun. Having fun is a sin. We're supposed to deny ourselves all the time. So, why would she ever want to enter the frame of a man who enjoys life?"

BECAUSE YOU'RE LIVING OUT YOUR FRICKING MISSION AND SHE SEES THE FRUIT.

How many times do I have to refrain it on this sub?!?!?! **MISSION FIRST**. Nothing else matters. Get that down and everything else follows.

There is no "Christian version" of anything

2 upvotes · 5 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I feel very betrayed.

That sucks. But I'm guessing you misunderstood what I was saying.

basically everything you've taught me, and most of the material here has been the Christian spin-off of many secular RP counsels

No, the point of this entire post is that it's the reverse. When I first became RP aware, I didn't think to myself, "I wish there were a Christian version of this." I thought: "They're just telling people what the Bible already says. They're ripping off the Bible and taking credit for it."

I've said it countless times here: secular RP is self-described as "men swapping notes," but RPC has a textbook written by the Teacher. Where do you think those secular notes come from? They're copying material put in place by the Creator. RPC is the original; TRP/MRP is the copy. But RPC was created later simply because prior similar church movements have never been able to gain traction in an increasingly feminized church, where there are actual spiritual authorities to contend with who tend to want to shut it down - whether on a congregational or denominational level. The secular crowd doesn't have an authority who can shut them down. I felt no concern starting RPC because I've always been comfortable working outside the church in the first place - and ultimately to transform the church.

Specifically, I hold that there are 6 contexts in which we can engage in a mission with respect to the church:

- Despite the Church: This is when the church is directly opposed to what you're doing and you find no support;

so you must leave the church to pursue your mission

- **Outside the Church:** The church isn't opposed to what you're doing, but they won't endorse or support it and they won't allow it in their walls, so you've got to do it on your own separately while otherwise continuing to attend.
- **Within the Church:** The church isn't opposed, but they won't endorse/support it, but they don't object to your engaging with its members toward your mission.
- **Utilizing the Church:** The church isn't opposed, but they won't endorse/support, but their existing independent functions offer a useful opportunity to work toward your purpose in tandem with them working toward theirs.
- **Transforming the Church:** The church thinks what you're doing is good and they're willing to learn from you and adopt your mission as part of their vision for the entire congregation (i.e. not just "cool idea, go start a ministry for whoever wants to join).
- **Alongside the Church:** The church is already on board with your mission and have adopted it in their vision and you're supply spurring one another on.

I usually use these 6 types when imparting the vision of disciple-making on men so that they know how to hone their disciple-making efforts in the most productive way. But the same is true of RPC. Originally the things I was doing were in the "despite" category - my church would have been directly opposed to the things I say here. After conversations with my pastor, he now sees value in it, but can't endorse it because it is not culturally appealing, thus would push people away. Sure, you may say, "That's a weak pastor - go find a better church" ... but let's be honest, how many pastors are willing to reject feminism and embrace biblical manhood? So, I functioned outside the church for a short time until others in the church read some of my Facebook posts (which is a lot of terminology-shifted content from RPC) and those within the church wanted in. So, I started working within the church - and then I saw opportunities to engage in men's groups and teaching classes, which have allowed me to work alongside my church. They're still not at the "transform" point yet, and that's the hardest step - it might be years before that hurdle is crossed.

But my point in all of this is that RPC came first because the Bible and divine revelation and the order of creation and the fall all preceded TRP/MRP. The fact that the secular crowd started an online chat forum to talk about what they observed in the created order of things (as adjusted by the fall) doesn't mean that they somehow came first.

A glib "i apologize if in the history of this sub I have done that by mistake and ignorance" doesn't quite accept culpability. **YOU HAVE BEEN DOING THIS SINCE DAY 1.**

No, I was referencing the scant few times where I talked about a purely secular concept that had nothing to do within how God created the world or how the fall affected it ... and yet somehow I called it a biblical concept. Off the top of my head, I can't think of any examples where I have done this, so I left it as a general apology in case someone does find something. But the overwhelming majority of the content on this sub is stuff that I believe originated with God, not TRP/MRP. The fact that I adopted their terminology is simply to help reach an audience who already had a lingo to work with. This is no different than a missionary translating the Bible into a new language - he's trying to figure out how to communicate a message from God in terms that a particular community will understand.

And let me be clear: this is also why I wrote my other post on the balance of theology and praxeology. Theology is discovering divine truth through divine revelation. Praxeology, when it is accurate, is discovering divine truth through exploring the functionality of creation - which is also from God, even in the context of the fall, if He is sovereign (as I hope we all agree he is). So, the only room for secular concepts to make their way in here are

when they are inaccurate representations of praxeological truths and yet somehow we (or I) have been duped into believing they have merit, and have *ex post facto* added Scripture to them.

concepts such as spinning plates and OYS that apply to RP do apply to church behavior, just perhaps whitewashed in new language and applied less bluntly. It's not what we'd prefer, and definitely not what we're told growing up. It is, however, the way things are, regrettably.

But if these things are praxeologically true, then they originate with Christ, through whom all things were created. First, both "spinning plates" and "OYS" are things that are directly referenced in Scripture, albeit by different names. So, when we adopt them as Christians, we are not "whitewashing" a secular thing - we are rejecting the secular thing and looking at what Scripture says, which is why "spinning plates" in RPC looks very different from secular plate-spinning, despite having the same core operative principles beneath them.

More to the point, because we will only find examples of these things happening in Scripture, we can't on that basis alone conclude that it is good or healthy. Instead, we must accept that as a praxeological matter, if God is sovereign and this is how the world functions - both within the church and without - and that this is what is necessary to make a marriage work toward God's purposes, then it must have originated with God's intent, even if only as a "next best alternative" response to being in a broken world. A more commonly known and accepted version is the allowance of divorce. God's original design didn't account for this, but as a praxeological truth, God knew that forcing people to remain married would cause even more problems than allowing for divorce, so he allowed it. In the same way, "spinning plates" might not be God's perfect ideal, but if that is what is necessary to avoid the greater harm of living in a broken marriage that stifles spiritual productivity, then I accept that the "next best alternative" comes from God as well - while also remembering the whole host of mutual benefit that comes with these concepts, and not just the selfish ego-boost that women, feminists, betas, and white knights would like to highlight as if it's the only relevant part of the conversation.

If what you are saying, that even these considerations about practicality are irrelevant to the true kingdom of God

To be more concise, I'm saying the opposite: *That praxeology, although secondary to theology, is still an accurate measure of what God intended if one maintains appropriate spiritual priorities.*

The reason secular RP goes way off course is because they prioritize sex over the calling to make disciples, or even their own eternal fate. This misguided set of priorities allows them to skew their application of praxeological concepts. If praxeology is taken in the context of eternity, as it is meant to be, then we learn that praxeological truths make a lot more sense. That is why I repeatedly distinguish on this sub between descriptive and prescriptive aspects of RP. This should also address your last two paragraphs.

The value of application

2 upvotes · 3 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Touche

Need some advice on how to respond to this comfort test

2 upvotes · 2 February 2018 · /r/askMRP

Pressure flipping is probably the best option here. Get her talking about why she has this concern. That said, I'm not always processing the "best" response immediately, so the two times my wife has done this in the last six months, instead of thinking to pressure-flip I gave the following two responses:

- "Oh, you weren't supposed to see me stabbing those needles into my eyeballs the other day."
- "If I'm unhappy with you, you'll know it."

- She responds: "I feel like I do know it."
- I answer: "Oh, this is going to be real fun when I really am unhappy with you then."
- She punches my arm for teasing her, but still smiles.

Your proposed response comes off as super butt-hurt about something.

There is no "Christian version" of anything

2 upvotes · 2 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Or you're a Wesleyan who believes God makes decisions based on foreknowledge.

Or you're a compatibilist who goes with some mix.

I have no doubt good would have liked for everyone to be on board. But I get the impression that they had lost their chance before the ark was even finished being built. The ark isn't symbolic of Jesus's. It's judgment day.

The interplay between theology, praxeology, and philosophy on human behavior

2 upvotes · 30 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I don't, as my ongoing effort to build up this sub demonstrates. That said, many guys come over here with a psychological dependence on the approval of the rest of the manosphere. If someone on MRP starts calling them names and tells them to get their butt in gear, that has an impact on them - especially if they're weak in faith and that secular MRPer is telling them to do something contrary to the faith. They just might be persuaded to give in so that they can earn the approval of their fellow men.

When people come here, there needs to be something distilling that concept. They need to know that RP is not about doing whatever the MRPers or TRPers are telling you to do. It's about embracing the truth and letting that guide your decision-making processes. If I don't write things every now and then that makes this clear, new guys to the sub will never feel free to embrace what we're professing under God's Word.

The interplay between theology, praxeology, and philosophy on human behavior

2 upvotes · 30 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Indeed, indeed. This is my conclusion as well. Of course, this gets us heat with the secular crowd who says, "No, you must endorse our prescribed behaviors as well."

To their credit, I think I understand their rationale. They believe: "If you truly understood red pill praxeology the way we do, you would agree with us about the best course of action necessary to take." And in their frame of understanding, they're right. The key is to remember that "best" implies a directive. That "directive" for the secular crowd is enhancing sexuality.

To that end, I fully embrace every aspect of the secular RP view, including the prescriptive behaviors, as being the most effective method for optimizing human sexuality. But the "best course of action" for me isn't pointing toward optimizing sexuality alone; it is pointed toward maximizing my sexual experience without compromising my higher priorities, which I derive from theological conclusions, which in my understanding of "truth" or "Truth" will always trump praxeological conclusions.

More to the point: I believe that if every one of the secular RPers, no matter how hard core, embraced the truth of Christ as expressed in the Bible, virtually all of them would agree that the whole picture of the truth changes things and eternal consequences should factor into our sexual strategy.

After all, this is why MRP exists on a much, much, much smaller scale, right? As W&S once told me (paraphrasing): "It's not that we at MRP are pro-marriage. We're still anti-marriage, just like TRP. But we're simply against all the bad things that can happen to a man if he gets divorced." So, RP prescribed praxeology had

to change from TRP methods to account for this new purpose that TRP otherwise ignored: avoiding the pains of divorce. In very crude terms, RPC is now doing the same thing: adjusting the application of RP knowledge and praxeology to account for a new purpose that MRP otherwise ignores: avoiding the pains of hell (among countless other purposes we derive from biblical theology).

I'd be most intrigued to hear /u/BluepillProfessor's thoughts on this, as he was part of the transition from TRP to MRP, and now has been overseeing the birth of RPC as well.

How Can I Bring My Girlfriend to a Relationship with Jesus?

2 upvotes · 30 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Haha, well that sucks. God-speed in your recovery!

And yeah, I'm mostly on board with compatibilism, with a few minor exceptions :) I reach a similar conclusion, but on completely different grounds.

How Can I Bring My Girlfriend to a Relationship with Jesus?

2 upvotes · 30 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Do you know how many men have said and felt exactly the way you do, only to find out from the horse's mouth and/or clear evidence that they were banging another man like rabbits?

---> This guy! <---

This is dangerously close to the worst stereotypes of beta behavior. White Knights rushing in to save a "broken" woman.

Nail ... meet head.

How should one phrase to a woman that they don't want to have premarital sex, however, you still want to pursue the relationship?

2 upvotes · 29 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Ah, that makes sense. Although I don't disagree about the underlying compulsions, I do believe Christian women exist who are overtly desirous about sex while also having remained pure to a point. That is, some women remain pure until they meet the right guy. If OP is that guy, he might genuinely be the first one she might have been willing to give it up to.

It might also be her way of trying to lock him down - by weaponizing sex as a means of forcing him to propose under spiritual pretense: "We've already been one flesh, if we don't get married now that would make everything we're doing sinful."

Or it could just be that she's never met a guy who has aroused her enough to even spark this type of sexual desire in the first place, specifically to the point of being willing to overstep her spiritual bounds and OP is the first.

It could also just be that OP is interpreting her behavior as sexual interest when, in fact, she's just being more generally flirtatious.

Or maybe OP can handle more in the way of physical contact without crossing a line than she can, so once her line is crossed she's horny and just wants it, but OP has been the initiator all along, never passing the point of his own control ... and no other guy has initiated with her past one of her boundaries before.

I guess my point is that there are several scenarios where OP's situation might make sense and her still be a virgin, but without discrediting the fact of her female compulsions, hypergamy, etc.

All of that said, I do also agree with you that if she is trying to tempt him to go further sexually, "she is acting very unlike a Christian woman."

How should one phrase to a woman that they don't want to have premarital sex, however, you still want to pursue the relationship?

2 upvotes · 29 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

True, true.

you /him are asking her to contract now for later. thats what my issue here is.

Well, he's not making a contractual expectation on her overtly. He's simply saying that between now and marriage he has a boundary of no-sex that he will not cross.

Yes, there is a presumption that he expects her to be totally horny for him post-marriage, but that's not a condition of his boundary, thus it's not a contract. If he covertly maintains this expectation anyway, that's a covert contract he'll have to abolish. But it should be a characteristic about her he should suss out anyway.

If she's hot for him now, and he keeps her dangling, there's no reason to believe she will lose interest purely because of the marriage itself. Most loss of interest post-marriage is the result of changed behavior patterns once the commitment is solidified by vows and protected by divorce laws.

he wants her to be a virgin in some sense - then I can tell you with near certainty she isnt.

What makes you say that?

How should one phrase to a woman that they don't want to have premarital sex, however, you still want to pursue the relationship?

2 upvotes · 29 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Ah, I see what you're saying now. The context of OP's question made it seem like she wanted to have sex with him right now and he was trying to find a way to say, "Sorry, but not until marriage."

If we enter with the presumption that she has been jaded by the church against all thoughts of sexuality (as was the case with my wife - and to an abnormally extreme degree), then yes, a totally different conversation needs to happen. I'm not sure why, in that case, OP would be worried about this conversation because he already would know she'd be enthusiastic at the opportunity of avoiding the "dirty evils of human sexuality" for another few years.

Tag: /u/akohlan198

Christian dating: Good book 2 read together?

2 upvotes · 28 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Unfortunately, I'm not aware of any red Christian books. There are some that are purple at best.

Complementarianism usually is applied as purple, but something on this list might help:

<https://www.9marks.org/article/a-brief-history-of-complementarian-literature/>.

Just be ready to lead her away from any purple or blue ideas that may be expressed in anything you recommend. Even MMSLP has very purple tendencies. If she trusts a book author more than you, there's a problem.

Rollo Tomassi – The 21 Convnetion Talks

2 upvotes · 26 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I very much enjoyed the interview I saw with you from that convention. I'm looking forward to diving into the

full talk as well!

Given your prior misgivings about the 21 Convention, what % of the content available would you endorse v. reject as being "too purple"? Or does the site itself label different videos as "red" or "purple" so someone can figure out for themselves what to give the most attention to and which they can ignore?

Hypergamy in the Bible (Song of Songs)?

2 upvotes · 25 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Not necessarily to disagree, but for the sake of undersatnding: how do each of them demonstrate hypergamy?

My gut reaction is to say that Abigail wasn't trying to up her position, she was defending her rauckus husband and intended to remain faithful, and even after he died it wasn't until David approached her that she acted on it.

Similarly, Bathsheba doesn't show any interest in leaving Uriah for David. Rather, I get the impression that she would have preferred to stay with her husband, but only went to David after her husband was dead (albeit by more nefarious means than in Abigail's story).

Thoughts?

FR: Crawling back to RP after some struggles, wife kicks me while I am down.

2 upvotes · 25 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That's the point ;)

Hypergamy in the Bible (Song of Songs)?

2 upvotes · 25 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Could be ... haven't watched the video. But what you described isn't even remotely present in the text at all. So it leads me to think they're doing a lot of "reading between the lines" or just making it up as they go, rather than taking the scripture at face value.

Having my mother NOT come out for the birth of our child due to the way my wife treats my mother?

2 upvotes · 24 January 2018 · /r/askMRP

I agree fully. I was just noting that it's easy to convert passive aggressiveness into active aggressiveness.

Random RP Thoughts!

2 upvotes · 24 January 2018 · /r/RedPillWives

Yeah, that's mostly TRP. MRP is better, but still not perfect. If you can handle spiritual conversation [r/RPChristians](#) is probably more aligned with the mutual appreciation you have in mind.

Having my mother NOT come out for the birth of our child due to the way my wife treats my mother?

2 upvotes · 24 January 2018 · /r/askMRP

The aftercare is a legit thing. My wife's been through a couple c-sections and is given a severe weight-lifting restriction. When you have other kids running around the house that you can't pick, it's a serious problem when the guy's off at work all day. The problem isn't her need for help, it's that OP is letting his wife dictate what help she wants and why and on her terms and the only option he sees to take the reigns back is extremely passive-aggressive (no to mention the subliminal context others have already commented on as well).

Having my mother NOT come out for the birth of our child due to the way my wife treats my

mother?

2 upvotes · 24 January 2018 · /r/askMRP

Good answer. But it's only passive-aggressive if he doesn't tell his wife why he's not inviting his mom over.

Question about dating - denominational question - (22 y/o male)

2 upvotes · 24 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Methodists do have the traditional aspects to them, but they are also on the more theologically liberal end of the spectrum. Not as bad as Episcopalian though.

403 - The Lens Part 1: The Hopeless Cycle

2 upvotes · 24 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Indeed. That's the exact reason Paul wrote Galatians 3:3 :) Glad to hear this is helping. I'm looking forward to putting up part 2 soon.

Question about dating - denominational question - (22 y/o male)

2 upvotes · 24 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

As already noted, the Catholic and orthodox varieties certainly have a very restrictive view on sexuality. This is predominantly from tradition and only marginally from scriptural interpretation. Or to put it another way, their views cannot stand on scripture alone, though there are passages that may allude to their views.

Among protestants, some varieties of Southern Baptist are very prude, known for things like prohibiting high schoolers from going to prom because people dance at prom and dancing leads to sex, which is generally viewed as taboo. To be fair, not all Southern Baptists are like this.

In addition to the above three, Lutherans and the Amish reject most forms of birth control.

As for everyone else, there's no standard view from one to the next on sexuality. Individual pastors tend to set the stage for their own congregation's views.

Filtering RP through a Christian Worldview

2 upvotes · 23 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Good thoughts here. Let me clarify a few things:

Spinning Plates: For the most part, I don't recommend this to people. I only note that it can be done under limited circumstances without sin. As [/u/Whitified](#) noted, this isn't part of the descriptive aspects of RP, it's among the prescriptive aspects. When RP delves into the realm of prescribing life behavior, it steals away from the "you do you" attitude into trying to create uniformity - forcing men to adopt the same frame rather than creating one of their own. This is dangerous to do on an institutional level if not done with extreme caution. From the secular RP subs, I simply don't see that appropriate level of caution - it's communicated recklessly.

I did write a post recently on spinning plates. The point isn't to provoke interest in other women intentionally. It's the fact that when you're a high value man, you're going to develop plates that spin themselves. Even common daily interactions like saying hi and smiling at someone can be enough of a flick to get the plate spinning and she just keeps herself going on her own inertia after that - and that there's nothing wrong with this as long as you maintain appropriate boundaries and an up-front attitude of those boundaries. In essence, "plates" are simply the male version of "orbiters" for women. My wife has orbiters. I know countless other Christian women - married and single - who have orbiters as well. It's just a fact of life. We don't have an obligation to shut down every orbiter/plate that comes our way. Rather, as believers we have an obligation to engage others with kindness, patience, respect, grace, mercy, love, etc., but also with a firm representation of the truth, including of our own boundaries.

ONEitis: ONEitis isn't about singular affection; it's about singular obsession. It really stems from a conflict between the sniper mentality and the shotgun mentality. The sniper mentality is the guy who perches himself on the sidelines waiting for the perfect opportunity to take his one shot at a singular target. The shotgun mentality involves the fact that buckshot spreads everywhere in a short reach. It takes no patience or precision - it's just a matter of going out and doing your thing.

To that end, what you're really confusing in both of your question topics is the difference between the "finding sex" mentality and the "improving sexuality" mentality. When finding a sexual partner (which in a Christian context means someone to marry) the shotgun method is without question the absolute best to go by. The sniper mentality simply does not work and typically results in significant disappointment and the infusion of many beta traits that become self-incapacitating as to one's own goals.

Once married, you're not in "finding sex" mode, you're in "enhancing sexuality." In this context, the shotgun mentality is still the best approach, but from a totally different angle. You're not firing off your buckshot bag a new bird out in the field. You're displaying how powerful your shotgun is because that power makes your wife wet.

Now, the anticipated objection is that sniper rifles should be impressive to your wife too. That's fine if you're shooting at someone else, but good luck hitting your target ... your wife will get bored with the wait and not believe you'll ever bag the bird - especially since you don't intend to anyway. In reality, with the sniper mentality in this context, you're aiming the gun at your wife, and that's not sexy. That makes her want to run and hide.

To be clear, I'm not suggesting you actively seek orbiters with the shotgun mentality. I'm suggesting that you put a shotgun on your mantle instead of a sniper rifle, and that when you're polishing that tool (i.e. going to the gym, OYS, etc.) you do it openly rather than feeling like you have to hide yourself away.

To that end, I like it when my wife struts around the mall with me showing off her cleavage. Sure, she's got a shotgun there too, and when she wears her yoga pants to the gym, she's polishing her shotgun in front of everyone - and I prefer this over her (1) not taking care of her shotgun or (2) hiding herself beneath baggy clothes.

Long story short, if you make your wife your target, you do both her and yourself a disservice. Show affection, yes, but not as a shooting strategy. Do it because you want to, not because you *need to*.

I'd also challenge the concept of not showing affection to other women. Don't be romantic with other women, but you can certainly be kind, patient, gracious, merciful, a servant, etc. - and you should do these things intentionally. The church today grossly limits a man's ability to be Christ-like toward others when it tells men that they should ignore Christ-likeness in order to take on extra caution to preserve purity in their marriages. The Pharisees did the same thing - they added extra rules and laws to be extra sure they didn't fall into sin ... and Jesus condemned them for it. So when the church implies that we should avoid ever talking to other women because it might possibly lead to temptation ... well that's just nonsense and we don't see Jesus or the apostles doing this. We see Paul saying men should work alongside the women who contend for the Gospel (Philippians 4:2-3).

I have no desire for my wife. I cheated. What is the end-game?

2 upvotes · 22 January 2018 · /r/askMRP

Good anecdote. Would you argue that everyone else's experience will mirror your own? Or even a majority would if people gave up plate spinning in favor of monogamy?

I have no desire for my wife. I cheated. What is the end-game?

2 upvotes · 22 January 2018 · /r/askMRP

See my above response

Sandcastles and Dust to Dust

2 upvotes · 19 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is a good word - especially that last line. Especially for Christians, life has no end. So, if we were looking to some big finale as our defining moment, we're going to be disappointed for all eternity. This is expounded even further when considering even something like sanctification during this life, which won't ever be made complete, but the process of improvement and betterment is crucial all the same.

Thanks for sharing this!

A few questions for you "RP" hotshots

2 upvotes · 19 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Excellent post. A great reminder of things that often are implied, but left unsaid. Thanks for this, brother.

Blood sacrifice? Really?

2 upvotes · 11 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Sounds about right. I suppose my continuation to embrace Catholicism here is because "the average modern post-Vatican II Catholic who doesn't know, and frankly hasn't been taught or required to know, the historic and dogmatic positions of the RCC in this area" is the overwhelming majority of Catholics ... and I don't want to reject people on the grounds that they identify in name with something, but would very likely reject that name if they knew all it entailed. To that end, these types of things are part of why my church is something like 74% ex-Catholic. For many of them, I hear, "Once I heard what Catholicism actually teaches, I ran the other way." But, like Mormons, the Catholic church often hides some of its "less friendly" views to get people in the door and only springs it on them when they feel like those people are already hooked and reeled in.

Help I'm stuck in betabucks purgatory

2 upvotes · 11 January 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I would have responded, but it was already removed.

Blood sacrifice? Really?

2 upvotes · 9 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I assumed Catholics were here too. Maybe catholic isn't considered christian to some people.

Catholics are certainly welcome here. I use the standard of the Nicene Creed. It's not a perfect standard, but it's a simple and definitive one. All Catholics affirm the Nicene Creed, so I assume they're "Christian" for purposes of self-identification (again, where a person's heart actually is - that's a different question). A Mormon, for example, could not pass that test and would not be allowed to self-identify as Christian because they deny the Nicene Creed.

I overcame it about 3 years ago

This is the most encouraging part of your story :) I have a lot to say about this process and, unfortunately, have simply become too busy to keep putting out 400-level content, which is where most of this will be addressed. But as I see men posting about their deeper struggles like this, I'm renewed in my conviction that I do need to return to this soon.

I didn't even know that "catholic guilt" was a thing ! Wow. I just read about it online. That sums it up for me.

And it's not just Catholics. Many/most Protestant denominations lead to something similar, though Catholics are uniquely notorious for this. My wife was an extreme sexual prude for a long, long time due to guilt from religious

upbringing. She often told me in arguments about sex, "My parents only ever taught me two things about sex: if you're not married it's evil, and it hurts a lot. For almost 20 years that's all I was told about sex from my parents or my church. It's hard to get past that." She was never Catholic - that was coming out of Protestantism. So, we have it too. As I noted in another comment above, every denomination can be reamed for a myriad of flaws - maybe not always in *what* they believe, but in *how they apply* what they believe.

Amazing grace has a line in it about being a wretch like me. Why? It wasn't until I cultivated my own personal power and stop giving all my power away to the priest that I finally felt great.

The theological statement is an accurate and good one, but has little to no practical value in the context you were formerly trying to apply it. The truth is that apart from Christ we are filthy, wretched sinners. We are awful people. There is nothing good in us. Genesis 6 describes this saying, "Every inclination of the thoughts of man's heart was only evil all of the time." When Romans says that Jesus sets us free, it's not a freedom to do whatever we want; it's a freedom to do good. Before Jesus the only option is evil. As Romans 14 says, "Anything that does not come from faith is sin." But through Christ we now have the ability to choose good over evil, whereas our "good works" before Christ were always tainted with impure motives.

I suppose that's a long way of saying that God wants you to be empowered to make the right decisions yourself. If you ever do something *because you have to*, you're not doing it for the right motive and it's probably still sin anyway, even if it causes a positive result in the world. As /u/Whitified noted: don't let anyone be an absolute authority over what you believe or what you do other than God Himself (vis a vis the Holy Spirit or Christ in you). Be your own man and test everything against the Bible. After all, in Acts 17 Paul commends the Bereans for refusing to trust him until they saw in the Scriptures with their own eyes that what he was saying was true. We should all follow in their example.

Perhaps this post wasn't in the right place.

Nah, this is the right place. The initial reaction just started down a rocky path.

I was just curious what to do when you start questioning your faith ?

I'll try to write up a more full direct reply when I have some more time.

The Real Purpose of Woman!!!

2 upvotes · 8 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

What is the real purpose of woman? The Bible is pretty clear: to be a helper to her man.

What is the real purpose of man? The Bible is pretty clear: "The end of the matter; all has been heard. Fear God and keep his commands, for this is the whole duty of man."

Merge these two and we see that that the purpose of women is to help their man fear God and keep his commands. This, of course, only makes sense if we consider God's affirmative commands and not just the negative ones. Negative commands = "don't do this, don't do that." Affirmative commands = things like, "Make disciples of all nations," and "multiply, fill the earth in number," and all that other proactive stuff.

What if a woman is single? Is she without a purpose? Of course not. She's the bride of Christ, so he's her man, so she can participate directly in the divine plan.

For those who are married or want to marry: Why?

2 upvotes · 8 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Good stuff here. Primary takeaway: "It isn't wrong for women to make sure they will be protected from the

harshness of the world." Of course not. God designed women to be this way. That's a good thing that should be praised, not a selfish trait to be condemned.

Not a virgin

2 upvotes · 6 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Why pursue a relationship with a girl who isn't marriage material in the first place? Sounds like you're wasting your time and hers.

Not a virgin

2 upvotes · 5 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

To that end, call her out on the lie, repeatedly if necessary, and she'll appreciate your no nonsense attitude - particularly if you sprinkle in a few "I'm not judging you" mannerisms. She just might actually fess up to the truth. And if she really is telling the truth, you're still the guy who tells it like he sees it.

How betas manage to be bf ?

2 upvotes · 4 January 2018 · /r/askTRP

On the whole, I do believe that. The evidence I've seen to the contrary is usually a Q&A session with women, which is skewed by their perception.

I'm not aware of any definitive studies done on genetics about the subject; rather the comments about genetics are usually someone making an interpretive assumption based on those Q&A "research studies." I'm open to changing my mind on this, though, if I see evidence to the contrary.

The only thing I can think of off the top of my head is that male sperm recharges every 48 hours, giving heightened sexuality during that time. For those who have sex or masturbate every 48 hours or less, that urge doesn't ever manifest. For chronic masturbators it's a whole different dynamic in the first place.

On the female side, though, they have an entire week where their sex drive is amplified during ovulation, which does not diminish with sexual activity. So, whereas increased sexual activity for a man may decrease his sexual appetite while he recharges, the woman's is constant within each phase of her cycle. Of course, many men don't track her cycle, try to initiate just before or on her period where her drive takes a nose dive, then say, "See! She doesn't like sex."

Given that most men (committed Christians partially excepted) masturbate every 48 hours or less, the number of hours per month they spend beyond a given 48 hour span is almost certainly less than the number of hours a woman spends during or near ovulation each month. So, from that angle, over the span of a month, there's more time that a woman is likely to be sexually charged than a man. But, in turn, because men usually go at least 24 hours between sex/masturbation and recharge fast, their truly sex-averse phases are similarly fewer.

To put it another way, men are consistent with a modest sexual appetite, whereas women fluctuate with longer periods of heightened biological inclination toward sex than men.

Christian Plate Spinning ... Seriously? Sure. Let's do this.

2 upvotes · 3 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I seriously doubt that many husbands would be pleased with their wives developing abundance mentality this way

Fair point, but I'm pretty sure the boilerplate RP response would be that abundance mentality is an attraction factor for a woman toward a man, not the other way around. In an RP framework for understanding marriage dynamics (at least from a secular perspective, I haven't explored this from a Christian perspective), a woman

doesn't need an abundance mentality to enhance attraction to her from her husband. So, that abundance must be serving another purpose.

Now RC has made the comment in MRP that Christianity allows for polygamy, and has implied it's just the local law of the land that prevents engaging in other options endorsed by MRP because polygamy is against the law.

I literally just made a post on this. Although this is my leaning right now, I would not intend this as a hard theological statement for all.

I fully expect to see RPC eventually allow a second spiritual side marriage in lieu of adultery

I don't expect that. To have one "legal marriage" and multiple side "spiritual marriages" would be to spit in the face of the governing authorities contrary to Romans 13. This is what Mormons do. I myself will not endorse that.

this abundance mentality that includes flirting

I didn't say "flirting." My example was with a "hi" and having a conversation. Flirting is an additional layer of effort. Some people can engage that way without sinning, others can't. But that's riskier ground than the given example.

It's like putting a dieter in front of a buffet as expecting him to self-regulate. AMALT.

Sure, some may react that way. But I also understand that the cure to ONEitis is to spend time getting to know the object of your affection - and to realize that she's just a normal person like everyone else. She's not the "special snowflake" that you assumed from afar. In my experience, maintaining my distance keeps the mystery and magic alive. Once I get to know a person I often find myself losing interest because I start to see the flaws and how the relationship would likely play out, which actually has a positive effect on my ability to remain faithful.

And no, this guy's marriage is not solid since he has stated that he would have remained single given the knowledge he now has.

I'd say my marriage is solid. It's not perfect, of course. But you're confusing the point of my statement. The reason I wouldn't re-do it was (1) only if I could retain the knowledge of discipleship, and (2) because Jesus and Paul both appropriately say that one should remain single if he can, as this allows him to be wholly devoted to God. It has nothing to do with wishing I could get out of my marriage.

Tag: [/u/OsmiumZulu](#)

Christian Plate Spinning ... Seriously? Sure. Let's do this.

2 upvotes · 3 January 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

It is only the premarital sex that gets some Christian brother's panties in a bunch.

To that end, I say rightfully so. Although I do use the phrase somewhat flippantly, I really don't believe "premarital sex" is a thing, since I believe sex creates a marriage bond. Instead, I would technically call it "pre-ceremony sex." So, if a guy goes out and has "pre-ceremony sex" as part of a one night stand, that's fine as long as he acknowledges that he's created a spiritual one-flesh bond that God calls marriage. In this, there is no sin. It only becomes sin when he then abandons that relationship for another one, in which case his new partner is now someone with whom he is in an adulterous relationship.

Alternatively, you could view the new partner as a polygamous relationship and say that the sin is that he's not maintaining the God-given obligation to the girl from the ONS - especially if she goes off and sleeps with another guy, given that tacit approval of polygamy in the Bible was only ever one-directional, as polyandry never got similar attention. Would polyandry have received similar tacit approval from God? I don't know, but I'd wager not. If we look at the relationship with God and the Church, it still seems one-directional. Christ has one bride: his Church. But you could also look at it as to all of the individual parts of the body of Christ. I am Christ's bride just as much as my pastor is, just as much as my wife is, etc. But ... if I, as Christ's bride, decide to go take for myself a second husband, that's a violation of Rule #1: "Thou shalt have no other gods." This is probably worth a post just to see what others think on the subject, though.

All that said, I agree on all counts. My point in quoting Rollo is simply to say that "spinning plates" does not *have* to be sexual. Even the secular guru acknowledges this.

Interesting article from 2011 I thought would be beneficial to share | Her Desire, His Rule

2 upvotes · 2 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Although I appreciate what /u/Whitified and /u/RedPillWonder have said, I might say "yes" in a few circumstances.

- If it's a gray area and you have exercised your authority to cause them to act, then you are responsible for their sin and they are not responsible.
- If it's a black and white issue and you have exercised your authority to cause them to act, then you are responsible for sin, and they are also responsible.
- If your failure of leadership has increased their sinfulness on the whole, then you are responsible for the degree of the increase in their sinfulness.

That said, to give a contrary position:

- If your exercise of appropriate, godly leadership has increased their sinfulness (as often happens), then you are not responsible for this increase in their sinfulness. This, instead, is their own sinfulness reacting negatively in the face of genuine conviction, as people often do.

The RP is tearing me apart. Don't know what to do.

2 upvotes · 2 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Removed for a Rule 4 violation. If you want to argue a rational point, I'd be more lenient, but just posting links (these ones in particular) hits everything in Rule 4:

- against the purpose of the sub
- promotes outside content
- nominal quality

I'd probably be happy to entertain the conversation I think you're trying to start, but you have to actually start the conversation.

I had an epiphany this week

2 upvotes · 24 December 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

It promotes covert contracts. The whole concept behind the book is: "If you act this way toward your spouse, he/she will love you and be overjoyed and want to do anything for you." That's a lie. The idea behind having

different ways to communicate affection is valuable, but the author takes it too fast when he goes from "here's some helpful stuff to try" into the realm of "oh, by the way, if you do this then all these other things will happen too" - and the fact is that most of the time they won't. He took good advice but attached a false promise to it.

For those who are married or want to marry: Why?

2 upvotes · 21 December 2017 · /r/RPChristians

TL;DR - If a woman is faithful, available, and teachable, her negative AWALT tendencies can be overcome or minimized as she grows in faith, so these qualities are more important than finding a woman who "isn't like that."

Be the Judge

2 upvotes · 20 December 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Have you read through steels 'mystery method' post?

Loved it!

you cede the power in the moment you begin to DEER

I still believe this is context-dependent, per my reply to bogey. You seem to be saying "no matter the context" in one hand, but the given examples are always situations where she would have a cause to look with a judgmental eye in the first place. I am confident that there are times when a quick explanation has far greater value than other non-explanatory tactics and can often prevent arguments before they start.

For example: "Go put on your red dress. I'm taking you out tonight." You issue an order, then you explain your order. That explanation preempts her "why" or any likely complaints about not wanting to go out and it also gives her context for getting ready without you also having to say, "Also, put on blush, put on lipstick, put on nice shoes," etc. You can clear up a lot of otherwise wasted dialogue if you just give a quick explanation up-front. WISNIFG's "self-disclosure" category is almost always an explanation framed as a statement of intent.

I've also found that a non-engaging explanation of "Here's what we're going to do and why we're doing it" in the midst of what would otherwise be an argument enhances respect and trust. She knows that you're actually processing decisions before you make them rather than flying off the seat of your pants. It shows that you're trustworthy, competent and wise as opposed to brash and irrational. Sometimes brash and irrational is sexy. Sometimes it's not. I've tested both methods and have noticed a difference in both submissiveness of character and sexuality between when I employ each of the two.

That said, I do agree that *ex post facto* applications of DEERING are virtually always harmful regardless of context (unless you can conceal the fact that it's *ex post facto*). And I think this is what you and bogey have in your head. You're thinking of one specific context and assuming that the explanation is always coming from a mentality of weakness and can't quite wrap your mind around the way it can be an expression of strength, wisdom, and strong leadership - just not all the time.

To that end, what you're saying sounds great on paper and makes for great theory. The intellectual in me wants to agree with everything you and bogey say ... but in practice the results come out quite differently, at least for me. So, while avoiding explaining or rationalizing your decisions may generally be a good idea, I do see some situations where there is positive value in doing these things - just not in a manner where you're engaging with her on her level; rather, in a manner that engages her as the submissive who can benefit from the additional information you're providing.

If you don't see very easy fly balls when it comes to this, how does that lend to credibility, when a new mental model without any anchoring in what we already know comes around?

First off, most intelligent men should be able to self-assess devil's advocate positions enough that there aren't any unanticipated fly balls. But even if they do come, the default reply is: "Let me think about that." It successfully nullifies the thought from being pressed any further at that time, puts you in the position that will issue a judgment on that thought rather than her, and tells her that you're not a brash person who acts without processing relevant information.

Be the Judge

2 upvotes · 20 December 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

DEER is always a bad choice in every situation.

If I walk into court and refuse to present an argument that defends my client's position, demonstrates excuses for his behavior, explains his rationale, and rationalizes the wisdom in his choices I would lose my license.

DEERing is not "always a bad choice in every situation." Period. It is a bad choice in most situations, sure. But not every. Applying RP concepts in their proper context is valuable. Taking them beyond what they were intended to do just because it sounds more manly is idiotic.

To quote the post you cited:

I think fundamentally DEER comes from a place of a lack of confidence and a fear of judgement. People who do it are afraid of the consequences of their actions or inaction. They are afraid of people judging them or their decisions.

Using the court example, an attorney or party can DEER with a great deal of confidence in their position, but it's also worth noting that the judgment is real. The consequences for their actions are real. If a guy is falsely accused of committing a crime and does not defend himself, he will go to jail.

you really have to start digging into the reading

I've read it all. I'm on board with virtually all of it (just as I'm sure there are some technicalities you'd disagree with as well). But even these books are "explaining" and "rationalizing" their positions, and many of them preemptively present a "defense" of what they suspect others will argue (or already have argued) against their positions.

In faction, Rollo often talks about the conversations he gets into with those that object to his content. Sometimes he blows them off. But other times he engages. It's the "rational" male for a reason - because *rationalization* is not inherently a bad thing. If we were to say that all defenses, explanations, excuses and rationalizations are bad, then there would be no sidebar content in the first place. This sub wouldn't even exist. Someone like [/u/jacktenofhearts](#) would have been kicked out for how much he explained things to people he was trying to help.

Be the Judge

2 upvotes · 20 December 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

This notion that "DEERing is always bad no matter what the context; this is an infallible rule of manhood with no exceptions" is idiotic to me. The advice against DEERing is predominantly for idiots who don't know how to be wise about when to utilize these concepts and when not. They will always make the wrong choice, so we just tell them not to do it at all. When a person wises up, discretion can be added back in.

Be the Judge

2 upvotes · 19 December 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

True, no analogy is perfect, but they still hold value.

Why does a judge need anyone to represent his position? All judges enter a case with a basic impression on how the case should be decided. The attorney's job is to persuade the judge that the attorney's way is better than the judge's default view. Even without opposition a judge can be unpersuaded and go with what he originally intended.

113 - Christian Frame: Part 1, an Introduction

2 upvotes · 19 December 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I would call the great commission a clarification of Genesis 1:28, not necessarily a sub-point. The prompt to reproduce and fill the earth in number and master over it in a physical sense has shifted to a spiritual fulfillment of that same imperative. Spiritual reproduction is now the goal, not physical reproduction. We are called to multiply through discipleship, not necessarily child-bearing.

Specifically, humanity started fulfilling the physical command to fill the earth, but God said, "Guys, guys ... that's totally not what I meant. Let me send a flood and start over so we can try again." Malachi 2:15 explains what Genesis 1:28 really meant - that God wanted "godly offspring."

Of course, having physical offspring is necessary for there to be godly offspring. But we have filled the earth (some say we've overfilled it), so the command in a physical sense is moot. But we have not filled it with godly offspring, so the remaining imperative, through the Gospel, is to make the offspring living today "godly," per Malachi 2:15.

Should Christians Care About Physical Attractiveness?

2 upvotes · 18 December 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Excellent post. Thanks for this!

Should Christians Care About Physical Attractiveness?

2 upvotes · 18 December 2017 · /r/RPChristians

This is a genuine psychological phenomenon, not just among the RP population. Just as women have retroactive emotions, men have mnemonic attraction. A woman's retroactivity with her feelings says she imputes how she feels today onto her memory of how she felt in the past. A man's mnemonic attraction (my terminology, I don't recall the actual phrase) means he imputes his attraction from the past onto how he sees someone today.

It stems mostly from what I've written about in the past about the "summer effect" in high school. In past comments, I've noted that a fat nerd who gradually from August to May becomes buff will still never get noticed by the girls - he's still the fat nerd to them because his change was incredibly gradual. But take the same person and the same development from May to August (during summer when those girls won't see you for a few months) and all of a sudden people are asking, "What happened to him over summer? He's hot now!"

Since we're around our wives all the time, and they're around us, a similar effect happens. We still see them as they were, not as they are. At a conscious level, we can pick apart the differences, but subconsciously that memory from our attraction in the past is burned into us. That's why the "past lover" or "old fling" is such a powerful concept. We remember this intense, burning desire and when we see them again, in the absence of drastic, drastic changes that cannot be ignored, the subtleties of age, just a few pounds, less muscle tone, etc. just go unnoticed and we still get that rush of excitement at seeing the person we were once obsessed with. But if the changes are too significant, then the "summer change" effect triggers and our past attraction is broken.

402 - Impact of the Cross

2 upvotes · 18 December 2017 · /r/RPChristians

There certainly is some correlation on a denominational level. For example, virtually all Pentacostals tend to align with the spiritual warfare theory, and the results are pretty obvious.

Is speaking harshly to your wife a sin?

2 upvotes · 15 December 2017 · /r/RPChristians

As /u/OsmiumZulu alluded to, I always like to compare my relationship with my wife to how God relates with his bride. Now, I don't necessarily use Israel as the prime example. It's a good one - but I also take the view that the Church is now Christ's bride and not Israel anymore. Because the church is part of the new covenant and Israel was interacting with God under the terms of the old covenant, there is a difference in how we should view the parallel in the relationship.

That said, even when looking toward the Christ/Church relationship rather than the God/Israel connection, we see many harsh words. This comes first and foremost from the apostles (namely Paul). Although Paul is not the groom in the Christ/church relationship, if his words are inspired, they're from God, who does hold that position vis a vis Christ. So, Paul's God-inspired harsh words against the Corinthians, for example, are things that we can emulate in our own marriages. Similarly, Revelation (especially the agnells addressing the churches) is chock full of harsh words.

But what's most important here is that these words are always accompanied with an attitude that they are spoken for the benefit of the bride, not to express one's own frustrations and anger. So, I would do likewise. Before speaking harsh words, calculate carefully the impact of your words and determine if the severity is necessary to bring about the end you're trying to accomplish.

I do this all the time with my kids, by the way. They do things and I'm not necessarily angry at all. But I know they need to see me react a certain way in order to mold their behavior. So, I'll fake a modicum of anger, disappointment, or whatever the situation calls for in order to communicate to them that their actions affect our relationship, just as our actions affect our relationship with God. Now, my kids' actions aren't going to affect the fact that they're still my children (i.e. God won't kick us out of salvation, for the most part), but the character and the quality of the relationship is affected for sure. Similarly, if your wife is acting in a way that affects the character and quality of your relationship, just as Christ (who I do not believe we have the power to wound, hurt, upset, disappoint, etc.) reacts to us to reorient our lives to be in a right relationship with him.

Book Suggestions?

2 upvotes · 12 December 2017 · /r/RPChristians

For men who are not yet RP aware, John Eldridge is a decent starting step. He's definitely purple ... leaning more blue than red. But he's certainly redder than the rest of the church, so it's not a bad place to test the waters in starting someone's journey.

I would not recommend his stuff to a guy who's already embraced the red, though. This would be a step in the wrong direction. But you specifically asked about recommendations for someone who isn't yet RP aware, so he's a fine starting point. Just don't take anything he says as dogma.

Non-covert contracts... just contracts... how to handle?

2 upvotes · 30 November 2017 · /r/askMRP

Fellow guy with a deeply religious wife and 4 kids ... can affirm. Rambo is possible, but when she is convicted against divorce, you do have a lot more flexibility and can make progress much quicker.

It's hard to lead if you don't have preferences

2 upvotes · 29 November 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

In specific, you're correct. That said, there is still value in addressing principles behind leadership.

Consider personality typology as a nice, neatly packaged parallel. To rephrase what you said: "Personality is the distilled version of YOUR traits and synthesis of YOUR experiences that creates a unique style that suits you." Absolutely. And no two people are exactly alike. That said, personality inventories like Myers-Briggs, although far from perfect, still get used worldwide and are widely agreed upon as having value in understanding general principles, even if they lack the ability to predict with specificity how a person will act in a given situation.

Now, I know the M-B typology of pretty much every person I interact with on a regular basis. It's not a flawless predictor of their behaviors, but like a wide river, although I can't steer a drop, I know where it's all going to end up. I can guess the flow of a person's decisions, which helps me figure out how to interact with them most productively (which is incredibly helpful in my profession).

In the same way, although you're right that leadership can't be pinned down, trying to draw out general principles has great value - especially if one accepts that there are different ways to influence people and don't try to force every square, triangle, rectangle, etc. peg into a round hole.

How to respond to a marriage ultimatum?

2 upvotes · 25 November 2017 · /r/askMRP

Limited availability while on vacation, but here goes ...

But religion!

The disciples (Matthew 19:10), Jesus (Mathew 19:11-12), and Paul (1 Cor. 7) all agree that it's better to avoid marriage at all. Period. Legal or religious, I don't care, I speak from practical experience when I say their advice is on point.

You can't "keep the courts out of it."

I wouldn't say this is true for most jurisdictions, but definitely for some. All states have tweaked common law marriage to some degree from what it was pre-90s. In my state, common law marriage is gone in full. In other states it's just a higher bar to reach. Some it's still easy. The ceremony and wearing (or at least owning/exchanging) rings and calling yourself married will almost certainly meet even the higher standard.

For preference not to start a conversation that might tick off some mods, if /u/zamunda761 wants to ask about the best way to address this issue, he can PM me or ask the question on [r/RPChristians](#). My views on the subject keep evolving as I'm learning to filter out blue pill ideology from what the words in the bible actually say and mean in what was otherwise a very red pill culture (comparatively at least), so I'll note that for Christians the answers may not be immediately apparent. Interestingly, apart from RP, my wife independently came to the same conclusions I now hold :p Makes my job easier.

Discerning God's will - emphasized for singles

2 upvotes · 20 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

This makes sense to me. I agree :)

Discerning God's will - emphasized for singles

2 upvotes · 20 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Sorry if I made some bad assumptions. The context of your comment sounded like, "If I want to sin, I'm just going to do it because as long as it makes me happy it's not really sin because God wants me to be happy." I'm not really sure another way to have read that :/

Discerning God's will - emphasized for singles

2 upvotes · 20 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

In almost every case as long as I am myself God is happy with me.

This is an *EXTREMELY* dangerous thing to say without appropriate context. You have to remember that we have two selves: (1) the self we experience consciously in the flesh, and (2) the self we experience spiritually through Christ in us.

If you're referencing #2, then absolutely - God will always be happy with us when we're being ourselves. But everything you've written implies you really meant #1.

You're right that God is not a "moral policeman" - but the Bible is clear enough that he will judge people according to what they do (Romans 2:6, though 8 is also highly relevant here). If who you are has not changed from before you said "the prayer" to after, then being yourself will land you in hell. That's a straight up fact. You have to be the person God is trying to mold you into - not that works save, but that the one who isn't living righteously clearly doesn't have genuine saving faith. Read the entire chapter of James 2 for more on this.

I say this not to be harsh with you, but to wave a giant red warning flag because I really care about you and don't want you sucked into the easy-believism path. Easy believism says a person just needs to verbally profess Christ as their savior, but that they can continue in salvation without any evidence of their faith being expressed through their actions. To be clear: *faith makes no sense if it's not in the context of *being faithful**. You can't claim to have faith if you're not living faithfully to the calling God has on you. <Man, I'm really going to have to accelerate this 400-level stuff.>

God wants good for me. And in a sense, that means that he wants me to go after what I want

This couldn't be farther from the truth. To quote Galatians 5:17, "For the flesh desires what is contrary to the Spirit, and the Spirit what is contrary to the flesh. They are in conflict with each other, so that **you are not to do whatever you want.**"

This entire comment falls in the Proverbs 14:12 category: "There is a way that seems right to a man, but in the end it leads to death." I really don't want to see you go down that road, brother.

113 - A History of Feminism

2 upvotes · 17 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Interesting reference. I hadn't noticed that one before.

113 - A History of Feminism

2 upvotes · 17 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Ephesians 5:25 is clearly referencing Christ's death for the redemption of his bride, the Church. There is no confusion or mistake there. But it also cannot be taken in isolation of all of the other ways that God interacts with his people. For example, there are some who claim to be Christ's bride, but to whom he says, "I never knew you, away from me you evildoers" (Matthew 7:23). There are also passages about people who disown Christ and how he'll disown them before God in response (Matthew 10:33; 2 Timothy 2:12-13). So, if Jesus says, "There are some circumstances where people who are allegedly my bride will not be entitled to get the benefit of my sacrifice," there are also circumstances where your civil/legal bride will not be entitled to the benefit of your self-sacrifice on her behalf if she is not one with you in spirit.

But this is more significant: there are a whole host of things that Jesus **DOES NOT SACRIFICE**. He never once sacrificed his mission or plan of disciple-making. He didn't sacrifice his perfection. He didn't compromise on any of his teachings, views, or beliefs. He didn't cave on what he expected of someone who wanted to be one of his

followers (i.e. his bride) - and he let them walk away if they wouldn't adopt his frame. He did sacrifice his time, attention, energy, finances, popularity, and ultimately his life.

And what did he sacrifice for? For the church's happiness? No. For the church's freedom to get their way? No. For comfort and security from worldly pressures? No. Freedom from oppression? No. For the church to feel all warm, cuddly, and cozy in his arms all the time? No. His sacrifice functions to restore us into relationship with Him - to bring us into *HIS FRAME* rather than bolstering our own frames (or our collective singular frame as one body and bride).

So, if you hear a pastor talk about how you have to sacrifice your life ambitions, your time, attention, effort, etc. to make your wife happy - that's a joke. **Your sacrifice should be to do what it takes to get your wife into your frame.** That was the singular and primary goal of the cross. That's why the fall evicted people from the garden, as a demonstration that they were leaving God's frame. It's also why Jesus says in John 10 that he is the gate through whom we must enter (by virtue of his death/sacrifice), literally living inside the frame/gate.

How did Jesus get us into his frame? What, exactly, was the sacrifice he endured? What does this mean to us? That means suffering at the hands of the people you love. Jesus' sacrifice was directly caused by the Jewish people (who had to pressure Pilate into it who otherwise tried to release Jesus) - those same Israelites of whom God said in Isaiah 54:5, "For your Maker is your Husband - the Lord Almighty is His name." He suffered torment from these people in order to pave a way for them to be restored to his frame and away from their sinful rebellion.

In the same way, your sacrifice is meant to be to endure the torment and wrath of your wife to whatever degree necessary to pull her into your frame. This is why it's so essential to learn to pass tests. Because that's what the Gospel was - the biggest s-test God's bride had ever thrown at him. And he did it to bring her back into relationship with him *on his terms*, not on ours.

So, don't ever let someone confuse you on what Ephesians 5 means when it says, "Love your wives as Christ loved the church, who gave himself up for her." Understanding the context of what Jesus gave up, why he did it, and the things that his sacrifice actually accomplished - that's the only way to read Ephesians 5 correctly ... not imputing the blue pill mentality of a husband just sacrificing for his wife's happiness because it's 'the right thing to do.'

Of course, if you deny lordship salvation and embrace easy believism, none of this could make any sense - because then the church gets to maintain its own frame and doesn't have to enter Christ's.

Tag: [/u/BluepillProfessor](#) - given that you always seem interested in biblical perspectives on fitness tests, and this is about the biggest one the Bible (or world as a whole) has to offer.

113 - A History of Feminism

2 upvotes · 17 November 2017 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

you're really rejecting the World's version of chivalry

Or, more accurately, I'm using the word in its original, purest form. In the intro to *Mere Christianity* that words stop having value when we're constantly changing what they mean. He gives the example of "gentleman," which meant "land owner." He says someone quite nobly, but altogether uselessly commented, "Ah, but is not the true gentleman the one who is a gentleman at heart?" This is a great sentiment, but we already have phrases like "nice man" or "good guy," and we don't need to commandeer a term for a social classification in order to repeat what we can more directly say otherwise.

Similarly, people today have commandeered the term "chivalry" to mean something beyond its original bounds. We already had terms like "gynocentric" and "women worship" and whatnot.

The thing is, some words are accurate in their meaning, but other less accurate words have positive emotional connotations. People (usually liberals) find it easier to steal words that have positive emotional connotations and change their meaning, rather than trying to describe themselves accurately and change the culture to view the accurate words positively. This is an intentional psychological ploy.

Of course, the same thing happens with negative words too, like "intolerant." The original definition of "tolerant" was something along the lines of "able to live and function harmoniously alongside those with opposing views" - and *intolerance* was the inability to do so. I have now seen in a few modern dictionaries that the definition of *tolerant* is "someone who supports and encourages the views of other people," which gives the liberals the ability to call anyone who disagrees with them *intolerant*.

Word games are really a funny thing. But it's funny in the way that turning on a buzz saw and waving it over your newborn's head like you're pretending to cut her head off just to freak out your wife is funny.

Can I salvage this?

2 upvotes · 16 November 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Wanna know how I got out of it? Fucking discipline and accepting that the new "me" would never be the same as the old "me" ... man up, deal with the symptoms and eventually they would either get better or I would get better at dealing with them.

Reminds me of what Daredevil said to the disabled kid in the beginning of The Defenders:

- *That money is really gonna help your parents. But for you, from here on out it's only gonna get harder, Aaron. You realize you're only at mile one of the marathon, right? Everybody's gonna tell you how to feel. Doctors are gonna tell you to stay positive. Your family's gonna tell you not to feel sorry for yourself. Your therapist is gonna tell you not to be angry.*
- The kid says, "I just want my life back."
- Daredevil: *They can't give you that. Maybe you'll walk again. I hope so. But maybe you won't. But your ability to get through it as this gets harder - that is a hundred times more powerful than slapping a smile on your face and pretending like everything's just fine. <sighs> Do you understand? Hey, listen ... no one can give you your life back, Aaron. You have ... You gotta take it back.*

Give Me The Feels

2 upvotes · 16 November 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

the only time women want to win is when they're in competition with other women. Has nothing to do with their man, or men

I call this "the comparison game." I actually wrote a post on this (coupled with preselection) a couple weeks ago but never published it.

The thing is: it does have a lot to do with their man. Women only play the game with each other when the stakes are something that matters to them. So, a working mom might compare her great job to all the housewives who have no job - because her career matters to her. The housewives won't care about losing the job comparison because career doesn't matter to them - instead, they'll compete about how well their kids are being raised. Because the career mom cares about that too, it becomes a mutual competition where the career mom uses her additional financial resources to compete with the time and attention that the housewife can give to her kids.

The quality of a woman's husband always matters to her. Period. So, she'll either manipulate her man to make it

look like he's the perfect husband and avoid talking about how horrible their sex life is because she really isn't attracted to him (i.e. the hollow victory - she cheated to win), or she'll cede the loss, but get the approval and support from other women by complaining constantly about how awful her husband is.

My solution to men is, of course: don't play the game. Doing so steps you into her frame and makes you too concerned about how other people perceive you, totally killing your life directive. Instead, you do your own thing, invite your wife into your frame, leading her to ignore the game altogether ... and by doing so, incidentally that's how you win the game for real - when you stop playing. But at that point neither of you care that you actually won, yet the relationship still gets the benefit of the preselection/dread because everyone else can see that you're winning even if you and your wife are OI/DNGAF about the results of the game.

What is the value of femininity?

2 upvotes · 14 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

You might find [this comic strip](#) entertaining. It's not necessarily RP, but it about sums up the distinction between how feminists view women who live within their feminine role, as opposed to how Christian women actually experience it.

I will also re-reference [this comment](#) and that entire thread, which is designed specifically to answer that question: *How does submissiveness benefit the wife?*

Failed a fitness test tonight

2 upvotes · 14 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I always viewed AA as an immediate response to a shit test, not something done in the process of the conversation

Ideally, yes. But if you don't see a clear opening right away or aren't experienced enough to do it right off the bat, you can do it mid-conversation as a way of saying, "I'm done with this nonsense ... now let's have some fun."

We had a conversation with our pastor and his wife where I OYS and listed off a ton of areas where I have been passive

This is a great way to avoid the Rambo rap. Have someone with authority over the two of you tell you that you need to be making the changes you're already planning on making (i.e. being less passive, being more flirty, etc.). At that point she can't get confused about why you're changing - you're just doing what your pastor suggested. Why wouldn't she be okay with that? Well played. If she does get in the "you're changing too much! Let me take control again!" mode, just blame it on your pastor rather than revealing RP. Just be careful that this doesn't backfire if your pastor has a second conversation to 'clarify' what he meant ... and then you've got him speaking against your RP changes because he's too BP to know any better.

I also wanted to include this

Interesting article. Thanks for sharing! My wife is most likely suffers from approval idolatry. I think comfort idolatry is more deeply rooted in her, but approval dominates her surface actions.

Failed a fitness test tonight

2 upvotes · 14 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

It might have come across as me being butt hurt though.

This is the key right here. Lots of guys argue, "But I wasn't butthurt!" In reality, it doesn't matter if you are or not. It only matters if she perceives that you are. Perception is everything to women.

I don't know how Negative Inquiry will get her to see her feeling are not my fault

NI can certainly have that impact, and often does with my wife, but that's not the point of it. The value of NI is (1) that it gives you time to collect yourself, (2) puts her on the defensive by pressure-flipping and making her explain herself rather than you explain yourself, (3) pokes around at enough different places and causes her to say enough things until a clear AA is established, (4) disorients her from what she was originally trying to argue so that AA makes more sense when you do it, (5) helps you figure out the core of the issue so you can determine if it's an s-test or a comfort test much easier, and (6) helps put you in the frame of mind of realizing how ridiculous she's being so you can regain amused mastery as soon as possible, if you ever lost it in the first place. None of these depend on convincing or changing her perception of the problem - it's all about helping you by giving you a better perception and opening up opportunities to steer the conversation you want it to go. It's a way of commandeering a conversation that was otherwise at first dominated by her emotions.

How is getting butthurt a sin?

To be fair, I said "usually." I also define sin more openly than most. The original Greek word that we translate as "sin" is *hamartano*. In its earliest and most consistent uses before biblical writings it was an archery term that was said when someone "missed the mark." The distance from the dead-center of the bulls-eye to the arrow was the "hamartano distance" - just how far you missed the mark. Even if you hit the bulls-eye, if you were off-center, you had a hamartano distance. The idea is that God is perfect, so any imperfection at all, no matter how slight, is sin. It may not be morally condemnable sin, but it's an imperfection nonetheless - and all imperfection highlights our differences from God.

When a person gets butthurt, it's usually a display that they're not living in the contentment that comes from Christ. They're letting worldly influences affect their internal emotional state, which should always rest on Christ and only genuinely be affected by Him, except in circumstances where Christ would want you to mourn or become angry, etc. To that end, Jesus got "butthurt" when he saw the money changers at the temple and decided to drive them out with a whip. He mourned when Lazarus died. He got anxiety to the point of sweating blood when he was about to be crucified. So, emotional reactions aren't bad. But these were reactions that were consistent with his plan, his heart, his intentions. They were not responses to someone else trying to manipulate him. So, he was emotionally expressive, but he wasn't emotionally reactive, if that makes sense. Accordingly, when we act emotionally reactive, it comes off as butthurt (whether we intend it that way or not), which is an example of how we're not acting like Christ in a given moment - and that distinction of us being non-Christlike is an imperfection, and therefore sin.

I think I am more OI now and maybe it is just being communicated as butthurt?

Probably. Again, perception is everything to a woman. If you're not actually butthurt, it might not be sin; but if she perceives it as butthurt, she's going to think you're in sin. You'll have to figure out how to communicate in a way that avoids this perception in her - not because you have a spiritual imperative to convince her you're not in sin (as long as you know you're not, that's enough), but because that's going to impact how she is attracted to you and how well she respects you. If she's going to follow you in your new endeavors to grow and become the godly man you're orienting your life to be, she will need to see that you have the emotional wherewithal to get the job done and to be trusted.

I have a long history of being butthurt so maybe that is what is being communicated to her?

Indeed, I'm still getting over this with my wife. I have to go above and beyond to show her that my reactions today are not what she's used to seeing from me. I don't do this with words - I do it with my actions. When I was getting more denials after starting my MAP, I noticed her still recoiling a little, waiting for me to get butthurt - and even if I didn't want to act all lovey-dovey at the time (in fact, that's the opposite of how I want to (re)act), I still did it because she needs to see with my emotional state that I'm not hurt by her rejection. After that happened enough times I developed actual OI (rather than the 'fake it til you make it' type of OI) to the point where my gut reaction is actually aligned with being lovey-dovey in the face of rejection ... and the result is that rejections are pretty darn rare in the first place now.

How would I know I am going to fast? ... just changing as I learn new things

The thing is, you can learn things faster than she can follow. So, if you implement new things as you learn them, you're almost always going to be going too fast. I had started down that path and saw how it was setting a bad foundation for my improvement process. I got some good warnings early on about slowing down and took the advice and never actually had any explosions, though I did have a few comments where she'd be yelling and I'd be laughing and she'd say things like, "If this is part of all that 'self-improvement' stuff, I don't like it." That was the worst I got ... and now she likes it, so there's that.

As far as how you know, just gauge her reactions. If you notice her making comments about you changing, you're going too fast. Ideally, it should be so gradual that she doesn't notice. If she notices, she'll recoil and try to pull you back into her frame. That's fine because you'll know how to deal with it; but it also makes your job harder and it also makes her more alert to further changes. Reeling in the 1,000-foot rope should be something done in a manner where she doesn't even realize it's happening.

wtf is going on, I was in control of the relationship but I feel it slipping away, I need to do something about this

To some degree, this is a good mentality. But it does also demonstrate that you might be coming on too strong. She should be noticing this after-the-fact, not as it's happening. She should be thinking, "Huh, I just realized this happened yesterday," and not, "What's happening right now?"

Wife complains that she feels like I am "leaving her behind".

2 upvotes · 13 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I just didn't want to scare her away

Indeed. Don't go Rambo. If you've been a supplicating beta for years until now, you're going to have to keep some of those behaviors going for a while. Trickle in the things you're learning slowly and gradually, not as soon as you learn them. There's a temptation for new guys to read something, see all kinds of great stories on RP forums of how well it worked for someone else, and want to implement it immediately in the hopes of getting the same results. This does not work. You can't really internalize things properly that way - it's simple behavior modification, and if you don't see the return on your behavior change that you're expecting, you'll end up losing steam and regress (this is what we call covert contracts - an expectation that if you do something she must respond a certain way).

with HOW MUCH talking I've done over the years

This is why you don't talk to her about any of this. She's used to you telling her what you're going to do, and words never pan out. They're hollow promises. Instead, **SHOW HER** what you're doing to change (pacing yourself, of course) and let her live in the fruit of that. This can take anywhere from a few months to a couple years, depending on the length of the relationship. Be prepared - the longer you've been beta and the more you've

convinced her your changes are always superficial the longer it will take to turn her around.

i've damaged things beyond repair

Here's the beauty in our faith: once you're married, you know God wants you to remain married. So, God's going to make a way for the marriage to work. Period. It's never 'beyond repair.' Now, whether or not you're willing to follow through with what it takes to make that "repair" functional is up to you. But you have the entire concept of redemption working in your favor.

theres really not much mystery to me... i've verbally communicated every thought and desire i've had to her

But people change - and obviously you've started changing. There's no mystery right now because she's had very recent communications to you. But if you stop that over-communication, eventually the silence will catch up to where she thinks you're at and she'll start seeing gaps between what she expects you to do and what you actually do.

Also, and this is a tip from my pre-RP "humans are my lab rats" days (not a suggestion; just letting you profit off of my past): intentionally do things people would never expect you to do just to see how they respond. This adds the mystery back to you because she can no longer predict your actions. It also gives you an opportunity to learn how she reacts to you in different situations. It also tests the limits of how far she's willing to follow you and under what conditions.

For example, you've probably never just randomly scheduled a one-night trip to a hotel in your home city to just chill with her and your kids (if you have any) at the pool and a new environment. You can probably find something for under \$100, plus a \$50 meal = a relatively inexpensive getaway that changes up the focus that she's not expecting at all.

Other ideas include sending her an unanticipated lewd photo of yourself or text message and see what she says; show up after work with pizzas without telling her in advance, even if she happens to have already made dinner for the night (in fact, that's even better, as it forces her to see the unpredictability of your behavior); pinch her butt in public where other people can see; call up her parents for a quick chat and don't tell her about it - let them do it, then play it off casually like you just felt like catching up with her dad. Seriously, just find stuff she'd never expect you to do - things that are generally positive and, if possible, sexually suggestive - and start doing them to add that mystery and unpredictability back into the relationship.

Failed a fitness test tonight

2 upvotes · 13 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I was mostly stoic during this conversation which is pretty new for me.

You may already know this based on our private conversations, but just to clarify, stoicism isn't about being emotionless; it's about not letting circumstances affect you toward negative emotions. As wikipedia says, "Stoicism teaches the development of self-control and fortitude as a means of overcoming destructive emotions ... becoming a clear and unbiased thinker." One should still maintain their positive emotional traits. A decline in positive emotional traits at a given time shows that your wife's outbursts are affecting you - even if she can no longer draw you into negative emotions. So, if you were smiling and cracking jokes before, you have to continue smiling and cracking jokes through the test to show that you are unphased by her actions. Simply avoiding negative emotions is not enough. Even better is to increase your positive emotional expression as a counter (not a support) to her efforts, which is why AA works so well. But even [/u/BluepillProfessor](#) notes in his podcast that AA should not be the default test response in a marriage the same way it would be if you were single.

I since changed my mind about said goal and didn't tell her.

This is where you failed to lead. It happens, no biggie. It's rightly her job as your helper to highlight when you're not oriented toward fulfillment of communicated goals, so she wasn't wrong in what she did, though probably wrong in how she went about it. Of course, this could have been averted with a simple, "Hey, just so you know, I changed my mind about ..."

I should have A&A in response. My response instead was to get ready for bed which I said I was going to do

Conflicting thought here: (1) you told her what you were going to do and you followed through despite her comment ... but I get the impression from the rest of the post that she took this as a negative emotional reaction from you - the withdrawing/passive-aggressive type of emotional butthurt rather than the active-aggressive type ... either way, you did what you said you would, so props for that; (2) AA would have certainly dispelled any impression of being butthurt and positioned you in a much stronger place overall.

if you want to ... (trying to regain frame)

These two phrases are often incompatible. Simply say, "I'm going to keep getting ready for bed, like I said. Come on in here and we'll continue to chat." Or, if you don't want to chat and AA isn't a natural thing yet, just STFU and let her figure out if she wants to talk at you or not.

says I was in sin by disrespecting her

NEGATIVE INQUIRY!!! There's a reason this is my favorite. "I understand you felt that way [fogging]. What did I say that came off as disrespectful? [NI] ... What is it about that you think is sinful? [NI] ... I can see why you would think that [fogging], but is there a place in the Bible that affirms this, or where are you getting the idea that this is sin? [NI]" 99% chance she's trying to use "sin" as a spiritually manipulative term against you - especially when she's got the plank in her own eye.

I always got on her for walking away when we were talking (... true)

Why does it matter if this is true or not? This isn't an "I do that to her, so she can do it to me" scenario. And if it was wrong for you, it's wrong for her. Your wrong doesn't justify her wrong ... two wrongs don't make a right, and all.

my new norm is just walking away from bad situations. Maybe since I don't know what to do I am trying to regain frame?

I wouldn't walk away mid-fight unless it becomes dangerously toxic. The typical pattern should be STFU -> [Fog -> NI - on loop until you can figure out a good AA opening] -> AA

How do I decipher between fitness tests and her actually being concerned I am in sin and is calling me out according to Matthew 18?

Her attitude. A concerned wife sounds very different from a shrewish wife. BPP's podcast actually has some humorous audio clips of his wife that he uses to assist in identifying s-tests from comfort tests. The "concerned I am in sin" thing is a comfort test. It's her way of saying, "I'm really worried about you and I want to know that you're committed to me and to Christ." It's easy to get these confused, so I don't blame you for the question. But the podcast is a good place in discerning these. MMSLP also goes into it some.

Is there any way to reply to being called out in sin without DEERing?

If you've actually sinned (and getting butthurt is usually sin, for the record), then fogging is your best friend. Agree, confess, etc. But if she's calling you out in a negative way, you can still AA after fogging and agreeing. If it's a comfort test and genuine concern, just acknowledge it, repent, and be appreciative that you've got a first officer who knows how to keep an eye out for her captain's spiritual well-being.

Is it just fogging?

Mixed with AA, STFU, and NI.

Should I ever say "thank you for your permission" even in a sarcastic way?

Never be negatively sarcastic. AA by definition is positive sarcasm.

My stoicism made me seem like an a-- hole this time, but should I ever say it even jokingly?

I'm not sure of the context for the phrase, but probably not.

How do I handle pre established norms that need to change?

Patiently. Just keep doing you and let her follow at her own pace. Don't try to force the norm to change. Just let it happen whenever it does. If you've been married 10 years, expect it to take 10 months.

Should I specifically say things are different?

No.

It has never been a norm for me to be stoic or not need to fix things.

Then don't jump into genuine stoicism too fast. If you had a pattern before of getting needy and rushing to her to fix things every time there was a problem, continue that pattern - just phase it out gradually. As you phase it out, make sure you're doing it in a manner where you're only displaying these blue pill tendencies when it will do the least damage. Trying to implement too much too fast results in going Rambo and she will explode on you, which it sounds like you're predicting to be the case from your first line of this post.

Should I specifically say: "if you start disrespecting me, I am going to walk away."

No, but after she has already disrespected you very clearly in exaggerated ways, feel free to say something along these lines.

Is this a good guide for fitness tests

It's not a bad outline, but BPP's podcast covers it better. That link is geared more toward singles. Things are slightly tweaked when you're married, particularly in a Christian relationship.

What is the difference between an "alpha" and a sociopath?

2 upvotes · 10 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

An alpha does what he wants. A sociopath doesn't care what other people want. The two can overlap, but there's a lot of room where they don't.

Hypergamy for the Married Man

2 upvotes · 9 November 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I'd love to see how you rationalize SGM or MMSLP or BPP's book/podcast or even NMMNG itself being on the sidebar with however it is you're defining covert contracts.

And as I've said before: DEERing is how we learn and grow. There would be no RP if nobody ever took a position and defended it or explained why they hold that position or developed a rational foundation for why something works. If you were a woman I was trying to screw, I wouldn't DEER with you, but as far as I can tell I'm not trying too screw you ...

Hypergamy for the Married Man

2 upvotes · 9 November 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

https://www.reddit.com/r/marriedredpill/comments/7bk3il/hypergamy_for_the_married_man/dpku8hq/

Hypergamy for the Married Man

2 upvotes · 9 November 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Translation: "I'd rather mock a fake ideology to ignorant people who don't know any better than engage with someone who knows I'm actually speaking out of my butt."

I could just as well go around telling people **"/u/RuleZeroDAD** thinks covert contracts are the way to win a woman's heart - don't waste your time listening to him because he's totally clueless." If I make up something about what I think you believe, that doesn't mean you actually believe it or that the dogma you follow supports it.

Hypergamy for the Married Man

2 upvotes · 9 November 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I was referencing the "covert contracts" and "he's removed 'GTFO' as an option" bit. I don't care if you want to call me purple. But don't go waving a false banner about your speculations of me to justify your efforts to discredit what I have to say when they're inconsistent with what I actually think and believe.

Hypergamy for the Married Man

2 upvotes · 9 November 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Meh, says you. I think that's more you imputing your misunderstanding of my ideology onto me and not what I actually think/believe.

Hypergamy for the Married Man

2 upvotes · 9 November 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Go one step further ... look up **Georges Lemaitre**. To quote Wikipedia:

Lemaitre also proposed what became known as the Big Bang theory of the origin of the universe

Oh yeah, and he was also a Catholic priest who essentially invented this theory while teaching at the Catholic University of Leuven.

Hypergamy for the Married Man

2 upvotes · 9 November 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Our religion sure did a number on this woman. That was not what God intended at all!

I think that's more her parents, abusing religion to get her to conform to their expectations. A sad, yet common reality.

The woman's unfailing mythical Chad Detectors are absolutely EASY to fool

I've noticed this repeatedly. But you have to be careful or else you start to contradict what you said in that one conversation with willow on RPC about window dressing. Yes, they're easy to fool, but at the same time, the man still needs to internalize it. It's not just "fake it to get what you want, then keep faking it" - it's "become the type of person who gets what he wants."

AND that you can manipulate your relative SMV by basic behavioral changes- in the same way women alter their SMV with a corset and makeup and high heels.

Perhaps, but there is a timing difference. The woman's change in SMV can literally happen instantaneously or in a matter of minutes. The man knows who the woman used to be, but doesn't care if she's dolled herself up in the moment and acting all slutty at a given time.

On the other hand, if a guy steps up his alpha game, the woman will still judge him by his past behaviors and it takes time to convince her that his new behavioral patterns are more than just an act to get in her pants. This is why, as you say, dread occurs over a span of several months - even a year or more, and not something that can be employed all at once for immediate results.

you show not that HE is not a threat to YOU. You show that YOU are not threatened by HIM. See the difference?

Absolutely. I was careless in my wording.

Hypergammy is not good or bad, it just is.

Agreed. I wasn't saying hypergammy is bad. I was saying that it can work for you or against you. If it's working against you, those are the "negative impacts" I was referencing. The whole point of the post was about how to stop hypergammy from working against a guy and get it working for him instead. Stopping a woman from being hypergamous would be tantamount to trying to turn her into a man, and I assume we all don't want to be married to dudes.

Hypergammy for the Married Man

2 upvotes · 9 November 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Some of the items I listed have been added, but divorce has always been an option. When I said in the past that it's not, it's because the conditions by which I would consider it an option were not in existence at the time, so I was trying to nip the "ditch and replace" comments in the bud. Obviously that has pretty much always been taken the wrong way.

Hypergammy for the Married Man

2 upvotes · 8 November 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

You're probably right on that. There are just some standards that are so mass accepted that it seems to be objective.

And no, I don't intentionally seek orbiters. But that doesn't stop them from finding me.

Hypergammy for the Married Man

2 upvotes · 8 November 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

The practical application points are based on things I have naturally done, not mental strategizing angst implementation. As noted in the post, one of the examples came from almost a decade ago, long before the notion of sexual strategy entered my mind and before MRP existed. They come from a place of thinking, "I noticed this worked for me, maybe it will for you too."

Suggestions on how to undermine the crab bucket

2 upvotes · 6 November 2017 · /r/askMRP

"Christian" friends who are, of course, actually feminists underneath their Christian cover

Oh, how I hate those who give us (Christians) such a bad name.

I am "using" her because I refuse to legally marry her

Let's be fair here. You are. Even if you married her, you'd still be using her. It's not a real relationship if it didn't involve each party trying to use the other for something.

her friends keep telling her ... I've been .. calling out ... and telling my girl

Okay, it's your word against theirs. In a word-battle, she's going to side with her girlfriends every time. She might behaviorally align with what you say, but internally she will feel like they're her real support system, not you - especially if they're telling her what she secretly wants to hear anyway.

Solution? Don't use words. Don't tell her anything. Just do you.

This is common problem for men dating Christian women

I can say with 99% confidence she's probably not a genuine Christian. She probably has the fear of hell in her, so tries to self-identify with a religious organization in the hope that her skin won't be melting off for all of eternity, but that's not how Christianity works. If she were truly "saved" she wouldn't be dating a non-Christian or having sex before she's married (or at least she'd have serious convictions against it after every failure that it would severely affect the relationship). **This comment** demonstrates that somewhere around 18.65% of people who attend church regularly actually meet some minimal criteria for "saved" ... and if that number is extended to all self-identifiers, it's only 3.8% of all people who call themselves Christians. Chances are you found someone in the 96.2% (or if she does go to church regularly, the 81.35%). I wouldn't take her faith seriously, especially if she's already shown significant signs of being willing to compromise it when it suits her fancy.

The reason she's so influenced by these other women (even though the odds are that those other women are also in the 81.35%) is because women inherently get their identity from other people. So, if they want to figure out if they're "Christian" or not, they look to other "Christian" women for validation. If these other women give a nod, then she feels secure, even if it's a false identity coming from a false source. As the man, it's your job to give her an identity. When she lives in your frame, she's adopting your identity. If she's that worried about eternity, she's always going to have one foot out the door, looking to someone else for that aspect of her identity (whether right sources or not), and you need to decide if you're okay with that.

208 - Leadership Part 2

2 upvotes · 4 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

We periodically talk about the state of our marriage at my prompting.

Do you ever wish he would initiate these conversations?

I've read on RP subs that a woman can never love a man the way he desires. Yes she can and yes I do because Sarah and Ruth are my role models.

I agree with you on your thoughts on this. That said, to be fair to the rest of the RP community, I think they mean this in the same way they mean "AWALT" - not all women are actually like that, but all have that underlying imperative. Some women actually *aren't like that* - but only because they're suppressing the tendencies that really are there, exercising greater self-control.

In this situation it works similarly - all women find it incredibly difficult to love their men the way those men want/need to be loved. Some are able to overcome that underlying difficulty better than others, but the struggle is there - and your story affirms this. You just happen to be a woman with a stronger drive :) Props to you for that!

I've read that a man cannot show weakness or she will lose interest and branch swing or have an affair.

This goes to the "useful" v. "non-useful" assumptions category. Again, it's clear that many women remain totally faithful to extremely weak, beta guys. In fact, I saw a thread on askMRP recently where one of the mods reamed a guy for over-hyping the "all women cheat" notion, and his point was just as I said: "The evidence is that many women do remain faithful to weak, beta men."

But assuming she'll be faithful no matter what is not a useful assumption. It doesn't help the man better himself, nor does it protect him in the event he actually did marry one of the cheating-type with low self-control.

Assuming she might cheat under the wrong circumstances gives a guy a reason to keep improving - which also benefits his wife. It also (1) prepares him to minimize the risk of cheating, (2) puts him in a position that helps her exercise self-control and develop strength of character, and (3) minimizes the devastation he might otherwise experience if she actually does end up cheating anyway.

Basically that a woman isn't capable of actions of love without a man leading her.

That I disagree with ... but I should qualify: *Without God, I do believe he is right*. 1 John 4:8 says that God is love. So, without God no one is capable of pure love the way God intends. I say this boldly, but with reservation at how I know how poorly this will be taken by many, but I do not believe non-Christians are capable of true, pure love. They can experience and express a shadow of it, but not the real thing (see Hebrews 7-10 re: earthly expressions being "shadows" or "copies" of the truer heavenly things; and I believe pure love is one of those "heavenly things" that non-Christian love cannot rightly attain).

In this regard, even non-Christian men are incapable of loving their wives appropriately, nor can they lead their wives to love them fully. As among shadows, I can't say for sure - but I do suspect that the "shadow" concept is partly why many men on MRP don't experience love "the way he desires" - because God has put in a specific desire that only He can fill and no woman can fill that void.

Now, among Christians, I do believe that a woman who is living by the Spirit CAN love her husband appropriately and purely, even without him leading her into it. But this is working against the grain of the order of creation. It's possible, but not the way God designed things to function, so it's easier to facilitate pure love as a two-way street when the husband actually is leading his wife.

Anyway, I will be deleting the painful part of this post.

I'm sorry to hear that any of this is painful for you. What about it causes pain? Is it at remembering how much you have sacrificed for the sake of being loving and submissive?

Back to Basics – Mystery Method, The Game, and the Rules of the Game, Married Edition

2 upvotes · 3 November 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Dang! A month to write a post? That's insane. Longest I've spent is probably 2 hours :p You're making me feel lazy.

FR: Why having a mission is so important

2 upvotes · 3 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

We're starting a new small group sometime in the next month or two and this time it's mostly made up of people she's inviting (I've drawn the crowd for the last few groups we've led). It will also be more co-led this time, rather than past groups where I did all of the teaching and facilitating.

Also, she started an 8-week women's group last week, where she's implementing things that I've instilled in her in the girls in that setting.

Also, I'm encouraging her to invite more families from the neighborhood for dinner, which we just had a couple over last night that she had invited. In the past I was always the one connecting with and inviting people.

We're also scheduled to lead a conference in February on spiritual healing/freedom where I'm writing most of the content and she stepped up and decided she wanted to be the one to share the Gospel on-stage for the conference and write all the content that would go in the handbook for it. This is very exciting given how introverted and timid she usually is! From being too shy to pray out loud at small group to speaking on stage at a conference is huge :)

FR: Why having a mission is so important

2 upvotes · 3 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

We're starting a new small group sometime in the next month or two and this time it's mostly made up of people she's inviting (I've drawn the crowd for the last few groups we've led). It will also be more co-led this time, rather than past groups where I did all of the teaching and facilitating.

Also, she started an 8-week women's group last week, where she's implementing things that I've instilled in her in the girls in that setting.

Also, I'm encouraging her to invite more families from the neighborhood for dinner, which we just had a couple over last night that she had invited. In the past I was always the one connecting with and inviting people.

We're also scheduled to lead a conference in February on spiritual healing/freedom where I'm writing most of the content and she stepped up and decided she wanted to be the one to share the Gospel on-stage for the conference and write all the content that would go in the handbook for it. This is very exciting given how introverted and timid she usually is! From being too shy to pray out loud at small group to speaking on stage at a conference is huge :)

204 - Abundance Mentality ... and Humility? Yes, both.

2 upvotes · 1 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Glad to hear it :) I always advise to continue testing everything against Scripture. Even I go back and question some of the stuff I've written and wonder if it needs revision or is really biblically sound. So, always feel free to challenge and ask questions.

In the meantime, I'd love to hear your story and what's been going on during your lurking phase. Maybe make a post about it!

207 - Perseverance, Sin, and Fitness Tests

2 upvotes · 31 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Unfortunately, this sub is probably the closest thing in the world you'll find to a "red pill church." I'm sure they exist ... I just haven't found one. I had a pastor who was unwittingly a clear red-pill type guy, but he moved off to the other side of the country ... Phoenix, AZ. Very sad.

And so my journey must begin

2 upvotes · 31 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

if my wife left the home and took my kid?

If she did this, she's got bigger arguments to worry about than whether or not you were an involved enough dad.

Even so, if you've provided financial support, attempted phone contact, attended the kids' sporting events, how often you've tried to reach out to her to spend time with your kids, how long it took you before initiating court action, etc.

if I'm deployed overseas?

Unfortunately, military personnel, as a practical matter, do not get custody often due to the nature of the job calling them away at a moment's notice and the inability to make parenting decisions and spend time with the children while on deployment. That said, if the mother is totally screwed up, it does happen, and the father just has to make arrangements for while he's away on deployment. In the alternative, some men simply have to choose between continuing a career in the military and having custody of their kids.

As for the arguments, the above still applies with regard to your efforts to be involved.

I need some encouragement about remaining sexually pure.

2 upvotes · 30 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

When you say that it's better for some people to remain unmarried, isn't that like some serious straight-up *RPChristian* stuff? I feel like RP mainstream is mostly about getting laid.

It's not unique to Christianity. [/u/Whitified](#) and I have had lots of conversations - ultimately in agreement that marriage is the lesser option in a Christian world, but head over to TRP and you'll see swarms of advice there on why RP is "anti-marriage" (or more accurately: "anti-marriage 2.0" ... or 1.5 or whatever). Neither secular nor Christian RP will tell a person they're "wrong" for wanting to include marriage as part of their long-term goals, but making *marriage itself* the goal is the epitome of the beta mentality. You must have a transcendent purpose for wanting to get married - both in secular and Christian RP.

The difference is that secular RP abandons marriage because it's easier to get great sex when you're not married, so getting married puts you at a disadvantage on any sexual dynamic. Christian RP discourages marriage because (per 1 Cor. 7) it interferes with a person's ability to commit to his mission from God, while continuing to deny sex outside of marriage.

Do you know guys who are single and happy?

Yes. They're the types of guys who could easily get girls/sex if they wanted, but have chosen otherwise for an intentional purpose - and usually they're uniquely capable of remaining celibate once properly unplugged from cultural conditioning toward sexuality as being the primary focus of life.

I don't know anyone in real life, any female, I'd like to have mother my children and wake up to, etc.

And therein lies part of the problem - those are peripheral aspects of marriage that show that your view of Christian marriage is still about each other and not a greater purpose. It's nice to have someone you can enjoy waking up with and raising kids together ... but those are secondary to the purpose of the leader-helper dynamic in the context of the God-given mission to make disciples of all nations.

A priest told me I should look at relationships as exploring other people.

That's a good way to put it. I consider it more like an intimate job interview. God started an organization called the church. He put you in charge of a specific division in your locality. He says you can fulfill that on your own if you want, but if you feel like you need a helper, go for it. So, you decide to hire an employee to be your right-hand-woman - someone who will help you manage the day to day operations, marketing/getting the word out, handle administrative tasks, etc.

Online dating sites or "word of mouth" from friends are the weeding process where you're sorting resumes and gathering recommendations from other colleagues you trust. The first date is the initial interview. Dating itself is like an internship - a trial period with no long-term commitment, but necessary to test the waters and see if this person will actually help or not. Marriage is the post-internship employment contract. Of course, in the church this is an eternally binding agreement. You can sever practical relations, but God only gives you one "hiring token" - and once you've spent it, it's gone (unless you maintain a view that remarriage after "divorce with grounds" is not sinful).

Now, if we all had this mentality, wouldn't that drastically affect what we look for in a woman? Of course, this context leaves sexuality as a sideline thing - but that's exactly what it should be. It's a secondary function of marriage itself in a post-Gospel world (in a pre-Gospel world it was the primary because sexual reproduction was necessary as a metaphor to help people understand spiritual reproduction in a post-Gospel world).

From here it should now be much clearer how devastating it is to make the marriage your goal in life - especially the woman. How would it make any sense for a regional manager to interview dozens of people and go through several interns just to find an intern he can devote his life to pleasing, at the expense of the company? That's literally what 1 Corinthians 7 is saying happens when we get married for the sake of the marriage - it's a distraction from our actual purpose. The new employee then doesn't actually have a job because the regional manager has folded the company in order to center everything around the employee, who is left wondering, "Wait, why did I want to get hired here in the first place? Oh well, if it's going to be all about me I might as well just take advantage of it and live it up as much as possible," and thus men get manipulated in marriages.

And so my journey must begin

2 upvotes · 30 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Sound Activated Recorders (SAR) are not admissible as evidence (and their existence should be Top Secret), but they can give you direction on her intentions.

That's state-specific. My state allows audio recordings as long as one person involved in the conversation (i.e. you) consents to the recording. The other person can be oblivious and it still counts.

I need some encouragement about remaining sexually pure.

2 upvotes · 30 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Why do I still struggle so powerfully with this?

Because you don't have a mission in life that transcends your sexual desire. You are still living in the blue pill -

you idealize marriage and sex as some ultimate goal in life. You have made it your emotional center. RP is about breaking that ideology and returning to a state where you're in control of your desires rather than letting cultural influences and social norms tell you that you should want sex and that marriage is some ideal bliss that everyone should strive for.

In reality, marriage, at its core, is a contract to enter into a partnership for a common purpose. The man sets the purpose. The woman says, "I like your purpose. I want to be involved and I trust that you can actually get that purpose done. What can I do to help? Where do I sign?" This is the leader-helper dynamic God established in Genesis.

If you don't have a purpose, you're not going to find a wife. It's that simple. Or if you do, you're going to find one who will likely reject you when she figures out your life is aimless or that she doesn't like whatever purpose you end up coming up with after the fact. The worst thing you can do is to make your wife your purpose. This is the epitome of the blue pill mentality and it will crush you. It's also why you're still struggling - because you have an ideology that needs to be broken. When you have a right view of sex in its relation to your purpose, that's when your struggle will become manageable. It will cease to be an ideology that you worship and instead become a tool to drive the ship forward.

Why does my desire to please Christ so barely edge out my desire to please myself?

Because you're still on the blue pill. You still have a fantasy world about marriage and sex. Someone like [/u/BluepillProfessor](#) is far better at explaining all this than I am. [/u/Whitified](#) probably has some useful things to say on the topic of unplugging as well.

But from a Christian vantage point, there's another layer to "the red pill." TRP and MRP stop at understanding the truth of how intergender relational dynamics function. But the matrix analogy works much, much better and more completely when we understand that taking "the red pill" encompasses *the whole of the spiritual influences behind all of the physical life*. There are literally angels and demons running around fighting battles and whispering in your ear. There are hierarchies and schemes and plans that have been in the works for centuries. There is another dimension - a spiritual realm - hiding behind this physical manifestation that we get to see with our eyes and feel with our hands. The physical world is merely the matrix - a place originally designed by God to be a paradise for spiritual beings to experience physical bliss.

When the fall happened, that physical reality became a prison. We lost touch with the spiritual truths behind our being and the enemy contorted the physical realm as a curtain to hide the truth of what goes on behind the scenes - just as the machines did to the humans in the matrix. When someone unplugs, they start to see the world for what it is - a copy or shadow of the real world, and one that only purports to have a sense of order while actually being a placation tool against the reality of the war that goes on in the spiritual realm. That war is fought over souls. I know that sounds cliché, but it's literally the truth. The devil's goal isn't to get people to sin - it's to use sin as one of many tools to keep people from being unplugged.

You are still plugged in. You still think that anything that happens in the matrix actually matters. As a result, your pleasure matters more than God's pleasure because you don't see the gravity of everything happening in the spiritual realm and the importance of the mission we, as the unplugged Christians, have to play.

Why is God silent when I ask for a wife?

Because he's more interested in you becoming a soldier. The wife's job is to help her husband. If you're not on a mission, you don't need help with anything, so why would God give you a wife? Worse yet - if you're on a mission that's inconsistent with God's actual universal goals - he would be doing harm to his purposes by giving you a wife. That's why I say repeatedly: find a mission first. "Seek first His kingdom and His righteousness and all these things will be added to you as well" (Matthew 6:33).

Then, of course, is the fact that God wants you to take ownership of the whole situation. Once you're on mission alongside God - on His mission and not whatever purpose you may concoct for yourself - he wants you to conduct the interviews and figure out who will be best suited for the job. Tag: [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) - in case some of this helps with your upcoming content for single guys :)

Why am I so weak?

Because you're plugged in.

What am I supposed to be learning?

The reality of how the world works - both in the RP intergender relational dynamic sense and in the broader biblical sense of everything happening on a spiritual level. But it can't stop at learning - it must switch to applying in both cases.

If a wife is not part of God's plan for me, does it get any easier?

If you remain plugged in, no. If you unplug, yes.

I need some encouragement about remaining sexually pure.

2 upvotes · 30 October 2017 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Not sure why this got downvoted ... it all seems solid to me.

I need some encouragement about remaining sexually pure.

2 upvotes · 30 October 2017 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

God wants to be first in your life, and may be withholding the wife you want until you are willing to put Him first

I find this to be true for many people in a wide variety of situations - not just this one. Well said.

I need some encouragement about remaining sexually pure.

2 upvotes · 30 October 2017 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

we both needed time to mature

This is key right here.

Wifey misses the feelz

2 upvotes · 26 October 2017 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

As you alluded to, Jesus only forgives genuine repentance, not insincere words designed to sweep a situation under the rug. A genuine apology requires repentance. Because we're not omniscient like God, we must discern behavior over time, meaning the immediacy of the forgiveness component is not truly possible among humans.

Consider a wife who cheats on her husband. She begs and pleads and apologizes so he will take her back, and he genuinely believes her and says he forgives her. Is he really going to release all consequences so quickly? Will he let her grab dinner alone with her ex the next day? No, because he needs time for her to prove the genuineness of her repentance.

Working on the Sidebar

2 upvotes · 24 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Interesting. I heard that he had propositioned Dalrock to co-write a book about RP Christianity, but the project never got off the ground.

I take the view that morality is subjective, but enforceable by power. Because God is the most powerful, we are judged by his morality. We can all choose for ourselves which side of that judgment we want to end up on, becoming submissive to God's standards or following our own. So, if God decrees that cheating on your wife or engaging in divorce (limited exceptions apply) is "immoral" by his standards, anyone is free to reject this. In that sense, RP is genuinely amoral, as are all things of their own accord (see Romans 14:14).

None of the descriptive aspects of RP are immoral because they're just ideas in a vacuum. It's not until they are personalized and internalized (and ultimately acted upon) that they develop a moral quality about them.

To that end, as long as RP is a toolbox, there is never a morality issue. Tools don't have a moral quality about them. But some tools simply cannot be used without creating a moral quality in the application. So, when a "hard core" RPer says that a person cannot truly be RP without embracing the tools of cheating and divorce without grounds as tools you are willing to employ - that person is inherently forcing RP to become a moral concept.

If RP is merely a descriptive set of truths, it is amoral. But if it prescribes that under certain conditions a person must act a certain way or is prohibited from acting a certain way, then it becomes a moral issue.

The Trident of Masculinity

2 upvotes · 24 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

The same could be said of reddit - even MRP. For some, it's great. For others, they spend so much time reading and talking that they never actually get to the gym or game their women.

It's not that there's anything wrong with the medium itself. It's about how you use it.

The Trident of Masculinity

2 upvotes · 24 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Although it only applies to one type of "spiritual," [r/RPChristians](#) does hammer this point home quite well. The 300-level series is devoted to it.

Wifey misses the feelz

2 upvotes · 24 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

You've said a lot of good things here - and have done an excellent job explaining the dichotomy between the "ditch and switch" mentality evident on TRP from the Christian concept of spiritual oneness, which assumes a life-long bond before God that cannot be broken by man (even by divorce). When you say "like your own flesh" - the Bible goes further and says that you *actually are* one flesh. That your bodies don't just belong to each other (though it says that too), but that the other person's body *is your body*.

That said, I don't think pair-bonding and RP are incompatible, particularly from a Christian understanding of how God designed relationships. For those who do not comprehend how the human spirit functions, I can see why this chasm might seem to be the natural conclusion, but it doesn't have to be.

Rp is not about "unplugging *from your wife*" - it's about unplugging from the conditioning that your wife, and a feminist society at large, has placed on a man. It's unplugging from the notion that one must bargain for sex or from the idea that one even *needs* sex to be fulfilled as a man in the first place.

The sex-negotiation-game is actually just as big of a hindrance to pair-bonding as implementing commitment-fear to get sex. Although I don't doubt the effectiveness of dread, in some aspects it presents the same concept of

negotiating for sex that most women employ. The difference is that women negotiate sex for physical service whereas dread institutes commitment and emotional security as the currency with which sex is bought - or in the reverse, that sex is used to buy commitment and security.

- Beta male mentality: *I better do as many chores as possible and provide a lot of money and buy her nice things for the hope that maybe it'll be enough to get sex for a night or two this week.*
- Female dread mentality: *I better have frequent sex with him and give BJs and try new positions and kinks for the hope that maybe he won't feel like he need to respond to all those other girls giving him attention.*

Betas tend to be defined by their emotional connection to ideologies beyond their control, whereas alphas sever those emotional connections and merely pursue pragmatic goals. The beta may have the same pragmatic goal as the alpha, but they are so emotionally invested in the goal that it affects how they perceive the path to accomplishing the goal, particularly when there are intangible ideologies at work that may muddle the clearest path.

On a separate scale, dominant people tend to maintain their own goals and manipulate others and their environment to that end. Submissive people adopt the goals of others and function within a prescribed role for the role's own sake.

When a man is beta, the woman will usually step up and become alpha. Someone needs to have a pragmatic plan or the ship sinks, so if the man is going to be an idealist, the wife will set the down-to-earth agenda. As I wrote to [/u/matrixtospartanatLV](#), women typically don't have to play an intentional game here because they can get what they want most of the time without exerting any actual effort - particularly around beta males. The primary beta-male ideology is nobility and chivalry for the sake of the woman anyway. So, it's easy for women alongside a beta guy to just do whatever they want, screw the consequences - because they can still get what they want no matter how bad they act out; and this is the dominant actions behind her alpha mind-set.

When the man becomes alpha, there's a tendency for the woman to then shrink into a beta box rather than expressing her alpha in a submissive framework. But things don't have to be that way for the relationship to work. A man would do better to have a submissive wife than a beta wife and those are two different scales. I'm piggy-backing on your comment to brainstorm a bit here, but humor me in contemplating four potential categorizations:

- **Alpha-Dominant Woman:** Caution to the wind, she does what she wants, is not manipulated or controlled, and exerts her influence over anyone and everyone in range. When people oppose her or criticize, she doesn't take it personally and will often fight back or just go about her day as if nothing ever happened. She has goals and pursues them, but isn't emotionally tied to these goals and is not broken when a goal becomes unattainable. She simply readjusts her direction and plows ahead down the new path.
 - Archetypal Examples: Beatrix/Uma Thurman (Kill Bill); Meryl Streep (Devil Wears Prada); Sigourney Weaver (Aliens); Angelina Jolie (Mr. and Mrs. Smith)
- **Beta-Dominant Woman:** These are the harpies that most men are married to and complain about. They have an ideology of what life *should* look like and their emotional state depends entirely on (a) how closely her actual life is to that ideology, and (b) whether or not other people *perceive* her life as being close to this intangible ideal. Most of these women don't even know *in detail* what their fantasy life would look like, they just know they're not living it. No matter how much they get in life, they always want "the next thing." True satisfaction becomes an intangible goal. As a result, they lash out at everyone around them, blaming everyone else for why they're unhappy. They then use their emotions to manipulate others into getting them a little closer to their dreams, which always raises the bar on how high those dreams extend.
 - Archetypal Examples: Pretty much any sitcom TV wife ever ... think of Everybody Loves Raymond, King of Queens, Modern Family, etc. More classic examples: Vivien Leigh (Gone With the Wind) or Audrey Hepburn (My Fair Lady), although each of these women transform into the Alpha-Submissive by the end

- **Beta-Submissive Woman:** These women have fantasies about life and are emotionally attached to those fantasies, but they have relinquished control over their attainment. So, instead of manipulating others to push closer to her dreams, she has given up and latched onto someone else's dream, hoping to experience fulfillment in life vicariously through the satisfaction their man experiences in accomplishing his goals. Because their satisfaction in life is almost exclusively found vicariously and never directly, she often finds herself desperately clinging onto what little she has in life and is easily subject to manipulation; likely to fall into depression or otherwise emotionally withdraw from her partner or the world entirely
[[/u/slipknot_is_metal](#) talks about this a good bit in response to conversations on upper-levels of dread].
 - Archetypal Examples: Molly Hooper (Sherlock); Bella Swan (Twilight); pretty much any damsel in distress who's only along for the ride
- **Alpha-Submissive Woman:** She has set childish fantasies and ideologies behind her and accepts life for what it is. She sets clear goals and makes plans for accomplishing those goals - but her primary function is one of supporting the vision of another. Her goal isn't vicarious fulfillment through someone else's joy in accomplishment; it's in the diligent fulfillment of her role in a grander plan for the sake of that role itself. Whether she is a pawn or the queen, her pleasure comes from being the best pawn or queen she can be - playing her part so that the game, as a whole, advances for the team she's backing.
 - Archetypal Examples: Catelyn Stark (GoT), Lois Lane (and pretty much any superhero's main girl), most Disney princesses (Belle, whose primary function is Beast's agenda; Jasmine, who follows Aladdin's lead; Mulan, whose strength serves a greater cause); Fiona (Shrek)

I think a lot of what you're describing is a break in the alpha/beta mentalities between women. But I do believe a woman can retain her alpha while still being submissive. RP hasn't explored this distinction too much yet and just assumes submissive and beta are the same thing within women.

Wifey misses the feelz

2 upvotes · 24 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

The pinnacle of leadership is to get someone else to come up with your idea and execute it with passion and precision.

This is pretty much exactly what I was trying to describe with my response here - let her take ownership of things and brainstorm, and let her think the ideas were hers all along and that they're working. This is how a leader can get his followers to engage with a personal investment in the leader's pursuit. Lack that personal investment and she'll feel like she's just fulfilling a duty, so fulfilling a duty is all she'll give back.

Then I told her she will always know how to warm me up.

And this is the flip that needs to happen. She wants you to warm up on her terms, and the husband must show her that the hot/cold knob isn't an emotional one, but a physical one. Women don't understand this because their emotions determine whether they're feeling hot/cold toward their spouse at a given time, so they assume it's an emotional system for the husband too. This is actually kind of weird because they *know* we're physically driven, they just lack any capacity to understand it and apply it.

This is why men must be intentionally strategic, whereas women are innately strategic. Sexual strategy comes naturally for them because there is no cultural imperative for them to *need* sex - they can get it any time they want. As a result, although they do employ strategy, they feel like it comes naturally. This is why many women can't stand the idea that men are employing a conscious strategy - because it comes off as being "fake," when in reality very few men naturally exude the strategy necessary to maintain a healthy sexual relationship in the context of marriage (or even outside of marriage, for the non-Christians).

An interesting thing I noticed recently along these lines - when beta men realize that women don't *need* sex because it's just always available, if the beta man isn't getting sex (or at least the sex he wants), his usual strategy is simply to withdraw his sexual attention and wait her out until she wants it so bad that she's begging him for it. I tried this strategy. I've seen several posts on deadbedrooms about guys saying, "I'm testing to see how long she'll go." It never works. That's why things like:

Treat her like a woman. Game, kino, etc.

will always be more effective than any beta-minded strategy. But this is also why men have to act as if these things come naturally to them.

207 - Perseverance, Sin, and Fitness Tests

2 upvotes · 24 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

True, true. My only point there was that Michal lost her man over this issue. It's actually a very sad thing, but a reality that must be faced. Though I do just naturally assume most people know the story of David and Bathsheba.

What is going on in the head of Christians that give BP marriage advice?

2 upvotes · 23 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

People give bad advice, not always maliciously, but because it's from a paradigm of what they have come to accept in their own weakness.

The irony is that this all comes from a place of arrogance and pride. "Nice guys" believe that the world is bigger than they are, so they're incapable of doing anything other than being victims. They can't control whether or not their own desires are met. So, instead, they develop a means of self-validation whereby they can feel good about themselves even when they consistently fail to get what they want in life. They then pride themselves in this failure because they're living life by a higher standard. Then they think that everyone who is strong enough to go after what they want and actually get it is somehow weaker because they're playing on "easy mode." They aren't living by a higher standard - they do things too directly. But the "nice guy" - he has rules that he's made up for himself that make it much harder for him to get what he wants, so when he does get something to go his way he believes this is a greater victory than the 95% success rate the alpha males tend to have. "You took the easy way; I took the hard way. The hard way is much more rewarding." Then he looks at his life - the sexless marriage to an ugly wife with a mediocre dead-end job and acquaintances who never quite become friends - and he gets a self-satisfied, smug grin on his face because he earned it without "breaking the rules."

Now, God did give us rules - and they are not to be toyed with. But God's rules aren't in conflict with alpha-dom - they actually lead a person into becoming alpha and losing the beta mentality. The problem is when the Bible is read from a beta framework it's going to come off as beta. But the people who wrote it were in an alpha-dominated society where people would have been murdered for saying in quiet whispers what modern politicians preach to the masses. If we read the Bible from that mindset - the framework of the people who wrote it - we get a very different result. An easy way to do this is simply to parrot a catch-phrase before every command you read in the Bible: "The true alpha ..."

- "Do not lie" = "The true alpha does not lie" -> They don't need to. They're all OYS and tell it like it is. The beta avoids lying because he's afraid of the consequences.
- "Do not steal" = "The true alpha does not steal" -> He doesn't have to. He positions his life in a way where he can provide for those he loves. The beta avoids stealing because it's wrong and he might get caught.
- "Do not commit adultery" = "The true alpha does not commit adultery" -> He doesn't have to. He dominates

the bedroom with his wife and is satisfied. The beta avoids committing adultery for fear of losing his wife.

The list goes on, but the point is that this actually explains why the commandments are beneficial. They're not just a list of bad/immoral things that we shouldn't do *because God said so*. They're a list of things that, when followed, compel us to live the life God designed us to have. That's why betas are so worried about how much they're sinning or whether or not what they're doing technically meets some weird theological definition of sin; whereas the alphas are more concerned with positioning themselves in a way where sin won't be a temptation in the first place.

Okay ... time for a post on sin-avoidance.

Tag: [/u/generic____account](#) (this was more written for you - I was just piggybacking on his comment).

Advice to a married recovering beta on initiating

2 upvotes · 23 October 2017 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

any man could fulfill your position.....a beta provider is all the same right?

This is solid and doesn't get said often enough.

What she can't and couldn't accept that is that a large portion of my marriage to her was based on her body.

As I've said before:

- Sex defines the marriage (literally: God defines it by "two becoming one flesh"). If you're not having sex, you're just roommates.
- But because you can get better, more frequent sex outside of a monogamous marriage, if you're going to get or stay married, you'd better have a purpose for being in the marriage that transcends sex itself.

These two facts create an internal conflict that's often hard to reconcile.

We've not had sex in somewhere 3 years now, I've actually lost track to be honest.

Dang, I thought my 18 month streak was bad. To be clear, though - you said "example from my own past," but also are using present-tense words and say "now." I'm not sure if you're talking about a prior dead bedroom or literally from 2015-2017.

Going "cavemen" during the starfish/duty sex is your attempt at showing her how fun sex should be.

I'm still working on this. My wife is extremely sensitive to pain and probably has fear/anxiety-related vaginismus (she won't talk to a doctor about this). It's one thing to go a little wild and leave her sore. It's another thing when the slightest bit of insertion makes her grimace and wince. This happens pretty much every single time on initial entry, even if she's well-lubricated.

There are ways to avoid her having that reaction, but it involves a lot of time and foreplay and going very slow. I've tried the "just ram it in"/"caveman" approach to get the initial shock over with all at once and that never goes well. The two or three times I've done this she ends up crying in soaring pain and we have to stop. Once we get going, she's usually fine for about 10 minutes, but gets sore and either starts pushing me to finish so we can be done, or I'll remove myself and we'll do other stuff while she recovers so I can reinsert again. This all makes the dominance/caveman parts of SGM somewhat difficult.

Frankly reading Sex God Method will be of benefit. It goes into detail over the psychology of sex which is fairly complex.

I was actually disappointed in the psychology component of the book, but it was certainly worthwhile nonetheless. It neatly packages everything in a clear, easy-to understand way that you simply don't get from most other books.

Advice to a married recovering beta on initiating

2 upvotes · 23 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Well said.

What is going on in the head of Christians that give BP marriage advice?

2 upvotes · 22 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Yeah, I should have been clearer: women are more likely to believe they have developed an emotional connection with God. They are generally more emotionally expressive than men and rely on their feelings. So, if they're praying and happen to feel something they assume it's God, whereas the man would be more discerning in many situations (although in increasingly shocked at how men are losing this discerning ability in recent years).

How does this advice change for dating?

2 upvotes · 21 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

No clue, but I do agree that the actual methods each person employs is unique to their own talents and gifts.

How does this advice change for dating?

2 upvotes · 20 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I do come from RP after being a big ole beta, after all.

This statement concerns me and makes me think the exact opposite. I believe you don't pedestalize women, but there's more to RP than that. Having a mission independent of your mate is a big part of it. As I just wrote to someone else on askMRP:

This is your problem right here. You don't have a purpose in life. As a result, you're just aimlessly wandering waiting for a purpose to fall in your lap. When a guy's like that, girls become his default. And when you make girls your default purpose, they become your emotional center. When your girl is your emotional center, your relationship jumps from want to need. When you feel like you need her, that's where you become totally subservient to the feminist imperative.

Now, you're not fully down this path. In fact, you're probably making some nice steps back. But right now you're somewhere between "she's my emotional center" because you're so worked up about whether you should keep her or leave her ... and "I need her" because you're showing clear signs of panic about the whole thing.

That last bit was targeted more for the other guy, but the point is still the same. You're not "subservient to the FI," but the longer you lack a life purpose, the more likely you are to slide in that direction - because at some point you're going to start to panic and think, "I'm X years old and all my friends are married, but I haven't found a wife yet! What's wrong with me?" and that emotional disturbance is going to ruin you.

Get the mission now and this problem goes away. Even if you do get to be X years old and wifeless, you won't care because she's only there to help anyway - and if you're doing fine without a helper, so be it. Now, you

probably want a helper, and God designed you to have one - but you won't *need* one.

How do you guys keep an abundance/abundance mentality without actually cheating?

2 upvotes · 20 October 2017 · /r/askMRP

Abundance mentality should reflect the entirety of your life, not just your abundance of women. If you have a scarcity mentality about finances, but an abundance of women, you're still going to be pretty stressed and miserable and it will show in your relationships. For all the non-women areas, I wrote [this post](#) on RPC.

As for abundance mentality with women, a catch-and-release policy can work wonders. If you can get a number close and then just not follow-up, your psyche will get huge shocks of "I'm awesome" because you'll know you could easily start adding plates if you wanted to.

Personally, I'm satisfied with IOIs. I got some numbers in the past, and still do on occasion. I've had two different girls give me their number on my receipt at the drive-through in the last 4 months - and I wasn't even trying to game them.

In reality, I just focus on striking up conversations with hot girls. Back in the day the thought of talking to the "hot girl" was terrifying. Now I know that I can hold onto a conversation with one indefinitely - and keep her smiling and laughing the whole way through. I don't ask for the number. I just be awesome. If she tries to touch me, that's more than enough to show me where the conversation would head, so I'm cool cutting things off and leaving. Find your line and what you're comfortable with and hold firm to your boundaries.

How does this advice change for dating?

2 upvotes · 20 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

the ones who aren't need a lot of discipleship and spiritual maturity to become that way

As I have often said before - if you can't find a godly woman to bride and bed, raise one up. Finding a woman who is marriage-ready at the time you meet her is like walking into a random kitchen pantry and expecting to find a 5-course meal ready to eat.

Sure, someone out there might actually have a meal cooked and ready to go just sitting around, but that's extremely rare. It's more likely that you'll find all the ingredients in the pantry for a great meal, but you still have to do the work of warming up the veggies, saute the mushrooms and onions, grill the steak, etc. But even then, it's even more likely that they're not going to have all the ingredients *for the meal you want to eat*. So, you're going to have to figure out if you're okay with the meal those ingredients are capable of making or if it's worth the effort to go to the store to buy the ingredients for what you actually want - and then figure out if the kitchen has the equipment to cook that meal in the first place, and maybe the store nearby the house you walked into doesn't carry the ingredients you want, so you're going to have to find creative alternatives to get it.

Okay ... weird analogy, but it's the first one that popped in my head and I'm at work. Bottom line: if you want the "right" girl, you've got to find someone who has the raw material to work with, then disciple her to become that. In my view, there are only three necessary raw materials if you're a good discipler: *Faithful, Available, Teachable*. If you're a novice discipler or haven't disciplined anyone yet, you're going to need a lot more than just those 3. Solution? Develop your spiritual maturity until you're actively reproducing your faith and life in others - then you'll be much, much more prepared for finding a wife and raising her up.

Anyone have experience with NMMNG groups?

2 upvotes · 20 October 2017 · /r/askMRP

Yeah, I've definitely led enough small groups on other topics to know how to keep it from becoming a victim-puke fest. Also, I think the fact that I wouldn't be exposing them to the RP-verse right away would allow me to

use trickle-truth to keep them from going Rambo. My basic outline would be patterned off the first 6 levels of dread, at least at first, and look something like this (sorry, this is more me just processing openly than actually responding to anything you said):

- Week 1: Intro - Everyone shares their stories; lay ground-rules for the group (i.e. no talking to your wives)
 - Assignment: Do something for at least 1 hour that you wouldn't normally do - break the pattern of your story
 - Spiritual Growth: Begin praying for your wife
 - Reading: NMMNG - 1/2 of the book
- Week 2: DL2 - Monk mode, STFU, and Lifting - talk about how and why; psychological boost, built attraction, etc.
 - Assignment: Lift 4 days, 1hr/day, cardio doesn't count
 - Spiritual Growth: Continue praying for your wife
 - Reading: Finish NMMNG
- Week 3: DL 1 - Unplugging; biological imperatives (polygamy/hypergamy; spontaneous/responsive desire); non-negotiable attraction; why BP mentality doesn't work
 - Assignment: Plan a family activity, prep everything yourself, and go do it - don't tell her about this, just do it
 - Spiritual Growth: Begin having a quiet time
 - Reading: First 1/3 of WISNIFG
- Week 4: DL 1 - Introduction to frame; recognizing fitness tests; importance of developing a mission outside the marriage
 - Assignment: Tell your wife "no" to something, and don't give in if she fights back
 - Spiritual Growth: Develop consistency in your quiet time
 - Reading: Middle 1/3 of WISNIFG
- Week 5: DL 3 - Male hobbies, spiritual growth, family leadership
 - Assignment: Do something on your own with another guy (preferably from the group) without your spouse/kids
 - Spiritual Growth: Begin practicing fellowship
 - Reading: Finish WISNIFG
- Week 6: DL 3 - Progress reports - share stories of what's working and what's not; successes and failures
 - Assignment: Try something that worked for one of the other guys
 - Spiritual Growth: Continue practicing fellowship
 - Reading: First 1/4 of MMSLP
- Week 7: DL 4 - Passing fitness tests (STFU, AA, AM, fogging, etc.) and conditioning availability
 - Assignment: Experiment with test-passing techniques more consistently; be ready to go to spend more time at the gym or hanging out with guys from the group if she's not responding well
 - Spiritual Growth: Begin studying parts of the Bible
 - Reading: Second 1/4 of MMSLP
- Week 8: DL 5 - Thinking beyond your wife; improving personal hygiene, bodily aesthetics, work attitude, and other stuff outside the relationship itself

- Assignment: Get a new haircut, buy a new outfit, step up your work performance
- Spiritual Growth: Continue in Bible study
- Reading: Third 1/4 of MMSLP
- Week 9: DL 6 - Game and kino
 - Assignment: Flirt with your wife and ease into kino, escalating if you've been easing in the whole series so far
 - Spiritual Growth: Begin delving into practical aspects of the Gospel
 - Reading: Finish MMSLP
- Week 10: Understanding frame at a deeper level; being an oak
 - Assignment: Take practical steps to work on your weak part of the oak - the strength or the comfort aspect
 - Spiritual Growth: Continue understanding and applying the Gospel
 - Reading: Genesis and Hosea (books of the Bible) [Might have them start reading MAP instead; haven't decided]
- Week 11: Abundance mentality; stay plan is the go plan
 - Assignment: Take 1 practical step to reduce scarcity/increase abundance ([per this post](#))
 - Spiritual Growth: Begin Scripture memory (book of Philippians)
 - Reading: Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians (books of the Bible)
- Week 12: Progress reports
 - Assignment: Try something that worked for one of the other guys
 - Spiritual Growth: Continue Scripture memory (book of Philippians)
 - Reading: Read 2 books of the Bible you've never read before

There would be stuff beyond this ... but that's what I've mapped out so far. Thanks for letting me use your comment as a processing tool :p This was more just for my own benefit than anything else. [EDITS: Also, sorry if I keep editing this. It's easier to just keep adding new thoughts here than trying to set up a google doc.]

Anyone have experience with NMMNG groups?

2 upvotes · 20 October 2017 · [/r/askMRP](#)

Ah, good to know! Then I'll tag [/u/reddreadwolverine](#) to this post here.

Failure, not sure why

2 upvotes · 19 October 2017 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

why the dichotomy?

What's the incongruence?

Chad isn't so much RP incarnate as he is the threat to you and your relationship

Sure, that's been my understanding as well, context-dependent, of course. The hyperbole line has me curious, though. What's the hyperbole that I confused? You're probably right, I just don't know what you're referencing.

Also don't confuse the idea of PUA with RP.

This is a good point. I think I assume that pick-up artistry is a sub-component of being an RP man - that you have to know how to game women, and for MRPs: your wife as well. So, I have traditionally seen PUA as a sub-component of the larger framework of everything that goes into an RP man. Is there another way to view this?

As for PUAs in the "artists" sense of the word, I usually associate that with seddit, not RP.

The ultimate goal here is to keep your woman from wandering. I believe the Bible admonishes men of this

Indeed, it does.

Again something not said much on the MRP sub is that RP is a toolbox. Pick a tool and use it. TRP is a little different they would rather you play the game by the playbook.

Per my post from a couple days ago on "defining RP for this sub," I get the impression that anyone labeled "hard core" would disagree with this. They act like you must embrace all of the tools and if you personally reject any of the tools in your own life, then you're not "RP" and anything you say is tainted by BP virtues. After all, that's the reason cited for why I got banned from MRP in the first place (before being reinstated) - for saying on another sub that I reject cheating or divorce in my own life.

It's why there was a schism between the two a couple years back but it's now largely been healed

I would love to hear more about this. I know the 2-paragraph summary, but I feel like understanding the history better might help me grasp how MRP functions more clearly so I don't butt as many heads.

With feminism in play women are at a huge disadvantage in maturing.

True, true. But in addition to Dalrock's points (which are well taken) the Bible itself says as much. I mean, Paul says that women are not to participate in church - they're to learn in quiet submission and ask their husbands if they have any questions. So, single ladies are at a serious disadvantage already because God has designed the natural order that women are meant to develop in maturity through their husbands, thus a woman trying to mature without a husband (although possible) is going against the grain of God's design. If a woman does have a husband, but he's immature, he's never going to be able to lead her to become mature - you can only lead as far as you, yourself are. So, on the whole, female spiritual maturity is, indeed, a more difficult thing to see, although the modern church glorifies emotionalism, so women often get praised as being "spiritually mature" because they have an emotional connection that many men lack. This is a grave misunderstanding. I'd like to see Dalrock talk about that - haven't read enough of his stuff yet though.

But the church is largely to blame here

Agreed wholeheartedly.

Many men grumble about it but do little to stop it. I left.

Although I mourn over that decision, it is certainly an understandable one. I am probably 3-5 weeks out from starting an NMMNG group within my church (I have 3 guys ready, trying to put feelers out on 2 more). I almost made a post on askMRP about that last night, but decided to post 206 on RPC instead.

But as to the "Mother's Day" v. "Father's Day" differences in how the church approaches things, my biggest frustration is that even when the church does promote anything masculine, it's all gross stereotypes and not actual character issues. It's, "Let's go hunting and shoot guns" or "camping trip!" Activities don't make you a man. Those are only the context in which you express your manliness.

I mean speaking from authority because you have the character and the confidence to do so.

Gotcha - the same way the Bible says people were amazed at Jesus' teachings "because he speaks as one with authority," even though he was a homeless carpenter.

if I can do that at work ... then I can do this any where.

I had a similar epiphany with applying lawyer skills in my home.

IN my mind I see goofy getting up and trying to out embarrass the AMOG that showed up. Then again OP is way too worried about what she thinks.

This makes a lot more sense now - and I fully agree.

206 - Brace Yourself for Battle

2 upvotes · 19 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

But you've said that your plan is, essentially, to lay low and really not make an intentional effort in the fight. I've told you my plan, which centers around discipleship - and this sub is a springboard for other men to move in that direction as well (late 300-series will get there more specifically). So, the wait is short - the degree of influence will be the bigger challenge. But you can't hold out for some major church-wide movement to just spring up all at once. Jesus always started with a few to reach the many. That's what discipleship is all about ;)

Question I always had about Christianity (but every pastor/priest is too bluepilled to answer)

2 upvotes · 19 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I totally missed that quote before. Thanks for sharing that! For a book that MRP endorses, I'm surprised at how many people there reject this concept.

Question I always had about Christianity (but every pastor/priest is too bluepilled to answer)

2 upvotes · 19 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

In case you haven't noticed, I've been following (stalking) you since you appeared.

I do remember you saying you would do this after a conversation about not wearing our rings. I kind of forgot about that, though. Hopefully it's been worth the effort?

I thought at first that you were him.

Interesting. In what ways, in specific?

In all cases the problem is the fight with the "vows" issue/hamster.

I can see that. And I should note: vows do mean something to me too. That's why I don't have a present intent to cheat. But, as I said, I also realize I am human - and for a long time in our marriage I had thoughts of cheating running through my head 90% of everyday. But I thought I had to hide that because "Nice Guys" hide their flaws. *If she knew how dark and dirty I was, she wouldn't want me. She would hate me if she knew I was thinking that!* How dumb I was.

In reality, Jesus tells us that confession is the beginning of solving our problems. [/u/rocknrollchuck](#) gave the example of being drowning, holding on to a plank of wood to survive and someone throws you a life raft. That piece of wood is all the garbage that I'm hiding, thinking that hiding it will save me. I have to let go of that plank

(by confessing) before I can grab the life raft, where true safety and life can be found. Jesus isn't going to magically make my sex life amazing if I'm still clinging onto all my old BP garbage ways of getting the job done. He's trying to throw me a life raft, but I have to let go of the thought that "hiding" will save me before I can accept his lifeline.

And, of course, confessing my weaknesses is letting my wife know: "I love you, but I want to screw other girls. I can't reconcile those two forever." This isn't manipulation to get sex. It's raw honesty. A kind of honesty that we don't see in Christian marriages very often. An honesty that, if communicated more often (on the whole within the church, not necessarily in one isolate marriage), might let wives know the gravity of a problem before the husband ends up cheating behind her back. After all, what's done in secret comes off in the church as, "I had no idea this was going on - how horrible that seemingly good people can be hiding so much!" But if a guy is just brutally honest with his wife, pastor, etc., then at least some semblance of integrity can be maintained. "He did wrong, but under the circumstances, who can blame him? He was open and honest, we tried to help in every way we could, but nothing was working. Eventually he got worn down and gave in. I get it." My own discipler made that comment to me once when I was struggling through pornography during my 18-month dead bedroom (no sex at all).

You'll note that with all the mega-church pastors who end up in major scandals, they're in those scandals not because of what they did, but because of the way they tried to hide it and cover it up. Brutal honesty is the key here. So, when you previously mentioned "plausible deniability" and "maybe not actually cheating, but giving the impression of possibly doing so" - I think those conversations and non-verbal communications can be given with a lot more honesty than most Christian men would be willing to admit.

I think a Christian Capt Jack Sparrow may be what you are looking for.

That's an interesting characterization for biblical manliness in a marriage. I'll have to ponder that one for a while. Thanks!

How does this advice change for dating?

2 upvotes · 19 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I should also note ... I disciplined a guy a few years back who is an ex-meth addict. After coming to Christ, being fully aware of the glory of meth ... he totally wishes he had never done it.

Question I always had about Christianity (but every pastor/priest is too bluepillled to answer)

2 upvotes · 19 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Yep, I fully get all that. That's part of the foundation of my 107 post on why (most) women actually want to feel dread in a relationship. I'm also not beyond letting my wife think I might cheat on her someday. After all, Christian or not, I'm still a flawed human being. Just because I don't intend to right now doesn't mean it won't happen someday.

That singular concept probably deserves a post of its own, and could stir up serious controversy among genuine Christians, even here. But the truth is that even good, well intentioned Christian men often still end up breaking their promises of fidelity, even when they were sure they never would. So when we promise or wives a lifetime of faithfulness, we're potentially lying to them, or at the very least are speaking shallow words. Why give false assurances when doing so creates the exact circumstances where we are most likely to break the promises we just made? That just seems idiotic to me.

111 - "As I Say" v. "As I Do" and the Polygamy/Hypergamy Divide

2 upvotes · 19 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

there would be no need to police this with some sort of imposed restriction. Women would flock to the top guys naturally.

Well, hypergamy doesn't mean women go after the *top guys*. It means they go to the *top guy they can get*. For many women, the *top guy they can get* is a deadbeat guy who will abandon them and leave them destitute. So, you'll still have some of that problem. Even if they do hyper-game their way up a rank or two, they're still with low-income guys who can't afford multiple wives unless the wives are the income-earners supporting him and/or the other wives too ... in which case they're really marrying down, so that would be counter-productive to the hypergamous drive anyway.

Question I always had about Christianity (but every pastor/priest is too bluepillled to answer)

2 upvotes · 19 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I'll have to check that one out. I know if I had the choice, knowing what I know now, I would do things very differently and probably avoid marriage altogether. But, and I know it's cliché ... I would never want to lose my kids.

Developing the RP Unfazed Attitude

2 upvotes · 18 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

when your wife sometimes doggedly sticks to her guns

Here's the fundamental problem. This phrase means you're operating in her frame. You see it as your job to get her to stop sticking to her guns - to move her. If you operate in your own frame, you'll realize that she's the one who has to move you. As a good helper, she should have valuable things to contribute sometimes. So, it's okay to move and adapt your frame when she has a legitimate source of improvement. But when she's wrong, she's wrong. You don't have to change her mind - make her feel like she's the one who has to change yours.

I think the butthurt mostly stems from a man's lack of internal emotional control

Indeed. Just as "the testing of your faith develops perseverance," so also does the testing of your frame. 2 Peter 1:5-7 lists a progression: faith -> virtue -> knowledge -> self-control -> steadfastness -> godliness -> brotherly affection -> love.

Self-control is one link in the chain, but a very important one. To master it, you need Jesus first, then to develop a character modeled after his, and then to understand how to utilize the character/virtue God is instilling in you - basically all the 300-series stuff. That's when self-control develops, which causes "steadfastness" - another word for an unbreakable frame. Then it affirms that this firm frame is what makes a man godly - that our godliness and strength should be applied for the benefit of our brothers (not in a beta way, but in an alpha/oak way) - and all of this is the epitome of love. Lose that frame and you compromise your capacity to love. The church will tell you the reverse - that breaking frame is how you love your wife. But that would be denying the "steadfastness" link in the chain.

The difference between immoral and amoral

2 upvotes · 18 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I appreciate the plug for RPC and am happy to entertain these conversations there. That said, even from a Christian viewpoint, I'm inclined to agree with you. Romans 14:14 is clear:

- *I am convinced, being fully persuaded in the Lord Jesus, that nothing is unclean in itself. But if anyone regards something as unclean, then for that person it is unclean.*

As with your gun analogy and the toolbox view [/u/SteelSharpensSteel](#) mentioned (which I just posted about on RPC last night) - tools are not evil; only what the user does with them. That said, there are some tools that on their own are quite innocuous, but could not realistically be put to practical use without calling the decision into question.

Question I always had about Christianity (but every pastor/priest is too bluepilled to answer)

2 upvotes · 17 October 2017 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I won't disagree there!

Question I always had about Christianity (but every pastor/priest is too bluepilled to answer)

2 upvotes · 17 October 2017 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Haha, this is crazy scary in comparing to how my wife used argue these points with me. She wouldn't deny Paul's authority, but she'd say things like, "He just seems arrogant and I don't know how much I trust him - I know it's still Scripture, but only as to what God intended, not what Paul intended."

Defining RP for this sub - and understanding the toolbox

2 upvotes · 17 October 2017 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

The premisses of most RP material is based on evolution.

Evolution was developed as a concept to explain how humanity (and the rest of the world) got to be the way it is, but without utilizing the Bible. The bottom line is that evolution must lead to the same conclusions about actual human existence today because we know the end-result (we're living it). The Bible does the same thing - it gives a framework for how humanity came to be what it is today. Whether non-Christians want to utilize evolution as the backdrop, or Christians want to use the Bible as the backdrop, the fact is that we're all still functioning in the reality of how the world operates today. It doesn't matter so much *how things got this way* as it does *understanding the way things actually are*.

With this in mind, when I reference *descriptive principles*, I don't mean that as an endorsement of how the RP world explains these principles to have developed. I just mean the reality of how the world operates today.

Therefore, a RPC foundation would have to consider the fact that the human nature is corrupt and that our perspective about sexuality was also compromised.

Absolutely agreed! And I think that's covered in the first few posts in the 100-level series.

Without this understanding and the comprehension that only God can redeem and lead us into healthy relationships, the tools that could be developed to "fix" the problem aren't going to work very well.

Agreed. The 400-level series will address the Gospel as the primary and ultimate tool for all things that need to be "fixed" - I'm just not ready to start going down that road yet. I want to lay more of a foundation in the 300-level series first.

That said, if you want to skip ahead and make some more posts on appropriate Christian tools, I'd love to engage!

RP was initially considered to be a ideology to stop the feminism abuse on society and now it has become a roadmap to increase the chasm between the genders

This is an unfortunate reality :/

Deconditioning the wife who is disgusted at your touch - 10 Levels of Kino

2 upvotes · 13 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

However not initiating sex would surely be much more effective if combined with other dread

As well as all the other RP concepts, of course. This post wasn't meant to replace all that - it was an appendage to deal with a unique type of problem that is surprisingly common that the mods and most flaired people simply don't get because they haven't lived it.

I find it all really funny, particularly after years of being on the receiving end of guilt trips and self-righteousness.

Good for you - and keep that attitude up!

Deconditioning the wife who is disgusted at your touch - 10 Levels of Kino

2 upvotes · 13 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Scroll up to the top of the page - it's all in the original post.

Deconditioning the wife who is disgusted at your touch - 10 Levels of Kino

2 upvotes · 13 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

But for seasoned MRPers.. I can see why this is getting backlash.

That's why I tried to put up-front: "This isn't for the vets or men with wives who like touch/sex."

I now see that people do not want details, they want the dumbed down truth to save time and energy

True. But when we give the dumbed-down generalities, people misapply the concepts and then they get ridiculed for going Rambo and they're told they're idiots and fags and retards or autistic for trying to figure out how to do something when no one ever explained how to do it.

In general, I see the utility in brevity. But when dealing with mental health issues, such as a targeted sensory defensiveness disorder, you can't leave a lot to chance.

So instead, they just stick to general platitudes (MRP world: lift, kino, OYS, IDGAF, etc)

And then how many posts do we see on TRP - "I always see people talk about kino, but how do you actually do it?" or "I'm trying to lift, but I'm not seeing gains - how do I do it?" Or men who screw up the whole OYS thing and get ridiculed for not innately understanding what no one explains. It's one of those aspects of the manosphere that I simply don't get and quite loathe - ridiculing people for not doing what you've intentionally avoided telling them to do.

But all you have to do is just repeating the same dumbed down message over and over again to attract the unconscious masses of people out there (voters.)

But this attitude actually supports the accusers that say RP is just a cult - that it's more interested in getting people in than it is in actually helping them. I can't support that, and I don't believe that's what RP is.

Deconditioning the wife who is disgusted at your touch - 10 Levels of Kino

2 upvotes · 13 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

How would I learn or grow from quitting? That's just saying, "If RP on hard mode is too hard for you, just quit the game and start over on easy mode." I like hard mode. I enjoy the challenge.

Also, I started this process while fairly beta and trying to re-learn my alpha. It wasn't until I was around level 9 that I discovered RP. So, the thought of divorcing my ONEitis during this process didn't compute at that time.

Deconditioning the wife who is disgusted at your touch - 10 Levels of Kino

2 upvotes · 13 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Ugh ... I'm an idiot. To you and /u/red-sfpplus - that part of the drop in body fat was actually from February 1 through June 8. I've fluctuated a little since then but hover around 225. I want to get to 200 or less, and the way I diet that can be done in the month I'm giving myself starting next week.

I use the whole 30 plan for my diet (basically meat, fruit and veggies and nothing else). 30 days on that with no lifting and 1 day of cardio a week was enough to lose 20lbs. But I only did that for 45 days total. I normally just pay attention to CICO when cutting. When lifting heavy I eat whatever I want.

I certainly have stretch marks but no loose skin issues. The stretch marks have faded quite a bit too, so that's good.

I'll make the edit as soon as I'm at my desktop ... The mobile app won't let me edit for some reason. The lifting (165 to 250) did happen in 2 months though. It took another 2 or so months to get up to 285 (just this week).

As for the 7 year hell, that was mostly because I was beta like none other in my marriage. Knowing RP up front, your risk of that becomes insanely low. But I do agree - if you're someone who can handle not being married, this is the better path. But that conversation is better had on RPC.

Where Is The Good?

2 upvotes · 12 October 2017 · /r/askMRP

Heh ... my backsliding was long before then. Starting cardio was at least *something* of a step in the right direction. And I still do cardio ... I just make sure the 2-3 miles everyday is only my warm-up, not the main event.

Keto/LCHF

2 upvotes · 5 October 2017 · /r/RedPillWives

Same experience here as soon as I ate some potatoes!

Sleeping Naked

2 upvotes · 5 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

haha

Sleeping Naked

2 upvotes · 5 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

True. And again, it's more because they're my gym clothes. She does most of the day to day laundry, including 100% of the laundry for the kids. But that's because I gave a hard rule on that one. She insists on this notion that if a kid wears an outfit for even 60 seconds, its dirty and cannot be reworn. This applies to pajamas too. So there's literally two loads of laundry everyday. My policy is if there's no visible dirt and it doesn't stink, its clean. But it's a "pick your battles" thing for me ... so she can follow her standard as long as she does all the kids laundry - and she's not allowed to complain about it.

Sleeping Naked

2 upvotes · 5 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Nice ... but I always got the impression Ken was just Barbie's man- toy.

Sleeping Naked

2 upvotes · 5 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

That's what I'm hoping for. One anecdote (mine) doesn't prove much.

Sleeping Naked

2 upvotes · 5 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Done that with clothes on. Haven't tried recently or with clothes off ... I imagine it would only really work if she's nude too.

Sleeping Naked

2 upvotes · 5 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I do the modeling thing and had her return 3 or 4 outfits. But let's get real ... the stuff I want her buying wouldn't necessarily be appropriate work attire in the first place.

Also, I do my laundry and toss her stuff in when I have extra room. 99% of the time I do laundry all I have is my gym clothes from the past 5 days or so plus maybe 2 work outfits, so there's usually lots of extra room. I do it because I need stuff, not waiting until it's backed up to a full load.

Sleeping Naked

2 upvotes · 5 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I doubt she's noticed the laundry pattern, but it's a fair point. Also, her spending was within the monthly budget I give her, so no qualm there. The comment was more about the fact that she bought more ugly clothes than n the fact that she spent money.

Sleeping Naked

2 upvotes · 5 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I would just cut out the TV part and I would say that is a good compromise.

True, but once every few weeks isn't a big deal - and I like the idea of cuddling up to a show with my kids rather than just going straight to sleep.

Sleeping Naked

2 upvotes · 5 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Haha, I wish. I have started a pattern that when I do the laundry I only wash her clothes that turn me on. The rest of them I re-bury at the bottom of the hamper and she can get to them whenever she wants.

Unfortunately, this backfired as she went out and bought a bunch of new clothes at the mall this past weekend, saying, "I noticed I never have enough clean work clothes, so I had to buy some more." Fail.

Keto/LCHF

2 upvotes · 5 October 2017 · /r/RedPillWives

I did the Whole30, which is basically Keto on steroids. I've also done Keto for a while. From what I've gathered, it's great for people who have a predominantly sedentary lifestyle, but if you're highly active (i.e. training for a

marathon, lifting weights, backpacking, etc.) then you're going to stunt your progress and feel miserable.

Looking for resources on modern ways to walk into Christian marriage without the state involved. Are there any foolproof ways?

2 upvotes · 5 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

wtf dude? Children are everything. For many men that alone translates to "Pre-nups are useless".

There's no alternative, though. A single guy has far, FAR, *FAR*, **FAR** fewer rights over his children than a married guy. So, if "children are everything," then that alone should be incentive for every guy to get married. Married men have presumed custodial rights over their children. Unmarried men have to start from scratch with default custody being given to the mother, usually they can't even get any rights at all until they get a DNA test first. So, +1 to marriage on the score sheet. Not being able to address the issue in a prenup doesn't hurt the father's rights, but being in a situation where you need a prenup in the first place (i.e. getting married) will, in fact, help his custodial rights.

Isn't marriage to him as good as a con? A scam?

That depends on how entrenched he is into his delusion and if he's one of the 50% who won't ever get divorced. If his marriage is in the 50% that lasts and he legitimately finds joy and satisfaction out of his delusional worldview, great for him. In that case, it doesn't matter whether it's a con or a scam - he's winning. Of course, that doesn't negate the fact that it's a risk that literally has the "flip of the coin" chance of backfiring on him.

If he's a non-Christian guy, it's actually probably worse. If the total rate is 50% divorce and the "dedicated religious people" rate is significantly lower, then that means that the "non-dedicated religious people" rate is higher than 50% to get to that 50% total average. But that's beside the point.

For the married guy: you have to walk on eggshells.

Maybe, and I'm sure that's how several of the 50% who stay together manage to stay together. But I'm sure there are also some in that 50% who don't feel that way (at least not most of the time - everyone feels that way some of the time).

Or at least, its a LOT of work (right women, right earnings, right this, right that... we're not lawyers!!!)

Totally agreed there. That will be true for 100% of couples who remain married.

especially if "keeping safe" involves doing all the things you mentioned in this whole thread.

Point understood, but really, "keeping safe" only involves two things:

- To avoid financial divorce rape, help your wife get an education and job on par with yours. It doesn't have to be exact, but if she's got 40% of the marital income and you've got 60% (that 60/40 magic ratio), you'll probably get out of support, even though your income is 1.5x hers (i.e. 50% higher).
- To avoid custody divorce rape: (a) don't beat your wife and kids, (b) don't do drugs, (c) act like you have sole custody during the marriage. Follow those 3 simple rules and you're guaranteed at least shared parenting 50/50 time.
 - Anecdote time: Our office recently handled a case (I only did nominal work on it) where the wife (our client) accused the husband of using the children to create child pornography, saying the evidence was on his phone. Interestingly, the children were interviewed and affirmed this and the husband's iphone

(allegedly used to take the pics) was confiscated by the police and he refused to give up the password (due to the ESCA, the court can't force Apple to unlock the phone; FBI couldn't hack into it either). Dad got his parenting time temporarily suspended and eventually reinstated at the rate of 2 hours/wk. Dad, who otherwise had a good reputation and was a nice guy, requested psych evals. The psychologist found that our client (wife) was crazy and probably made up the whole thing and Dad is perfectly sane. We request two additional independent evaluations - same result. Turns out the kids made up the whole thing because they wanted to live with our client and dad refused to unlock his phone because he thought our client planted pictures on there to incriminate him. He did eventually unlock the phone and it revealed no pics. Next thing we know, our client (wife) is stuck with supervised visitation for 2 hours a week and dad has all the rest of the time with the kids. The court eventually starts realizing that mom wasn't being malicious - any mom whose kids were saying those things would have done the same thing. So, the case ends up in shared parenting with 50/50 time ... as pretty much always happens. The whole thing turned out to be "much ado about nothing." In the end, dad (a) didn't abuse his kids, (b) didn't have addiction issues, and (c) was an active, involved father - and despite all of mom's wild accusations, he still got his time, and for a time even had mom on the defensive.

- An important lesson from this story: women are crazy. AWALT. Even women themselves openly admit that they're all a little crazy. So, if men want to win custody cases, they just need to request psych evals. Women-crazy always shows up. Sometimes the guy is worse, but not nearly as often. Psychologists know what's up.

or that at least you can understand this TRP stance towards marriage is not irrational

From a secular point of view, it makes sense. Because TRP is secular, yes, I agree it is not irrational from their perspective.

As a Christian, I'm confident enough to say that marriage 2.0 is but a corpse, nothing like what God had created.

I agree. But as a couple other divorce attorneys pointed out in one of Rollo's MRP threads a while back, the laws are changing back. One of them even commented that it's more like "Marriage 1.5" now.

I'm not asking you to look for a challenge, only that you test this hypothesis against people who actually know what you're talking about :)

I follow now. In my view, it's not just a hypothesis - it's factual observation from firsthand experience of someone who watches not just one or two cases as an interested party (i.e. the person actually in the divorce case), but someone who sees literally hundreds of these cases a year (and in my office: the most extreme ones imaginable, as that is our specialty) who has an independent/uninterested perspective (i.e. whether my client wins or loses doesn't affect the fact that I get paid and my life goes on).

The infamous MIL ...

2 upvotes · 5 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

You know, I had the exact same thought for OP. But I had once asked the question of whether or not it was okay to share WISNIFG with your spouse because of similar issues as to OP, but the overwhelming response was: "Horrible idea." The main rationale is that it would teach her the tricks of the trade and how to be a better arguer against me, making it harder for me to lead her. She'll simply respond with things like, "Stop trying to fog and broken record me!"

What's your thought on that?

Looking for resources on modern ways to walk into Christian marriage without the state involved. Are there any foolproof ways?

2 upvotes · 3 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

No fault divorce

I agree that this is a horrible law, but it's not slanted either way. Men take advantage of it just as much as women.

Do you not think the Law will suddenly change to suit the best interests of women, in an instant?

Given how unbelievably difficult it is to get the laws change, I don't think so. Over time, maybe - but doubtful for lawyering issues alone. Remember, the laws are already backtracking away from women's rights - a shift that has been happening since the 90s. Remember that once upon a time there was just a default assumption that mothers should get custody. The default in most courts now (at least in major metropolitan areas) is shared parenting with 50/50 time. There are now countless guardian ad litem who specifically advocate for men, recognizing that their rights have been gypped for so long. It's a very, very slow turn, and has not yet hit the break-even point, but the direction of the law right now is toward equality and away from favoring women.

Also, you conveniently left out the entire topic of Domestic Violence claims.

No, that's specifically what I meant by "custody issues where women lie in court."

The point here is that the entire system is set up not to favour you but the woman

Agreed. But, again, that's changing. As the older judges and magistrates finally retire (the ones from the 70s and 80s when women had the true power in custody battles) and new blood comes in, the new blood will only know the current law and will not have lived through old days of default power to women.

You know this. We in RP know this.

Not accurately, though. RP looks at a few isolated stories and creates this major boogeyman out of the "court system" and "domestic relations laws." They then exaggerate these things. And when they hear the stories of "divorce rape," you're 99% of the time only hearing the man's side of the story and not getting all of the facts that the judges are. I'm not saying it doesn't happen, but RP certainly exaggerates this. Why? I think it's one of the manipulative tactics that our [and I say that as the possessive because, for better or for worse I'm a part of it as well] communities use to keep people entrenched. I have yet to see a truly fair and appropriate solution to the problem from any MRA or RP source. Their answers are always, "Screw the women, just give men everything we want." That's replacing a broken system with another broken system.

The men who are aware of this are therefore expressing their lack of trust for the Law to look after their interests: a natural reaction. Its therefore irrelevant whether or not they can, as laypeople, mention any specific marriage/divorce law that's unfair: talk about missing the point!

I get what you're saying, but I trust facts more than anecdotes. The divorce boogeyman is a creation mostly of anecdotes - things that happened to a few people somewhere, most likely who are incapable of communicating an impartial assessment of the actual situation because they're still looking for validation from a community and the scarier their story the more validation they get. Those stories are by and large the rarity - they are the exception, not the rule. RP often says for every other area to follow the rule, not the exception (AWALT, for example) ... yet for this one thing they want to go the other way. It seems highly inconsistent and is one of the few areas where I lose a lot of respect for the RP community at large.

Interestingly enough, my opposition on that point is something of an anomaly. My faith-agenda (i.e. preserving

marriage, opposing divorce) would actually be better served by giving more power to the fear of the boogeyman. But I cannot in good conscience feed into what I know to be a factually inaccurate representation, so I go against my own purposes in doing so :/

she is still legally the one who can end it anytime she wants, with terms very much in her favour

Only if the guy insists that she not pursue a career or if he marries someone who he knows will never have a comparable earning capacity to his.

This is really hypergamy's advantage more than anything. Women see a man's earning capacity as a significant factor in his SMV. Men don't consider this when evaluating a woman's SMV. The conclusion is that women are instinctively looking for marriages with men where they (subconsciously) know they will have the legal advantage because that's how they maintain the power in the relationship. If a woman marries down, the guy is the one with all the power and protections.

To put it another way, current divorce laws aren't pro-women, they're pro-underdog. I've had countless cases where I've represented the man as the lesser earner and he ended up getting all the same support, property, and custody rights that women typically get. It's the RP insistence to extend the "male dominance/female submissiveness" concept into household economics that is creating their own disadvantage. Now, to be fair, I totally empathize with that extension, but as I've often said before: I do everything I can to encourage my wife to increase her earning capacity, rather than stifling it. This makes my job in leading the household much, much harder when she sees herself as an equal financial contributor (or close to it), but I'm willing to take on that additional challenge to maintain the other dynamics on my terms. If other guys in the RP world are not willing to do so, that's their call and they can accept the consequences of that.

She is the one who legally gets to decide, she is the one who you legally cannot offend. She is even the one who decides whether or not you are the head of the house.

I still don't get where the law gives her this power. You can't just speak generally - there has to be a statute or case law somewhere that authorizes this type of attitude. Otherwise, what you're suggesting is that men are to be controlled by fear of divorce, which sounds counterproductive to the RP agenda. The only way she gets power is if the man cares enough to lose his stuff. Why is he so attached to it in the first place? Attachment to material crap is specifically counter-productive to the RPChristians agenda even beyond the traditional RP interests, where material things might matter a lot more.

Looking for resources on modern ways to walk into Christian marriage without the state involved. Are there any foolproof ways?

2 upvotes · 3 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Makes sense. Thanks!

Looking for resources on modern ways to walk into Christian marriage without the state involved. Are there any foolproof ways?

2 upvotes · 3 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

of the couples who practice NFP, only 2% divorce

You have a source for that? I'd love to have that for future use.

Looking for resources on modern ways to walk into Christian marriage without the state involved. Are there any foolproof ways?

2 upvotes · 3 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

This is true as long as a feast follows the famine. If the wife is sexually denying during the "on" times, the husband's resentment will only increase during the "off" times, blaming it on her having just one more excuse to avoid him. That's dangerous.

Looking for resources on modern ways to walk into Christian marriage without the state involved. Are there any foolproof ways?

2 upvotes · 2 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

While I appreciate your other comments here ... on this point I do have to ask: how can your husband know that for a fact, though? Or what about extreme situations? What if he cheats on you, then decides to murder you so he can be with his lover, so he stabs you with a knife and starts threatening to kill your children too? Would it still be "a fact that i won't divorce my husband"? And if there is a line that can be drawn as to when you will, what's keeping that line from moving? Other than pride, of course, which many Christians like to use the word "conviction" as a cop-out from admitting that this is really what it is.

I used to tell myself the same thing: *I'll never divorce. Period. Even for infidelity. I know this as a fact.* My mind has changed, as has my spiritual understanding of the matter. I realized that I was pretty darn arrogant about my views back then and it led me to make some serious mistakes in one of my early relationships. God had to show me my understanding was wrong and that there are times when he will cut someone off. Maybe 20 years from now your mind will change too. Maybe it won't. But no one can know that with absolute certainty - and to say so at present usually implies that, in arrogance, you're not open to correction from the Spirit on that issue.

Some people, of course, suggest that the Spirit is the one who gave them the conviction in the first place and the Spirit won't ever contradict himself. But I've seen those exact same people (with a 100% rate) eventually have to change their mind on something they were convinced the Spirit had told them. Given your Catholic background, if you lack the infallibility that the pope has in discerning God's will, or even if you have this power but are not exercising it at a given time (and I understand the times when that power applies are extremely limited and narrow in scope), then you can't say definitively whether or not something was from God, and therefore can't know for sure that God won't compel you to change your views on a matter sometime down the road.

James 4:13-15 seems on point here.

College Kid... Relationships are hard

2 upvotes · 27 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

2/2

Get Yourself a Mission

You need a mission apart from girls. Until you have that, you'll never truly be happy or satisfied in life. God didn't create you to be a boyfriend or husband. He created you to be a glory-bearer, glory-giver. Your drive for a physical relationship and to start a physical family is powerful because God uses that as a parallel for the spiritual relationship he wants with you and the spiritual family he wants you to build.

Ever wonder why even the Christian divorce rate isn't statistically different from the non-Christian divorce rate? Because most Christians have never adopted the mission of disciple-making. When you look only at Christians with an active lifestyle of evangelism and discipleship (as opposed to Christians on the whole), the divorce rate is something like 1/8 of the rest of the world. Why? Because they have a mission that transcends the relationship. This is what makes for a successful marriage.

Should I even do what's best for me?

People like this "JOY" acronym for how you should prioritize your love and efforts: "Jesus first, then Others, then Yourself." It sounds noble. But Jesus said, "Love your neighbor *as yourself*." Not "more than yourself" - *as yourself*. That is, you can't love your neighbor until you learn how to love yourself first. Then, 1 John 4:20 says, "If anyone does not love his brother whom he has seen, he cannot love God whom he has not seen." In other words, you can't love God until you learn to love his people first (see also Matthew 25:40-46 - amazing passage). So, the real order is that you need to learn to do what's best for you before you can have the type of overflow to figure out what's best for others, and you can't really say you love God rightly until you get to that point.

What about her heart and life and situation?

You goofed. You got into a relationship you shouldn't have gotten into. Mistake made. Now that you're aware, the best thing you can do is get out. Continuing in a mistake doesn't undo the mistake - repenting and turning away is what redeems our mistakes.

As for her heart, it's one thing to say you're not responsible, but I get you're still going to feel that way. Humans are weird like that - feeling responsible for other people all the time. To be fair, Jesus modeled this for us, by bearing the responsibility for our sin on the cross to deal with the fact that apart from him we're utterly irresponsible. And honestly, once you're married to someone, you do need to model Jesus' behavior in the relationship in every way, shape, and form. But not while you're still dating.

AXIOMS to Consider

Here are two new axiom I'm going to create for this sub, just for you ...

AXIOM 1: *If your woman is with you for a particular reason, she'll leave you on the grounds of that same reason.*

- If she's with you because you're good looking, when you gain 30lbs after the honeymoon, she'll leave you for a better looking guy. If she's with you because you're intelligent, but you end up wasting all your time on Netflix rather than stimulating conversation, she'll leave you for another intellectually stimulating guy.
- Inversely, if she's not with you because of your mission in Christ, your being on a mission for Christ won't do much toward keeping her around. If you don't have that mission yet, you'd better believe she will resist that mission when you get it. Why? Because your mission will interfere with whatever real reason she's with you in the first place.

AXIOM 2: *If your woman isn't with you because of your mission, she will interfere with your mission. This will make her miserable, not just you.*

- You'll be miserable because you'll feel isolated and alone, even from your own wife, because you don't have a common purpose. I lived this for years 2-8 of my marriage. Don't make that mistake.
- The reason the wife is miserable in this situation is not only because her actual reason for being with you is in conflict with your dedication to the mission, but also because she is designed by God to be a helper, and if she isn't 100% sold out on your mission, how can she fulfill her role as your helper if she's not on board with what you're doing in the first place? And if she isn't really helping you to fulfill something she's jointly passionate about, she will feel empty for not being able to live out the purpose for which God created her.

How does one even behave in this situation?

The same way as every other situation:

- Love **God** - adopt his purposes as your primary life aim, not finding a girl; repent from your mistakes no matter the cost
- Love **Others** - be tactful and caring about others, mindful of the implications your decisions to love and follow God have on their life
- Make **Disciples** - invite Christ into every aspect of all of your relationships; don't make projects of people who aren't ready to commit to Christ, and don't commit to them yourself either.

The real "Red Pill" that you need to swallow

2 upvotes · 26 September 2017 · /r/ExRedPill

Every theory says the same thing.

303 - Fellowship

2 upvotes · 22 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

1. God told us to (Hebrews 11:25-26, I think)
2. Because Christianity is not about puffing ourselves up; it's about giving to others.
3. Those of us who understand godly manliness have a spiritual obligation to impart what God has shared with us to others (i.e. "Ask not what your church can do for you, but what you can do for your church" mentality).
4. Because the church has side/peripheral benefits that we cannot get in its absence, even if we have to filter out some of the garbage.
5. Because, for better or for worse, God has allowed the western church to be what it is and we shouldn't reject what God has not rejected.
6. Because it provides a convenience for finding other believers with whom we can fellowship and minister - something much harder to do in the absence of a local congregation.

There are more, but these are the big ones for me. As I often tell people: *Work to improve your church; until it's in great condition, consider it a tool that provides resources you can't get anywhere else; the most important resource is that it brings together believers who might otherwise be difficult to find.*

303 - Fellowship

2 upvotes · 22 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

You ever read the book *The Insider* by Jim Petersen and Mike Shamy? The whole book is devoted to what you're talking about. Good stuff. Great resource for helping new Christians remember to keep ties with their old non-Christian friends without breaking off the relationships because the church gives that unspoken pressure to do so.

due to the lack of frame many Christians have

So, so true.

some condemn, others try to change the conversation for lack of knowing how to respond without feeling like they're encouraging the behavior

I wrote a book on discipleship (unpublished) that addresses all of these processes and problems. Some of that will be included (in very small degree) when I get to the evangelism post :)

Therefore, with a strong frame, us Christians can be equipped to interact with non-Christians, maintain Christ's light in us, all without loving the world.

Yeah, I feel like most Christians need to read a book titled: *When I hear 'No' I Feel Guilty*. When's that one coming out? I suppose WISNIFG will do for now.

303 - Fellowship

2 upvotes · 22 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

What denomination are you guys?

I don't identify with any denomination. I have been involved with countless and currently attend a Nazarene church, but disagree with much of their theology.

Lord's Supper

Yeah, this has long been my position as well. When you look at the way Jesus modeled "communion" (which the Greek of 1 Cor. 11 for that term is *koinonia* which implies a oneness fellowship/relational bond, not a ritual), it's more about bonding together as believers over the mission to make disciples (i.e. the primary purpose of the church). This simply cannot be done in a "10 minutes at the end of service" ritual. I was once asked to teach a class for my church about communion and had to declined because I told them point blank: "The way you do communion isn't biblical, is not what Jesus modeled, and serves no valid spiritual function." Rather than discussing the matter and re-evaluating, they just found someone else to do it. *Sigh*.

from personal observation alone... there are many, MANY Churches today that insists that all fellowship and meetups among members today have some deliberate "Christian" intent behind it

True. Although I agree that "good Christian fellowship" cannot exist in the absence of a spiritual bond being fostered, it's unhealthy to be all relational or all intentional.

I train small group leaders to include 3 elements:

- Relationship building - fun, games, and just generally getting to know one another. Go bowling, see movies, hang out at a restaurant, etc.
- Life and ministry skills training - Figure out what it is God wants you doing, then teach, correct, rebuke, and train one another in accomplishing that purpose.
- Character building - figure out personal issues going on in people's lives and help them work through it, whether it's grief, sin issues, depression, etc.

Lack any one of these and the group will ultimately fail in what God wants it doing.

Advice on Maintaining Rule #1 and #2 on devices

2 upvotes · 21 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

Hah! Which was it? Please tell me SGM.

What's the MRP stance on responsive sexuality?

2 upvotes · 21 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

Ah, gotcha.

What's the MRP stance on responsive sexuality?

2 upvotes · 20 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

some women initiate in really stupid ways

Yeah, the changing in front of me thing wouldn't communicate anything, and I definitely don't think my wife's trying to initiate that way ... but maybe I'm just ignorant. My wife's typical way of initiating is very defensive: "I'm not necessarily in the mood, but if you want to have sex I could be okay with it tonight." Once I get her going, it's great - but the initiation is so infrequent, weak, and fraught with ASD and "I need to minimize the potential pain of getting sexually rejected" ... it makes me wonder what's actually going on in her brain/libido/tingly area. To be fair, she does have days where I come home from work to lit candles and lingerie - but that's pretty darn rare. There are also days between these extremes.

I find that I'm initiating about 85% of the time (5/6). Even so, I read story after story here about guys who say their wives are coming onto them several times a week, bragging about getting her panties wet with a single word, etc. and I start to wonder how much of that is just BS male ego stroking from what legitimately happens ... or if they just happened to have found a spontaneous wife rather than a responsive one, yet are acting like all wives can and should be that way. I'm curious if the "she rarely initiates" is still common even for the men who have fully mastered RP.

To put it another way, although I don't doubt the effectiveness of RP methods themselves - I am living proof that they work ... but I am beginning to doubt the way some posters characterize the degree of effectiveness, telling extreme stories as if they're a daily occurrence (or should be) when maybe they're really only happening once every month or two, or other forms of exaggeration in the hopes of gaining acceptance by this community. After all, there's nothing men like to hear more than: "Here's a great sex story about all the slutty things my wife does - and here's how I got her to do them. If you do it, you can get your wife to be like that too."

Advice - Keep working on LTR or cut losses.

2 upvotes · 15 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

You're so full of contradictions here I can't even begin to guess at what's really going on.

Example: "she is still receptive to Kino" followed immediately by "attempts at escalation go nowhere." This makes no sense. That means she's not receptive. It means kino is not working on her.

Plus, how in the world is a girl who goes to strip clubs and is hiding things from you "wife material"? You're compartmentalizing and thinking: "These traits make for a good wife, and all those other bad things are on the side and don't affect her wifey status." That's beta thinking - because you're idolizing aspects of her that you like while pushing her negatives into their own separate box of: "I want to keep all this good stuff, but help me kill the bad stuff in her."

Here's the deal: **SHE WILL NOT CHANGE**. If she's into watching sexy muscle hunks dancing on stage for her now, she's going to be into that later. Your goal shouldn't be to get her to change (i.e. by revealing your knowledge of the pics); rather, it's to become the guy she wants to stare at - so much that she doesn't give a crap about going to strip clubs when she's already got something better at home.

Men are the polygamous ones. No matter how hot their wife is, there's always going to be the temptation to go to a strip club. Women are hypergamous. They go to the strip club to fantasize about a man who's better than they have now. Become the best man and that fantasy shifts to being with you and the strip club will have lost its allure. That's not to say she'll never go again. She may still like the GNO effect. But her reason for being there and her eagerness to go will be very different.

Question I always had about Christianity (but every pastor/priest is too bluepillled to answer)

2 upvotes · 12 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

What "dirty work" is circumcision enabling men toward?

Why is this "violence against men" different from the cruelty and violence against women that was permissible in that culture? How is that more impacting on society?

Question I always had about Christianity (but every pastor/priest is too bluepilled to answer)

2 upvotes · 11 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I still don't see how you're connecting circumcision to "die in a battlefield." The only vague reference is some thinly veiled "because we're conditioning these men to believe that it's okay for them to feel pain, but not women." Again, there is absolutely no evidence to back up the connection between circumcision and being war-prone. All of the non-circumcising countries had warriors all the same. Circumcision doesn't do anything to enhance a warrior mentality.

Question I always had about Christianity (but every pastor/priest is too bluepilled to answer)

2 upvotes · 11 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

The whole reason this topic, circumcision, is alarming is because it does seem to reinforce this "NO ONE TOUCHES THE WOMEN" gynocentrism. All while shrugging as baby boys are circumcised.

And what about all the passages that let a man cheat on a woman and get away with it, but if the woman cheats on the man she's killed? Or that men can rape a woman and live, but if she does the same, she's killed? I think you're losing the context here. Circumcision wasn't meant as a protection to women, but an elevation of status for men. Anyone who tells you otherwise has clearly not read the rest of the OT law.

let's just assume for a second that circumcision actually is as harmful as our friends over at [/r/mensrights](#) claim they are. Would your replies to my points change?

First off, I am circumcised, so I really have trouble believing a lot of the garbage people spout about it.

To your point, though, no, my reply would not change. Again, the point of circumcision is not to protect women from harm, but to be a physical representation of a man's connection with God - an elevation of his status that women were not permitted to share in. They had to use their husbands as a middle-man to have a connection with God. Husbands had the ability to learn an approach directly (I know I'm grossly oversimplifying, but this works as a bottom line without several thousands of words to prove this conclusion).

perhaps gynocentrism isn't the thing I've made it into

I think this is the conclusion. If I'm cold, heartless robot who shows no emotion or empathy in day to day life, then randomly find a joke funny and happen to chuckle out loud - would someone be justified in saying, "Look how emotionally expressive he is! That guy's an emotional nut-job!" That's what you're doing with the OT. You're picking one single point in the face of all evidence to the contrary and saying, "Look how gynocentric it is!" And even at that, you're missing that this one point is actually the exact opposite of gynocentrism.

Question I always had about Christianity (but every pastor/priest is too bluepilled to answer)

2 upvotes · 11 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

if salvation flows ...

This is the flow of discipleship. It's like in Exodus 4, where God says, "I'll talk to you, but you've got to be the one

to talk to Aaron, and he can be the one to talk to the people." We see at least 3 places in the New Testament where God affirms this pattern in marriage: "I'll talk to the husband, he'll talk to his wife, she can talk to other."

If the wife refuses to submit or learn from her husband, God won't communicate directly with her any more than he did with Aaron. The exception is when a woman does not have a believing husband, but I can't remember the passages for that off the top of my head.

I decided to read a Focus on the Family article on developing a "satisfying" sex life.

2 upvotes · 10 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

they can have it all. That's a lie from the pits of Hell, IMO. (lol)

Totally agreed.

Under those circumstances, it's probably nothing short of miraculous that the husband is getting sex at all!

Agreed. But also remember that those are my exact circumstances right now too ;) Our baby isn't even 3 months old yet. It's true that a woman's body agenda is screaming: "Don't get pregnant again!" while she's breastfeeding, so there's an innate lack of desire. The return to work (my wife is taking a pause from maternity leave to help during a busy season, meaning working 7 days a week) is also exhausting. So, no matter how hard you step on the gas pedal, if you're up against a wall, you're not going anywhere - you're just going to spin your wheels.

But learn to break down that wall and things can change - even in the midst of the inverted body agenda and increased stress and exhaustion. Expectations must change, but they don't have to be turned off altogether.

pick two of three

On rotation, this is fine. When you permanently neglect one, that's when the problems start. For wives, I see those three as: (1) mental/work; (2) emotional/relationships; (3) physical/sex. There are times when all 3 can be great, but at other times you have to shut off your emotions and relationships to get your job done - in these times sex can be a necessary relief. Other times you pull back at work to refocus on the family dynamic, including sex with your husband. Other times sex takes a nose dive because work and friends/family just becomes too much that the desire isn't there.

Other times you can literally only focus on one. When my wife starts working 100+ hour weeks right before a deadline, she never sees anyone and sex is off the table. I accept that. It's not a lack of desire - it's a legit limitation. Other times she has a friend or family member in crisis and it literally consumes all of her time. This is rare, but it does happen. Interestingly, despite how many dead bedrooms I hear of and the number of people who understand this concept, I've never heard of the wife who spends all of her time so consumed with fixing or improving her sex life that she doesn't have the capacity to focus on work or relationships with friends/family. This often shows where sex is in the priority of the three - even when it's clear that a marriage is in crisis because of a lack of sex. In my former days, when we had marriage crises over not having sex, my wife's response was not to make it a top priority, but to put it on the back-burner hoping to fix it over time. But with literally any other problem in her life, she's on the internet researching, asking her friends and family what to do, praying about it, etc. Sex? "Don't worry, I'll work on it, just be patient," and then nothing changed until I started changing.

More to the point: many RP people mistakenly assume that the sex drive can always be there. They then do thing after thing after thing to bring it back. In reality, it never went away, it just wasn't the right time within that balance. So, after several attempts, they then give credit to the one they tried right before her life rhythm cycled back to being able to have free, open sex again.

Picking the right attorney

2 upvotes · 10 September 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

If you're going to the courthouse anyway, just ask the bailiffs/court officers. They're really going to have the answers you're looking for. They know all the attorneys and how they practice - and specifically which ones the judges like and don't.

If you're looking online, I can't say how your county is organizing cases or whether or not they reveal the attorney name or make it searchable that way. I can only speak for my own county.

FR: 1 Year from the artist formally known as prarrott

2 upvotes · 10 September 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

2/2 Tag: /u/redeemedpr

She had decided to see this marriage through, and she was going to do that

In the absence of her efforts to divorce you, this is now your job. 2 Timothy 2:[something teen] - *If we disown him, he will disown us. If we are faithless, he remains faithful.* You didn't disown her, but you were certainly not faithful. Nevertheless she remained faithful to her covenant to you, just as God does to us. She's being the man. Now it's your turn to be the man.

What my wife has requested most of me in this time is vulnerability

Don't confuse this with transparency.

- **Transperancy:** Completely 100% open and honest. "I'm really struggling with ____ right now."
- **Vulnerability:** Allowing others access to your weak points, defenses down. "Can you help me with ____? I'm really struggling."

RP ideas to not show emotion

I believe the RP idea is not to be controlled by emotion. Communicating emotion is good and healthy. We just don't want to be reactive; rather, we need to be proactive and responsive. There's a difference between saying calmly, "What you did hurt me," and crying for several minutes before lashing out: "What YOU DID hurt me!"

it could truly spell the death of my sex life forever

As my discipler once noted: *Until we are content to be made nothing, God will often only make nothing of us. When we become nothing, that's when God can start working.*

I was no longer concerned with trying to be "attractive"

It seemed pointless because it is pointless. Your job isn't to be attractive to your wife. It's to do what God put you here to do. Incidentally, doing that is what makes you here attractive. Most of the stuff you read in RP is the training to prepare you for the ministry God's calling you to: make disciples.

- Lift? People naturally follow fit, attractive people. Also, this is a physical metaphor for developing spiritual strength. They are inextricably linked - don't underestimate that.
- Develop a mission? You can't lead others if you're not going anywhere.
- Strengthen frame? We're in a literal spiritual war. Not a hypothetical, fun to think about battle. A real war. Crap from your wife, your friends, your congregation, etc. are all tools of the enemy and things that you need

to be able to overcome to do what God put you here to do. You'll fail if you have a weak frame. Period. I've seen too many Christians die out after only a few years because they have a weak frame.

- OI? You can plant or water, but God makes it grow. The results are up to God, not you. If you're only in it to look successful to all your church friends, you'll be a failure in the mission to make disciples. Look at Noah - everyone he preached to died except his immediate family. Or Moses - the entire generation he "saved" from Egypt? God killed them all off before they could step foot in the promised land. From a human perspective these guys were royal failures. But they had OI. They didn't care about their success - only that they were living in the mission God gave them.

The list goes on ... you should get the idea by now. Everything RP is here to develop you to become the disciple-maker he's calling you to be.

lucky wife, now she doesn't have to deal with the guilt of denying her husband sex

Do you really think she felt guilty about that before any of this? Besides, when has adding guilt ever improved something? Guilt is a powerful manipulator of behavior, but its results are non-sustainable and weak. I do everything I can to take guilt out of the equation. The less guilt my wife experiences, the more free she is to feel more positive things. "I feel guilty because ..." turns into "I feel sexy because ..." or "I feel horny" or "I feel tingly."

the last 2 weeks we have had more sex than we have ever had in our 10 year marriage

First, be careful not to assume this will continue indefinitely. You're in new territory, so it's exciting. That will wear off. Be ready and diligent.

Second, she's initiating = she repented. God's trying to show you that your end conclusion should be repentance of being the harpy, denying, self-entitled bride you've been. He wants spiritual reproduction. Become intimate with God, then go make spiritual babies - or as Jesus tells Nicodemus in John 3, cause people to be "born again."

I am fighting to forgive my wife for years of harpy, disrespectful, bitchy, cold and sexless years

God already forgave you of these things. Now prove he was right to do so. Stop acting that way toward him.

Conclusion

Context for Your Narrative

God gave you three commands we call great:

- Love **G**od - the greatest command
- Love **O**thers - the second greatest command
- Make **D**isciples - the great commission

Making disciples is the reason God has you on this earth. Loving Him and loving others are the foundation of how you're going to get that done. It's impossible to do any of these the way God intended if you're missing one of them.

Your Actual Narrative

Your marriage problems have always been about reproductive acts (i.e. sex). You had a new baby and both you

and your wife saw an inherent need to raise that baby. You realized you weren't reflecting God's character, so you repented and decided to be the man God created you to be. Your wife also realized her failures and contribution to the problem. Her repentance and your striving to be like Christ has revived your marriage. Your passion for one another again in physically reproductive acts has returned.

This all happened specifically to show you that your spiritual problems have always been about reproduction. God wants to use you to cause others to be "born again" - and then to continue using you to nurture them into maturity. When you and your wife both repented to reflect the character of the relationship God has with his church, your physical intimacy and reproductive acts revived. God modeled this in your marriage to point you to the fact that now that you're repenting and trying to be right with Him, you're going to stop being the cold, denying harpy; instead, you are going to have the same passion for spiritual reproductive acts (i.e. evangelism) that your wife is showing you for physical reproductive acts (i.e. sex).

In short, your marriage had to blow up so you could see what you were doing to God by virtue of what your wife was doing to you. Now that your relationship with your wife is restored, you know what you need to do to restore your relationship with God. Just as you're to lead your wife with a mission she can help you accomplish; God's going to lead you with the mission of discipleship that you're going to help Him accomplish.

Digest this for a while until you understand it inside and out. I've alluded to some of these things on [r/RPChristians](#) and this will grow as the sub does. Once you feel like you've fully internalized the mission for discipleship and the parallels between your physical marriage to your wife (where you're the husband) and your spiritual relationship with Christ (where you're his bride) **AND you are living them out in noticeable ways**, after explaining these things to your church (i.e. explaining your new lifestyle) their jaws will be dropped and people will flock to you. That's the power of this narrative. It's not a covert contract: "Do this and people will follow." With God, this is a promise.

FR: 1 Year from the artist formally known as prarrott

2 upvotes · 10 September 2017 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

Best reply here. Great breakdown.

50/50 v. OYS/Value

2 upvotes · 8 September 2017 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

Just made a post reciting most of this comment plus additional information - specifically including the questions to ask. But you're honestly better off asking court staff for a reputation check.

I decided to read a Focus on the Family article on developing a "satisfying" sex life.

2 upvotes · 8 September 2017 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I agree. I didn't mean to imply that caring, responding and assisting are bad things - only that it's bad to associate them with how you increase physical desire, which they won't.

50/50 v. OYS/Value

2 upvotes · 8 September 2017 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

I wouldn't say never there. It usually is. What you mean is that divorce is never "get out what you put in."

Calling out your partner's bullshit?

2 upvotes · 7 September 2017 · [/r/askMRP](#)

I don't think she was lying about being constipated. But she was certainly abusing it as an excuse to get out of sex.

That's a garbage excuse. AA - "I bet you are constipated. That's why you need me to pound it out of you ... loosen up your insides a bit."

I decided to read a Focus on the Family article on developing a "satisfying" sex life.

2 upvotes · 5 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Beautifully said.

I comment on RPW occasionally, but I don't often take it seriously as an RP sub, as it feels more to be for women with conservative values than about learning and applying RP principles themselves.

I decided to read a Focus on the Family article on developing a "satisfying" sex life.

2 upvotes · 5 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Fair. But doesn't RP do the same? Instead of trying to fix the wife or tell her what to do we say to fix the man.

302 - Bible Study

2 upvotes · 4 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Why/How is this the "Red pill" way of studying or applying the Bible?

If you try to filter everything through a red pill lens, including Scripture, you're probably idolizing the role of "the red pill" in your life. There is no "red pill way" to mow the law, but being a red pill man means you get it done all the same. If someone's totally clueless on how to mow his law, someone's gotta teach him. The 7 basics are things that most people are fairly clueless on. Being a Christian man - even a red pill Christian man - means knowing how to study the Bible. A man cannot lead his home spiritually if he doesn't know how to read and understand the Bible.

How is this any different from the standard FI-infested churchian way of bible study?

Just because the church is "FI-infested" (a point I readily agree with) doesn't mean everything it teaches must be abandoned. We shouldn't diss and abandon Christ's bride because she went on a power trip. Instead, per Ephesians 5, brides are meant to be purified and cleansed. There is still good in the church. Rather than abandoning it and starting over, trying to get Jesus to marry someone else, we're better off purifying the bride he'll never leave. Take the good and prune away the bad. After all, this is exactly what Jesus himself says he does - he just chooses to use godly men to accomplish this task. Our job is to be those godly men who will accomplish the task.

Proper understanding of the Scriptures is how we're going to get there. Proper Bible study is how we get proper understanding.

More to the point of your question, most churches don't teach people how to study the Bible - like this or at all. In fact, when I tried to teach my pastor, who has his masters degree from seminary, how to study the Bible he commented, "This just makes too much sense. How come seminaries don't teach it this way?"

Instead, there are legit liberal seminaries who teach you to interpret Scripture through a cultural lens (i.e. feminism). Others will teach "authorial intent," but just focus on specs and details ("Here's how to use a lexicon" and "Here's how to cross-reference") and reading commentaries rather than the actual structure for how the study should be accomplished.

Some life advice needed

2 upvotes · 1 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

These types of situations are judge specific, so there's no way of guaranteeing a particular result. Most judges would probably help you out if there was an overt representation that the kitchen stuff would be there when you moved in, but simply seeing it on a walkthrough might not be enough evidence to prove an overt representation if the previous tenant had other stuff there too.

Most landlords are only responsible for providing basic fixtures. Fixtures are defined at law as things actually affixed to the property that cannot be removed without causing damage to the property. A cabinet is a fixture. A stove is not.

If you file something, even if your odds of winning are low, you still have "nuisance value." Don't pay the \$250 to hire a lawyer - send a letter to your landlord saying:

I spoke to an attorney and we are ready to file suit. I'd rather not deal with a court battle over this. Here's what I'd like to offer to remedy the situation: ...

Then add at the end: *In the alternative, I will accept your releasing me from the lease so I can find another place that has appliances provided.*

Bluff or not, see what you can get. If you end up buying new appliances, you'll end up bitter at having to pay for all that, but at least they're yours and you can get what you want. If you go to court, even if you win, you'll probably still be pretty darn bitter, stressed, and will have burned a bridge with your landlord - and still only get whatever crappy appliances she buys off craigslist to appease you.

As a lawyer, take it from me: it's usually better to avoid court if you can. Think of it like a nuke - a powerful deterrent that you hope you never have to use, but the threat of using it can often get you some portion of what you want anyway.

Information too late ...

2 upvotes · 1 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

This is a terrific response - sees right through all the crap I was missing. Thanks!

Information too late ...

2 upvotes · 1 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

I am. The appointment just isn't here yet. In fact, on [r/RPChristians](#) I made a field report about the conversation where I first told her I was getting a vasectomy. She didn't take it well at the time, but is fully on board now.

Information too late ...

2 upvotes · 1 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

No. It's at the end of September.

Information too late ...

2 upvotes · 1 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

Good point. I'm confident I don't want more kids, and I've told her this. As noted to another user, she even attended the vasectomy initial consult with me and has been on board.

Information too late ...

2 upvotes · 1 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

We talked about me getting it done and she attended the initial consult with me, but I didn't schedule the actual procedure until a couple days ago.

302 - Bible Study

2 upvotes · 1 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Well, he knew that going in. That's why he asked me to disciple him in the first place. We've been working together to change the culture at our church from "casual and friendly attenders" to "purposeful, loving, and intentional disciple-makers." I happen to know how to do this and he's been highly motivated lately to make some serious changes :)

Dread-game may be the most important aspect of a Redpill LTR or marriage.

2 upvotes · 30 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

As to that last point, I could not agree more!

What's the point?

2 upvotes · 30 August 2017 · /r/askTRP

Even the guys I consider to be alpha get no attention.

You're probably mistaken in what you consider alpha.

gang members and scammers

These are the guys you need to be looking toward to define alpha. You don't have to make the same moral choices they do - but accept the fact that they're exemplifying the model alpha traits. They're just doing so in a darker context. Dark alpha or light alpha - you figure that one out for yourself. Just make sure you're looking at the right model for alpha traits in the first place.

Filed today.

2 upvotes · 29 August 2017 · /r/askMRP

A key thing to remember is that parenting time is freely modifiable, but property division and (usually) spousal support are not. Relax a bit on the modifiable stuff to get a better result on the permanent stuff (if it makes sense to do so), then a year later go back and modify the parenting time to get your 50/50 when finances aren't at stake anymore.

I do the same thing with mothers in custody cases. Custody itself is tough to modify once it's established (so never settle for less than shared parenting), but child support is easy. So, I have women agree to \$0 child support in exchange for sole custody. Most guys are dumb enough to jump for joy at this proposal. 3 months later she "happens to" change jobs and is requesting a recalculation of child support and gets that too. Do the same thing back but with property division/parenting time as the negotiable factors. Of course, only do this if it makes sense in light of your situation.

Own Your Shit - Own Her Sex

2 upvotes · 29 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Makes sense. I've only gotten "jerky" enough so far that she's started calling me a jerk at times.

Mitch's Red Pill

2 upvotes · 29 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I just slap them upside the head. Like I have been doing to [u/Red-curious](#)

Heh ... is that what you think you've been doing?

epitome of a purple piller man

Admittedly, I'm still working my way through. But I'd love to hear your explanation on this anyway.

kill the beta completely

And yet Athol Kay and countless mods/flaired people here have refrained that one needs to keep a balance of some beta to maintain sustainability in a relationship.

As I often quote [/u/cholomite](#) for saying: *Tingles without fuzzies won't last; fuzzies without tingles are worthless.* MMSLP highlights that fuzzies come from beta traits and tingles come from alpha traits - and both are necessary if one's goal is to maintain a marriage indefinitely. [/u/jacktenofhearts](#) repeatedly talked about using the alpha to bolster one's frame with titanium, but using the beta to add pillows and cushions inside so someone might actually want to live there.

I'm on board that the mental perception of how the world works must come from a red pill praxeology, but I don't think that excludes all signs of beta traits, and I think a single post not only on this sub, but also on [r/theredpill](#) will prove that the majority agree: *some beta* is necessary. I've already seen this conversation happen at least twice on [r/theredpill](#) and countless times over here. "Blue Pill" and "Beta" are not the same. Although there is a significant correlation and overlap, there are aspects where each are mutually exclusive - where BP guys leave the realm of beta and where beta traits can be practiced outside of a BP mental framework. In the case of the latter, these beta traits *can* be practiced within an RP framework.

Otherwise, what are we doing still promoting MMSLP on the sidebar?

301 - The 7 Basics

2 upvotes · 29 August 2017 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Bible study and Scripture memory would have such a strong correlation as to be able to be rolled into one

I can see how some would think that, but the way I interact with God on each is soooooooo totally different that I can't justify merging them. For me, Bible study is almost entirely an intellectual exercise that deepens my understanding of God. Scripture memory is more of an emotional exercise, as prayerfully meditating on the passages to commit them to heart and mind allows God's Word to permeate my soul in a very deep and intimate way. In fact, although Bible study is my favorite (because it's my natural best), of all of the basics I have never connected with God more deeply than through Scripture memory, which is a higher form of connecting with God's Word than study alone (but that's a post still a few days away).

Grace of the Sacraments

These are certainly important, I won't deny you there. I'm not Cathodox, but I do tend to hold the sacraments as being of higher importance than most protestants. While I agree that the sacraments are a "basic" as far as what new believers should do, my experience is that their growth-value doesn't come until one is more mature.

To reword that: the 7 basics I listed are ways that new and mature believers alike can connect with God in a personal and intimate way. Although new believers should partake in the sacraments, new believers simply do not (on the whole) grow in their faith as a result of partaking in the sacraments; rather, that growth from the sacraments begins to manifest as they are mature enough to understand and connect with God through them, which takes time.

LTR had nudes in her laptop from her phone dated June/July. Pussy and ass pics. She has never sent me nudes in our 9 month relationship.

2 upvotes · 28 August 2017 · /r/askTRP

Haha, cool and thanks! I'm a divorce attorney, so I'm used to advising clients on how to get information without getting caught.

109 - Pursuit, Seduce, Initiate

2 upvotes · 28 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Fair point, but I do seem to recall the book opening with her setting the stage and Solomon's first words are about his attraction to her (i.e. she's made herself pretty enough beforehand to get his attention in the first place).

What to do if SHE has a higher sex drive than YOU?

2 upvotes · 28 August 2017 · /r/askMRP

As [/u/sekerzitski](#) noted, up the price. Right now she highly values sex with you and can get it dirt cheap. Make her work harder for it and as effort increases, quantity will decrease - but because quality goes up at the same time, she stays hooked on you and not some other dude. Plus, by shifting/insisting from low-quality to a high-quality sex life, that's a DHV, so she's going to be more motivated not to screw it up.

Another user suggested being more beta. This isn't a terrible idea, and I had a similar thought, but proceed with caution. If you take that route and it lowers her libido to where you want it, fine (I still think it's a mistake, but you can do that if you want). The added beta will increase her comfort level and decrease attraction, so she should ideally be more motivated toward longevity in the relationship. That said, monitor this extremely closely because if you drop her attraction to you and her libido doesn't change then she's going to start looking elsewhere, even in the face of the increased beta comforts. That's not a risk I would gamble with, personally, but if you know her extremely well and can read her flawlessly, then it might be a valid option.

Weekend Challenge

2 upvotes · 28 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Here's my report.

ONE - I did this in lots of ways. An easy example: my wife became obsessed with buying a particular house. She has been hounding me about it for a while and it was literally all day on Friday and part of the day on Saturday. Personally, I think it's out of our price range, even with our combined (almost) quarter-million income, plus we just had a kid. Standard techniques worked to abate in the moment, but she kept bringing it back. I brought up 1 Cor. 4 and said I don't want to increase our standard of living - if anything, I'd be more inclined to decrease or give from our excess. Nevertheless, I agree that we need to move (had 0 kids when we bought our current house; now we have 4). So, I laid out a clear plan: "Chart our post-tax take-home income for the next three years. After you get me that, I'll set up an appointment with a mortgage broker to see what we'd qualify for and what the actual monthly obligation will be under different scenarios. If it works, it works; if not, we'll find out what price range does work." That pretty much put the conversation to rest and she was much, much happier and more affectionate, even touchy-feely afterward. Granted, I assume her being affectionate is trying to butter me up, but she should know by now my decisions don't respond to that.

TWO - I took off work 2 hours early on Friday, so that created an abundance of time. I brought my kids and wife to the gym with me on Saturday, so that killed two birds with one stone (lifting + family time at the pool). I also managed to process a major breakthrough in one of my cases, so a big plus there.

THREE - I had plateaued my lifting for a while, so even without a spotter I decided to do my max for bench and squat and up my max for the shoulder press by 20lbs (I failed; could only up by 10). At the same time, I usually do a bit sub-max for 1 round, then 3 mid-rounds, then 1 light for each workout. This time I did 1-max and 4 just beneath max. In addition, due to the time-constraints of having limited daycare time at the gym, I shortened my rest periods significantly. Also, today I managed to run a 10k at an above-5mph pace the entire time with no

breaks. I'd been able to do a 5k like that for a while, but this is the first time I've tried a 10k with those criteria (I've done it before, but usually would walk intermittently after the first 5k or otherwise would just lower my pace to a light jog).

Thanks for the challenge!

Negativity of wife - your opinion?

2 upvotes · 28 August 2017 · /r/askMRP

I wrote about my solution here in [Dealing with the stressed wife](#). It's a short-term exercise, but for me was enough to set the stage for long-term leadership as an overt expectation up-front, not a covert op that takes months of infiltration and gradual redirection.

[/u/BluePillProfessor](#) called for field reports, but I haven't seen any yet other than my own experience and that of one other guy I've mentored. So, if you give it a shot, report back for the benefit of the community.

Got married prior to discovering TRP. Now having sadness over the feeling of "not having had sex with enough women."

2 upvotes · 25 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

for the first time since giving my life to Christ, I desired a walk with Him just a bit more than I desired attention and flirting with attractive women

Dang, man. That's a powerful realization and the start of something beautiful!

Thanks for the update and I'm glad you're finding some forward movement in your life here!

Weak pastor comment

2 upvotes · 24 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Be forewarned that the auto-mod picks up violations of rule 2 automatically. I'll manually approve some of them, but keep that in mind for the future.

Your wife is a whore and you should divorce her

2 upvotes · 24 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I still don't follow ... where was my ego hurt or if it was attacked somehow, where is there an indication that matters to me?

Your wife is a whore and you should divorce her

2 upvotes · 24 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I have no clue what you're trying to say here.

Your wife is a whore and you should divorce her

2 upvotes · 24 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

You're the one who mentioned the "cost of doing business." I was just extrapolating on that. Although some parallels may be useful, I prefer to avoid that particular analogy except in select circumstances.

Your wife is a whore and you should divorce her

2 upvotes · 24 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Totally agreed there. But the new testament does change the nature of the covenant. As I just replied to scurve:

That makes more sense. To that I'd defer to 2 Timothy 2:12-13 - "If we deny him, he also will deny us; if we are faithless, he remains faithful."

So, if she is merely faithless to the marriage vow (i.e. by constant denying sex, for example) then we should follow in Jesus's example (Paul is actually quoting Jesus from Matthew 10:33). But if she actively disowns that vow (i.e. cheating or trying to divorce you, etc.) then we're free to disown her right back. I don't get the impression Jesus would be happy about this second option as many men would be at the freedom to start anew, but we're all still human.

RPW, please don't have this mindset when you get older

2 upvotes · 24 August 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

True. I just commented on a rather old post here about this in the Christian sphere, referencing some stats a friend of mine came up with when doing a research study. The conclusion is that for a Christian guy to find a mature Christian girl who's in his age range and be a good relational fit *and is still single*, he'd have to attend a church of at least 1,250 people and hope he happened to get to know the one girl out of all of those people who meet those criteria. [The post is here, for reference.](#)

Hypergamy: Have you ever seriously thought about cheating and/or acted on it?

2 upvotes · 24 August 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

AWALT

[/u/ruizbuja](#) once made a post in [r/askmrp](#) about this being a potential inconsistency (if AWALT, then why is "nexting" or divorce a rational option? won't the next be like that too?). The responses were intriguing.

What I noticed out of [r/MRP](#) on the subject was essentially that the red berets and mods don't actually believe "AWALT" - it's more a combination of two things:

- *Don't be surprised if your woman ends up like that* - meaning that you don't know if your woman is one of the 20% or the 80%, and statistics work against you.
- *AWALT is useful; denying it is not useful.* To believe that you have a special snowflake puts you at great risk without gaining any significant advantages. So, even if NAWALT, it's still more beneficial to believe that AWALT so that you're prepared for the worst and in control of the terms of your relationship rather than walking helplessly into scenarios setting yourself up to fail. In that sense a refusal to acknowledge AWALT, although ironically would be a correct view, also becomes self-fulfilling prophesy in that such denial greatly increases your odds that your woman will end up being like that.

Pareto Principle

This is brilliant - defining how to get to the "unicorn." Obviously 80/20s would be way off - even as to the 80/20 within that. To say that 1/20 girls is truly "cream of the crop" seems optimistic in my book, at least from a Christian perspective. [/u/ruizbuja](#) once did a [research study and statistical analysis](#) on finding a godly Christian woman in today's society and the conclusion was that if you just wanted a *Christian woman*, only looking at regular church attenders, you've got about 18.65% of people who are likely actually "saved," half of whom are women, so 9.325%. If you want someone who is truly "godly" in the sense that their faith matters enough that they have an intentional plan for sharing it, you're down to 2.61% of all regular church-goers, and assuming half are women, that's 1.305%.

He then assumes only 75% are in an appropriate age range, only 25% of them are likely to be single, and

assuming one third of those people (being optimistic) are actually a good relational fit for you - that's 6.25% of church-goers who are single, in your age range, and a good relational fit. So, if only 1.305% of church-going women are truly mature believers, then .08% are women who you could potentially marry. Convert that to a decimal and invert it and you get 1 in 1,250 people. So, you'd have to attend a megachurch of 1,250 people - and meet all the singles within your age range and vet them to find the one person who would be a good relational fit for you to marry - and then hope she agrees! Haha.

He proposes the better alternative: find someone who is faithful, available, and teachable, and then disciple her into maturity. Finding a woman who is (pardon the acronym) FAT is far easier than finding a woman who is already mature, marriage-ready material. Not to be crude, but it's like buying a house. You can find a fixer-upper really easy, then put in some work to shape and mold it, or you can look for the move-in ready home and have a lot harder of a time and ultimately paying a much higher price.

Starting to recognize and pass Fitness Tests. Am I doing this right?

2 upvotes · 22 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

The food analogy is a bit different (but only slightly). The key difference is that you can go get food without her. If you want it, just go get it. It doesn't matter whether she needs or wants food at the time or not.

With sex, the answer is usually the same with a caveat. If you want it, you go take it. Caveat? Learn to recognize the hard no. A soft no is usually a fitness test. "No, I'm good. I don't need/want sex tonight" is a fitness test. She's trying to see if you'll fit into her frame and let her control your sexual appetite (or at least whether or not that appetite gets fed). Solution? A&A ...

You: I know you don't want me <hop on top of her> ... I'm going to make you **crave me**.

Now, ignore everything I just said. That's not a good idea for you yet. You try to do that at this stage of the game and mark my words: it will backfire. This only really works when she recognizes you as a high-value man.

Someone else on MRP pointed out that women don't evaluate SMV the same way a guy does. It's not about preferring a 6 over a 5 or comparing the 6 guy to her 4 and then desiring him. He said that women just want a guy who's in the top 20%, which is surprisingly easy for men to do. If top 20% = 6, then it doesn't matter that you're a 5 and she's a 2 - your higher SMV still won't make her want you in the context of a familiar marriage. Note: the unfamiliar increases SMV because of the mystery and hamstering about "what could be," making new guys easier to hop into the top 20% - she just assumes everyone else is better than you and doesn't have your flaws.

Now, where I disagree with that guy is that when a woman's SMV matches or is above the SMV of the top-20% guy, then her hypergamy will cause her only to notice guys whose SMV is higher than hers. So, if you get yourself up to a 6, but she's a 7, even if you're in top 20% she won't care - she's not interested in you because she's above you. Your efforts to pass tests and flirt with her aren't taken seriously. Instead, they're teaching her how to develop an amused mastery mindset against you. This is the often under-discussed aspect of going Rambo. Everyone will point out the "blow-ups" that happen, but there's also a psychological disadvantage in how she views you. You become cute, yet pathetic. It might get you some pity sex here and there, but it's hurting your long-term plan.

However, when you hit SMV 8 and she's a 7, now your efforts are real and produce dread. She thinks, "Dang, he could go get another girl if he wanted to. If he came onto someone else the same way he's coming onto me, she might actually say yes." Right now you're not a threat. You try to come onto someone else outside the marriage and she's confident you'll get rejected.

Long story short: top-20% first. Once you're there, just keep your SMV higher than hers.

Starting to recognize and pass Fitness Tests. Am I doing this right?

2 upvotes · 21 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Truly? What do I want? I want to wake up in the morning and not be afraid. I want to be able to get out of bed eager to get started because the prospect of a new day is no longer terrifying to me. I want that more than anything else in the world right now. If I had that, I'm sure that I would be okay.

Memorize Philippians chapter 4. This is really going to help. Meditate on every word of it.

Peace from God aside, you'd be amazed at how so much of what you're talking about changes as soon as you can see your abs and you're benching 250+. 2 years I would have written off the psychological benefits of lifting. As I stand today, I'm telling you it's massive. It takes time, but drop the weight and get to a point where your muscles start showing and your perspective on life will change. This is the beginning of **abundance mentality**, which is what you really need right now (oh, and make sure to work in the humility along the way too!)

Starting to recognize and pass Fitness Tests. Am I doing this right?

2 upvotes · 21 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

2/2

currently 4 months pregnant

Huge game changer right there. Read MMSLP and you'll get a lot of info on body agenda in the first few chapters. This all assumes a woman is not pregnant or breast feeding. When she's in either of those modes, her body agenda is reversed - it's telling her to avoid any form of reproduction because she needs to recover and have time to make sure this child is healthy and stable before re-engaging the imperative to make more babies. I will very strongly re-emphasize my recommendation to go into monk mode and not initiate sex. If it happens anyway, go for it - accept it. Train her to understand that sex is not a source of anxiety anymore (i.e. from your prior rejections of her). But don't initiate unless you know her hormones are straightening out and she's likely into it.

To be fair, I just went through this. I have a newborn (2 months old) and my wife probably has another 7-10 months of breastfeeding. So, I feel your pain. During the pregnancy I went into full monk mode (didn't know it by that name at that point). After the birth, she was noticing the changes in me and responding very well. Having lost 40+lbs and having muscles she could actually feel made a big difference, of course, but she had a lot of concerns about whether or not our relationship could handle a 4th kid. If this is your first, she's feeling that even stronger. So, holding frame, practicing amused mastery, stoicism in the face of her hormonal outbursts, etc. were all absolutely fundamental not only to passing negative fitness tests she threw my way, but even in the absence of her sending comfort tests, they were giving her the comfort she needed anyway - the comfort of knowing that our marriage wasn't going to fall apart from the uncanny levels of stress she was feeling and afraid would continue after the birth. Result? A couple weeks after the baby was born she's already responding to me sexually (though we had to do other stuff while waiting for her to heal). Even now, she's still not "all in," but her sexual responsiveness is better now than it has been at any point in the last 7 years (been married for 9), and that's even with her body agenda wanting to avoid reproduction while breastfeeding.

300 lbs at 5'8" even before she got pregnant. She is timid and shy about her body

Be honest - how overweight are you? There's a lot of indication here that either: (1) you're freaking out and this is all just because she's pregnant; when the pregnancy is over you'll be in good shape again; (2) she has a genuine mental health issue and basic RP tactics won't work or will have to be adjusted to work for her; or (3) realities aside, she has no dread and perceives her SMV as being on-par with yours or slightly higher. My guess is it's the third - she knows she's not a catch, but thinks you're not either, so it's not a big deal. Read MMSLP, he talks about this more, especially as to the "how to get her to lose weight" component. Just make sure you're content

even if she doesn't. You do you, no covert contracts.

At first I did ok. I kept my frame. I thought sure let's chase this rabbit for a bit.

The beginning of the conversation doesn't demonstrate this. By asking questions the way you do, you're inviting her to control the conversation. You feel like you're in control because you're the one prompting where she goes next, but each question is handing the reigns to her. "You tell me what's wrong. You tell me what 'disrespect' should mean between us. You tell me how I should act that you would perceive as respectful."

Keep in mind that I'm just screwing with her at this point, not actually serious. SHE thinks I'm serious but I'm cracking up. Every time I cracked a smile she got angrier.

This is how you fail a comfort test. She needs to know that you care for her in ways beyond sex. You may think you're communicating it, but she's not receiving it. Read ruizbujc's [205 - How to Lead](#) to find some new tactics to employ that might get through to her. Your current strategy is the "investigator" approach - ask her a bunch of questions that are most likely designed to lead to a conclusion that you want her to reach (that her notion of you disrespecting her is bogus). That's my go-to method as well. It doesn't work well with my wife. She receives best by life-sharing. Figure out what your wife responds to and shape how you engage in these conversations accordingly.

More to the point, though, read WISNIFG. You really should have been fogging the heck out of that conversation.

she said that I needed to make her feel a certain way. I told her that I'm not responsible for her emotions

I may slightly diverge from the rest of the RP community here. They would all agree with your statement, and I do to the degree of day-to-day living. That said, you're the leader in the home and *it is your responsibility* to cultivate an environment where she is able to experience positive emotions. Imagine how she felt back in her days of abuse. Now, imagine if she complained to her abuser about how he made her feel and that man saying, "I'm not responsible for your emotions. If you want to be happy while I abuse you, just be happy." She's perceiving you like that. You do have a responsibility to cultivate an environment where she can respond positively to you. Lift harder, fog more, go monk until she's done breast feeding. This is probably your best bet for salvaging something long-term here.

She couldn't reason her way out of it

What makes you think she's trying to reason her way through any of it at all in the first place? She's not reasoning through it - she's feeling through it. You were the one reasoning. You will lose this game every time.

I kept ~~countering~~ DEERING her

FTFY

I should have just shut up and walked away long before this.

This. Go monk mode until you figure all this out, then re-engage.

But I was trying to practice frame

You don't send soldiers in to practice on the front lines. This is not the place for practice. If you can't do it and you're in nuclear war, STFU.

She has a problem with me "groping" her because I'm not attractive enough to her.

And there confirms my suspicion from above!

I waved the keys at her.

You were Rambo way earlier in this post - this is just laying it on thick. If you were a nice guy for a real long time, despite what you may read, you have to keep being a nice guy even though you know it's the "wrong way" to do things - and do that until you have the ability to ease RP stuff in slowly. You're trying to make too many bold moves too fast, so stuff's exploding.

Also ... she's 4 months pregnant. Seriously? Contrary to what you may read, not everything is a negative fitness test. Sometimes she just legit needs help. Go back to MMSLP.

Did I handle this right?

No, see above.

Don't worry too much, though. She's pregnant. She won't be bold enough to make any big moves for the next few months. Seriously: **GO MONK MODE**. Lift, focus most of your reading on MMSLP and WISNIFG, ease into all of this, and continue being a nice guy until you're sure you're ready to start adding each new layer. Practice in safe settings, not during nuclear war.

Starting to recognize and pass Fitness Tests. Am I doing this right?

2 upvotes · 21 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

1/2

Lots of issues here, so sorry if this gets long. But I think this is what you wanted, so here you go.

Been immersed in RP reading

I get the impression you've only been reading posts. Posts are worthless until you've been through all of the sidebar books (or at the very least: NMMNG, WISNIFG, and MMSLP). The books give context for the posts, otherwise you'll think you understand what people are saying, but you really don't. I made that mistake. Don't repeat it. If you say you're reading the books, go back and re-read WISNIFG because you didn't get it or aren't applying it.

Am I wrong for having the attitude that I'm kissing her or touching her because I want to, not because she has given me permission?

That's the right attitude, but I don't think this actually is your attitude based on the rest of your post. It's like she's a closed door and instead of saying, "I can walk through the door when I want," when it doesn't open you just start banging. When you try to be "playful" like you describe, that just comes off as banging on the door. She's still closed. You didn't get permission to enter, and you didn't actually go through. You're still stonewalled.

The problem here is that she likely thinks your increased affection is a sign that you want more sex. In fact, you probably do want more sex. But the way you're going to get it is to drop her LMR shield rather than increasing it. Or, more accurately, to convince her she never has to put it up in the first place (the whole "I can dodge bullets?" "No, when you're ready, you won't have to" thing). The way you do this is to train her that your acts of physical touch are nothing more than that; that you don't expect them to lead to sex. Focus on doing them in times where she knows sex is not a realistic possibility. Kiss her at red lights - and hold it for longer than you should. When you've got company over and she steps into another room, follow her and make out for 15 seconds. When the

kids are running around and nowhere near bed time, grab her thigh and start rubbing. Do a ton of this stuff in a day, then kiss her goodnight at the end of the night and don't try to initiate. Stay in monk mode until you're improved enough that she doesn't see rejecting you for sex as a control measure. I wrote a tad bit about monk mode [here](#) and [here](#). A key worth noting is that when you train her that your touch isn't a sign of trying to initiate sex, she'll be more inclined to accept your touch. Incidentally, physical touch that she warmly accepts is far more likely to lead to her being aroused, which actually increases her responsiveness to you when you actually are ready to start initiating - or it may cause her to initiate with you as a response to your non-sex-directed touching.

I am not sure if I am expressing love or seeking validation.

Nothing in here indicates "expressing love." I do see some validation seeking, but that's not necessarily the strongest motive I'm picking up. If anything, I feel like your motive is that you just want to have a better sex life and you're trying too hard - Rambo and all that.

Would denying affection be appropriate until she initiates?

Does it sound like a good idea to you to put her in charge of your sex life? Also, what you said doesn't make sense. "Denying" means you're turning something down. If she's not initiating, you're not denying. I think you just mean "withholding." When she's emotionally withholding to you, does that turn you on? If you were physically withholding to the girl at the bar, would that turn her on? Reading up on [106 - What doesn't work](#) could be helpful.

Even at our best times she has always struggled with being affectionate due to childhood abuse.

If [she has a personality disorder](#) that changes a lot of things. If you think she has something in that post, reply with how extreme you think it is on a scale from 1-10, acknowledging that most women show tendencies of many of these (often simultaneously) without actually having it severely enough to interrupt daily function of interpersonal relationships. But, if the abuse has caused a personality disorder to manifest (as it often does, usually in the form of borderline), then this affects the conversation. The rest of my advice is based on the assumption that she's just normal woman crazy and not actual crazy.

She didn't speak to me for five days after our last fight ... I kept my silence. Didn't make any concessions towards her anger and butthurt. Didn't apologize. Didn't try to manipulate her into talking to me. Just left her alone.

In other words, you became passive. She gave you the silent treatment and you followed her lead in return. You entered her frame. As the man, it's your responsibility to pull her out of that funk and address the issue, not wait around for her to decide when it's time to fix the problem. The longer you let that go, the more respect for you she loses. Ephesians 4:26 - "In your anger do not sin: Do not let the sun go down while you are still angry." I live by this. If my wife and I fight, we resolve it right then and there. She tries to give me the silent treatment? I pull her out of it and we deal with it. She walks away? I give her 3 minutes to cool down, then I go in there and pull her out of it. Take the lead, don't defer the lead.

Giving her the silent treatment back is the definition of butt-hurt. It's just a less intuitive way of expressing it. It's childish. To develop a mindset of amused mastery, you have to see her antics as childish. My 3 and 5 year old kids love to say in a huff, "Fine, then I'm not going to play with you anymore," then walk away to their room. Your wife is doing the same thing: "Fine, then I'm not going to talk to you anymore," then goes off to do her own thing. She's being a child. Don't be a child back. 1 Cor. 13:11 - "When I was a child, I talked like a child, I thought like a child, I reasoned like a child. When I became a man, I put the ways of childhood behind me."

See it for what it is. When you see her antics the same way you see how a child acts, that's when you'll start to

realize how to overcome the issue. Sometimes I have to go in there and comfort my kids, explaining to them the harsh realities of life, while giving them a hug and letting them know that the hard truths that started it all (like: "You need to learn to eat your veggies") don't change the fact that I love them. Other times I have to lay down the law and let them know: "This is a hard boundary and I will not tolerate your crossing it. If you do, here's what's going to happen ..." If your wife is acting like a child, think of how you'd parent a child who acted that way and go do the same. No, she's not actually a child. But when she acts like a child, don't treat her like an adult. Being treated like an adult is a privilege to be earned by being an adult internally and not merely by age.

she didn't push me away but she wasn't exactly warm to it

That's because you're training her to have mixed feelings about physical touch. The combination of being awkwardly playful, your own internal insecurities about whether or not to initiate, a possible insensitivity in dealing with her past physical abuse, the increased effort toward initiating touch coupled with the sudden drop during the 5-day silence, etc. Your touch isn't a comfort to her; it's a source of confusion. Develop consistency here. Have a strategy and don't back down from that strategy, even if she's giving you the silent treatment. Plow through and do your 10-second kiss anyway. If she cuts it off as you try, then back down - but show her that her emotional outbursts aren't going to change your behavior or your mood. You have to keep your mood steady as a rock, unaffected by her mood.

As I was loosening the hug I moved one of my hands down to cop a quick feel on the way out and she violently pushed me away and told me to get off.

I'm not fluent in the art of kino yet, but my understanding is that you're not supposed to escalate until you get a positive reaction from the level you're already at. If a girl is wincing when you touch her hand and acting disgusted, you don't put your arm around her or move in for the kiss. You continue applying game and hold frame with where you're at until the reception changes, then escalate, and do this for each new phase. Again, this is just my own impression, so go read up some posts on kino (I probably need to do the same; I haven't needed to yet, hence my delay).

Starting to recognize and pass Fitness Tests. Am I doing this right?

2 upvotes · 21 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

If it all went south today, could you lift yourself out of the ashes and continue being a man? Or would you be a blubbering pile of goo at the bottom?

This is the key question. I have often held that God does not make much of us until we are first content to be made nothing. If we can be in Job's spot and still say, "God, my faith has not wavered; I will continue to be who you created me to be," that's when we are malleable enough that God can do anything with us.

What we can learn from the feast-day of the Dormition of the Theotokos.

2 upvotes · 18 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

He doesn't next us, we next him

That's a much better way to put it. But the result is still the same: the relationship ends (or is deemed never to have begun at all) and the person is, as you say: "to our own damnation."

Thanks for the resources! I'll try to look into them over the weekend after my trial tomorrow.

Supportive Relationships Linked To Willingness To Pursue Opportunities

2 upvotes · 17 August 2017 · /r/RedPillWives

Oh, I wasn't challenging the connectivity of the content to the sub, or even the usefulness of reminding people to be supportive - props to you for doing that!

I was just baffled at what the researchers were thinking in setting up this test in the first place :p I'd love to see what hypothesis they were trying to test and how it got past the: "Why do we need to interview and test 326 people to figure that out?" phase.

How marriage changes things

2 upvotes · 17 August 2017 · /r/RedPillWives

Having upstanding children is a good purpose - but, as you noted, it's such a common one that you'll never feel like you have a unique impact on your world, plus you won't see the fruit of your labor for so long that you won't be able to experience the up-swing on the curve (18-ish years, to be exact).

But here's the bigger problem with children being the purpose: They're going to move out someday and you'll still be left with your spouse, and now in your 50s trying to rediscover life. That's dangerous and leads to a lot of divorce, cheating, mid-life crisis mode, etc. Plus, the focus on the children is still internal.

I'm not saying don't focus on the children - absolutely place them as your highest priority after your spouse. But, even children need to see that the world is bigger than them, or even their parents - that we all have a contributing part to play in society. So, living out your external purpose will actually give your children a much healthier perspective on their ability to engage with their world as well, defeating notions of self-centeredness. My 5-yr old is starting to get this even at his young age! It's exciting to see how he processes what we do outside the home and why :)

coral reef restoration

That would be totally awesome :) Just make sure it's a mutual passion - something your heart is into 100% and not just something you do just to have something to do. If you're not 100% on board with it, explore other options with him. Let him keep that as his passion, but work with you until you find one you can enjoy together.

Or - give him the chance to get you hooked :) That's what I did with my wife. She was not originally on board with discipleship. She had been at one point, but due to a relationship-gone-sour she backed out and decided it wasn't for her. This was pretty devastating to me for a long time. But, as I improved and she saw the good that I was doing in others' lives, and the ways that she could contribute to that good, she eventually wanted in! I didn't even have to initiate it ... she just saw my passion and the fruit that my life produced and that was enough for her to be fully engaged.

Turning down bad, placeholder sex

2 upvotes · 17 August 2017 · /r/askMRP

I just commented to someone else on monk mode [over here](#). That's one solid strategy if you're early in your process. If your SMV is already higher than hers, you've lost your chance at the primary benefit that I see monk mode as having.

Your key is that she sees that you want sex more - but she herself doesn't want sex more yet. So, my guess is your SMV is still lower. There's no dread. There's no amused mastery. If anything, she's AMing you - she thinks she has you figured out with this placation game. But now that you've read some of the sidebar, you're seeing that she has been employing these very tactics against you that you're now learning to employ back. The difference is that she's doing it instinctively as part of the female psychological default imperative ("lizard brain" and all that).

You're going to do it tactfully. So, while you're using the same weapons, she doesn't know how to wield them.

That said, I agree 100% with [/u/-ChillPill-](#). The goal is to show her you won't accept bad sex. If you turn it down

before it starts, she takes it as a personal rejection, not a failure to meet your standard. But even then, you've got to be worth that standard in her eyes first. My wife used to starfish and she's gotten a lot better. I'm now convinced that women starfish when men aren't leading them. You don't like the position she's in? Physically pick up her body and put it the way you want it. This actually often gets her more into it.

Another huge factor I've noticed - women tend to be sexier when they feel sexier. The 10 second kiss is a nice start (one I like using daily as well), but develop other tactics for making her feel sexier - especially in the actual act of having sex. She certainly knows how to have sex beyond just the starfish position, but maybe she doesn't know what exactly you like, or she hasn't done it enough yet to be comfortable - so you need to lead her in the bedroom. There's a time for monk mode, and if you haven't mastered your game yet, you might be able to go back there. But if she's already initiating, in those moments I'd focus more on leading in the bedroom than leading outside - and for the love of all, don't turn her down until she's had a chance to turn you off. If you never let her try to get you excited in the first place, you're not doing yourself any good. When she sees that getting you excited is a challenge, the pressure is on her to step up her game. Whether she will or not is her call, and that mostly depends on how your SMVs compare.

How marriage changes things

2 upvotes · 17 August 2017 · /r/RedPillWives

Great question! I did a much longer write-up on the whole thing [in this post](#), including the concept of what the purpose should be. Being a Christian, I think that purpose for other Christians should always be disciple-making - the mission Jesus gave the church. So, for Christians I'm fairly restrictive on this.

That said, for everyone else I acknowledge that other purposes can and do work. The primary requirement is that it has to be something beyond just you and your spouse. If your purpose is internally focused, it will fail every time. So, "Make \$X, buy our dream home, have a great sex life, and raise wonderful children" is not a healthy purpose. You will always succumb to the same pitfall that everyone who pursues the American dream will cave to: *Just a little more*.

If you pick something beyond your life, you'll realize that you can have a significant impact on your world, but you won't become consumed with a dissatisfied "more, more, more" mentality. Good examples of purposes beyond what I'd recommend for Christians:

- Fighting human trafficking.
- Feeding starving children.
- Becoming a vigilante and stopping criminals.
- Making a difference in local politics.
- Brighten the world with laughter.
- Help people heal broken relationships.

Each purpose then can be carried out in any number of ways.

- *Human Trafficking*: Get a job at the DOJ or AG's office; join an awareness club; give seminars; start a shelter for victims; counsel victims, or just go talk to them; etc.
- *Starving Children*: Join city council; start a non-profit; supply a food shelter; help their parents find jobs, tweak their resume, etc.; provide entertainment to the kids
- *Vigilante*: Okay, that one was a joke.

- *Politics*: Run for city council; start a petition; attend community meetings; get on the school board
- *Laughter*: Make business cards with jokes on them and hand them out just to get people to smile; do stand-up at a comedy club; do street comedy at fairs and festivals
- *Relational Healing*: Participate in online forums like these; get a counseling degree; build deeper relationships with neighbors and develop a voice in their lives

Whatever the purpose is, just make sure it's bigger than you and your spouse. It can be tied to your profession or be purely a hobby - that part really doesn't matter. Just don't be internally focused on your own goals. Have those goals too - certainly desire the big house with 4 beautiful kids and a nice car. But don't make that your end-game.

The Dangers of so-called "Biblical Counseling"

2 upvotes · 16 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

As ruiz said, I wouldn't idolize the "proper view of headship" aspect when looking for a discipler. In RP it's easy to make this a be-all-end-all of life and ministry because RP praxeology centers around that concept. In reality, God gave us other higher purposes than just "lead your wife." If someone can help you fulfill those other purposes, I'd say go for it!

The Dangers of so-called "Biblical Counseling"

2 upvotes · 16 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

If it's marriage counseling, this is absolutely true. But remember that many people seek counseling for other issues. Instead of going in to figure out how to deal with her husband, suppose she is struggling from panic attacks and wants to get them to stop. Most husbands won't be trained or equipped to know how to address the issue. In some circumstances, the panic attacks might be induced by the husband's failure to lead and affirm, but other times there are legit deeper issues. If it's something where proper headship can solve the problem, the husband really should talk to someone to figure out how to be a better leader to stop the panic attacks. But if it legitimately has nothing to do with her husband, she might legit need a therapist to figure out what's going on and how to address it.

That said, 99% of the time the answer (particularly for the man) is not counseling, but discipleship. He needs someone who is more spiritually mature who can act as a spiritual authority over him. A counselor merely plays a suggestive role, saying, "Here are some cool tricks I learned through my education that might help." A discipler lives life alongside the man, knows his issues intimately, helps the husband understand the issue, and then models the solution in his own life so the husband can see how it works firsthand.

The Dangers of so-called "Biblical Counseling"

2 upvotes · 16 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

That's an interesting article. I don't agree with everything said, but I will note that of over 30 counselors I have worked with in the last several years (professionally, not personally), there is exactly 1 who actually "gets it." Interestingly, it's a girl. Most male counselors aren't actually into male rights, as one might suspect - they're so beta and influenced by the feminist agenda from their education that they want to impress every girl that gets in their office and they just assume that the guy is screwed up. Many women buy into this as well, but there is the occasional woman who knows women well enough to see through the garbage. I find this to be more common than men who want to help men.

But, on the whole, 99% of "biblical counselors" are a joke because they don't know how to incorporate the Gospel as the only permanent solution. Instead, they are really secular counselors who quote the occasional verse to support what their education otherwise said. Every now and then you'll get a true biblical counselor who just misapplies the Bible by looking at other things than the Gospel itself. It'll be good for human-effort behavioral

modification, but it will do nothing to lead to the internal transformation that only Jesus can provide.

That said, there are still a wide array of benefits even to secular psychology. So, I wouldn't dismiss the profession entirely.

Why I'm not afraid of divorce rape - and how to get yourself there too.

2 upvotes · 15 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I just went to trial on a case a few months ago where the wife started an argument, recorded the back and forth yelling, then chased my client into a bedroom, drops her phone (conveniently), and starts screaming as she slams the door on her arm repeatedly. She actually did this in front of the kids, which was idiotic on her part (they were old enough to tell the police what really happened, but not old enough to be witnesses in court). Bottom line, even without the kids' testimony the court didn't believe her one bit, even with her video trying to set up him as the aggressor. My client was "hailed out" for a few months, but we got the court to make her pay: (1) all of his apartment and utility expenses during that time, (2) all of his legal fees to defend against the false allegation, (3) a portion of his peripheral expenses (groceries, travel costs, etc.), and (4) make-up parenting time for every day he missed. That case did end in shared parenting, but my client (husband) got more than 50% of the time.

Would the judge still base calculation on her full time potential and/or order the kids into daycare?

I actually had a case last September where this exact issue came up and the magistrate ruled: "Mother's proposed schedule is unworkable because it would preclude her from seeking adequate employment. The child has been thriving while in daycare, and the child will likely continue to thrive in daycare. Granting Mother this additional time would be an unknown quantity, having an unknown impact on the child's well-being, and this court declines to exchange a thriving situation for an unknown quantity."

Do a ctrl+f for "doughnut" in this thread and you'll see more info on this case. Long story short, she was imputed at full-time capacity. Then, to pour salt on the wound, the magistrate actually made her pay my client (father) child support based on an income level she wasn't actually earning - just because she was *capable* of it.

When I hear all these horror stories, I repeatedly assume that these people are either representing themselves or they went out and got the cheapest budget attorney that no-money could afford. That said, to be fair, the guy in the first case above had a total legal bill of over \$100,000 to defend against all that crap (she paid him back for around \$30,000 of that, the rest was for other divorce and custody related issues). The guy in the second case had a total legal bill of around \$40,000 for the base trial, then paid another \$20,000 to defend against his wife's appeal (we won that too). So, yeah, I get that not everyone can afford these kinds of legal expenses, thus they get screwed with the budget attorney.

108 - Life-Path of a Relationship

2 upvotes · 15 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

we probably skipped that "Honeymoon Culture" phase almost entirely

Yeah, your peak may have been much lower than most others. But, it's extremely rare circumstances where someone never enters that quadrant at all.

We went straight to logistics (ie. Obligatory Interactions)

This happens for everyone after the wedding, but it's not the lower-right quadrant until your relationship is defined by stress and frustration. As long as you're still happy about the logistics and able to function with a positive attitude, you're in the upper-left or upper-right.

Sure, we has sex like rabbits for a while. We had five kids in about 11 years

Heh, that doesn't actually prove a great sex life. My wife and I have had 4 kids in 6 years ... and probably had sex about 40 total times in those 6 years. An entire 18 months in that time was without any sex at all. More to the point, if you're having "sex like rabbits for a while" this is usually from being in the upper-left.

I don't think we ever got to "know" each other in order to bring about the affinity your graph talks about.

The "affinity" line is more about how happy you are in the context of your relationship (as opposed to your individual happiness for its own merit). It's not some super-deep intimacy, which most couples never actually experience until after making progress at the turning point (it will occasionally happen before then, but not often).

Which way will we go once we "know" ourselves? ... We're still in that bottom green circle (divorce or turning point).

I'd say the more important factor is how well you both know God and the plan he has for you. Again, if you don't know that plan, go with discipleship - I'm very confident that in time, as you mature, you're going to conclude that's the ultimate plan anyway, so might as well start there. If something else jumps out at you, give it a shot, but make sure it's beyond just you and her. Your marriage or your own joint life circumstances cannot be your ultimate goal. If you want to know more about discipleship, stay tuned or PM me and I might be able to help you find someone to disciple you in the process in your local area (I have connections all over the country).

I do me. You do you. And that's what I'm doing for now.

Excellent plan :)

I want to receive grace, and I want to give grace ... to my wife, my kids, and to others in our community. And I plan on fleshing that out as we hopefully move forward together.

This is a noble goal. Just make sure you have a clear, observable plan and how to carry it out. General concepts don't make good visions, so *flesh this out* as clearly as possible. Does "give grace ... to others in our community" mean helping at homeless shelters and food pantries? What's the purpose of the giving grace - just so you can feel good about yourself, or is there something more to it? If something more, what is that and what ways can you tailor the "give grace" plan to be specific and driven toward that directive?

To be clear, the forward-progress doesn't start happening until after the revitalized vision for how your relationship fits in God's plan is already fleshed out and you start living it. Even then, it doesn't work until you both get excited about it and can see the contributions you're making. That's when the forward progress starts. If you're not both excited about it, then it's a unilateral vision, which doesn't help the relationship. If you're excited, but not actually doing anything about it, you're not going to be compelled forward. If you're not seeing the fruit of your labor together, the excitement will die and you'll slide back. Keep these things in mind :)

Why I'm not afraid of divorce rape - and how to get yourself there too.

2 upvotes · 15 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

For many people who were not intelligent about the planning going in, this may well be the case. But I also proposed ideas that can mitigate the suggestion. "Cheaper to keep her" isn't always your choice. If she decides to wait another 5-10 years then screw with some other guy and divorce you, you'll be in an even worse spot. Take steps now to mitigate your potential damage later.

Why I'm not afraid of divorce rape - and how to get yourself there too.

2 upvotes · 15 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Interesting. I spoke to a TX lawyer a few years back (maybe 4) and this wasn't the impression I got - the % calculation was similar to what you're describing, but it's based on % of income, so income does matter. But he also affirmed that TX had deviation factors. I talked to him because one of my clients was relocating there and I was trying to help my client find a good attorney.

Also, "joint custody" doesn't automatically negate support in any state (as far as I'm aware), so that's not unique. It's the deviation factors where the game is actually played.

Fasting and Hard Nosed Prayer

2 upvotes · 15 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Indeed.

Why I'm not afraid of divorce rape - and how to get yourself there too.

2 upvotes · 15 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

you may as well be divorced

Nah, if she's contributing about equally, it makes sense she'd get about 50/50 out of it. I know the courts will do 50/50 anyway, so I just make sure she's holding up her end of the 50/50 and not able to argue, "I cleaned the house, so he needs to pay me for the next X years." Divorce is only cause for concern if the man lets her get away with not holding up her 50% end. If her services around the house are actually higher value than any income she could produce, I've given techniques for how to mitigate the effect on support (prenup, premature legal separation), but it also just may be that she is contributing half when she does that in low-income marriages. As noted in the other thread on point, daycare for my family is about \$4,000/mo, so keeping her home would be of higher value to me if her income was under \$48,000/yr post-tax (i.e. \$68,500 pre-tax gross salary), and she really is pulling her weight in staying home at that point. It just happens to be that my wife earns substantially more than that, so she's higher value working, so I have her work (with acceptable exceptions that won't put me at risk).

Most guys are going to get divorce raped, they are going to get less access/ custody of their children, and depending on the jurisdiction the courts are going to give her a better share of the money

If guys are idiots and don't plan, then you're absolutely right. The point of the post isn't, "Look at me and how awesome I have it." The point is: "Here's a model to shoot for so you don't let your idiocy put you at unnecessary risk of divorce rape." That's why I gave alternatives where I know many men might not be in marriages similar to mine, such as with the spousal support issue, because most of their wives probably don't earn over \$100k.

Men face extreme prejudice in most western jurisdictions. Until those laws and prejudices are fixed, then we have a long way to go.

This comes off as bitter ignorance. The laws themselves have mostly been corrected. The prime advantage women have is in the judicial discretion, not the laws. If you end up with a beta judge who has the hots for your STBE, you're screwed. If you have a SJW for a judge, you're screwed. I actually prefer female judges because they tend to look down on unempowered women with an "I can do it, screw you for not" attitude and they crack down on other women.

But here's the kicker - all of that discretion garbage gets thrown out on appeal if it (1) oversteps the bounds of otherwise fair laws, (2) shows a clear bias, or (3) is based on an erroneous finding of fact. Getting a case overturned on appeal is harder than defending one, but it still happens all the time - literally everyday when these

judges try to abuse their discretion. But so many people are clueless about the appeal process or aren't willing to go through another 9 months of dragging things out that they just throw in the towel early and blame the system for being garbage. I have no respect for complainers who got a crap result, didn't appeal, and then want other people to sympathize with them.

Want to know how that will play out?

The cases you're describing happen, but the wife rarely gets the result you're implying - especially if appeal is on the table (and she knows it in advance). You're only explaining what she'll do, not what will happen as a result of her actions. She starts saying things like that to the kids? 75% chance you're getting custody as long as you don't screw up. Why? Parental alienation is a huge deal to the GAL. I'm going to trial on one now where the GAL and psychological evaluator both said that mom was so alienating that her visits need to be restricted to supervision-only because they're so concerned that she'll keep trying to bad-mouth dad. This is the common reality - and that was a female GAL that came to that conclusion.

In reality, I referenced two situations where I recommended the legal separation, but still live together route. In both cases the parties resolved things extremely amicably and they're still together today (after 3 and 5 years). If the wife decides she wants to file for divorce instead, how's that any different than if the husband just skipped straight to filing? You don't get brownie points with a judge for being the reason the case is on their docket.

Why I'm not afraid of divorce rape - and how to get yourself there too.

2 upvotes · 15 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I thought about it. I actually do love minivans, and they are extremely practical. But we already had one and I wouldn't want to deal with parking it in my work garage everyday

Why your wife should work at a real job

2 upvotes · 15 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I literally just made a new post on this (one I've been meaning to write for a while). There are 3 key areas to any divorce, so it's a different one-liner for each:

- **Assets:** Doesn't matter, this is all 50/50 if you don't back down; be smart about things like tax-effecting and what's liquid and not.
- **Support:** Get her earning money or at the next main event file for legal separation to get a court-ordered allocation of income, expenses, assets, etc. (essentially: cut your losses sooner before they build further), then keep living together after that to work on your marriage without the fear of divorce clouding your judgment.
- **Children:** Act like a sole custodial parent during the marriage and your chances of getting custody (or at least shared parenting) soar through the roof.

How marriage changes things

2 upvotes · 14 August 2017 · /r/RedPillWives

Being a divorce attorney is certainly not easy, but I believe it has given me numerous huge advantages in my own marriage, so there's the silver lining!

If you're interested, replying to your post prompted me to do a more full write-up at another RP sub I run on the whole relational life-cycle from the graph I linked to. Maybe people here can find it interesting :) [Here's the post.](#) I've actually had one fully-licensed marriage counselor tell me she's using this as the base model for all of her marriage counseling now, rather than what her degree taught her :D (She still uses other techniques and things from her education, but they're applied in the context of the graph rather than as primary models in themselves).

Thank you from a SF Bay Area Christian

2 upvotes · 13 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Good question. I really mean how institutionalization plays out in the western world - more of a cultural institutionalization rather than a rote dictionary definition. In American culture, institutions run on one of two primary operative drives: (1) to grow, or (2) to benefit the people at the top.

- **Growth:** Ideally, the "growth" will be connected to the primary function. So, if organization's primary function is feeding homeless children, the drive to grow is to feed more homeless children than it could at a smaller size. The key factor in this "growth" section, though, is that the institution itself wants to be the one credited for feeding the homeless children, rather than simply seeing homeless children be fed. So, if a random stranger decides to help feed a homeless child, the institution either doesn't care about him or it will attempt to take credit for it ("Look at the random acts of kindness we've inspired!").
- **The Top:** This is fairly self-explanatory, but even every Christian institution has some form of hierarchy. It's rare to see someone start a non-profit to help starving children simply because they care about starving children - usually they get some benefit out of it too. If there's no one at the top trying to get ahead, the organization doesn't usually grow.

There was once an article that explained the natural life-cycle of a denomination in these types of terms:

- **Visionary:** Someone gets a vision for what God's calling them to do and they start doing it.
- **Growth:** His vision catches fire with others and they follow his leadership to pass it on.
- **Organization:** As growth happens, it is necessary to get organized so that people on the fringe edges of the growth don't lose track of the original vision (ex. Jesus disciplined Paul, who disciplined Mark, who disciplined ...) like a long game of telephone.
- **Institutionalization:** People begin to care more about the organization itself than they do about the vision the organization was created to promulgate. As a result, there is a shift in balance from carrying out the purpose of the organization to getting others to join the organization (growth). Those at the top stop living out the purpose and become predominantly administrative in function, focusing on the growth: (1) because they believe it's their job, (2) because that's how they make money or get recognition, and (3) because, as they rationalize (sometimes honestly), that's the only way the cause can advance. In reality, they could have appointed someone else to focus on the growth and kept practicing themselves - but since it's "their vision"/"their baby," they have personal/selfish reasons for wanting to be on the forefront of the growth aspects rather than just doing what they originally set out to do.
- **Die and Repeat:** When the heart for the original purpose is gone, those involved in the organization become discontented. Internal grumblings about leadership start to happen because of the administrative components ("I really wish they did it this way instead of that"). People start leaving. Someone from within or who has observed this process from outside steps in with a new or revitalized sense of vision and repeats the process from step 1.

Jesus never talked about the church in the way we see institutionalization happening in the western church. In fact, this process really started in the 200s when Constantine officialized Christianity as a religion of the state. So many people started rushing in that fast administrative efforts had to be put into place to accommodate the rapid growth, rather than the more organic processes that had been driving the church before then.

Instead, I see Jesus talking about the purpose of the church and what the people are supposed to be doing. He was a man with a vision and he imparted that vision to a few to carry on his work. He was not focused on rapid growth and maximization, nor was he in it for his own glory (although he got it - that was God the Father's

purpose for him, whereas Jesus existed to glorify the Father). I believe Christianity was always meant to be a grassroots movement of the people founded on discipleship as its primary organizational structure, rather than administration.

What's the big deal about this RP stuff?

2 upvotes · 11 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Yeah, I agree with /u/ruizbuje that this stuff isn't anything new; but the information has certainly been repressed. So, if you ask anyone point blank: "Will a girl be more sexually attracted to a guy who smothers her with affection or who flirts for a minute then goes off to do his own thing?" Most guys I know will get the answer right. The problem is that we're never asked these questions point blank. The answers are in our subconscious and can be pulled up when something evokes it. But without that summoning ritual, we all function on auto-pilot and what we get fed from the media, the internet, movies, etc. dominates our conscious thoughts. Immersing oneself in RP switches the balance - the truths of the world become conscious and you're taught how to suppress the other junk. As a result, your auto-pilot changes too. Stop thinking about RP stuff for too long, though, and that balance will revert - it's got to stay in the conscious brain.

Wife is validation seeking ... how to respond?

2 upvotes · 11 August 2017 · /r/askMRP

"Drive yourself on over and I'll show you how pretty I think you are."

The usual mantra is: *don't talk; do*. When you're at a distance that's kind of hard ... but, rather than just telling her the answer, you might be able to hold some semblance of that frame by telling her what you'd do instead.

Got married prior to discovering TRP. Now having sadness over the feeling of "not having had sex with enough women."

2 upvotes · 11 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Interesting view. I've never thought about it like that - but I like it! I'll have to ponder that one for a while :)

Divorce Incorporated

2 upvotes · 10 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

California instituted "no fault divorce" laws, after which virtually every other state followed.

Need help pulling my life together after rape charge

2 upvotes · 10 August 2017 · /r/askTRP

Most often the mantra "you get what you pay for" rings true here. Best way to find someone good is to get a referral from someone who had actually been through a trial. If you don't know anyone, call up the biggest, baddest divorce attorney in town over the age of 50 - and say you're looking for a criminal attorney. 99% he knows who's worthwhile. Plus if the referral comes from him, the criminal attorney will be more motivated to do it right to keep his divorce attorney friend happy so the referrals keep coming in.

But more important than finding the right attorney is simply realizing that you, as the client, have the power as long as you pay. He can technically drop you, but not right before a trial - and not if you're still paying, unless he has a legit independent excuse.

Good or average doesn't usually matter in the end - there may be a 5% difference in results (just don't go for "bad" - that does matter). In the end, if you insist on your trial most attorneys will get you close to the same result.

Need help pulling my life together after rape charge

2 upvotes · 10 August 2017 · /r/askTRP

Joining a church can help, but is rarely the right solution in the short-term, unfortunately. That's more of a long-term goal. If you're referencing the spiritual aspect of things specifically, here's what I recommend:

1. **Start reading the Bible on your own.** There are free versions online everywhere. Begin with the book of John and just ask each time you read, "Who is this Jesus guy? What can I learn about him from this?" Even if it's just 5-10 minutes a day, this will at least give you a starting premise.
2. **Find other Christians in your life who you know and trust and spend more time with them.** If you don't know any, join us at [r/RPChristians](#) (a red pill community for Christian, to be clear). Places like [r/TrueChristian](#) can also help. Start spending time with them and ask about what they believe and why.
3. If at all possible, **find someone who will meet with you one-on-one** over coffee or a meal periodically who you can ask questions to and who you know is a genuine Christian and takes their faith seriously. 99% of the time these people will be thrilled at this type of opportunity, so the fear of rejection should be almost nothing. If you have trouble finding someone like this at first, feel free to PM me and I can do this privately for a bit, although it's much harder to do this online.
4. **Pray periodically.** It doesn't have to be intense. I don't use any special holy language or anything. I talk to God like he's any other friend, "Hey, this crazy thing happened today - got the time to chat about it? Of course you do, you're God. So, I was at work and What do you think I should do?" Or, if it's more internalized as to your faith, "Hey, I read this in the Bible today, God. What did that mean? Can you help me figure all this out?"

If you find that you really have no other Christians in your life and all of this seems really awkward, then I'd start trying to find a church to meet people who can help you with this process. But finding a good church can be so intimidating for some people, especially trying to meet new people at that church, that you might really get discouraged or frustrated, which is why the above can be easier - you're not trying to do something big and new all at once, you're working with people you already know and trust or otherwise getting to know God by spending time with Him directly and personally through the Bible and prayer. That said, if you think you really do need to find a church in your area, let me know and I'll help you out.

Also, I'm not there yet, but over on [r/RPChristians](#) I'm doing a series where I will eventually get into dealing with emotional baggage. I'm actually leading a 2-day conference on this for churches throughout my city this fall. Feel free to shoot me a PM and I can walk you through some of it, as it might really help with how you're feeling with things right now. It's designed for people who suffer from persistent addiction, depression, guilt, shame, fear, etc. (assuming they're mental or emotional at their core and not physical - if it's physical, you need medication).

I hope this helps :)

203 - Lifting and Diet

2 upvotes · 9 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

That's awesome :) Thanks for sharing this. I suppose the "women who lift heavy will bulk up" thing is a myth I had bought into. This is one of those comments where I wish I could show my wife some stuff here. Specifically ...

Women should lift as intensely as a man. I lift to exhaustion, when my legs or arms begin shaking too much to continue.

The very few times I've gotten my wife to do any lifting she takes the approach of doing low weights for more

reps, and stopping as soon as she feels a slight burn. The concept of maxing or "to exhaustion" is quite laughable to her :/ Nowadays she sticks to running/walking intervals on a treadmill - with her "running" speed being 6mph and walking at 3mph ... every now and then she'll do a short burst at 7 or 8mph. Usually when she hits a 5k with this balance (at around 35-40 minutes), she notices her body start "glistening" and says that's the perfect time to call it a day. A hard sweat is a huge no-no.

To her credit, her wedding weight was also around 132, but with less muscle than what I'm guessing you have (she's 5'10") - and after our 3rd kid she managed to get her weight back to 137 before becoming pregnant again. Now that we've had our 4th and final child, she's starting to diet and exercise again, but will say things like (as recently as two days ago when talking about maybe doing another run at the Whole30 with my siblings), "I don't know if I could ever give up carbs. I like them too much. I'll just stick to portion control, but eat whatever I want." I can't complain too much because from a pure weight-loss standard, whatever she did before worked well enough to get her close to wedding weight even after kids. That said, where she was "tight" when we were married (at 132), I did notice that even back at 137 that "tight" look was gone. Nevertheless, she's still pretty hot to me in all such circumstance :) ... although she doesn't believe me when I say it or even show it.

Anyway, I really don't mean to say any of this as complaints against my wife (although I'm sure there's a subconscious element of that to it) - I'm quite happy with the progress she does make, and am quite attracted to her even when she's not "tight." Rather, for context: how do you recommend motivating my wife to go the "extra mile" (maybe even literally?) with more high-intensity, lifting and cardio training? Or is the recommendation simply: "Anything you try is going to come off as belittling and push her away; you're better off just letting her do her thing and take what you get, hoping that as you get ripped, she'll be more motivated to keep up." This is what others have told me before. It also seems to be the general TRP/MRP consensus, except they'd add, "And if she doesn't improve, just divorce her and move on," which is a silly thought when the distinction is little more than "thin, but not toned" and "tight body." Focusing on myself never seemed to be all that motivating to her - even when I did have the perfect 6-pack and bulging pecs several years ago (which also did nothing to solve our DB back in those days).

The Sandbox and the Swingset, Introducing MRPW

2 upvotes · 7 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

So, point 2 sounds like "passive aggressively be a bad wife until your husband changes."

2 is actually more aligned with what the other women were saying: "STFU and get out of his way." Or in other words, "Stop trying to take over and do everything yourself. Let him figure out what needs to be done on the ship, then delegate."

she shouldn't just suddenly stop to manipulate him into behaving the way she wants

Let's be clear, this is what they're doing already, just with sex instead of these other things. When a man's not leading, his wife loses attraction, so she stops having sex with him. This is a subconscious means of manipulating him back into leading again. All I'm recommending here is to redirect it into an area where he's more likely to figure out how to respond, and hopefully he'll figure out how to carry that attitude over into the bedroom as well.

Also, some of the responses seem to assume that I'm suggesting all of these things should be done "just suddenly." Most men would agree that "just suddenly" employing healthy RP tactics = going Rambo = bad. If someone "just suddenly" starts doing things, that comes off as (to use a word over-used on these RP subs) *autistic*. People need to use their brains in how to implement things.

The Taming of the Shrew: A Red Pill Analysis (X-Post from TRP)

2 upvotes · 4 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

See my post. I took about every Shakespeare class my university had to offer - most of them were led by the same Feminist professor. I explain her viewpoint in the first half. It's somewhat laughable.

Can you divorce a woman if she lied about her number of sexual partners? (within biblical rules)

2 upvotes · 3 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I take it "LL" means 'low libido'?

Correct.

I can only imagine the tremendous relief she felt when she discovered that having converted her feelings for you into marriage was actually honorable.

Well, that was only one of many psychological barriers she has. But it was a significant one to overcome.

idea that derives from how we define salvation

I have often said that concepts of "once saved, always saved" or "loss of salvation" only fester into arguments because people define "salvation" differently. If we used the same definition, most of us would be saying the same thing.

As a Protestant, to hear a Catholic insist man can lose his salvation seems ludicrous

Actually, only about 1/3 of Protestants are Calvinist. About 2/3 do believe in a "loss of salvation" model - but again, I believe this distinction is almost entirely a semantics issue. If we go by a Calvinist definition of salvation, I think everyone would agree that that version of salvation can never be lost.

Do you enjoy your work?

Yes, but divorce work is not for the faint at heart.

What advice do you have for someone while in and once he finishes law school in order to be successful on the outside?

Get a mentor ASAP. Suggest for the first year of law school to meet every 2-3 months, then increase as time goes on. Once you're graduated, try to meet with that mentor every other week for a while until you get a grasp of your career. Ideally you'll find a mentor in a niche you want to practice. Finding a mentor is the single most important thing you can do. Don't wait until you graduate.

Get a referral for a mentor, as that immediately establishes context for calling them up and asking. I did this by going to the domestic court and asking several bailiffs: "Who would be a good mentor?" Several of them said the same guy, so I called him up and said, "So and so referred me. Would you be interested?" He said yes.

After graduation, my state gave both the mentor and mentee CLE credit for the entire year if we followed a specific curriculum, which we did as a formality, but talked about more practical things most of the time anyway.

What do you think?

My career is not an end-goal for me, so I'm on board. There's something to be said for wanting to excel, so don't slack and say, "I didn't want to be the best anyway," but do prioritize appropriately and try to excel in all things,

as Christ compels us to do.

For now, trial law is appealing.

You'll get more in-court time doing criminal, domestic, or workers' comp work than anything else - probably in that order. BWC stuff is different, though, as it's not directly adversarial in the same way. It's also hard to make money off of it without working yourself to death.

I'd like to work for government. But working on my own is something I'd really like.

If you like trial law, government work = prosecutor or public defender and that's about it. Private work can be anything.

That said, let me caution you that you probably don't really want to be a trial attorney. I am a trial attorney. I thought that's what I wanted during law school. I probably do more trials than any of my other law school classmates. I hate it. It's not what I expected, and it's way too much work. Trial itself is fun, but completely exhausting - and the prep work to get ready for trial just plain sucks. Be prepared for this if you pick a niche that has a lot of trials, like criminal or domestic.

But it's the people one surrounds himself with which make or break a job in a fulfilling field.

I tend to agree - it's not about what you do, but who you do it with. That said, you have to remember that just as often as you interact with co-workers, you're also interacting with opposing counsel, judges, bailiffs, magistrates, etc. This is a unique thing in law that doesn't apply to most other professions. So, even if you find a great place to work, you may still get burned out because of all the garbage from other people you're forced to work with, and changing your employer won't fix that.

I'm sorry if I've encroached the bounds of courtesy here. And I ask your forgiveness if I've gone too far.

You haven't gone too far at all :D

Can you divorce a woman if she lied about her number of sexual partners? (within biblical rules)

2 upvotes · 3 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

is it any wonder that the disciples then asked in exasperation "who then can marry?"

Haha, that's a great point!

I haven't ever heard a reasonable Christian say Abraham was bad because he was polygamist, mostly it's a judgment about faith in divine promise.

That's a good point - the doubt in God is certainly the primary cause of his condemnation. But most pastors I've heard to preach on the subject have still commented, "By the way, he also committed this other sin - he tried to use sin as a means of fulfilling God's promise rather than faith." The sin here is not polygamy, as he didn't marry her - he was straight up sleeping with someone he wasn't married to at all. She was a servant, so this was culturally acceptable, but you're right in that the law on point isn't super clear.

I'd like to press you to include another factor: public declarations ... just saying two are married because they are one flesh may lead to problems.

You're right it does! I was only referencing marriage in the eyes of God, for which the "one flesh" thing makes

sense to me. But if you want to function in society as a married couple, then you're right - there will have to be something to let others know you're married, or else there will be societal issues. So, although it may not be required for God to view two people as married, something as simple as wearing a ring will cause others to acknowledge what is already true before God. Whether or not they respect it is a different matter.

He said because it was all private that it was not authentic.

I don't see this distinction being made in Scripture, and it would have weird implications on people who elope and never publicly acknowledge their marriage. Although I'm not Catholic, I think if you look at the story of St. Crispin you might find this concept come up. IIRC (and I may well be wrong), one of the versions of the tale (most likely not an accurate historical one) involves him being a shoemaker who married the king's daughter in secret and continuing their marriage in secret for some time before finally being discovered. In that version of the tale, the king's daughter had gone missing at one point and the king decreed that whoever could find and return her could marry her. Crispin (who she was with) produced her and their marriage was officialized before the king, but they had already considered themselves married, although it was private. Like I said, this is one of the more bizarre versions of the story, and it's been years since I've read it so my memory may be hazy, but it seemed on point and is quite a fantastic tale if you can find it :) I actually tweaked it and incorporated it in one of my fiction books because the themes fit quite well with what I was trying to convey on a grander scale (each of the books in the series includes a tale of one of the old saints).

I'm not asking you to agree with me but to taste the fragrance of a different perspective.

A good taste, indeed. I've never had anyone critically challenge my view on bare-bones marriage except to say that state-implemented cultural norms should be followed because of Romans 13 and all that. But that brings so many troubles that no one can stand on that ground.

Although I didn't have sex with my wife before we were married, nor did we touch any erogenous zones ... we clearly had times where our make-out sessions were inflamed with lust and pushing boundaries. My wife felt a tremendous amount of guilt over this, feeling as though she had sinned. After our marriage, this contributed to her LL because she felt like God was disappointed in her for lusting before marriage. Somehow she rationalized that into needing to be LL in the marriage to make up for her sin. It was weird.

Anyway, my point is that explaining the "sex + consent = marriage" equation, and her examining the Scriptures for herself to affirm that same conclusion, resulted in her acknowledging, "Even if we did have sex before our wedding day, it wouldn't have been sin because we would be married in God's eyes and the ceremony would only be a formality." That then translated to: "What we were doing was even less than that, so it is all the more appropriate and not-sinful."

That was a HUGE mental block for her to overcome. If we had separated before the wedding, then yes, our lust would have converted to sin - but the fact of our marriage (by consecration, not by ceremony) absolved us of any past lust we experienced for one another because it was toward our actual spouse, not another.

This, then, brings up another very interesting point that is worth noting. When is a person saved? Well, we can say "when they repent" or "say the prayer" or "experience transformation by the Spirit" or whatever you want to call it. But in God's eyes, were they destined for hell before then and then suddenly the space-time continuum changed and their destiny is now toward heaven? No, God knew before the person said "the prayer" (or whatever you want to go with) that they would be saved, and so God knew that person's destination would be heaven long before that "salvation moment." As a result, in God's eyes, the person has always been saved - there's just a point in time that we can look at that consecrates what God always knew to be true.

I think marriage functions the same way. God knew in advance who my wife would be (not to say he predestined it, but foreknowledge at the very least). From his perspective, when she was born he sees: "Red's wife" and when

I was born: "that girl's husband." The fact that the context of this relationship is consecrated years later doesn't change the fact of God's knowledge that we are and would be one flesh. To that end, I wonder if any "pre-ceremony" acts are justified before God because you're doing them with your spouse and not someone else's wife/husband - and because God already views you in light of your marital connection that he knows to be an inevitability.

That, of course, doesn't give an excuse to start screwing people and say, "I thought we were going to get married, so God would have been okay with it." That's recklessness. Anyway, that's just some of the weird stuff I think about sometimes. Being a divorce attorney, technicalities about marriage in the context of our faith and God's eyes really fascinates me.

Single Father v. Single Mother Stats

2 upvotes · 3 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I'm very familiar with PAS. In my county, you have to be extremely careful with throwing that phrase around flippantly, though. Many people use it, but most judges won't take it seriously without clear evidence, and using it without such evidence can really hurt your case.

Also, it's not an official diagnosis in the DSM-5, so judges don't have a scientific rationale for relying on that language when making a custody determination. Instead, they have to beat around the bush to get to that conclusion. Someone wanting to claim PAS really has to get a psychologist to diagnose the child with "Child Psychological Abuse" and then identify which parent is the perpetrator of such abuse (and sometimes it's both). Fortunately, the DSM-5 actually allows for this, which the DSM-4 did not, so this was a huge development in the last few years.

[This article](#) goes well into the reasons why people were fighting for PAS to be directly included in the DSM, although they ultimately failed on a technical level. [This article](#) then explains why "child psychological abuse" diagnosis is substantially close enough. For friends of the manosphere, they'll be happy to know that the article itself takes a fairly anti-feminist approach.

Single Father v. Single Mother Stats

2 upvotes · 2 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Remember that I represent female clients too ;)

Divorce Incorporated

2 upvotes · 2 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I'll try to make a separate post on it at some point.

Anniversary guilty feelings

2 upvotes · 1 August 2017 · /r/askMRP

If you can do so without fostering resentment (which will be your biggest enemy), whenever you think:

i havent given her anything for the last 2 months but the feeling remains..

Ask yourself: does she feel guilty when she's turning you down for sex?

Its strange because i KNOW im not doing it out of pure love..

And what if you were? Would that somehow make it better? Even if you were gift-giving out of pure love, is that motivation change going to solve all your problems? Why are you on MRP in the first place? Go back to that problem and ask: "Will having a motivation of pure-love in my gift-giving solve that problem?"

It seems like you idolize this "pure love" concept. It's a good concept, don't get me wrong. But it's also an elusive and relatively undefined concept that means different things to different people. Be careful with thinking "pure love" will solve all of your problems and remember that nothing is pure. Period. [religious exceptions apply]

The RP Can Only Do So Much Married To An Alcoholic

2 upvotes · 31 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I'm sorry to hear about your situation. That really sucks. Unfortunately, it's one that I see a lot.

I need to love her like Christ because she hasn't cheated and that's the only "out".

I usually reference the 4 "outs": (1) sexual sin (not just what we classify as adultery) (Matthew 5); (2) unbelieving spouse leaves (1 Cor. 7); (3) believing spouse is treated as an unbeliever b/c of unrepentant sin, but if they continue to identify with Christ, you're to expel them (Matt. 18/1 Cor. 5); (4) death (1 Cor. 7). I'm open-minded to going beyond this, if I can be persuaded through Scripture, but for now I can at least give these as fairly definitive conclusions. There are probably 2 more that I believe are valid, but I don't teach as definitive.

Also, most people are grossly confused about "love her like Christ loves the church." Christ employs very harsh, tough-love a lot of the time. Remember, this is also the guy who said in Matthew 7, "Yeah, if you only pretend to love me, I'm going to kick you out hard because I don't even know you." This is also the guy who loved His people enough to flail whips at them when they were doing wrong. It's also the guy who disciplines people to correct them. Don't be fooled by American notions of "love." Look at what God and Jesus mean when they use that word and do that.

That said, I would still encourage you to try to redeem your marriage, and you are not beyond hope. One of the men I led in my small group went through exactly what you've been through. He had a main event and actually moved out of the home, but was eventually able to turn things around and his wife now has the alcohol issues substantially under control. Although there are still issues, my friend is much, much happier and has a stronger handle on his life and marriage.

I will be letting her know that I know what's going on, and that I will not be married to an alcoholic and under no circumstances will I let my kids stay in this environment.

Although I prefer to avoid the divorce route, it is wise to be prepared. Get your evidence bullet-proof before you have this conversation with her. As many know, I'm a divorce attorney, so I speak with professional knowledge that once you tip her off that you know, her guard will go way up and you're going to have a tougher time proving your case. If you want custody, start prepping now, while she's still ignorant.

I have also reached out to an attorney and soon will be looking at how bad my divorce rape is going to be.

Feel free to ask me any questions. I can only speak as to my own home state, but it should still give you a general idea.

Also, before you're ready to file, save up for a psychological/custodial evaluation (each state uses slightly different terminology). If she's really as problematic as you describe and you're pretty clean, this is the fastest track to custody or having the upper-hand in a shared parenting scenario. In my state, these can range from \$3,000 to \$10,000, but they're worth more than your attorney, if you can be on the winning end of one.

Did MRP save my marriage? No...but it made me stronger to now deal with this in a completely different way than I would have a year ago.

As [/u/BluePillProfessor](#) often says: the stay plan is the same as the go plan. That's why this works. I'm sorry for the divorce, and I do hope the main event pulls her around, but I'm glad that you're in a place where your kids

have a rock to rely on and this won't otherwise cripple you so they have neither parent to trust.

Any advice you guys have on how to prep for divorce

There's lots to say, but because I can go on for days, I prefer to stick to answering targeted questions, if you have any.

That said, one key thing to remember is that the law is reactive, not proactive. Very rarely will a judge issue a ruling based on a potential danger. Instead, you have to show that the danger has already occurred or been threatened. As a result, saying that she "might" drive drunk with the kids won't get you very far. If she has a DUI, now you've got some evidence that the judge can react to, or if you have a witness who says, "Yeah, I was in the car with her when she was drunk and the kids were with us too," that's something a judge can react to. But if it hasn't happened yet, don't expect them to get all excited about whatever evidence you think is killer. This is the single most frustrating aspect of divorce law. The courts won't often protect you until after you've already been harmed - and they especially won't protect kids until the kids have already been beat up or put in harm's way.

What's your preferred system?

2 upvotes · 31 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

[/u/CowboyBigBoss](#) is actually the guy who introduced me to RP a year or two ago (it just took me forever to really start digging in with it, so I don't count my first introduction back then). I don't know how far, exactly, he dives into it, but at least I know he's theologically sound.

I also know the other users that have been trolling us (at least some of them). Like CBB said, I wouldn't take anything they say seriously. My experience with them is that they are, essentially, non-Christians who like to claim the title "Christian." They are SJWs in the rawest sense. 1 Cor. 5 says of these people, "Do not even eat with them." So, the ban list just grew from 1 to 8 in 3 minutes.

Although I'd love to say that sharing the Gospel would help, as CBB said, it's like throwing pearls to swine. One of the 7 guys brigading us (who are all from [r/BrokeHugs](#)) actually used to be a mod on [r/TrueChristian](#). Somehow he got booted and I'm guessing he's still pretty bitter, and probably doesn't like that I referenced a personal connection I have to one of their current mods, so he's taking his frustrations out on me. Oh well ... DNGAFlip and all that. I'll just keep moving on :p

107 - Hyper-Hypergamy, the Comparison Game, and Positive Dread

2 upvotes · 30 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Thanks for the encouragement. I plan on it :)

Spiritual warfare and your spouse

2 upvotes · 30 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Well said.

Spiritual warfare and your spouse

2 upvotes · 30 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

This is a good reminder. I do want to caution people that not everything is demonic or spiritual all the time, as James 1 points out that many temptations begin with our own evil desire. Also, sometimes a cold is just a cold, caused by a virus, and is not necessarily some demon prodding us with pain. The same is true with many other negative things we experience in life. That said, it's blatantly obvious to me that genuine spiritual threats often go unnoticed and are explained away as just "life." This is a very dangerous mentality to have, especially when one fails to recognize application of their spiritual gifts or the authority that Jesus gave us.

What's the best way to play this out?

2 upvotes · 26 July 2017 · /r/askMRP

it frame the entire interaction as you being some placating validation seeking schlub

And that's why I asked - I had that blind spot that it might be perceived that way. I opted not to take this course of action. Thanks for the insights.

Honestly, one would be better off being an aloof dick "don't worry where we are going, get a dress, be ready by 7"

She called asking where my old phone was so my son could play with it. I got in mini-crisis mode because there would be notifications from my TRP/MRP/RPC posts on there, which she would see if she turned on the phone. I tried to brush it off, but she pressed the issue. I explained, "I've got an app on my phone where I wrote some details about what we're doing tonight and you know I like surprises, so don't mess with my phone. All you need to know is I'll be home at 6 and you should wear a skirt and a tank top, and bring a sweater in case it gets cool outside." She was excited that there was actually a plan for the night, tried to inquire, but I explained my client was coming back from the restroom. I'm confident she will follow the instruction not to look at the phone (she won't defy direct instructions I give her like that).

It may not have played out like I wanted it to or come up under ideal circumstances, but that's what happened :p

Why are you sabotaging yourself?

Great point! Again, that's why I asked. Someone accused me of trying to humble-brag, but I really wanted to know these things.

The best successes here have come from treating any betabux in you as if they never happened.

That's wise. I've long noticed that a woman's perception of the past is based on how she feels in the present. So, reminding her of how she felt about me in the past would be dumb. I wasn't thinking fully.

You aren't leading, you're demanding (read: not commanding). It's pressure, chicks hate pressure.

Aaah, I see this now.

assume no sex

I developed that attitude long ago. The fact that this area has already shown improvement hasn't made me develop new expectations that I had cast to the road long ago.

Anyway, great response! Thanks for taking the time to help out.

What's the best way to play this out?

2 upvotes · 26 July 2017 · /r/askMRP

Panic Ms panicson hates when everything isn't wrapped around an itinerary. For me, I want to be able to flex as needed. Women will panic when they don't have 100% control over something, you can easily nuke it with a 'not talking about this', and the knowledge you have enough skill to handle stuff on the fly if need be.

This is my attitude as well. My wife is an accountant, so everything is usually done with precision and preparation. I do prepare in advance (been looking into options for a while), but I don't want her to know that

because it's going to feed into her extreme Myers-Briggs J attribute, which is the primary aspect of her personality that tries to fight my frame, as I'm usually far more P (though have learned J traits for professional reasons).

107 - Hyper-Hypergamy, the Comparison Game, and Positive Dread

2 upvotes · 26 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

they wrongly feel as though they are complicit in the sins of lust or covetousness if they or their spouse draws the interest of another person

I had a full reply written up to respond to this, but decided it's probably better as a post of its own. So, I'll just put it up separately. Either way, great thoughts and thanks for sharing!

Use red pill to get out of a dead bedroom

2 upvotes · 25 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I only started to send articles after the deadbedroom was resolved with daily sex initiated by my wife.

That makes a lot more sense now! Thanks for that clarification.

fun free date ideas for after work?

2 upvotes · 25 July 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

That's why I gave other ideas too :)

Use red pill to get out of a dead bedroom

2 upvotes · 25 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

That's great. Your wife was okay with the obvious agenda in you sending her these articles? Was this something where she knew there was a problem and you did this as a joint decision to help her overcome the issues? Or was it more, "You're not having enough sex with me, so I'm going to make you pay attention to the issue and keep reminding you until I see change!"?

Submissive?

2 upvotes · 25 July 2017 · /r/askMRP

AA would have been better. A straight "yes" kinda kills the mood because now you're putting expectations on her = covert contract. "Glad you noticed all my improvements. Now you'd better start responding!" The goal is to make her want to submit, not to tell her she has to.

"Well, I have been eyeing a leather whip lately ... I wasn't actually going to buy it, but now that you bring it up ..."
" <cue devilish grin>

Half assed mrp?

2 upvotes · 24 July 2017 · /r/askMRP

Touche.

Your opinion of open marriages?

2 upvotes · 24 July 2017 · /r/askMRP

That's a good way to put it.

Good Enough?

2 upvotes · 24 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

sexual shame to deal with herself and just doesn't want to be what she perceives as slutty, at least not with me.

And there is the real crux of the problem. I haven't seen anything on RP yet that truly addresses how to approach a woman with genuine mental health problems. The advice is always, "AWALT - mental health problem or not, she looks like a nail to me, so let's keep using that hammer." In reality, she's screwed up and needs a screwdriver.

Maybe it's the years of beta maybe she would worship Brad Pitt's cock, whatever.

I used to believe that even if Brad Pitt or some insanely high SMV celebrity did come in the picture, my wife wouldn't even be remotely tempted. I figured, "She's legit LL, not just LL for me." She was raised in an extremely conservative religious home and was told all of her childhood: "Sex is bad until you're married and when you do have sex, it hurts a lot every time" (her mom had physical problems). Because she wasn't married for the first 23 years of her life, that was 23 years of believing "sex is bad." The "until you're married" part never stuck because that wasn't her immediate context. Her brain naturally filtered it out as irrelevant information because it wasn't applicable to her at the time. So, I just assumed her mental damage was irreversible.

Then, about 3 years ago, after I had turned her down for sex due to beta-anger, a few days later I went to bed to find her crying. I asked what was wrong and she said, "I went on youtube and started watching the 50 Shades of Grey trailer." For her, this was the same thing as pulling up hard core porn. This recontextualized the problem for me: my understanding of her long-term mental health damage about sex was affirmed, but I also saw for the first time that underneath that damage she really did want to feel like a sexual person.

Stupidly, I didn't know how to take advantage of the situation. I was consoling her and affirming that she didn't do anything wrong and that it's good for her to have a healthy sex drive. But I did this all with words, when I should have just STFU and spoke through my actions.

I'm not sure if any of this resonates with you, but I feel like we're in substantially similar spots with regard to our spouses, except maybe I'm a little more hopeful and optimistic.

No question, Just a rant. Fuck you TRP

2 upvotes · 20 July 2017 · /r/askTRP

My favorite is from a movie my kids love: *Mulan - A Girl Worth Fighting For*

I want her paler than the moon with eyes that shine like stars. My girl will marvel at my strength, adore my battle scars ... bet the local girls thought you were quite the charmer, and I'll bet the ladies love a man in armor ...

Then Mulan, pretending to be a man, chimes in:

How 'bout a girl who's got a brain, who always speaks her mind?

Everyone else:

Nah!

And finally ...

When we come home in victory they'll line up at the door. What do we want? A girl worth fighting for.

Of course, in true Disney fashion, despite one decent-themed song the moral of the movie is still one of feminine empowerment ... <sigh>

The Importance of Qualified Pastors

2 upvotes · 20 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

if your pastor's marriage is not one of headship and submission, or if his wife is a feminist, his household is not well ordered and it would be wise to consider being lead by another pastor.

I've never really thought about that, but great point! But I do want to clarify: headship modeled after Christ and submission modeled after the church. Christ is our head with a firm hand, but much grace. The church is meant to be submissive in all things, but Jesus also delegated much authority to his bride because he has empowered her and guides her through his Spirit.

So, I ask men everywhere: has your wife caught your spirit? Or is she going on her own spirit, motivations, and agenda?

Are you under the leadership of a qualified shepherd?

I have had exactly one masculine pastor in my life, but he moved off to the other side of the country after a few short years. I miss him.

My current pastor is the next closest, but he still loves the "happy wife, happy life" mantra and cracks jokes from the pulpit about "who really wears the pants in the family." That said, I'm pseudo-discipling my current pastor and have been able to teach him several strategies for implementing long-term leadership skills that hopefully he applies in the home and not just the church.

Does your pastor actively promote biblical gender roles?

In word, yes. If someone were to ask him point blank, he'd give the correct answers. That said, when he teaches on tangential matters, not hitting the issue head-on, I get the totally opposite impression - that he emphasizes woman-worship, as if God put our happiness in the relationship as a higher priority than His glory (which is why he let Steven be stoned, the apostles be martyred, etc., right? /s). He will teach "husbands love your wives" for 40 minutes with about 30 seconds of "your desire will be for your husband, but he will rule over you." Sure, this is a key balance to maintain, but when you so drastically over-emphasize the part that benefits women and try to explain away what "wives, submit to your husbands as unto the Lord" to accept it but pluck out all its teeth ... the actual message the Bible tries to convey gets distorted.

What weak qualities or beliefs have you picked up from leaders that you are working on uprooting?

There are two key ones:

FIRST: The idea that the man should always sacrifice his happiness and glory for that of his wife.

This is ridiculous, but it's what gets peddled from the pulpit. When I see how God interacts with the Church, I do see significant sacrifice, but that sacrifice is always for the greater good of the relationship, not just rote happiness. In addition, although Jesus "humbled himself ... and became obedient to death, even death on a cross," the next part is: "Therefore God glorified him to the highest place and gave him the name that is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow in heaven, on earth, and under the earth."

The way God structured the Christ-Church relationship is designed for Christ's glory. If Ephesians 5 means anything, it's that the Husband-Wife relationship should function the same way. That's not to say men should get

big heads and egos about themselves, but if they're stifling their own glory to appease their wives, how does that adequately reflect to the world what God wants everyone to see about his relationship with the Church? We bear his image not only as individuals, but in our family unit, and if we choose to forego that image then we have failed to glorify God appropriately. Although Moses was "very humble - more humble than any other person on earth," his face shone with the glory of God so brightly he had to hide it under a veil. We can be humble and shine with radiant glory at the same time.

It should also go without saying that when the husband is right with God, happy, and content, this will overflow to his wife. Yes, there are times that we need to be "poured out like a drink offering" (as Paul says), but I have noticed in my marriage that when I am unhappy my wife becomes bitter. When I'm in good spirits, she follows suit. That said, when she's unhappy I have the ability to maintain my emotional momentum through her turbulence and this actually knocks her out of her funk. But when she's happy and I'm not, my unhappiness ends up bringing her down. So, I've changed the mantra to: "happy wife, happy life; but a happy husband is how you get a happy wife." My wife is thankful I've adopted this attitude, despite the fact that most feminists would love to stone me for it. Look how oppressed she is, being so happy like that!

SECOND: That your marriage does not affect your ministry.

No pastor will ever say this. The problem is that they don't affirm the opposite either. By teaching ministry as one compartment and marriage as another compartment, they are subliminally communicating to the congregation: "These are two separate things. They don't mix. You can have a great ministry and crap marriage and vice versa, and your laziness in one area really doesn't affect the other." I lived in this mindset for way too long. I do agree that there is a degree to which God can make someone fruitful despite having a broken/dead marriage, but there is more often a stronger correlation than we'd like to admit. It's easy to say, "I'm really good at ministry, but getting my wife to be attracted to me is hard work, so I'll just focus on my ministry," or "Ministry is hard; marriage is great, I'll just be happy with what God gave me and keep loving on my wife." In reality, we are capping our growth when we do that. Sure, you could keep honing your strength, but you'll be moving inches when beefing up your weakness in the dichotomy could take you miles - and only after men have started implementing this concept do they realize just how immature their ministry and marriages really were and what great heights God has in store for them.

[META] Field Reports, OYS, etc?

2 upvotes · 19 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

OYS accountability threads. Is this something that we plan to do in RPC or should we contribute to the TRP/MRP threads?

This could be a good idea. I know other subs have code to have an auto-moderator post these up weekly. I'm not sure how to code that, but I can certainly look into it! That said, I wouldn't discourage people from participating in conversation on TRP/MRP either ... just know you're likely to get a different responsive conversation than what I'd expect here.

Field Reports ... high level didactic material ... this question post ... Is this the sort of post that should be encouraged? If so, how?

My hope is that there would be a healthy balance, and I envision that balance as being about 50% questions, 25% field reports, and 25% theory. That said, with the sub being so new and having such a small user-base, we're not going to see a ton of FRs and questions. We have to get content up to show that this is an active enough community to be worth the subscription and participation, and also that people here are competent enough to answer the questions and won't be giving garbage advice - hence the need for an early flurry of theory posts.

Are there any similar challenges that you guys would like to see done here?

Do you have any suggestions? I'm not opposed to all levels of dread. In fact, I believe in latent/smaller quantities it's actually something a wife should enjoy, despite the terminology. But the later phases and when it becomes overt, that's when it becomes more destructive than constructive from a Christian vantage point.

keeping post lengths down should be encouraged

Not a bad thought. This is obviously not part of my nature, but I'll try to be more mindful of this. That said, I have noticed that in TRP/MRP, the post lengths are traditionally much longer than anywhere else on reddit anyway, so I assumed this was an appropriate carry-over.

less cussing here

I have the auto-mod filter that and just made a new sticky about this.

My wife used a stun gun on me and I took it

2 upvotes · 19 July 2017 · /r/askMRP

I like this.

Reacting v. Responding v. STFU

2 upvotes · 19 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

She would become more pissed. Ask more questions. Become stand offish and make an issue about it. Tell me I'm being weird.

I.e. re-affirm that you've got a good dread game going.

Draw it out till she gets what she wants.

The fact that you consider this a possibility shows that you're building your frame with straw. That's cool ... straw is a common ingredient in bricks. Just make sure you're strengthening it as you go and not being content with a straw frame that buckles when the big bad wolf comes blowing.

I get annoyed by it

I.e. butt-hurt. That's reacting.

But I try to hold frame

STFU will be fine if you don't know how to formulate the response. That's better than saying something stupid, as long as it's clear that you're not emotionally withdrawing (as per my original post).

I'm partial to the fogging-broken record combo. This doesn't work in every situation, but with my wife it works quite well. In proper WISNIFG form ...

HER: You didn't say ILY to me.

YOU: You're right, I didn't [fogging]. I don't want to cheapen the phrase [self-disclosure]. I'm not going to say it every time you want to hear it [assertion].

HER: But don't you love me?

YOU: Of course I do [self-disclosure; fogging]. But that doesn't mean I have to say ILY every time you want to hear it. [broken record]

HER: But if you really loved me, you would love saying it to me!

YOU: I can see how you would think that. I'm sure a lot of people are that way [fogging]. But I'm not that way because I'm not going to say it every time you want to hear it. [broken record]

HER: You're being really cold and mean right now.

YOU: You're right, I probably am [fogging]. But I'm still not going to say something just because you want to hear it [broken record]. I will say it when I mean it [self-disclosure].

Note: the self-disclosure in your first line is an explanation, which is part of DEERing. But it's not in combination with the other parts, so it's not as problematic. Also, note that you shouldn't get into an argument over why you think that's a good policy to have - that's where DEERing really comes in. You state your policy, even if it's an explanation (that's fine), and then stick to your conclusion.

Bear in mind that these are assertiveness/ domination tactics. We'd be crazy if we assumed that every single one-off conversation must automatically end up in panty-wetting. As MMSLP says, "Things are probably going to get worse before they start getting better." Eventually she will realize her antics won't get you to back down and that she either has to accept your boundaries or move on. If she's like most women, this assertiveness and your willingness to let her go will let her know that you're a high-value man (or at least give her that perception - after all, you're not clinging onto her like she's the best you'll ever get), so she will be naturally more inclined to accepting your boundaries, which usually has the result of fostering attraction.

If I'm extremely lovable and attentive. She reacts better. But I can't always be that

Ick ... she's got you trained. Lovable and attentive are good. "She reacts better" as your motive for being that way = she's conditioning you to treat her a certain way when she acts out so that she can get away with more tantrums. More tantrums = more hits against your frame. Stronger tantrums = more opportunity to break your frame.

Here's the thing: women are experts at reverse manipulation. They don't know they're doing it, but they are. They make you think, "I've got her figured out. If I do this, then she'll respond this way." In reality, she conditioned you to get to the "If I do this" line in the first place because that's what she wants you doing. Get that out of your head :p

Also, "If I'm extremely lovable and attentive. She reacts better" is a blatant covert contract. Go read NMMNG again.

Reacting v. Responding v. STFU

2 upvotes · 19 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

saying I didn't even say I love you. I tell her I don't have to you know I do and I'll show you tomorrow when you come over. She tells me "well it's nice to hear

Yeah, that's DEERing. "I don't have to" = Defending. "You know I do" = explaining/excusing. "I'll show you tomorrow when you come over" = rationalizing that it's okay not to say it today because there's always tomorrow.

Her response = "Screw your excuses and rationalizations; you'd better do things my way." She's trying to pull you into her frame. This is where you have to pick your battles. Is it just a small chip in the corner or is she trying to break through a hard line for you?

My guess is that this isn't a hard line, but the idea of "if I say ILY all the time it'll lose its meaning" probably holds some weight to you and you don't want to overdo it. Overdoing it with ILY forces you to escalate your

efforts to make her feel loved. When one tactic becomes stale, you've got to step it up a notch. To avoid those notches getting into absurdity, you've got to be strategic with when and how to dole out comfort and affection. If it seems like a free gift, she'll stop valuing it.

My wife used to get really mad when I'd forget to kiss her before heading off to work. In my beta days, I tried even harder to remember that quick peck on the cheek, thinking that would make her happier. I had pampered her for so long, she got used to it and felt like a princess with her boy-servant. Joy. /s

At one point a few months back I cut that out. I walked off without the kiss, not making a scene of it. She noticed and called me ...

HER: "I'm hurt that you didn't take the time to kiss me goodbye. You said you'd work on remembering."

ME: "Sorry, I forgot. It happens. Deal with it."

... **NOT.** That sounds "dominant," but would, in fact, be DEERing. "Sorry" is my defense. "I forgot" is my excuse. "It happens" is my explanation/rationalization. "Deal with it" is just being a jerk.

ME FOR REAL: "Crap, you're right. Sorry about that, I guess I'm going to have to kiss my secretary now." [A&A]

HER: "That's not even funny!" [but she laughs anyway, although still obviously a bit miffed that I'd even joke about that]

ME: "What makes you think I was trying to be funny?" [implied wink in the tone of my voice]

HER: [dead silence]

ME: "Getting another call, gotta go."

I don't know how closely this conversation parallels your situation, but it worked for me. I still kiss her in the morning sometimes, but often don't. I do it when it's convenient for me, whereas she used to make me head up and down stairs to give her that kiss because she was too lazy to get out of bed to meet me at the door. I'm not putting up with that anymore. But I do like kissing my wife, so if she's there by my side, why wouldn't I kiss her?

My guess is, you probably do love your girl. So, if she's there and handy, why wouldn't you communicate that in some way? Well, I gave a couple reasons why, but you can work around that by finding different ways of communicating affection so that "ILY" doesn't become stale, but she still gets the comfort she needs - and that this happens on your terms and not her demands.

How does biblical submission benefit wives?

2 upvotes · 19 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I know my comments may come across to some as "women bashing" and I'm not.

I never got this implication. You're all good in my book :)

Some Scriptures seem "tough" to deal with, especially in our modern era and the "mainstream" ideas pushed by society, and we don't understand or know God's heart, the spirit of the law, and more.

I think [/u/BluePillProfessor](#) hits the nail on the head here: these things weren't even questioned in the time the Bible was written. We don't understand it because we've never lived in a culture that actually embraced biblical concepts on gender and family roles, nor am I aware of any such place on the earth today. That said, I'd wager people alive in the time of the Bible itself would have fully understood these Scriptures and they wouldn't have seemed "tough" in the slightest.

Was this the an RP move? Need advice/input.

2 upvotes · 19 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

this maturity is vastly uncommon- however, that shouldn't make someone lower their standards for it.

I get what you're saying, but I don't think the Bible or RP would endorse waiting to find a unicorn. Maybe [/u/RedPillWonder](#) has more to say on this, though?

Again, to clarify, I'm not saying you should compromise on hard-next issues, like having a high n-count or having dabbled in homosexuality. Those are pretty big issues. But if your concern is that she's just a passive church attendee who doesn't know who Esther is and she's had dinner with a few other guys ... sure, she's not a perfect image of the iconic Proverbs 31 woman, but she's got room to make it there.

Also, RP says that if you want an LTR, you've got to find them while they're young before they make all these mistakes - that way you can mold them into your frame from the get-go. This is the same thing as me saying, "Find someone within range and raise her up." The only difference is the terminology between "mold her into your frame" and "disciple her."

I think the jist of what you are saying is to keep your standards high, but don't be so quick to write people off because every Christian is technically a "work in progress."

That's a great way to put it :)

Part 1 - Signs your wife might have a personality disorder

2 upvotes · 18 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

That's because narcissists get their validation from success. A strong partner will reduce their win-rate in the relationship. A weak partner will let them win every time.

I love negotiating against narcissists because they often don't see it coming. They are used to their weak spouse and assume the negotiation will be against their spouse. They think, "This is easy, I got this. I win against him/her all the time." Then I step in the room and start fogging, broken record, negative inquiry, and all those other WISNIFG tactics I had learned far before knowing them by name. The other party finally backs down and lets their attorney run the show - or they fire their attorney and try to go it alone, which just makes it even better for me.

Was this the an RP move? Need advice/input.

2 upvotes · 18 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

The unequally yoked command applies to dating, but from a different source. That explanation is too long to get into here though.

Once the 'gina tingles kick in and the lack of her being a mature Christian (if one at all?) and two and two adds up fairly easily.

This is where MMSLP explains that for girls, "It just happened" is a good excuse. "I would never do that. I'm not that kind of girl. But I'm not responsible because it just happened." That's how the hamster works.

104 - How to compliment your wife and make her feel sexy

2 upvotes · 18 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Well said.

Was this the an RP move? Need advice/input.

2 upvotes · 18 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I'm going to say some hard truths below. So, let me explain first that I say it from experience. I have been where you've been - but even worse. I actually did get this particular girl. We dated for about 9 months. During that time she cheated on me with at least a dozen different guys. I took the same mentality you did: "She wants to grow in her faith and develop self-control and to become a godly woman. How can I turn her down?" I should have gotten out of the relationship after the first week. I was an idiot. My male hamster was hard at work and raw emotional flutters at the fact that she was my first-ever girlfriend kept me pretty blind. Every line you mentioned was something I identified with in some way.

With respect that I've been there too, this is the most blue pill story I've seen in a while.

- Severe oneitis? Check.
- Orbiting? Check.
- Giving up your value for free? Check.
- Friend-zoning yourself with her? Check.
- Pedestalizing? Check.
- Letting her define the relationship? Check.
- Getting butt-hurt? Check.

I stood my ground and controlled the flow of the conversation

From what you've explained, you did not. You spilled your guts, put your heart on a plate and said, "Here, this is yours. You can do whatever you want with it."

What do pastors say about girls being promiscuous? *Give yourself away for free and people won't value what you're offering for very long.* The same goes for you: *Give your heart to her for free and she'll throw it in the trash pretty quickly.* Nobody values freebies.

I told her that what she did was wrong in using me

i.e. "I got all butt-hurt and let her see it."

she conceded that she did use me and that she knew how I felt about her. She never apologized for wasting my time.

i.e. "I'm not sad that I hurt you; I'm sad that you found out I've been manipulating you all this time."

I essentially told her that I did not want a friendship any longer

More butt-hurt.

all of my time and energy would go into finding a good woman to help me through life

Emotionally reacting instead of shutting up until you have a solid response.

I decided that I was done being used

This is the one place where I will give you a solid.

and left on my terms

No, you left on her terms. You just wanted to make sure she felt a sting as she got her way. I'm pretty sure from the tone of your post that you left the conversation far more wounded than her.

dating an unbeliever ... justified it based on irrationality, poor theology ... and emotion

Welcome to the hamster. You're learning.

She proved to me that she wasn't the good catch I thought she was.

I have said this a dozen times I my non-RP account in Christian subs, and will refrain it here: **If you can't find the perfect, godly woman, raise one up.** As the man, it's your responsibility to lead your SO/wife. I hear guys complaining all the time, "All the girls in my area are so shallow and don't take their faith seriously and will give it up to the first guy who gives her tingles. Where are all the good Christian girls who I really want to be with?"

First off, they exist, but often-times men are too looks-picky to go with one of them. Second, find someone who's already on the path to Christ who you find attractive, enter into a relationship, and begin discipling her. If you have to, go below your bar and raise her up. Is she not very attractive, but has other great qualities? Join in and show her how to become attractive to you. Take her to the gym with you; go clothes shopping with her; help her pick out makeup and perfume. If she's already attractive, but spiritually immature, start a relationship and lead her into godliness.

If you had discovered RP stuff a year ago and this sub actually existed back then, there might have been more we could do to help - and she would eventually see that you would've likely been the exact kind of guy she wanted. But it's too late for that. So, you'll have to get over the oneitis ASAP.

I recommend 3 months of monk-mode for you. Otherwise, you're probably going to be on an emotional swing toward the next girl and you won't fully be able to digest and implement the RP stuff you're learning.

I also recommend reading through the lives of David and Joseph. These are guys who know how to accept the crap that life gives them and take charge anyway. Make them your heroes for the next 6 months and aspire to be as much like them as humanly possible - not necessarily in their faults, but certainly in the way they're willing to accept their faults and move on.

In particular, you were pining over this girl and getting all weepy and emotional while you still thought there was a chance. Now that you see the chance is over, you seem a little more confident and able to move on. Why bother crying over spilled milk? David did the same thing when his baby was prophesied to die. While there was still a chance he wept and fasted. When the baby died, he stopped being butt-hurt about it and went to lead his country. Guess what happened: the next child born by that same woman was Solomon, his great heir. Who's going to be your next, and are you going to be man enough to trust God with the situation?

Part 1 - Signs your wife might have a personality disorder

2 upvotes · 18 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Sorry to hear about the divorce. There is hope for working out these relationships, but I do agree it's very difficult. As a cautionary note, if the NPD is in the more severe ranges, you're not going to get very far in mediation. The best way to deal with a narcissist is to refuse to back down.

In addition, under no circumstances ever are you to explain yourself. Narcissists will always be able to out-manuever you from their own flawed perception of logic. They think they're smarter and better than you and deserve more than you, so even if your argument is rock solid, they're still going to assume their argument is

better just because they said it. At best, you'll hit a stalemate that way. At worst, you'll come off looking like an idiot to the mediator, who will then start pushing you to be the one to cave.

This is where WISNIFG is immaculate. I could have written that book from a legal strategy standpoint. The fogging-broken record combo is worth its weight in gold when negotiating with a narcissist. "What you're saying makes a lot of sense. But I still want this anyway."

Always make sure you're negotiating from a position of strength with a narcissist. If they're in the upper-hand, they'll know it and milk it. You have to find a way to turn the tables, and if you can't, then start learning to accept your lumps. If you do have the position of strength, because a narcissist will never believe you about your strengths, you must go to a higher authority - someone they can't deny. Get the judge to say at a pretrial, "I'm with 'ImSteveMcQueen' on this one." As soon as that happens, the narcissist is all about saving face and will buckle.

Also, narcissists care more about their image and appearances than actual substance. As a result, if you're fighting over custody, for example, you can concede to do "faux shared parenting," where the narcissist gets a document that says "shared parenting" on top, so she can wave her equal rights to all her friends, but in the document itself have a clause that says, ["/u/ImSteveMcQueen](#) has final decision-making authority in the event of an irreconcilable disagreement."

Also, most narcissists are more concerned with their bank account than anything. Use financial leverage to gain the upper-hand in custody. If possible, settle the custody matters first while the financial issues are still looming, that way the stuff with the kids are off the table. Narcissists are prone to do this because they like to be the good guy/girl who "put the kids first - made sure they were taken care of before dealing with all the money stuff." Then, once you get the custody arrangement you want, using the financial pressures, fess up that you don't think you'll reach an agreement on the financial issues and you're ready to go to trial. Also, threats about how expensive litigation will be are fairly effective with narcissists.

Lastly, if custody is at issue, get a psychological evaluation. An evaluator worth his salt will know how damaging it can be to have a narcissist in charge of parenting decisions and how harmful that can be on the kids. Very rarely do psychologists recommend custody or shared parenting rights for a narcissist.

House-wife v. SAHM

2 upvotes · 17 July 2017 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Good thoughts!

Advice to Young Women Today for a Better, Happier Life and Relationships

2 upvotes · 17 July 2017 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Plus, we haven't gotten into the discussion of college/university culture and hook-ups, potential indoctrination from professors, heightened peer pressure, etc, all of which is magnified when going off to university.

Great point there too!

Rejecting appreciation ... weird concept, but it works for me.

2 upvotes · 17 July 2017 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

There are other forms than PIV. That was a mental block I had overcome when initially tuning into RP stuff about 3 weeks ago. I was telling myself the 6-week rule would apply to everything, which was just dumb.

Advice to Young Women Today for a Better, Happier Life and Relationships

2 upvotes · 17 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Interesting take. I like it!

RP Christians: Great Idea

2 upvotes · 16 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I love it! I'll definitely have to look into your book :)

Advice to Young Women Today for a Better, Happier Life and Relationships

2 upvotes · 15 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Beautiful post! I love every bit of this. One follow up question: do you have any insight for younger believers about how to balance the "marry early ... but be patient" part?

My wife and I married at 23. I was her first boyfriend and she was my second girlfriend. We both waited until marriage for sex. Although I have always been confident, she used to have doubts about us early in the marriage because she never really got to experience what a relationship was like with anyone else. It hasn't come up in ages, but she really struggled with wishing she had dated around first ... but I would rather my daughters (3, 2, and 4 weeks) one day follow the same path she did: vet, vet, vet until you find the right guy. Thoughts?

Reacting v. Responding v. STFU

2 upvotes · 14 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Fair enough. I think the post was clear enough, though, that I was referencing a literal silence with no emotional reaction either - complete and total nonresponsiveness. That's what didn't work, but it was a necessary midpoint I went through on my journey from being emotionally reactive to informationally responsive.

Woman's desire is to their HUSBAND according to God

2 upvotes · 14 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Great thoughts :)

Woman's desire is to their HUSBAND according to God

2 upvotes · 14 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I have read his comment and agree. My original perception is that we are Christians first, RP second. As a result, if someone asks for relationship and sex advice to do things that are Scripturally prohibited, rather than being RP first and giving the advice, we would be Christians first and address the sin issue and not support it.

I would prefer to allow the opportunity to discuss with someone why they are experiencing those desires and how Jesus can help fill the void rather than ill-placed sexual attraction ... rather than just censoring and cutting out the conversation altogether. That said, without seeing the character of the community here, I don't know if my preference is a realistic option or if it will end up backfiring and causing more trouble than it's worth.

I know when I've seen this type of stuff get brought up over on [r/TrueChristian](#) the community there is more than prepared to address the topic in a godly way that doesn't compromise biblical values and tries to engage with the person both lovingly and in a way that draws them toward Christ. I simply don't know if this community is capable of doing that yet, so I defer judgment on the issue until it actually comes up :p

Woman's desire is to their HUSBAND according to God

2 upvotes · 14 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Your evangelism method seems interesting. I'd be interested to see what the follow-up is like with people who do appear to be genuine. I often find that some people will have a genuine emotional reaction to the gospel but will

not invest in it despite having said the prayer or changing behavior patterns temporarily. This is where discipleship after-the-fact is key.

The Ray Comfort model is fine if you're dealing with somebody who actually cares about the fact that they are sinful or the potential consequences of that sin. Unfortunately, most people don't. They think of hell as one big party and if you try to argue otherwise, even knowing you're right, you've just engaged on their terms in an argument that doesn't really matter in order to condition them to accept your method of evangelism, which they will probably still not respond to, even if you persuade them that hell is horrible, because intellectually acknowledging this is not the same as the subconscious impressions they have had of hell for a long time that one conversation will not be able to break through.

My preferred model is to use what I call the lens illustration. It centers around a person's present felt needs. Although it may not be a perfect illustration, because everybody has an actual felt need, whether they admit it or not, it is applicable to every person. It also helps the recipient feel the seriousness in the conversation because you're discussing a matter that is deeply important to them and affecting their daily life. I have reference this illustration once before on this sub and will probably do a post on it at some point even though it does not directly tie to Red Pill principles because it tangentially addresses matters relevant to emotional stability, which is certainly a core RP concept. I believe the gospel is a better answer to emotional stability than studying stoicism.

a person must understand their sinfulness in the eyes of a holy God before they will see their need for Christ

This is true for many, but as I noted above, I think that showing a person how Jesus has an answer to their immediate felt needs can be even more powerful than convicting them of sin, particularly when they don't already care about whether or not they are sinful.

I often wonder how those who call themselves "Christians" but never share their faith can justify that

They can't. It is their hamster running their faith rather than their spirit. To get over this I often ask people what they would do if they found a note under their door saying, "I will kill you and all of your family at midnight tonight." There are three possible options:

- not believe the note and do nothing. Your family will die.
- believe it but not care, so you do nothing. Your family will die.
- believe it and care, so you do everything you can to protect yourself and your family.

Only the last of these will actually save anybody. It is not enough to intellectually acknowledge something, if we really believe something and it matters to us, that belief should inherently prompt action. The action is not what saves us, because we have no power to save ourselves. Instead, if you call the cops they can send a protective detail or protect you in any other number of ways. If you just try to deal with the matter yourself, it is highly likely that you will fail because the murderer likely has a plan and knows what you might do to fight against it. The only solution that actually works is to ask for help. That is why faith in God will save us, but our actions will not.

103 - Desire Cultivates Intimacy

2 upvotes · 14 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Glad it was helpful!

Dealing with the stressed wife.

2 upvotes · 14 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I think [/u/bluepillprofessor](#) called for field reports on this. Make a thread of it and share your experience so we can all learn, tweak and apply. We need to know what works and what doesn't, and every application of it will bring out more information than just how your and my wife has responded to this method. Also, others may be able to help you refine things so it goes even more spectacularly next time!

Woman's desire is to their HUSBAND according to God

2 upvotes · 13 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I take the sexual aspects to be parallel as well :) Malachi 2:15 coupled with Romans 9:8 start to allude to the conclusions.

Woman's desire is to their HUSBAND according to God

2 upvotes · 13 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Indeed, although Hebrews 10:26-31 has actually given me even more pause for concern than Matthew 7.

Woman's desire is to their HUSBAND according to God

2 upvotes · 13 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I actually don't mind a little theological debate here and there. I just prefer it stays respectful and mutually edifying ... and at least reasonably close to on topic.

Woman's desire is to their HUSBAND according to God

2 upvotes · 13 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Hey there! You're definitely doing a good job adding to the conversation.

I totally did not pick up on that implication when I first watched the video. On a second review, I do see how you would get there, although I wonder if the whole video (rather than this 4-ish minute clip) would reveal more about creation that precedes the immediate context of the curse, which is where this clip starts. To that end, I usually give people the benefit of the doubt.

That said, I do (and always have) 100% agree with your interpretation and that any implication that the headship role was first established by the fall is **wrong**. Given my 102 post about this subject, if you think I left a false implication here, please let me know so I can correct it!

EDIT: This is what I wrote in 102 that related to my interpretation of the first three chapters of Genesis in this context:

God gave the command to "be fruitful and multiply" before the fall. In order to ensure this command would be followed, he gave us all libidos. In order to ensure our libidos did not hinder us from doing everything else he put us on the earth to do, he made our libidos dependent on our actual fulfillment of those duties and our ability to let the other person fulfill their duties in the context of a relationship with us. When Adam and Eve became sinners, they lost the ability to trust their natural impulses because of the new sinful nature. To help set things right, God articulated the curse as a clarification of our duties.

From there, fulfillment of those duties is what we find attractive, though we are all naturally bent to do the opposite. Women's sinful nature gives them a bent to want to control their men (as opposed to letting them lead). Men's sinful nature gives them a bent toward laziness and apathy (as opposed to working hard). Fortunately, in both cases Christ conquers the sinful nature in us so that Christians have and more natural time overcoming these innate weaknesses ... which is part of why I think RP thinking comes naturally to some Christians - because we've

been reading it in the Bible all this time, but without a pragmatic world-view to give us context to understand what we're reading ... which is why RP is also a tipping point for many Christians, where the church has otherwise obfuscated more straight-forward readings of these passages by their "say one thing, but establish a culture that does another" patterns.

Woman's desire is to their HUSBAND according to God

2 upvotes · 13 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I have never really thought about that. Very interesting :)

Woman's desire is to their HUSBAND according to God

2 upvotes · 13 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Very well said. A man's fitness, ability to lead, etc. are all things that assist the woman in her ability to submit, but are not necessary. The reverse is true: a woman's submissiveness and beauty (internal and external alike) are things that make it easier for a man to lead and want to stay fit, but they are not necessary.

As I noted in 102, these traits develop mutual attraction and can play off of one another - not only to the degree that we see a desirable trait in the other, but also to the degree that we see the other person will allow us to fulfill our role in the context of the relationship, thus satisfying their desires and knowing that what we do matters to the other.

More important than anything is this (which TRP/MRP/RPW alone could probably never conclude): the reason we can live out our roles independent of our physical spouse's fulfillment of his/her roles is that we have a spiritual spouse who **always** fulfills His role for us, empowering us to be faithful (action) and content (emotion) in all things (see most of Philippians 4).

I'm seeing a need to do a post on this soon, but I have a lot to say about the way physical and spiritual relationships are meant to parallel one another and how we can utilize each to understand and improve the other better. Either way, great job with your comments here!

102 - Desire and the Curse

2 upvotes · 13 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I expressed anxiety about the move, but never his decision

This is a huge and vitally important distinction to make! Most women would do well to keep this in the forefront of their minds.

I had to do what was best for him and help him make the right decision, even at the cost of my own job. That is what a helpmate does

My previous pastor said it best: **It's not submission until you disagree. Otherwise you're just doing what you already would have done anyway.**

I can think about the term husband and become aroused. I sort of thought this was common in Christianity but I see I am wrong on that. So my understanding of what a husband is produces physical desire.

Very, very wrong indeed! Haha. But I think your last sentence is key: *what a husband is* - that's what produces physical desire. Most of MRP (as opposed to TRP) strategy is about making men into husbands the way God designed them. They take roundabout methods of figuring out what a true man/husband is supposed to look like; the Bible is more of a cheat-sheet. It tells us directly and gives us example after example after example. It's interesting to note that historically many church men were the forerunners of true manliness and husband-ness. It

wasn't until the church started worshiping culture instead of trusting God that we see this fade among men in the church (predominantly in the 1800s, but a little before too) and it took RP thinking to really pull all these concepts back from the ground up - and they did it the hard way. It gives me a greater respect for our non-Christian brethren.

sex helps seal the bond

Remind me someday to do a post on seals and covenants. I've written about it on other subs on my main account several times, but I bet it would be really helpful to this community as well. I usually use it in a context to people better understand how to relate to God by the way he established physical sex as a parallel to spiritual concepts; but the reverse is often true - when we are spiritually healthy but need help with our physical lives, looking to the spiritual truth can help us set our physical world back in order. This radically changed my life when I started understanding and applying the concepts.

My boyfriend likes that I'm smart

2 upvotes · 13 July 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

Great article. Took a while to get through, but it's really interesting. I feel like I had already figured out most of the conclusions, but it was incredible to read the theory behind why those conclusions work the way they do. Thanks for sharing!

Part 1 - Signs your wife might have a personality disorder

2 upvotes · 12 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

But once a women becomes **diagnosably**, statistically significant crazy, then it starts being less about successful relationships and more about escaping with your sanity and your life.

That is the conclusion most people come to. That said, I don't think it *has* to be this way, and it could be very unwise for some men who are late enough in the marriage to assume this as the first option over learning to develop an effective framework for maintaining poise and control in the face of a relationship with significant PD issues.

MRP fixes the man, and this usually fixes the woman, so why bother with diagnosing

As I just noted to /u/GargantuaBlarg29, the beauty of PDs and RP thinking is that PDs are virtually incurable. Until about 5 years ago they actually were deemed incurable.

The resulting conclusion is this: *If you're in a relationship with someone who has a PD, accept the fact that you cannot fix them and adjust yourself to orient your relationship toward the results you want instead.* This isn't a "do whatever it takes to minimize the expression of her PD" suggestion, but one of establishing a frame that accounts for all relevant facts.

Sometimes I get the impression that people here think that there is only one possible frame and everyone must use that frame and you're not allowed to adjust that one-size-fits-all frame for the specific details of your life.

It takes TWO to form a dysfunctional relationship, so if your woman is sick, you are likely sick in a synergistic way as well or you would be gone already.

This I totally agree with. Very well said.

"Strategies" to deal with ...

Absolutely agreed on that entire paragraph. Even when I counsel men through marriage difficulties (not in a licensed capacity; usually as a mentor-mentee relationship), I do so with a mindset: "Hope for the best, but prepare for the worst."

Part 1 - Signs your wife might have a personality disorder

2 upvotes · 12 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

There hasn't been much collaboration of information in that manosphere that I've seen

I haven't seen it talked about at all either. The only way collaboration can happen is if someone starts the conversation ;)

most weak men try to label their women with something to put the blame on the woman, avoid blame themselves, or just can't handle the fact that people can act this way

The beauty of PDs and RP thinking is that PDs are virtually incurable. Until about 5 years ago they actually were deemed incurable. Recently certain types of dialectical behavioral therapy through intensive out-patient programs in both group and individual settings simultaneously for a minimum of 2-3 years is necessary to develop a lasting change. I have yet to meet anyone who has ever actually underwent this process and succeeded.

The resulting conclusion is this: *If you're in a relationship with someone who has a PD, accept the fact that you cannot fix them and adjust yourself to orient your relationship toward the results you want instead.* This isn't a "do whatever it takes to minimize the expression of her PD" suggestion, but one of establishing a frame that accounts for all relevant facts.

I believe a lot of "personality disorders" are just BS titles

For high functioning individuals (as most people with PDs are) you're exactly right. But when you meet someone who (under the former DSM-IV standards) would have a GAF score of 50 or less, you'll see all of these traits very clearly pronounced and would readily acknowledge, "There is something wrong with that person far beyond the ordinary things that distinguish unique individuals from one another."

There's nothing "wrong" with them like there's something wrong with a schizophrenic

As a point of clarity on what I just said: sometimes there is, sometimes there isn't. That's why I say: it's a scale, not a switch.

RP aware men don't think they deserve anything

I get that, but I'm speaking as to all narcissistic traits. In the DSM there is something like a checklist and if you hit x out of y of the traits, then on a rote technical level, you have the disorder. A sense of "deserving" something from others might just not be one of the ones that's checked for true RP guys ... or maybe a guy is RP, but that's one of his weaker areas and why he still needs to be on this forum for support and encouragement in maintaining that aspect of his RPness.

AWALT. This isn't a personality disorder, it's AWALT

You're probably thinking about it in the context of casual expression as opposed to manifest expression. You're used to seeing people whose quirks don't have a substantial negative impact on their ability to interact with other people because most people aren't clinically "crazy." But the fact is that many men do marry clinically crazy people without realizing it until after the fact. If you've managed to avoid these women and never run across them

or gotten to know them intimately enough to see that level of crazy come out, then props for you. But I wouldn't dismiss the fact that countless men (and women) have a different experience that transcends "AWALT" into a unique mess. Again, that doesn't make it okay to blame the woman, and the point of part 2 is to show men that they're not helpless victims of circumstance ... so there's no excuses to be made.

Part 1 - Signs your wife might have a personality disorder

2 upvotes · 12 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Not sure if I like this post because AWALT

Indeed, all women are a little crazy. This post is meant to highlight women who go beyond the ordinary levels of AWALT crazy, even when we don't recognize it. In addition, it's good to know the tendencies your woman have toward which type of crazy.

As for bipolar, it does get confused as a PD a lot. In reality, Axis 1 disorders relate to personality and Axis 2 relates to mood disorders. Because bipolar is Axis 2, I didn't include it. Although there are distinct differences, borderline is close enough to cover a lot of the bipolar concepts anyway. The primary distinction is that mood disorders are episodic (i.e. come and go), whereas personality disorders are consistent (although they produce episodic features, even when the episode isn't manifesting the thinking structures and behavioral patterns are still there in a different way).

What gets really bad is when a person has both Axis 1 and 2 issues. My preferred psychologist expert calls this "the perfect storm" and supervised visitation is virtually always necessary when these are coupled with any substantive degree of manifestation (i.e. GAF score even of 70 or so, if GAF was still being used).

6 Questions for Christian Merps

2 upvotes · 12 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

mercilessly attack any new guy and use classic shame and blame tactics

This is my greatest fear in what could happen here, and I intend to do everything I can to prevent it from happening. The last thing I want is guys on the right track being intimidated back into BPdom, giving the opposite effect of what I'm trying to foster.

Part 1 - Signs your wife might have a personality disorder

2 upvotes · 12 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Well said. My thoughts exactly. I'm baffled how many comments I'm getting about how labeling and targeting is worthless when most of what I read on these RP subs is exactly that.

Part 1 - Signs your wife might have a personality disorder

2 upvotes · 12 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Part 2 won't make any sense without part 1. I get the sense you like to argue and criticize just for the sake of arguing. Or maybe you feel like you've got something to prove so you go around beating your chest, trying to puff yourself up or ridicule anyone who challenges your self image. Maybe the NPD section resonated too close to home so you've got to try to tear apart the post in the hopes no one will read it and you won't be outed. Regardless ... I'm going to keep doing my thing and if you don't like it, that's your problem to deal with, not mine.

Part 1 - Signs your wife might have a personality disorder

2 upvotes · 12 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

This is incredibly ignorant and completely ignores the fact that the whole point of a personality disorder is that it affects behavior and interpersonal relationships. That's why they're so vital in divorce and custody cases.

If they act right, there is no disorder. So, your comment is basically saying, "If she doesn't have a disorder, why should I care if these disorders exist?" The answer is that some people do have these disorders.

Part 1 - Signs your wife might have a personality disorder

2 upvotes · 12 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

In practicing law for the last 7 years I have only run across two women who did not have a personality disorder, and maybe a dozen or so men. That's why I included the AWALT quote up front and the blurb at the end about severity being key, not just the fact that a disorder exists.

My boyfriend likes that I'm smart

2 upvotes · 12 July 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

Glad I was able to give you something to think about! And thanks for sharing the article. I'll have to read through that soon!

How did you end up discovering Red Pill truths?

2 upvotes · 12 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Mind sharing some of those Scriptures?

Some of the bare bones, yet core ones are on the sidebar. The rest of them I will be rolling out with the 101, 102 ... series I've started. I just finished a rough trial, so I'll probably be back to posting again either tonight or tomorrow.

true and lasting change comes from teaching the youth and growing them into the next generation of leaders that do things the right way from the start

Exactly. That's what discipleship is all about ;) This is my biggest passion and mission in life. I've written a book on the subject, but haven't sought to get it published yet ... maybe I'll look around someday.

To Confront, or Not to Confront. That is the question.

2 upvotes · 11 July 2017 · /r/askMRP

Here's the deal ... tell her you're picking up signs she might be cheating on you. Say it's because of her unusually high/good attention or something. Ask if she's been talking to other guys. Be calm and direct.

If she admits, she did the hard part for you. If she doesn't, she's lying to you and has already violated your trust. Her hamster will rationalize that your violation is worse and she'll get all accusatory, but by now you should know how to deal with that problem ... like any other hamster-caused fitness test.

One thing I've noticed is younger chicks don't seem to care about my career, only older women are impressed. Any thoughts?

2 upvotes · 11 July 2017 · /r/askTRP

Follow other good advice here too ... but here's something I've noticed from practicing divorce law: older women are naturally attracted to narcissists, younger women are turned off by an inflated ego. I don't have answers on why, I just see the data and know it to be true.

Tons of young couples get divorced because the husband was narcissistic (yes, we do psych evals to confirm this) and she didn't realize it for what it was until after the marriage and kid. Very rarely do I find NPD being diagnosed in divorce cases for people over 40, though.

This is weird because NPD is darn near impossible to cure and doesn't just magically vanish, yet these guys all test clean. But I constantly find from my clients that their narcissist exes are getting lots of action with the post-40 crowd (they usually complain about all the strange girls around the kids), even when the guy is under 40. I see similar patterns in my narcissist guy clients. It's weird and I haven't developed a hypothesis yet ... just observing.

I'm not saying you have NPD, but trying to impress people with, "I'm a med student" certainly gives that vibe.

There's my .02 ... take it or leave it.

RP Christians: Great Idea

2 upvotes · 10 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

other than a Christian lens

Ooooh ... I'll have to do a post on "The Lens Illustration" sometime. I'm leading a 2-day conference centered around it in September. It was a total life-changer for me and would probably help a lot of people figure some stuff out here too.

The RedPill Christian should seek to identify the same problems that any other Red Piller identifies but also provide a better solution than just "go lift," "eat clean," "go have more sex," etc.

One of my good friends once explained: "TRP has done a stellar job identifying a problem; but they have gone too far in offering a solution."

I discussed this issue a lot recently with someone else who insisted that you couldn't "Christianize" TRP/MRP stuff - that it's like swimming and philosophy ... they're just totally different things.

Ultimately, I think the Bible has a lot of answers about how God created sexuality and human impulses. So, I totally disagree and see them as very, very related. Everything TRP/MRP seeks to understand was identified in the Bible first. They're just finding what the Bible would have already told them and contorting it for their own goals.

Rather than being RP people who try to cling to a biblical worldview and not compromise our values, I think it would be better to be utterly Christ-centered in our identities, but implementing the practical truths that TRP/MRP have discovered about human nature which are often overlooked in the way the feminized Christian culture pressures people to interpret the Bible.

Don't aim for perfect game, the bar for sex is not that high!

2 upvotes · 10 July 2017 · /r/seduction

Nah, I don't recommend this. In fact, it's morally atrocious to me. But my intellectual nature gets lost in theory sometimes. "The Nuclear Option" is not something I condone, but it is an unfortunate reality that many guys use it and it applied to the conversation. I have often fought against this cultural attitude in religious circles, but it's not an easy one to break.

I totally see how I came off that way, though. Sorry about that.

EDIT: I should note, though, that there are some people who need their egos knocked down a few pegs. This applies to both guys and girls. I was one of those guys :(

Welcome to Red Pill Christians

2 upvotes · 10 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Will do. I want to review and implement a few things from MMSLP before trying to do another knowledge-dump though :p I've done so much reading lately I don't want to over-ingest and miss things or have too much to apply that I don't do it in proper balance.

Help

2 upvotes · 10 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I'm familiar with what it is to disciple someone. It's a large part of what I do on a weekly basis.

But do you disciple her on a weekly basis?

I struggle to see how I am at all at fault for her outbursts of anger. Even if I have done something she doesn't like, I'm not responsible for her anger

You're not at fault for how she reacts. That's her responsibility. But you do always have some involvement in the circumstance leading up to her reaction. You don't validate the degree of her reaction, but you do need to acknowledge that you did something to contribute to the situation.

For example, suppose you're walking down the street wearing a yellow jacket. Some lady sees your yellow jacket and her eyes follow you instead of watching where she's walking. She trips and gets hurt. She runs up to you and starts cussing you out because you're at fault for her tripping. Sound like a fairly parallel situation?

Instead of getting defensive and explaining why she shouldn't hold you responsible (DEERing = bad), your better option is to say, "I can see how this bright yellow jacket would have contributed to your problem." You're not admitting you've done anything wrong. You're acknowledging her feelings about the situation. That's all that matters for her.

After that, if you want to say, "But I like this jacket and will keep wearing it," that's perfectly fine. If this is a lady you have to deal with every day and she argues back, "If you do that, then I'll keep tripping and getting hurt! You need to stop wearing it." That's when you can either try to find a workable compromise ("I won't wear the jacket during a time of day I know you go on your walks") or you set a boundary ("I will keep wearing my jacket. If this is a problem for you, I recommend learning how to look away or finding a different time of day to go on a walk").

Help

2 upvotes · 10 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Don't have the time for a full write-up on that, but some things were mentioned in my main post here. The bottom line is that hyper-hamsters means that you have to expect irrational behavior and engage her with parallel emotion rather than attacking emotion. This is super hard for someone like me because I'm not an emotional person on the whole, but I promise it's an art that can be learned. My wife doesn't have BPD, but she has frequently said things like, "You're so cold and robotic all the time" and "Don't you ever feel anything?" It's like working out your triceps. You don't use your triceps for heavy lifting very often in day to day life. For most people, there's no imperative to have super strong triceps. But if you find yourself in an activity where you need to use your triceps all the time, you need to start working out that muscle and it will get stronger and stronger over time.

6 Questions for Christian Merps

2 upvotes · 10 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

where you were going to draw the line

Although it's not the best standard, the Nicene Creed is an easy one that most people can look up. I'll probably use that for the most part. Mormons can't pass that standard.

Also, interesting article. I'm not sure I agree with everything he says, but it's certainly a unique and rational point of view.

101 - Fitness develops attraction

2 upvotes · 10 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Well said. Although I agree, when speaking from an authoritative standpoint (i.e. trying to teach a lesson) I tend to be more cautious when imputing applications beyond the context of the passage itself. Not to say it's wrong to do so or that it's an incorrect application ... just not my style. Thanks for this explanation though.

6 Questions for Christian Merps

2 upvotes · 10 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

In the later levels, absolutely. The only context in which I would use dread is in parallel to the way God models it in his relationship with us/the church, which is never with a motive to foster fear, but to inform of the consequences of what will happen under certain circumstances. Hebrews 10:26-31 comes to mind.

6 Questions for Christian Merps

2 upvotes · 9 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

This is probably a good question for the group as a whole, so I'll request that you post it as a separate thread for more input and I'll give you my answer there :) More threads will help the group grow and be active!

6 Questions for Christian Merps

2 upvotes · 9 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

my seminary is actively *harming* the Church

I reached this conclusion a few years ago when researching seminary teaching models and a biblical basis for seminary.

Quite frankly, there is no biblical basis for seminary. It arose from the same mentality that's been killing God's people since 1 Samuel 8 when Israel asked for a King. God said no. They complained, "But all the other worldly nations have a king. Can't we be like the rest of the world?" So, as Romans 1 affirms God still does, God handed them over to their own devices.

The church, for the first century or two, was predominantly a lay-run thing. There were certainly supported missionaries, as the apostles set the stage for that, but it was more apostolic in nature and not institutionalized. When Constantine officialized Christianity, droves of people started flooding in, sometimes for genuine reasons, but often for societal conformity purposes. The Church didn't know what to do, so it looked at how the rest of the world institutionalized and copied similar formats, which resulted in things like corporate communion rather than communion being about relational fellowship among people with Christ; baptism became about sprinkling a few drops of water instead of a serious commitment that involved a field trip.

As time went on, when education really started becoming a thing, the church did it again: *The business world is really good at getting a message to many people; let's copy what they did; they used college degrees and institutions, so let's start our own institutions and degree programs.*

Every single time the church does this, we find a Saul-situation ... things start falling apart and we don't really understand why, we just know there's bad leadership somewhere, but with all the division that "bad leadership" is a phantom that can't be pinpointed. I'm pinpointing it anyway: seminaries. Jesus modeled discipleship as the means of training leaders in his church. The apostles modeled discipleship as the means of training leaders in the church. We gave up on what they established and adopted the world's model of academia.

I'm not saying all seminaries are bad. There is still some rote value to them. But I have found that they are a grossly inadequate qualification system for deciding who should be leading God's people.

There are a lot of people who are hungry for "Red Pill Christianity," but they're quiet about it.

Maybe the anonymity of an internet forum like this will give them the guts to start voicing themselves as a first step to doing so more publicly. Spread the word ;)

Marital Confidence Intervals and Probabilistic Stage Setting

2 upvotes · 9 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I understand. That said, I initially read that TRP is *descriptive*, not *prescriptive*. Is this incorrect? It sounds like what you're saying is that TRP is about telling men what their goal should be, whether they want to adopt that goal or not.

Marital Confidence Intervals and Probabilistic Stage Setting

2 upvotes · 8 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Haha, I get that. We're all wired a little differently. The same reaction you have to six sigma is how I feel when someone wants me to watch a football game. I love high-intensity activity ... but I'll never understand why people get so emotionally invested in how impressive someone else performs in an activity where I'm not trying to compete at the same level.

Dealing with the stressed wife.

2 upvotes · 8 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Haha, thanks! I'll keep that in mind.

I do, in fact, write books ... but I haven't done one on this topic yet.

Am I correct saying that my "job" is to initiate sex and hers is intimacy?

2 upvotes · 5 July 2017 · /r/askTRP

5LL fosters fuzzies. RP/being alpha fosters tingles. Cholomite's law: *Tingles without fuzzies won't last; fuzzies without tingles are worthless* (for the guy). It's our job as men to lead in reaching the appropriate balance.

Taking an Ex back? It was my fault and I blocked her?

2 upvotes · 5 July 2017 · /r/askTRP

As I recall, the whole point of TRP is that if men don't have the life they want, it's always their fault. If you try to blame the woman here, you'll get stuff like, "AWALT" and "It's not her fault you couldn't keep her attracted." Your story is no different; you just tried to re-package it in an effort to find a loop hole.

More interestingly, you know the loop hole is garbage, but you posted it here anyway. This tells me that you don't really want to get back together with this person - you want people to help you get over her ... to motivate you to move on. Hopefully you've seen some of that here.

Personally, if you've got a bad case of oneitis for this girl (and I'm not as opposed to oneitis as others may be), then head over to MRP to help you get your act together for the purpose of figuring out how to sweep her off her

feet again and get her to forget about Chad forever.

Always looking for validation

2 upvotes · 3 July 2017 · /r/askTRP

As [/u/Auvergnat](#) said, NMMNG can help, but I think the first 3 chapters of WISNIFG (When I Say No I Feel Guilty) are much, much more on point and applicable. He goes through this "bill of rights" that will probably solve your problem and explains it from an internal psychological viewpoint that will help you agree with adopting that right within your own life. The rest of the book is all about tactics on how to enforce those rights when other people peck away at them.

Why do people like each others company so much?

2 upvotes · 2 July 2017 · /r/askTRP

Part of me wants to comment to help, but the way you get so defensive and flaunt your denial about everything makes me feel like I'd be wasting my time.

Read NMMNG and search the sub for threads about DEERing. That's what you're doing, and no one here will respect you while you do that. Other than that, I do hope you can learn to accept that an objective opinion from an outsider (even if they don't have all the facts) might be more helpful than digging your heels in the ground where you're already at.

If your question is purely a psychological one about what makes you tick and why you're different from most other people, you should be asking it on a sub about psychology, not a self-betterment/sexual strategy sub.

The change in how people treat you once you get fit/bulky is real, and one of the best things that happened to me. Thanks TRP

2 upvotes · 2 July 2017 · /r/askTRP

HISTORY - It's probably worth knowing that back in January I was 275. From January until last week I did almost exclusively cardio (I have a history of being a XC runner and did 5Ks and things long after). From Feb-April I lost 25lbs, then another 20 in May from doing the Whole30 diet, then another 10 in June from more cardio and not stuffing my face. I used to lift a lot in high school/college, so I'm not totally ignorant, but it's been a really, really long time :p (I'm 32 now).

As part of my "cardio," beyond just street and treadmill running I was doing a lot of plyo, insanity, p90x, and mma training videos on youtube. A lot of those included body-resistance strength training. So, I was unintentionally prepping myself for lifting, but nowhere near to the same degree. That said weighing 275 and doing 25-35 push-ups probably isn't all that different from benching 205-225.

BENCH - Remembering that I've only been at this a week (unless you count the body-resistance), if I have a spotter, I do 15lbs less than max and try for 4 reps (i.e. 4 @235). Second and third sets I try for 90% max (i.e. 225) for 8 reps then 6 reps. If I'm really out of it, I'll drop to 205 for the last set and go for 12.

If I don't have a spotter, I just start with 25lbs under max (225) for 8, then drop another 20 or so from there (whatever is convenient with the plates; in this case 205) for 12, then another third set of 12. I usually start with the bench as one of my first arm/chest workouts, doing declined sit-ups between sets, then circle around back to it as the last thing I do before leaving the gym, so I get a total of 5-6 sets in (3 of everything else I do). Gotta get rid of those man-boobs (though they're mostly gone at this point, but certainly not tight ... just not flab).

SQUAT

Because I've only just reintroduced lifting, I haven't tested everything. I've only done legit squats once and stuck with 315 as a safe number, doing sets of 12.

By body weight alone, I can do an easy 100. I rarely attempt more than that because that's usually a nice switching point to something else in my plyo/cardio routine (which changes every 3 days). Writing this actually prompted me to get up and do another 100 just now, after having already spent an hour and a half lifting (finished an hour ago).

If it makes a difference, I more often do the leg press machine, where I max it out at 500lbs. Is there a big enough difference that I should be switching back to squats? I've never cared for those glider machines and don't trust myself doing a free-bar when working out alone (which has been all but once).

DEAD LIFT - Haven't even tried.

CARDIO - I usually run a 10k. I'm still too fat to have great times, but my 5k time is around 26 minutes and my 10k time is just barely under an hour.

PROGRAM - None. Recommendations? My general cycle is 6 days on, 1 day off. At least, that's what it's been with cardio. Lifting might be harder, given that I actually have to go to the gym (45 dumbbells are the most I have at home). I'll probably end up splicing 4 days of lifting, 2 days of cardio (when I can't get to the gym) and 1 day off.

Thanks!

On momentum and self control

2 upvotes · 30 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

Not to answer for /u/cholomite, but ...

From what I understand, if your motivation is externalized you're building covert contracts. There is an implied expectation, "If I do this, then ____ will happen in my life." Usually that's, "My wife will be attracted to me and want to screw me more often," but it could be any number of things.

Once you build the covert contract, your motivation dies when the contract is not fulfilled. Pretty much everyone here will tell you that women will never fulfill their end of the contract when you treat it like a contract.

- First, they don't even know you've made this contract.
- Second, even if they are aware of this implicit agreement, adhering to a contract requires rational judgment and women are not rational.
- Third, even if she is trying to be rational in following the unspoken agreement, the hamster wheel gives her loop holes out of the contract:
 - (a) because implied contracts don't have specific terms so her understanding might not be the same as yours
 - (b) because she rationalizes and justifies breaking the contract for reasons that defy logic
 - (c) because *things just happen* for girls and they're not responsible when it *just happens*.

Really, you're expecting her to work on your paradigm when girls have a different frame of mind entirely. When your motivation is external, you become ticked when you don't see the rewards, then lose motivation. Even if you do maintain your cool for a while, remember that women aren't dumb; they're emotional empaths. She will pick up on the external motivation factors and perceive you as being manipulative, even if you think you're really good at hiding it. This will turn her off.

"But I'm really, really good at hiding it!" No, you're not. "But my wife doesn't know how to look that deep." Maybe not consciously, but her subconscious will feel it before you can think it.

If your motivation is internal, her emotional-empath super powers will pick up on the fact that you're a man on a mission and not a manipulator, and she will like you for this. But it's all about the internal motivation first, then everything else follows.

I'm a Christian and there's a very similar concept at work in how we balance faith, good works, and God's favor.

- Some people use works as a means of earning God's favor (legalism) and assume that because they have works their faith must be real. These people end up frustrated with God (or too proud to admit it) and often burnt out. These people think they're "saved," but they're not. In Matthew 7, Jesus actually says that these people are evil, even though they're claiming to do good things.
- Others are OI. They love God just because he's awesome and deserves to be loved. The byproduct of this genuine love is that these people end up doing the same good things that the first crowd does, and usually even more. They do it not because they want a reward, but because it's who they are, inside and out. These people are "saved."
- **CONCLUSION:** Works cannot produce faith; faith always produces works; God only responds to genuine faith. The key is being OI in our relationship with God (lots to say on that, but I'll refrain from the sermon and get to the point).

The same concept is at work in your relationship with your wife. You're trying to balance between three parallel concepts: internal motivation for self-improvement, actual actions toward self-improvement, and lifestyle expectations.

- You use the self-improving actions to prove that you have what it takes internally to be the best you. Just like God sees our hearts, your wife sees this reliance on your actions as a cheap substitute for the real thing. As a result, you get burnt out trying to hide the fact that your motivation isn't actually internal (even though maybe you were too proud to admit this at one point). These people think they're RP, but they're not.
- Other people on this sub are OI. They want to be awesome just because being awesome is awesome. The byproduct of this is that they are doing the same self-improving things as everyone else; but this is coming out of an overflow of their internal awesomeness and not to try to prove something. These are the true RP guys.
- **CONCLUSION:** self-improving actions will not make you RP or motivated; actually being internally motivated will always produce self-improving actions; wives/LTRs only respond to genuine guys. The key is being OI in our marriages/LTRs.

Another way I've heard it said is: *God doesn't give until you stop expecting to get.* The parallel is: *Your wife won't give until you stop expecting to get.* Don't assume she's too dumb to pick up on your motivations. These emotional empaths are far more insightful than many of us give them credit for.

The after/eternally persistent test ... ?

2 upvotes · 30 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

Very interesting. Thanks for the input. If it makes a difference:

- I wasn't flirting. I was just answering a question for someone who happened to be young and hot. I get questions all the time. My wife knows this. When she asked about it at first, I tossed her my phone and said, "Here, take a look. I've got nothing to hide." She read some of the conversation, saw that I was telling the truth, but still came at me afterward with the, "I don't want you talking to other girls any more" stuff.
- My wife doesn't flirt. EVER. Even with me (though that's my fault). Her big push-point in this whole

conversation was, "I never talk to any other guys one-on-one outside the home, ever. It hurts my career to do that. People probably think I'm sexist because I only meet with other women in the office, but I do it because those boundaries are important to me and that's what we agreed on when we got married."

- I did, when we were first married 9 years go, agree never to be alone with another woman. I viewed it as a boundary with rational flexibility, she views it as a pillar of fire surrounding our marriage. For example, when I have a female client in the office and the meeting goes long so all the other employees leave the office, she expects me to kick the client out so we're not alone in the office together, even though this is grossly impractical and unprofessional. Rather than complying with that request, beta-me just avoided situations where that possibility could arise.

With these things in mind, here's what I'm contemplating saying next time. Let me know your thoughts:

I love you. I want a strong marriage, just like you. What we've been doing hasn't been working. I'm sure you've noticed me changing some things, and I dare say you're liking those changes. A new way of doing things means new boundaries. You'll just have to trust me where I set them.

And then let that be the end of the conversation. If she continues to argue, I just refrain, "Trust me," or if she really needs to hear it [i.e. comfort test], "Trust me, I'm not going to cheat on you."

Regarding the flirting gap thing, that's pretty clever. But again, I think my wife is the outlier on this one. For a myriad of reasons, on that bell curve she's the one on the outermost extreme.

Even if she really does fall into the AWALT category on this issue (which will be really darn hard to convince me, but I'll go with it for the sake of argument), she's been big-pregnant for the past 6 months, and now that the baby is born she will literally be at home with 4 kids for the next 6 months (yes, very long, fully-paid maternity leave) with pretty much no male contact other than me. So, at least as far as temporal proximity goes, it's extremely unlikely that she's been flirting with anyone for the past 6 months, and even less likely that she'll be flirting with anyone for another 6 months to come.

Perhaps that plays into your theory. If she really did have a flirting life that I'm totally oblivious to and she's bold-faced lying to me (again, something I simply can't imagine from her extremely conservative "must follow every rule or I'm a bad person" upbringing), then I suppose the fact of her unavailability to flirting could be why she perceives that gap closing.

In reality, I think her expectation is just: no flirting from either of us at all ever. In that sense, she internally assumes there is no gap. As I'm improving, she's fearful that I will be increasing that gap in my favor when there just should be no flirting from either of us at all, and this makes her upset, specifically because it violates an overt (as opposed to covert) contract that we have explicitly stated early in our marriage.

NMMNG and Divorce

2 upvotes · 29 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

This makes a lot of sense and wraps together several concepts clearly and succinctly. Thanks!

That said, I think I'm going to hold off on MMSLP anyway. I would rather postpone books that are predominantly about improving sex-life until I'm at a point where I can actually have sex with my wife. She just had a c-section, so sex is prohibited by her doctor for 6 weeks ... 4 1/2 left to go. I'd like to go through MMSL and related ones closer to the end of this time-frame so that it's fresh in my mind, and instead focus on (1) fitness, and (2) learning how to pass tests so that she's already entered my frame by the time sex is back on the table again.

NMMNG and Divorce

2 upvotes · 29 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

I feel like this has been directly stated by several people here. I'm still working my way through the sidebar, and I understand that it has to do with sexual strategy too, but many have framed it in the context of sexual issues breaking a marriage and how to fix it.

5 Love Langues v./and (?) NMMNG

2 upvotes · 28 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

Pardon my naivete, but can you elaborate? I'm guessing it's because she didn't care to be touched by a pansy beta, so getting you to serve her was the best she expected to be possible from the relationship, therefore she learned to make that her craving, suppressing actual physical desire. Is that about right, or were you implying something else? (Asking to take application in understanding my own patterns with a wife who has constantly rejected physical touch as one of her LLs).

RP and religion ...?

2 upvotes · 26 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

Yeah, that's weird. Off the top of my head, I can't think of a time when Jesus ever spoke sarcastically or in hyperbole, although there are a few passages where people impute that attitude on him just because they don't like the implications of what he really said.

A friend of mine used to say things like this: "I did a Greek word study on the word 'hate' in that passage. I read all kinds of dictionaries and looked up the etymology, non-biblical uses of the word, and even asked an expert on Koine Greek. Do you know what I discovered that word really means in the original language? Hate."

RP and religion ...?

2 upvotes · 26 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

You wife will never chase you if she knows you won't ever leave. That puts you in the default position of chasing her, which is really not good for your marriage.

This is something I'm going to have to think long and hard about. One thing that I've really been bothered by his her perception that "godly men are supposed to pursue and chase after their wives." Frankly, I don't see this in the Bible. Read literally any passage about budding relationships and it's almost always the woman seducing the guy to drive him crazy until he finally chases her because he wants her so bad - but it starts with her interest in him and not the other way around.

I brought this up once in a study in the book of Ruth and the entire group's jaws dropped. "Yes, that's exactly what happened. Ruth liked a guy who wasn't her husband, seduced him, and then let him buy her." They couldn't believe it and kept trying to read other things into the text about how Boaz was really the white-knight beta savior who saw a woman in need and came to her rescue. No, she's the one who chased after him.

Regarding the nuke example, we'll have to agree to disagree there. As a philosophy it makes sense, but there are some lines I will not cross and this one breaks two of them: (1) acceptance of divorce without grounds, and (2) using threats and manipulation to coerce behavior. That said, because of my occupation, she's terrified at the prospect of ever leaving me (again, I'm a divorce attorney).

lack of leadership by delegating all decisions to the church

It's more the other way around. I disciple my pastor and he comes to me for input on how to run the church. I'm the one teaching classes, setting policy, and cultivating the culture in our body. I do make sure that my leadership

is always aligned with what I understand to be biblical and I will never depart from that. So, I guess you could say that I'm delegating decisions to the Bible, but I don't think there's anything wrong with that when the Bible has an actual directive on point. But there are several matters where I disagree with my church and refuse to conform ... that's been true in different ways for pretty much every church I've ever been in.

RP and religion ...?

2 upvotes · 26 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

Religion

I agree with the "one flesh = sex" reading of the Bible. During my early beta days, my wife and I used to argue about that. When we'd fight she insisted that I sleep in the same bed as her because sleeping in the same bed is a "symbol of commitment in the marriage." I explained, "No, the Bible is pretty clear: sex is the symbol and seal of a marriage. Why should I buy into your personally created symbol when you won't accept the God-given one?" I haven't brought this argument up in years, though, nor do I intend to try to rehash all that. That would just be giving her more power, making her think it still gets to me.

To that end, yes I do know the Bible inside and out ... to the degree that even my pastor acknowledges that I know more about it than anyone he's ever met, including himself and his seminary professors. But knowledge and understanding aren't everything, just as I've seen a lot in TRP/MRP threads that reading up and knowing the theory of frame and all that isn't the same as actually putting it into practice. So, I'm still working on growing :)

Condition of Home

I did add an edit about the condition of my home. We're not slobes and our house is in good shape and clean most of the time, and we have a cleaning lady come in bi-weekly to keep up with the stuff that we don't have time for. My point wasn't that our house is crap - it's that I feel like I'm wasting my time on stuff that doesn't matter to me, making it hard to maintain motivation. I do have a threshold that I'm not willing to dip below, but early in our marriage I wouldn't do anything until it hit that threshold (which was still pretty darn good compared to 90% of people's homes I see); then in my heavy-beta phase I just did whatever her threshold said to appease her.

My bar was high enough that I'd be comfortable inviting attorney friends or judges/magistrates over, but my wife was still mortified when a crumb was found on the floor or the TV had a fingerprint on it and she would take the burden upon herself pick up the difference from my bar to her bar. When I started owning my life, I sucked it up and just started raising my bar to her bar anyway - no longer to appease her, but because that's what I thought I should be doing. But I'm losing motivation and interest in doing things like vacuuming a clean floor simply because it hadn't been done in the last 48 hours. The excess is what's killing my motivation, as I don't see any return/reward for my labor and time.

To go back to the "Captain" example, imagine the wheel needs to be calibrated once a month, but your first mate is insecure about it and thinks it should be calibrated every single day, just in case something went wrong. Even if I buy into the mentality that it's better to be safe than sorry and I fully take ownership of it, at some point I'm just going to feel like a fool doing things that don't actually need to be done.

Expectations

If you are fine with it going to pot, then dont expect your wife to do the work instead

With the above context that it's never really going to get that way, one thing that has always been clear throughout our entire marriage (and maybe this is part of my problem?) is that I don't expect anything from her. If I want it done, I do it. Period. Probably not healthy, but I can't think of a time in our marriage where I've legit asked her for help on a significant project, except a few times where I had to work late and asked her to pick up the kids from daycare. There are probably a handful of times a year where I ask her, "Can you hand that to me?" but that's about it.

She has actually complained about this, saying that it's nice that I don't pressure her to do anything and that I am able to take care of myself and the kids independently, but that it makes her feel like I don't need her, and therefore she's irrelevant in my life. I think that's part of why she raises the bar on taking care of the house - because then she feels like she's adding value in an area that she sees as meaningful, but gets really frustrated when I don't sing her praises for meeting a higher standard that I didn't care to have met in the first place.

Either way, I'll check out Darlock and some of the other recommended reading materials soon.

Dating questions while reconnecting with my faith

1 upvotes · 1 June 2026 · /r/askRPC

In the Greek, the word is "epithumeo," which means "covet." Sexual desire is merely passively appreciating someone's beauty and sexuality. It doesn't become "epithumeo" (i.e. lustful intent) until you actually start desiring to have it for yourself.

- Sexual Desire: "she has nice boobs"

- Lust: "the things I'd do to those ..."

Of course, this still falls into the realm of Romans 14:14 - if you think it's sin in your heart, even if it's not for someone else, don't violate your own conscience because it becomes sin for you anyway. If you feel like you're lusting inappropriately, then stop.

I am considering getting rid of my desires for love

1 upvotes · 2 March 2026 · /r/RPChristians

You can say "porn." [r/TrueChristian](#) has a sidebar post on how to conquer porn permanently. I wrote it. But porn isn't actually your problem. It's just the thing you hold so close to your eyes that it blocks your vision and you choose not to see all the other stuff behind it.

God has clear, Scripture-given purposes for your life. Making disciples of all nations is an obvious example, as it's the prime mission of all of His people. How are you doing at fulfilling that command? How many people are you currently discipling? How many have you disciplined in the last 5 years? My guess is the numbers are small and you're using porn as your blinder-excuse. "How can I disciple someone else into spiritual maturity when I still struggle with this?" Wouldn't it be great if when Jesus gave the great commission he hadn't mentioned porn? "Go, therefore, and make disciples of all nations, unless you struggle with porn, then conquer that first and get back to work." I wish that second part wasn't in Matthew 28:19-20.

In Genesis, God gave Adam a job: name the animals, tend the earth and subdue it. Imagine if Adam were lazy and not doing that job. Do you think God would say, "Dang, this Adam guy just sits on his butt all day enjoying the fruit I bloom for him and not doing the work I gave him. I bet he needs even more help at being lazy and ineffective at the job I gave him. Let me make a helper suitable to aid him in his avoidance of my task"? Or do you think God is more likely to say: "Adam's doing great at the work I gave him, but it's a lot. Let me give him another person to help him out and they can do it together"?

99%, if God hasn't pruned you of porn yet, it's because you're not bearing fruit for His Kingdom (i.e. reproducing your faith) - or if you have, it's not become a sold-out primary purpose of your life and is more just something you do "on the side." John 15:2 is clear enough of that. And if you're not doing what God put you on this planet to do, why would you expect to need a helper in your current aim of not doing it?

I am considering getting rid of my desires for love

1 upvotes · 2 March 2026 · /r/RPChristians

Amen.

When Weakness Becomes the Gateway for God's Power.

1 upvotes · 2 March 2026 · /r/RPChristians

Yeah, I definitely don't see Scripture telling us to strive to become weak or maintain our weaknesses. It's like when Paul writes in Romans that our sin increases God's glory all the more - because it's that much more that His grace has overcome in us. But then he says, "That doesn't mean we should go on sinning," and explains that we should still strive to stop sinning, even despite that our sin brings God glory.

In the same way, our weaknesses certainly bring God glory because it's clearer that He was the one working through us. Sin itself is a weakness in us - and Paul did boast about His own sin as something that held him back, yet God's still choosing to work through Him anyway, to God's glory (Romans 7, esp. 24-25) - but that doesn't mean we ought to keep sinning any more than we ought to keep being weak.

I believe the imperative is to continue growing and improving, but praise God when He works through us even in the midst of our weaknesses. As I just commented to you in the other thread: *If people are going to reject what you're giving them, let it be the message itself that holds them back, not the messenger.*

How to avoid self-pity?

1 upvotes · 27 August 2025 · /r/RPChristians

This is a weak post. You can't solve your own sins. Galatians 3:3 makes that pretty clear. Only God can prune these away. John 15:2 says he does this for fruitful branches. Focus on bearing fruit for Christ and you'll see your brain warping to think of things on God's terms instead of your own, and the self-pity will wash away naturally because you'll be less worried about dumb stuff and more focused on things that have eternal impact.

Consequently, this will make you a more confident, assertive person with ambitions that would be more alluring to Christian women than "I hope God doesn't see me accidentally sin," so it's a twofer and will probably help your dating life all the same.

Anyone looking for a biblical marriage. Super old fashioned completely submissive godly wife material?

1 upvotes · 27 August 2025 · /r/RPChristians

Gotta also remove the post, otherwise psycho idiots would just DM her after reading the title, haha.

Unknowingly married someone with BPD (and was pressured into doing so)

1 upvotes · 27 August 2025 · /r/RPChristians

****PART 3/3****

****CONCLUSION on What You Should Do****

With all of that said, you need to stop worrying so much about her. Grow in your faith. Develop a biblical mission. Be a godly man. Expect her to get on board, and be a good leader to her. If she violates your boundaries in the home, enforce those boundaries instead of letting her emotions rule your life. If she doesn't like it, she can leave.

Specifically, if she is rude and disrespectful to you, she is living in unrepentant sin. Matthew 18 says you must first go to her directly, then bring witnesses to support you (i.e. an intervention-type thing), and ultimately get the church involved - and after all that, if she still doesn't repent and continues these behaviors (as she is mentally predisposed to do, without significant and very fine-tuned psychological help), Jesus says to treat her as if she's a non-believer. That doesn't mean you hate her and treat her like dirt. We love non-believers and treat them with patience in hope that they come to faith.

But 1 Corinthians 7 says that if you're married to a nonbeliever and they are willing to stay with you, you must endure the marriage, but if they want out, you're free to let them leave. You don't have any further obligation to

try to "save the marriage." That same passage also says: "Let those with wives live as though they had none" in the context of our lives being committed to pleading God by doing the work he set out for us to do (i.e. "make disciples of all nations").

So the best thing you can do is get your head wrapped around living for Christ the way Scripture tells you, invite your wife to join you. Ask her to grow in faith alongside you, including getting mental help so she's able to stabilize enough to be the helper God designed her to be. If she chooses not to, you can enforce your boundaries by prioritizing your purposes in Christ over her. If this causes her to want a divorce, you're allowed to let her file.

****For Re-Emphasis****

Under no circumstances do I recommend having a child with her until you are confident she has internalized the skillsets necessary to be a good mother. She will more likely than not get at least (BARE MINIMUM) equal time with your child and spend the next 18 years manipulating that child to think you're a villain-father, and almost certainly will also cause severe psychological harm to your child in ways that you will be incapable of protecting the child from experiencing because it'll happen on her time when you have no oversight. You're just inviting yourself to have a child subject to constant mental trauma when post-divorce you're no longer the focal point of her love-hate cycles.

Tag: [u/merebear2](#)

Unknowingly married someone with BPD (and was pressured into doing so)

1 upvotes · 27 August 2025 · /r/RPChristians

****PART 2/3****

****Answering Your Questions****

> God hates divorce, but does He call us to endure this kind of constant abuse? Can I even call this abuse?

This is manipulative cop-out wording here. God didn't "call you" to endure constant abuse - and to your second question: no, I'm not even convinced that what you've described is "abuse" yet - though it may get there.

God called you to be faithful to whoever you choose to marry. You chose to marry someone hastily and under pressure. You state that it's your "conflict avoidance and fear" that were the "major contributing factors" to making this choice. It doesn't sound like your choice was rooted in (a) testing the relationship through what Scripture says, (b) prayer, (c) counsel of other godly men in your life, or (d) letting the circumstances evolve and evaluate them (i.e. the 4 things on my "frame" illustration on how to discern God's will - can't remember if this is in the sidebar or not, but I think it is).

Point being: instead of making a godly decision, you made one based on your flesh. Your post blames your wife for everything (perhaps rightfully so), and then your question seems to blame God. While you have acknowledged some faults, at no point in the post or comments have I seen you take clear responsibility that your weaknesses and choices are what put you in this mess. That's going to be starting point 1.

> Does entering a covenant under pressure and without spiritual intention even count as valid?

Yes. I think of the story of Jephthah in Judges 11. He made a flippant statement as a vow - "God, help me win this battle. If you do, I'll sacrifice the first thing that walks out of my house to you." He had no intention of sacrificing his daughter, but she's the next thing that came out. Between the sin of murdering a child and the sin of breaking his vow to God, he chose to prioritize keeping his vow to God and went through with it - and Hebrews 11:32 lists him alongside some of the greats, like Samson, David, and Samuel, even though this is the only thing of any real significance Scripture records Jephthah doing (and I don't believe there are any other known Jephthahs in Scripture it could be referring to).

Point being: when you make a vow to God, it doesn't matter if you were flippant about it, didn't really mean it, were pressured into it, etc. Jesus and James both say: "Do not swear by anything - just let your yes be yes, and your no be no." There's a reason for that: even flippant words matter. In fact, Matthew 12:36-37 even references that "on the day of judgment people will give account for every careless word they speak, for by your words you will be justified, and by your words you will be condemned." God holds you accountable to what you say, even if you weren't being serious when you said it.

> Am I breaking my vows, or was this never a true covenant because I married under coercion and fear?

If you made the vow and you subsequently had sex with her, then you're married. The covenant is agreed upon and sealed by becoming one flesh. The only passage that touches directly on "marriage induced by fraud" is in Deuteronomy 22, where if a woman is found to have lied about her virginity to induce a man to marry her, the solution is to stone her, essentially going along with Paul's statement in Romans 7:2-3 that marriage is for life and you're not released until your spouse dies; so in that case of virginity-fraud, they freed the man by killing the woman. While it's OT law, and therefore not something you're to follow, even if it did apply, she admitted she wasn't a virgin when you married her, and the difference of "1 other guy" v "100 other guys" isn't a line the passage seems to care about.

Tag: [u/merebear2](#)

Not sure what to do, need guidance.

1 upvotes · 16 August 2025 · /r/RPChristians

****Part 2**** - Tag: [u/Secure_Fudge2485](#)

- With the kids still living in your home, find 1 hour a week to have one-on-one time with each of them. Do something THEY enjoy, not something you want to introduce to them. Don't resort to "Johnny and I do this, it's our thing." Scratch that out. Maybe Johnny doesn't like it anymore and is too scared to tell you. If you don't know what your kids genuinely like to do, you're way too far out of touch and need to figure it out anyway. Just ask them.

- Make a list of your top 5 best male friends and text all 5 of them at least once a week for the next 12 months, and do at least one phone call a week with one of them. No less than once a month, meet up in-person. Don't have 5? Great, go find some. Small group at your local congregation doesn't count unless you're connecting with those people outside of small group meetings too. But yes, joining a small group is mandatory at this point anyway. Beyond that, another prime option is to join a [meetup.com](#) group and connect no less than once a week; if they don't meet that often, join more than one. Get actual friends out of the house.

- Don't initiate with your wife like a pandering fool. You were a failure. She was a brat. Let her be a brat while you work on fixing the "failure" lifestyle so she has reason to stop being so bratty. If she initiates with you, have fun with the conversation - not with the goal of trying to "win her back," but with the expectation that she's probably going to divorce you anyway, so just enjoy doing and saying whatever you want (within godliness and love - obviously I'm not encouraging you to cuss her out just to screw with her, but teasing, pranks, etc. are all good) and just don't worry about how she responds. Don't expect or push for sex. If she initiates, go for it, and let her know with your behavior and attitude toward her (and NOT your words) how much you want it - even if the answer is not at all, and communicate it in a fun/playful way, even if it's disinterest ("Aww, are you coming onto me? How cute. My brain sees what you're doing. This guy down here, though? Floppin' around. Another time, maybe").

- Make a list of your 3-month, 6-month, 12-month, 3-year, 5-year, and 10-year goals. Set a schedule for mile-markers you will have to hit to meet those goals. Have separate categories of goals for career, spiritual growth, parenting, lifts, etc. Meet them for the next 12 months on-time, no excuses.

There you go. That's your plan for the next year.

This plan is not designed to "fix your marriage." But yes, it's the best chance you have at fixing your marriage, by happenstance. The intent is to make you a better man. If your marriage falls apart during those 12 months, don't come back saying, "u/Red-Curious - it didn't work, your plan failed me, she divorced me anyway." I probably won't check this account often enough to see it, haha. So what if she divorces you? You'll just be that much further ahead of the game with your next inevitable relationship. Instead of pulling some fatty single mom on drugs who's willing to tolerate a skinny-fat alcoholic with no mission or motivation in life, maybe you'll be able to pull someone who's only mildly obese. Who knows.

I already know your first thought: "RC, there's literally not enough hours in the day to do all that." For a year, yes there is. Yeah, you'll burn yourself out if you try to do all of this every day for the rest of your life. But for a year? Yes, it's definitely feasible. I've been doing a heck of a lot of this almost daily for the last 8-9 years. I'd burn out if I did ALL of it every day for that long, but for a year? Deal with it. You get 10 days of vacation, but only if you're actually traveling. Have fun.

Why I'm not afraid of divorce rape - and how to get yourself there too.

1 upvotes · 11 September 2024 · /r/MarriedRedPill

If you don't trust it, don't do it. Your call.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (04/29/24)

1 upvotes · 1 May 2024 · /r/RPChristians

If it's a shallow copy then it's not actual joy, right?

No, it's still joy. For example, if we were to talk about "love," the Bible definitely talks about non-Christians loving someone. But that love is still a "shallow copy" compared to what we have through Christ. Are we to conclude, "No, I will only think of the idyllic concept of love and deny anything else as being love" and therefore deem the Bible wrong when it says that a non-Christian loved someone? Or do we embrace that shallow copies are still the real thing, even if a weak expression?

Never get hung up on the idyllic mentality. That's what the mainstream churchianity culture tries to push and one of the reasons why it went so, so, so wrong.

I would argue that under 20% -more likely under 5-10%- of people in the United States who say they are Christians actually have faith.

Nice, we're on the same page here. I did a personal survey of multiple congregations at one point and came to the number 16% of active, consistent churchgoers who I'd say are "actually saved" people and 1.6% or less who were living an intentional plan for spreading their faith to others. So while we're in agreement on the rarity, I do think that 14.4% disparity still exists, and those 14.4% are the people I'm referencing. Perhaps you're suggesting that salvation is even more stringent in God's eyes than I would otherwise think and believe only the 1.6% are saved? I'm not opposed to that suggestion, it's just not where I land presently. My purpose for this conversation is more to note that "being a good person and hoping that somehow people are passively inspired to follow Jesus" is not at all what Jesus had in mind by the Great Commission. So, if a man is trying to determine what his mission should be, "Do x, y, and z and hope that people will passively come to Christ without me having to be active about it" is inherent in his approach to life-mission, I have to oppose that.

And the minutia matters when you're dealing with title insurance.

Not only insurance, but actual deeds too. For example, if you spell the name "John Paul Smith" but the deed says

"John P. Smith" the deed will be rejected by the auditor, so we have to be extremely careful when drafting divorce decrees allocating real estate to one party that the names/legal description match up perfectly if we're going to incorporate "this document shall serve as a deed" language. I've yet to have someone who needed to "clean up my messes" in my career - at least not that anyone has ever had to tell me, haha.

I get too autistic when I have a step-by-step guide. The part that you liked is what I started with before I found your guide and tried to follow your process.

Gotta love irony. Yeah, the whole purpose of that post was to address two things:

- The Great Commission IS IN FACT your mission, and if you end up writing something different, you're wrong and have a crappy mission that's incongruous with God's purposes for your life. Writing it down forces you to come face-to-face with this reality.
- All the other superfluous facts I have people add are meant to inspire thought about the specific ways their lives can be used to contribute to that mission which are unique from how their neighbor might attempt to fulfill it. In the end, we are still beholden to Jesus' model; we can't just make things up as we go.

"Go, therefore, and make disciples" wasn't said in a vacuum - he was telling them, "What I just did for you, go do for the rest of the world." But we still see John's unique expression of love and joy, compared to Peter's fiery temper and brash condemnation, compared to Paul's intellectual presentation - all leading to the "one body, many parts" concept.

Where the problem enters is that someone will abdicate responsibility by saying "That's not my gifting/role/skill-set." For example, if a naval commander ordered the ensigns to "swab the deck," one might press hard on small patches to remove deep stains, another might use wide strokes to create a smooth finish, and still a third might be more interested in the soap-to-water ratio in the bucket. They all bring unique thoughts/skills to the table to get the job done. But if a fourth man says, "I'm good at cooking, so I'll skip swabbing the deck and just go cook a meal to feed the guys who are swabbing the deck," he has defied the commander and failed his mission. Nobody can say, "You make disciples, I'll go do this instead." Yet that is exactly what most people do - "I'll point my finger at parking spots on Sunday morning as my excuse for not making disciples, and tell God that I was doing this to assist someone else in making disciples. I hope it works and he's proud of me!" I believe that is a grossly unbiblical expression of our faith.

When I use the term "missions" I mean sending someone to travel to an un/under-reached peoples group. Not everyone is called to go on missions ... However, everyone is called to evangelism.

On this we agree. I use the word "mission" to define the purpose of a man's life (either tacitly by his own ignorance or through overt, conscious, intentional directive). But yes, I can see that the colloquial concept of "missions" certainly points to an evangelistic effort outside one's normal context - and that not everyone is called to this, even if everyone IS called to a singular and common *mission*.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (04/29/24)

1 upvotes · 30 April 2024 · /r/RPChristians

Thank you for the recommendation

Solid. You won't regret it. I did just put up a post covering the first 1/3 of the book in summary form. Might be worth reading before you listen so you know what to expect and make it easier to wrap your head around the concepts.

ingrained in our personalities

Humorously, the book denies the existence of personalities and focuses more on "lifestyle." But I'll let you get to that on your own :p

Which is why spreading joy inherently means spreading Christ. You're trying to argue symantics with me. The result is the same - spread Christ. I focus on the process and minutia, you focus on the end result.

I don't think we're saying the same thing here, actually. For example, a non-Christian can spread joy. The joy they spread is a shallow copy of what Christ offers, but can still exist as a goal without spreading Christ. Similarly, there's a stark contrast between: (a) "I will make other people joyful, generically, in the hope that they will see that my joy is from God and find Christ," and (b) "I will share Christ with someone through evangelism or discipling them, and this will have the passive byproduct of bringing joy into their life." In one, joy is the active goal and Christ is a passive hope; in the other, Christ is the active goal and joy is the passive hope.

I focus on the 50 commands of Christ that naturally lead those who are in Christ to share Christ with the world. You focus on the 50th command and trust that that end result is enough to generally cover the 49 commands.

The "naturally lead" line here is what I'd challenge. I know COUNTLESS (I mean that literally) church-attending, Bible-believing people who prioritize these virtues who have never once shared their faith with a non-Christian or taken a younger believer on as a disciple to raise them up into maturity in the faith the way Jesus modeled and instructed. I don't believe that the 49 naturally lead to disciple-making. I do believe that disciple-making naturally leads to a fulfillment of the other 49 because "no disciple is greater than his master," so if you want to disciple someone, you must naturally grow in these virtues independently in order to pass them on so that the fruit you produce actually resembles Christ.

you divorce attorneys only care about getting the order signed

I think you have some misconceptions about my personal practice, but I understand the appropriateness of the stereotype about divorce attorneys as a whole. I've also seen over-minutia cause far more problems than it solved (on many occasions). So I try to find a healthy balance.

final decree stating that one spouse would sell the house for at least \$350,000 within 6 months after the order is signed

Yeah, I'd never allow a client to sign that.

This right here is why I've always thought mission statements were a waste of time. Just go do the action, because if you try to write it out you'll just end up arguing about what to include in the the marketing department's little exercise in futility

I broadly agree, but do find that having something written does cause people to consciously think about new lifestyle choices they need to make, whereas if they don't stop and write it down they will just keep their "in action" part consistent with what they've always done, and never actually pursue the purposes Christ gave us.

But you are skipping the details that make the gospel so beautiful.

I would argue that the "trees/detail" you reference are the VISION, whereas the forest = the MISSION. Mission = big picture; Vision = details of how you envision accomplishing it. That's where the other 49 things come into play as part of your picture.

Instead you are running to the end and jumping up and down because you know that we -as a natural outflow of our changed hearts- are called to, and will, make disciples.

To reiterate: this is what I believe is wrong. I don't believe this is a natural outflow, nor do I assume it is something that "will" happen all on its own just by virtue of practicing certain virtues, disciplines, etc. I have seen waaaaay too many people live the "don't do bad things" and "do good things" life and conclude: "if it's necessary, maybe I can kinda use words when the opportunity hands itself on a silver platter and is blatantly put in front of my face in a way that I couldn't possibly miss it and I feel a strong reassurance of comfort in saying something, then I guess in those circumstances it's possible that maybe I could say something small that feels safe and won't have much risk of making me feel awkward or hurting the relationship."

I love the trees. Each one is so beautiful in its own right. The changes and transformations that we are commanded by Christ are wonderful to me.

On that we can agree! :)

OYS - Where Progress is Made (04/29/24)

1 upvotes · 30 April 2024 · /r/RPChristians

I believe that my mission is to spread the joy of the Lord, satisfaction in Christ

In follow-up to what I just replied on your prior OYS, to come to this newer comment, this is a perfect example. Phrases like "of the Lord" and "in Christ" are just filler. Joy and satisfaction can't actually come from other sources anyway, otherwise they're just false expressions/shadows. Your mission is now to cause other people to be joyful and satisfied in life. If that's what you produce into the world, that means the seed sown into you is joy and satisfaction. After all, you can't produce what you yourself aren't. A fig tree can't produce thorns, nor a thistle produce grapes.

But if you're not producing Christ, and you're only producing specific individual qualities (even ones that Christ has), then it implies that you are not of Christ yourself. Think of it this way:

- A grape seed produces grapes into the world.
- A fig seed produces figs into the world.
- A joy seed produces joy into the world.
- A satisfaction seed produces satisfaction into the world.
- A Jesus seed produces Jesus into the world - and Jesus has joy/satisfaction as aspects of Himself, but the focus is Him, not the joy/satisfaction.

Does that make more sense? The focus isn't on the attributes. It's on implanting Christ into the lives of others and let Him be the one to produce those attributes. If I can make 1 million people joyful, but have never shared Christ with them, it doesn't matter that I got my joy from Jesus; I've still failed those 1 million people. If I implant a seed for Christ in 1 person, that is better than making 1 million people joyful or satisfied.

I believe that those who love God are called to generously care for the people in their community and to send people to spread the good news of Christ. Therefore, I believe that I am further called to care for the people geographically near me, both spiritual needs and physical needs, and to aid in sending people on missions.

Now this is where it seems you're starting to get it :)

- "Generously caring" is still a virtue/attribute
- "send people to spread the good news of Christ" is awesome! But why send people? Why not go yourself? Do you think missions is only done when you send someone overseas or go on a mission trip? Mission work starts with your friend at work, the guy at the gym, your neighbor, people you chat with online, etc.
- "care for the people geographically near me" - great! What does that mean? You explain: "both spiritual needs and physical needs." Okay, so what does this PRACTICALLY look like in your weekly calendar? The physical makes sense. You mentioned some "help the poor" stuff you do through your congregation. What does the "spiritual needs" thing look like? How often are you sharing your faith with unbelievers? How often are you telling younger believers, "Come follow me, as I follow Christ. Look after my example and watch how I live for Jesus so you can learn to do the same"? Are these things passive background aspirations or actual things you're living out in the moment day-by-day?

On this last point, I'll renew my recommendation toward *The Courage to Be Disliked* - it's not a Christian book, but very much addresses the fact that thinking backwards or forwards in life is ultimately a waste when we have to make real decisions with what we're going to do today. As I often tell people: *Your mission isn't what you write on a piece of paper to tell people what your priorities allegedly are; it's what you're actually doing with your time day-in and day-out, whether you consciously realize how you're spending your time or not.*

Overall, I do see that you're starting to "get it" here - but your final paragraph just seems like a restatement of what you had before with a couple words meant to appease a sentiment rather than fully grasping what the Bible is asking of you.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (04/15/24)

1 upvotes · 30 April 2024 · /r/RPChristians

She ... she ... she ... my wife ... she ... she

You're so hung up on what she thinks and how she behaves that you're not figuring out your own life. You're trying to manipulate her through sexual expression techniques. That's why it's not working.

Set aside some other reading material for a bit and go through the book: *The Courage to Be Disliked* by Ichiro Kishimi and Fumitake Koga. The audio book is on Spotify (not sure if you need premium or not; do the version with the tree on the cover). This will help you figure out what it means to operate in your own frame instead of hers. That's probably your biggest need right now, other than ...

Mission: To love and abide in Christ, being filled with joy and taking up ...

No, these are random excerpts of specific expectations. It's like you're trying as hard as you can to make yourself sound autistic in how you're approaching this. Christ had a clear mission for himself that he passed on to us: "make disciples of all nations." That's the mission.

To use his own terminology: our obligation is to produce fruit. Everything you listed are aspects of the fruit - the way it tastes, feels, what color it is, etc. In essence, if Jesus is planted in us, the fruit we produce into the world is more Christ - our fruit should look like that of the original from which we got our seed. But the PURPOSE or function of a fruit is to reproduce. The fruit is the reproductive organism of the tree that contains the seed that falls into the nearby soil to produce more of what was sown. I can flesh this out more, but I feel like you wrote all this just to yank my chain, so I'll just tell you plainly: your mission is to make disciples of all nations; all the stuff you listed are just examples of what a "disciple" looks like so you know what you're making.

Complaining and Comfort Tests

1 upvotes · 22 March 2024 · /r/RPChristians

Right. There's a reason I referenced comfort tests in the title and only used examples of her complaining about external things. If she's complaining about you, it's not a comfort test; it's a compliance test. Different test = different response. It's that simple.

For the most part, your approach is perfectly appropriate with regard to compliance/fitness tests. I'd recommend a more positive, teasing attitude in those more heated moments, but we all have our own style.

Sex Addicted v. Sex Starved

1 upvotes · 20 March 2024 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I'm sad to hear what all you've been going through there. I'm glad I've been able to give some sort of freedom in knowing you don't have a problem that most everyone else will try to project-diagnose you with. I'd encourage you to remain biblically grounded in your marital vows, but knowing that these things can definitely be turned around in time as you continue to work on yourself.

Dealing with ONEitis

1 upvotes · 20 March 2024 · /r/RPChristians

So glad it helped you, brother!

209 - Developing and Articulating Your Mission

1 upvotes · 20 March 2024 · /r/RPChristians

Thanks for sharing. Let me push back a bit:

to build close relationships and experience spiritual fulfillment

Will someone feeling close or fulfilled on earth make an eternal impact? Probably not. What's something you could do to change eternity? That will actually store up treasures in heaven? These are the questions that I started asking myself before realizing that it was painted all over Scripture: "Be fruitful and multiply" "I will make you fishers of men" "Your offspring will be as numerous as the stars in the sky" "Go and make disciples of all nations" "The one who produced 5/10 more was put in charge of 5/10 cities, but the one who didn't produce was cast out" "The fruitful branch will be pruned so that it will become more fruitful, but the branch with no fruit will be cut off and thrown into the fire" "The tree that doesn't produce fruit will be chopped down and thrown into the fire" "The vinedresser asked the master, 'Give me one more year to water and fertilize this tree so I can make it fruitful, and if after that year it doesn't produce fruit, then you can throw it into the fire, but if it does produce fruit, it will be well and good'" "[After judgment, in heaven] people from every tribe, tongue, and nation were worshiping at the feet of Christ."

Hopefully that gives some context. From Genesis 1 to Revelation 21, the whole of Scripture is all about spiritual reproduction and spreading God's image across the planet. Go make disciples. That's your mission. Don't settle for feel-good sentiments :)

201 - Healthy Sexual Desire v. Lust/Coveting

1 upvotes · 20 March 2024 · /r/RPChristians

I'd suggest doing a study on "guilt" in the bible. That should clear up how the Bible differentiates between what it means to be/feel "guilty" and what it means when it talks about godly sorrow, grief, etc., which are different concepts. If as a matter of modern linguistics, you use the word "guilty" when you really mean "sorrowful" or "full of grief," I'd be hesitant to impute that term onto Scripture.

I hope this clarifies.

201 - Healthy Sexual Desire v. Lust/Coveting

1 upvotes · 20 March 2024 · /r/RPChristians

I'd suggest doing a study on "guilt" in the bible. That should clear up how the Bible differentiates between what it means to be/feel "guilty" and what it means when it talks about godly sorrow, grief, etc., which are different concepts. If as a matter of modern linguistics, you use the word "guilty" when you really mean "sorrowful" or "full of grief," I'd be hesitant to impute that term onto Scripture.

I hope this clarifies.

201 - Healthy Sexual Desire v. Lust/Coveting

1 upvotes · 20 March 2024 · /r/RPChristians

I'd suggest doing a study on "guilt" in the bible. That should clear up how the Bible differentiates between what it means to be/feel "guilty" and what it means when it talks about godly sorrow, grief, etc., which are different concepts. If as a matter of modern linguistics, you use the word "guilty" when you really mean "sorrowful" or "full of grief," I'd be hesitant to impute that term onto Scripture.

I hope this clarifies.

Question about dating as a single Christian man who's looking for a Christian Woman in 2022

1 upvotes · 7 October 2022 · /r/RPChristians

Makes me wonder out of curiosity if these ugly or unattractive people are Christian simply because they're not desired by people for the most part, thus going to Church out of desperation or for personal comfort that they'd otherwise believe would not be needed if they were attractive?

Right. Isn't this the very heart of why Jesus says it's so hard for a rich person to enter the Kingdom of God? When people's lives are good, they don't feel the need for him. The reverse is also true: when people face rejection from the world, it's natural to turn to God, who won't reject them.

That doesn't make the Truth of God a lie or untrue just because it's more appealing to those who need it. It's common sense. Nobody goes to a lawyer or accountant who thinks they're doing fine on their own. That doesn't mean lawyers and accountants aren't real or that their work is unnecessary.

Doesn't sound like it. If they do exist, it seems that they're too few and far in-between from the way you're mentioning them.

Not at all. They exist in droves. They're just either (1) already married because they're attractive and got "snatched up" fairly quickly, or (2) unattractive and not in the social circles you'd consider "dateable," so you don't even bother to notice them. The women who are like this *AND SINGLE* are the ones who are few and far-between.

We used to tease the "2 of 3 Rule":

- Attractive
- Godly
- Good personality/mentally stable

If a woman has all 3, she's probably already taken (sometimes it's been the "3 of 4" and we add "single" to the list - if she has all the other 3, she's not single). The available women are likely lacking one of them. Pick which one you're willing to compromise on and you can probably *fairly easily* find a woman who meets the other two.

From there, the key is to remember that some traits are teachable. This is why we use the FAST acronym. If a woman (or potential disciple, more generally and out of the dating sphere) is Faithful, Available, Saved, and Teachable, you can instill virtually any other quality in them.

- If she lacks attractiveness, is it because she's overweight or doesn't dress to impress? If she's teachable, you can teach her how to lose weight or improve her wardrobe. If she's available, she'll give you the time and attention to figure this out. If she's faithful, she'll do it. (Saved is more a default reminder that you shouldn't be dating a non-Christian in the first place).
- If she lacks godliness, if she's teachable, she can learn how to be godly. If she's faithful, she'll implement it. If she's available, she'll devote the time necessary to continue growing in godliness.
- If she lacks a good personality, you can "teach" it to her, she will be "faithful" to applying what she learns, and she will be "available" to keep working on it.

If you have a FAST woman, you can instill virtually any quality in her. If you have a FAST disciple, you can instill virtually any quality in him. But here's the catch: **YOU also have to be FAST. People need a model to know what it looks like. That means YOU have to be Faithful, Available, Saved, and Teachable if you want to lead someone else in these qualities also - and you should express those qualities with the man who is discipling you, or if no one is available in your life to disciple you, you can express them in your own personal pursuit of God.** As Paul Tells Timothy, "Train yourself to be godly."

May I ask how young exactly? As in 22 years old at the oldest?

I know women in their 30s who are faithful to God, chaste, have great personality ... and are still single. 22 is not "the oldest." But it's just common knowledge that the older a woman gets:

- The more pressure she has to "find a spouse" because her biological clock for having children is ticking away. That means every year increases a woman's imperative to find someone, even if it means "settling" for "good, but not ideal" (ergo many divorces).
- The more her looks fade. Solomon says that "beauty is fleeting." Despite modern cosmetics, this is still a fact of life. Women inherently know that the older they get, the harder it will be for them to find a spouse. Younger women have little problem remaining single because they have lots of time. Women in their upper-20s and 30s feel more pressure to get married quickly as soon as the chance comes along, so the older you get the less single women there will be.
- The more opportunity she has to find someone. This is just common sense. What are the odds of finding a marriageable mate in 12 months? Low-to-mediocre. What are the odds of finding someone marriageable in a decade? Very high. The older a woman is, the more time she's had to find someone marriageable, so it makes sense that with every year of age there will be fewer single women who meet the characteristics you're looking for in a spouse.

... and the list goes on.

You mentioned they're new to the faith, but are there any who were raised by Traditional Catholics or nah?

I'm not Catholic, so probably not. Also, from what I'm aware of Catholic culture, that's probably another reason you're having a hard time ... but I really don't want to go into that, as that's a different can of worms than what you're asking about here.

I figured that they'd be taken up fast and possibly married with children as well. That makes it harder, but

I'm still up for the challenge. :)

It sounds as if you interpret the challenge as unicorn-hunting. This is the **WRONG** challenge. You **WILL** be sorely disappointed with your outcome if you make that your primary strategy for finding a spouse. The better strategy is to find someone who is **FAST**. There are a plethora of women with these qualities. Among them, build a relationship with the one you like the most. Ask her to grow alongside you toward improving the qualities she has that would keep you from thinking she's a unicorn. Give her the same call Paul gives us: "Follow me as I follow Christ" (1 Cor. 11:1). That could mean inviting her to spend time at the gym with you to take care of her body, if that's a problem. It could mean spending significant time in Bible study together, teaching her how to engage with and learn from God's Word (make sure you actually know what you're doing first!!!). It could mean spending time together meeting neighbors, strangers at the mall, etc. to practice social skills, if that's what's holding her back. Just always remember that you have to be willing and able to model for her in your own life what you expect her to follow in. Don't ever expect someone to follow you in an area that you haven't yourself figured out. As Jesus says, "No disciple is greater than her master." She can't learn from you skills or qualities that you don't also have. If you're obese, don't expect her to be thin for you. If you don't have daily quiet times, don't expect her to value time in God's Word either. If you don't pray, don't expect her to pray. If you don't dress nicely, don't expect her to dress nicely.

These are lessons I wish I'd learned sooner in my marriage. They're worked out now, for the most part, but my expectations were unrealistic to the actual dynamic I had with my wife and it was killing us. You're still single. Work on yourself now.

Are you saying that basically the attractive women who are actually devout Christians and not corrupted, egotistical and bordering on secularism/agnostic-atheism are unicorns and as such, don't exist? If so, then I'm at a loss of what to do now as I don't want to settle for less.

Not at all. I'm saying these woman **DO** exist. The attractive ones just aren't single. Take the word "attractive" out and you can add "single" back to the list. This is back to that 2 of 3 (or 3 of 4) rule again. While it's a flawed comparison, think about house-shopping. Some people want a house that's "move-in ready." Right? But houses like that are more expensive and usually go off the market extremely quickly. Most people have to settle for a house that has the structure they're looking for, but needs some work. This is the real nature of humanity: we all need some work. Even the "move-in ready" house wasn't "move-in ready" 3 months before it was on the market. The seller spent time fixing it up *TO GET IT* into "move-in ready" condition.

What I'm saying is: **you can't find unicorns in the world, but you can invest time, love, attention, skill, etc. into helping a non-unicorn become one, the same way we are not unicorns when Christ finds us - we're all imperfect sinners - but he invests his time, love, attention, skill, etc. to sanctify us into the type of bride he wants for himself.** That's the key in all of this.

Obviously I want to find a woman who'll grow in her faith alongside me, but she should already be humble and true to Christ when I meet her

I'd even remove humility from this list. If she is **FAST**, you can teach her humility. **FAST** are the criteria you're looking for.

Alpha or not, Idk if I'm capable of doing that, but I can try to.

"Alpha" is just a buzz word. Don't worry about that. Focus more on learning how to lead someone the way Christ leads up. This is part of that 5-fold discipleship model that we have in our sidebar: (1) Tell them what, (2) Show them how, (3) Let them try, (4) Send them out/keep them going, (5) Pass it on. If you're capable of these things (and I promise you are!) then you are capable of leading someone - as long as you actually exemplify the trait

you're trying to lead them in. If you expect them to live in a way that you don't, then you're just being a hypocrite at that point and you won't get very far.

I need to find a woman who's already drawn to the faith

Again, if she's FAST, this isn't a necessary criteria. Useful, absolutely. But not necessary. If you insist on criteria like this, be prepared to sacrifice in other areas. Focus more on leading someone into godliness than expecting them to have already arrived.

No, it's not okay.

1 upvotes · 12 August 2022 · /r/RPChristians

Psalm 1: 1-3. Psalm 119. John 17: 15-17

The word "abide" doesn't appear in any of these, so none of them are defining the word "abide" like the 1 John passage I quoted.

John 15

Two things here:

- **Us abiding in Christ and God's Word abiding in us are not reciprocal.** They are different concepts, each with distinct value. It says God's Word can abide in us, but it doesn't say that us abiding in Christ is meditating on his word. The concepts aren't necessarily reciprocal. It's like saying, "Food goes in your mouth" is reciprocal with, "Your mouth goes in food." Or treating "A husband enters his wife" as reciprocal with "a wife enters her husband." One makes sense, the reverse has an entirely different meaning. God's Word does abide in us and the result is that we bear fruit (i.e. doing God's work).
 - Sub-point: this passage says nothing about meditating on God's Word. It just says God's Word *can* abide in us.
- **This passage doesn't define abiding.** The 1 John 2 passage I quoted does specifically say what abiding entails. This one only uses the word as an instruction ("Abide in me, and I in you") or as a condition ("unless it abides in the vine" or "Whoever abides in me") without actually defining the word. This is much like reading "don't eat candy" and saying that's the definition of eating. It's not. You can't define eating from that sentence. Or it's like saying "Whoever eats candy will have rotten teeth" and then conclude that's the definition of candy. It's not. It's saying the effect of candy, but not what it is.

Now, if you are just here to cause trouble, this conversation is over. But if you have genuine insight that I'm missing here about how the Bible specifically defines the word "Abide" (or "μείνῃ" if you prefer), I'm happy to continue.

No, it's not okay.

1 upvotes · 11 August 2022 · /r/RPChristians

"whoever says he abides in him ought to walk in the same way in which he walked" ~1 John 2:6

God's work is *how* we abide in Christ - doing what Jesus did.

Smash The Overton Window

1 upvotes · 1 August 2022 · /r/RPChristians

I think the rendering of: "make disciples of all nations" is less clear than the Young's Literal Translation (which I recall you tend to appreciate) as "disciple all the nations" which makes clearer the object of the discipleship.

I do like the YLT :) That said, it's still not perfect. Here, we have two clear textual clues and one point of ambiguity that lead me to the opposite conclusion:

- Even the phrase "disciple all the nations" is, at best, ambiguous as to whether it's referencing intangible national entities or the people of that entity.
- The first real textual clue is that Mark gives a parallel account of the great commission that focuses on the fact of preaching the Gospel "to all the nations," which verbiage is preserved even in the YLT. While a national structure might exist and have a standing before God, it is still an intangible and cannot be preached to.
- Second, the actual word for "nations" is "ethnos," which usually refers to the Gentile people, generally, rather than to specific governmental units. In this, the great commission isn't understood as an instruction to "disciple Crete, Phillipi, Rome, and all those other countries" - it's more akin to: "disciple all the Gentiles." While the word has been used to reference actual intangible national structures, this is the minority use throughout Scripture and it would be a stretch to say, "The Bible only uses the word this way [say, for argument] 10% of the time, but that's definitely the particular use Jesus meant it in this one verse, not the 90% normative way it's used the rest of the time."

The rest is mostly nuance ...

So, to accomplish the macro goal of bringing all nations to kneel at the throne of God under the Lordship of Christ

That's the thing, though. An intangible organizational entity we call a "nation" doesn't actually kneel before God's throne, right? It doesn't have knees. Nations exist according to their organizational documents and are run according to the processes and systems in place to implement what their governing documents say. I always assumed that by "disciple the nations" you were implying: "Get each nation's constitution/founding documents aligned with God's will and conform the processes and systems to enact it."

If that's the framework, then I'd say we're just approaching the same spectrum from two different angles. I would still argue that manmade laws and organizational structures are trite and silly, but that they will eventually conform to God's will as a *PASSIVE* byproduct of individual discipleship. I have taken the assumption that you believe that conforming manmade laws and organizational structures *IS* the goal and that discipleship is just a means to get there.

the mission of the church is individual conversion via sharing the gospel

It's broader than mere evangelism, which is why Jesus adds, "teaching them to obey everything I have commanded you." I know the point may seem trite, as I'm sure you were speaking off the cuff, but it's quite significant given how the Church is so focused on making converts and completely undervalues any actual discipleship to help people grow into maturity. Lots of reasons for that, as your original post alludes to a few ... but the "evangelism-only" view is too massively widespread for me to ignore :p

Yet, once we begin to answer that question we've exited your position and have entered squarely into the "disciple all the nations" territory and begun to engage in theonomy.

We haven't exited my position at all. Discipling a teacher means showing him how to teach through a biblical world view. Discipling an electrician includes showing him how to do electrical work through a biblical worldview. Discipling a politician includes showing him how to lead a country from a biblical worldview. The career is never the primary focus, but it's still an essential component.

Another example. Say you moved to a small city in rural America and after a couple years every single person in the city professed faith in Christ. How should such a town be run? Do the elected officials and various other officers get any clues from Scripture, or is it just left entirely up to man how to govern righteously? I would argue that God has given extensive (though not exhaustive) guidance on how He wishes His people to be governed, and it doesn't look much like what we see in most places today.

Right. Those are great questions to ask. But implementing something like this is back to, as you said earlier, working through the micro to even get close to the macro. We don't begin with "let's reform the constitution" and find we have de minimis support for it. Instead, we begin with, "Let's get as many people following Christ as possible" *SO THAT* we can get to the critical mass of people who are ready, equipped, and sufficient to enact actual change. Further, once we have that critical mass, we will have, by all laws of probabilities, brought in so many people who are able to contribute to the "how should nations be run?" discussion than even we are that there would be even better end-results than if we were to attempt it now based on the very few of us who are actually playing in that arena in the first place. Plus, we'd have a network of actual laypeople to support the structure, rather than trying to create a kingdom of politicians.

In all, I think we're pretty aligned with the practice of what needs to be done and the actual disagreements are primary intellectual-only. Those differences may shape the aspects of our faith that we spend most of our free-time learning about and developing, but we're both still on board that the best way we can, individually, advance God's Kingdom is to (1) spread the Gospel, (2) raise up the immature believers, and (3) bring those who refuse to embrace Christ into subjugation to his will. Political structure is, perhaps, most directly tied to this third point. While politics certainly impacts the other two, the biblical example shows that they can be accomplished with great, thriving success even in an entirely hostile political climate.

Smash The Overton Window

1 upvotes · 30 July 2022 · /r/RPChristians

Agreed. The issue is that the righteousness aspect, from a population perspective, is subjective, whereas form is objective. To a nonchristian, killing babies is he righteous thing to do, to ours/God's it's "unthinkable." The objectivity of righteousness (which is arguable, even from a Christian standpoint) won't be made clear to anyone until judgment day.

From there, the best thing people know to do is to argue for a form of governance that is most likely to achieve the brand of "righteousness" they prefer. This can either be true form (monarchy, dictator, republic, democracy, etc.) or soft form (how the prevailing system will be implemented through their preferred party/candidate/persons of influence).

No, it's not okay.

1 upvotes · 26 July 2022 · /r/RPChristians

Eh, I don't agree with a lot of what I read either. It's not an offense issue. It's just common-sense that you have to filter the good from the bad when you read anything on the internet.

BPD wife - I need a miracle from God

1 upvotes · 21 April 2022 · /r/RPChristians

Bud = marijuana? That doesn't mean anything anymore. If she's on marijuana and you're on meth, you're going to get hammered and they'll overlook her use. Marijuana isn't a concern to most courts anymore, for the most part. If that's your trump card on her, you've got nothing.

I think you're overestimating the significance of T-levels, especially if you're naturally within normal ranges anyway. It sounds to me like you've been drinking the kool-aid with all the "low-T" scare that goes around on certain RP subs.

BPD wife - I need a miracle from God

1 upvotes · 20 April 2022 · /r/RPChristians

Eh. 1 Cor. 7 says if you separate it should be "for a short time" and for the purpose of prayer. I don't personally believe long-term separations are "biblical," even though I embrace them as a pragmatic necessity in the same way that divorce was never "biblical" even in the case of cheating, but Moses deemed it a pragmatic necessity anyway ("because of the hardness of your hearts Moses issued certificates of divorce").

Very Basic "2-2 Dinner Party" Social Skills

1 upvotes · 8 March 2022 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Hah. I'm so confused.

Abstinence till marriage (Advice/Discussion)

1 upvotes · 23 February 2022 · /r/RPChristians

there's nothing you've done other than look butt hurt over nothing

/u/redpill-cool is testing your frame. You're failing the test in your responses. This is something you'll learn over time. He insults me this way too. Everyone, in fact. It's his thing. Annoying as it is, it serves a purpose. But yes, he needs to figure out better discretion on when to apply this strategy and not.

I took a dose of finasteride to see how the body would respond. The drug has irreversibly emasculated my brain.

1 upvotes · 23 February 2022 · /r/RPChristians

Nah, I just like him for his musically-gifted brain. Jeremy Jordan, on the other hand ...

I took a dose of finasteride to see how the body would respond. The drug has irreversibly emasculated my brain.

1 upvotes · 23 February 2022 · /r/RPChristians

Musicals?

You intentionally trying to bait me? Haha

Fixing Your OYS - Your Life Will Keep Sucking Until You Read and Apply This Post

1 upvotes · 9 February 2022 · /r/RPChristians

Hot, sweaty, and fast paced.

Fixing Your OYS - Your Life Will Keep Sucking Until You Read and Apply This Post

1 upvotes · 1 February 2022 · /r/RPChristians

I have. Did the weight start coming on when you had your first kid? That's when all mine began. Once you have kids it gets way harder to keep it off.

Sales and Discipleship

1 upvotes · 31 January 2022 · /r/RPChristians

37, actually.

FR: Spank your wife.

1 upvotes · 24 November 2021 · /r/MarriedRedPill

But not to a woman with a HVM. She thinks she's disappointing me.

I remember when this shift happened. Crap used to happen to her and somehow I was to blame ever single time. A few months later, crap happens to her and suddenly she's not good enough for me. Large-scale shift from fitness tests to comfort tests as her primary operating dynamic (not to say the former don't still come, but it's not the same framework).

Truth be told, I've never actually ventured into spanking. This post makes me interested to try, but purely because you said:

I get nothing out of spanking my wife. She doesn't particularly like it either, at least in the previous context I've done it until now.

We're still in the "I don't care for it, she doesn't like it" phase and I'm not sure if our relational dynamic (not being 24/7 Ds like yours is) would get the same result.

I'm curious how much of this could be tied to childhood conditioning of punishment being associated with resolution of failures. For example, my kids have been known to punish themselves at times, or get upset when I don't punish them when they know they've been bad. Internally, when they know they've done wrong the punishment satiates their guilt or other self-defeatist feelings. It's closure. I can easily see some women still being in this context - "I feel like a failure, but there's no daddy to punish me anymore." Cue Big Daddy instead of Old Daddy, let the spankings roll, and suddenly those failures and disappointments have now been resolved through the punishment she received, so all is well in the world again. Maybe?

What's the end-goal?

1 upvotes · 5 November 2021 · /r/RPChristians

Indeed.

Sexual needs in deadbedroom

1 upvotes · 14 October 2021 · /r/RPChristians

I would not discourage seculars from posting here when the issues about our faith. We know the truth of Scripture. Better for a person to get biblical truth than secular speculation of the truth, however close it may be to actual truth.

Reading through the guide and having some trouble, can someone help me out?

1 upvotes · 14 October 2021 · /r/RPChristians

Top sprinters lift weights.

Distance runners too. My old cross country coach used to emphasize that hill-running had a significant influence from abs and pecs. I'm not sure exactly how he came to that conclusion, but at the time the articles he showed us made a lot of sense.

Reading through the guide and having some trouble, can someone help me out?

1 upvotes · 14 October 2021 · /r/RPChristians

justify replacing it with a ~~lesser~~ lazier variant

FTFY

I loved the 2022 Toyota Prius

1 upvotes · 29 September 2021 · /r/RPChristians

I would guess XLE or Limited.

I loved the 2022 Toyota Prius

1 upvotes · 29 September 2021 · /r/RPChristians

Pretty good. You?

Christian Plate Spinning (Part 2)

1 upvotes · 7 August 2021 · /r/RPChristians

Isaac is an anomaly. That's a bad example to look to.

Anyone want to explain how this post is right/wrong? And in what ways? I'm new to RP and still learning what it's all about...

1 upvotes · 7 August 2021 · /r/RPChristians

So many that the joke is quite tired ☹️

The Polarizing, Yet Equable and Rational Male

1 upvotes · 5 August 2021 · /r/MarriedRedPill

It took me way too long to get back to this.

Question is, what is the proper course of conduct? That which satisfies how he wants to live? Or that which gives him the results he wants?

That's for him to decide. And I think this is the thrust of what you're saying, with the caveat that some (most?) people don't know enough about themselves yet to make an informed decision. In that case, they have to explore to figure out who they are before they can begin to prioritize things like personal character and integrity v. results-based living.

The big questions then are: The way you behave, are you exploring? Is she exploring? ... Or are you both following rules that neither of you made...or even like? And if you are, is that rational?

Those last three words are the clincher, and it's one of the reasons that true "off the deep end" alphas are the epitome alphas. They don't even care if it's rational because "being rational" to them is just another one of those "rules" that someone tries to thrust on them.

I do think you're spot on, though, that people need to deviate from the box and challenge the things they're

taught. While a biblical example may not resonate well with you, it's one of the reasons I love Acts 17:11 so much - "Now the Bereans were more noble than the Thessalonians because they received the message with great eagerness and examined the Scriptures every day to see if what Paul said was true."

Here we have the apostle Paul - literally the greatest preacher ever to live after Jesus himself, who singularly wrote more than half of the New Testament in the Bible and was endorsed by all of the apostles who had actually been with Jesus - and the Bereans are being commended for challenging what he said rather than just taking his word for it.

If people would learn to challenge the paradigms in their own lives and explore new options (and yes, I've even done that with my own faith on a number of occasion, though always coming back to it), they'd be far more equipped to figure out the answers to the very important questions you're asking.

Christian Plate Spinning (Part 2)

1 upvotes · 5 August 2021 · /r/RPChristians

I completely agree with you on the benefits of having children early. That was one of my goals and I succeeded in it - all of my children will be 18 by the time I turn 50, when I intend to retire.

That said, on a purely marital level (excluding the parental), I've seen so many guys who have found "a high quality attractive woman" who 5 years later turns out to be AWALT anyway and the guy was just too young to see through his emotions, creating a halo effect around her and everything she does. So, I question the judgment of these low-20s men who are marrying - and that applies to me just as much as anyone, as I had missed a lot of warning signs that I am certain I'd pick up on if I were just getting started with someone today at age 36.

Christian Plate Spinning (Part 2)

1 upvotes · 5 August 2021 · /r/RPChristians

While technically correct, a lot can be said about pre-marital processes by looking at what the Scriptures say about how Christ drew his bride to himself prior to his union with the Church or the Spirit's indwelling us as "one." So, I don't think it's fair to say that the Bible doesn't have anything to say about pre-marriage processes. It may not say it directly, but it shows it. Watch what they do, not (just) what they say.

My Daughters Rules for Dating My Daughter.

1 upvotes · 8 April 2021 · /r/RPChristians

supposedly it's a Christian environment, but several of these kids seem to be hellions when mom and dad aren't around

That's how it was when I was in high school. The local Catholic school was known for being far more morally bankrupt than the public school - drugs, sex, violence, etc. The teachers were fine, but it forced the parents into the dynamic of: (1) pay lots of money to get biblical teachers, but highly corrupting peers, or (2) get unbiblical teaching with still-corrupting-but-less-so peers. I did it both ways and found my peers had more influence over my beliefs than my teachers, and the peers at my public school were better influences on me than at the Lutheran school I'd attended before that.

Her interpretation seems to be 'he just wanted sex' which has, again, gotten her mad and again she's doubling up on her convictions.

Kind of like the opposite end: "She doesn't want sex, she just wants commitment from me," and he goes into the RP anger phase.

I knew this conversation was going to be a little awkward, but we also got into the discussion about relationships, sex, and what a circus it can be

Ironically, I just had the conversation with my son (9) yesterday about those exact things, including my crazy ex. Fun times. It ended with my son asking me to disciple him (as if I wasn't already, haha! - it's just easier to make it more formal now).

Another discussion was that any date is at her pleasure, so if she wants to call it off for any reason, she's entitled to that.

I'm curious: if we were in a society that did things predominantly through arranged marriages by the parents, would you still agree with this statement?

It occurs to me that if the answer is "no, that would be different," then this is a standard born from cultural lenses rather than a biblical standard. Not to say that's a bad thing. But this whole post begs the question: where is the biblical foundation for whether your daughter's standards are healthy and appropriate or not?

Obviously the Bible isn't going to be so blunt as to say, "Thou shalt have your father present at all pre-marital interactions with a suitor." But what are, at least, the principles drawn on here?

Announcement: Red Pill Christians will now exclusively be a male only space

1 upvotes · 25 March 2021 · /r/RPChristians

Good point. Consider it done.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (03/17/21)

1 upvotes · 22 March 2021 · /r/RPChristians

Ah, I think I see things more clearly now. I agree with this.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (03/17/21)

1 upvotes · 21 March 2021 · /r/RPChristians

The original context you mentioned was: "the party signing receives no benefit under the contract." In this contract you are receiving a benefit: you're getting a month-to-month tenancy.

Yes, the circumstances you're describing could certainly result in a conclusion of duress. Writing "VC" won't do anything in court other than notify the court that you believed you were under duress at the time of signing the agreement. In this case, the court would take testimony about the circumstances, weigh the evidence, and if it believed you actually were under duress, it would void the contract. If it did not, it would uphold the contract, despite your personal belief that it was issued under duress.

I believe in every state any marking that you make on a signature line that is intended to induce someone else to uphold their end of the agreement is considered a valid signature, whether you use your name or you sign it "The Easter Bunny" or "ABCDEFGF."

I believe you previously stated that in court if you were asked if that was your signature you could just say "no," which would be technically honest. But any attorney - even crappy ones - is going to be smart enough to ask the follow-up question: "Did you write this marking on that line?" At that point you're going to have to decide whether or not you'll lie and say you didn't (i.e. "being dishonest" as /u/Proper_Screen alluded to) or fess up and be back on the same legal path as if you'd signed your own name.

I think what this all comes down to is that you believe you've found some loop hole in the law that isn't actually there. Yes, it can be wise to note your belief of duress. But that isn't binding on how a judge will rule on your

case down the road. It only gives you a piece of evidence to work with.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (03/17/21)

1 upvotes · 21 March 2021 · /r/RPChristians

If the party signing receives no benefit, then just don't sign. There is no such thing as a unilateral contract.

The notion of "imbalanced power" in the creation of a contract doesn't void a contract. What it does is creates a presumption that the contract should be interpreted in the manner most favorable toward the person who had no power in its creation. That's the proper remedy. I've never heard of a case where a contract was thrown out based on a "disparity of power." I think what you may be referring to are unconscionable contracts, which are a different beast altogether - and those can be thrown out when it's clear that the terms are so usurious that they are objectionable on their face.

But the bigger issue is my own judgement. In the court of my own conscience

Sure. But we were talking about the governmental law, right? If we go that direction, then we open up a whole new aspect to the conversation. To that, I'd just quote 1 Cor. 4 - "I care very little if I am judged by you or any other human court. I do not even judge myself. My conscience is clear, but that does not make me innocent. It is the Lord who judges me."

OYS - Where Progress is Made (03/17/21)

1 upvotes · 20 March 2021 · /r/RPChristians

I'm familiar with the concept, but it's mostly an urban myth. No statutory or case law has adopted this. All it does is create a statement of belief in the moment. But no court will automatically assume that your belief in that moment was accurate. Many people claim they're under duress when they're not. So, what you're really doing is saying: "I reserve the right to claim I was under duress at the time of signing this document." But that statement is true even when you don't put VC, so the value is minimal.

At best, it creates a "present sense impression" exemption to hearsay, which would be relevant if someone not involved in the court action were the one to have signed it. But because anyone involved in the action giving testimony is generally immune to hearsay about their own statements, the way the document was signed is going to be admissible either way. But the burden of proving duress still exists on the party making the claim, and putting "VC" doesn't prove it any more than standing up in court 10 years later and saying "I was under duress back then" proves it.

In short: I've heard of this myth, but have never once heard of a case where it was upheld without other independent proof of duress that would have been sufficient to make the claim even in the absence of the "VC" signature.

Why Lifting is Not a Suggestion

1 upvotes · 19 March 2021 · /r/RPChristians

Haha, touche.

Why God Doesn't Love You.

1 upvotes · 20 February 2021 · /r/RPChristians

Because lots of people struggling through the issues I'm addressing will say to themselves, "Because God hasn't fixed this issue yet, He must not love me."

Can Christians pirate? Christians *should* pirate

1 upvotes · 18 February 2021 · /r/RPChristians

This subject has nothing to do with the red pill. Way to be a sore sport about your post being removed.

Can Christians pirate? Christians **should** pirate

1 upvotes · 18 February 2021 · /r/RPChristians

Post removed. Surprise!

This isn't the right forum for this type of question. A buddy of mine has a post on the [r/TrueChristian](#) sidebar about "Is this sin? Is that sin?" type posts. I agree with it. Go read it and realize why you wasted all that time worrying this post unless you have a good answer to [u/TheInventor49](#)'s question.

Why God Doesn't Love You.

1 upvotes · 17 February 2021 · /r/RPChristians

"There's something so attractive about a person whose confidence is in the Lord,"

That's so, so true ... if he also has pecs and abs.

Contextually, I don't think John 12:32 (not 13:32) applies, but I get your point all the same. I'd just want to be cautious to avoid the "godliness is sexy" fallacy - or even the concept that a man can "confidence" his way into respect and authority without other supporting traits. I know countless men who have an alpha DNGAF degree of laser-focus on Kingdom-building who otherwise cannot make progress because other aspects of their lives are not up to par. There are some initial gut-checks that people give where they won't stick around long enough to see your good qualities if your bad qualities are too at the forefront.

Should things be this way? I don't know. Maybe. Maybe not. But the reality is that they are. And I don't think this is what you're saying, but in isolation without the caveat, it can have that effect so I'm writing this for clarity sake anyway: **You still have to lift, sidebar, STFU, etc. if you want to figure out how to earn influence with others, even if you already have an A+ game on your confidence and devotion to a godly mission.** I am living proof of that.

Backwards sexual dynamic?

1 upvotes · 16 February 2021 · /r/RPChristians

Unlocked.

Christian Marriage is not a good sub for young men looking for direction

1 upvotes · 13 February 2021 · /r/RPChristians

You can mention it and even outright complain about it. Just make sure you do it in a way that adds value to the people of this sub. Whining just to whine isn't value-add.

Wife took out loan against my will

1 upvotes · 25 January 2021 · /r/RPChristians

Another one of your big weaknesses is making compromises.

Book Notes: When To Walk Away, by Gary Thomas

1 upvotes · 25 January 2021 · /r/RPChristians

Good to know. I'll pass on the referral to my in-laws. Is it biblically based or secular?

LJBF Continued

1 upvotes · 25 January 2021 · /r/askRPC

Part of me wants to ...

Everything from this point on shows just how far in her frame you are. All those "reading more and more RP content" hasn't gotten you very far yet. Get back to it, brother.

Also, what could be some reasons that she is texting me?

I'm going to go with: an alien crash landed in her back yard and asked for you by name, but told her not to tell you about it. Seriously, it could be anything. Why bother wasting a single thought on this?

Book Notes: When To Walk Away, by Gary Thomas

1 upvotes · 25 January 2021 · /r/RPChristians

It seems to me that Jesus specifically cites "wife" instead of "spouse."

Right. It's probably worth noting that Jesus didn't say "divorce" in this passage, although he's used the word elsewhere. In fact, I imagine he's specifically *not* talking about divorce, given that Peter - who did not divorce his wife to follow Jesus - is the one who said, "We have left all we had to follow you!" as the statement to which Jesus is replying. He's giving Peter an assurance: "Yes, you have. And I have noticed and you will be rewarded with eternal life for that choice."

how does a wife, who is called to be submissive, be a helpmeet and to 'win her husband without a word, reconcile leaving a 'toxic' marriage?

I believe this is the concept that I was referencing in my summary when I said: "and also has a generally unbiblical view about how freely he encourages divorce from a 'toxic' spouse."

In this situation, he never quite says it, but heavily implies that he's adding "having a toxic spouse" as a ground for divorce. In the book he insinuates that this would still be sin, but it's a preferable sin over letting a toxic spouse distract you from God's calling on your life.

I have made similar comments in the vein of remarriage before. I've repeatedly stated that remarriage after divorce is always sin, but that sometimes it's a preferable sin over having sex outside of marriage if you're constantly in situations where you can't control yourself. In that case, go get remarried. Yeah, it's an inaccurate reflection of God's character to the world to do this, but rampant fornication would also be an even worse reflection.

As for what an individual wife needs to do in an individual situation - leave or stay - I'd treat that decision ad hoc. I don't want to set out a broadly applicable rule when the Romans 14:14, 23 dynamic is going to be essential to that analysis, which is unique to the individual as compared with other issues.

The most broad things I could say is that if your spouse truly is a "toxic" person, the best strategy isn't to walk away, but do as the author refrains a number of times throughout the book: *Let them be the one to walk away from you*. In the case of a wife, this is more difficult when part of what God has set out for you includes respecting and helping such a man. In Jesus' culture women weren't even allowed to divorce their husbands. If they wanted him gone, they had to act so vile to make him divorce them - which would certainly be sinful on another level entirely. In this, I can't say that there's any situation where a woman could "walk away" from her husband (divorce, legal separation, or otherwise) without it being sin of some sort, except perhaps as Paul offers in 1 Cor. 7 - that it's by mutual consent and only for a short time for the purpose of prayer. Whether that sin is

worse than alternatives or not is, again, an ad hoc issue.

Could you give a couple of more tangible examples to define what 'toxic' versus 'difficult' looks like in a marriage?

I wrote this post until 4:30am because I knew I'd be passing the book on to someone else the next day, so I don't have it in front of me. The key to remember in all of this is that the Bible never uses the word "toxic" in the way the author does. So, trying to differentiate between "toxic" and "difficult" isn't a biblical line - it's just one that the author draws for the purpose of convenience to prevent people from assuming the book applies to their situation when it doesn't.

Personally, I'd suggest a marital situation is merely difficult and does not rise to the level of toxicity until it starts involving a consistent pattern (i.e. not isolated incidents, or once-a-year infrequency) of behavior that involves constant threats of divorce, suicidal ideation, "I'm going to take the kids," calling the cops, false allegations, etc. used in an effort to get the other person to conform his/her behavior **OR** that the pattern of behavior is so severe that an otherwise healthy person on the other end begins suffering from persistent mental health disorders (PTSD, anxiety, panic attacks, etc.) as a consequence of the first person's conduct, even if it doesn't involve those types of threats.

Of course, that's me being a lawyer and using a standard that I wish the courts would employ rather than the loosey-goosey standards that are actually in place in many jurisdictions. Of course, even this has to be a little bit of an *ad hoc* determination in the sense that someone might be uniquely prone to mental health problems, so even "difficult, but non-toxic" behaviors could set them off. In that case, the other person isn't necessarily toxic as much as they are just dealing with someone who is extremely sensitive to any form of hostility at all - even reasonable or normal levels.

Toxicity could also be defined by intent. A "difficult" marriage could be two people who mean well, but a "toxic" one involves one spouse (or even both toward each other) who, thinking primarily of themselves, just wants to use the other person for their own feel-good results. Even if their expression of this is minimal, you still have a "toxic" individual who is just controlled/restrained in their toxicity - but it could explode at any moment, so watch out. Such people rarely think of themselves as self-centered; rather, the scale of self-centered-or-not doesn't even register to them because that's not a thing they think or care about.

Here are two real examples from people I know:

- *Example 1:* Bob and Sue fight all the time. They both want to make their marriage work, but lack the skills to pull it off. As a result, they frequently threaten divorce to each other, even though their commitment to Christ still holds them together. Their weekly threats of divorce are an expression of their frustration in the situation, not a manipulative effort to get the other side to change. This is NOT a toxic relationship but a difficult one.
- *Example 2:* Jimbo and Kristiana have broken up and gotten back together several dozen times in the last 5 years. Often-times these break-ups correlate with time-frame that would be personally advantageous. But for the most part, each break-up is treated as a way for one or the other to get out of having any obligation to the other. This is a toxic relationship because the behavior is manipulative toward the other for personal gain and without significant regard for the impact on the other person.

But again, this is not a biblical line. It's just one that I'd draw for my own purposes when working with people. And I reserve the right to change it as I learn and grow, especially given that "toxic" is not a category that I'd ever thought of before reading this book, as it was always more of just a generic adjective in obvious situations where it would apply.

You could argue that a spouse is living in unrepentant sin with controlling behavior and a wife is responding

in a self-toxic way by overcompensating for the sake of submission, what I believe wives are called to do according to scripture. Where is the line drawn when a spouse should leave the toxic behavior?

Yes, there is room for that argument. But this is where I would veer away from the "toxic" line and look more to a "biblical" line, which the author seems to abandon when he writes the section on marriage. He goes with philosophical thinking absent theological conclusions on the matter.

As a pragmatic matter, he's right. When I talk about the proper theological conclusion, I assume the wife in the scenario you gave is *capable* of living it out. This might not be the reality. If she lacks the "peace that transcends all understanding" in the midst of her husband's sinful conduct, she might emotionally burst in an even more destructive way if she is not given a pragmatic (however sinful it may be) solution, which I think is what the author has in mind when he wrote this chapter. He seems to know it's wrong, but he tells people to do it anyway because leaving room only for the "theologically correct" conclusion would be about as useful as someone asking Jesus how to get into heaven and him answering, "Be perfect, as your heavenly father is perfect." Yes, Jesus gave that command - but not for the purpose of actually expecting them to be capable of this; rather, it was to show them that the bar is so high that they can't possibly live up to it.

Book Notes: When To Walk Away, by Gary Thomas

1 upvotes · 24 January 2021 · /r/RPChristians

The book addresses this. But like you, I didn't find much value in a bunch of quotes identifying what qualifies a toxic, so I left most of that out.

Anything You Can Do I Can Do Better.

1 upvotes · 22 January 2021 · /r/RPChristians

Interesting. Got a link?

Anything You Can Do I Can Do Better.

1 upvotes · 22 January 2021 · /r/RPChristians

Read the sidebar. The discord link is there.

Also, what type of fiction do you write? I write fiction (and non-fiction) as well - a fun hobby, though I've never really pursued being published.

How to prevent or assess sexual incompatibility in a potential wife?

1 upvotes · 26 December 2020 · /r/askRPC

Is that a dig or a legit question?

How to prevent or assess sexual incompatibility in a potential wife?

1 upvotes · 26 December 2020 · /r/askRPC

Solid. I don't think this guy actually wants to engage, though. He's just looking for a platform to share his thoughts and self-validate by deluding himself into thinking he's "winning" some debate.

How to prevent or assess sexual incompatibility in a potential wife?

1 upvotes · 25 December 2020 · /r/askRPC

If she married you purely because of your personality

Nah, she married me because she was told by the church all her life: "Find the most spiritually mature man you

can and marry him." She commented at one point that she regretted it and found it to be horrible advice. She's fortunate that "spiritual maturity," if it continues in biblicality, *should* inevitably lead to RP-ness and thus development of attraction, eventually. At least that's how my story went.

they aren't exclusive to lifting

Sure, just like reading the Bible isn't the exclusive way to become spiritually mature. But it's the most efficient way and it'd be darn hard without it.

However this sub is highly obsessed with lifting

We're not obsessive about it. But if a guy is asking, "My wife won't have sex with me because I told her I didn't want her to get a tattoo, what should I do?" and he weighs 300lbs, there's a good chance the tattoo issue isn't the actual problem in their sex life.

When you date a girl, there are going to be certain things you'll want to filter out right away. Correct? That's part of vetting. In the first date or two you're going to want to figure out if she has any serious mental health problems, for example. Does that mean you're obsessed about mental health? No. It just means that's one of those early filters you have to go through before you can get down to business. Lifting is like that. It's an early filter that gives us context for all the other important things that come afterward. Yes, it's massively important. But the fact that you have to post your stats isn't to glorify body building - it's to help us vet people for actual problems before wasting our time answering a question that isn't actually going to solve their problems.

Doing a sport consistently will also give you a reasonable physique

Sure. And if you're getting the results you want with that, then go with that. But this conversation has come up MANY times on this sub. Runner/swimmer builds, for example, simply don't compare with the stats on how women are attracted to guys who lift. For that matter, virtually every major professional athlete you see lifts. Football. Basketball. Baseball. You name it. They all lift. It's how you excel at a particular sport. So if you look at professional basketball players and think, "I can have that body just by playing basketball and never lifting," that's straight up foolishness.

RPC aims for maximalizing looks

Funny word. Again, "maximizing looks" is just shifting from hard mode to easy mode. It's the low hanging fruit that makes everything else far more readily achievable. If you don't want to do it, or you go for a pure cardio body build, and she keeps fitness testing you because she can't glean "This man is hella strong!" from your appearance so she has to get it from your frame ... well, then don't complain and say, "Nothing's working!" But if it IS working for you, then do what works.

Personally, I lift big numbers. At one point I was benching 315, squatting 365, and DL 415. Post-COVID a bit down from those, but still way above most people. Yet my diet isn't that great. I don't have a 6-pack. My muscles, while dense and large, are broadly undefined through my skin. But I get the results I want and I don't feel the need to fast 50% of my days just to get my body fat below 12%. Instead, I hover between 15-18%, depending on the month. Take what works and leave the rest.

If bodybuilding was less emphasized

Let me explain this another way. In my profession, I see psychologists using the MMPI2 in literally EVERY. SINGLE. EVALUATION. EVER. It's basically malpractice to fail to do it. Yet I also find most psychologists saying, "I really don't care for the MMPI all that much, and I don't use it in formulating my opinions of a person very often." How can that be?

The answer I get when I ask why everyone has to do it is simple: "Because it addresses major psychological issues. I give the MMPI to rule those out, and then I move on to the more nuanced things that matter." But if the MMPI DID find a personality disorder, for example ... well, that's going to be a major aspect to their evaluation process. If there's something that major and defining to a situation, wouldn't you want to know it up-front? Does that mean you're obsessed with the metric? Of course not.

But the reality is that the vast majority of men in the world DO NOT have an attractive physique. They want to find some miracle attitude that will let them be obese and yet still have girls pining over them. That's just not going to happen.

my claim was simply that RPC puts a very big emphasis on maximalizing looks - making it critical.

So, let's flip things for a second. Explain to me why this is a bad or harmful thing. Maybe it's not to your taste/preference. But tell me how men will be worse off in life when encouraged to take better care of their bodies?

And I am sad to hear that you have such a low opinion about [r/TrueChristian](#) or most likely about "non red pillled" christians.

I'm hard on TC because I'm one of the most respected members over there - been around for a decade (maybe more?) and have considerable influence on that sub. As such, I have high expectations of it, knowing the effort I've put in to helping build up the community - and it times it seems to be going strong. But at other times, there are just so many liberals as an overflow from [r/christianity](#) that it's disheartening. With a handful of exceptions, I've taken about the last year off from there, coming back in spurts when I'm needed. I love TC deeply, but the fact that its cultural force is so heavily ingrained with a churchianity mentality often makes it more of a time-sink than it is a good investment.

Matchmaker, matchmaker, make me a match

1 upvotes · 21 December 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

At finding a wife, agreed. But by skipping online connections, he's losing out on a lot of silver-plate improvements that can be made to his social game along the way. Sure, "the hard way" will usually net the better result, but why ignore the easy gains to focus exclusively on the hard way?

Redpilled Christian marriage and pregnancy-bodies

1 upvotes · 19 December 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

no one has been able to give you an answer to your legitimate question about how to maintain sexualized attraction to your pregnant wife

Because you can't negotiate attraction. You can't will it into existence. We are biologically wired in ways that are beyond our power. As [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) occasionally says, if Rosie O'Donnell were your wife, there's nothing she could do to make you spontaneously horny for her. She might be able to get you worked up into it with serious effort, but no matter how great her lingerie or haircut is, you're not going to drop your pants the minute she walks in the room.

Now, in the reverse it's not quite as true. There are more things a man can do to cause a woman to be sexually attracted to him beyond rote physical appearance. But from the perspective of men looking at women - I have yet to ever hear an answer, and this question has been brought up many times on this sub in various forms. Nobody has ever come to a conclusion. So, until someone finds that magic wand, I'm going to operate on the premise that it doesn't exist.

How long did you wait till the next pregnancy?

1 upvotes · 18 December 2020 · /r/askRPC

At one point my wife and I had kids who were 0, 2, 3, and 5 years old - 4 kids who were 5 and under. I wanted kids close together (1) so they could play with each other and (2) because one of my life goals was to have all my kids turn 18 by the time I'm 50, facilitating early retirement at that point. Yes, there are aspects where this is more difficult, but I am extremely glad we did it this way.

What do you want to see covered on the Red Pill Christians podcast?

1 upvotes · 18 December 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Anecdotes about disciplining

Did you actually mean disciplining or really mean discipling?

OYS - Where Progress is Made (12/16/20)

1 upvotes · 17 December 2020 · /r/RPChristians

OYS - 12/16/20

PHYSICAL: This is my "feasting" time of year. I'm doing a better job controlling the food intake than I have in past years, but definitely feel the tension between all the celebrations (not just holidays, numerous birthdays as well) and fitness goals. Still hitting the gym, but I remember after a single bowl of chili feeling like I was going to vomit with every deadlift. Lifting is on track, though. I lowered my weights to go for higher reps, so currently doing 225 bench, 300 dl, 275 squat, 165 ohp, 155 row. Sex is great right now. Wife still responding to initiation. She's asking to try new things, giving more and clearer openings to initiate. I'm finding that some things might look hot externally, but just aren't as enjoyable when you actually do it.

MENTAL: Constantly learning and growing. More so this week than past weeks. I've set aside more time for reading, and am actually engaging on reddit again, after having to take a few months off.

EMOTIONAL: Work is starting to stabilize again, though I have a case that I just started that's going to stretch me soon. Fortunately, I'm bringing in a buddy to help me with it, which should take a lot of the pressure off, as he'll be primary, but if all goes well I could make bank and he does most of the work ;)

SPIRITUAL: - 7 basics: AoS 10, QT 6, BS 9, SM 4, Prayer 3, Fellowship 8, Evangelism 6. I'm hovering in the 4-6 range on too many. I need to pick to set it aside or give it more attention rather than trying to play the field. I'm less effective and grow less when I'm spread too thin and not balancing better. - Mission: Going great. Disciples are being made. I've connected with 3 new people who I expect could evolve into discipleship relationships over the next month or so if I wanted, though I'm not sure how much more I can add to my plate at this point. I may keep it casual and see where things go.

IMPROVEMENT: Dieting, better balance in spiritual disciplines.

The Church

1 upvotes · 16 December 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Jesus sang a psalm

Cool, in that same meal he also called Peter "you Satan" in rebuke. So let's make sure we incorporate into every single weekly meeting harsh rebukes against those who aren't submitting to Jesus properly.

Ephesians 5:19, Colossians 3:16, James 3:5

Right. Nobody is saying "don't sing songs!" But are you really telling me Paul intended these passages to be a how-to manual for weekly meetings? More specifically: James' example references singing as a personal expression of cheer, not corporately. Paul's examples both connect the singing with admonishment of sin toward one another.

1 Corinthians 14:26

Yep, it also assumes revelations are being shared, tongues are spoken, interpretations are given. Are you suggesting that we must mandate that all of these happen every single week too? Of course not, because the next verse says: "IF anyone speaks in a tongue." If. Paul didn't expect these things to happen at every meeting.

Also, the passage says "each of you has ..." - so why does only the "worship leader/team" get to pick the songs? Or if each person has a word of instruction, why do only pastors or staff members get to preach during services?

Again, I'm not saying to stop singing songs or preaching sermons. I'm saying that the way we organize Sunday services in modern churchianity isn't an accurate reflection of what we see in the Bible. Yeah, as you have attempted to do, there are some verses that could be used to make us feel good about the current model, but you have to bastardize every trusted interpretive practice and eisegete a desire to justify current cultural practices before reaching the (false) conclusion that our structure today is exactly what the Bible contemplated.

Singing was a normal and expected part of synagogue and temple worship ... I find it ample instruction to not only defend the practice, but to require it.

Yikes! Really?!? Jesus constantly condemns the Jews for inappropriate expressions of the faith, and the apostles condemn the notions of mandating Gentiles to follow Jewish practices ... and you're going to tell me that because the Jews sang songs, the Bible "requires it" of Christians today also?

Back to the point: *even if* it's required, the degree of emphasis relative to the model we see from Jesus and the apostles is disproportionate. **I hope you can see that cherry-picking verses to support cultural norms about "church meetings" is an eisegetical approach to self-validate those who are too scared to defy social expectations with how they operate their services.**

They don't call us to watch other people putting on a performance. So it's important to select music that encourages that- congregational singing.

Wouldn't the 1 Cor. 14 approach make more sense in that case? You're trying to control too much. What would be the harm in just asking the crowd: "Does anyone have a song they'd like to offer up to God?" Remember: "each of you has a hymn, or a word of instruction" - so if you want individual investment, let *each of them* participate as they feel led. Why strip that away from the people and give it to one particular leader/team?

And I'm sure the temptation is to programize it. "It's too logistically difficult to let the Spirit speak in the moment, so we must make people give suggestions a week in advance." Control, control, control. Are you trying to manufacture God's presence or the movement of the Holy Spirit by creating an emotional environment during your services? Or are you interested in hearing what the Spirit is actually and already doing in the community as it happens? To be clear, this is one of those rare areas where I see a problem, but don't have a clear solution. But they're things I think about - and the more I meditate on Scripture and the picture we see of how Jesus and the apostles modeled life for the Church, the more I'm persuaded that our current structure is way off.

1 Corinthians 14 and other passages definitely teach that this must be done in good order, that people ought not interrupt

I don't see that in this passage. Are you suggesting the disciples violated 1 Cor. 14 when they asked Jesus

questions while he spoke to the crowds? I see that we shouldn't let two people talk simultaneously over one another. "One at a time, please." So why is it "one at a time" for tongues, but "only one person a week" for words of instruction? Why do tongues get interpreters for those who can't understand, but if someone can't understand a word of instruction, "Too bad! No asking questions during the sermon!"?

"Because it would ruin my groove to get interrupted," says the pastor who apparently speaks from a groove of his own prepared thoughts rather than from the Spirit to engage the actual needs and curiosities of the people.

Again: "each of you has a word of instruction." Are we really going to interpret that to say that only staff members have a word of instruction? Be consistent in interpretation.

the public proclamation of the Word of God by one set aside for that purpose is central, and is repeatedly commanded in the New Testament.

Ah, the old "centrality of preaching" or "primacy of preaching" movement. Again, I'm not arguing against preaching. I'm arguing for a Scriptural expression of it that falls in appropriate balance with the model given to us by Jesus and the apostles.

The New Testament refers to preaching as a central part of worship quite a bit more than I think you're allowing for. The fact that we don't have a lot of full sermons recorded by Jesus I think doesn't make as strong a case as you'd think.

I'm actually fully aware of it all. I think you're arguing against "a case" that I'm not actually making.

Fellowship-- here's how it looks in my church

Seems very structured. That's not a bad thing, but it begs the question: *how much are people engaging with one another OUTSIDE the structured times?* That's how you're going to gauge the authenticity of the relationships in your congregation.

I ran a survey one time, accounting for over 1,000 people. I asked several questions about relationships in a congregational setting. Going from memory, here are a few of them:

- "Do you have friends in your local congregation?" Overwhelming "yes" answers.
- "Can you name 5 by both first and last name." About 80% could (or at least came close).
- "How many days in a month do you spend time with any of these people outside of a church/ministry context?" The majority (75%+) of answers were 0 or 1, with a small subset of 2s. Only 2-3 people answered 5 or more. Apparently THIS is what leaders mean by "doing life together"? haha
- "Do you feel comfortable spontaneously asking 2 or 3 of the people on your 'friends list' to do something with you, such as going to a movie on a Saturday night?" About 70% of the answers were no.
- "Would it have a significant emotional impact on you for longer than 1 day if one of your friends in your congregation moved away?" The majority of answers were no (don't recall the percentage, just that it was more than half).
- "Who is your best friend in life?" Less than 20% of people listed the name of anyone on their 'friends list' from the second question. About 30% of people said they didn't have a best friend.
- "What makes that person your best friend?" Surprising to me, not a single person mentioned: "We are in small group together." Most answers were along the lines of, "I love hanging out together," or "We had a blast when we went white water rafting together and have been close ever since" or shared some other experiential story

of them having fun together. Having "deep and meaningful conversations" was rarely mentioned.

- I also asked pastors uniquely: "Do you spend time with your congregants in context that are not scheduled for any ministry purpose and which do not ultimately transition into ministry-related conversations (i.e. you just enjoy each other's company and that's it)?" I think the number was over 90% who said that this never happens.

Interpret that however you like. Suffice it to say: I'm persuaded that congregations today are not good at facilitating authentic relationships. It's as if they think, "Close friends talk about deep things, so if they talk deep, they'll be close." It's not causal both directions. It just comes off as contrived.

Men that I'm in a more on-going mentoring relationship with I see more often than that.

Perfect. Are they now going out and doing this with others? Or are you the only one being intentional about building these relationships with people?

But yeah, not 30-45 seconds after singing. It's actually a lot of work

I'm glad to hear you've at least beaten that curve! Do you think developing friendships **SHOULD** feel like work? Or is it that the culture in your congregation isn't naturally a "friendly" one so you have to manufacture it through structure?

which is why most don't do it

You noticed ;)

it's always been my experience, in almost 20 years of pastoring, that people who engage in the life of the church (and the more the better) grow spiritually

I won't necessarily argue with the conclusion, but I'd question how you define "grow spiritually." Often-times the super-participants who attend 3 services a week, show up to small group, lead a Bible study, serve on the parking team, etc., etc., etc. are the least active producers for the Kingdom. They're too busy doing churchy things to be useful to God.

To quote Dawson Trotman:

If I were the minister of a church and had deacons or elders to pass the plate and choir members to sing, I would say, 'thank God for your help. We need you. Praise the Lord for these extra things that you do,' but I would keep pressing home the big job — "Be fruitful and multiply." All these other things are incidental to the supreme task of winning a man or woman to Jesus Christ and then helping him or her to go on.

The Church

1 upvotes · 15 December 2020 · /r/RPChristians

2/2

Jesus Himself went to the synagogue meetings regularly, and those were more formal gatherings

Yep - he invaded groups of non-believers to teach them the truth. This is just like my discipler, when he was a missionary in Thailand, attending buddhist temple services for the purpose of sharing Christ with the people there. If you want to go attend Jewish synagogue services to preach the Gospel from their pulpit, and you can get away with it - by all means, do it!

I'm not saying any of this to disagree or contradict what you're saying. I think you're making some really helpful and important emphases here.

I really appreciate that. And while I may be bold in my speech, do know that I'm not saying we should abandon the modern structure of the church we see today. While it is a flawed structure, it is still a useful one. All I'm saying is that we look at the map and try to re-proportion the way we give attention to things. If you want a big building, go have your big building. There's nothing unbiblical about it. It doesn't fall into the "Biblically Contradicted" category, so you have freedom in Christ to gather a bunch of people into a large building.

But when you meet in that building, are you going to perpetuate a distorted picture of the Church by over-emphasizing things the apostles gave relatively little attention to, or are you going to re-prioritize your leadership to make sure your body much more closely reflects the lifestyle of Jesus and the apostles?

Clear example: we already addressed music, above, so let's dive into sermons. How many uninterrupted sermons do we see Jesus actually preaching? Relatively few. And when he teaches, does he teach on the latest fads for Jews of the time, or do we see him explaining the Scriptures and how people are misunderstanding them and offering them a correct understanding? "You have heard that it was said ... but I tell you" and all that. Those are his "sermons."

And yet look at the maybe 2 uninterrupted sermons that Jesus preached compared to the countless times the biblical authors represent him engaging with the community in conversation, question-asking, public reprimand to the unrepentant listening in, etc. Look at all the times the biblical authors reference conversation with those they were leading rather than preaching at them. The very context of their writings makes clear that they knew each other passionately and intimately - something that's not born from a soapbox model.

So, should we really be insisting on uninterrupted sermons as the mandatory "gotta do that EVERY week!" and give a distorted picture from what the biblical authors thought to emphasize? Or do you reorganize and say: "Yeah, maybe we have a sermon once a month and the other 3 times we use our Sunday service time to foster conversation and do Q&A sessions from the pulpit, or to life model!"

One congregation in my city, which is one of only three congregations I've ever known to practice discipleship in a model that I would see as consistent with what Jesus did (not to say they're, by any means, perfect congregations) started one Sunday morning, saying: "I talk a lot about discipling people, but it occurred to me that many of you may have generic ideas about it, but may be intimidated by it because you've never seen what it actually looks like and how simple it can be." So the leader invites a guy he was discipling up to the stage and says, "This is Bob. I meet with Bob not just every week, but we chat probably every few days - not because those are our 'set meeting times,' but because we're friends and I love him. We text when we have thoughts to share. We swap funny stories. We send each other memes and go to the movies together. Our families get together to play board games. We love each other. But sometimes we also have intentional time together. And I'm going to show you what that time looks like." He then proceeded not to preach at the crowd, but to have a meeting with Bob in front of the congregation for everyone to watch. It was a conversation, not a lecture. Bob had questions, but the leader had even more - and the things they discussed were a lot of the same things others in the room told me afterward they were thinking about also.

It was beautiful. But it wasn't a sermon.

Now imagine if you could have that level of peer-to-peer interaction not merely with one person in front of the group, but if your congregants felt the freedom to cut you off mid-thought and say, "Teacher, I didn't understand when you said this. Can you explain this to us?" After all that's what the disciples did to Jesus, right? That's what the crowds did. And sometimes Jesus looked out at the crowd and the Bible says, "He could see that they were thinking this," and then Jesus addresses it. Have you ever stopped yourself in your tracks, looked at your congregation and said, "I can see that this is what's really on your mind right now, so let me shift gears to address that"? I've seen it happen, but it's extremely rare. Jesus did this kind of stuff all the time.

So, what's your norm going to be for your congregation? Are you going to distort your map to over-emphasize uninterrupted sermons based on the rare examples that we see in the bible of Jesus speaking this way? Or are you going to **ALSO** (not instead of) incorporate conversational components to your teachings, as the apostles wrote about far more, and gave greater emphasis when writing the Gospels to the various Christians around the world about how Jesus lived - with the understanding that they were inviting those congregations to live as Jesus lived?

Just some more things to think about. Again, I'm not against the standard church model. I'm hard on it, but I don't think we should abandon it. I believe we need to readjust it - but with a unique emphasis on personal discipleship outside of Sunday services. The corporate gatherings are nice, but the apostles were abundantly clear that they were never Jesus' focus. His 12 were his primary ministry strategy, not the 5,000 he preached to. Jesus never ignored the masses, but he always stole away to train up his 12 as his primary concentration.

The Church

1 upvotes · 15 December 2020 · /r/RPChristians

1/2

I do think a lot of what the traditional church does on a Sunday morning is defensible Scripturally

Right. Nazis, racism, pro-slavery, LGBT, pro-choice ... are all also "defensible Scripturally." I can find verses to back up any cultural notions I get in my head, if I want.

I often teach that there's a difference between:

- Scripturally Contradicted: the Bible directly says it's false. Example: "Jesus didn't rise from the dead." Direct contradiction.
- Scripturally Clueless: the Bible just doesn't address it. Example: "My mother's name is Betty." The Bible doesn't say. Might be true, might not be. No way to tell.
- Scripturally Consistent: the Bible vaguely alludes to the topic, but without taking a particular stance. Example: "Unicorns exist" or "The earth is flat." There are some passages that could inspire this thought, depending on the translation you read and how inspired you think it is. But when you look into it, you find that it's a term of art, not a set-up for theological conclusions. Yes, you can hold these views and not defy the Bible, but the Bible doesn't affirm the truth of the views either.
- Scripturally Circumscribed: the Bible creates a topic and gives a framework of governing principles for understanding it, but there is room for interpretation within the framework of passages on point. There are almost certainly correct answers, but there is legitimate room for disagreement on what the actual, correct answer is. This is where most theological differences exist. Example: "James 2:24 says, 'a man is justified by works and not by faith alone'" v. "Romans 3:28 says, 'For we hold that one is justified by faith apart from works of the law.'" Nobody would be debating this but for the Bible, so the Bible is the only text that creates the framework for understanding the truth. But there's no biblical explanation for how the passages are to be reconciled, so we endeavor to explain it ourselves - our explanations being circumscribed by the boundaries of Scripture. If I say, "I believe one is justified by drinking a glass of orange juice every morning," I have left biblical circumscription and skipped into "biblically contradicted" territory.
- Scripturally Compelled: the Bible tells us plainly and we ought to live by it. Example: "Jesus died as an atoning sacrifice for our sins" or "Husbands ought to love their wives, and wives ought to respect their husbands."

Everyone agrees that Scripturally Compelled things are mandatory. But the Bible doesn't compel much in the way of Church structure. Off the top of my head, here's the framework I see insofar as biblical structure is concerned:

- Apostles oversee the body.
- Women aren't to have authority, teach, or speak.
- Two or more people shouldn't prophesy or speak in tongues at the same time.
- No false teachers are permitted to speak.
- If someone identifies as a brother, but continues in unrepentant sin, they are to be expelled.
- The apostles set a model for living that was to be taught and passed on in local bodies.

There are *examples* of what some fellowships looked like in Scripture, but there's no mandate that we *must* be exactly like them. In fact, the apostles were constantly rebuking the church at different cities for handling things inappropriately.

When we talk about "sing x songs and preach for y minutes," we have definitely left Scripturally Compelled territory, and almost certainly even Scripturally Circumscribed territory. Other than very vague principles, the Bible really doesn't give clear commands on what **MUST** occur within biblical communities, other than to adhere to and pass on the model of living demonstrated by the apostles (i.e. discipleship) ... the one thing that virtually no congregation actually does anymore. In modern terms: "How dare a pastor be so arrogant as to tell me to be more like himself. He's a sinner too!" ... yet this is exactly what Paul did and instructed us to do also.

Instead, the current model of Sunday service structure we have falls squarely in the "Scripturally consistent" category. The actual format is maybe vaguely alluded to in a few passages, and there are certainly passages that might indicate it's a good idea to sing songs and listen to sermons. But the way it has permeated virtually every known body and has become indistinguishable on an identity level from culture's perspective ... that has so far deviated from "these are good things to do while exercising your freedom in Christ" toward "if you reject participation in this particular structure, you're a deviant in violation of Hebrews 10:25" - and it's super unhealthy. The degree of emphasis placed on otherwise useful concepts - especially at the exclusion of other even more essential aspects of Christian learning and living - is completely man-made.

It's like **this image of the world**, re-proportioned to be consistent with the amount of media attention. Anyone looking at that would say: "THAT is definitely NOT the world I live in." It's a gross distortion of what the world actually looks like and what maps should represent. And yet this is how the media portrays the world. Likewise, the modern structure of churchianity has grossly distorted what Christ's Church was meant to look like by only paying attention to the things that jive with current cultural trends, like "x songs" and "a y minute long sermon." Yeah, they may be biblically defensible as good ideas, just the same way I can defend the fact that the US should have significant media coverage, doesn't mean the final product is at all an accurate representation of what the Church should look like if we balance all things in proper proportion.

Look at that map again. When the world watches the media, that's what they think the world looks like, right? Now, look at the modern expression of churchianity and tell me if they're seeing a map like that or they're seeing an accurate portrayal in appropriate balance of what Jesus intended for his Church to look like.

For example: how many times do we see Jesus singing songs? How often do the apostles engage in corporate worship through music? The only example I recall is when Paul and Silas sing hymns to pass the time in prison. Yeah, we may want to *assume* that they may have been doing this, but the biblical authors clearly didn't find it fit to give any acknowledgment or emphasis to this aspect of the faith. So, why do congregations insist that we **MUST** sing songs and sing them a certain way with certain instruments in a certain style - be it an organ in hymnal tunes or distorted guitars and rock music? It doesn't matter because that debate only falls within the trap itself.

but also make sure we provide plenty of spaces for discussion as well. Small group gatherings, personal

interaction, casual fellowship, counseling- all these things play a role in the whole process of making disciples

I'm not against you, but I'd challenge you to look closer at whether or not your particular expression of these things is consistent with the WAY Jesus and the apostles modeled them, or if they're token nods to say, "See, we included that!" For example, "casual fellowship" often exists in many congregations I've attended by giving 30-45 seconds after singing is over to "greet the person next to you" or repeat a prefabricated phrase to them, like: "I'm glad you're here today." Do we see this as the way Jesus implemented fellowship with those around him? Certainly not. Instead, churchianity has taken buzzwords from Scripture, like "fellowship" and completely redefined them to lose all of their substance.

Or an alternative is, "Well, fellowship happens when people stick around to chat after service." Okay, but what is the leadership doing to facilitate that? Are you actually encouraging it or just randomly seeing it on its own. Because if it's on its own, you can't take credit for fostering that within your body. But even at that, the 5 minutes you chat before picking your kids up from the back room is still hardly following in the biblical model we see.

Some will say, "But our fellowship happens in small groups!" Okay: **How** does your small group implement fellowship? Virtually every small group I've attended (not led) falls into one of three main categories: (1) content-driven teaching and/or discussion, (2) group therapy, or (3) fabricated bonding, usually through, "How's your week been?" type questions and general casual conversation. The fact that you call it "casual fellowship" makes me think that your body may fall into this type.

I used to be lured by these models as well, as they're easy to structure for people. But when I started (a) observing the results of these types of groups, and (b) seeing what fellowship in the Bible produced, I saw a total misalignment. So, I started studying concepts of fellowship, *koinonia*, and the way the apostles connected with their followers and I saw an intense passion and loving bond. Paul talks constantly about how he is constantly overjoyed for his disciples, longs to see them, can't stop talking about them, etc. He even notes the reciprocity in Galatians 4:15 - "For I testify to you that, if possible, you would have gouged out your eyes and given them to me" because they loved and trusted him so much. Is that kind of bond actually being fostered in your body, or casual acquaintanceships that we pretend are authentic biblical friendships or purposed fellowships?

the four canonical gospels are not our only source for what church ought to look like. There are the epistles of the Apostles also

Completely agreed. And I'm CONFIDENT that if you re-examine them without the lens of modern cultural practices, you'll see what I see.

23 year old woman desperately looking for help.

1 upvotes · 10 December 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I could still see room for lots of holes. I'm leaning more and more to the point of saying: *that's an individual conviction you have to reach before God*. At the end of the day, it's not my place to judge what Scripture doesn't set forth. I'm okay with that conclusion.

Calling BS on Red Pill gurus

1 upvotes · 8 December 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I'm more curious: why was this posted *here*?

Prayers Unchained Initiative

1 upvotes · 3 December 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I'm not sure how this has anything to do with our sub.

The Basics of Female Frame

1 upvotes · 13 November 2020 · /r/RPChristians

You're about to be banned for trolling. I've told you what to do if you have a legitimate question.

Grieved that wife will never treat me how she treated others

1 upvotes · 29 October 2020 · /r/RPChristians

This is by far your biggest issue

Glad somebody said it.

Look at what they do, not what they say

1 upvotes · 25 October 2020 · /r/RPChristians

That would be cause for distrust.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (10/14/20)

1 upvotes · 19 October 2020 · /r/RPChristians

You've got deeper issues to address than this conversation warrants. You need a discipler and as helpful as OYS can be, it's nowhere near the same.

From there I'll just say:

1. Even Jesus preached fire and brimstone. Perfectly valid way to share the gospel in some circumstances.
2. Get in the word more.
3. Start memorizing scripture. Start with the book of philippians.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (10/14/20)

1 upvotes · 18 October 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I mainly resent God because of him sending people to hell

Have you ever stepped on a spider? You don't think much of it because you're such a higher life form with such a higher degree of intelligence that the spider's pitiful expression of sentience is so heavily inferior that it hardly even registers in your brain that his feelings, physical pain, terror, etc. might factor into the decision to chase him down and kill him. All you care about is that the spider is interfering with your plans and that's the end of it. In fact, if there's a whole colony of spiders infesting your house, you're not just going to kill one or two. You're going to call the exterminator and wipe out the whole doggone lot of them, right?

Now imagine you develop sympathy for spiders. You decide to love them and learn how to communicate with them on some extremely basic, rudimentary level. You are passionate about their well-being and care for them so personally that you recognize each of the thousands of spiders in your basement by name. In response to your kindness and provision of food and a place to live, most of them behave. But others repeatedly bite you and leave the basement that you've allocated for them to live, and when you have guests over they attack the guests. You give them repeated opportunities to stop, but as they continue and it threatens your plans for your home and your enjoyment of the house you've built for yourself ... well, what are you going to do? You're going to kill them or kick them out of your house to live outside your love, care, and protection. That's what most people believe of hell.

The fact that we step on spiders so nonchalantly immediately makes moot any argument that we may have against God for being cruel or vicious in his casting people out of his presence, which (by definition) is hell. It's my personal theory (not theological fact) that the fire, weeping, and gnashing of teeth isn't something God creates in hell; rather, it's a byproduct of the fact that without God's grace holding a semblance of civility together, humanity would burn the world to the ground all on its own - and that's exactly what will happen in hell, as the cruelty of man will cause them to torment one another, rather than God being the one to do the tormenting. God simply says: "You don't want to live in my house under my rules? Fine. Go live outside my house and figure out your own way of life."

him sending people to hell

From another angle: is this a situation where you can say, "God, I don't like that you do this. I would do things very differently. But you also know a lot more about how the universe and humanity function than I do, so I'll trust this is one of those areas where you know better than I do. Can you help me understand why this is what's best?"

I, of course, have theories on this - not the least of which is the simple question: what happens to humans when you reward bad behavior? They keep being bad. If God rewarded the wicked with a spot in his glorious presence, what incentive do people have to bring his Kingdom on earth as it is in heaven?

I'm calling it foolish because I know exactly why it's wrong, what it does to my state of mind and still want things my way.

I'm going to to out on a limb and suggest you don't actually know why it's wrong. This is an old post, but one I wholeheartedly agree with:

https://www.reddit.com/r/RPChristians/comments/cnoykj/understanding_why_sexual_sins_are_sin/.

In short the deal is that I believe Jesus died to pay the wages of sin for the world, but I massively struggle with the important part of actually orienting my life toward modeling Christ.

So, going to the "faith" section of [this post](#), it sounds like you're in the middle category. "Yeah, I know it's all real, but I don't care enough to do anything about it." That's a dangerous place to be, friend. James 2 is clear that this form of intellectual acknowledgment doesn't save anyone.

I thought the whole point of RPC is fundamentalist biblical teaching.

No. RPC is about TRUE biblical teaching. Fundamentalists are quick to read the Bible outside of its context in order to force overly literal interpretations, which are often extremely wrong and equally inappropriate as feminist and blue pill teachings.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (10/14/20)

1 upvotes · 18 October 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I resent God for a number of reasons and can't get over it in prayer or reading the bible.

As a former pastor once commented to me: "It's not submission until you disagree." Many biblical figures have questioned and even directly opposed God's perspective on things. Yet they still obeyed, and that's what mattered. Consider the wife in 1 Peter 3, who is told that she ought to submit to her husband - even if he is an unbeliever - and that her gentleness and internal character and submissiveness are what should win him over to Christ. This passage is couched between slaves submitting to their masters and Christ submitting to the government that crucified him. This is how women are told to submit to their husbands. Do you expect that the solution to the "I

resent God" problem is going to be any different? Yeah, you may think God to be evil for whatever reason - and you didn't elaborate, so I won't guess. But your opinion of him matters very little in comparison to the fact that you: (1) Believe that Jesus died to save you, and (2) choose to orient your life in a manner consistent with the character of Christ.

This whole "I resent God" thing is way too feelings-oriented. Feelings matter, but they're subservient and less significant in comparison to what you think and what you do.

I've been rebuked for rejecting what popular commentaries say on some topics, but I'm a God's word first person and make my own call on discerning the text.

Expect that from churchianity. Just don't go fundamentalist. Make sure you interpret things in their proper historical and spiritual context in light of God's plan throughout history.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (10/14/20)

1 upvotes · 16 October 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I don't know what I want to do with my life.

This is a clear sign that you're not being sanctified. Christ has a plan for you. If you become like Christ, his plan for you will become your own plan for yourself. That plan is to make disciples, which was Jesus' own plan for himself too. The more you are like Christ, the more this will become your plan also.

I have my doubt's that making disciples would be wise for me considering I might not be saved or even be unforgivable.

Fair enough. Figure yourself out, then. **Discipleship is a luxury**. This sub is a luxury. Ultimately, you have personal responsibility to train yourself to be godly (1 Timothy 4:7), and God has already given you everything you need for just that (2 Peter 1:3-4). There are no excuses here.

If your attitude is, "I may have committed the unforgivable sin, so I might as well just give up," then it doesn't matter whether you're wrong or right - giving up dooms you to hell either way. Of course, if you're wrong you're condemning yourself to hell for no reason, so believing you've committed the unforgivable sin is ultimately an idiotic position to take.

About lifting the GYM's in my state have been closed

Body weight. Cardio. BodBot app. Find heavy things, like jugs of water or a spare tire on your car and lift them. There's lots of stuff. This has been discussed at great length on this sub. [/u/skimthedross](#) has a post on this from when COVID first started all the shut-downs. Look it up.

I tend to study while reading and use a range of tools to do so. I never really get much out of opening a bible and just reading it. Maybe it wouldn't meet your standard, but it's why I decided to combine them.

Then you're misunderstanding the function of each. First, if you're using "a range of tools" for study, you're most likely not studying. The bible should be 99% of what you use. I advise men I disciple to avoid commentaries for at least 1 year, preferably 2, just until they figure out how to study the Bible for themselves. Same goes for various blogs, websites (ex. gotquestions.org), forums, and other sources, with limited exception.

As for quiet times, that goal isn't for you to "get much out of" it. The goal is to relate with God. I don't get fuzzy feelings every time I talk to my wife or listen to her drone on about her day. But it's an essential aspect to a healthy relationship anyway. I'd be a fool not to do it, even though I don't "get much out of" it.

As for scripture memory I don't really find memorizing single verses that useful.

This is sheer ignorance, probably born from the fact that you're not doing it.

I don't have photographic memory so I doubt very much I'll ever be a 10 or even an 8 in scripture memory no matter how long I looked at it.

Neither do I. My rote memory actually sucks. But I work hard at it, and it pays off. I hated Scripture memory at first and found no value in it. Now, I find that it's perhaps the singular most valuable of the 7 basics when I engage in it. It is perhaps the most significant pathway to maturity - not because it's more important than the others, but because it's often the weakest link, and when it is brought up, all the others come with it.

I need to fix it, but just haven't. And I haven't been able to develop a solid firm mission statement beyond what I already have. I would like a better one, but had no luck on developing it.

Glad to see you're getting it. Now by next week's OYS, resolve these two things so you can see progress.

What are Your Thoughts on Cold Approaches?

1 upvotes · 3 October 2020 · /r/RPChristians

My thoughts exactly. It's a skill worth developing for more reasons than merely picking up girls, though for some it can have that benefit too.

Don't Be Autistic

1 upvotes · 24 September 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

You can learn probably more from in-person friends than on here

Something I wish more guys on reddit could figure out. Part of the reason I'm not online as much these days. Too much crap in the real world to get done. Let the internet be a hobby, not the primary.

Don't Be Autistic

1 upvotes · 22 September 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

No clue. I assumed that's a mod thing.

Edit: Hey, there it is! Thanks for the fix.

Don't Be Autistic

1 upvotes · 21 September 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Every now and then I joke with people that I have "obsessive OR compulsive disorder" ... just never the two together. A psychologist laughed when I said that and added: "that's why conjunctions in the DSM matter."

any Eastern Orthodox on here?

1 upvotes · 21 September 2020 · /r/RPChristians

This is for /r/askRPC.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (09/02/20)

1 upvotes · 3 September 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Much appreciated.

The Origins of the Ekklesia ("Church")

1 upvotes · 19 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Not that I have any plans to look up again. Whether it's German or Proto-Germanic doesn't really make a difference because the base definitions still fall within the framework of my original post.

https://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/Reconstruction:Proto-West_Germanic/kirik%C4%81 - Even a simple wiki search on the word *kirika* that you're referencing shows this. It doesn't really change anything, so it's not worth the effort.

The Origins of the Ekklesia ("Church")

1 upvotes · 19 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

In all my studies on the subject, every resource (with extremely limited exception) has pointed to the English word coming from the German-speaking populace where *kirche* was the term ultimately transliterated to "church." There was no direct transliteration from Greek to English. That's not to say the German word wasn't related to some Greek word before that - it's certainly possible. But by the time we got the English "church," the cultural baggage from the German *kirche* was already carried with it and the original Greek definition that the German came from was lost.

But I already addressed this in the original post:

The word we derived "church" from is actually German: Kirche. Some suggest that this may have come from the ancient Greek Kuriakon (or sometimes conjugated Kuriakos).

- Kirche in the German referenced a building or location.
- Kuriakon in the Greek generally means "belonging to a lord."

Break up hurts

1 upvotes · 19 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Your post got removed for profanity. Also, you didn't follow Rule 2, which requires adding your stats for advice threads. This may also be a good question for [r/askRPC](#).

Do you have any concerns about how it seems like this view errs on the side of control of your wife over her personal growth and freedom?

1 upvotes · 15 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

it must've been worded differently.

Or maybe I'm just learning more as the days go by.

"How do I become Kingdom oriented to the point where I am not concerned with the feelings and actions of others towards me?"

Yes-ish. This is the point of my "mission matters, nothing else" post in the 200 series.

I say "-ish" because technically there's value in being "concerned" in the sense that the way others think of us affects our ministry. I know a ton of hugely obese preachers who take the view: "I don't care what people think of me, I just focus on advancing God's Kingdom, and that means I don't have time for the gym." Well, that's a fairly idiotic approach because their obesity loses them a lot of respect from people who otherwise do think looks matter, right?

Jesus preaches about how we should use our worldly wealth to gain friends for ourselves to serve eternal purposes. In this, there's the impression that having a good reputation matters. In fact, Paul even gives this as one of the requirements for being an elder - that he must have a good rapport with the community. So, the way other people feel about you does matter, to some degree. Of course, Paul also wrote this as a man who was widely persecuted, imprisoned, beaten, and literally cast out of entire cities and nations without an opportunity to preach the Word there. So, interpret Paul's requirements in the context of how he modeled them.

A picture of a relationally solid church community

1 upvotes · 12 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Of course, we would all like to say that if we were held at gunpoint and told to renounce Jesus or die, that we would choose death, but we can't really be completely sure...

I'm not even talking about that situation. I'd wager far more people would be willing to die for Jesus than live for him. Dying is easy. But the same people who legitimately would take the bullet before denouncing him are the same people who on a random Tuesday are going to watch porn and not have a passing thought about whether or not their neighbor is going to hell, and who aren't discipling anyone. Again: it's easier to die for Jesus than live for him.

I picked Muslimtown (a metaphorical place, obviously) not because of the risk of death, but because of the absence of ability to use a congregational structure as a crutch. It's more representative of how the early Church existed under the oppressive Roman government during Nero's reign. The Church was not a series of congregations from city to city, but underground meetings in people's homes, hence Brian Sanders' book *Underground Church*. When we remove the structural components that didn't come into play until much, much later (notably post-400AD), we get a better picture of whether or not people are really committed to Christ or committed to the structure that makes everything seem easy, doing all the heavy lifting for them so they don't have to do it themselves.

A picture of a relationally solid church community

1 upvotes · 12 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

One of the guys I reached out to and brought to church is doing very well, and he's discipling others.

That's beautiful to hear! Is he doing this because you intentionally trained him how and he saw you doing it with others, or is he doing it because of the congregation's teachings and what he's picked up from his time there?

Our leaders have commented before how 2 Timothy is like THE handbook on how to do discipleship

I'm glad to hear that! Personally, I preference John 13-17, if you want to be more comprehensive, but 2 Timothy 2 is good too ;)

2 Timothy 2:1-2. That means discipleship for 4 generations: Paul (1), who discipled Timothy (2), who is now called to entrust to faithful men (3), that can teach others also (4).

Fantastic! Matthew 28:19-20 takes it even further into infinite generations.

- Command 1: Make disciples of all nations.
- Command 2: Teach them to obey everything I commanded you.
- Implication 1: We must teach them to obey command 1, so all people must be taught how to make disciples.

- Implication 2: We must teach them to obey command 2 (which includes command 1 also), so all people must be taught how to make disciples and how to teach their disciples to make more disciples, and how to teach those disciples to make more disciples, and so on.

Our church is talking about succession plans since our top leaders are starting to get old. I don't know what that will look like, and I know that will be hard transition.

It shouldn't be hard at all! If they've been discipling guys, they should already have a laundry list of men who are capable and qualified to take over.

Think about it: Jesus started a movement and left it, in everyone else's eyes, extremely prematurely. But he had no concerns because he had a succession plan in his 12. Who are your pastor's congregation leader's 12? If he has them, they are his succession plan. If he's struggling to develop a succession plan, it's because he hasn't been discipling people properly yet.

I hope we can uphold the model of 2 Tim 2:1-2, and continue discipling people down to the 4th generation.

... and beyond until ALL NATIONS are part of the generational lineage. The book of Numbers didn't stop recording the genealogies after 4 generations. It kept going.

A picture of a relationally solid church community

1 upvotes · 12 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

For singles houses, there's often an older man/woman who serves as the house manager

Ah, crap. And you had me going for a second. Then it became overly structured and rules-driven yet again.

Husband and wife just each do what needs to be done around the house.

Right. But why? And according to whose standards? Suppose it's been 4 days since the floor was last vacuumed. Husband thinks it needs to be done once every 2 weeks, wife thinks it needs to be done every 3 days. How do you deal with that?

Traditionally, the wife does it, but resents her husband for being a slob because he's not an ultra-clean freak like her. Then he resents her for resenting him because she can't relax for 5 minutes like he can. So, he starts feeling pressured to start meeting her cleanliness standards so he doesn't get the cold shoulder - and when company's over he puts on a nice face, but behind the scenes he's harboring bitterness at the fact that he feels this internal (sometimes even self-created) pressure to maintain his wife's standards. That's the norm.

It is human nature, you are right. Which is why we must resist it.

I don't follow. Not every aspect of human nature is sin that needs to be resisted. I know some of the other mods and I have done some writing here that hypergamy is something God designed into women originally, but was merely perverted by the fall the same way every other healthy inclination was. The idea isn't to resist hypergamy or "repent and ask for forgiveness" any more than you would resist having sex with your wife or ask for forgiveness afterward. As I say, it's something you make work for you rather than allowing it to be expressed in sinful ways.

I mentioned in the original post that long distance relationships usually have couples fly to meet once a month, generally for the whole day. The reason it's for the whole day is so they can get a more well-rounded picture of each other, to see how the other person handles life situations beyond a well-prepared 2 hour date.

That way, they can see how they'll react to unexpected changes in the plan, handling transitions, their driving/road rage, weather issues, improvising, etc.

Wow. A whole day, huh! Impressive amount of time to really figure out what it's like being around someone else. At the rate of once a month, that's a whole 12 days together in a year! You'll surely know everything there is to know about a person in no time at all. And I'm totally sure that these people are being completely themselves and willing to express things like road rage rather than being on their best behavior during their one shot to impress.

Not even a weekend? Most people in that one-day get-together are going to try to "make the most of the short time we have together" that it creates an artificial closeness and enhances the halo effect during that time. I recommend reading more on LDRs on any of the red pill forums for more information on why they're not viable options. And I say that as someone who was in an "LDR" for the first year of knowing my now-wife. I'm not ignorant of them. I'm just not blinded by the blue pill ideologies surrounding the concept anymore either.

I'm also guessing that if these people really like each other it's not the congregation's mandate: "Thou shalt fly to meet each other once a month." These people should be struggling to stay apart for that long on their own! You make it sound so much like your congregation is full of these wise elders who have laid out extremely detailed plans on how everything should work, but a lot of what I imagine are the "cultural" rather than "rule-driven" aspects of this are really just the product of typical human nature within the hyper-purity context.

I thought the red pill mentioned in this sub however, was just what the Bible taught as inerrant truth

There's a difference between "biblically sound" and "red pill" when it comes to Christianity. The red pill beliefs we profess here are virtually entirely drawn from Scripture. There are other prescriptive concepts that are taught in the secular circles which go against Scripture (like banging multiple women outside of marriage) that we do not prescribe. As Rollo notes, the red pill is descriptive of a culture, not prescriptive - it's the truth of it, not what you do with it.

Things like hypergamy, fitness tests, amused mastery, etc. - these (and many more) are all concepts directly found in Scripture. They are just rarely preached on as such because ~~pastors~~ congregation leaders view Scripture through the feminized lens of the modern age rather than trying to understand how someone 2,000 years ago would have interpreted the passage in a more patriarchal, anti-feminist culture - they being the original audience the author was writing to.

I do believe a congregation *can be* red pill. I just don't believe any of them are, even if the lead ~~paster~~ congregational ... leader happens to be red pill. The reason is that the modern culture would reject it so thoroughly that it would crumble before it got off the ground.

The red pill lingo is just language developed to describe certain phenomena, but it itself is not necessarily directly from the Bible

No, these phenomena are often found in Scripture. There are, admittedly, certain concepts that the red pill discusses that we don't talk about much here that aren't as clear in Scripture - like the existence of the "alpha widow." When's the last time you saw a post on that in RPC? Probably never - because the Bible doesn't give us examples of this. And how could it? In the biblical patriarchal societies there would be little foundation for women to have the type of entitlement to become an alpha widow in the first place.

But those situations don't arise often.

the Bible (which I thought was the "true red pill" of this sub)

The Bible is the source of all truth, and the final authority on matters of conflict. It is not itself a "red pill" document in the sense that its aim is much larger than the red pill. It's like saying the declaration of independence

is a "red pill document" because it has a lot to say about declaring each person to have the right to operate out of their own internal point of origin (i.e. frame) - but we all know it literally had nothing to do with the red pill as we know it today, and much of its content is entirely distinct.

This is why Rollo and I often distinguish that the red pill is not merely "truth" - it is specifically the "truth about intergender sexual dynamics." The creator of those dynamics is going to have a lot to say on the subject, hence the Bible being a valuable resource. But it's not the only source - it's merely the only definitively reliable source.

Yet nobody will read the Bible and say, "Well, it didn't say $2+2=4$, so we better stop believing that." There are some things that observational reality shows us is true. If I put two oranges next to two other oranges, I can observe that I now have 4 oranges, not 3 or 5. I can observe that alpha widows do exist. We can collectively observe patterns in their life experiences that brought about their existence. These observational realities are no less true. And they are equally descriptive of intergender sexual dynamics - and thus can be equally a part of "the true red pill" insofar as we embrace them as true, just as we embrace $2+2=4$ as true.

Yet I also have at least one post and many comments on the knowledge hierarchy. The order is theological truth > observational/scientific truth > philosophical/logical truth. The secular red pill is based widely on observational/scientific truth (in the form of praxeology) with a little philosophy mixed in. RPC is based primarily on theological truth with a little bit of the others mixed in where theology may be silent - and only to the degree to which there is no conflicting theology.

But how much authority and control is too much authority and control is honestly a very culturally contextual question

That's a good point. To that, I'd answer that it depends less on the culture and more on whether or not the degree of control is hindering internal transformation by mandating behavioral modification. I have a post on that as well.

A picture of a relationally solid church community

1 upvotes · 11 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Okay, now go back and re-read what you just wrote here. You have recognized the first step: that people developed an unhealthy codependence on the original congregational structure.

The second step, then, is that they need to have the goal of starting a new structure in order to get their spiritual life back on track.

One of the things I write about in my book is the difference between a non-Christian -> convert -> disciple -> discipler -> leader.

- The non-Christian doesn't have Jesus.
- The convert will fall away or never grow if left to himself.
- The disciple could be thrown in the middle of Muslimtown and still maintain his faith, though he won't ever produce for Jesus.
- The discipler could be thrown in the middle of Muslimtown and not only maintain his faith, but also reproduce it in others.
- The leader wouldn't just reproduce his faith in others, but would also be organizing the spiritual reproducers around him (which, in the Muslimtown example, would be the people he himself brought to Christ and disciplined) in a common effort to get the Gospel to the entire country and beyond.

Yes, it's ideal when people grow through a fellowship, and that fellowship *can* be expressed through a

congregational structure. But what you're describing are people who are *dependent* on either the original congregational structure or their commitment to a new congregational structure they're planting in order to keep their faith active.

Instead of supporting a pastor of a new plant by being one of the founding attendees, how would these people fare if they were thrown into the middle of Muslimtown, where being a Christian meant death? Would they still follow, or let it fade away? Would they continue to share the Gospel with those around them? Would they see those around them bearing fruit with even more? Would they be starting congregations on their own from scratch, or keep it private to themselves and maybe a friend or two?

These are the types of thought experiments that examine the character of a person's faith. To be clear: I'm making no accusations. I'm simply suggesting that the answers aren't as easy as, "Once they join another plant they take their faith seriously again."

A picture of a relationally solid church community

1 upvotes · 11 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I've seen how plenty of people interact with their kids

Because they're discipling you and intentionally inviting you to watch that interaction? Or as a passive observe? Huge difference.

I've even literally lived with my leaders before and seen how they live

That's more like it. But when you say "my leaders" do you mean "I stayed with the pastor for a while because reasons made it a good idea at the time" or do you mean: "The pastor was discipling me and asked me to live with him for a time so he could intentionally and consciously show me what his life looks like in practice"? In most cases, I see the former, rarely ever the latter.

I didn't mention these things though since the focus on my post was specifically about relationships in the romantic context, since this is RPChristians.

Ah, then you are misunderstanding RPChristians, my friend. If you've read much of anything I've written, you'll note that above and beyond relationship advice, I push and will continue pushing the call to make disciples the way Jesus and the apostles modeled for us. If we can get this right, the relationship issues fall in line - most notably because that relationship IS the model for marriages as well (Christ-Church parallel with husband-wife).

How discipleship is implemented in the congregation tells me far more about what they believe about marriage and relationships than the technicalities of whether or not you can flirt with someone or if your wife is on a text chain with a client of the opposite gender, which would break attorney-client privilege if you're an attorney (like me).

What kind of evidence are you looking for that discipleship is happening? I think the fact that a lot of people in our church progress from non Christian to Christian to members of the church to team members to being willing to quit their job and move to help start a church somewhere else in a different state as evidence

From everything you've described here, it sounds like you're closer than your previous descriptions would have indicated. Maybe there's a semantic issue that your congregation may be *actually making disciples* without realizing it, whereas the contexts they use the phrase "do discipleship" for are those which actually have relatively little to do with biblical discipleship. I'd prefer to give you the benefit of the doubt on this one.

But what I'd really be looking for is a multi-generational familial structure that would look something like

"Abraham began Isaach, who began Jacob, who begat Levi, Benjamin, Judah, etc., who each begat others," and so on.

The majority of congregations that try to implement a biblical model of discipleship get stopped up in the first or second generation.

1 - The first generation is a stopper because in many cases the leadership are the only ones actually doing the discipling. They're not training the disciples to make more disciples. So, the person being disciplined eventually walks away thinking, "Great, I'm a more knowledgeable, mature believer. I'm not capable of reading my Bible and praying on my own without oversight," and that's it.

2 - The second generation is when the leadership is able to coach the person he's discipling on how to begin discipling someone else. Instead of "I'm more mature now," he walks away thinking, "I should go do with someone else what my discipler just did with me," and he takes personal ownership of the vision so that the leadership of the congregation is not expected to make all the disciples - rather, EVERY person in the congregation is eventually intended to be incorporated into the vision. But the 2nd generation barrier (the most common one) arises when THAT person makes a disciple, yet fails to instill the vision of discipler-making (notice I don't say disciple-making) into the person he disciplines, so his disciple (the 2nd generation man) walks away thinking, "Great, I'm more mature now," but with no imperative to disciple anyone else.

I know some congregations that actually pass the second generation barrier, but it's extremely rare. I can say in my city that there are only 2 congregations that have done it and at least 250 that have tried and failed (not to mention the thousands I'm ignorant of altogether).

Also, when you say that people "help start a church in a different state," I often interpret this as them attending and maybe leading a ministry team (parking, children's ministry, greeting, etc.) or a small group, but not actually taking ownership of the discipler-making process within the congregation. It's still a centralized structure meant to bring people into the building as the operative goal. Maybe I'm wrong about this - and I'm sure you can come up with anecdotal examples of certain individuals who haven't functioned this way, as every congregation can do. We all have our super-stars who actually *get it*. But is everything functioning properly *on the whole* or is it still a centralized "come hang out with us" ideology?

Not sure what you're seeing as a major failure.

Blue pill purity culture among the mainstream. It was a huge flop. Your congregation seems to be saying: "Well, it's because they weren't being pure ENOUGH!"

I think a tree should be judged by its fruit, no? Divorce rates, number of committed Christians, salvation decisions per year, tithing amounts, and just general satisfaction and joy that I see on people's faces seem to indicate at least something is working well.

I've written an incredible amount on the "judge a tree by its fruit" concept. It's probably the thing I discuss most here. I'm fully persuaded that the "fruit" is tied to those who are following Jesus today because of our life and effort.

- Divorce rates: I'm still calling BS on this one, but "not divorcing" isn't the same as making disciples
- Number of committed Christians: Committed to what? I'm hearing lots about commitment to the congregational structure and the community. You might say "committed to Christ" - but what does that even mean? Lots of people are committed in the sense that they won't abandon Jesus because they don't want to go to hell, but that's hardly indicative of anything. Committed to the mission of Christ? Now we're getting closer. Christ commanded us to make disciples. How many people in any of these congregations can actively identify at least 1 person and say, "I am discipling <Bob>," and that relationship he has with <Bob> actually mirrors

the relationship Jesus had with his 12?

- Salvation decisions per year: I love Dawson Trotman's talk, "Born to reproduce." He says, "An Armenian boy came into my office one day and told me about all the souls he had won ... and had the list to prove it. Is said, 'Well, what is this one doing?' He said, 'That one isn't doing so good. He is backslidden.' 'What about this one?' We went all down the list and there was not one living a victorious life." This is all too often the answer. [/u/praxology](#) and I had a good talk about this recently. Congregations are often more interested in getting people to say "the prayer" in an emotional moment than they are in parenting that person after they do. The majority of these "emotional moment prayers" never actually result in conversion. But they do give people a false sense of hope. Someday they'll stand before God and when he's turning them away they'll say, "But [/u/Citadel-3](#) told me if I said these words in a prayer you'd let me in." Imagine God slowly turning his head to look at you. Yes, I'm sure *some* people in your congregation are disciplined after saying "the prayer" - but I'm skeptical to believe that it's the majority/norm. I'm more interested in how many of these "salvation decisions per year" are making disciples of their own next year. That's the stat I want to hear. Because if they're not, they're a fruitless vine - the one Jesus says in John 15 will be cut off rather than pruned.
- Tithing amounts: Don't even get me started on this one, haha!
- Satisfaction and joy on people's faces: You don't think attendees at Joel Osteen's congregation have this on Sunday mornings? I promise they do. I know people who have seen it and reported on it. It tells me nothing of their fruit.

Matthew 7 is key here. You appropriately reference the fruit, but seem to indicate things as the fruit that Jesus would seem to dismiss in the very next passage, where he talks about those who are preaching, prophesying, performing miracles, etc. - and yet will be cast away.

A picture of a relationally solid church community

1 upvotes · 11 August 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

there's a lot of context and nuance that's probably being lost

I thought about that, and am still hopeful that this is the case with a lot of what you've written! :) That said, I do believe there are some things that are so blatantly unscriptural and blue pill'd that I'm not sure how "nuance" could explain them away.

All I can say is that I have not lived alone for many years, and have lived with other church members (often times with 10+ people) sharing a single apartment or house, and so have seen the way they live.

This is more encouraging in light of a discipleship framework. Now you're talking life-on-life. The only thing it's lacking is intentionality within an authoritative framework. It sounds like they pair up peers to peers rather than the mature with the young when it comes to living together like this. If you make that switch and add an imperative on the mature one to disciple the younger, then we're much closer to what Jesus modeled.

The living arrangements also sound a lot like an extension of the college environment, which could explain why the culture you're describing has a greater feel of commitment to it - at least among the singles. Living in the dorms at college, there's a much greater sense of community than we get living in isolated family units in the suburbs. Instead of 5 minutes walking, you've got to hop in a car, and there's often a different expectation of the presentation of one's living space that affects things. There's a lot that makes it different. But this type of communal living among the singles certainly explains a lot and, no doubt, is a benefit to your community. I'm still quite skeptical about those who are married with kids who aren't in this communal lifestyle.

What kind of objective evidence would satisfy you?

It doesn't matter because your obligation isn't to convince me. If it works for you, it works for you. The only real hurdle here is that some of the *teachings* that are presented are contrary to what we teach here, and that's why I had to give a cautionary to the post.

For example, flirting is discouraged to the extent that it's distracting for people who are here to study God's Word. If people are not distracted from the goal, which is evangelism, then flirting would be okay. But if it does, you will be asked to stop.

That's also true for most every congregation I've ever attended. But you also didn't make that dichotomy clear in your original post. The tone you originally gave seemed to cave to the hyper-purity culture that is, thankfully, in the minority among congregations now. You're just closer to hyper-purity than the standard "I won't ask if you won't tell me" culture we have swung to in the majority of churchianity today - which is the danger on the opposite end. If you have to err one way, I'd prefer erring on the side of purity for younger believers and going non-communicado for the more mature.

I'm not sure what's meant here by sniper mentality versus shotgun approach

Read the "Shotgun Logic" section: <https://therationalmale.com/2011/08/19/plate-theory-2/>

The danger of the sniper approach is that it precludes a man from ever developing natural abundance, which causes him to become codependent on his singular woman as his primary and only hope for intimacy. This is unattractive and makes his woman withdraw from intimacy as soon as other attraction-producing stimuli (most commonly NRE) are gone, creating a negative feedback loop that results in the destruction of marriages.

I'm not sure what else you can tell husbands. Don't help their wives??

That's exactly what you tell them! You don't help her. She helps you. The problem is that too many men are used to deferring their entire domain to their wife, at which point she's incapable of managing it, so she asks for help and rarely gets it. The advice to "help your wife" perpetuates the problem by allowing the woman to keep the domain and suggesting the man simply have more of the responsibility with less of the privilege. The reality is that it's his domain, which includes all the privileges that come with it, as well as the responsibility - and she is there to help meet those responsibilities if she wants to continue enjoying the privileges of the household he runs. I just wrote a post on this today.

I think it's just to avoid people comparing their current boyfriend/girlfriend with another potential option, if whomever they're currently dating would have been a perfectly fine and happy marriage

YIKES! Seriously? First, how do you know it "would have been a perfectly fine and happy marriage" without a crystal ball to look 50+ years into the future? Second, hypergamy is real and will rear its head no matter how much you try to stifle it. At some point the wife WILL get the hots for another man. She WILL start comparing her husband to him. This is human nature. I just wrote a post on it last week. By not allowing her to see if there's a better option, you're essentially convincing people to settle with the person in-hand, always wondering if it really was a good choice or not. This is totally absurd. I can say first-hand that my wife experienced this and on much less than what your congregation pushes, and it almost tore us apart.

I did not say long distance relationships are encouraged. I said they are common.

Semantics. They're not opposing them either, or acknowledging the practical limitations. Or is there another rule you forgot to mention where couples have to be in close-distance relationships for at least a year after being long-

distance before they're allowed to marry, so they have a chance to actually get to know the other and experience a more natural relational context?

I think you yourself married young at 24, correct? That would definitely be young for the secular world.

Right, and I've also commented that it was an unwise choice for me to have done that.

This goes both ways, not just for men

I assumed that, but it doesn't change the point that you're still virtually insuring that dread is never ever a possible viable option in any relationship. Good luck with that.

I think the older people and the top leads are [red pill]

When was the last time they preached on hypergamy or passing fitness tests or plate theory? If they are preaching on these things, then I'm completely wrong about this place and I'd be interested to learn more. If they're not, they're not "red pill."

I've written posts before (or maybe just comments, I can't remember) on why no congregation is "red pill." Too many people assume that "red pill" is synonymous with "teaches headship" - and even that doesn't seem to be taught in this congregation. Embrace the fact that there are going to be blue pill aspects to every congregation and you can work toward giving them a more biblical understanding. Otherwise you're going to end up falling into the churchianity mentality of "I love my congregation, so I'm going to believe everything they tell me." Don't be that guy. Be the Acts 17 Berean. I encourage that even of the things you learn here!

Spiritual Orphanages and MGTOW

1 upvotes · 11 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Notice the language - "The Church in/at" implies, "those within the Church who are at this city." Paul expresses this sentiment more clearly in Philippians 1:1 - "To all God's holy people in Christ Jesus at Philippi." I believe this is what the apostles meant in all their letters when they say "the church at ..." - not that they're validating congregational structures (which, for the most part, didn't even exist in those cities at the time), but the fact that God's Kingdom included people in those cities.

For reference, the first historical example we see of a congregation didn't arise until the 200s AD. Before then, the Church (proper) was meeting individually or in people's homes as a network, not a centralized unit. Brian Sanders' *Underground Church* is a great example of a decentralized means of connecting believers. Rather than pulling people in to a centralized hub, he's sending them out into communities as the primary function of his structure, and the only semblance of a centralized structure exists primarily to build up the people who will be going out into the world, as the Church was always designed to do.

I just saw this comment I'd started writing last week. Apparently I never finished it, but I'll send what I had anyway.

Update: Looking for guidance

1 upvotes · 11 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I know many wonderful Christian therapists and I don't know a single person who had regretted going to therapy

Christian therapists are extremely rare. Secular therapists who happen to be Christian in their private lives and

want to make a dime off a Christian client-base and are willing to quote a Bible verse every now and then (and therefore fraudulently call themselves "Christian therapists") are the norm.

People walk away from "therapy" happy because anger subsides naturally over time. Many of the people who need marriage counseling are repeat clients. They aren't finding permanent solutions. They find placating solutions. By the time they meet with the therapist a time or two, the issue has substantially died down and the therapist gets all the credit when in reality "time heals all wounds" is what's going on.

Therapists (not just "even" - but ESPECIALLY the Christian variety) are blue pillers because they give blue pill advice. Through my career I have known more marriage counselors, therapists, social workers, psychologists, psychiatrists, etc. than I know what to do with. I've interviewed them carefully - either on the witness stand or because I vet people before entrusting my clients to them. They all rely on secular education and they all completely misunderstand intergender relational dynamics. Typical advice is "do more chores for her and she'll want to have sex with you more" - and guys hang their hat on this to get more duty sex rather than desirous sex. The reality is you can't negotiate desire. Or they'll be advised, "learn to communicate better and she will love you for who you are," when the reality is that he's a fat slob who no woman would *want* to have sex with, so he gets pity sex that's generally unfulfilling. But people don't know that "better" even exists at all, so they take the scraps the marriage counselor leads them to (which in most cases would have evolved naturally even without the counseling) and start praising Jesus for the fifth-tier nonsense they end up with.

it certainly can help you and your partner find the way in which you both communicate best and can help both parties to feel heard and understood

Any middle-man can do this. Grab a random person off the street and they're capable of mediating that type of conversation. That takes no special degree, and there's nothing inherently biblical about it.

But the real point is that the emphasis is still on communication as the "life blood of marriage," as so many people often say. It's not. And any model that values communication over, for example, attraction - that's a model that's not trustworthy for long-term results.

Maybe therapy won't fix 100% of your problems, but maybe fix 1 or 2 or 50 and you and your partner will be in a healthier place than when you started

Right. And therapy very well may fix 1 or 2 problems. But it does so by instilling false and damaging frameworks for how marriages should operate, thereby patching 2-3 nicks in the wall by tearing down another, leaving the house in worse condition than it started. People see those two holes get fixed and aren't facing the torn down wall yet, so until they actually turn around and see the damage done, they feel satisfied with those nicks in the paint being covered up.

Bottom line: with how many marriage counselors there are in the world and how many people use them, the fact that divorce rates are still skyrocketing is an EXTREMELY clear testament that marriage counseling, on the whole, is not working and is likely doing more harm than good.

Spiritual Orphanages and MGTOW

1 upvotes · 6 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I agree with the premise of what you're saying, but not the practice of it.

We're adopted as sons! And we're being built into God's household!

Right, except the household is being built. Jesus is preparing the place for us. It doesn't exist here on earth and we're not living there yet.

First of all, these converts are not abandoned by their heavenly father.

Agreed. But it also has the practical effect of a distance relationship. Jesus said he was going away to prepare a place for us, and we have the Spirit he left for us instead. I also agree with Jesus that the Spirit is better for us than his physical presence. But the reality is that commissioning a new believer to be raised by the Spirit without the Church fulfilling its obligation in mothering Christ's children with close to 100% consistency will result in the person falling away. The statistics on new converts who never fellowship with other believers are extremely clear on this. They don't maintain the faith.

For those who do plug into congregations, instead of parenting, they get classes and mass teachings. The practical effect is: "We're a mom who doesn't want to invest in you, so take what you get and if you want more, go let your dad raise you." If we don't want to call them "spiritual orphanages," that's the closest we could call it.

Of course, the practical effect is that such a mother - even if an actual mother and not an orphanage - is still doing the exact same things an orphanage would do, and possibly even less. Even in orphanages we see lots of one-on-one time between the children with their care-givers. This simply doesn't happen in most congregations.

Can the evangelist say to the teacher, "I don't need you?" No. And of course we can also cross-train. But maybe someone's role really is to evangelize and leave the discipleship to others.

I've heard this argument a million times. It's not a very good one. It would make sense if discipleship were a specific gift or role given to some people in the body of Christ. But notice that "disciple-making" is not in the Ephesians 4 list of roles within the Church, nor is it listed among any of the spiritual gifts. There's a reason for that, which is as I often say: your function and gifting within the Church are the context within which you make disciples, not a replacement for your obligation to make disciples.

Even then, did Jesus say at the Great Commission, "Go, therefore, only you who are given the spiritual gift of making disciples and make disciples"? Of course not. The great commission was given to all and compelled to all. The very wording of the commission makes this clear:

- The 12 commanded to make disciples of all nations. That means every person in the world is part of the mission field - not just those gifted at discipler-making.
- They were also commanded to teach those disciples to obey all the commands.
- That includes teaching them to obey the command to make disciples, meaning everyone in the mission field is to be trained in how to fulfill the command to make disciples of all nations - not just the people "gifted" at it.
- It also includes the command to teach others to obey every command, so you also have to teach them how to obey the command to teach others how to obey the command to make disciples ... and so on.

Discipleship is the mission for all. Our roles and giftings within the Church are the context in which we fulfill it. An evangelist will make disciples of the people he converts. A pastor will disciple those within his flock. A teacher will choose from among his students people to disciple.

And the gifts play in uniquely as well. The generous should disciple those in need of their generosity - not merely giving, then walking away. The merciful should disciple those who are suffering, not merely consoling them and leaving. The hospitable should disciple those invited into their home, rather than forgetting them the moment they leave.

Paul does call himself the Corinthians' spiritual father, but he doesn't mind handing over their tutelage to someone else such as Timothy

Right, as he does with the Philippians as well. But this confirms what I'm talking about. Paul was functioning as a patriarch or forefather over all those who would believe through his ministry. Timothy functioned as a child to Paul (Philippians 2:22) and was sent to function as a spiritual parent to the Philippians (v. 23) - and Paul also disciplined others while he was at Philippi, and gave them authority to function as spiritual parents, modeling a Christ-like life to the rest of the believers at Philippi (3:17).

But Paul was called to travel and spread the Gospel through preaching and couldn't stay still in just one place, nor could he bring throngs of churches with him from all the places he visited

Correct, which is why he disciplined people at the places he went so that there were people local to each body who could function as spiritual parents - and when this was found lacking, he would send someone like Timothy who he knew would set them back on track.

The congregational structure today is abandoned this concept altogether. Nobody is being sent to us to get us back on track - and when something appears to be fulfilling this purpose, it has very little to do with living and more to do with theological discrepancy that needs sorted out - "Why are you teaching that?" kinds of questions.

I think about Apollos in Ephesus in Acts 18. He was zealous for Christ but only knew the baptism of John. Someone had evangelized him, but Aquila and Priscilla took him under their wing and filled in what he hadn't learned yet. He then went on to preach to others including the Corinthians.

Right, John was killed, so Aquila and Priscilla adopted him, taking on the parental role. I don't imagine the story is suggesting their version of "fill him in" was "we don't have time for you, personally, but you can come once a week to sing some songs and hear an hour and a half lesson, and maybe talk to others throughout the week if you feel like it."

Anyways, your main point seems to be to admonish people to evangelize and disciple more, and carry through on the roles they have, and at that level I completely agree.

Correct - and I'm glad we see eye to eye on this.

But the Church, an orphanage? No.

I want to be clear on this: I never said The Church is a spiritual orphanage. I wrote: "Congregational structures collect spiritual orphans, becoming spiritual orphanages." The congregational structure is not The Church. There is no "my church" or "your church," as those are only references to the congregational units and not The Church, proper. The congregational structures are a tool The Church has utilized - and a very useful one! I encourage everyone to make good use of the structure, once recognizing it's actual beneficial function. But the fact that COVID has shut down congregational structures, and yet The Church still exists is a testament to this distinction.

The only verse I have trouble interpreting within this framework is where Jesus says, "For where large groups of people gather in a building in my name, there am I in that building with them."

I gather that the thrust of your comment is this:

1. We are not orphans if we have a father. I agree. We are not technically orphans. But the way the modern congregational structure raises spiritual children is far more akin to an orphanage than being raised by a mother. That's my point.
2. It's commonplace throughout Scripture for the evangelist and discipler to be different people rather than the same person. I also agree on this. While the structure itself makes more sense to have everyone parent their

own spiritual children, there is a practical difficulty to this when one is so successful an evangelist that they cannot parent all of those who are born again through them - and that's a problem I'd gladly welcome of anyone, and I will happily discuss the issue with just such a person, as with Paul. As for the parallel, I will note that, as a matter of technicality, The Church is the bride of Christ and responsible for spiritually parenting those who are born again through them, so the actual person who plants or waters isn't extremely vital (though wise and convenient if the same). My point is more that congregational units aren't even spiritually parenting at all. They have abandoned any notions of parentage and followed more of a mass-produced classroom setting. This is addressed heavily in my walk-and-talk conversations with [u/r_horizon](#), [/u/paexology](#), and [/u/TheChristianAlpha](#). Those have been recorded and likely start being posted next week.

3. The Church is not a spiritual orphanage. I agree. The congregational units we confuse for The Church are what function as spiritual orphanages. Members of The Church attend these congregational structures (though not exclusively - there are a lot of people outside The Church who also attend, whether they realize they're out or not), which is why they are often confused for The Church itself.

When you have "feeeeeelz" for someone else

1 upvotes · 4 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I guess what strikes me with this movie is this idea that you fell out of something good that you know you won't get back

Right - another commonality with La La Land.

a relationship that made you happy that is something to not take for granted

True. Key word there, though: *made*. Past tense. What happens when a relationship *made* you happen, but doesn't *make* you happy anymore? That's what happens. The relationship, in this case, isn't what you take for granted. It's the happiness you had in the beginning.

Note the title of the movie: *The Last Five Years*. They didn't even make it 5 years before losing their happiness! They basically got through NRE and gave up. If that's the model for the relationship marketplace (as compared with the SMP), it's a pretty crappy one - yet as equally blue pill as those who misunderstand the sexual dynamics. The two overlap substantially, though not in every way.

Hell could be a little bit like this

On that, I completely agree.

And thanks for the despair correction, i'm getting there with english

Oh, despair was certainly the right word for Anna Kendrick's character in *The Last Five Years*. I was saying that La La Land had a similarly powerful ending, but was more hopeful in the way that it concludes, despite the permanent nature of the loss.

Who should you listen to on RPChristians?

1 upvotes · 4 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Huh ... I could have sworn yours always showed up blue for me.

Who should you listen to on RPChristians?

1 upvotes · 4 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Right. I get things wrong. I always encourage people to challenge everything they read against Scripture - including the things I write. As I've alluded to before and in the podcast, if I were doing things again today, there are significant chunks of even the sidebar material that I'd re-write. If anyone finds anything that needs correction or updating, just let me know and we'll talk about it.

In this, there's a delicate balance between **TEACHING** and **NOTE-SHARING**. RP claims, primarily, to be the latter. But when expositing Scripture, it often takes the form of the former. Even I can't keep straight sometimes when I'm teaching or passing along an experiential note - though the difference is definitively found in the Scriptural foundation between the two.

I've also acknowledged that there have been times when I've intentionally posted partially complete information, knowing I didn't have the whole picture correct, relying on Cunningham's Law to get the content where it needs to be.

So, again: don't just take my word for something. Use your own brains every now and then ;)

The Origins of the Ekklesia ("Church")

1 upvotes · 3 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Gotcha. While scripture doesn't directly address the issue, it's a fascinating thought that could lead to some interesting results.

The Origins of the Ekklesia ("Church")

1 upvotes · 3 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

What would this do on a national spectrum?

This is one of the structural aspects I do, personally, reject. The apostles are clear that they had the right to demand compensation through the Gospel - though they often refused to do so if it would compromise their ministry, contrary to many congregations' positions today. More to the point, there's plenty of precedent that even the local gatherings required some sort of funding - though certainly not to the degree we see it today.

I don't believe people should actually be paid to attend gatherings of the Ekklesia. But I do agree that the ekklesia, on the whole, should be internally financially self-sufficient and outward-flowing, rather than inward-taking. If you haven't yet, *Underground Church* addresses this a lot more.

I never understood why the Church doesn't come together as the full body and figure out how to lay seige on the hearts of their community

Because local congregations are more interested in growing their brand than they are in growing God's Kingdom. To them it's more about getting PEOPLE IN the door than getting CHRIST'S NAME OUT the door.

there were suddenly 120 people gathered in front of a super market? THAT would be interesting. What kind of attention would that draw?

Underground Church talks about this too. They have a network of small house-congregations that are what I'd call their *koinonia* groups, but when they meet corporately, because they don't put a mega-building in their budget, their 10k+ people often find places outdoors to congregate, and it's done at random intervals when the time is right, not weekly.

To be clear: the book fascinates me. I don't agree with everything in it, though. It's just one person starting to become woke to a lot of the ideas we discuss.

The Origins of the Ekklesia ("Church")

1 upvotes · 2 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Gotcha. Your position on wanting to have perfect theology is supported by such passages as:

- when Jesus cast the legion of demons out of the man by the decapolis and told him, "Now study the Scriptures and learn everything about them before you tell anyone what happened to you.

Or ...

- when Jesus healed a blind man, he said, "Make sure you understand exactly what happened and how it happened any why before you talk to anyone about this." And when the pharisees questioned him he said to them, "Sorry, I have to study more before I can testify about what Jesus did for me."

Or ...

- when the woman at the well wanted to tell everyone she know about her conversation with Jesus, but he stopped her and rebuked her for wanting to speak of such things without having perfect theology about them first.

I think you're onto something here ;)

OYS - Where Progress is Made (07/29/20)

1 upvotes · 2 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Right. This all makes perfect sense to me and I agree. The only place where I might clarify is that I've seen a distinction between two camps of "full preterists":

- (1) those who believe Jesus returned and the 1,000 years are over, yet the New Earth/New Jerusalem are still yet to come (maybe you'd call this "partial, yet mostly full"), and
- (2) those who believe this world we're living today actually is heaven, and being sanctified to its described state in Scripture, thus literally every single thing is already fulfilled (which I've occasionally heard referred to as hyper-preterism).

When I talk about "full preterism" as a direction I might lean at times, I'm only referring to the first of those two options - and even that is iffy.

The Origins of the Ekklesia ("Church")

1 upvotes · 2 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

My concern about the correct interpretation, including mine (I really want to nail it right and I fear otherwise) is not of atheistic or worldly origin; I really want to do exactly what God wants.

Name the last 5 people you've discipled and the last 5 you've brought to Christ and when each of them was.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (07/29/20)

1 upvotes · 2 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I was under the impression you did believe or push full preterism

No. I'm undecided on the issue. I've noted in the past that I lean in that direction, but only to the degree that I admit it's a possibility and would explain a lot. I believe that partial preterists and futurists are less logical in their approach and that the evidence for full preterism resolves the logical conflicts about the return of Christ and its

timing, which cause Christians to come under a great deal of scrutiny that's wiped away if we give credence to the texts that imply it may have already occurred. That said, this means that the partial preterists (as I actually place myself in) and the futurists are relying more on faith than on logic, and that's generally a safe place to be for a believer.

A position I don't think has enough evidence to support

Or, in the reverse, there's absolutely no evidence to support futurism. It's a belief structure based exclusively on faith because you can't prove something that hasn't happened yet - you can only believe that it will.

At most, a futurist's evidence is proof by omission, which means demonstrating that what allegedly already occurred has, by some evidence, been proven not to have occurred. But even this is hollow and weak. It means explaining away evidence rather than providing actual evidence. In the battle between evidence and no-evidence, at least from a rote logical perspective, evidence usually wins out.

But again: logic isn't necessarily the default conclusion-source for a system of faith, so at least in Christianity there's every reason for those suspicious of the historical record to insist on faith in futurism than the admittedly limited sources relied upon by full preterists (which I empathize with and acknowledge as possibly valid, but do not commit to on my own).

A number of versions of preterism have enough objective evidence however that I believe it could be true.

And even if you didn't, it still wouldn't matter much. This is, ultimately, a disputable matter that has relatively little significance other than shutting up the crazies who can't stop false-prophecy that Bill Gates is ushering in the apocalypse.

Tag: [/u/DeChef2](#)

Also: [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) - Because I know you have a similar leaning as I do and I'd be interested in seeing your thoughts on the discussion here sometime.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (07/29/20)

1 upvotes · 2 August 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

To be clear, I'm not intentionally a preterist evangelist. I don't care one bit if anyone wants to be a preterist or a futurist. It doesn't matter nearly as much as it is interesting to think about. That's all. I wouldn't urge anyone to spend more time on the issue than is warranted - which is none at all if you haven't mastered the art of raising up spiritual children first already.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (07/29/20)

1 upvotes · 31 July 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

[/u/Torn4_025](#) wrote:

God is not the author of confusion

I've heard this phrase chanted many times regarding revelation, and I used to buy into that belief. And while it sounds like a feel-good notion, it's not a reliable metric for understanding God's communications to man. 1 Cor. 14:33 is where the phrase comes from, but it's in the context of explaining orderliness in worship and part of a command not to cause disruptions and instability. The word is *akatastasia*, which is defined as "instability" and most commonly translated as *disturbance*, *upheaval*, *revolution*, *political/moral anarchy*. This makes sense in the context of the verse, as it's talking about not having multiple people speaking in tongues at a time, or multiple prophets prophesying simultaneously; rather, it should be done one at a time - because God is not a God of

anarchy or disorder in how he wants his people organized.

Now, having given the context for why 1 Cor. 14:33 doesn't mean God will never say anything confusing, consider all the times God DOES intentionally do and say confusing things with the express purpose and knowledge that it would be confusing and defy logic/common sense. I'll limit myself to 5 examples.

- When Daniel was given visions, there are numerous times where it says things like, "I was appalled by the vision; it was beyond understanding" - and that was even AFTER Gabriel told him what the vision meant! Gabriel didn't give a similar explanation of Revelation, the visions are of substantially similar content, so why would we assume God meant for Revelation to be any less confusing? I mean ... this is DANIEL we're talking about - the guy known throughout all of the Bible for being able to interpret dreams and visions (Joseph may be the other one to fit that mold).
- In Mark 4:11-12 Jesus explains that he speaks in parables because he did not want those outside the Kingdom of God to understand what he was saying. That is, he intentionally spoke in a confusing manner that precluded some people from following along. The thought was that the disciples would get it, but they didn't, so he proceeds to explain himself, realizing that his parable was too confusing even for them without further explanation.
- 1 Cor. 1:27 talks about how God uses the foolish things of the world to confound the wise.
- Isaiah 55:8-9 talks about how God's ways and level of thinking is beyond our ways and level of thinking.
- Isaiah 19:13-14 talks about how the princes of Zoan and Memphis became fools and were deceived, leading Egypt astray because "The Lord has poured into her [Egypt] a spirit of confusion. Egypt has been led astray in all she does, as a drunkard staggers around in his vomit."

What I see all throughout Scripture is that God does intentionally speak in very confusing ways so that those outside his Kingdom will not understand. His hope is that his people will grasp his intentions, but the parable of the sower shows that even Jesus's closest disciples couldn't always grasp what he was trying to say - and there are several other incidents throughout Gospels where the authors seem to add notes about how they didn't understand something at the time, but only much later realized what Jesus meant.

I'm not sure how we could say that Revelation should be something neatly obvious and understandable when something as simple as the parable of the sower (which yet even many pastors today fail to understand!) couldn't even be grasped by the disciples when it was first shared. Further, most scholars believe that John was intentionally trying to confuse his words to prevent the Roman government from understanding the contents of his book, lest it cause him and the churches to fall under even greater persecution because of the things said in it.

The website in question pushes a very figurative world view of the bible

I'm not sure how that could possibly be said in comparison to futurism. Most of preterism is dedicated to showing literal fulfillment of virtually everything Revelation has said. Futurism is the camp that hangs its hat on a figurative or metaphorical interpretation. More to the point: preterism focuses on interpreting prophetic visions consistently with known interpretations of prophetic visions. The beast, for example, is virtually always interpreted by futurists as a singular person. This might make logical sense because of a few things Revelation says about the beast, making it seem like an isolated, sentient being. Yet in Daniel's vision of the 4 beasts, those are also described as individual beings, yet the explanation given is that they represent kingdoms, not singular people. So, when preterists suggest that the best in Revelation is the Roman empire/kingdom, it's a matter of interpreting it consistently with how Daniel's prophesies about end-times were interpreted, using Scripture to interpret Scripture rather than taking a face-value approach. If Daniel had assumed that the beasts in his vision were individual people because that's how they appeared in the vision, he would have been wrong - and the angel

explaining it to him had to make the actual meaning clear to him.

That being said, I fully endorse everything /u/DeChef2 said in this comment I'm replying to. Well-put. And you're right that I do not push the idea of full preterism, nor am I fully persuaded. I just acknowledge that there's enough objective evidence that it *could* be true - not that it actually is true. I haven't spent enough time exploring that angle of things. I believe /u/OsmiumZulu is in the same camp on that one.

Episode 10 - No Frame, No Game Part 2

1 upvotes · 31 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

You're interpreting the verse to read:

When you show affection for an older man, encourage him as you would a father ... younger women as sisters, in all purity."

It looks to me like this verse is talking about how to approach someone when they need to be rebuked.

Also, I prefer to assume this couple is married - and there's no reason to believe they're not. Why assume they're sinning when we can assume the best in people?

40 million reasons and not a single excuse

1 upvotes · 29 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

To say you are responsible for either of those things is foolish and a lie, you are responsible for neither.

I agree. We're not responsible for everything. But in my hypothetical between myself, the other attorney, and the judge, I was the one who was late. I have to acknowledge that or respect is lost - even if my lateness was due to uncontrollable factors.

Part of this also comes into the believability of so-called "uncontrollable factors." People hear excuses of uncontrollable factors all the time. If the dog really did eat your homework, was that actually uncontrollable? Maybe you shouldn't have left your homework where the dog could get it. Maybe traffic really was bad - but why didn't you leave even earlier? Sure, a drunk driver hit you - but maybe you could have been a better defensive driver.

Now, it's possible that you hid your homework in a lockbox where only you knew the code, but your baby brother was spinning numbers and it randomly opened and the dog crept up and ate it at that point and you really did take every possible precaution. But at some point, when all you have is your word for it, it's just going to sound like excuses. Telling the judge that it's not your fault because traffic was bad is often going to be interpreted as an excuse, no matter how legitimate it is.

And this is the thing: in situations where you're reporting to an authority what matters more than the reality of the facts is the perception of the one in authority. In this, if they're not likely to fully believe your story, you're better off just owning up to the portion of the scenario that's relevant to them rather than shifting blame on the parts that are only relevant to you. "I'm sorry, your honor, that I'm the one that held up the hearing." This goes a MUCH longer way in earning respect than blame-shifting.

Now, in an ideal world everyone would automatically know how much a person can be trusted and would believe true stories and see through lies quickly and appropriate blame-shifting would be able to occur by nature. But we don't live in an idyllic world. So, we can't always look to the idealism of "genuine situations where it's not my fault" and instead embrace the fact that most people only care about the frustration you caused them without caring about the reasons why you had no choice.

In all this, I think you're getting too hung up on the technicality of "there is no such thing to apologize for," when

most people won't perceive it that way, even if it's true. When you're with your subordinates, don't worry about it. You don't owe them an apology on that anyway. But with a superior, like a judge, being respected is often more important than being right on a technicality.

Locked down and lacking motivation

1 upvotes · 28 July 2020 · /r/askRPC

It'll be posted next week.

Saw a post asking about porn addiction the other day. Here is a really great video that's helped me a lot already.

1 upvotes · 27 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I get what you're saying. The rule on the sidebar is, as [/u/rocknrollchuck](#) referenced, that posts must have a reasonable quality. In the case of link posts, people are arguing that the link is where the quality is found. But that doesn't mean the post itself is of a reasonable quality. The quality relates to the post on this sub, not the content off the sub that's being referenced.

40 million reasons and not a single excuse

1 upvotes · 27 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

couch, *verb*: (a) to arrange or frame (words, a sentence, etc.); put into words; express; (b) to express indirectly or obscurely

The idea is that you're framing the way you communicate in a manner that will be received the way you want it. If you're too blunt about some things, it can work against you. But if you're not blunt enough, it can also come off as evasive or deflecting. How you "couch" your words/express your situation can make a big difference on how it's received.

your definition for 'reasons' precludes things you truly have no control over

That's fair. I suppose I don't necessarily see a point to this on a theological level, though. Romans 9 talks about how we're still responsible for things that are exclusively under God's control, right? We have to accept that responsibility regardless of our lack of control over the situation. I'm okay with that.

Example: I'm late to a court hearing because traffic is unusually bad - and I even left 15 minutes early just in case. That's beyond my control. But how do you think the judge would react if I went in saying, "It's not my fault. Traffic was really bad"? They're going to lose respect for me, even if they believed me.

Instead, I still accept responsibility for the situation and say, "I'm sorry for my tardiness. I was caught in traffic. I will make sure it does not happen again." The reality is that the judge just wants to start the hearing. I'm the one not there. Often-times they don't care - reason or excuse - why I'm not there, they just want me there so they can get started. In this reply, I accept responsibility for the fact that I was the one holding up the hearing. But I present it ("couch it") in a way that evokes sympathy and understanding from others around and likely increases their respect for me for not being a pansy by avoiding the acknowledgment that they were waiting on me.

I can't really follow the "rear-ended by a drunken driver" or "workplace accident" examples you gave because you haven't given a context for why you'd be giving excuses/reasons in the first place. Are you just assessing the situation yourself? Or is someone harassing you about why you're not wealthy yet? Or is a friend questioning whose fault the accident is? The way you approach the situation changes based on those contexts. The existence of the situation itself does not inherently imply any form of reason/excuse.

Anyone else frustrated with their church leadership re: COVID?

1 upvotes · 20 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Haha. "Actual meaning of ekklesia"? You do realize the original ekklesia was an outdoor meeting of the Greek populace and didn't involve a building, right? The ekklesia was a reference to the people, not the location. It's like the word "council." The council might meet in a building, but the building is not the council itself, and many council meetings happen outside the normal meeting place, such as at restaurants or even over the phone.

And the fact that a group of Christians in 233AD in Syria decided to use a building is a FAR CRY from suggesting they glorified the building location itself. I do agree that building idolatry did indeed develop over time. But there's no evidence it began that early.

Anyone else frustrated with their church leadership re: COVID?

1 upvotes · 19 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

As I understand it, the apostles and early believers were going to the temple courts and synagogues not to congregate with one another, but to preach the Gospel, and their participation in the eucharist afterward was, as Jesus modeled, a time to share the Gospel and discuss the imperative to spread it to the nations.

This is clear from not only the many examples where they were proclaiming the Gospel in the temple courts, but also the examples where the Jews were running them out for doing this. They were, on the whole, not welcome there.

In Acts 2, specifically, they had a number of converts at Pentacost, which was a singular day event. Jews from all over the known world were congregating at the temple courts and stayed for some time to pray and worship there. It was the primary reason for their travel and the apostles knew this. So, they would preach in the temple courts to share the Gospel with all the Jews amassing from everywhere before going into the homes to get down to business.

More to the point: when Jesus was kicked out of the temples, we see him gathering with people in homes, on a mountainside, in front of a fountain, on a road, in/from a boat - basically wherever he could. The apostles seem to have followed suit, as we see ministry happening on the road, in open fields, on ships, in homes, etc. There's actually scant little that supports the idea that they congregated in centralized locations - but a great deal that shows them meeting up in smaller settings in homes rather than large structured buildings.

I simply don't see the foundation in Scripture for what you're proposing - yet if you look throughout Acts and the letters, it's much, much clearer that homes rather than buildings were the norm for most meetings.

Anyone else frustrated with their church leadership re: COVID?

1 upvotes · 9 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Yikes. That's some of the poorest exegesis I've seen in ages ... if it can even be called that.

How the Truth Set Me Free From Masturbation and Pornography

1 upvotes · 6 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I don't mind recording anything. But let's chat further in PM.

How the Truth Set Me Free From Masturbation and Pornography

1 upvotes · 6 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Haha. Want to make it a recorded walk and talk? Let me know the topics in advance and we'll make it happen. But deliverance/healing is a more prominent thing I've been involved with, having led a team in putting on a conference on the subject last year, and being one of the keynote speakers. I didn't see eye to eye with everyone involved, and my primary function was to keep the more ... "spiritually minded" people grounded in scripture

rather than demonic philosophy or spiritualized psychology.

How the Truth Set Me Free From Masturbation and Pornography

1 upvotes · 6 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I'm confused.

Reformed? Or Arminian?

1 upvotes · 5 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

If you'll forgive a "No True Scotsman" logical fallacy

It's not a fallacy if there's an actual authority who gets to decide what's true and not.

God's intentions and decrees are compatible with man's sinful nature and behavior. Hence compatibilism.

This is not the definition of compatibilism I'm accustomed to.

"limited free will" position ... man is free to do whatever he wants, but he is not free to want whatever he wants

Right, this is the first "predestines our circumstances in a way that he knows we will only be inclined to choose the path he wants" route I mentioned. In this case, the "predestined circumstances" are the desires God created to be associated with their nature.

But your argument also opens itself up to numerous holes. Perhaps those particular Jews killed Christ because it was part of their nature. Yet there were other Jews who had that exact same nature who were not part of Christ's death. So, why is it one person's nature to kill Jesus and not the other's, if they both have the same nature? Well, then we're stuck saying that there are technically unique finger-print-like natures for every person, devised by their own circumstances and one set of Jews' circumstances were more associated with Christ and their hatred of him than another's, and that God, having designed for Christ to die, molded their circumstances to cause their will to be carried out in accord with his will. This is still a phantom "inevitable choice" argument that is not the same as compatibilism. It's a way of pretending to be compatibilist while really undermining free will to get there.

All of this also doesn't account for the believer's spectrum nature where, at different points, we are less sanctified and more sanctified, having a perfected spirit with a sinful flesh (Romans 7:25, for example) and that nature is constantly changing.

Also, the entire concept of being a slave to one's nature, while certainly having some biblical foundation, undermines the point of free will in the first place. My point in saying this is not to say it's definitively wrong, as there are good cases to be made for a "non-free-will" position. Rather, my point is that these explanations are still not aligned with compatibilism which fully embraces free will and sovereignty together without compromising either to make the compatibility work.

To be fair, it's these varying definitions on "compatibilism" that have caused me to be hesitant in the past in identifying as a compatibilist. Perhaps you've persuaded me I should stop using that word to define myself, as the way you mean the word is clearly not what I intended when I said it.

Reformed? Or Arminian?

1 upvotes · 4 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Like I say, I'll have to look into this more. This is in contradiction with most everything I've heard from every other self proclaimed "reformed" person. At best, I've heard people try to give explanations that pretend to give room to free will, while undermining its validity by arguing things like (as only one example): "Good lets us choose, but predestines our circumstances in a way that he knows we will only be inclined to choose the path he wants" - which I call the *inevitable choice* argument.

Another explanation takes away the function of free will by saying it's valid, but never of any significance (**this, for example**).

My understanding of compatibilism is that it rejects these ideas that render one side of the coin to have no valid function.

Reformed? Or Arminian?

1 upvotes · 3 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Interesting. I've attended 5 ish congregations in the last few years that self identify as reformed who preach predestination in the absence of free will as their soteriological model, and this has also been the position of those identifying as reformed on **r/TrueChristian**. Of the many, you're only the second to tell me that reformed believe in compatibilism. I'll have to research this more sometime because my anecdotal evidence of those who call themselves reformed, while vast, may end up being wrong.

Religious Gf of 4 years broke up with me a month ago. Messaged me today that she wants to get back together. But she doesn't not want any sex during the relationship. Need advice?

1 upvotes · 2 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

This is not a mission. It's a set of vague career goals. If it is technically a mission, it's clearly not influenced at all by your faith. I recommend examining this further and why your life ambitions are separate from your faith.

Religious Gf of 4 years broke up with me a month ago. Messaged me today that she wants to get back together. But she doesn't not want any sex during the relationship. Need advice?

1 upvotes · 2 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I have no idea where you're getting this paradigm from. Please elaborate.

Refreshing words and an encouragement to start conversations

1 upvotes · 2 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Most of it is already in the 300 series. But yes, some of them could use more expansion.

Feeling discouraged with many churches' support of the Black Lives Matter movement, including my own.. Are there any truly alt-right/conservative churches left that don't buy into this?

1 upvotes · 2 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Right. The problem is that someone who's a true comic book fan will realize all the ways superman has been over-feminized by different writers over the years, so he's not always the ideal man. He always has absurd oneitis for Lois, for example - and that strings through even some of the better portrayals of him. Of course, this is going to be true through virtually every heroic character because they're off doing so many other things on their mission that there's not enough pages to write about them shotgun approaching a few dozen hotties. But some of the more recent writers have at least caused him to ditch Lois for Wonder Woman, who he has less infatuation for because she can take care of herself.

But the fact that he puts his mission above all else, and always succeeds despite Lois's constant penchant for

getting in the way, is still an admirable quality in Superman among all his writers.

Anyone else frustrated with their church leadership re: COVID?

1 upvotes · 1 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Right. But the current congregational structure folds without the pastor. So, if the pastor chooses within his own conscience not to attend Sunday services, then the whole thing falls apart anyway and it'd be better for the congregation just to hold out longer until the pastor does feel comfortable and safe again.

Don't get me wrong, this whole setup is a tragedy in the first place, which is why I embrace, yet simultaneously fight against the congregational structure. But it's worth spending time meditating on every now and then.

Anyone else frustrated with their church leadership re: COVID?

1 upvotes · 30 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

This is wrong. I assume [/u/CentralParkWst](#) (OP) was referencing the stats for his own age group, which is generally referenced as (I'm assuming) 25-34 or 35 to 44. The .5% number is combining all age groups into a single statistic and focusing on only corona-related deaths, whereas the 4.8% number (I usually see it as 5%) is the percentage of corona-positive deaths (even if the cause wasn't corona itself) relative to total deaths from all sources.

[This link](#) shows that .676% of all corona deaths occur in the 25-34 age range, and 3% of all deaths within that age-range are corona-positive.

If we bump up an age range, it's 1.722% of all corona deaths occur between 34-44, with 5.3% of all deaths in that age range being corona-positive.

My point is: by quoting numbers that incorporate ALL age-ranges, you're giving misinformation as it relates to the users talking within their own context here. If you can provide other evidence that the age distribution on this subreddit is identical to the age distribution in the world, generally, then I'd be happy to reconsider and start giving more credit to statistics that account for the 80+ or even 70+ demographic. Do we even have ANYONE at all who's in that age range? I have yet to see a commenter identify as such (highest I've seen is in his 60s).

INFECTION FATALITY RATE

Now, you'll notice that many statistics that purport to be corona death rates are really showing the rate of corona deaths relative to total deaths, or the rate of corona deaths in an age range relative to the total corona deaths. But what we should really be looking at is the rate of death relative to infection within a particular age range. Even then, we want to consider it by locality, as different locations are better equipped to treat patients, affecting the risk of death.

Wikipedia [has a page devoted to this](#) and breaks it down by state, in many cases. Most of their numbers are current through late-May/early-June. The HIGHEST rate in the US for someone in their 20s is .5% in Mississippi. 0.0% is more common in states like Idaho, Kentucky, Minnesota, Oregon, and Virginia. .1% exists in Connecticut, Indiana, Massachusetts, and Missouri. .2%, as OP referenced, is applicable in Colorado, Maryland, Washington, and Wisconsin.

Even if we bump the age range up to people in their 30s, Idaho, New Hampshire, and Oregon have a 0.0% death rate. .1% for Massachusetts, Minnesota, and Virginia. .2% for Colorado, Indiana, Kentucky, Missouri, and Wisconsin.

The point is: .2% is, for many people, a realistic number for a death rate. By sharing a misleading statistic that compares people's risk of death outside of their own demographic, you give in to the social agenda that supports all the liberalism that's already taking over the country.

Always question everything you read from the media these days. Make sure when you see a statistic that you know exactly what that statistic is actually reporting and whether it applies to anyone's individual context. My guess is that the primary demographic on this sub is 18-40. These are extremely low-risk cases and it's not fair to be pushing all-age statistics on this community where those statistics do not apply, unless you're *specifically* making an argument about the impact a user can have on the older communities outside of this sub.

Why You Must Be Willing to Nuke Your Nuclear Family

1 upvotes · 23 June 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

In order, they're 1 Cor. 7:29, 1 Cor. 7:15, and Luke 14:26. There is a LOT more, though. I was just giving the low-hanging fruit relevant to the post. I created a whole sub for this: [r/RPChristians](#) (as well as the newly created [r/RPCWomen](#)) to talk about all of these things from a biblical angle. Our sidebar content goes into the Scriptural foundation of pretty much everything. Enjoy.

RPCC Episode 3: The State of Marriage

1 upvotes · 20 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Get me a more specific time-stamp. I'm hearing nothing at 3:30-5:30 about BPP.

Are women really "saved through child-bearing"? Yes.

1 upvotes · 18 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Interesting perspective.

RPC Chat - Episode 4: Christian Dead Bedrooms

1 upvotes · 18 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Haha, exactly.

Thoughts about fraternity/sorority culture?

1 upvotes · 17 June 2020 · /r/askRPC

Fraternities have value in the sense that you learn to relate with other men, which is a skill many men end up lacking. Most guys lack this type of relationship with a variety of men, instead only having one or two close friends. The life-on-life nature of fraternity culture also has value in understanding what discipleship can look like when you're living alongside others so closely.

Of course, in fraternity culture you're among peers, not under a true authority structure as the foundation of your "life-on-life" nature. Also, the men you're being influenced by may not be the greatest influences.

So, there are pros and cons. There's nothing inherently red pill or blue pill about the structure itself. There's nothing particularly Christian or unchristian either. It is what you make of it. I've had friends who joined fraternity culture in order to witness to the other men there, and they had great success doing it. I had others who went in passively and ended up worse off for it.

The Narrow Way

1 upvotes · 17 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I just noticed this was removed. If that happens again, just message us and we'll approve it, as long as it generally follows the rules. The post is approved now.

Are women really "saved through child-bearing"? Yes.

1 upvotes · 17 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

So the reason for the Holy Spirit inspiring Paul to include that verse/phrasing in regard to women is to point to spiritual reproduction?

Yes, That's how I'd take it.

We have studies today that show how children in single parent households fare in comparison ... It's not a stretch to think the same is true in regard to godliness.

You'd think, logically. But the stats on retention rates within the church are extremely low. Now, I attribute this more to the failures of churchianity in its lack of spiritual parenting (discipleship). But even still, it could just as easily be argued that united households lead people not toward godliness, but to embrace the coveted things of the world - monetary gain, scientific insight and understanding, etc. I could be wrong on this, but my guess is that the stats do not support a higher correlation of genuine, world-changing believers among united homes over non-Christians within united homes. I'd be more inclined to believe that those from broken homes are apt to seek and embrace what Jesus has to offer. Of course, I may be biased in that my parents divorced within a couple years of my becoming genuinely saved.

Because God wants godly seed, and if/when a couple has children, marriage is the best environment in which children will turn out to be godly.

I think you're missing Malachi 2:15 by focusing too much on 2:14. Marriage is not the context in which children are most likely to become godly. 2:15 says that the parents are meant "to PRODUCE godly offspring." As noted in my original post: this isn't merely toward the production of offspring, generally, which Adam and Eve did through the time of Noah, yet God wiped them away. What I didn't emphasize clearly in my post is that the operative of the PRODUCTION is the godly aspect. That is, it should not read "to produce offspring who are godly," but instead: "with their offspring, to produce godliness." That is the better interpretation of this passage.

Marriage in itself will tend toward the former interpretation, whereas parents committed to discipling their children (which is rare) are the prime context in which godliness can thrive within a home. Again the operative compulsion is to produce godliness in the offspring, not to produce the offspring themselves. This is why it is a reference to spiritual reproduction and not mere physical reproduction.

Of course, somewhat implicit in this Malachi interpretation is that a married couple will have children (but it doesn't seem to compel it), but the focus is on the covenant between the two, and not on the main purpose being procreation.

If you take 2:14 and exclude 2:15, that would seem to be the case. Yet 2:15 unequivocally states that the purpose of marriage is to produce godly offspring. I merely take it in the context I just explained, which from a completely different angle agrees with your conclusion that the focus is not on procreation - yet it disagrees with your alternative conclusion about the covenant. The focus of marriage is not on the covenant, but on the compulsion to produce godliness in one's offspring (whether physical or spiritual). The covenant is referenced as the context in which this union should exist, but the purpose of the union is not for the covenant's own sake. That's like saying, "The purpose of buying a car is to enter into a contract to own a car." No, that's not the purpose - that's the vehicle through which it happens. The purpose of buying a car is so you can drive places.

That said, these are good and interesting thoughts all around.

You did tag 4 people, so no one will get the notice, but I'll tag the other three for you: [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) [/u/Deep_Strength](#) [/u/rocknrollchuck](#)

Thoughts about fraternity/sorority culture?

1 upvotes · 16 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Read the sidebar:

[r/askRPC](#) - While RPC proper exists for higher quality content, [r/askRPC](#) is available for quicker questions or content you're unsure about, but for which you'd like feedback. Substantive questions, the answer for which would be beneficial to all, are still welcome on RPC - especially as they pertain to field reports. But if you're asking about a more niche issue, go to askRPC. Yes, the mods do actively check both subs regularly.

Actual conversations with "abuse" victims.

1 upvotes · 13 June 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

It's funny how riled up you get over a disagreement with a rando on the internet. You don't have to read any of this if it upsets you that much.

Actual conversations with "abuse" victims.

1 upvotes · 11 June 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

You're missing the point. What you're describing may be a form of coercion, but it isn't abuse and there's nothing unlawful about certain types of coercion, such as what you're describing. At the end of the day, if she didn't like it, she could leave and the laws will help her do it. "He gets angry and makes me lose sleep every now and then" v. "I'm being sexually abused/maritally raped" aren't even close to the same spectrum.

You ask any woman: *Would you rather be sexually abused and raped by your husband, or have him get angry and call you names?* The answer is a no brainer and the fact that they make the opposite choice in practice makes it clear that at least in the moment it doesn't feel like sexual abuse or marital rape - they only want to recharacterize it that way after the fact when it suits their purposes.

RPCC Episode 3: The State of Marriage

1 upvotes · 9 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Unfortunately, I sold my psych 101 book as soon as the class was over. I do know there are mixed opinions on the subject, but most people I know in person - especially those who like to zoom through podcasts, as [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) and I apparently do, affirm the conclusions of the study.

I believe slower speech rates can assist in comprehension if you're working with children or people with generally low IQ who need lots of time to process information.

Also, I've read that quantity of information affects preferred communication style too. For lectures, it's better to talk fast, as you can get through more content, keeping the brain engaged, in a shorter time. If you speak slow to get through the same degree of content, people will lose interest and become distracted over time, losing focus on the message being shared. Slow speech is also less exciting, which contributes to interest-loss. Contrarily, fast speech on very short bullet points gives too little time to process everything, so if you're just citing off conclusory points to remember, it's probably better to go slow because instead of explaining why it's significant (which would require fast speech), people need to figure out why the conclusory statement is being made on their own, which requires additional time for the brain to process what's being said.

Also, different types of mental health issues can affect this. I have a teacher friend who has reported that his training suggests people with ADHD should speak slowly to help their brain speed adjust to their speech levels without tripping over their words, whereas you should speak faster when talking TO a kid with ADHD because it gives him less room for distraction, helping to maintain the focus.

A Complete Idiot's Guide to Conversation

1 upvotes · 7 June 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Always assume they do

Indeed. This is my standard mode of operation. I've found that it's true about 95% of the time.

As Blarg notes, there are rare occasions when someone legitimately doesn't want to talk, but even those are usually just a tact issue. The only examples I can truly think of where that's not the case are when people are sleeping or pressed for time and you can't help them.

Actual conversations with "abuse" victims.

1 upvotes · 6 June 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

As expected, she is totally on board. I do not think it is unreasonable either.

My own children do not live with my full time.

I'll never understand guys who don't get this.

When do you realize it is the right person?

1 upvotes · 1 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

You sound like a woman. Are you a woman? Sure, you said "(M21)" but I'm not convinced.

- "Do you go with your gut FEELINGS?"
- "Do you have to FEEL strong connection?"
- "We both have FUN. But when we go on a first date ... [the fun FEELING is] just not there."
- "No super magical ~~moments~~ FEELINGS we would be really EXCITED from."
- Because for a long time I haven't FEEL any super romantic EMOTIONS whatsoever."

Did you even read what you wrote? Emotions are an awful metric to go by. They're fickle and change constantly. They are guaranteed to change at some point after you're married.

A better metric would be a combination of genuine attraction and the FAST qualities, among any other personal preferences and boundaries you may have. Are you attractive enough that such girls are swarming over you yet?

Also, you're trying too hard. Have you read the sidebar? Have you read the "How to Find the Girl You Can't Keep Yourself From Banging" posts? This is very basic stuff.

What is the Christian right's future in American politics?

1 upvotes · 20 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Agreed.

What is the Christian right's future in American politics?

1 upvotes · 20 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

the government isn't the one calling the shots. It's people with enough money

I disagree here, at least on the political level. The rich have influence over their own sphere. But the government

is influenced by the rich on both sides of the line. There are countless liberal rich people and conservative rich people who are lobbying for conflicting results. Do you think Trump, as rich as he was, had much influence over Obama? Or do you think the fact that he didn't have much political sway during Obama's time was part of what compelled him to run for the presidency?

become so rich is that you could pick and choose who will be leaders

Notice that democrats always spend WAAAAAY more on campaigns than republicans, including in the Hillary/Trump campaign. Trump still won. Money has influence, but not as much as you seem to be giving it.

Of course, you would have to be doing this for the right motives and this would have to be done out of faith As Romans 14 says. At this point it wouldn't be considered rebelling.

Right. The Navigators is already doing this. College ministry was actually the third area they got into. They started as a military ministry, then moved on to disciple political leaders, and only after that did the move into campus ministry. Of course, most of us aren't in the military or political figures, so we mostly just hear about the campus ministry aspect.

Either way: I agree that discipling political leaders is not rebelling at all. It's highly encouraged! But no amount of discipling is going to get the country to a point of shredding the constitution and starting all over.

If we take Romans 8 into consideration then it could be said that our founding fathers were in violation of God's commands

Right. And I believe they were. But they weren't doing it *because of the Bible*. The true history of our nation isn't as "Christian" as some like to make it seem. That's why someone like Thomas Jefferson created his own edited Bible that removes every reference to miracles or supernatural beings and events and only tells the history and moral teachings.

The revolution was going to happen whether the Christians wanted it to or not. The Christians piggy-backed onto that and became influencers to make sure the new government was as godly as possible. I'm okay with that. Not with rallying believers together to upturn everything.

The one exception, of course, would be if there was divine prophecy where God ordered the US to secede from Britain. But I don't see any evidence for that.

I personally don't think we are very oppressed, but at what point do we draw the line?

I suppose if Caesar Nero's reign wasn't far enough to cross it, I have no idea how far that line would have to be, but we're nowhere near it ... prophetic compulsion exempted, of course.

Do you wait for it to go to hell or do we act proactively and do something now?

Perhaps it going to hell is God's judgment against the nation or the Church. After all, he did it to Israel whenever they were wayward. I believe he will allow the Church to become persecuted and veer away from his protection if we stray as well.

With how much we talk about how far the Church has strayed, don't you think it would be appropriate for God to use secular authorities to kick it in the butt, just like he did to Israel?

I don't see any direct correlation where is Jesus relates a government to its people akin to a husband and wife. You can't impute that model to the husband-wife model that Jesus gives with the church

You're right - and I knew I was stretching it when I said it ;) But if it's the closest parallel we have between a leader-follower dynamic, that's all we have to work with.

I suppose a better correlation would be to say it'd be like Jesus coming off the cross and whipping Pilate and Herod for being so oppressive against him and his followers.

What is the Christian right's future in American politics?

1 upvotes · 20 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I blame the country less for it and more the church for getting lax at best and scared to upset someone at worst

Oh ... you mean because the men who run it have lost their masculinity? You're describing a beta - passive and always in someone else's frame. This is why biblical masculinity is so critical today - and always has been.

Is marriage worth it?

1 upvotes · 20 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I'm a divorce attorney. I have drafted many prenups. I've also shredded many that other attorneys drafted. So yes, if a crappy attorney does it, it's worthless. I've never had any of mine be discarded by the court.

And no, she doesn't have to keep her job. She just has to keep current on her credentials to qualify for the job. The will can impute income to someone who isn't working at capacity.

If she quits, file for legal separation instead of divorce. It splits the financial entanglement under the law while keeping the marriage intact.

There's a preventive solution to most every problem.

Is marriage worth it?

1 upvotes · 18 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Is marriage worth it?

Yes.

Your answer here shocks me in the face of 1 Cor. 7 and Matthew 19, where Jesus and Paul both say that it's better not to be married if you can avoid it. I don't see any way to interpret this than as a de facto way of saying, "The benefits of marriage are not worth the cost of marriage." Even though marriage is recommended in the case of one who cannot remain sexually pure, it's still phrased as, "The one who marries does good, but the one who does not marry does better."

As for your passages, Hebrews 13 is a reference to the imperative for purity in marriage (i.e. no adultery), not that married people are to be honored as better than single people. 1 Timothy 4 warns against forbidding marriage, but this is a far cry from being interpreted so as to compel everyone that they must marry or even to suggest that marriage is better than non-marriage. It's just telling men not to forbid someone from doing the only thing that might otherwise validate their sexual activity that would otherwise be sinful.

In this, I believe your comment was not necessarily from a biblical standpoint and more a pragmatic assessment of the general benefits of marriage compared to the legal issues OP was talking about. In this, I agree - with proper legal planning, the legal benefits of marriage certainly outweigh the legal risks associated with it,

especially if you're already intending to have sex with the person - not just because of the "premarital sex" issue (which is effectively resolved through spiritual marriage), but because of the child custody/visitation/support laws.

But if we're talking on a pure spiritual level, I have to agree with Paul in 1 Cor. 7 that getting married does more damage to your devotion to God than it benefits, and therefore "the one who marries does good, but the one who does not does better."

Tag: [/u/benjiii1995](#)

Is marriage worth it?

1 upvotes · 18 May 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Is marriage worth it?

No. Paul says in 1 Cor. 7 that it is better not to be married. Jesus also says in Matthew 19 that if you have the ability to avoid marriage, you should. This is definitive biblical evidence proving that being married is NOT better than being single.

The only exception in Scripture is if you can't keep your pants on, then you're better off marrying than having extramarital sex - and there's nothing wrong with this. Yes, you make a sacrifice by tying yourself to another person, and there are many beautiful things that come with this. But the imperative from Scripture seems obvious: the benefit of having a woman at your side will always be outweighed by the cost of the impact it has on your ability to devote yourself to God and your mission.

How to evaluate sexuality compatibility as a Christian with no pre-marital sex and only chaste behavior

1 upvotes · 15 May 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

She and I were both taught FAT in a ministry we were both part of. I added the S. But yes, she's well aware of these traits.

What is your opinion on women who have had a breast reduction?

1 upvotes · 12 May 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

No asking for pics.

Discovered an inappropriate relationship

1 upvotes · 11 May 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Sure. But Jesus also judged the pharisees pretty harshly for adding rules and laws that weren't from God. So, if you have a biblical basis for saying that "Emotional intimacy with anyone of the opposite sex is cheating" - knowing full well that people will interpret "cheating" as synonymous with "adultery" - then you'd better back that up.

Or if you mean something different by "cheating" and that your view of "cheating" is that it's not actually sin at all, then explain that.

Or maybe you don't equate "cheating" with "adultery," but you do still call it sin. In that case, what's the other definition and where's the biblical premise for calling it sin?

You can't make conclusory statements like this without some kind of explanation - especially when it pushes the same garbage blue pill notions of marriage, relationships, sexuality, boundaries, etc. that churchianity is already pushing.

Discovered an inappropriate relationship

1 upvotes · 11 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

That's not at all apparent from your comment and the context of his frequent references to initiating divorce.

Discovered an inappropriate relationship

1 upvotes · 11 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I suppose this is where one's views on exist soteriology actually matters. Some believe you can go in and out of salvation, which would be akin to a couple getting divorced and remarried a number of times (most I've seen in my career is 5; 2-3 is common).

Others believe that you can't lose your salvation at all. That is, once you're one with Christ, you're one forever. The "never really saved in the first place" card can't be played when translating this to human marriages because there are extremely clear indicators to show that you actually were married ... especially if there are kids involved.

The last, more interesting (and perhaps largest) group believes that you can lose your salvation, but once it's gone it can never be regained, as if you committed the unforgivable sin (Hebrews 6:4-6, among others). In this situation, once the door is closed, it's closed forever. This group holds that when God sets a boundary, he sets it hard and the penalty for willful, consistent violation is being permanently kicked out (Hebrews 10:26-30). So, as 2 Timothy 2 indicates, God is generally faithful even when we are faithless, but when we are blatantly defiant against him, that's the end. I believe that's where /u/lololasaurus is.

The question: *Is your behavior consistent with your theology?* That question matters more to me than where you fall on a relatively debatable issue.

Frame Fail?

1 upvotes · 7 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Right now my immediate mission is just to be the best man, husband, father I can be

This is fine in the immediacy. Long-term, you're going to need more than this. If you stay on this path too long, you're going to end up having your life defined by their expectations. If your "mission" (if you can call it that) is defined by your relational context to them ("husband, father"), then it's too easy to slip into letting them have too much influence in directing how you live your life.

https://www.reddit.com/r/RPChristians/comments/6toetn/108_lifepath_of_a_relationship/

What's up fellas. Would love to hear your thoughts. I am also a strong believer.

1 upvotes · 6 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Removed. Please don't do link posts. Just copy/paste the text into a new post here so it doesn't redirect people.

Roosh V on Jessie Lee Peterson

1 upvotes · 4 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Right on.

Idealism and Opportunism are not sex specific

1 upvotes · 1 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

both are what we would call blue pill idols ... For women, it's creating an image of a Prince Charming (that no man can meet)

Right - but why does any woman want a prince charming? Because he's always rich, gives her all kinds of emotional validation, treats her like a queen/princess, etc. But even in the Disney fairy tales, why does prince charming like her back? Certainly not for what she brings to the table. She's just pretty ... but far be it from Disney to sexualize that attraction, so it comes off more as an altruistic love for its own sake with the princess usually being as flawless as the prince, except on more womanly terms (not overweight, doesn't nag, supports his mission, etc.).

men think the rule applies 100% of the time which it obviously doesn't

Agreed. But again, that doesn't make it useless. It just means your post is written for the low-minority of men who aren't in the norm. But that also makes it dangerous because it means the majority of men reading this might feel validated in thinking, "So maybe my wife truly is a special snowflake!"

It's the same with Christian men reading secular RP and coming here with the attitude that all women are whores and terrible people

Right. Now this is certainly a trope that defies the evidence by exaggeration. I actually wrote a much longer multi-paragraph section here elaborating on how this identity exaggeration without context affects other areas of life ... but because it mostly poked fun at the Ray Comfort model of evangelism, I decided it wasn't worth ticking off chuck ;)

but simultaneously have some nuance as men start to understand more.

Agreed ... but ONLY for those men whose wives actually break the mold. It's possible that a man completely overhauls his life, is biblically well along his way in sanctification, has a solid body, is leading like a hero, etc. but his wife still loves him opportunistically. Just because he changes himself doesn't mean she will change how she loves him.

This is kind of like the Brad Pitt Thought Experiment post you did, but in reverse. Instead of putting Brad Pitt in front of her, test the altruistic nature of her love by making her husband, who she claims to love unconditionally, 300lbs, jobless, struggling with depression, verbally abusive, and he demands constant replenishment of his beer can while he watches 12 hours of football a day. Of course, he's sensitive enough that he doesn't demand his beer while she's at work trying to earn a living to pay his mortgage. There, now that we've made him the opposite of Brad Pitt - how well is her altruistic love going to hold up in this situation?

Because I know men whose wives are EXACTLY like that on the feminine side, yet they continue to maintain their altruistic idealism in how they interact with her. Any guy who's ever married a borderline knows how this goes. As soon as his value goes down far enough, she drops him like a rock. Maybe she did love him altruistically, but hypergamy won out over her altruism. But can we really call that an altruistic love if it was still conditioned on him satisfying her hypergamy?

Idealism and Opportunism are not sex specific

1 upvotes · 1 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Well said. I obviously missed that when I watched them a decade ago. I keep waiting for my son to be old enough.

About to file for divorce

1 upvotes · 1 May 2020 · /r/askMRP

He did put it up. It didn't have the issues I was expecting. I mostly agree with what he says, though there are certainly some differences in our underlying framework for understanding it all. I gave him the benefit of the

doubt and filled in the gaps.

Refreshing words and an encouragement to start conversations

1 upvotes · 30 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Who says I'm afraid or encourage anyone else to be?

Are there some worship songs you enjoy?

1 upvotes · 28 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Very encouraging to hear!

Do you think the pandemic, is the foundation for the mark of the beast?

1 upvotes · 28 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

This.

Is compatibility essential (or even useful!) in a marriage? No, not really.

1 upvotes · 28 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Right. My point is that compatibility in itself is a myth. Consider ...

- Birds of a feather flock together /// Opposites attract

So are "birds of a feather" more compatible or are opposites more compatible? There's really NO usable pragmatic definition of "compatibility" to base a relationship off of because everyone is going to have a different theory of compatibility.

Question about my youth group

1 upvotes · 27 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Right. TRP was born out of PUA discussions, but the MRAs, PUAs, MRPs, and TRPs all splintered in different directions.

So, what if you're into military type men?

1 upvotes · 27 April 2020 · /r/RedPillWomen

I'll give this caution: men are men, whether they're in the military or not. Each one is still an individual, and each one has the same attraction triggers. Each one is going to have their own plate of issues - and they're going to be different from one military guy to the next, though some may overlap from time to time. You might find military guys more susceptible to things like PTSD and highly controlling behaviors - which is fine if that's your gig. But don't exchange the **CONCEPT** of a military man for the fact that he is still just a man.

This is, of course, no different from the way men tend to have a "thing" for certain types of women. Sure, lots of guys think they'd love to marry a porn star. Yes, they have lots of inherently attractive qualities. But they're still women just like anyone else with a vagina is a woman.

Military guys can beta up and become unattractive just as easily as any other guy (I've known many). So, make sure your "thing" for military guys doesn't blind you to the reality that he's still a man, for better or worse. To that end ...

You ask about advice for vetting. Figure out his life mission up-front. This is an easy first date question: "What do you want to have accomplished in life by the time you're 80?" A guy who can't answer that question isn't worth following. A guy who can answer it, but with an idiotic answer is slightly better, but still not worth following.

Choosing and Developing Hobbies

1 upvotes · 27 April 2020 · /r/askRPC

This is an excellent start. I recommend taking it down, I can give you a few pointers, and then you put it up on RPC AND MRP. This is the type of content they could use over there too, if developed properly - and I rarely post even my own stuff over there. If you're up for it, shoot me a PM and include the text of this post (as I won't be able to access it if you delete this).

Is compatibility essential (or even useful!) in a marriage? No, not really.

1 upvotes · 27 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I second this. Also, vaginas don't have MBTI distinctions. Just their brains. If you want work her brain a certain way, knowing her MBTI *can* be helpful (though less than many would make it seem). If you want to work her vagina a certain way, MBTI isn't designed for that.

Need some advice, long post. And apologize for the scatter brain

1 upvotes · 26 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I think you're foolish if you sideline the importance of lifting just because your wife told you so. Other than that, what you're saying makes sense.

Is compatibility essential (or even useful!) in a marriage? No, not really.

1 upvotes · 26 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Sounds like you got it all figured out. Go write a book.

Is compatibility essential (or even useful!) in a marriage? No, not really.

1 upvotes · 26 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Seems hard to assess. A trait only has value if you can discern it. But really, what you're describing is a unicorn. Good luck finding one.

Need some advice, long post. And apologize for the scatter brain

1 upvotes · 26 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

If she's denying you, she does. It's taking you too much effort to get her worked up before she's started. A girl doesn't say no (with limited exception) to a man she trusts after she's already wet. She's saying no to you because it takes you too long to get her worked up. She should start with the tingles before you even initiate.

Need some advice, long post. And apologize for the scatter brain

1 upvotes · 26 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Your listening to what she says. Feel he panties after she watches Magic Mike, then we can chat.

How important is compatibility for marriage?

1 upvotes · 25 April 2020 · /r/askRPC

Women will always change. Accept it. This means that whatever "compatibility" you had when you got married will only remain in place as long as you keep changing with her. Men are averse to change. We can, and sometimes do, but not as fluently. If you're changing with her, you're in her frame and headed toward destruction.

You're better off having her change to mold to you. If you're already compatible up-front, then it means you have to keep growing and developing in the direction you want to go in order to give her something to keep morphing to, otherwise she's going to get bored and morph away from you. If you're not compatible up-front, you just bought yourself a few months/years (depending on how incompatible you are) before you have to worry about

her getting bored with the relationship.

Also, what do you even mean by "compatibility"? Like, your personalities are a good match for each other - you're extroverted and she's introverted, so you've got both bases covered? That one of you is really good with house work and the other is really good in a professional career? That one is really talented at kissing and the other one's exceptionally good with his/her hands?

Or do you mean you're "compatible" because you both like the same kinds of music and TV shows? I love my brother's comment as he neared the end of his 20s, "I wish I knew in high school how unimportant liking the same music was in a relationship." He literally only dated girls who liked the same bands as him. Idiot.

My wife once commented that when she was a kid she thought, "How are my aunt and uncle ever going to be happy in a marriage? One is a [sports team 1] fan and the other is a [team 2] fan? How did they ever get married?" See how juvenile those thoughts are? Yet the world still thinks this is true - that if you don't like the same things it will never work. It's laughable. This is probably worth a post. I might write one soon.

Let's Have a Little Talk About Respect

1 upvotes · 25 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Literal and metaphor has nothing to do with forcing a 2020 definition onto the way a word was used 2,000 years ago.

Also, conflating biblical exegesis with an alpha/beta designation? We don't take kindly to the "anyone who disagrees with me is beta" attitude. Take a 3 day ban and learn to knock it off during that time.

Let's Have a Little Talk About Respect

1 upvotes · 25 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I seriously hope you don't take that approach to word meanings when you study Scripture.

Let's Have a Little Talk About Respect

1 upvotes · 25 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

semantic problem ... "respect" in English ... noun: a feeling

That's really all you had to say. Emotionalism culture has redefined every word of biblical substance it possibly can. It's even taken words that aren't of biblical substance and tried to make them substantive. Good luck having a rational argument with an emotionalist without having to spout out semantic differences half a dozen times.

Let's Have a Little Talk About Respect

1 upvotes · 25 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Titus 2:4 also more directly answers the question without having to beat around the bush.

Tag: /u/Willow-girl

OYS - Where Progress is Made (04/22/20)

1 upvotes · 24 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Don't forget teaching them to pass it on too ;) You want spiritual grandchildren, right? Just as a man must teach his sons about relationships, sex, and reproduction, you have to do the same with your spiritual children.

“Why won't he be the king I know he is, the king I see inside?”

1 upvotes · 23 April 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

"Good this" and "Good that" ... but really the +1 is for a post inspired by a musical reference ;)

Bible Studies for Men's small group

1 upvotes · 22 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I've heard mixed reviews on Tony Evans. Some people really like him around here. Others say he caves to the same "everything is the man's fault, women are never to blame" type of thinking that the rest of churchianity pushes. I haven't done the studies he has, but for those looking, treat it the same way as with everything else (including this sub - and even my own posts): (1) always challenge everything against Scripture, and (2) take what's true and works and leave the rest behind.

Find Something to Lift around the House

1 upvotes · 20 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

But Jesus isn't a pussy. So why would I say that to him?

Someday is a dangerous word

1 upvotes · 18 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Right. You go find me one.

Someday is a dangerous word

1 upvotes · 17 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I haven't seen any other content online that breaks down how to map out a person's life goals through various categories, mile-markers in each category, timelines for accomplishing the goals, etc. Feel free to refer me to as many as you think are better. But the most I've seen are people who generically say, "Write down your goals and set mile-markers," but give no actual example to look off of.

If you can't handle hearing someone share their own sinful thinking, how do you even exist in the world? Do you not have any non-Christian friends?

Someday is a dangerous word

1 upvotes · 17 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

You're still missing the point. I didn't tell anyone to watch this for its fantastic financial advice.

six words only

1 upvotes · 16 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I'm removing this. Feel free to repost on askRPC if you want. But this is too much of a low value gimmick post for the main sub - especially in light of [u/OsmiumZulu](#)'s latest post.

Living Out of Yourself

1 upvotes · 16 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Beautiful story, sister. Thanks for sharing this! You should post this note publicly. If not here, [r/TrueChristian](#) could benefit from this too :)

A Primer to Visual Arousal Patterns

1 upvotes · 14 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Good points. Hopefully this post adds some substance to that list if/when you create it.

Living Out of Yourself

1 upvotes · 11 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

That's my issue here. If becoming a new creation is exclusively the work of the Holy Spirit

Yes, that is certainly the issue. I don't believe this view is biblical. That said, as already noted, I'm a compatibilist, not a hard-core Calvinist. This is probably where we're not seeing eye to eye.

Black pill has been generalized to mean "truth of a hopeless reality" just like red pill is generalized to refer to truths suppressed by society

Good luck trying to use that definition with any of the mods or ECs on TRP/MRP.

I do agree with your last chunk, though :)

is love between women and men real?

1 upvotes · 10 April 2020 · /r/askRPC

I think you're trying to boil down all types of love to a single kind. On that, we'll have to agree to disagree.

is love between women and men real?

1 upvotes · 10 April 2020 · /r/askRPC

God's love is defined as extending to all of humanity, even in their sin

That's not the same thing as being unconditional. It's like a TV announcement that says, "Anyone who comes to our store will get a free handbag." The invitation goes out to everyone, but it's not unconditional. They're not giving the handbags to everyone. They're conditioning the gift on you actually going to their store to get it. The benefit of God's love is absolutely conditional - if nothing else, on faith. People who reject Jesus - who don't have faith - will not get the benefit of God's love. In my view, this is the unambiguously clear truth on the matter from Scripture.

I think where you're getting hung up is that you quoted, yet ignored my clarification: "at least in regard to our ability to have access to the benefits of it." I agree that God's goodwill extends to all of humanity without condition. But God's good wishes toward you don't get you into heaven; they don't, on their own, warrant his blessings over your life; they don't give you any reason to expect something from God without *SOME* response on your part. Go back and re-read all of the verses you quoted, assume you're a non-Christian doomed to hell, and see if those verses still mean what you think they mean about everyone having "unconditional" access of all of the benefits of God's love, even without Jesus. That makes no sense at all.

Living Out of Yourself

1 upvotes · 9 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Very good point!

Living Out of Yourself

1 upvotes · 9 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I struggle to see how to apply it all the way through. Much of this is outside the human sphere of influence.

The primary application is to have guys really stop and look at what they want to do so that the desires of their heart are more naturally exposed. This paves the way for authentic repentance when they realize they are not who

they thought they were based on the outward behaviors they present to others.

The only way this works is if the Holy Spirit intervenes. Otherwise, man is doomed to a cycle of empty behavior modification

Right, which is why I didn't include this on MRP. I have to assume the Spirit is always at work in us. I suppose there are situations where this may not be the case. But I'd wager the times it's not the case are more because of people stifling the Spirit, not because the Spirit abandoned them.

The doctrine of predestination turns this into a black pill or at the very least, a divine application of dread.

I wouldn't know much about that. I tend toward compatibilism, so I don't think of things from a pure predestination mind-frame. OZ would be better for that end of the conversation. I believe I'd mentioned to him in the past my view that there are aspects of Calvinism that are incompatible with a biblical overlay. That is, one can still acknowledge the truth in each, but they no longer overlap smoothly.

How does one die to oneself without living in a perpetual state of struggle against the sinful nature, which is the true self of the unredeemed sinner?

Christians are redeemed. Non-Christians don't die to themselves. Christians do. Dying to yourself is the process of sanctification. "I must decrease, he must increase" is an apt summary of the work of sanctification (granted, not the proper context, but the phrase still applies).

Man's efforts to change are fruitless because he cannot cure himself of his sinful nature without divine assistance. So, man asks for divine assistance.

Right. But divine assistance works alongside our will. I know that concept is often lost on a Calvinist - especially if you're a hyper-Calvinist (i.e. even the choice of which socks you put on in the morning is predestined). But that's how I must answer the question all the same.

You don't know if you're 1 or 2 unless God intervenes

But I'm only talking to Christians, so only referencing #2. Or are you suggesting that God will save someone and then refuse to assist him in sanctification afterward?

Those afflicted by this must confront the reality that they might fall under category 2: no divine action. This is a black pill.

I think you're misunderstanding or misusing the black pill term. The black pill is the view that looks are the only thing that matters - that genetic factors put a rational cap on how attractive someone can be (ex. birth defects), and therefore everyone should accept their own lot with who they can pull after reaching a reasonable plateau.

But again: I'm speaking specifically to Christians, who I do believe have the capacity to ignore and reject the work of the Holy Spirit in their lives (at least for a time), otherwise all believers would be fully sanctified even in this life - or else we reach the conclusion that the Spirit is ineffective in his work or otherwise wills that people perpetuate in sin they could otherwise be sanctified of. There are way too many holes in that angle for me.

Living Out of Yourself

1 upvotes · 8 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I like that. And good reference. I'd completely forgotten about that post. Glad to hear it helped you!

Living Out of Yourself

1 upvotes · 8 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Right. When they're young, they need to listen to their parents, but the goal is always to instill an *internal character* in them that they innately do what you would have them do without telling them to do it. This, I believe, is God's goal with us. I like the reference here.

2 "Redpill" lies and deceptions built to enslave us.

1 upvotes · 7 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

What would He want me to do? This is a/should be a Christians primary/ first thing on our minds.

Wrong. I just put up a post to address this.

But is the chase for excellence in a lot of Red Pill men out of a godly stand point or is it more primitive and debased?

If you were writing on one of the secular subs, this might make more sense. But on a Christian sub, your point is still off-base. Yes, many men might be doing it for secular reasons, but the underlying premise of the biblical reason is a godly one. If you want to say, "Stop chasing excellence the way non-Christians do and start doing it in a biblical way," that's better, but telling people it's a fallacy altogether is wrong.

our MPO is still him. That never stops

Right. But is he in you and one with you so that there, as sanctification progresses, becomes no distinction between the "I" and "Christ" in your life? Or are you still viewing Christ and his standards as external to you (i.e. behavior modification)? You seem to be missing that point.

If we're talking about virtues that we acquire and the desire to please God then I agree

We're not. Imagine a man wants to accumulate worldly wealth. He covets his neighbor's possessions. That is his internal point of origin. Does the sanctified man still have that desire for wealth and covetousness in his heart that he has learned to control? Or is the sanctified man the one who no longer sees the need for accumulation of wealth and coveting and can, instead, from the bottom of his heart rejoice with his neighbor at his successes? You act like this is an unreasonable transformation. I suggest it's not at all. I know MANY people who have EASILY been able to make such small strides.

I think your overestimating our ability for our desires to be magnified by God

I suggest you're underestimating the power of God to transform someone's heart. I'm guessing this is because you're still so tied to churchianity's behavior-modification way of doing things that you're not used to seeing those with an internal heart-change. Read through Scripture and tell me if you believe Elijah, Moses, the apostles, etc. had the type of heart you expect people to day to maintain and be unable to break free of. No, they were not perfect. But they certainly were a lot further along in their own internal point of origin than you seem to think is possible. And I see those around me daily who are living proof that this internal point of origin growth and sanctification is an actual reality, not a mythical notion.

those desires will never fully go away

In 100% complete and total fashion, sure. There will always be some desire toward sin. But you're speaking as though you don't believe God can and will actually conquer issues for us. You seem to take the view, "Once an alcoholic, always an alcoholic," believing that God will never free someone from any form of addiction - that the

underlying desire will always be there.

This is simply wrong. I know MANY alcoholics, cigarette smokers, (legit) porn addicts, druggies, gluttons, gamers, etc. whose desires have actually gone away to the point where the compulsion to return to their sin isn't even remotely present - even when they re-experience their past vice. I know alcoholics who can take a drink once in a while and experience ZERO temptation to drink a second one, former porn addicts who can see a popup ad click away without the thought even crossing their mind to click on it and watch, or ex-drug addicts who legit are disgusted at the thought, even when in the presence of it (tag: [/u/rocknrollchuck](#) - haven't you affirmed this in your own life?).

I disagree tho that the MPO needs to be yours. You can have a strong frame in an MPO that is of God

You're still acting as if God is external to you. This might have been true in the OT and while Jesus walked the earth, but the whole point of sending the Spirit is so that God would be IN YOU, not external to you. Study this further.

The self- Sacrificing narrative is a biblical one, we are infact sacrifices on the altar to God

This is another HUGE misunderstanding of churchianity. Self-sacrifice doesn't mean sacrificing your desires in exchange for the behaviors God wants you to do. That's totally ridiculous.

Jesus actually says to DIE to yourself and to "take up your cross." The goal here is not to sacrifice every day your own will for his - an impossible task. It's that your internal point of origin dies away as you become sanctified and more one with Christ so that YOU die and CHRIST lives IN YOU. Isn't that the point of Galatians 2:20? That "I have been crucified with Christ and I no longer live, but Christ lives in me"?

I already know the true nature of my heart, and so does most

Right - and this is where churchianity has lied to you. It tells you that YOU are sinful as your operative identity and that sanctification is external behavior modification against your internal sinful desires. This is why churchianity is so doggone bad at getting people to stop sinning and start living rightly. Because they misunderstand the internal beauty of sanctification - that our heart is actually being transformed. "I will remove from you this heart of stone and give you a heart of flesh," right? It's not just an external behavioral change to cover over our perpetually internal evil state of being. It's that our internal state of being is in the process of becoming like Christ because we are one with him.

Infact its required for repentance,a requirement for salvation

But you're describing repentance as behavior modification. It's like you're saying, "Repentance is when you get to keep your sinful desires, but you just choose to ignore them as much as possible." That's ridiculous. Repentance is not a mere recognition that we DO evil, but that we ARE evil, and then repenting not merely of what we DO, but of who we ARE and letting who we ARE be what gets changed.

You've got a lot of potential, brother, but I think you need to keep reading the Scriptures more and more to discern some of these things and much more! I'll be excited to see where you are 6 months from now.

The 3 wisdoms

1 upvotes · 7 April 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I'm going to take this down as it seems a little bit too unrelated to the purposes of this sub. Your last post, while off, was still worth thinking about. This would make a better edit into that post than a substantive separate post of its own.

Lifting Troubleshooting Questions

1 upvotes · 6 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

The wrong thing to do is try to force it and muscle through it. That increases your likelihood of injury

Whoops. I've been lucky then ;)

You're getting heavy enough now that you will have a much harder time making progress if your form isn't really solid

I'll echo this. After all my early noob gains when I got back into lifting plateaued after about 6 months (and I know [/u/SkimTheDross](#) is much longer in than that). I had to take another 3+ months with no gains at all, just working on doing my existing lifts with better and better form, then went to start pushing up again.

and did hard-resets (completely set the bar down and come to a complete stop between reps) and built back up

Is this not how it's always done? I was unaware of other forms.

Lifting Troubleshooting Questions

1 upvotes · 6 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Good progress, brother. Others have already given good and clear input. I know my general rule of thumb is that my 5-rep sets are based on 90% of my ORM.

Remember also that a brand new ORM exists within an error margin. I've had some really good days where, at my peak last year, I was able to put up 300, but the next day I couldn't. That means that my error margin is on the low-end. So, if I were to try to bench 270 (i.e. 90%), I might only get 3-4 reps out of it on some days because I haven't fully normalized at the new PR level.

On the other end, if I can bench 300 as an ORM with high confidence and consistency, but still can't get the second rep or bump the weight to 310, maybe my real ORM is 308, and so hitting 270 for 5 reps is much easier. My ORM hasn't changed in that range, but being new to it v. acclimated to it makes a difference.

Also, the last time I was in the gym before the lockdown was with my dad. I put up 275 for 4 reps. And that was after trying 295 and failing to get even one. Logically, that doesn't follow the math of what you'll read online at all. But the body isn't always subject to those formulas - they're only rules of thumb and nothing more.

For another formulaic difference: when I was benching 300, my max overhead press was still 185. If you look at normalized benchmarks, it should have been significantly higher than that for other people with my comparable body weight and other lifts - but that's still the most I've ever put up on that particular lift.

Other times, a person has stabilizer muscles that work perfectly with one particular grip on a particular day, but the next day you're balanced ever so slightly differently that causes your stabilizers to work from a different angle, making it slightly harder to lift. This effect is exacerbated for leg lifts where it's easier to space your legs an inch or two differently, or you lift at a slightly different angle, whereas a bench is extremely mechanized in form (comparatively).

Or perhaps your particular body doesn't work on a 90% of ORM for 5-rep set rule of thumb - maybe your flow is 3-4 reps for 90%.

Regardless, I wouldn't get hung up on not being able to do something unless you were able to do it 10 times in 10 previous weeks and suddenly you can't do it the next 5 times at the gym. Then there might be something going on. Otherwise, this sounds more like a fluke.

Have you swallowed the Red Chewable Tablet?

1 upvotes · 3 April 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Now I'm curious what he said.

When do the lines begin to blur in Christianity?

1 upvotes · 3 April 2020 · /r/askRPC

/u/UpTanks is spot on. His second paragraph is pure gold. That's a great summation of my thoughts on these issues.

Most Christians Do Not Love Women

1 upvotes · 2 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

They can't force you, but they can punish you for not feminizing yourself. Yes, this is happening. The impact of the APA study finding "traditional masculinity" to be "harmful" is already reaching the courts.

Most Christians Do Not Love Women

1 upvotes · 2 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I'd argue that a single woman can be 100% fully satisfied in Christ in this life, but she won't be "complete" as a person until the resurrection when her marriage to Christ is manifest more pragmatically and physical marriage, as we have on earth, will be done away with. To that end, I'd also suggest that the "completeness" any man or woman has on earth is still little more than a shadow of the "heavenly things" - whether they're married or not.

If a man were able to change the bible would that prove they are the 2nd coming of Jesus?

1 upvotes · 31 March 2020 · /r/askRPC

I still don't see how all these concepts are connecting for you. My underlying point hasn't changed: just because someone changes what the ink on the page says doesn't mean they can change what the original authors wrote. To do that, you'd have to be able to travel through time. And I'm pretty confident Einstein proved that backwards time travel is impossible (at best, one could travel forward in time at a slower pace than the rest of reality).

As for the end times stuff, I'm a partial preterist, so most of your conversation is lost on me as I believe a lot of it already happened. So, there's little point talking about a future anti-christ.

Married Man's Guide To Dating

1 upvotes · 31 March 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I can agree with that.

Is kissing before marriage a sin?

1 upvotes · 31 March 2020 · /r/RPChristians

First you're going to have to read this:

https://www.reddit.com/r/TrueChristian/comments/f8vuke/is_this_a_sin_is_that_a_sin_not_the_right/. It's along the lines of what /u/Deep_Strength commented, but much more fleshed out.

Second, we have a post titled "An Official Stance on Sex Outside of Marriage," indicating that the question early on in this sub's history was whether or not SEX before marriage was even sin (conclusion: it is). Now you're suggesting that even kissing might be too?

Per ruiz's post I linked above, you have to look at Romans 14:14 and 23. If you're doing it because of your faith, it's not sin. If you're doing it for any other reason, it is. 14:14 makes it clear that there are no particular acts that are always sin no matter what, so don't get hung up on whether "this" or "that" is sin. Like Deep said, focus more

on the direction you're moving.

Wife is 8 months pregnant. Need advice.

1 upvotes · 23 March 2020 · /r/askMRP

I've been a lot better at this whole alpha male stuff

This sounds like the epitome of the purple guy. "I want to maintain all my blue pill hopes and dreams, and maybe by sprinkling some alpha on it I can actually get them." Don't be like that.

When women comfort test it's not just for empathy. They want to know that it's actually safe for them to be in your frame. You can't display this if you're still weak-minded about how you view your relationship. It's like a civilian telling the Hulk when he became a pussy after getting whooped in End Game, "Don't worry I'll take care of Thanos for you." If she views you as weaker than her, she sees herself as the hulk and you as the puny civilian. It's not enough just to act alpha - she'll see through that. You must actually be it. By wording it as "this whole alpha male stuff," it tells me you still see alpha as "other" to you that you're just dabbling in. It hasn't pervaded your identity of who you internally are now.

What I'm more asking is how can I comfort her when she is depressed and feels like poop?

And pregnant. You forgot the "and pregnant" part here. You're separating her mood from her condition. Bad idea. Why? Because the "and pregnant part" is the part that pretty much guarantees you can't comfort her. No matter how hard you try to logic her brain or fuzzy up her heart, she's going to keep feeling this way.

You're too hung up on her here, which is also destroying your frame, which cripples your ability to provide her any actual comfort. If she wasn't pregnant, the answer would be simple: *Hug her, let her vomit at you about all her worries and concerns, kiss her on the forehead and tell her everything will be okay.* You can still do that here. But it won't actually pass the test. It'll just get her off your back while she still carries on with those worries because pregnancy hormones don't go away. They abate and come right back 5 minutes later. She will have to figure out how to self-regulate so she's not hanging on you 24/7 and you can have some time to focus on your mission.

My point here is, most guys will say: "Don't fix her problem, fix her feels." That's a solid answer. But in pregnancy, sometimes you just can't. Accept that, do what you have to do to be the oak, but ultimately be okay with moving on even if she still feels that way.

Whose game are you winning?

1 upvotes · 23 March 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Of course. A woman can and likely will divorce a man without warning as soon as she's decided she doesn't like being married to him anymore. There's never a guarantee.

That said, MRP doesn't give any guarantees on anything. Ask any mod you like. All of them will tell you: *If you're doing any of this to get guaranteed results, you're a fool.*

And I did note in other comments (or perhaps it was in my [r/RPChristians](#) post on these comments) that a guy would waste his time having a crappy mission that's too small and uninteresting. If his mission in life is to kill all women - that's a epic-size mission, but one no woman will ever get on board with (though it'd still probably give her the tingles seeing such raw, unashamed ambition). On the other hand, if his life mission is to eat a cheeseburger from McDonald's, even if she absolutely loves cheeseburgers and is the biggest McDonald's lover in the world, she's not going to be aroused by this because it doesn't show off any masculine qualities.

At some point, the masculine display and her affinity to your direction in life have to meet for the mission to be a

binding force in your marriage.

That said, most women are willing to drop their own personal ambitions and life mission when they see an attractive man with a better life mission than their own. They will want to leech off of his drive, feed off of his passion, and orgasm off of the masculinity it takes to get his job done.

Ultimately, women WANT to be their husband's biggest fan. Unfortunately, most can't because most men are so weak and unambitious that there's nothing to cheer about in the first place. Nobody cheers over a basketball player just dribbling the ball (low ambition), nor will a PETA-lover cheer over a world-record buck a guy bags (lack of affinity). But history and experience does seem to show (as is discussed often here) that women are like clay - they will mold to their man, which includes adopting his mission, if he is attractive. That is the byproduct of satisfied hypergamy.

Whose game are you winning?

1 upvotes · 23 March 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Generic success, yes. Highest-tiers of success ... possible, but unlikely. So, I suppose this depends on how you want to define success. If it's something that can be accomplished while being fat and/or ugly, my guess is that your bar for success is too low. Think bigger.

As for the money component: "get rich" is a crappy mission, if you can even call it one. Your mission is the way you get there. Many of the examples I gave do have the end-result of becoming wealthy, but the wealth isn't the point - it's the passion for something that drives you that those around you (such as your wife, people in your social circle, etc.) can see and your excitement rubs off on them. Everyone wants money, but no one loses sleep just looking at it (except maybe Scrooge McDuck). People *will*, however, lose sleep and make other huge life sacrifices to write their book/play, work in the lab, make sure their organization keeps running, train their body (or their team's), hone a skill, practice their singing, or disciple other men.

Again, "make a lot of money" is a passionless pursuit. How you're going to make it, if you're passionate about it, is of value. A B-Tier replacement would be what you intend to do with the money once you've made it.

I encourage my American friends to be fully stocked, supplied, and able to effectively work from home by Sunday, 3/22, though EOD tomorrow would be ideal.

1 upvotes · 20 March 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

My setup ...

- A stationary bike. **This is the one I use**; goes for \$200.
- A bench. **This is the one I use**. \$100. Note: I don't have the bar, I just use it with dumbbells.
- Some dumbbells. Highest I have are 45lb. **They're \$90 for a ste at Walmart**. That said, I probably need to get a couple more sets - 45s aren't enough to curl with anymore, but 100s would be perfect for doing heavy sets of the standing row and high-rep sets on the bench.

Now, I've bought these things over the past few years, not all at once. But even if you do have to buy it all at once, the point is that you can get basic crap for pretty cheap that will get the job done. The things I mentioned here should be enough to at least do maintenance work and collectively would be around \$400 (with tax). I'm paying \$75/mo for my family gym membership that we can't use anymore. If yours is comparable and this lockdown ends up lasting into summer, like some people are projecting, you could easily break even. While you might not get AS good of a workout as you will in the gym, you'll have access to keep using these things indefinitely even when you do go back to the gym. At that point, you have options. If you don't have time one day to drive to the gym, you have alternative things to do at home that knock off the 20+ minutes on your round trip.

Whose game are you winning?

1 upvotes · 19 March 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

1 and 2 just seem too focused on your wife/partner

They were meant to be. It was an explanation of how your mission improves your attractiveness. If I were addressing general benefits of having a mission, I'd certainly have included your third point, among many others.

I would just hope it's not at the expense of her own

A woman's mission IS her husband's mission. She is called by God to be his helper. God gives him a mission (i.e. he follows God), and the husband gives her a mission (i.e. she follows her husband). It would be unbiblical for a wife to adopt a mission of her own other than the fulfillment of the role God has given her. If she is married, that role is to submit to her husband. If her husband is a non-believer, than that role is to win him over to Christ through her submissiveness (1 Peter 3).

This, of course, doesn't mean she can't do other things on the side, sharing the Gospel with women she knows. And perhaps she has a weak husband who asks so little of her that she has freedom to do other great things for the Kingdom. That's fine too. But her primary role and obligation is to her husband.

For example, my parents ended up divorced. One of the primary reasons my dad cites for why he left was the fact that my mom was so committed to ministry activities with the church that she never had time for him or their kids (including me). Was it good that she was supporting the church and sharing the Gospel with other women and children in the body? Absolutely. But it was also sin to the extent that she actively defied her husband (my dad) in order to go off doing what she thought God wanted her doing at the time. Both of my parents are far worse off financially, relationally, spiritually, etc. because of all of this. It's sad to see.

Are women allowed to post?

1 upvotes · 17 March 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Interesting. So you think her husband is 100% at fault for all of this? At least, that's how your reply reads. Even if that were the case, it's better to challenge people to take ownership over their problems rather than give them more and more encouragement to point the finger at someone else.

Whose game are you winning?

1 upvotes · 16 March 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I wouldn't say it's so linear. The stages can (and likely will) come in different orders for different people, and you can repeat stages if you're not paying attention. They're more like zones on a map. Some people just wander around the map and randomly find themselves in different areas, whereas others select a destination and purposely plot out the best path to get there. Obviously I believe the latter is the best, as even when the wanderer gets where he should be, if he doesn't know that's where he should be, he'll still wander away. I had that experience a number of times.

As for posts about switching up the game, [u/RStonePT](#) has done some writing on the "main event." Those posts would be a good starting place. But you have to be well on your way before you're even ready to start that discussion. Children with dynamite and all. Generally, the people who are ready to have that conversation are already self-aware enough that they don't really need it anymore.

Whose game are you winning?

1 upvotes · 12 March 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Right. But it would make more sense to assume some degree of common sense rather than pretending I operate

on some extremist attitude.

is love between women and men real?

1 upvotes · 12 March 2020 · /r/askRPC

Right. Just be cautious with the "God's love is unconditional" bit. I believe this is part of the blue pill lie used to manipulate men into presenting an unconditional love toward their wives, letting them get away with anything, whereas women are still permitted to have conditions on their love toward their husbands.

Nothing in the Bible says God's love is unconditional - at least in regard to our ability to have access to the benefits of it. If it were unconditional, Jesus wouldn't have been a necessity. Instead, God makes faith a condition of receiving the benefit of his love. Those without faith will be cast into hell and not get that benefit.

... unless you're a universalist, in which case I'd have to argue that your personal philosophical idealism of unconditional love has eisegeted its way into how you view Scripture. But I'll give you the benefit of the doubt that you're not. But universalism is the only theological line that can actually claim God's love is unconditional; yet it's not biblical.

Whose game are you winning?

1 upvotes · 12 March 2020 · /r/RPChristians

If she saves up, there will be funds in the account to cover it and I wouldn't say no.

Whose game are you winning?

1 upvotes · 12 March 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I'm confused. What are you talking about?

Whose game are you winning?

1 upvotes · 11 March 2020 · /r/RPChristians

If there was any recent history of that working on me, I'd entertain the notion. But she knows very well right now that when I make a decision, that's the answer. And she hasn't tried to bring any of her requests up again since.

Whose game are you winning?

1 upvotes · 11 March 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

[u/Sepean](#) is correct. You can read more about my mission and goals on [r/RPChristians](#), but the bottom line is that it doesn't really matter what it is as long as it's something you can get her on board with. There are some things you'll just never get a woman on board with, though, so there's that.

Does plausible deniability & hypergamy absolve women's sins?

1 upvotes · 10 March 2020 · /r/askRPC

I agree with everything [/u/helaughsinhidden](#) said to your original post. As to this particular question, I'll simply add that the prevalence of blue pill ideology throughout the world is evidence, to me, that men are even more delusional, on the whole, than women. It takes a special kind of delusion to accept such fantastical notions of how the world should operate - and the fact that I lived in that delusion for so long makes me all the more confident of the capacity of men to be at least as, if not more so, delusional than women.

What's worth noting in this is that men are conditioned this way from the start. There's no rationalization that happens - we just innately want to believe in Disney notions of "love and happily ever after." For women, there's certainly a cultural element that enables their rationalization/hamstering, but the mental gymnastics many of them go through seem to be case-by-case, meaning it's self-taught, not universally and uniformly conditioned. In other

words, they come up with their own lies that they tell themselves, but they're trained by culture to believe it's okay to lie to themselves as one of their vaginal powers.

How has God humbled you?

1 upvotes · 9 March 2020 · /r/askRPC

God's humbled me in a number of ways, but the most consistently effective is that when my pride rises without my realizing it, I notice an impact in my ministry in the way it becomes off-putting to those I'm trying to reach for Christ, and this is a clear reminder to get back on track. In short, God hinders my mission until I am right with him so that I am clear that it's on his power through which I work, not my own.

Appreciation Post - For advice given 1.5 years ago and Question about how to identify Masculine Churches

1 upvotes · 9 March 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Removed for link spam. A link here or there isn't a problem if you're explaining what you're linking to, but you can't just start spewing off propaganda videos.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (03/04/20)

1 upvotes · 5 March 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I'm disappointed with the comments you're getting on this. It seems like people are trying to get you to empathize with the position the leadership is taking here. But the fact is: they're wrong. Not just for failing to give you up-front notice of their rules. Their rules are wrong too. They are uniquely designed to prevent actual discipleship relationships from forming.

If they want to have a rule that says you can't interact one-on-one with girls in your ministry, I can at least understand that. I'm not opposed to guys discipling girls, but unless she's your wife it's probably best to stick with other guys if there are any available.

But by removing the individual relational component of discipleship leaves them with the garbage philosophy (not theology) that church work is best left to arm's-length teaching and interpersonal relationships have no part of it. Biblically, the relationship **IS THE VEHICLE** through which teaching occurs, not classroom environments, pews on Sunday, or couches at a small group meeting. Lesson's don't make disciples. Sermons don't. Bible studies don't. Relationships do. If they are taking out the relationship component, they're basically saying, "We don't want God to work through you in their lives; we just want you to communicate content to them and let them decide what to do with it." This is wrong and it's offensive to the Spirit and Scripture.

So what do you do with this? It boils down to a flow chart. Making disciples among the students in your ministry is impossible under their rules, so let's start there.

- Are you satisfied to communicate content and never actually disciple anyone? If so, then stay where you are and follow their rules.
- Are you committed to making disciples? If so, then where? If you're fine with communicating content to the students and making disciples elsewhere in your life, then stay where you are and follow their rules. Your vocational ministry will fail, but you will at least succeed in what God has called you to do. The leadership will simply not get credit before God for the work that you do despite them.
 - If you're committed to making disciples among your students, you have two options: (1) stay where you're at, ignore their rules to the degree they become a hindrance (follow them insofar as you can without hindring your disciple-making), or (2) leave and find another place that will not prohibit you from building relationships with the people you're trying to disciple.

Now, I know a million people are going to slap Romans 13 in your face and say that because they're your spiritual authority, you are obligated to submit to them. But remember that Paul wrote Romans 13 under the rule of Caesar Nero, who had standing orders that all Christians be killed. Do you think Paul was really compelling Christians to obey their government by turning each other in to be slaughtered? Obviously not. When Paul describes submission to our authorities, we have to take it in context of how HE submitted to get an idea of what HE meant when he wrote that. Paul's form of submission was to do what God called him to do without regard for human rules (and good luck finding in the Bible: "don't snapchat with people in your ministry" or even "adults shall not build relationships with minors"), but when he was caught he accepted the consequences of his actions, even when he had an opportunity to escape (Acts 16). He certainly defended his actions. He didn't go down fighting. And he leveraged his voice in his defense to preach the Gospel! You can do the same here. Do what you know is right, and if they want to take their human rules to protect the reputation of their brand over doing God's work, then use your defense as an opportunity to teach them why their rules are unbiblical and counter-productive to authentic relational discipler-making the way Jesus modeled it for us.

This is too big of an issue to back down on. If you give up on relational discipler-making now, you're going to lose a taste for it and end up indoctrinated to the stale, unsalted garbage that I throw away from my pantry. Your best solution is to focus on the guys, but never stop your one-on-one relationship-building. As long as you're not doing it with girls, they have less cause for concern and you can focus where you're going to be most effective anyway.

Tag: [/u/rocknrollchuck](#) - you wrote:

I know you mean well, but you're in the wrong here brother. 1 Thessalonians 5:22 says "Abstain from all appearances of evil." As much as it sucks sometimes, appearances DO matter, especially when it comes to those in official church positions.

I agree with you to the extent that keeping up appearances advances one's mission (which is often). However, in situations like this, I'd suggest you have to step on some toes to get people to move.

Also, that verse doesn't say what you quoted it as. This is why I often tell people to avoid the KJV for interpretive value (read it for pleasure, sure, but not for understanding). It is literally the only translation I know of that uses the word "appearances" there. Every other translation, especially the original Greek, translate it as form/type/kind. When the KJV translated it that way, they meant it in the sense: "When evil appears, avoid it," not the way we mean "appearances" in a colloquial sense today.

To be fair, someone else called out [/u/Deep_Strength](#) for making this same misquote, and I reamed that guy for being overly technical. But in that case, there were plenty of other passages to prove Deep's point: don't do things you know will cause others to stumble. In this situation, he's not causing anyone to stumble. He's just dealing with overly pious people who don't want to risk their good name being harmed. Sound like anyone else? The Pharisees. And even though they were the religious leaders over the Jews (and yes, Jesus was a Jew), he ignored them through and through and kept doing what God called him to anyway.

Note that several times throughout his ministry, people accused Jesus of doing evil and inappropriate things too. How many times throughout the ages have people accused Jesus of sleeping with Mary Magdalene? How many times did the Pharisees accuse him of blasphemy? Or working with Satan? People thought Jesus was doing wrong too - he presented the appearance of evil *to them*. Just because these people THINK he's doing evil doesn't mean he's actually doing evil and he doesn't owe them any obligation unless his behavior is in a position that will cause them to sin by doing the same things in an inappropriate way. I see no evidence of risk that this is actually going to happen, especially since the main complainants are the other staff members who have already demonstrated that their own personal boundaries are high enough that they're not going to be tempted by his actions.

Sorry, I know when you asked us to weigh in this might not have been what you were looking for, but this is how I understand the situation and what OP needs to hear.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (03/04/20)

1 upvotes · 5 March 2020 · /r/RPChristians

For the most part I am very concerned with how others see me

Galatians 1:10 - "For am I now seeking the approval of man, or of God? Or am I trying to please man? If I were still trying to please man, I would not be a servant of Christ."

Everyone is afraid of what others think because they think others have some power over them. They assume that a wrong impression will make them not want to be friends anymore, which will lead to loneliness and depression. The irony is: over-worry about what others think of you is the EXACT thing that is keeping them from building any meaningful relationships.

Worrying about what others think is a great way to develop casual acquaintances. But you can never go beyond that. You're always too withheld to pique their interest beyond, "Oh, that person is nice." But when you stop caring, you start engaging. Yes, you're going to do some stupid things. But everyone is going to end up laughing at the stupid stuff anyway and those are part of what build the bonds of friendship - especially among men, who connect through ribbing, jabbing, and teasing each other. I have a post in my history about the differences between how men and women relate and utilize the statistics about loneliness to demonstrate that while women are generally viewed as more relational than men, it's obvious that men have much better success at building meaningful ties with others, whereas female relationship strategy (especially if you've read much about the feminine social matrix) is designed to keep other women at arm's length.

My wife was just in tears over this issue yesterday. We just moved into a new house. The neighbors have been around each other from before we moved in and she feels excluded. But she's also too introverted to do anything about it. Even when she does engage, standard female relational norms make her think she has to remain courteous and polite. But she's never going to build the relationships she wants if she stays like that. There's a task for me this week: work with my wife on her relationship-building skills.

I find myself frequently analyzing other people's actions and attempting to relate them to myself, or compare my actions to others, or question why someone did a certain thing to someone else and not me

You're acting like my wife. Stop being a girl.

This has something to do with some belief in my head that the world revolves around me

Your world does. Their world doesn't. Do you think Indiana Jones, when he's questing for some lost artifact, is worried about whether or not the people at the party he's infiltrated like him, or why they're talking to each other and not him? No.

Why? Because he's got more important things going on in life.

What's your mission? What are the more important things going on in your life? When you've got bigger fish to fry than making friends, you stop caring about making friends, and ironically happen to make more friends because you're not worrying about it and your passion for something of value attracts other people with a similar passion. From there ...

my mission is ...to become a disciple ... Now I say this, but I don't think That I truly live it out

Then it's not your mission. It's a vague obligation you feel in the back of your head that you should be living up

to.

Your mission is what you're actually doing with your life. If all you're doing is just surviving from one day to the next then your mission is "to survive." That's a crap mission. But if you don't care about making disciples or being a disciple, then you can't call that your mission. It's what God told you to do, but you have to take personal investment to make it your mission.

Own Your Shit Weekly - March 03, 2020

1 upvotes · 4 March 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Right on.

Question regarding classification of beliefs

1 upvotes · 4 March 2020 · /r/RPChristians

This is all kinds of screwed up. If that's really your only purpose for the question, I'm taking your thread down, as this forum isn't designed for ego stroking and personal questions that have no application to the rest of the community.

Own Your Shit Weekly - March 03, 2020

1 upvotes · 4 March 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

IF there was a god...do you think it would please him more that you followed his way and did well in life because his priests told you to? Or because you took ownership of your life and CHOSE to live a life he gave you?

Certainly the latter. I take the view that doing anything "because I'm supposed to" is just as much sin as doing it maliciously. While priests/pastors may at times have wisdom to share (and at many, many other times, trash to share too), if one fails to operate within their faith from their own internal point of origin (frame), they have missed the entire point of what faith is in the first place. It becomes about behavior modification rather than personal growth and development. It's like the blue pill guy who wants to sprinkle on some alpha, thinking this will get him the results he wants. It will work for a time before he utterly falls apart, unable to maintain the facade indefinitely - because he, himself, as a man, has not actually changed.

if there was a god, why wouldn't he show himself?

Missiologically, it's because God has determined that the Church (his "bride," per countless passages) would be the more glorious vehicle through which he would send the Gospel into the nations (i.e. spiritual reproduction), rather than if he were to do it himself.

By way of example, imagine if you could produce children through masturbation or genetic incubation. Would you prefer to create your offspring this way or by screwing your hot wife? I'd rather bang my wife and have her carry my children. God prefers the same - and I believe this desire of ours comes from God's desire for the church infused in us, giving us a compulsion toward sexuality to reflect his desire for spiritual reproduction through the Church.

On a more technical, theological level, I could alternatively note that God has always valued faith over knowledge.

- Jesus tells Thomas, "Because you have seen me, you have believed; blessed are those who have not seen and yet have believed" (John 20:29).
- Paul explains his methodology in 1 Cor. 2:4, "My message and my preaching were not with wise and

persuasive words, but with a demonstration of the Spirit's power [which I interpret to be his testimony (i.e. story of how his life turned around)] so that your faith might not rest on human wisdom, but on God's power."

- The Bible repeatedly down-plays those who think they know something, often stating things like, "Although they claimed to be wise, they became fools" (Romans 1:22) and "Knowledge puffs up, but love builds up" (1 Cor. 8:1).

More to [u/ancient_resistance](#), now:

I'm where I am because I followed people who told me they knew what was best.

Your anger here is certainly understandable. But it's also pointless. Everyone vies for power in some form or another. Whatever our motive for wanting that power, it's easiest to get it from other people rather than manufacturing it for ourselves or discovering it innately from within. So, it's not surprising that whoever you're referencing (I'm going to assume it's a pastor/priest) would try to get people on board with *his way* of doing things - because the more people who are committed to *his way*, the more power he has, the more he can accomplish his goals. Those goals may be noble goals, but they're still inherently his - whether he adopted them from someone else (i.e. God/Bible/another pastor/whatever) or came up with them independently.

You were the one who decided to give power over your life to him and his intellectually incompetent way of observing and understanding the world. As soon as you realize that the responsibility for your trust in him is on you and not on him (for he's just a man doing what men do, just as your wife is a woman doing what women do), you can finally enter into your own frame and begin moving forward.

As long as you're blaming someone else for your actions, you are inherently succumbing to the view that they have a power over you which they do not. This power keeps you in their frame. Even when you defy them, you only do it BECAUSE of them. Instead, you need to stop thinking about their thoughts and judgments of you altogether and figure out what you want for yourself.

Example: Imagine my kids act out. I plan to discipline them by doing X. Before I get the chance, my wife says, "You need to discipline them by doing X." If I act on it, she's going to think it's her idea. Do I change X to Y instead just to show her she doesn't control me? No. That's idiotic. Do I try to explain that I already had that idea so that she'll realize I'm doing it for myself and not her? Of course not. I just do what I was going to do anyway and let her think whatever she wants. Why? Because my life isn't defined by what my wife thinks. If she wants to think I acted on her idea, let her. If she figures out on her own that I probably already planned X anyway, that's fine too.

In the same way, don't react to the people who were running your life before. Don't get mad at them - that anger will only keep you in their frame even longer. Don't even separate ties with the person/organization/whatever. Instead, utilize the position you've already got and the connections you've made to advance your own purposes, whatever they may be. It's tempting to start fresh once you learn something new, but starting over also means giving up advantages you've built where you already are. Don't make such a decision lightly. Even if the only advantage you have is familiarity, that's still something that will take time to build elsewhere.

Question regarding classification of beliefs

1 upvotes · 4 March 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I agree with [/u/Praexology](#). You are very obviously eisegeting your own personal philosophies in how you interpret Scripture. When you do this, you're always going to deviate from the mainstream denominations because your line of theology is your own personal concoction. There are as many combinations of interpreting the numerous Scripture passages as there are people who have lived or ever will. Some of your views overlap

with Catholicism, others with Orthodoxy, and others with numerous Protestant sects. For that matter, some of your views overlap with Satanism, Mormonism, Islam, etc. - as do mine. There will always be things we agree on and things we don't.

That being said, why get hung up on which denomination is closest to your theological viewpoints? I've already discussed many times on this sub that it's a relatively useless notion to pick a denomination based on who you think agrees with you the most.

I have yet to find a single denomination that 100% aligns with everything that I believe. I do find that I believe at least 1% of what every denomination teaches. Figuring out which denomination is 94% from 95% really doesn't matter much in the grand scheme of things.

From there, with regard to the "ego" concept, the way psychologists discuss the ego today is not found anywhere in Scripture. The use of the modern conceptualization of the ego is a secular interpretation of what psychologists observed in the natural order of the world under the rules and consequences God set in motion. It's the same thing with hypergamy, for example. I can talk about hypergamy until I'm blue in the face, but will never find an example where the Bible uses it as a concept the same way the secular red pill means the word. And yet I know God created women to be hypergamous all the same - and the underlying foundation for the concept has always been evident in Scripture, but under different words that lead to the same conclusions about the nature of the human race.

In the same way, unless you're witnessing specifically to psychologists (as we do to the red pill community), it's best not to over-use psychological terminology out of the context of your target ministry. Among people who will not readily identify with your terms, you're better off speaking in biblical terminology to explain your conclusions rather than using secular words that most people will not understand or identify with. Doing this makes it look (as I have suggested up-front) as though you're eisegeting Scripture rather than exegeting, which is a dangerous practice and where cults spring from.

What about BDSM and Roleplay?

1 upvotes · 2 March 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I agree with [/u/Deep_Strength](#). If you're asking the question, you're already in the wrong framework for understanding godliness.

A friend of mine who mods [r/TrueChristian](#) just wrote a fantastic post addressing these types of questions in great detail. [I strongly recommend you read it.](#)

Q&A on Sexual "Brainwashing"

1 upvotes · 21 February 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I don't think the connection to a workplace romance would be at all apparent to most people outside the red pill. When I first got here, I didn't understand how it connected either.

Q&A With an untrusting wife

1 upvotes · 11 February 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I'm guessing it will be too long to transcribe. I'm anticipating it to be 1+ hours per session - more akin to red man group than BPP's audio series.

Are all missions related to becoming a Pastor or Missionary? Or can it be anything?

1 upvotes · 28 January 2020 · /r/askRPC

Hah! An amusing analogy.

Are all missions related to becoming a Pastor or Missionary? Or can it be anything?

1 upvotes · 27 January 2020 · /r/askRPC

I do believe career missionaries are perfectly appropriate and necessary. The apostles and Jesus model it both ways. That said, Paul was careful never to let his financial needs compromise the message. If a vocational missionary is asking for money in a way that causes anyone to be skeptical of their ministry, I'm automatically skeptical because Paul would sooner take up tent making again before allowing his ministry to anyone become compromised. Vocational missionaries (whether local pastors or overseas workers) should follow in this example. I very much stand against almost every mega church I see because of this incongruence (among other issues).

Are all missions related to becoming a Pastor or Missionary? Or can it be anything?

1 upvotes · 27 January 2020 · /r/askRPC

It's more a frame of mind thing. To say, "I am both a missionary and IT technician" implies that they are separate vocations, as if you do your missions work when you're not doing IT work. Wording it the way he did, while sounding "sneaky," as you put it, is really a misnomer to communicate the broader concept that missions work is an underlying foundation of our identity and function in the world and that our day job is nothing more than context.

Are all missions related to becoming a Pastor or Missionary? Or can it be anything?

1 upvotes · 27 January 2020 · /r/askRPC

The guy who discipled me (Justin) often told a story of a guy we'll call Bob. Justin discipled Bob while Bob was in college. Bob was studying for a career in IT. Justin often asked him for updates and Bob would waver: "I can't decide whether to be a missionary or an IT technician." At graduation, Justin pressed him: "The time to decide is up, so what's your answer? Is it missionary or IT worker?"

Bob answered, "I've decided to be a missionary ... disguised as an IT worker."

This is the proper framework for understanding your day-job. Whether your day-job is to work in a hospital or people's homes or an office or a sanctuary, we're all missionaries. Our job merely creates context for living out our common mission to make disciples of all nations.

David and Michal

1 upvotes · 15 January 2020 · /r/askRPC

Yes, not the other way around.

David and Michal

1 upvotes · 15 January 2020 · /r/askRPC

Right. We can notice the overlap when they occur. But seeing something "through a lens" usually means you're letting that lens affect how you interpret it. We should not go into Scriptural study trying to force red pill concepts into the way we interpret the Bible; rather, we let the Bible speak for itself and marvel at the way the secular red pill crowd has independently discovered through observation of creation the same things the Bible could have told them if they'd only looked.

Empirical evidence to support RP in general?

1 upvotes · 12 January 2020 · /r/askRPC

I thought he went Orthodox?

Are all relationships that explore sexuality prior to marriage headed towards failure?

1 upvotes · 12 January 2020 · /r/askRPC

Well-put.

One Year FR

1 upvotes · 12 January 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I had fun reading this. I see a lot of growth, but I'm more impressed at your recognition of your ongoing areas of need for improvement. Keep at it, brother.

How would a turnaround for the church look like? Making it more RP than Feminist.

1 upvotes · 22 December 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Yes we have :p

I don't think the debate is as big as you think, though. I know a lot of people (pastors even) who will vouch for the validity of old testament law off the cuff, but I have yet to meet a single person who maintains that view after studying that particular issue directly.

How would a turnaround for the church look like? Making it more RP than Feminist.

1 upvotes · 22 December 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Note the context of the conversation was my telling him you can't use old testament law as an authority on the issue of homosexuality. OT law is informative, but non binding on all issues.

FR: Fatherhood. Some early observations.

1 upvotes · 17 December 2019 · /r/RPChristians

splurge on conveniences for the first month

That's fair. The biggest convenience, in my view, is having a decent swing. With a good enough swing, you can have your life back for several hours. I know you're not technically supposed to, but I used to let my kid sleep overnight in those things when they were particularly cranky. Worked every time.

My son pisses straight through the disposables

Weird. I've only ever had that happen twice and it was because we went hours past a normal changing time without realizing. My experience with the cloth diapers, though, is that the pee always soaks through.

working out later on suits me

Me too. And that was my pattern at my old gym. After moving, the new gym closes at 9:30. Kids go to bed at 8 (aren't actually done with night time routines until 8:30). Add in the 10 minutes it takes to get there and time to walk in, drop stuff off in the lockers, etc. plus buffer time ... I'd end up with like 35 minutes, which just isn't worth the effort. So, night time lifting is out as an option for me for now.

invest setting up a modest home gym

I already have a bench. I just need a decent bar and weights (right now I only have dumbbells to go with it). My wife also bought a stationary bike for my birthday. I've had a treadmill before, but too many things can go wrong with them that they're just not worth it in the home.

What programming are you running?

I do a modified greyskull. I focus on the 5 main lifts still, but I drop it down to 3 sets instead of 5, and reduce the weight, up the reps each set. So, my first set is about 90-95% of my max, then I usually drop a 5 or 10 off of each side, depending on the type of lift it is for each successive set with the expectation of doing an AMRAP for the last set. The only lift I do every time is the bench (the other 4 alternate), and I do leg raises on the bench after every set to hit my abs. After doing 3-4 of the main 5 lifts, I usually pick a couple peripheral things to work. Most often it's lats or biceps.

I believe the reason for my losses has less to do with my current routine and more to do with the 2 months off from moving, then another month off after taking over my law firm. I just haven't had the time to rebuild yet. I haven't lost much, but am certainly not able to repeat a 300lb bench again.

Are you eating enough / getting enough sleep?

I probably still eat too much, so that's not an issue. If anything, my biggest aesthetic gains need to come from better dieting. As for sleep, that's always been a big, fat no for me. I average about 5.5-6 hours a night. I've been that way since high school. It's only recently (within the last 6 months) really started to affect me to the point I feel myself wanting more sleep, but my body won't let me even when I try. I'll have to work on that.

I am blessed to have a registered dietitian for a wife

That's definitely helpful. I remember commenting to my wife when we were dating on how much food she eats - most of it junk. Her reply: "It's a blessing from my dad's side of the family. I can eat whatever I want and really never gain weight."

This has mostly held to be true. While she's not flat-abbed, she does often get comments from people about how she stays so "skinny" (skinny fat is probably a better term - thin, but no toning/definition). It probably has something to do with her height too - she's right around 5'10", which is tall for most girls. Either way, the effect is that she can still eat whatever she wants, which makes it less likely that healthy foods are getting put on the table if she's in charge of the cooking for a day. I do most of the cooking and for family meal days (i.e. when we don't have company over) it's usually chicken/steak with broccoli and my son eats cereal or peanut butter.

On the kid thing again: the easy way I've resolved the food issue is simply to offer a default option if they don't like whatever I make for dinner. So, my son, who is incredibly picky, never has to eat what I make - but when he doesn't, he's stuck with PB&J. After 4-5 days of PB&J in a row, he starts to become more adventurous and willing to try new things ... then about vomits and goes back to PB&J. I know he doesn't like PB&J that much and he complains about it, but that's the point. He has to default to something unpreferable so he stays motivated to keep trying what we make.

How God Saved My Marriage

1 upvotes · 17 December 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Excellent FR, brother. I bet this lesson would have been a whole lot easier if someone **put up content on the sidebar about how having a mission can turn a marriage around**. I mean, **does anyone even talk about these things?** It's so important that maybe someone should **write a very simple step-by-step guide for how to develop a solid, biblical mission**.

Teasing aside, I'm glad it finally clicked and you're well on your way! The next challenge is refining your mission into something that actually matters. Then you've got to develop a vision for how you're going to accomplish your mission. Then you've got to figure out how your wife and kids fit into the team that's going to carry out the mission rather than you being a one-man show.

But always bear in mind that the mission cannot be vague and directional. The mission is the destination. The

vision is the direction for how you'll get there - and it must include mile-markers. If your mission is big enough, you'll need help, and that's where they come in. If you could accomplish it alone, it's not big enough. For reference: "Grow closer to God" is not a mission (it's a direction, not a destination) and you can do that by yourself. Some people like to use the cop-out: "Grow closer to God *as a family*" to force-in a way to need your family. But that makes your family the mission, which means they can't be helpers on the mission if they're the mission itself. Bad idea. Lots more to say, but hopefully you get the point for now.

The Truth About Porn

1 upvotes · 12 December 2019 · /r/RPChristians

It's a mutual thing.

1 Cor. 7:3-4 - "The husband should fulfill his marital duty to his wife, and likewise the wife to her husband. The wife does not have authority over her own body but yields it to her husband. In the same way, the husband does not have authority over his own body but yields it to his wife."

Some good news and some questions

1 upvotes · 26 November 2019 · /r/askRPC

I was going to respond, but [/u/Deep_Strength](#) (and several other people) already said everything I intended. This relationship is headed for long-term disaster. How do I know? Because I too have been exactly where you are. Underlying problems aside, let me skip straight to your actual questions and then not answer them:

How do I make her feel more comfortable being the one to initiate physical affection?

You don't. Men are spontaneously sexual. Women are responsively sexual. Yes, they will initiate from time to time. But don't expect that to be the norm. If she does, she's not your unicorn - she's just lying to you about her sexuality.

Is that something too awkward to talk about?

This very question is in her frame. Why do you care about how awkward it might be? If you want to talk, talk.

she never initiates herself. I guess it's just not how she is? What do I make of this and how should I react?

You don't react. Reacting is bad. It lets her create the baseline and your behaviors depend on what she does. You initiate and let her react. What you make of this is that she's a girl - not a unicorn: a girl like any other.

I'm having a hard time discerning exactly how much affection I should be showing her.

Exactly as much as you want. Not as much as you think she wants.

If I'm the prize, I can still adore the beautiful gift that she is, but too much adoration can obviously shatter that frame

You seem to be misunderstanding frame. You're trying to define your frame by "a man she's sexually attracted to" - and if you do anything that makes her less sexually attracted, somehow you "broke frame." Don't let her perception be what defines your frame. Let that come from within you. As Rollo says, it's your "internal point of origin." If your thoughts originate from external stimuli, it's not YOUR frame.

I want to tell her I miss her when I'm gone for the weekend, I want to tell her how special she is, I want to tell her I love her, etc.

In other words: you have serious emotional connectivity problems that preclude you from thinking rationally during this infatuation stage. Welcome to the club. I also married a woman who'd never dated a guy before me. She'd never kissed another man, much less slept with anyone. She verbalized her desire to be submissive to a husband. She had everything you describe and more. Yet you know my story because we've had phone conversations over exactly this. It turns out she was just like all the other girls. I just hadn't known her long enough to realize it.

My ONEitis had to wear off before that became apparent - and once you marry this girl, you're going to realize the same thing also. Not in every way. My wife isn't the slutty, branch-swinging AWALT type. Everyone expresses their AWALT tendencies in different ways and to varying degrees. My guess is that the girl you've found isn't going to go full slut or branch-swinger either. Instead, she'll express herself just like my wife did. There's a type.

But RP principles and social psychology have ingrained into me to withhold much of that (because women fiend for mystery, emotional longing, a chase, etc.)

Cool. So you know the psychology. You also know what you want to do. Make your choice and reap the consequences. That said, the fact that you still feel compelled to pedestalize her more and more and more - and verbally directly to her, even - tells me that you're still in the uncertainty phase. You know what RP says, but you don't quite believe it's true. So, you think that you'd better treat her the way you were culturally ingrained to treat a woman you like as the "safe" route, and because it's all you really know. Or perhaps there's an emotional weakness that precludes you from controlling how you feel. I don't mean controlling how you express your feelings - but how you *actually* feel. You should really learn this emotional self-control before delving too much further into feeding the ONEitis.

Can you guys just offer me some thoughts on how to reconcile these principles with a situation where a genuine love is really there?

You have yet to describe anything that I recognize as genuine, biblical love. All I'm seeing is emotional infatuation. This explains why you can't reconcile the concepts. The principles you referenced are irreconcilable with unrestrained emotional infatuation, but they are not at all irreconcilable with biblical love (yes, that's in the sidebar too ;)

FR: Phone Repair (WISNIFG)

1 upvotes · 26 November 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I rarely see anyone writing about WISNIFG techniques being applied to everyday situations, most men tend to only make use of it in their relationships

I use them in my job every single day.

Thank you Jesus

1 upvotes · 26 November 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Sorry, this is too low quality. You're welcome to repost this on [r/askRPC](#).

Tips for Utilizing Passive Dread, Isn't It Toothless?

1 upvotes · 21 November 2019 · /r/askRPC

Yeah, my point was simply that there's more to it than just qualities that prove you're a good leader. You get that, though. The way you had it worded made it seem like leadership was the primary focus, though.

Tips for Utilizing Passive Dread, Isn't It Toothless?

1 upvotes · 21 November 2019 · /r/askRPC

Solid.

Women usually get offended if you bring up how pretty other women are

The one exception I'd give is passive comments about TV/celebrities. They know you're not trying to make them jealous because it's not realistic, so they're not hurt or offended. But it does show them that you have sexual thoughts broadly and not merely for her alone. Or to put it another way, it's more honest about the sexual thoughts you have, bringing out overtly what most men are too afraid to communicate in front of their wives.

It also alerts her to the types of things you find attractive without you having make it personal toward her not fulfilling that desire.

women/wives are still attracted/aroused to a man that other women find attractive regardless of moral character or not

Right, as I often note that dread is a byproduct of preselection post-marriage, not jealousy itself. That probably deserves a post at some point. Even the secular guys will acknowledge that if you're trying to make her jealous, you're doing it wrong. At that point, you're in her frame, worrying too much about what she thinks or feels toward you.

"Passive dread" is becoming more attracting by being a godly, masculine, muscular, confident leader.

As well as developing wit, a better fashion sense, learning kino, etc.

Attention Whore Starter Pack

1 upvotes · 19 November 2019 · /r/WhereAreAllTheGoodMen

I was once told: "You're not really a practicing attorney until you're grossing a quarter-mil. Anything less than that and it's just a hobby that pays."

That's about what photography is for most women: a hobby that pays. And it usually doesn't even pay - or when it does, it's like \$250/yr because they charged 5 friends \$50 to take a few shots.

Service and Mission

1 upvotes · 12 November 2019 · /r/RPChristians

He means my book on discipleship, which I wrote 9 years ago :p

Service and Mission

1 upvotes · 12 November 2019 · /r/RPChristians

As the beginning of discipleship, yes. I don't think they have to accept the gospel to be served. But they do have to show that they're at least not obstinate against it and that they want what other believers have. I mean ... do we see Jesus washing the pharisees feet?

Sharing church with soon-to-be ex-wife

1 upvotes · 11 November 2019 · /r/askRPC

The legal/psychological term is parental alienation. Also ...

even if you've done nothing wrong it doesn't mean she won't twist the narrative into you being the bad guy

No matter the situation, there's always some contribution to the problem, even if it's unknowing or unintentional. And an ex will always spin it against you in court.

The Truth About Porn

1 upvotes · 10 November 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Very interesting idea. I like it. I'll think on it. Any suggestions?

Proposal, Engagement and Marriage Traditions

1 upvotes · 7 November 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Integrate better into society. Tell her: "It's sexist to assume the man should bend his knee. You should bend your knee to me when I propose." Win win, right?

Sex and Sin

1 upvotes · 6 November 2019 · /r/RPChristians

The role of correction is only among other believers. This is clear from every time it's brought up in scripture. It's impossible to get a nonbeliever to stop sinning anyway, so correcting them is the definition of futile. By their very nature, everything they do is sin.

The Truth About Porn

1 upvotes · 6 November 2019 · /r/RPChristians

What's the story there?

what is the RPC reason for not engaging in hookup culture?

1 upvotes · 5 November 2019 · /r/askRPC

Why don't RPCs spin plates? Game lots of girls?

We have more important things in life to do. As Rollo often says, RP isn't about prescribed behaviors; it's about knowing the truth - and what you do with that truth is up to each man. The secular subs have a strong bias toward making sex with multiple women their primary mission in life. Those of us on RPC find that to be a relatively weak and useless mission and we've prioritized other things over sex such that we maximize our sexuality without having to sacrifice our higher priorities in the process.

I'm not asking for rule-centric Bible verses, moralistic judgments, or such. I'm asking for experiential reasons

Chances are, most of us have "experienced" much greater satisfaction in life through our higher priorities than those who spend their lives chasing tail.

Part of the draw for me to women is pure sexual attraction. I wanna slay as much p*ssy as I can.

Yep, we have that desire too. We just have other desires also. Part of the process of becoming attractive enough to "slay as much p*ssy as I can" is having higher priorities than pussy.

I've never had that life where I'm banging multiple girls a week.

Part of it is because you seem fixated on getting it. It's somewhat of a catch-22. You have to let it go and focus on other things than girls before you can become naturally attractive in this way. When you make it your aim, you

care too much.

Most of the things I learned in church I don't know how I feel about them. The niceness and the emasculation

Yeah, we're not for much of that either. Churchianity is more interested in stereotypes and tropes than truth.

I'm wondering if this whole monogamy thing is really doable or even smart, or just part of the beta male feminist universe

Look, at the end of the day you can make whatever choices you want. There will be consequences to those choices. Heaven and hell are real places. If you want to accept the consequences of such an eternal decision, that's on you. No one can force you to choose Christ. If you want to go screw around with a bunch of girls making the same choice, go for it. But if we're right about the Bible, there really only seems to be one logical conclusion - only one "smart" choice.

As for monogamy itself, I often teach that men are inherently polygamous. We live in a monogamous culture, though. The laws enforce monogamous relationships insofar as marriage is concerned. So, either don't get married and screw whoever you like, or get married and deal with the pains that come with divorce. Or stay monogamous. Again, you pick whatever path you want, then deal with the consequences. Yes, there are negative consequences to being a Christian. We've simply decided that the benefits outweigh the costs. If you come on the other end of that spectrum, I believe you'll come to regret it one day, but that's still your decision to make, not any of ours to make for you.

what a Christian alpha is

There is no such thing as a "Christian alpha." There are alphas and there are non-alphas. There are Christians and non-Christians. It's like you're asking, "What's it like playing the piano as a black man? Tell me about being a black piano player." The answer is clear: *It's exactly the same as when white people play the piano.* The color of their skin doesn't make the instrument work any differently. Yes, they might play a different song with the instrument because of their cultural experiences that differ from others - or maybe they play the same song. It doesn't really matter. At the end of the day, the piano and the skin color are separate entities in themselves.

In this context, non-Christians might use alphaness to slay pussy because that's their highest mission in life. Christians might use it to advance other purposes we think are more valuable to our long-term interests. At the end of the day, alpha is still alpha regardless of whether it's coming from a Christian or non-Christian.

On creeps and romantics and obedience to God

1 upvotes · 4 November 2019 · /r/RPChristians

As I noted elsewhere, I think what [/u/lololasaurus](#) was alluding to is the fact that a man's compliance to his wife is what's unattractive and makes him less attractive to her. The guy could be earning 6-figures and still doing most of the household chores himself. The issue isn't one of whether or not he does chores. It's the reason why he does them. If he does chores because his wife nags him into it, then his motivation is to appease his wife - an unattractive reason. If he does it because he's a responsible man who doesn't need his wife to tell him what to do, then he's attractive.

Encouraging leadership in with non-rp husband

1 upvotes · 31 October 2019 · /r/askRPC

And speaking for myself I don't mind a little (or even a lot) of extra weight. And again, speaking for myself, attraction is a large part mind game

But that's just the thing - you're only thinking for yourself here. Are you so sure that he thinks the same way on this? If he's at all like 99.999% of other men, he doesn't. He might make you think he does because he's too afraid to disappoint you or to sound shallow in any way. Culture has conditioned him to give these types of responses. But you're not dealing with what he says; you're dealing with his biological impulses and how to trigger them.

I am not talking divorce

You said this to someone else too. Whenever you say, "I know we're not supposed to divorce, but ..." it doesn't matter what follows the but. You're talking divorce. The thought is running through your head. You wish you could divorce. If it wasn't unscriptural, you'd already be gone. Kind of like when a guy is tempted to lust - he sees another girl. If he wasn't bound by marriage, he'd be gone. Jesus says he has committed adultery in his heart when he's hit that point. You've committed divorce in your heart, hence the second of the two options you gave to [/u/Deep_Strength](#) - "2) I disconnect."

And I emphasize things like my choosing and expressing gratitude in this Christian subreddit as that is common advice for people in situations like these - particularly Christian women - to focus on the good and positive.

Ah yes, the typical Christian advice that works so well for most couples. Laura Doyle has some good stuff, for sure. And I'm not saying it's bad advice. But, as with most Christian advice - while good, it's utterly incomplete and only accounts for the way things *should* be without considering *how they actually are*.

That advice assumes a woman's inner character and attitude toward her husband should be the most important thing to solve every problem for her in marriage. Why? Because they (mistakenly) think that's what the Bible says *should* be true. But the fact is that weight issues, for example, are not "contributing issues." They are foundational. That's why the only bolded post on our sidebar is "Lifting is Not A Suggestion."

I am certain there are fat couples still having passion and intimacy in their lives

You may be right. There are also people under 6'0" who are good enough to play in the NBA. So yes, there are overweight people who are exceptionally skilled enough in other areas to maintain physical passion. If you're not there, start with the low-hanging fruit first. Rather than trying to up your respect/submission game from an 8 to a 9 and hope that solves all your problems, try upping your physical appearance game, as that's where most of your easy improvements will come from. Not to say it will be easy. It won't be. Losing weight is HARD work. I know first-hand. And when you start to see *some* results, you'll be tempted to get complacent and quit. Don't.

To be clear: I do get what you're saying. This isn't the only issue. There will be other things that need addressed. Other insights you're getting here are good too. But, in my candid opinion, you're wasting your time working on things you're already competent at. Could you get better? Absolutely. But start with your weakest areas first. This is not one of those situations where you play to your strengths - especially if doing so hasn't been working for you so far.

Killing the Blue

1 upvotes · 31 October 2019 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

I can't believe I'm the one saying this, but you and [/u/Blarg_Risen](#) are way overthinking this.

My point was simple: rather than letting a woman or culture tell a man how he must lead his family and what roles he will or won't fulfill, he should decide for himself. It doesn't matter what is nature from nurture - he can deny them both if he wants.

The reason this doesn't go into an "everything in the entire spectrum" result is that there are still clear data points that are attractive and not and which will trigger sexual tingles in each gender. A guy can choose not to live up to these data points if he wants, as long as he agrees to bear the consequences on his sex life. He can choose what his priorities are. He can't let his wife or culture or Rollo Tomassi or some random endorsed contributor on MRP or TRP tell him what his boundaries should be. At best, they can give insights (whether reliable or not) on strategies that can help him accomplish the goals he sets for himself. But if they're telling him he must change his goals, that's where it all goes awry. Yet this is exactly what wives and culture demand of us. Hence many of the points in my post.

Is my marriage salvageable?

1 upvotes · 23 October 2019 · /r/askMRP

Then support isn't as much an issue. Who saves more for retirement?

Is my marriage salvageable?

1 upvotes · 23 October 2019 · /r/askMRP

Right ... so he read the books before he ordered them?

Is my marriage salvageable?

1 upvotes · 23 October 2019 · /r/askMRP

If he's a reasonably higher earner (i.e. more than 20% higher income than her), right now he's looking at 6-7 years of support. If he waits too much longer, that's going to turn into lifetime support. It also means another several years of accumulating retirement benefits, interest in the market, asset value appreciation, etc. that's all going to be split rather than nipping that in the bud now.

That decision's got to be made quicker if he wants to limit his damages. Of course, doing another separation, but legalizing it this time would offer some protection.

Amused Mastery, Outcome Independence, Agree and Amplify, Frame, etc.

1 upvotes · 21 October 2019 · /r/askRPC

In addition to what /u/Praexology said, the way you explain how "they come together" is really, really broad. It's like saying that (1) having a stable prayer life, and (2) memorizing tons of Scripture are basically "not separate from each other per-se" because "the higher one's spiritual maturity, the more easily one will be able to" do these things regularly.

The fact is, they're very different concepts. You can be great at one and awful at the other - even among "spiritually mature" people.

App Review: BodBot - Two Thumbs Up

1 upvotes · 19 October 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Yes, I use it off and on. It's not as good as one of the standard gym routines, so I don't use it for that. But it's excellent for home routines once you learn to filter out all the worthless exercises it throws in there.

Question: Understanding Passive game vs. Approaching

1 upvotes · 18 October 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Passive game sets the difficulty. Active game is the game itself. A guy who has mastered passive game (physique, confidence, social status, etc.) is playing on easy mode and doesn't need to apply much effort to win the active game. A guy without good passive game needs immaculate excellence at active game to have success - but it's still doable.

Another way to think of it: passive game sets up for longevity, whereas active is about short-term wins. Without a passive foundation, the active game can never be maintained indefinitely, turning you into a fraud. If passive game is the foundation and active game is what's built on top of it, what happens if you have a tiny foundation with a massive active game on top - like an upside-down pyramid? It's going to topple. Focus your effort on the foundation and you really don't need much at the top to be effective, though it still helps.

Wouldn't God's mission for us to become like Him in passive game by acquiring the Holy Spirit and then the active (thoughts, words, deeds) game that proceeds from that will be more "powerful" and attractive in that one is rooted on the foundation of God's mission and then the mission is able to translate into active game more fluidly?

This question is somewhat incomprehensible to me and seems to confuse concepts. If you're talking about evangelistic/spiritual game, then it makes more sense. Yes, learning how to follow God and do so in front of others is a good parallel to passive game (i.e. what I call passive evangelism in the 300 series). Actively and verbally proclaiming the Gospel to others is parallel to active game (what I call proclamational evangelism). But these are the spiritual truth behind the shadow that we call dating. Don't confuse the shadow and the real thing.

Now, as a matter of technicality, anyone who lives by the Holy Spirit will invariably take care of his body through exercise and dieting, will be maintaining his household in good order, will be effective at building relationships and earning respect in his community, will be diligent at his job, and will know how to season his conversations with salt. So, yes, living the Biblical life will inherently encompass all necessary aspects of passive game in a dating context as well. But when you say "acquiring the Holy Spirit," it gives the impression that you mean something more akin to what churchianity would put out as the Christian lifestyle, which almost certainly doesn't include things like going to the gym or learning how to say no to people, etc.

The main part I get stuck up on is that I approach women I find attractive, but feel as if I'm expending too much energy on that. I usually try to invite women to Church and things that I'm already going to, planned myself, etc. so that I'm not wasting the valuable time and resources that God gave me. Where I struggle is the "attention" part and valuing that.

You're thinking about this too much. Your mission is to make disciples (which is not to be confused with evangelism alone). This process is 5-fold:

- Tell others what to do
- Show them how to do it
- Let them try in front of you
- Send them out to do it on their own
- Commission them to pass this process on with others

How does a girl fit into any of these roles? It could be that you're teaching a small group and you want her to help (1) invite more people to learn from you, (2) type up hand-outs for your content, (3) tell stories that support your message, (4) invite you into her networks that could use your teaching, (5) take care of logistics so you can focus on teaching. Interested in a girl? See if she'd do any of those for you. Then her time is worth your attention.

But it's not just about teaching - you also have to show people through your own life. So, if you believe a disciple serves the impoverished, ask her to (1) help you serve at a soup kitchen, (2) raise funds for kids without lunch money at school, (3) research what social needs are greatest in your city, (4) contribute her own funds to a cause that helps your influence in making disciples, etc. Or perhaps you're not trying to prove service, but you do want to show that a disciple knows Scripture, so you ask her to (1) help you review verses you memorized, (2) quiz you

on a passage you studied recently, (3) study a passage with you, (4) brainstorm different ways to apply a particular verse, etc. And in all this you're showing her through your own lifestyle what you value as being a disciple, and asking her to help develop your own character for these things.

Part of the process is letting them try - so perhaps you start delegating responsibilities to her that help your mission: (1) ask her to study a passage and show you what she comes up with that might give you a new perspective, (2) you test her on her scripture memory and perhaps learn some new important passages for yourself, (3) ask how she values serving those in need and if you can watch her do it sometime, connecting you with those she's serving so your social network expands, etc.

See how this works? You disciple her, but you're also using that as the context for getting to know her better - but in a way that advances your mission. And as you get to the "send her out" phase, you've really got someone who is doing your work, but in a social network that you couldn't otherwise reach because she knows people that you don't and she can reach a gender that you won't have as much influence among. And then when you invite her to pass on all of this to someone else, the people she passes it on to will now be advancing your mission even though you've possibly never even met them.

That's not to say you can't employ active game for more typical things like going out to dinner or watching a movie. Rather, I always try to find a way to link those things with my mission, redeeming them rather than abandoning them.

For example, I enjoy watching Netflix with my wife. Rather than picking a random interesting show, I strategically pick shows that I know other people are watching so that I'm doubling my effort: quality time cuddling with my wife on the couch, while also ingesting an aspect of culture that will help me relate with someone else who enjoys that same aspect of culture. Watching that indie film that no one has ever seen before, but happens to be a really good movie ... does nothing for my mission.

On the flip, she got me onto this "big picture" show on Netflix. It's totally not my normal taste, but it's full of interesting trivia. The first episode was on the crime industry and its significance (both good and bad) to the world. Within 24 hours of watching that episode, I found myself in conversation with a police officer, referencing the things I learned in the episode to build a conversation. He loved the fact that I seemed to understand his world better than most people - all because I watched a TV show episode and learned a few tidbits of information. That's value - not because I know random tidbits, but because I was able to repurpose my TV time toward building a new relationship through fascinating conversation on stuff I otherwise never would have thought about, which can now be leveraged for disciple-making as he and his wife will be in our small group.

In the same way - if you're going to employ active game through non-missional activities, contemplate ways that you can repurpose these activities to be missional. Otherwise, the focus is purely on her and "the relationship" which for Christians leads to blue pill ideologies of what could evolve and the way to go about doing that.

Question: Understanding Passive game vs. Approaching

1 upvotes · 18 October 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Assuming you're single, yes, approaching women is still a good idea. The reason for the approach is what changes the value from a positive to a negative. If you approach because you have these fantasies of getting married and having lots of sex, you're going at it the wrong way and ultimately doing yourself more harm than good. If you're approaching because you've got important crap going on in your life and you need help getting it all done, then you're doing it properly.

As /u/Deep_Strength said, the passive things you do to improve your life are going to increase the quality of the person you invite to help you. The active part of it is actually inviting her to help you. The passive aspects are worthless if they don't become active at some point - but make sure that your active mentality is always mission-focused, not tied up in the notion that you want to get married just because it's "the thing to do" or because you

think it's going to make your life full of all kinds of joy just by owning a ring. If you're using game (passive or active) to fulfill blue pill fantasies, you're still blue pill. I'm not even convinced that "purple" even exists at all, though I still use the term from time to time as a matter of convenience.

So, as Deep alluded to, passive "game" is self-optimization toward your mission. God called you to make disciples. You can be mildly effective with mild stats. An obese guy who's addicted to video games and still lives with his mom because he has no job - he might be able to make a disciple here or there, but it's going to be super hard for him to gain much traction for Christ within his sphere of influence because he really has no sphere of influence. Get him a 6-pack, a decent wardrobe, charming personality, social status with a large network of friends and acquaintances, etc. and suddenly everyone wants to be discipled by him and people will hang on his every word. That includes women. And the larger a guy's following becomes, the more he's going to need help managing everything going on in his life - and what better way to get that help than to start asking hot, single women to do things with and for him? And the more helpful they are, the better a candidate they become for marriage.

[FR] "Happy Life, Happy Wife" & Empathy Theory

1 upvotes · 18 October 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Hamilton is my jam! But my love of musicals is no surprise here.

Women typically value group success over individual success

This is only true among women

I disagree with you here, because if a guy is doing loser-ish things it will lower her standing within her girl group ... women use men to raise their status around other women

You're not disagreeing with me here - you're just still talking about her status as among other women. But between a husband and wife alone, taking out the other women, the wife almost always becomes competitive against her husband for authority, playing the martyr on who does more work around the house, who cares for the kids more properly, etc. This is not a group-benefit dynamic at all.

I am very direct if I like or dislike something, and while I agree that removing attention is effective at training

That's not what I was implying. I simply meant that you should show her your good mood through your actions rather than announcing it up-front. Again, I'm happy to be proven wrong, but this type of announcing/verbalization often undermines the effort. The way you talk also makes it sound like you're stiff in your communications. Better just to be fun and friendly and let that rub off naturally rather than commanding her to accept it, which is often received by women as a challenge rather than an invitation - and you don't want to put them in a mood to fight back.

You are pigeonholing yourself into just classically conditioning your wife

I wouldn't even call this conditioning at all. It's just a guy doing what a guy wants to do. If your goal is to condition your wife, your strategy may be slightly more effective ... but it also puts you too much in her frame. Long-term, you might win at conditioning her, but you're going to lose attraction in the process. A woman attracted to a man will adapt to him on her own; a man trying to condition his wife becomes unattractive over

time and the conditioning ultimately loses ground when he stops making an effort of it. Stop worrying so much about what she thinks. You do you. Let that be that.

I believe this is a cultural disposition and can be trained out.

Again, you're worried too much of what she thinks or feels. The more you try to train her, the more resistance you're going to get. It may work in the end, but it's going to take multiples more effort than the more broad "you do you" approach. Don't live in her frame.

I'm of the mind that, even if I'm not sure why it works

Works to what end, though? To improve her mood in the moment? Sure. To improve her attraction toward you? Less likely.

[FR] Comfort Test About Finances and More

1 upvotes · 16 October 2019 · /r/RPChristians

They're won't be for everyone, but will be for some. I do have exclusively joint accounts with my wife, but have contemplated doing away with this, as it gives her too much access to spend money without me knowing what on. This has been an issue at various points in our marriage. For us, we make enough money that the problem is less about what's actually being spent than it is sm authority issue ... but I'd hate to be in that position on a tighter budget.

Also, there are legal and psychological benefits to consider.

[FR] Initiate Often, Confident Always

1 upvotes · 15 October 2019 · /r/RPChristians

If a man is divorce-proof, and his wife would lose immensely more by losing him, would her perception of the power dynamic favoring him raise his SMV to her specifically?

No. I see this ALL THE TIME in my career. The woman just feels trapped. She does not like him more. She just knows she can't leave ... until a white knight comes to save her.

Developing charm?

1 upvotes · 15 October 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Is that research based on what women say or what actually makes them tingly?

[FR] Initiate Often, Confident Always

1 upvotes · 15 October 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I just gave a reply to that last bit to the other guy. Feel free to read my answer there.

[FR] Initiate Often, Confident Always

1 upvotes · 15 October 2019 · /r/RPChristians

did/does this make you lose respect/desire/love for your wife?

Too many people try to lump words like "love" and "respect" as holistic concepts. "Do you love your wife?" could simultaneously evoke both answers. *I love her smile* is just as valid an answer as *I don't love her nagging*. The refrain comes: "Yes, but do you love HER?" But who is she? What defines a person? Is it a mere balancing

act, asking if the things I appreciate about her outweigh the things I don't? You can see how quickly the conversation can become existential and so theoretical as to be moot.

To break away from the holistic view: Yes, the constant rejection in that phase of life made me lose an incredible amount of respect and desire for my wife in a sexual context. No, it did not decrease, for example, my respect for her ability to crunch out tax returns (her job) or love for the way she'd help care for our kids.

I'm curious if the interrelational RMV shifted between you and your wife, putting her in the position of losing more if you left

You might be blending RMV and SMV in a weird way here, when I think you really mean to reference the power dynamic in the relationship (i.e. the cardinal rule of relationships). RMV doesn't quite touch on this in the same way, as it draws from principles of not only sexuality, but also contribution to entirety of a person's life. Beta guys, for example, have relatively high (yet capped) RMV because they bring a lot to the table in terms of personal servitude, financial provision, flattery, validation, etc. SMV describes only the way those things affect sexual interest in another person. A high RMV makes a woman think, "You have a lot to offer me," whereas a high SMV man makes a woman think, "I need to have a lot to offer you." Power in a relationship is characterized by the balance of each of these respective scales relative to the other.

There are two ways for a man to increase his power and assume a position of dominance in a relationship (i.e. the attractive position that makes a wife sexually attracted to him): (1) up his SMV/RMV to a point that surpasses hers; (2) decrease her SMV/RMV to a point that falls beneath his. This latter one sounds stupid because why would a guy want a less attractive wife? But in reality, this dynamic functions on two perspective planes:

- The wife's frame: If a wife perceives her man's SMV/RMV going up or hers going down, the power dynamic will change even if the objective qualifiers are unaltered. A great example of this is battered women. Objectively, any outsider to the relationship will reject this man as having an incredibly low RMV to a degree that undermines any SMV he might otherwise have. Nobody wants to be in relationship with an abuser, even if he is otherwise sexually attractive. However, the battered woman is already in a relationship with him, already depends on him, already has a psychological bond with him, and therefore perceives his RMV as way higher than it actually is. As a result, he maintains the position of dominance in the relationship, even though he is objectively a bad-egg. More commonly, rather than her perception of his SMV/RMV is a wife's perception of her own. Highly self-conscious women post-marriage will often not realize the value they bring to the table, and therefore might believe their husband holds the position of dominance in the relationship when in reality he's the lucky one, as he's generally less attractive and has less to contribute than her. This also occurs when a man is skilled in the art of playful (rather than mean/harsh) negging.
- The man's frame: The wife's framing of the power dynamic matters to the degree of receptivity she has toward her husband. Perception is everything, so his being objectively attractive means very little if she doesn't find him attractive (or at least more comparatively attractive than she believes she is). However, the same is true in the inverse for a man - if the man doesn't realize he has more power than his wife, even though she sees him in the position of dominance in the relationship, he won't ever make use of the power he doesn't realize he has. Interestingly, flip the roles slightly and let him perceive himself in a position of power, even if she does not see it (perhaps the most common circumstance that leads to Rambo-ing) and suddenly he is happier all the same, even if she is not yet responsive to his self-perceived dominance. Why? Because a man who has regained his sense of self-worth has abundance, options, and confidence. This attitude, then, becomes attractive, having the eventual effect of raising his SMV to his wife's perception - not necessarily past her perception of her own SMV/RMV, but at least some change in the dynamic.

My point in saying all of this is simply to say that the power dynamic doesn't actually change until a perception shift takes place. The internal balance from rejection "killing my confidence" to "improving my confidence" did

not improve my self-perception of my SMV/RMV, but it did decrease my perception of my wife's SMV/RMV - because what good is it to have an attractive wife she isn't willing to be sexual with you (i.e. rejection)? So yes, the balance of power shifted slightly in my favor - not because I became a better man, but because I perceived her as a worse wife. I became less attracted to her and therefore needed her less - not necessarily to a tipping point that I perceived myself as higher-value than her on the open market, but it was a start.

In terms of her frame, her rejection of me and my succumbing to her rejection probably validated her view that she was in the position of power: because she could decide whatever she wanted and I would go along with it like a good little boy. This did not make her perceive herself any higher, but it did decrease her perception of my SMV, therefore validating her position of power.

So, while I felt more empowered in the relationship through this constant rejection, so also did she - so no, she was not put in a position of losing more if I left. This is particularly true when you realize that all of this only effectuated internal changes in our own perceptions, but did not affect objective reality on the outside either. The fact is: despite my increased confidence and decreased perception of her SMV, she was still an attractive woman and I was still an obese man-child who didn't bring much to the table except a paycheck, which wasn't even a necessity given that she had/has a comparable job. So, in that sense, no changes were made to the balance of power in any objective sense.

it gives me the relational upperhand because I am able call bluff and not lose more than she would

I think your previous sentence hit closer than this one. It increases your confidence. It does not actually give you the upper-hand in an objective sense or relative to her frame. And until she is in your frame, her frame still matters to the degree that perception matters.

Am I sinning by robbing my SO of the chance to validate me?

Where does the Bible give her that right to be your validator? It doesn't. In fact, it is sinning to let your validation come from her in the first place. As I often cite Paul, "I do not care if I am judged by you or any human court. I do not even judge myself. My conscience is clear, but that doesn't make me innocent. It is the Lord who judges me" (I think that's in 1 Cor. 4). See also Galatians 1:10 about not worrying about what other people think of you. This includes your spouse. Jesus's emotions aren't hung up on our validation of him.

I'm curious if your approach to your relationship is that you: A) Don't lose confidence by being rejected, but also don't feel validated by being accepted.

First, rather than "don't lose confidence by being rejected" I would re-write it: "gain confidence by being rejected." As for the second half, it's not sin to feel validated; but it certainly becomes damaging to a relationship if your enjoyment of validation from the relationship becomes something you depend on. In that sense, I would prefer a guy receive no validation from his spouse at all and have that come purely from God rather than that he would depend on validation from his spouse. Somewhere in the middle is more appropriate, but when first getting started guys don't know how to find a balance so they need to be pushed to one extreme or the other.

B) Don't lose confidence by being rejected, but allow yourself to be validated by spousal acceptance/confirmation

It's probably worth noting here that in addition to enjoying validation when it comes there is a point where one enjoys it too much, even without depending on it, that it can negatively affect his frame, as he starts to weigh his appreciation of her validation of him more than his own internal sense of self-worth, even if he had his sense of self-worth to fall back on all along.

C) Something else entirely

Probably the best way I'd put it is: (1) Increase confidence by being rejected, (2) appreciate validation when it comes, but don't depend on it or revel in it for too long.

[FR] Comfort Test About Finances and More

1 upvotes · 8 October 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I don't necessarily pick up on this from OP, but for reference purposes: what you're talking about is a covert contract.

AWALT and M/W-Complex

1 upvotes · 8 October 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Interesting story. You should elaborate on that a bit more and what lessons you've learned since then and make a post on it.

AWALT and M/W-Complex

1 upvotes · 8 October 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Haha, true. That's the difference between RMV and SMV.

A Friendly Plea

1 upvotes · 3 October 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Yeah, without any knowledge of what you teach on those subs, we can't let them be publicized. Thanks for your efforts, though. Maybe as we get to know you and your views on things, our thoughts here will change.

Is there a subreddit for people who are real christians but don't go to church?

1 upvotes · 1 October 2019 · /r/RPChristians

When you want to speak as a mod, click the "distinguish" button under your comment - preferably even "distinguish and sticky" if you want it to appear as the top comment.

Men of Iron

1 upvotes · 25 September 2019 · /r/askRPC

Well, every website that claims to talk about biblical masculinity will claim to have some unique insight on what it means to be a "true man." Even RPC.

But talking about men's issues, and even supporting men in a modern feminist culture doesn't make something "red pillled." Noobs do this all the time - "My church is pretty red pillled." *Why?* "Because they believe in biblical marital roles, headship, etc." *Okay, but that's not what the red pill is.*

The red pill is inherently an understanding of intersexual relational dynamics *as they actually function, rather than how people say they function.* That's all. It is not a prescription on how a person ought to behave. You can do with that knowledge what you will.

However, just as with "faith," it's 99% probable that if someone doesn't adjust their behaviors because of what they believe about Christ, they probably don't have actual, real faith; and if someone doesn't adjust how they relate with women based on what they learn from the red pill, they probably haven't actually swallowed the pill, despite having some rote intellectual awareness of the ins and outs of it all. So, if a guy claims to have red pill awareness, but still holds onto his blue pill hopes and dreams, or otherwise doesn't seem to live up to any rational implications of red pill knowledge, he is at best purple - or in faith terms, "luke warm," claiming to have knowledge of God and to be a believer, but not actually living up to it in practice most of the time. It's playing

games instead of playing the game.

So, before calling another organization "red pillled," I'd want to know: are they aware of things like fitness tests? Do they realize that things like AA or fogging or whatnot are effective conflict resolution tactics that increase respect and attraction, or are they using other methods that are less effective? Do they know the difference between a "nice guy" and a "good man"? These types of questions and more are what give greater insight into just how "aware" the organization's communicators are about how intersexual relational dynamics actually function today. Simple puff pieces for men mean squat in deciding if someone is red pillled. It doesn't mean it's unimportant; it's just distinct from being red pillled.

Lifting Questions

1 upvotes · 23 September 2019 · /r/askRPC

Is it a good idea to have a recovery week every few cycles to lift light (65-70% of training load)?

The guys to listen to say yes. I realized my best gains without any off-time or light weeks. But I was also going for rote strength, not physique. The recommendations are different. Physique inherently relies on lower weights for more reps, which is a lot easier on your body in general.

How long should you stay on a program before switching?

I agree with Deep. Go until you plateau.

Is testing your 1RM's worth the risk and something to do periodically?

I only do it with a spotter. I haven't done it in 4 months. No, it's not worth it other than bragging rights.

Is going to failure and set it down on the safeties the better way like I am or de-load the WM to where I can get 20?

That depends. If your goal is strength, stick with the higher weight, even if you can't get the full 20. But the fact that you're doing WMs at all tells me you're going for physique, in which case you're better off lowering the weight to go for the higher reps.

Indonesia to outlaw sex outside marriage

1 upvotes · 20 September 2019 · /r/askRPC

Right. Respect does still have to be earned. That's another backwards aspect of liberal culture that assumes respect should be your default attitude toward people, even if they haven't earned it yet.

Indonesia to outlaw sex outside marriage

1 upvotes · 20 September 2019 · /r/askRPC

Right. But the gospel is one of those and yet I can still respect many of those filthy heathens who believe it's false.

How does Christianity affect AWALT & Hypergamy?

1 upvotes · 20 September 2019 · /r/askRPC

Does your gf have an arm? Dude! My wife does too. I guess AWALT. Oh wait, God shouldn't want us to stereotype women, so we'd better just never assume that a girl we meet has an arm. For all we know, it's just a really good prosthetic.

Awkward to talk that way, right? Of course women have arms. There are general rules, and there are outliers. But

there are also women with long arms/short arms; fat arms/skinny arms; dark toned arms/light toned arms; etc. The fact is, God created all women with arms. He created all women with hormones. He created all women with the purpose of helping. And when we sinned, he decreed that all women would be cursed through Eve. AWALT represents the inclinations inherent in women (whether or not they express them) that are a product of (1) creation, or (2) their sinful nature. It's that simple. The red pill figured out what those trends are through observation; we see it through reading the Bible.

Hypergamy is also a God-created phenomenon that was perverted by the fall. God designed it for good. Women perverted it for evil. But it's a sub-category within AWALT. God created all women to want to follow a capable leader (AF). The curse of the fall is that all women then want their man to be subservient to them (BB). That's hypergamy.

"she's not yours, it's just your turn"

This is a concept straight from the Bible as well. "You are not your own, you were bought with a price." We belong to Jesus. God gives others into our lives within our responsibility - our students, disciples, a wife, children, etc. They belong to God; but he gives us a turn with them, and we are to steward our time and relational energy with them in a manner best suited to advance His Kingdom.

Per the fall, this concept has become perverted. Instead of, "I'm not yours, I'm God's" it has become, "I'm not yours, I'm his." And men do this too. AWALT. AMALT - "I don't belong to my wife, especially now that my heart is really with some other woman."

The fact is, some men get to keep their turn for an entire lifetime before giving her back to God. Others get to keep her for a few years before she runs into the arms of another, before she ultimately goes back to God. But no matter how it plays out, she's on loan and is never yours to begin with.

Even under secular terms, the goal of the phrase isn't to convince men that their wives absolutely will cheat on them, which is absurd and grossly against observable reality. It's to point out to men that you don't own your wife, so stop pretending you should be able to control her every move, emotion, decision, etc. Enjoy her while you've got her, but don't wrap your entire life around keeping her by your side. If she leaves, deal with it. Oh well. But don't try to force her to do anything because you're just going to end up in her frame and digging yourself into an even deeper hole. That's it.

How does Christianity affect these "truths"?

It doesn't. The truths are a product of the way God created the world. That's like asking: "I heard we're supposed to love our neighbor. How does Christianity affect this concept of loving my neighbor?" Uuuh ... it doesn't. Christianity is the one that came up with the concept in the first place.

Help! Stunned by wife

1 upvotes · 20 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Good word, brother. Glad to see you take the time to comment this.

An Interesting Study Indicates Men and Women Sin Differently

1 upvotes · 18 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I couldn't have said it better myself. Seriously ... if I tried it would have been way too long and convoluted.

[FR] Wife goes off the rails, did I 90% pass my fitness test?

1 upvotes · 18 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Maybe we need some F.R.s of women being good humble and obedient to the husband REGARDLESS of his poor planning and health etc.

You're not going to get them.

1. Women don't act properly "regardless" of their husband's poor choices; their good behavior is a byproduct of his right choices. Toss in the husband's "poor planning and health etc." and you get an upset woman, not a magical unicorn.
2. FRs like you're suggesting would essentially communicate: "Men, you don't need to get your life sorted out because women will just automatically treat you right even if you are a fat loser who doesn't know how to handle conflict." Very counter-productive. They would undermine the work we're trying to accomplish here, even if an extremely rare outlier event like what you're describing were to occur once in a blue moon.

Now, to be fair: I can give plenty of examples where my wife has chosen proper behavior over improper behavior, even without my prompting. It's just not the default state and it's not the problem situation we're trying to help men figure out how to work through. If it's not broke, don't fix it - so no FRs necessary to tell guys how to deal with the functional times. We're here to help through dysfunction when it arises.

[FR] Wife goes off the rails, did I 90% pass my fitness test?

1 upvotes · 18 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

It's a fine line. Athol Kay in MMSLP talks about the difference between fitness tests and actual needs for help.

I learned that early on when my youngest was a baby. My wife is breast feeding and asks for the remote. It wouldn't make sense for her to stop feeding the baby to get it, especially when I'm right there. This isn't a fitness test - it's just a matter of practical convenience.

However, if it's something she's perfectly capable of doing herself, it's a fitness test. My wife and I are sitting next to each other on the couch. She asks me to get her a cup of water. She's the same distance from the fridge as I am. The answer is no. That's a fitness test. Add in that she has a broken leg and now it's a legitimate need for assistance.

In this case, OP specifically outlined that his wife was only doing things that were already part of her daily routine - things that she could handle perfectly well on her own, but on this particular day she decided to get fussy with him about it. This doesn't strike me as a legitimate need for help - it's more that she doesn't like some aspects of being a mom and decided to take it out on her husband. Reasonably so. I've had 4 kids, so I know how hard that time of life is. But she also signed up for the job when she agreed to stay home while he works. Yes, he can share responsibility. No, she doesn't get to dictate the terms of how he does that.

My Wife's Emotional Affair

1 upvotes · 17 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Most people, unless they deviate severely from the norm, have options.

Ah, good point, as it leads to an aspect I didn't address before. The quality of the options matters. A woman who believes, "There's no way he could get another woman like me" is more prone to feel empowered and entitled in the relationship and less likely to find her husband attractive. In her mind, she's at the top-tier of women he could get, which means he's at the low-tier of men she believes she could get.

So yes, we all know that somewhere down the line another option might exist. But the fact is that most people don't have many other *good* options. That word "good" should always be a qualifier before "options" here.

"The bride" (the church) is a collective

Agreed. Singular bride. Not sure how that changes things, though. Collectively, we know that Christ could reject his church at any time if he wants, raising up stones or enjoying the praise of the angels instead of us. But he didn't choose stones or angels - he chose us. And this, in itself, is valuable and motivating. If Jesus had no choice of stones or angels or pagans or any other possible bride and he HAD to work through the church, imagine how empowered and self-entitled the church would become?

Oh, we already have sects that have this mentality, so it's not hard to imagine it. I won't name names, though.

Biblical marriage doesn't give the man the option of ditching his wife and taking up with some other woman who expresses interest in him, so that's an idle threat

Again, you're misunderstanding this for active dread. I'm not suggesting men cultivate back-up plans in case his wife wakes up on the wrong side of the bed one morning and disrespects him. But the fact is that marriages do end. A woman is more likely to walk away from a man if she feels like he's a deadbeat that nobody wants for a husband - and certainly not her, than a man who is very attractive and could get a "better" woman at the drop of a hat - because how's she going to get a better man than that?

The fact is, and I know this from professional experience as well as statistics: the overwhelming majority of divorces are filed by women walking away from men, not men walking away from women. Women are the ones with the commitment problems, not men. I believe the 2011 study on the topic found that 80% of divorces were filed by women - leaving 20% for men. That's 4 times as often that women initiate the divorce. That's a LOT. Why are they doing this? Because they believe they can do better. Hypergamy.

Now, if the guy is the best they're ever going to get and she knows it, they're not going to file for divorce. This is obvious from even some extreme cases we see, like women with battered wives' syndrome. Their husbands are legitimately awful people. But the wives can't find it in them to leave him or file criminal charges. Know why? It's certainly not because they like their beating. It's because they have been psychologically conditioned to believe that they are worthless and couldn't get anyone better. So, as crappy as that guy is, if she doesn't believe she can do any better, she'll stay. The ones who do leave do it because they have friends who press hard: "You don't need him. You can do better than him."

Now, take a guy who isn't a wife-beater. A legitimately grade-A type guy, like the kind we try to breed here. Put him in a marriage where his wife doesn't feel worthless, but genuinely knows she's got one of the good ones and that other women would long to have what she has with him. Is that undermining the integrity of their marriage, or bolstering it?

It seems to me like you're arguing that this would weaken their marriage bond instead of bolstering it - but even with theology aside, I'm not even sure how we make that logical leap.

The only possibility is that you are assuming the man in this situation, because of his options, might leave the woman. Well, the fact is that women with options absolutely do leave their men. So taking these good options away from the man certainly isn't keeping those marriages together - it just makes the wife feel like she's married to a loser who could only get lower quality girls than her. But we know that men, on the whole, are more likely to remain in bad marriages - for better or worse (and I say this because a lot of that rationale is cultural conditioning). So, a woman with options is highly likely to lead to divorce. A man with options is mildly likely to lead to divorce. Between the two, I'll take the latter any day, even if "marital strength/integrity" is the only criteria we're accounting for here.

rationalize the pleasant ego-stroking that comes from receiving attention from a woman other than your wife

Why would I need to rationalize such a thing in the first place? You speak as if there is something wrong with a

man having his ego stroked every now and then.

the dividends you reap from making your wife feel insecure

Who ever said my wife feels insecure? Again, you're imputing too much thought from secular readings here.

I once commented to my wife on our very first date: "Everyone must be wondering how a guy like me is so lucky to be holding hands with a girl like you." I thought I was being sweet, paying a clever compliment. Instead, it really upset her and she almost didn't go out with me again because of that compliment alone. She explained, "I don't want to feel like I'm with some loser, as if everyone is thinking, *What's she doing with THAT guy?* I want to know I'm with someone who I can be proud to walk around with and would make them think, *Wow, good for her!*" If only I'd understood what she was saying back then ... I could have saved myself a decade of trouble.

My wife likes the thought that other women find me attractive. This doesn't make her feel insecure; it makes her feel like she made a good choice. I'm not actively out soliciting other women. I've never cheated on her. But when other women notice me, she perks up a bit and gets happier. As much as you talk up your man, I'm curious why you would jump to feelings of insecurity around him in such a context rather than the more typical appreciation of value.

I think it was Dave Chappelle who once said, "I don't actually mind it when another man stares at my wife's breasts. Most guys get all jealous and want to fight the dude. To me, that's the biggest compliment another guy can pay you - if he ogles your wife. It's like he's saying, 'Good job, brother. I wish I had that.'" Now, apply that in the gender reverse and that's my wife's mentality - even verbally stated by her. It has nothing to do with insecurity.

My Wife's Emotional Affair

1 upvotes · 17 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

You're still putting words in my mouth. I didn't encourage him to go off flirting with other girls. But the fact that the option exists helps defeat the codependency that most men feel toward their wives, which ruins marriages. And it is useful for the wife to know that she's got a good one, rather than some dud that isn't going to turn any eyes.

We see this in at least two places in Scripture with regard to our relationship with Jesus/God:

- In Luke 19 (around verse 40) the Pharisees tell Jesus to rebuke his disciples for praising God and him, and Jesus says, "Surely if they didn't, the rocks would cry out." That is, God has abundance. It's important for us, as his bride, to know that our groom is one who has options and that he will be praised whether we're the ones living up to his expectations or he does it without us.
- In Matthew 3 Jesus says something similar when rebuking the pharisees, who thought they had some exclusive right to be called the children of Abraham. They had the comfort in the relationship that you talk about husbands and wives having, and that let them become everything we think of when talking about Pharisees today. Yet Jesus rebukes them and says that God can raise up children for Abraham from the stones if he wanted. That's Jesus' way of saying, "God doesn't need you, so you'd better get back on the ball with how you follow him." This is the same concept as a man having abundance and his wife knowing that he's desired by others.

What I don't see in Scripture are examples of the types of boundaries you're encouraging. Logically, I agree with you. It sounds like a really smart idea to put those kinds of boundaries in place to protect the integrity of your marriage. But logic is lower on the totem pole than theology. Theologically, I can say with great certainty that my spiritual groom is worthy of praise, obedience, adoration, etc. and that if I don't give it to him, he can get it from even the rocks, if not other people. This is a healthy thing. And if I am to model my marriage after how Christ

relates with his bride, this must be incorporated.

Yes, Jesus commits to his bride - but he doesn't say, "And I'll never do anything to keep others from noticing me ever again." He intentionally flaunts himself to the world and asks us to be his biggest advocates in doing so! How great if a wife were to praise her husband to everyone she meets, rather than hiding him away like her own special secret. It's no wonder why people are so backwards about evangelism these days.

My Wife's Emotional Affair

1 upvotes · 17 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Me:

husband is attractive to other women

You:

man spending time and giving attention to some other woman

We're talking two different things here. Active v. Passive dread. Active dread is not necessary or beneficial for all relationships - and is especially prone to backfire, as you say, if a guy is actively trying to create dread.

An actually attractive guy doesn't need to pander for the attention of other women, though in some cases a touch of validation is a necessary prerequisite to building an abundance mentality before we encourage guys to strip that validation-seeking away again. Women can find a guy attractive and hit on him even if he isn't "spending time and giving attention" to her.

What do you think about courtship?

1 upvotes · 16 September 2019 · /r/askRPC

True - I just assumed everyone would be competent enough to see the full link in the reddit post. Probably stupid of me to assume competency.

What do you think about courtship?

1 upvotes · 16 September 2019 · /r/askRPC

when do you know it's time to marry/make someone your bride?

When you can't keep from having sex with each other much longer. 1 Cor. 7. Yes, that could be relatively quick. I'm okay with that.

Once you determine that a woman is FAST and EASY, and is ready, willing, able, and actively contributing to your mission, is that it?

Not if you're not horny for her, or her for you. If you're not horny for her, get out. As time ticks on, she will become less attractive, not more. It's unlikely she will post-marriage up her attractiveness game from where she was at pre-marriage.

If she's not horny for you before marriage, get out. Not because you need to find someone who finds you attractive as you are - which is total garbage. It's because you're not attractive enough to warrant getting married yet. A man can keep growing in attractiveness well into his 30s. If she's not attracted to you, you haven't hit your peak yet - and chances are, once you hit your peak, the girl you got before you hit your peak won't hold a candle to the ones you can get when you're there. Then it's just a matter of maintaining your peak as long as possible - your frame: the best version of yourself all the time. Age naturally has an impact on this, but honestly not much.

Since you seem to be in the same demographic as another user on the RPC Chat, I'll paste to you what I wrote to him about dating. For context, he asked: "Can you expand on why you don't like 'scheduling a date'?"

For non-Christians, dating is great. It's an opportunity for a guy to prove quickly that he's the prize by displaying his SMV in the marketplace itself in order to get a quick hookup. The goal of the date for the non-Christian guy is sex. As soon as possible. Preferably on the first date. But a lot of guys will bail on a girl after 3-4 dates if sex is off the table. Why? Because that's too much time, emotional energy, money, etc. to be worth investing into a girl who isn't going to put out.

Now, pop in a guarantee that she's not going to put out - because you're not asking her to, due to your faith - and what's the point?

You might say "vetting her" is the point. Great. But why do you have to be in a date context to vet a girl? In reality, "dates" are the absolute WORST context to vet a girl.

- She primps herself up, so you can't see what she's actually like.
- She knows you're actively vetting her, so she's on guard to hide the information she doesn't want you to know.
- You're also meeting up in a non-mission-oriented context so she gets no idea what your life is all about [other than through your words, not through your actions].
- The focus, being solely on each other and not on the real world out there puts you in somewhat of a bubble that artificially creates emotions without giving an accurate portrayal of life together.
- Women seek emotions, men seek sex; and Christian dating only feeds the emotional side for women. You might say, "Ah, but I'm a man and I LOVE the emotions of dating too." Great, we all do. But those emotions make you want to have sex with her, which you know you're not going to get for some time, whereas her emotions don't lead to anything - she just enjoys them, so she ends up full and you are left wanting.

Song of Songs refrains a number of times: "Do not awaken love before it so desires." This, in essence, translates to: "Don't get yourself horny before you're ready to tie the knot."

Classic dating is uniquely designed by culture to facilitate strong emotional connections as fast as humanly possible. This is the very definition of awakening love before it so desires. Instead, wait until love desires to be awoken naturally, then pump the emotional steroids.

Again, that's not to say you should never go on a date. Rather, it makes more sense to vet a girl by you staying on mission and seeing if she'll follow first. If she won't follow you before you start dating, then any following after dating is more easily understood to be a ruse to get you to keep seeing her.

Of course, I could be a little jaded there. Many of you know that my wife specifically told me 7-8 years into our marriage, after refusing all that time to join in on my mission: "I tricked you. I lied about being on board with disciple-making in order to get you to marry me." It took becoming red pill to get her following my lead - and now past our 11-year anniversary, she's genuinely on board.

I don't want to see other guys get duped in the same way because a girl is trying to put her best foot forward. If you're going to vet at all, vet first, then date, then marry. Or just vet then marry, for all I care. Or make your mission the context for your dating first, before moving on to classical dating - no vetting at all.

More on the futility of vetting from [u/RStonePT](#) here:

https://www.reddit.com/r/marriedredpill/comments/chp2w6/vetting_why_bother_when_boundaries_are_way_better/ Not to undermine [u/RedPillWonder](#)'s posts on vetting too much - but I tend to agree with a lot of what RStone says here. I'd be curious what RPW thinks of it all.

[FR] Unstoppable Emotional Inertia

1 upvotes · 14 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

You know - of thre response I've gotten to this post on both here and MRP, what's shocked me the most is all the comments about the display of physical strength. Is this not something most guys can do? Are their wives that fat or they just that weak? This should be easy stuff.

Confronting the myth that you have to “earn sex” in marriage, and that if your wife deprives you, or worse, cheats on you with another man, it is completely your fault as a man for not being “red pillled” enough to stop her. This attitude is blue pillled, and takes away responsibility from women.

1 upvotes · 12 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Fortunately not! It is one of the few legitimate avenues a man has left to keep his wife in line.

I will note: it's highly probable my client will have to pay spousal support on final orders here. You don't have half a mil disparity in income on a 34 year marriage and walk away scott-free. But she'll be stuck with half the cost for all his steaks and lobsters too.

Confronting the myth that you have to “earn sex” in marriage, and that if your wife deprives you, or worse, cheats on you with another man, it is completely your fault as a man for not being “red pillled” enough to stop her. This attitude is blue pillled, and takes away responsibility from women.

1 upvotes · 11 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Very true - I'm speaking in terms of spiritual marriage, not legal marriage. If a guy wants his autonomy back from the civil obligations of marriage, let him file a civil divorce and live only under his spiritual marriage.

But you're also confusing fault and responsibility, as OP did. Eve was at fault for her choice. Adam is still responsible for how HE handled the situation. If he chose not to eat when she gave it to him, he himself would be blameless, but as the man it would be his decision what to do with the mess she made. Her made the irresponsible decision instead and ate also.

If my son hits a ball through our neighbor's window, who is at fault and who is responsible? He's at fault, I'm responsible. He's a child under my care. Do you yourself not say a wife is the oldest child in a man's house? Either she's a child under our responsibility (spiritual) or an autonomous adult (legal).

What if I see my son hitting balls at the neighbor's house and watch him do it, knowing with great certainty he's eventually going to break a window and I'm going to have to pay for it, but I let him do it anyway - now am I at least partially at fault? Maybe not for his hitting the window, but I'm certainly not innocent in my obligation to pay anymore.

... again, from a biblical perspective, not a legal one. I agree with you on the legal side, which assumes women are competent, autonomous, responsible adults.

Confronting the myth that you have to “earn sex” in marriage, and that if your wife deprives you, or worse, cheats on you with another man, it is completely your fault as a man for not being “red pillled” enough to stop her. This attitude is blue pillled, and takes away responsibility from women.

1 upvotes · 11 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Could be. He'd be the type to do that.

Getting better "game"

Vision for a Biblical Church

greater freedom to take bigger strides in influencing people within local congregations, whereas before they felt subject to the leadership of those congregations in stifling ways.

Not sure if this is making sense, but I hope that helps.

FR: The Spell is Broken

1 upvotes · 10 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

only an understanding wife can give duty sex

Yeah, that's not what I said. I said that a wife who gives sex only because she understands her role/obligation and without attraction will always be duty sex.

Frequency and denial have nothing to do with quality of sex, only quantity. You can have high-frequency duty sex or passionate sex, as well as low-frequency duty sex or passionate sex.

Personal Finance and Peace

1 upvotes · 10 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Risky, sure. But the bank has always refunded us everything whenever there has been an issue in the past. The risk is extremely low in those situations.

My wife and I get fraudulent charges on our credit card at least once a year. It's only happened twice on our debit card in the 11 years we've been married.

Self-conscious about things I cannot change immediately.

1 upvotes · 9 September 2019 · /r/askRPC

If you get married, are you going to have sex with your shirt on too? Gotta get used to it, brother. Use it as motivation to get in shape.

Personal Finance and Peace

1 upvotes · 9 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

True. We use our debit card as backup. It still gives points, no fees, but gives us something in those rare occasions when our credit card has unusual charges and is blocked.

Thoughts on the fall from my RPEP

1 upvotes · 6 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Hmm ... I'm not sure the actual language agrees with you here - and in guilt of the same technicality. Correct me if I'm wrong, but as I recall, the curse doesn't suggest Eve would desire to rule over Adam. It says: "Your desire shall be for your husband but he shall rule over you." What's interesting here is that the verse actually uses the word rule to describe Adam toward Eve, but it does not mirror that word from Eve to Adam. This implies that it's talking about two different things.

Now, we always interpreted this as Eve's desire to RULE over Adam because of Genesis 4's parallel language to describe sin's desire for us, which we associate with a controlling desire because of our other connotations of sin in us.

But what if there's a reason the word "rule" is conspicuously absent from Eve's desire? Wouldn't it be more consistent to read this as Eve's desire for Adam to live up to her expectations. That is, the crux is what Eve desires FOR him, not Eve's desire for HIM.

- For HIM: "I want him to be mine to do with as I please." But no, he will own you.
- FOR him: "My desire for my husband is that he ... get in better shape ... be smarter ... make more money ... etc." But no, he's the one who gets to set expectations over her.

The second one jives much better with the actual wording of Genesis 3. It also makes the desire and the ruling juxtaposition much more coherent. The alternate view would also imply that we are trying to circumvent the curse by failing to treat women as objects to be possessed or owned, rather than as helpers subject to the expectations of their ruler.

This view then assumes the disconnect is that Eve will always expect more from her man, as suggested in the original post.

This also works with your "punishment of increase" framework because she never had an ownership interest over Adam of which this desire is an increase, and to say that Adam's rule over her is an increase would go against the evidence you appropriately point out for headship being true before the fall. Instead, Eve always had expectations for Adam, but her expectations for him increased beyond his post-fall default.

Thoughts?

Thoughts on the fall from my RPEP

1 upvotes · 6 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Good thoughts, brother. Curious, though ...

In general, I don't think Eve wanted a better Adam, but it was one of the obvious consequences of the temptation to be like God

Isn't the temptation to be like God a *de facto* determination that she wanted better than she had now? In the case of her own eating, that's one thing - but in the case of her giving it to her husband too, doesn't that automatically imply that she wanted him to be like God too, and therefore better than he was?

Thoughts on the fall from my RPEP

1 upvotes · 6 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

"And Adam, you will never be the alpha you wanted to be" ... He says this based on what?

Not to speak for him, but I'd guess he's using "alpha" interchangeably with "leader" here. That phrase is also in the context of the curse, whereby Eve will desire mastery over her husband. God created Adam to lead, which presumably means he had a desire to lead as well, and the curse is saying he's not going to have the easy-street on this now that they're fallen and Eve will be vying for that leadership role. I think this is a perfectly fair statement to make.

I don't think he worried about being more "alpha."

Again, the "more alpha" comment is in reference to the curse. When he writes "The curses coincide with: you will always want more alpha" I interpret this to mean that Adam's greatest failure in the fall was not leading his wife (i.e. what he calls alpha), and therefore man will always want to have that leadership role back, but always struggle with it in comparison to what he could have had if the fall had not occurred, ergo: "Now that you're fallen, you will always want more alpha/leadership" - or perhaps he was referencing Eve wanting more alpha, which works too.

I think much of your comment is written on the mistaken assumption that he was talking about Adam wanting to

be more alpha before the fall.

They had nothing to compare themselves to at that time (other humans, that is)

Right. But they did have God to compare to. And we know with certainty from the passage that their comparison to God was the driving force behind the serpent's temptation: "You will be like God." So, when he suggests that Eve wished she was married to God instead of Adam and wanted to give him the fruit to up the "quality" of her man, that's hardly a stretch.

Most especially, we don't know what Adam thought or knew would happen if he hadn't eaten of the fruit. Did he wonder if God would make him another woman? (assuming she died/was killed/banished/etc) God had already done a sort of psychology job on him ...

This kind of outside the box thinking is why I love conversing with you. I love it, brother!

Eve wanted more alpha

I'm genuinely curious, based on what?

I'm pretty sure he's referencing the "you will be like God" as part of the temptation - that they can be more than mere humans. Remember: this is the EXACT same temptation Satan himself fell for. He wanted more power, dominance, control, authority, leadership - whatever you want to call it. These can reasonably be described as "alpha."

I actually wrote on this exact topic in 107 a couple years ago - the "Satan's Ploy" section, and how Satan tried to tempt Eve with the same desire that corrupted him - Satan's desire to be the alpha over God, so to say, and Eve then takes the lead (alpha?) over Adam in eating the fruit and giving it to him, and presumably wants him to be more like God too.

why would she think eating it would improve Adam or their kids in other ways?

From the serpent's targeted temptation to Eve: "You will be like God."

There's so much we don't know.

Completely agreed. But like you say, it's interesting to speculate - and this seems as reasonable a theory as any, especially if we swap out RP lingo for more classical terminology.

But again, keep in mind that during this entire time, there's no sin, no sinful nature, no tugging or pulling or proclivity to indulge desires

I don't know that I agree with this bit. The sinful nature is our internal temptation. But those desires can be (and actually were) piqued from an external source: the serpent. If there really was no desire to sin at all, then they wouldn't have been tricked in the first place. That desire just had to be put in them from the outside rather than happening spontaneously because of their own internal compulsions.

The difference with the sinful nature today is that we don't need a serpent prodding at us. We just come up with these bad ideas all on our own. James 1 and all.

He's a pastor and he only recently learned this? A plain reading of the text highlights this.

I'm confident that what he meant is that he didn't realize the significance of this distinction until recently. It's like reading the story of Peter meeting Jesus walking on the water and saying: "I just realized the other 11 stayed in the boat." Obviously. Anyone reading that story can see it plainly in Scripture. But I had read the story dozens of times before actually *noticing* that aspect of the story for the first time, and it was an "ah ha!" moment.

I look forward to reading your thoughts!

Hopefully I haven't disappointed ;)

Vision for a Biblical Church

1 upvotes · 5 September 2019 · /r/askRPC

I've been in too many Churches that never have a building ever, and they have to move and relocate every few years

This right here is the framework issue.

First, you're still confusing congregations for the Church. They are not "churches" any more than I am Christ's bride. Christ has one bride. I am only one small part of the body of his bride. Individual congregations are not "the church" or even "a church" - they are one small part of a much larger body. Getting off the idea that a congregation is somehow a sacred biblical organizational structure can really clarify a lot of Scripture and open up options for more Spirit-led influence in the world rather than the modern strategy of structure-led influence.

Second, once we realize that The Church proper is a network of believers and not defined by individual congregations, we see that individual buildings are a convenience and not a necessity. Jesus did not own a building for his ministry. The apostles did not. Were they poor stewards? No. As I noted in my original comment, they crowd-sourced. They worked from the resources of their followers, just like Uber works through the resources of their drivers, running an entire company without owning the cars they ship people in or employing the drivers. The same thing is true for wikipedia - the largest encyclopedia that hasn't paid for a single article. Or consider Air B&B or Google's traffic tracking algorithms or any other number of ways a visionary has used the resources of the people they serve to serve the people. And this is what Jesus did.

The only time a building becomes necessary is if we feel a compulsion to centralize ministry into a "come to us" model instead of Jesus's "go to them" model. Modern congregations even confuse this thinking that "go" really means "go tell them to come." That's still a "come" model and not a "go" model.

Jesus didn't meet with the 12 and say, "Let's grow this group, and when we get to 24 we'll split into two groups; and when each of those grow, we'll split again - and just keep splitting as long as people keep coming." That's the modern churchianity model of small groups, and even larger scale with plants and carvers.

Instead, Jesus met with the 12 with the express knowledge that he would cut them off and send them out at some point. When's the last time you heard a pastor say: "I've taught you everything I know to teach. You're ready to lead your own ministry now. So get out of my congregation because you're only being held back while you're here." And yet this is exactly what Jesus and the Spirit did when Jesus left and the Spirit scattered the apostles all over the world. And even as they discipled others, it was never to build up their own ministry, but to train them to go out. Paul didn't say, "Timothy, stay with me by my side until I die, and then take over my ministry." He sent him out from city to city to go raise up more and more people who could be sent out. Everything Paul knew he instructed: "Entrust to reliable people who will also be qualified to teach others." That's the model.

While I use the term colloquially for ease of communication, I'm really not interested in disciple-making. I'm

interested in discipler-making. Huge difference. Disciple-making requires buildings because the disciples keep congregating in one spot. Discipler-making doesn't require buildings because the disciplers go out to wherever people need disciplined - and they teach them how to be disciplers too.

The modern "we need a building" or "mass gatherings are the way to go" model is born not from Jesus or the apostles, but from necessity when Theodosius I mandated that all people become Christian. The floodgates opened up and waves of people were allegedly "converting," and the Church didn't have the capacity to disciple all of these hordes, so they developed fast-food Christianity that formed the basis of most "tradition" that the Catholics and Orthodox rely on today - tradition meant to satisfy pragmatic needs rather than rely on theologically sound models for ministry. As a result, the Church became overwhelmingly watered down as the focus became the masses instead of the few, and buildings became a necessity, whereas most of the early church was still meeting in small groups and at people's homes before then. Theodosius I really screwed a lot of things up for everyone and we see the effect of his ruin today in the modern institutionalization of the church.

That Girl at Work

1 upvotes · 5 September 2019 · /r/askRPC

Those do sound like subtle IOIs, but VERY subtle - questionable, even. More overt IOIs are things like privately winking at you while in a group setting, giving her number without solicitation, touching you while she laughs at one of your jokes, just "happening" to be going the same way you are at the same time, then "randomly" forgetting they need to go back somewhere (because they didn't need to go that way in the first place, but don't want to admit it).

These are the types of things I was seeing regularly a few months ago, before I started the whole moving process, which interfered with my gym time. I'm hoping to be back there in 2 months.

[/u/OsmiumZulu](#) has written a lot in this thread - his advice is solid. Follow it.

That Girl at Work

1 upvotes · 5 September 2019 · /r/askRPC

One or more of these things ain't true and your perception isn't correct.

That was my EXACT reaction when I read this too. I'm guessing the girl is another HB6 who got inflated in his mind because through mental masturbation he believes she'd be more sexually exciting than his "no intercourse yet" wife, making her feel more attractive than she actually is. I've been through this a number of times, where I see another girl through rosy glasses, and then a month later I see her again and she's just meh.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (09/04/19)

1 upvotes · 4 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Amen. Pascal's Wager always seemed a reasonable beginning to faith, if not a permanent place to live.

Is it ok to go out to bars a few times/week and socialize?

1 upvotes · 3 September 2019 · /r/askRPC

The biblical mandate is to maintain a sober mind. I have no problem drinking one or two here or there, including at bars. Scripture shows godly people drinking regularly. Solomon even notes in one of the proverbs that wine should be given to those who need to drink their sorrows away.

But drinking won't solve your social issues. There are better options out there. I just posted two links to a couple of my past posts to another guy on the main sub who was asking about loneliness or isolation. Check that thread and read those posts. They should help solve the social issues you're experiencing.

Is it ok to go out to bars a few times/week and socialize?

1 upvotes · 3 September 2019 · /r/askRPC

You didn't answer /u/Deep_Strength's most important question:

- What's your mission for God?

As he noted, what you're going through is a byproduct of lacking a mission. Start that mission and give it the weight that eternity would have it, and you'll find yourself naturally building the skills you need to engage socially.

What do you think about courtship?

1 upvotes · 3 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I think /u/OsmiumZulu meant to reply to you, but it went to another user in this thread instead. He suggested you post this on r/askRPC. I agree. I think this would be a fascinating conversation and would be worth having over there.

[FR] A Changing Dynamic

1 upvotes · 30 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Ah, I've heard mixed reviews on his stuff but have never been through it myself.

[FR] A Changing Dynamic

1 upvotes · 29 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

What material and book?

r/askRPC is live.

1 upvotes · 29 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

It was. Reddit is weird and booted this announcement rather than last week's OYS when the OYS for this week came up. Not sure why it didn't rotate out the oldest announcement, but we only get 2 at a time.

[FR] A Changing Dynamic

1 upvotes · 29 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Fair. But in your example you're actively trying to cook to his taste, so his adding salt makes you feel like you got it wrong. In my case, my wife can't handle any hot sauce at all, yet knows that I *always* like my chili with hot sauce. I don't fault her - she shouldn't have to burn her tongue to cook chili that I like when I can just put hot sauce in my own bowl much easier. But the fact is that she's asking me to enjoy something that she already knows I won't fully, because even if I made it myself exactly to my own taste I'd still prefer that hot sauce in there.

It's not a big deal, but my point was to say: yes, in my own home when the situation calls for it, I'm going to tweak the food to my own taste instead of bearing through with something that could be made so much better in mere seconds :p If she is offended that my taste buds aren't the same as hers, that's her problem. But if she was trying to be unique to my exact taste, then by all means I'd give it a shot first.

[FR] A Changing Dynamic

1 upvotes · 28 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

My wife asked me on Monday: "If I make chili and add corn wok you eat it?" Her chili usually tastes like water with calories in it. I said: *Use half the water and sure.*

Got home, consistency was perfect. Scoop some in my bowl. Grab the hot sauce and she gets huffy: "Can you at least try it before putting that in?"

Babe, I'm the chili king. Nobody makes better chili than me. You know this. But even as good as it is, I still pour hot sauce in MY OWN chili before eating it.

I took a bite anyway and said, *It needs hot sauce.*

Own Your Shit Weekly - August 27, 2019

1 upvotes · 28 August 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

This is the right path. I have no idea how this case could have ended up the way it did, even if you did hold a knife to her throat. Seriously: our state has case law that says even fully proven DV against a spouse shouldn't affect custody if it wasn't against the kids. Now, it still affects things anyway, but not nearly that much and not on a he said/she said.

Was your trial lawyer not also an appellate attorney?

Edit: Also, you do psych evals? That's where the money becomes worth it. Women always bomb that crap. I have a client who was a full on meth addict and kept testing positive well into our case and I'm still going to get him custody over her because of the psych eval. Powerful stuff if you get someone worth their balls.

Struggling in my faith

1 upvotes · 28 August 2019 · /r/askRPC

Glad to see you here, friend. I've known plenty of guys in your shoes. The most recent was a life-long atheist who started going to small group with his wife because he was suspicious of what she was doing. He ultimately decided it was good for family bonding because he wanted to talk to her about something she was passionate about. Then he started deciding that many of the moral philosophies were worth his time, so he began serving alongside the group when they would go out and preparing for the content in advance so he was fluent enough to talk openly and engage. The fellowship itself was entertaining for him. Eventually he noticed how his internal compulsions were gradually being transformed the more he started following Christ alongside these people, even though he didn't believe in any of the Jesus stuff in the first place. He noticed that the changes happening in his life through following Scripture (even as an intentional skeptic) were more significant than the changes that happened in his life during countless runs through secular groups for things like alcoholism, a history of drug addiction, a gambling problem, etc. He noted: "Even though I don't believe it, I can't deny that there's something to this Bible thing that works that all the PhDs and professionals out there are missing."

So, he started bringing his Bible to those secular counseling groups, led by PhD trained psychologists. He really respected their intelligence, but as they would teach a counseling tactic he started saying things like: "No, I've tried that for years and it never actually worked. I've watched the men in this group try it, and we're still here." Then he'd pull out the Bible and quote a verse and say, "Then I started trying this and suddenly it worked. I'm still an atheist, but if this Bible stuff works, why aren't we using it to help more people like it helped me?" The psychologist would argue that not everyone believes in the Bible, so it wouldn't work for everyone, but that if he found value in it because of his faith then he was welcome to keep using it. Of course, he replies: "But I don't even believe in the Bible - and yet it's still working. Why not give the other non-believers here a chance?"

Now, the guys in his group were pretty desperate with how broken their lives were, so they chose to give it a shot and asked my buddy to lead a few sessions on how the Bible helped him. The psychologist wasn't okay with this, so they stuck around after the meetings to start reading the Bible with him - and that lasted for about 2 months before many of the guys reading the Bible with him (which was about 1/3 of the group) started noticing the same changes in their lives.

One of those people was so overwhelmed by the transformation that the Bible brought that the world never could that he finally asked my buddy: "I can't help but believe this now. I didn't believe, but I tried it and I was wrong. It works. How can you still see all the good that's coming from this and not believe it's true?"

That was the moment he changed his mind and realized: *I guess I've actually been a believer all along, I was just too tied to my atheist identity to admit it.*

I don't know if that story is helpful to you, but it's one man's journey. To finish the story, yes, he's a full-on believer now and planted a ~~church~~ congregation as a layperson (i.e. no pastors) to the homeless community in my area that his primary congregation eventually adopted and now fully funds. They've been meeting for a few years now and seeing numerous homeless in the area come to Christ.

If you want to believe, here are a few things to note ...

Don't try to persuade yourself. Logical argument can certainly persuade you toward Christ. But as easily as you are persuaded toward Christ, you can be persuaded away when a better argument on the reverse side comes up. Don't abandon logic, but remember that the boundaries of logic are higher than the boundaries of our awareness and thinking capacity. Even the best argument you've heard in your life can have a better argument on the other side that you're simply unaware of yet. In this sense, logic-ing your way into the faith creates unstable faith on sand, but logic can certainly help you understand what you believe once you're there.

Jesus tells a parable of two sons who are asked to work in their father's field. One says no, but relents and does it anyway. The other says he will, but is lazy and never goes. Who is the faithful son in this scenario? You are saying no to your Father. But are you going to follow him anyway?

It's also important to understand what faith actually is. Many people try to make it look like faith is absolute confidence. It's actually quite the opposite: room for doubt is what creates the possibility for faith, otherwise it's false knowledge. Consider:

A note is slid under your door threatening to kill you and your family. What do you do? You've got a few options:

1. You deny that the threat is real, treat it like a fake threat and go on your way.
2. You acknowledge the possibility that the threat is valid, but just don't care enough about your own life that you go on your way anyway.
3. You are absolutely convinced the threat is real and take measures to protect yourself by setting up security cameras, calling the cops, buying a gun/baseball bat, etc.
4. You have serious doubts about the validity of the threat, but you figure you'd be a fool to take chances, so you take protective measures anyway.

Which options will save you?

Yes, this is a rhetorical question. The point is simply to note that the 4th is still faith. It says: "I have no clue if this is right or wrong, but I'm going to orient my life and actions around the truth of it anyway because I'm not willing to bet my life on it."

Faith in the biblical sense can also mean: "I have no clue if Jesus is God or rose from the dead for me or not, but I acknowledge that it might be true and I'm going to orient my life and actions around it being true anyway because I'm not willing to bet my soul on it."

From there, I've had countless conversations with atheists who have told me that the "true atheist position" is not that there is no God, but that they don't know if there is a God or not, and therefore they decline to let the possibility of God affect their life. They call this agnostic atheism (as opposed to gnostic atheism, which claims to have affirmative knowledge that there is no God).

Gnostic atheism is the first option. If it turns out they're wrong, they die. The second option is nihilism, and that

man still dies. The third option is blind confidence, but his confidence is placed in the right direction, even though he has no real way of knowing his belief on the matter is true, but he is saved all the same. The fourth option is faith. And such a person is saved from the oncoming threat.

There are, of course other options beyond those 4. I could add #5, for example: the man investigates the threat by looking for finger prints on the note, locating the guy, and discovering his base where you can see the weaponry he intends to use to carry out the threat, and then overhear him talking to someone about his intent to kill you. Now, technically you still don't know for sure - it could be a really elaborate prank and you're on candid camera the whole time. There's never absolute certainty of anything. But at this point you've jumped into a higher category I call "informed faith."

Faith and faithfulness are heavily linked. You're welcome to entertain doubt for any amount of time, but it is faith that compels you to live as if it is true even despite your doubts. This is what Jesus means when he says, "Blessed is the one who has not seen and yet believes." That is, blind faith is better than knowledge. But even better than blind faith is informed faith - the kind that acknowledges, "I still can't know, but I trust enough to investigate and orient my life around this and as I see the results and receive confirmation, I become more and more persuaded."

That's what my friend did throughout his story - he went from absolute rejection to nihilism (though I didn't go through that part of the story), into being the son who says "no," but does it anyway, and on to subconsciously blind faith and ultimately consciously informed faith.

First argument in a while

1 upvotes · 27 August 2019 · /r/askRPC

I just put up another comment to AlanNoles in this thread giving a much more detailed explanation of frame. I'll probably turn it into a post eventually ... not sure when I'll have the time though.

First argument in a while

1 upvotes · 27 August 2019 · /r/askRPC

Ah, I haven't started season 3 yet.

First argument in a while

1 upvotes · 27 August 2019 · /r/askRPC

What show?

Any tips/resources for evangelism in the west?

1 upvotes · 27 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I would not trust Todd White. I've known one guy and heard of more who came from his ministry and would do these "healings" with him and were trained by him. It's really the power of suggestion, and they are trained to create a suggestive psychological connection with someone that makes them feel something that doesn't actually happen.

He also has serious doctrinal things wrong with his teachings. For example, he tells people he's sinless just like Jesus. He also teaches that God saves us not because of grace, but because we are so innately valuable to God that he'd kill his own son to buy us because we're that valuable.

His evangelism style is also based off of a complete misunderstanding of 1 Cor. 2, which says, "My message and my preaching were not with wise and persuasive words, but with a demonstration of the Spirit's power." People assume this means miracles. This isn't true at all. We actually don't see Paul or any of the apostles bringing many miracles to the table when witnessing to non-believers. The greatest example of how Paul evangelized was in Acts

22. How did he do it? He shared his testimony. The power of the Spirit he demonstrated was not miracles, but the way the Spirit had transformed his own life so dramatically from the Christian-killer he was to the disciple-maker he became. This is consistent with Revelation 12:11, which says that the enemy will be defeated by (1) the blood of the lamb, and (2) ~~miracles~~ the word of our testimony.

I'm also not a fan of Ray Comfort's *Way of the Master* (which is not based on Jesus's model of evangelism AT ALL), but it's much better than Todd White's phony garbage that he uses to get donations to buy himself that huge mansion he lives in.

I would much rather follow a method of evangelism that Jesus modeled for us, as the disciples modeled as well. More on that if you re-post this in askRPC.

Rethinking about MGTOW as a Christian

1 upvotes · 26 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Right on.

why did christianity adopt "christian pacifism" despite it going against the bible?

1 upvotes · 26 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Do you have a plan for doing this that ordinary citizens are legally authorized to execute in order to effectuate the goal you're asking for?

It sounds to me like you're making a plea to the director of the FBI, CIA, ICE, etc. While I may be on board with some of what you're saying, it's valueless content if there's no actual plan to solve the identified problem.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (08/21/19)

1 upvotes · 23 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

about as luke warm as they come. Really lacking the motivation to want to mingle with the churchians

Do you feel luke warm because you're not aligning with churchianity's expectations of you and therefore you feel like they would judge you as luke warm? Or is it because you're not committed to your mission in Christ and are whittling your days away on the generic secular grind with nothing more than hopes of one day making a difference for the Kingdom?

OYS - Where Progress is Made (08/21/19)

1 upvotes · 23 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

rut of "needing to be cheered up" though - in the long run it's a DLV if displayed with any regularity.

This is a good word. Over time, sexual favors will become associated like Pavlov's dog with the man's negativity, and that only spells disaster when she starts feeling like he's in a negative mood every time they have sex because that's usually when she engages.

A Man and His Struggle

1 upvotes · 22 August 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

How far do I live from the first aquifer? If he's draining my aquifer I'm going to tell him about the other one. He can go drain his own crappy well.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (08/21/19)

1 upvotes · 21 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Why do you think this is?

Company in town every weekend, and she was on her period one week.

You said she was acting bratty, did she give you attitude?

She started the conversation with a bad attitude and a sense of entitlement to the whole of the desk space. To her credit, yesterday was the first time I'd used the desk, though the plan was always that we would both utilize it as a home office. She just works from home more often than I do, so I've usually let her have it when we're both home. She got used to this generosity and exclusivity, so she didn't like it when I finally started using it like I always said I would.

Amen! I look forward to hearing more about this when you're ready.

I've already shared a lot of it in our Thursday group last week. Good stuff in line for this week too, I hope.

More Than Marriage: How churchianity has screwed up friendships too

1 upvotes · 21 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Glad to have helped, brother.

PSA: The "Reformed Slut/I've Been Hurt Before. Are You Willing To Wait For Marriage?" Shit Test.

1 upvotes · 19 August 2019 · /r/WhereAreAllTheGoodMen

Apparently you haven't seen Netflix's rendition of the show Lucifer (they bought it for Season 4). Hint: Eve is STILL a raging party girl and nymphomaniac who wants nothing less than the devil himself.

The "Closer to God" Myth

1 upvotes · 18 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

True dat.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (08/14/19)

1 upvotes · 17 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

It's a running joke between the two of us. She has curly hair and I run my hands through and sometimes it gets stuck on the curls. She gets mad every time, but eventually starts laughing.

Looking for advice, Need help. +Apology.

1 upvotes · 16 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

He was asking about the entire sub, not just you. But as to your specific context, that makes sense.

Looking for advice, Need help. +Apology.

1 upvotes · 16 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I agree with everything you've said here, including the disgusting perversion that people call the "church" today. Mainstream evangelicalism is certainly sickening in the way it approaches a number of issues, even beyond sexuality, though that's certainly one of the most central problems.

In your church, does your pastor address "sinful" male sexual behavior while women and girls are present?

There's a broader framework issue with this question. Individual congregations that we refer to as "my church" or "your church" are not actually the Church. They are a gathering. A congregation. The ekklesia in Scripture is The Church singular. There is one body of Christ, not many bodies. The many congregations are each a part of that singular body. One might be an eye, another a foot or hand. Some congregations are merely knock-offs designed to look like part of Christ's body without actually being connected to his body at all.

While The Church is a singular corporate entity, "my church" is best understood as the relational network I have within that corporate entity, which isn't confined to a singular congregation. The people I have consistent regular meetings with (be it on Sunday or any other day of the week) are people I'm leading and pastoring, so there is no pastor over "my church," as I am the pastor - just in the biblical sense, not in the secular vocational sense. To that end, I address both sinful male sexual practices and sinful female sexual practices both when women and men are present for each. I also teach what non-sinful sexual thoughts and practices are, including the Word *epithumeo*, which you appropriately noted means to "covet" and not to "lust," and that this coveting assumes intent and not mere desire, so that those I lead are fully aware that they're not condemned for every passing sexual thought they have toward a girl they're not married to, as the rest of the church suggests. I have a post on that in our sidebar too.

As for a congregation itself, these are nothing more than tools that can be utilized for the advancement of my mission. In theory, they're supposed to have the same mission I do, as it's the one Jesus gave us ... but we all know how well most congregations stick to what the Bible actually says.

More specifically to your question, I just moved. The ~~head-pastor~~ leader of the previous congregation I attended was extremely off on his teachings of male/fame sexual dynamics, which was part of the reason I felt no displeasure in leaving, though I had stayed because the associate pastor was red pill and I had hope that his influence could produce a change.

Since moving, I have attended exactly 1 service at a new congregation that I intend to utilize for the purpose of making disciples. I don't know exactly what the ~~pastor~~ leader there teaches on these issues yet, but after a 3.5 hour 1-on-1 conversation with him yesterday, it's apparent that this will be a fantastic place that will pursue the same mission alongside me. So there's that.

Looking for advice, Need help. +Apology.

1 upvotes · 16 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Is there something you're referencing in particular? Need some context.

Looking for advice, Need help. +Apology.

1 upvotes · 15 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

This is a potent start all the same. Well said.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (08/14/19)

1 upvotes · 15 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

From an Evangelism standpoint, I'm improving.

Cool. That's what we'll be chatting about tomorrow.

He's the worst when he's just with his mother and his sister. He pushes their buttons so bad.

My son does the exact same thing. He's got a genius level intellect (99.99 percentile in all his standardized testing, except reading: 99.79 percentile). He intuitively understands human psychology at the age of 7 to a degree that is

frustratingly complex and impossible to fool. He then uses that against my wife - and I think he knows her psychology better than she knows his - and at a conscious level, not merely the way kids generically know how to manipulate parents. She gets so mad and he just snickers, and he can out-argue her any day, until she pulls the "I'm your mother and I said so" card - because she knows he's right, but it's still not what she wants anyway. As WISNIFG says as one of their bill of rights: "You have the right to be illogical." She innately gets that ... but probably because she's used to her history of arguing with me :p

So, yesterday I'm trying to get my kids to clean up the living room and dining room. I tell them that I'll give them an extra show before bedtime if they can get it all done in 10 minutes. My son says, "That's not worth it. Besides, we only have 8 minutes left on the episode we're on." I told him it would be a full show. He says, "That wouldn't make sense, because we wouldn't be able to finish the one we're on." So I said, You've convinced me. You can finish the one you're on AND watch a full extra one too. Sound good? He goes and gets the vacuum. Then he stops himself and says: "Dad, I know you just say 'you convinced me' in order to get me to do it because you knew I would think you were giving me something extra, making it feel like a better deal. But I also know you were going to let us finish that first episode anyway, so I'm not really getting anything extra. I also know that you're going to make me clean the room either way, so I'm better off getting something good out of it than being punished for not doing it at all. I'm pretty sure I could have gotten a better deal if I had said this instead of that [he was right! haha], but I didn't think of it until 5 seconds after I said that. But I also know that because I just told you, it probably won't work anymore. I'm just telling you because I want you to know that I knew how you were trying to trick us into doing the cleaning with only getting 8 more minutes of our show, which isn't really a lot. But I think I've got this game figured out now, and next time I might be able to get you to give us not just 1 show and 8 minutes, or even the extra show I could have gotten today, but maybe even 3 shows."

Yes, with the exception of the italicized words, that was virtually an exact quote from my 7 year old son. I'm pretty confident that his "3-show" plan has something to do with him proposing just guy time between the two of us after the girls went to bed. I asked him today why he went to bed instead of trying to trick me into giving him more shows and he said, "Because tomorrow is the first day of school and I knew that's too big of a deal that it wouldn't work on you today, so I have to pick the right day for you to be in a way of thinking that it'll actually work." HAHHAH!

I'm so proud of my boy. But goodness is this going to be a mess raising him.

I have had lots of teasing, flirting and kino but haven't hard initiated this week

I get the impression from your OYS posts that you're not really all that upset about the frequency. Sure, it could be a bit better, but you seem pretty chill on that subject. I can't tell if that's OI or DNGAF or having better things to do or if you really do care more than you're letting on. Whatever the reason, if the frequency really isn't a huge deal, what are you doing to up the quality? That's where the game got more fun for me.

Who should disciple women?

1 upvotes · 13 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Yes, they're called Anglicans, Episcopalians, Presbyterians (PCUSA, specifically), etc. [u/osmiumzulu](#) probably has a better list than I do.

But I'm not aware of a secret cabal of women with the Express goal of feminizing the church. It's more seepage from culture, where there are secret cabals that do have this express purpose on a national level.

As for resources, start with Deep's book on the sidebar. Then go to The Church Impotent.

Who should disciple women?

1 upvotes · 13 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Agreed.

Who should disciple women?

1 upvotes · 13 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

That's not right. Seminaries didn't exist in the bible. Graduating from one certainly doesn't make a person a pastor. But this is probably tied to the confusion that we call most congregation leaders "pastors" when they're not fulfilling a biblical pastoral role at all, but something more akin to a combination of administration and preaching (usually not even teaching).

One of my recent "pastors" used to comment on this from time to time. He'd say, "I don't know why they call me a pastor. Nothing I do has anything to do with that biblical role. At best, I'm an elder, and perhaps not even that. Our 'head pastor' is really a preaching administrator. These titles are handed out as a sign of respect, but I bet they really confuse a lot of people."

Who should disciple women?

1 upvotes · 13 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Interesting. They call her a pastor though?

Who should disciple women?

1 upvotes · 13 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

True. But most female teachers in the mainstream today are teaching original content from their own studies. Yes, somewhere out there, a man in church history probably said it first. But if she didn't get it from him she's still playing doctrine dynamite herself.

The Kingdom of God is a Party

1 upvotes · 12 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

While that's certainly an interesting approach, I'd be curious of its long-term effectiveness. It sounds like it's highly effective at getting people to join a meeting. But churchianity is already really good at that. That's why I often push against the weekly Sunday meeting model in the first place, as if it were some ultimate goal to fill the seats. It misses the whole point of Jesus's model of ministry.

What I did find really cool, though, was that the congregation I visited just yesterday had a dance party outside the building with music, games, gelato, etc. It was relatively spontaneous. They didn't announce it as some event. Someone just brought some gelato to service to share. Someone else decided to play music. Kids started dancing. Adults joined in. It was fun without an agenda, but which still fulfilled a purpose.

The Kingdom of God is a Party

1 upvotes · 12 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

include everyone in the church and not judge people based on social class

Are there any congregations out there that actually kick out people who are below a certain income threshold? I haven't seen one yet :p

spiritually party about him

Does that mean an actual physical party from 5 to midnight? Or something more cryptic, like having the attitude (you know, in our *spirit*, since it's a spiritual party and not a physical one) of someone who parties a lot ... but to

have that attitude toward Christ a lot of the time?

physical parties in the Bible and their importance

Right on. Now I can follow that.

again how everyone should be invited

Am I missing something here about the church being a tough-nut club to get into? If anything, I see congregations being over-including as the ultimate problem that has led to our inability to discern who is genuine from who is fake, and giving no application of 1 Cor. 5.

the worlds version of a party is not Gods version of a party

So he wants to change the definition of a party. Interesting.

Can I say that my definition of flogging is when a Christian serves their neighbor, and then recommend that Christians start flogging each other a lot?

importance of small groups instead of huge congregations as well as what a proper small group looks like.
50% personal/emotional talk, 50% actually just enjoying the company of others "partying"

Now that I can get on board with! Though I actually split it out into 3 categories:

- 1/3 on fun/games
- 1/3 on addressing character issues (i.e. personal/emotional talk)
- 1/3 on leadership and life skills training and development

Don't forget that last one. It's arguably the most important one, in my book. Most people can intuitively figure out the other two eventually, with enough time and motivation. But the third rarely comes without intentional leadership making it a specific point in the group.

preface where he said the Great Commission is the #1 thing and how "partying" ties into it

Works for me. That'd get me interested too!

definitely some good nuggets in it

I'd love to hear more of those nuggets as you reach them. Please update.

The more I think about it, the more genius that God's creation of man and woman becomes

1 upvotes · 12 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

And yet God is sovereign. The wisdom is only problematic if a husband is living in apathy toward or active defiance of God's will. If he is seeking first God's Kingdom, then God's sovereignty can be trusted to ensure he does not lead the family astray.

The key here is the authenticity of the seeking. You can't pray about a major life decision for 30 seconds as a formality and say you legitimately sought God's input on the matter. You can't ignore the great commission (i.e. the primary means of seeking the interests of God's Kingdom) and assume that hours of prayer and asking godly counsel are at all going to lead to wonderful life decisions.

I can't control my diet.

1 upvotes · 12 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Agreed. [/u/Insatiable-Curiosity](#) - knowing your physical stats is extremely relevant to your situation. But knowing whether or not you've read the 400 series is also useful, as that really addresses how to resolve addictive issues, as well as 202, and a handful of other posts sprinkled throughout.

Also, spiritual maturity is incredibly relevant here because it's directly tied to your ability to find satisfaction in Christ rather than through worldly vices, such as gluttony.

Finances are probably the least relevant of those items, but it can be more understandable if someone is extremely poor that they're going to struggle with weight issues because junk food is generally cheaper than healthy food. So, if that's an issue, make sure to boost your income enough to afford a better diet.

Ultimately, addiction is evidence of a weak frame. Develop your frame and you become master over your own life rather than something else becoming master over you.

Denominations Question from Newcomers and Those Seeking to Return to the Church

1 upvotes · 11 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Interesting. I've certainly heard of Arminian Baptists, but every Baptist I've ever met was a Calvinist with a Calvinist preacher. Weird.

Denominations Question from Newcomers and Those Seeking to Return to the Church

1 upvotes · 11 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I usually don't recommend new Christians attend a congregation right away. Doing so usually subsidizes a believer's willingness to entertain what Scripture actually says in exchange for the cultural imperatives of the church. That is, they think Sunday service teaches them everything they need to know from Scripture (which is incredibly wrong) and that serving the congregation is their way of serving God (even more wrong).

If you can resist these compulsions by committing to reading Scripture on your own and testing everything your congregation leader says against it (per Acts 17 Bereans) and also maintain a commitment to making disciples independent of any ministry involvement you may have within your congregation, then you are in a healthy place to attend a congregation. Until you're stable on those two things, you're better off finding other like-minded believers to fellowship with as your means of meeting together with other believers.

Once you are ready for a congregation, I most recommend interdenominational congregations, as you'll get a broader span of teaching and they're often more willing to learn from denominations rather than fight against them. After that, the Nazarenes probably have the best missiology (though it's still far, far off from what Jesus modeled.), and the Lutherans, Missouri Synod, tend to have the best theology (though still quite a ways off on several points).

More than their missiology or theology, though, I'd be interested in the character of the people within a congregation. If they're faithful, available, and teachable, go there and leverage your relationships with the people there for the advantage of the Gospel. If they're not, keep looking until you find a congregation with such people. Faithful, available, and teachable people are plentiful enough that I'd be shocked if you couldn't find anyone, though you may have to look outside an age or socio-economic demographic than you'd normally be comfortable with.

Denominations Question from Newcomers and Those Seeking to Return to the Church

1 upvotes · 11 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Calvinist at heart, but I attend a Baptist congregation

Not sure why that's a "but." From what I can tell, most Calvinists are either Baptist or Presbyterian.

I was labeled a misogynist because I said that I preferred someone who was conscious about modesty

1 upvotes · 3 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Well put.

The Main Event

1 upvotes · 2 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Good stuff. I'm pretty sure I agree with your position on all of this, including #2. #3 takes too much of a straw man on how non calvinists view salvation to be deemed credible, and falls apart horrifically when we recognize that congregations that tout themselves as "churches" are not actually the Church at all, but a man made institution that intended (and failed) to organize the efforts of the Church in fulfilling the purpose Jesus gave his bride.

But I'm not sure any of this actually answers the question I thought I was asking.

A fundamental aspect of the red pill is dread, right? This primarily involves the wife recognizing that her husband has other options and therefore she is not eternally secure. Whether you want to view eternal security from an individual or corporate (The Church) standpoint doesn't change the question. If Christ gives his bride eternal security AND tells us about it through Scripture, then there is no room for dread. At that point, we either:

- say that we should ignore the way Christ relates with the church on this point in our own marriage, maintaining a (secular) red pill view on this, or
- follow the example of Christ and just deny dread in our marriages as contrary to Jesus's example.

At the end of the day, if you believe in OSAS then you believe Jesus told his bride - and what would that do to a marriage if the man openly told his wife, "No matter what, I will never leave you, just as Jesus will never leave his bride. You have absolute security in our marriage"?

Tag: [u/lolosaurus](#) [u/thechristianalpha](#)

The Main Event

1 upvotes · 2 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Makes sense, but from that position it's impossible to distinguish between:

an adopted son or daughter of the Father loves the Father and actively wants to be like our Father

and

I would just call someone who outwardly follows Christ for a time but falls away, a false convert. They didn't lose their salvation; they never had it to begin with

And if there's no way to externally distinguish between these two, then the definition of "salvation" becomes a fairly useless one. It may be technically and theologically accurate, but it holds no pragmatic value, which is why Jesus and the apostles often talk about salvation in terms that could be seen and expressed on earth, even if this led to some dissonance on a theological level.

I just think that it's relevant that Christ doesn't leave us or forsake us

Right ... but what about us leaving him? Again, "If you disown me, I will disown you." That's not just Paul in 2 Timothy 2 saying that, but Jesus himself in Matthew 10.

And this same concept works in a marriage

So would you call those "never were" *Christians* God's "concubines" instead of his bride? Or are you suggesting that Jesus would never have an FMOFY conversation (regarding spiritual reproduction) with his bride? Which would seem to undermine the parable of the fig tree. This is where I'm not seeing how the reality of physical relationships can follow in the example of the spiritual reality of our relationship with Christ, taking after his model, if there isn't room for him to let his bride walk away - other than to say it's a unique exception. Or perhaps your view is that the "RP Christian" should take the Calvinist approach that because it's impossible for anyone to separate from Jesus once genuinely in that relationship, a husband should model this and never leave his wife no matter how downright nasty and vile she becomes - because she's still legally your wife and you should never leave her nor forsake her. Because at that point you can't say, "We weren't ever truly married" because you are.

Let me be clear: I'm neither Calvinist nor Arminian. Or perhaps I'm both. I believe under the most technically accurate definitions, salvation can never be lost. I also believe that under more pragmatic definitions, salvation can be lost. So, I'm not trying to beat down Calvinism - only explore the ways that it portrays a disconnect between the model of Christ and the RP advice. So either Calvinism is more at odds with red pill praxeology than Arminianism, or Arminianism's pragmatic model simply explores the practical world in a way that Calvinism simply doesn't address, and therefore gives us a model for expressing Christ's example that is consistent with red pill praxeology and Calvinism is simply silent on the issue due to its insistence on remaining technically accurate, however useless that technicality is.

The Main Event

1 upvotes · 2 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

marriage is a "growth machine."

I've heard this a million times from mainstream ~~pastors~~ congregation leaders. I'm totally unconvinced. Yes, marriage can produce unique growth that wouldn't have happened without marriage. But I can say the exact same thing about having a difficult job, being in an abusive family ... for that matter, being in a loving family, or running a farm, or being a stay at home parent. All of these are contexts in which people grow in unique ways that you wouldn't learn in the absence of that particular context.

But this isn't the *PURPOSE* of marriage.

Malachi 2:15 says the purpose of marriage is to produce godly offspring. If you want to connect it to growth, you can also take my view that all OT things are road maps to point to a spiritual truth, and therefore the *purpose* of physical marriage is to help us understand our *spiritual marriage* to Christ, and in this sense is primarily about spiritual growth *specifically toward the end of learning to produce spiritual offspring, and not just physical offspring*.

But 99% of the time people say "marriage is a growth incubator" they aren't talking about disciple-making. They're talking about character issues being challenged. I can get character issues challenged anywhere in the world. Marriage doesn't corner the market on mechanisms for character growth. At best, it does corner the market on giving practical wisdom for spiritual reproduction and parenting.

People usually do whatever they can to avoid reaching critical mass. This makes them willing to engage in anxiety regulation through accommodation for years.

This is a wise phrase - and something guys would do well to remember. In this sense, a guy hasn't reached critical mass - he's only hit a plateau shortly before the apex. In sexual terms, he's edging. He avoid eruption, but also isn't willing to let the tension run down. Of course, in one case the eruption and the other ... not so much.

The main event - or Critical Mass is not low value. It is the way to exit the Gridlock and reach for something better!

But critical mass and a main event are clearly two different things, from what's described. At best, critical mass could be described as the demeanor that can lead to a main event. But it is not the main event itself.

The way he describes critical mass, it's almost as if it's a resentment that causes you to shut off the other person emotionally and just start focusing on yourself for a change. This can certainly be beneficial (though preferable if the motive isn't reactionary due to resentment). But it doesn't turn into a main event until the other side realizes they're losing you and they start to care again - enough that they pull every emotional trick in the book to get your attention and reassurance.

To quote [/u/SteelSharpensSteel](#) quoting [/u/RStonePT](#) - "if there's not snot rockets, it's not a main event."

The Main Event

1 upvotes · 2 August 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Right on.

The Main Event

1 upvotes · 2 August 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

She almost left, but I ~~think we're through that~~ called her bluff

FTFY.

lost the battle for frame, my frame is what won the war

It's not so much putting two people in the ring together to duke out a victory (despite my MMA analogy elsewhere). It's more like Frodo trying to get to Mordor and Golem keeps trying to take the precious from him until he ends up actually journeying alongside them - and for a brief moment even coming to appreciate his time with them. There are better examples that don't end up in one of them falling into a volcano, but you get the idea. It's more of a journey/"you can't distract me" than a "my frame will beat your frame" kind of thing. That's the missional focus aspect of it all.

This is the strongest frame of all because it's Christ's frame, when in its pure form.

You get it! Too many people get caught up in the whole "once saved, always saved" line of theology. It may not be technically wrong, but it also leads to an incredibly feminized view of marriage - that "ship out" is never an option to Christ. In reality 2 Timothy 2 says, "If we disown him, he will disown us. But if we are faithless, he will remain faithful." Jesus is always on the move. If he invites us to follow and we say, "Screw off, Jesus. I'm going my own way," ... well, he just keeps walking and we get left in the dust. Are we okay with that in our marriages?

Not that I'd ever impute RP praxeology into theology, but if one were to do so, it'd be a heavy push against Calvinist soteriology. I'm curious how [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) would reconcile this - or if he'd perhaps suggest there is

no reconciliation, and it's an "outlier example" where the physical relationships on earth simply aren't meant to follow in the Christ/church example in this isolated situation.

The Main Event

1 upvotes · 2 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

As well the Bible said they would be ;)

The Main Event

1 upvotes · 2 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

More to [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) - I've had a main event ... but it was in my beta days and I was the one trying to keep her around. I haven't had one in the reverse since the tables turned ... just small pockets of, "Are we okay?" and "Is there something I need to know about?" that lead to enough gentle course-correcting that a main event never needs to happen.

In fact, she had that conversation with me this morning: "You're acting like everything's normal, but I'm feeling like something's off. Are we okay right now?" followed by, "Stop laughing, this isn't funny. Is there anything going on inside your head that you're not telling me?"

Yeah, we're good. We're gonna have sex tonight too. Be ready.

The Main Event

1 upvotes · 2 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I do remember that post - and it was a good one. I think we're both describing the "main event" as a clear turning point. But this could just be a matter of perspective - it's a main event for the guy if his wife finally cedes the power because she can no longer control his frame. Women can have a "main event" where their guy gives the "I'll do anything to keep you" reaction that typically precedes (or follows) ILY, BINILWY. Regardless of the source, they're both parties to the "main event." You don't have Conor McGregor without Khabib Nurmagomedov (yes, I had to Google how to spell his name).

In my line of work, I guess I'm too used to seeing the main event turn into divorce - usually because the party in power has already checked out too far and isn't willing to come back even with all the promises of submission. So perhaps that slants my view.

The Main Event

1 upvotes · 2 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Agreed

Joshua Harris, author of "I Kissed Dating Goodbye" is getting divorced and has fallen away from the faith

1 upvotes · 30 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

To be fair, at least he used one of Luther's worst quotes ;)

More Than Marriage: How churchianity has screwed up friendships too

1 upvotes · 30 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Excellent comment. Very thorough, added new insights, and challenges new action. I like this.

More Than Marriage: How churchianity has screwed up friendships too

1 upvotes · 30 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Very interesting quote. I like it, but without the context I'm not sure I understand it fully.

Older female Virgin

1 upvotes · 30 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I really have no clue what any girl on here looks like. But as a matter of cold, hard factual reality, most men assess their sexual interest in a woman predominantly on looks. I would be lying to pretend otherwise. And it doesn't do girls any good to lie to them about their looks or even to say that looks don't matter when they do, just to protect her feelings.

Yes, my wife is post-wall. Yes, I believe she's hot and I agree women can be hot for years post-wall. But they will never be as hot as their maximum potential pre-wall either, except maybe to a guy who has a fetish for older looking women.

But notice in my comment that I did give room for husbands to appreciate their wife's looks even through aging. While women have retroactive emotions, men have retentive memories about how women look. A man will remember his wife's former beauty and often still see that in her, even past the reality of its fading. But this isn't true for new women he meets, as he's never known them in their glory days to be able to remember, and it only applies within a reasonable range. For example, a guy might not notice an extra 20lbs on his wife, but after 200lbs a threshold will be crossed.

Oh, and we just hit 11 years a few days ago!

OYS - Where Progress is Made (07/24/19)

1 upvotes · 26 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

PHYSICAL

I've made good progress on my cutting this week. 2 days of sub-500 calories, 4 days of 1500 and 1 day of 2300 (my average daily idle burn). I've also added running and home exercise back to the mix and will be finding a gym by the new house this week in the hope of starting lifting again by next week.

MENTAL/EMOTIONAL

I'm feeling great, leading well, and being productive. If anything, work is taking a mild hit due to the things around the new house that need done, or going out to buy things to furnish the new house, etc. My wife has more flexibility in her schedule than I do right now, so she's been handling a lot of the day to day stuff with unpacking, so that's been helpful. When I get home I focus less on the decorating and more on the essentials - things that really need to get done but where you don't feel like there's a ton of progress when it's complete. Like yesterday, setting up the water line on the new fridge that came in. It probably took me an hour to work it all out. I could have unpacked 5 boxes somewhere in that same amount of time with a visible dent, but instead all I can say is that the refrigerator runs. I'm okay with that, but noticed for a brief few seconds that I felt as though I wasn't accomplishing much. Time to keep going.

SPIRITUAL

No real updates here since last week, except to note that prayer has suffered and I'm less intentional with my kids, which needs to get fixed. I've been rushing through night time prayers with them so I can focus on getting other stuff done rather than taking the time to model the importance of their relationship with Christ.

No Real Man Fallacy

1 upvotes · 25 July 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Right. And sometimes the "mentors" do this intentionally - whether because they themselves are misguided or

because they're testing everyone else's frame (or probably both). This is why a man can share his ideas on masculinity and half a dozen people will call him a faggot or autistic. They're communicating, "You are worthless as a man because your thoughts on masculinity don't measure up to mine."

So, I wouldn't blame that dynamic entirely on the new guys, though I'm sure they have more than a fair share of this problem going around as well.

No Real Man Fallacy

1 upvotes · 25 July 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

No.

Are wives a gift?

1 upvotes · 25 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Is your wife a gift?

Yes. We have good sex, she earns a great income, she works hard around the house, she responds well to initiation and leadership, she has insights I don't, she provides an extra set of hands, she does a great job teaching our kids, etc.

A car is also a gift lots of people get. It is great to have one - you can drive around in it, impress your friends, listen to music, keep air conditioned in the heat while you travel, etc.

But you also have to oil the car, fill it up on gas, pay for insurance, clean it out from time to time. The gift comes with responsibilities if you don't want it to crash and burn.

Even the best wives, who are genuinely a gift from God, still require an incredible amount of care and maintenance. It comes with the territory. Gift doesn't mean "all benefit, no responsibility." It means that you get more benefit than responsibility. It's not much of a gift if someone "gives" me a car that I'd have to put more money and time in to fix it up (or even the time to sell it for scrap metal) than it's worth to me.

What is a good measuring stick to know if it is appropriate thankfulness and not worship?

Is the degree to which you express your thankfulness hindering your mission, or are you doing it from a place of perceived compulsion?

If I decided I wanted to take my wife out on a nice date to show appreciation to her for the hard work she's done to help me, that's great. If I skip meeting with a guy I disciple to do it, that's a problem. That's not to say that he's more important to me than my wife (though in the grander scheme, he might be - *and that's okay!*), but that I can exercise flexibility with how and when I choose to reward my wife, and I have no internal compulsion that tells me I **MUST** reward my wife to show my thankfulness to her.

When you catch yourself saying, "Well, she really deserves this; and while it's not the most convenient time for me, it's the only real chance I'll have for a bit to show her my appreciation, so I'd better do it now" ... that's when you've switched to compulsive thinking that's unhealthy.

As far as raw positive thoughts toward your wife go, feel free to get as emotionally uplifted as you like. No need to stifle your excitement to be around her, as long as it's not getting in the way of your mission. But most guys go beta when they let that emotional excitement cause them to smother her. She becomes the source of their feels. Let her contribute to your feels without being the primary provider of them. Icing, not the cake.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (07/17/19)

1 upvotes · 22 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

At the time I wrote that, we hadn't moved. We moved on Saturday and are still working on unpacking and setting up the new house, which will likely take 2 weeks. Motivation on losing weight is always helpful, though I'm usually good at maintaining goals once I set them. I'm starting today with a quick detox - 2 days straight of only fruit/veggies, 1 day of 2k calories, and 2 more days of fruit/veggies. After that I'll revert back to the same diet I was on when I was losing 1.5-2lbs a week with [/u/thechristianalpha](#).

Time to redevelop a habit of consistency. What's the hardest exercise at the gym?

Right now it's going to have to be home routines for a bit. We moved a bit too far from our current gym to make it out there consistently. So, I need to cancel membership soon and open one somewhere closer. But I don't want to lose the access to the pool just quite yet. The kids enjoy it too much.

But ask yourself, what is God trying to accomplish in your life right now by allowing this?

While often a useful question, I don't think it always has a valid answer. Sometimes God lets us make our own choices and bear the consequences of them. Moving was a choice I made - one that he didn't force me into, but allowed. The consequence of that is significantly reduced free time. I'm not sure I'd say God is intentionally trying to do anything through this, other than to show that he lets us reap what we sow. That said, there are certainly passive benefits I can keep an eye out for, such as increased discipline, training toward higher productivity, etc., as compared with the pitfalls that could affect me if I chose to drop the ball on the many things going on right now.

Hey, an opportunity to practice Frame and brush up on A&A and AM. Woohoo!

Right. Of all things, I find it hysterical that the one that she has harped on the most is how I fold towels - complete with the phrase, "Can't this just be one of those things where you show your wife you love her by folding the towels my way?" I smile and say, "Absolutely. I will fold them my way from now on." A silly pun I use on the kids all the time, but an effective one nonetheless.

I take it you're still shopping around then?

I view it less as me shopping for them and them shopping for me. But yes.

Right now the system is backwards. Congregations are so desperate for people (scarcity mentality) that they'll put on the best show they can to get the attention of anyone and everyone who might walk by. It would be so much better if I could put my spiritual resume out there and congregations were selective over the people they accepted. Someone like either of us would be begged to be taken, whereas the average pew-sitter would be put on a wait list until they showed how serious they were about following Christ ... which, by the way, is pretty darn close to how Jesus did it. Instead of congregation leaders salivating over the potential of someone like me working alongside their ministry, they're content to just keep on keeping on and if someone happens to show enthusiasm, then great - they'll drain them of all their time, money, and energy and still keep on keeping on with no real change or impact. It's so frustrating.

Could it be that God is giving you a breather so you can put some additional time into RPChristians and possibly your book?

I don't have the time yet, but it's certainly a possibility - and one that I've considered. I still want to give Deep's book a year before I start teasing mine much, as I don't want to undermine him. But that doesn't mean I can't be drafting in the meantime. It has been a couple months since I did any serious writing.

Feeling Guilty and Redemption

1 upvotes · 22 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Have you gotten through the 400 series yet?

The Second Kiss of Death

1 upvotes · 18 July 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Well said. I enjoyed this comment thoroughly.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (07/17/19)

1 upvotes · 17 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

PHYSICAL

- I've slacked off the past 2 months. Of the 25lbs I lost, 10 are back. I'm assuming 5 is water weight, which is unsurprising, but I've not been careful enough with my eating to account for the lost gym time while doing everything associated with moving.
- Despite not being at the gym nearly as much, my lifts have only suffered slightly. I went once this week and with great effort was able to lift about 90% of what I was two months ago. That's not as much loss as I was expecting.
- I've decreased my initiation due to higher priorities. But quality has been high. Wife is still following my lead. I bought a vibrator - our first toy (unless you count cuffs/rope). This was definitely a boundary-stretch, but a worthwhile investment. It was awkward at first, but she followed and now she loves it, and it makes things easier/more fun for me too. The first time we started with external use only, but she was the one who asked to try it inside, so that was a positive sign of intrigue and sexual exploration. We don't use it every time.

MENTAL/EMOTIONAL

- Having 1/10th the free time I'm used to sucks. Still able to keep a smile on my face most days, though, so that's good.
- Relationship with kids has boosted significantly. I'm getting better one-on-one quality time with each of them, doubling this into my exercise, talking with them while I run.
- Finally had the sex talk with my 7 year old son. He has lots of questions, some of them are hysterical. I'm glad he's asking me than someone else, though.
- Wife and I are getting along well, despite the moving process. There's definitely some head-butting. She likes the packing to be done her way. I don't do stupid things that waste my time. She gets mad, I crack jokes. It turns out fine.

SPIRITUAL

- I'm doing about as expected on the disciplines, perhaps regressing slightly due to time constraints.
- We visited a new congregation that my wife was excited about. I'm shooting it down hard. Two clear and obvious misuses of Scripture and one of their staff telling me that they're not open to trying new ministry models related to making disciples. I'm out.
- Now that my red pill ex pastor has moved away, I don't have anyone local to spiritually spar with. This is going to wear on me quickly. While I can stay faithful, it's easy for me to get derailed or lose sight of my mission without someone like this who I'm regularly meeting with.

Question regarding men being the ruler of the family

1 upvotes · 16 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I actually count death as an increase too. I believe humans were created with the capacity for mortality before the fall, with the option of sustaining life indefinitely via the tree of life. That's why when they were banished the tree of life is specifically referenced as what would cause them to live forever, and why it shows up again in the New Jerusalem.

The fact that they would *surely* die is an increase from the fact that death was a mere possibility before then, but not a surety.

Jesus can Free you from the system and Save you!

1 upvotes · 12 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

For posts like this, which clearly violate the rules, I'd just remove them and not lock them. Locking them still lets others see it on our page.

MRP/TRP says it's my fault if my wife cheats on me. What does RPC say?

1 upvotes · 10 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

it's your fault. Wait, WHAT? How?

Fault really matters very little. We can play the blame game all day and it won't get us anywhere. I think what /u/ReddJive was referencing was the fact that blaming someone else is pointless because you can't control them. AWALT. You can control yourself, so that's not pointless.

There is no such thing as a one-sided conflict. Both people have always contributed to an issue, even unknowingly. The "you're to blame" attitude in on TRP/MRP is not a statement that it's 100% on you. Rather, if you contributed 5% of the problem and 95% is on her, then you're better off working on the 5% you can actually do something about than twiddling your thumbs wishing she didn't do what 95% of women would do if given the chance without moral constraint.

What does this sub say?

For purposes of Judgment Day, God holds each person accountable for their own actions. Period. There are no exceptions.

For purposes of improving yourself, your sexuality, and your relationships, blaming her will only increase your resentment and decrease your attraction, and also hinders you from working on yourself when you aren't willing to acknowledge your own contribution. So, as a practical matter, while it's not technically accurate, it's idiotic to focus on her blame when you could actually do something about yourself.

It did not say, "You shall not make your wife commit adultery."

It does charge husbands with a responsibility to lead in the home, though. A guy's got to be a pretty crappy leader if his first officer is quick to jump ship when the opportunity comes.

Is this the extent I am to see it from a RPC perspective? And what other takes (if any) I should have on it?

It's just a matter of different wavelengths.

Anyone who wants to talk about philosophical truths and technicalities will readily come to the conclusion that the wife is primarily to blame for her actions in cheating, and the Bible makes it clear that God will agree on Judgment Day.

Anyone who wants to talk about what will actually solve problems and keep a man's wife from cheating will need to be **FORCED** to stop blaming her because as long as he's doing that he'll never work out his own issues. The easiest way to get him to stop looking at her fault is to get him to look at his own need for improvement.

It's like when the secular community calls people "faggot" and "autist" all the time. They don't mean that they believe these people are actually faggots and autists. They're communicating something that's untrue in order to force a mental shift to get the person to have the reaction they need to start making progress.

I'll also note that most men who hear the "if she cheats, it's your fault" line are guys in failing marriages whose wives have not actually cheated yet. As such, there's no actual fault to go anywhere. But if a guy could have done something to prevent it and declines to do so, how should we take that?

Suppose there's a mountain of candy on my street that smells wonderful. But there are alligators swarming the area. My kids love candy, but have no clue how dangerous alligators are, and they're too young to understand it even if I tried. If I:

- let my kid play outside without supervision
- fail to put a fence around my yard
- fail to call an alligator control facility

etc. ... then when my 4 year old wanders off to get some candy and is eaten by an alligator:

- Yes, it's technically her fault. She chose to go over there even when I told her not to.
- But I'm also an idiot and to blame because I knew it was in a child's nature to go after that candy and I didn't do my role in preventing it.

AWALT. Women have a nature. If you know RP, you know their nature. While it may be different for spiritual purposes, for pragmatic reality, if you know women are prone to cheat and you have the means to prevent it, but you turn a blind eye, that's on you. She's no different than the child with candy.

"But they're grown adults and should be able to control themselves. The 4 year old child doesn't have that same mental capacity," is probably what you were thinking, right? There's a reason we call wives "the oldest teenager in the house." This type of response demonstrates a lack of understanding of hypergamy and the power female emotions to control their decisions. While women are capable of thinking logically quite often, when emotions are strong enough logic goes out the window and they're back into the same mental state as the 4 year old who sees a pile of candy.

We talk about how "hamsters" run wild in their brain to create logical rationalizations for emotionally impulsive decisions because that's what women actually do.

- "God wants me to be happy."
- "If I'm this unhappy with my spouse, maybe it's because God is leading me to another man."
- "I haven't felt close to God since I've been distant from my husband, so maybe he's the one holding me back from being closer to God."
- "When I had sex with that hunk who wasn't my husband, I felt incredible! God wouldn't let me feel so good about something if it really were wrong. The Holy Spirit would convict me. So my good feelings about this must mean that God supports the decision."

- "This other guy is so much more godly than my husband. Yes, we had sex outside of marriage, but that isn't what determines godliness. He's engaged in so many other ministry things and doing God's work that I think I could make a much bigger contribution to God's Kingdom if I kept having sex with him instead of my husband. He needs my support and help more than the deadbeat I'm with now."

Yes, these thoughts are idiotic. They're also things women actually think. How do I know? Because I'm a divorce attorney and they've told them to me. While not exact quotes, I have heard each of these rationalizations expressed to me from various clients.

Women will always do what's in their nature, even if it defies logic. Expect them to be like a 4 year old child when temptation comes to your door. That's why, as [/u/Deep_Strength](#) often points out, the whole point of Ephesians 5's bit on marriage is that the husband is responsible for sanctifying his wife - not that he's to die for her happiness, but for her holiness. She can't be trusted with her own sanctification any more than the church can be trusted with its own sanctification without Christ.

So yes, a responsibility is created. Yes, the husband is in some biblical respect responsible if his wife is so unsanctified that she cheats on him. Yes, she will be held primarily responsible. But for practical purposes ... come on. What did you expect her to do if the guy is an overweight porn addict with no real direction in life?

MRP/TRP says it's my fault if my wife cheats on me. What does RPC say?

1 upvotes · 10 July 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I like this. Excellent break-down.

MRP/TRP says it's my fault if my wife cheats on me. What does RPC say?

1 upvotes · 10 July 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Spot on.

RedPill in Scripture: Genesis 39 - Joseph

1 upvotes · 10 July 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Good to know. That's how I usually took it, though I often assumed one word referred to his body (form) and the other to his overall look (appearance), which included grooming, hygiene, etc. I could very well be wrong on that though.

I'm meeting her dad tomorrow. Any advice?

1 upvotes · 9 July 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Nothing immoral about it. We're all sinners, right? So should I "be myself" and keep adding because it would be "misrepresenting myself" to act like a non sinner? The moral thing is to be better - who I want to be before God, not who I am now.

"Be yourself" is a woman's advice so women can identify quickly which guys are worth their time and which are losers. Being yourself is not attractive if you're in the latter group, and there's nothing immoral about being more attractive as you practice toward improvement.

Matthew vs RP

1 upvotes · 8 July 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Excellent reference.

Matthew vs RP

1 upvotes · 8 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Kind of like [/u/NoFaithInThisSub](#) described, Maximus from the movie *Gladiator* is the epitome of meekness. He has incredible strength and skill, but uses it only when necessary. There are two ways to look at this:

1. A man who has no strength cannot choose to be meek. At best, he's automatically meek; at worst, he's only weak. If he's not choosing to express the virtue, he can hardly claim the credit of having the virtue.
2. Alternatively, you could say a man is being meek by choice - by refusing to lift, OYS, etc. He is responsible for his own weak position in life and doormat qualities. He has chosen a foolish and ungodly path that forces him into expressing the virtue. Now imagine slaughtering your entire family. Naturally, you would mourn their deaths. The fact that this mourning is self-inflicted doesn't change the fact that you'll still mourn the loss and what you've done and what you've become. Is this the type of mourning that will cause a man to be blessed? Will God bless someone who uses ungodliness to create the conditions that Matthew 5 says will be blessed? That's pretty foolish and sounds like manipulating God. But if one is godly he is strong, and if he still expresses meekness despite his strength in godliness, then he will be blessed. He will not be blessed for being meek because of ungodly choices.

Another thing to note is that the beattitudes don't inherently suggest everyone should aspire to attain these qualities. Jesus isn't suggesting we all strive to mourn over something so that we can be comforted. He's saying, "Some people mourn. This isn't bad if it happens. It's a good thing because you will be comforted." In the same way, meekness isn't a virtue we are all called to adopt at all times. Rather, there are times that we will be meek (and other times we ought to be meek, just as one can refuse to mourn when they should), and the blessing is reserved for those times. Or you could even argue that some people are designed for meekness and others aren't - and those who are designed for meekness get a unique blessing, and this doesn't mean that those who aren't meek are somehow sinners.

The passage only says the meek will be blessed. It doesn't say the non-meek will be cursed or punished or deemed sinners.

Tag: [/u/Dumblydorewitit](#)

What does the bible say about the existence of modern day prophets?

1 upvotes · 6 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Cool song. Been a while since I heard it. What does imogen heap have to do with prophets?

Jekyll and Hyde

1 upvotes · 2 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Yep. I track with all that. But I also have seen people cast out non sentient spirits. Some people call them demons.

Jekyll and Hyde

1 upvotes · 2 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Interesting. Do you think there's an unusual concentration of demonic activity there? This seems to be common for you, but even among the people I know who are most trustworthy with deliverance ministry, seeing a sentient demon is incredibly rare. The people who experience this as a common phenomenon (myself included) almost always experience it as evil spirits and not sentient demons. Sentient demonic exposure in America seems incredibly rare and I'm curious why it would concentrate around you so much.

Awesome girl that doesn't take care of herself

1 upvotes · 2 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

When I wrote the sidebar I used "FAT" but decided it didn't make sense to tell guys to look for a FAT girl, so I changed it to FAST, as "saved" was something of an unspoken prerequisite. The "EASY" part was added as a joke during a Bible study session and I decided I liked it enough to keep it around. It's not on the sidebar anywhere, but I did include it in one of my recent posts here:

https://www.reddit.com/r/RPChristians/comments/c27btu/the_second_kiss_of_death/

While I would never compromise on any of the FAST qualities, the EASY ones make a relationship work "easily" in most cases, but they're really to taste.

Wife pushing back after upping my SMV and holding frame.

1 upvotes · 2 July 2019 · /r/askMRP

"are you just going to fucking ignore me?!"

Acceptable response: *Well, I've already done the ignore part, so that just leaves the F-ing. I'm game.*

I set my phone down, told her not to be shitty with me, in firm tone

I.e. got butthurt. "No, I was setting a boundary." That's not how setting boundaries works. You got upset by her tone and showed it with your sternness.

Got up, took care of kiddo, and then changed clothes and went to work out

So you gave into her demands anyway, despite her bad attitude, then gave her the cold shoulder. So many guys haven't watched [/u/BluepillProfessor's](#) youtube videos yet. You don't walk out *right then and there* as a display of your anger (unless things are so heated that you have to to protect your legal safety). You wait a while. You generally withdraw your presence, not withdraw it in the heat of the moment. The first is conditioning, the second is emotionally reacting.

She also stated she doesnt want to have sex then go on about our separate missions (not sure what to make of that?)

This is perhaps the most significant thing in your entire post. If you can bear through the Christian stuff, I made a post titled "[Mission Matters, Nothing Else.](#)" The 16 Commandments of Poon has this as one of its main points too. Your mission is your greatest asset toward improving sexuality and respect in the marriage. If you don't have a solid mission, you'll be spinning your wheels in the mud on everything else. If she's on a different mission than you, then your top priority is getting her on board with your mission. If your mission is something garbage, like "having a great family, good home, and being happy in life," you're wasting your time. It has to be tangible and presently out of reach - and preferably something you can't do alone, ergo needing a wife to help you at your side. Like every bond chick who is not only his arm candy, but also has a role to play in the plot.

She wants better communication, which I agreed to

Yes, because communication is the life-blood of marriage and something every man should strive to improve on. /s

You ceded to her frame.

She dislikes that I "shut down and refuse to fight"

Classic guy move. Most guys think this isn't butthurt because they're not getting angry at her. In reality, it's just a

different manifestation of butthurt. Incidentally, the very next post I wrote after the one I linked above was [An Anatomy of Butthurt](#), which goes a lot more into this "robot mode" form of butthurt. That was my go-to. Trust me when I say that yelling and screaming butthurt is better than robot-mode butthurt. With women, emotion is always better than no-emotion. Robot mode guys get crap for make-up sex. Angry guys get the better end of the make-up sex deal because when the relational tension has been resolved their anger is interpreted as passion (note: women have retroactive memories, experiencing past events through the lens of their present emotions; so if they're emotionally positive toward you, they will interpret your past anger in an emotionally positive way ... ergo every battered wife after the make-up).

I've invited her multiple times to join me on my journey

Good. What is that journey? Is it something actually worth joining?

She asked "What if I couldn't have sex for 6 months, or a year? Would you leave?" I answered honestly and said I didnt know

Comfort test failed. Acceptable answers:

- "Babe, that's what threesomes are for."
- "There are other holes I can work with."
- "Yes."

asked if she would grow with me. She said she needed to think

She throws out a possible future contingency. You say, "I don't know what I'd do in the future if that happened. But follow me into the future." Her: "Hmm ... I need to think about that." What's so shocking here?

I realized I was DEERing and decided it was best to just STFU

Yes you were. Good thought. But that's not what you did.

told her to stop, and left for work with no affection given

I.e. you "told her" instead of STFU, then got butthurt again.

So, advice? How do I move forward, keeping my frame and keeping attractive traits? What can I expect? Critiques?

What frame do you want to project? You just projected your frame as the guy who gets upset and can't handle it when his wife gets pissy at him. If that was the frame you were going for, bravo! You played it masterfully.

If you want to project the frame of a fun-loving guy who DNGAF about silly complaints and emotional outbursts, instead finding them cute and laughable ... then learn to AA, practice AM, develop your fogging and negative inquiry skills to buy you time while you figure out how to AA and AM, and just have fun screwing with her when she's angry. Yes, it will tick her off more at first. But when she realizes you're not an angry, butthurt guy anymore ... well, I'll let you figure that out for yourself.

Also, get your mission stuff figured out. You say you have one, but I'm skeptical about the utility of your mission in your marriage and sex life.

Cold-approach? Day game? Night game? What are the specifics?

1 upvotes · 1 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

General social engagement is the next best alternative. I never posted it on RPC, but I did a post a while back on social influence and what I call "no-context conversation."

https://www.reddit.com/r/TheRedPill/comments/88dyg6/social_influence_and_defying_context/

DHV "battle" between me and my wife; question.

1 upvotes · 1 July 2019 · /r/askMRP

It's the reverse: her making more than him is actually the insurance policy. By her earning more, he takes a huge step toward becoming divorce-proof, where divorce-rape is unlikely.

In a sense, she doesn't "need" him with regard to finances, so it might look on the surface like she is more likely to run off with some other guy. But women don't evaluate men on money alone. Yes, it's an important factor, but a high-value man doesn't rely on his income alone to keep women following. He's also fit, charismatic, confident, OYS, DNGAF, knows how to employ kino, is a wonder in bed, etc. Where else will she find a man who is all of those other things - especially when she's used goods at this point? She could probably find such a guy to sleep with, but not to stay committed to her. So a shift in balance in the incomes may cause her to lose a small modicum of respect, but but the other factors keep it in balance and OP should be fine if he wasn't placing all his eggs in the "I make more money than her" basket.

If OP really knows how to play his cards right, this is actually a huge opportunity for uncommon dread. By making less, there's little room for financial legal repercussion. Assuming he's on-point with the kids, as his job is more flexible, he has little to worry about on the custody front as well. This will eventually sink into her mind: that he could leave with the kids and not owe her any form of support - she might actually end up owing him - and there's nothing she could do about that.

This is the pressure that gets many a man to supplicate to their wives. A wise man in this reversed position could leverage his own freedom the same way. He just has to be high enough value that the threat of him leaving is real. For most moderately attractive women, any guy knows she can find another guy in a heart-beat, so she doesn't have to do much to make that threat a reality. But if the guy takes the typical SAHD approach, he free-loads off of her, making it clear to her that no other woman would want him, undermining the possibility of this advantage.

This is all more to [/u/ke3bsf6](#)

The Second Kiss of Death

1 upvotes · 25 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

The easy answer is to dress sexier when you're at home and modestly beautiful when you're out and about.

Probably the better option is to show him the passages on modesty and say, "I'd love to dress sexier for you, but I also want to obey these passages on modesty. Can you help me find the balance?" From there, if his definition of modest is different from yours, that's a submission issue. If his definition is plainly wrong (ex. wanting you to wear nipple clamps and a thong to the grocery store), you'll have to suggest he research it further and get input from other godly men.

It's also worth noting that I don't recall "causing other men to lust" as the reason for the biblical passages on modesty. They're really about not looking like a hooker so that the world didn't confuse Christian women with temple prostitutes that were common among other beliefs at the time.

Logically, you could make an argument for the "don't cause men to lust" line of thinking, but when Jesus talks about not causing others to sin, he means: don't do it intentionally. When he turned the water into wine at the wedding, he knew people would get drunk off of it. But his motive wasn't to entice them to sin. It was

submissiveness to his mother. If other people sinned because of it, that was on them.

In the same way, your duty is to your husband, not to randos on the street. You can't use them as an excuse to avoid following your husband's lead. If other guys look at you with lust, that's on them - unless you're intentionally plotting to make them covet your body. If your motive is submission to your early authority, you're in the same boat as Jesus turning the water into wine.

The Red Pill & Religion – with Conk & Sam Botta

1 upvotes · 24 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Why'd you delete the link? I just got back from vacation and was planning to listen to it. Shoot it over if you still have it.

The word "nice" comes from the root word "nescire" in Latin, which means "to not know"

1 upvotes · 20 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Good to know. Would be nice if there were reference to patriarchy as a system rather than as a person, but this does at least give some framework to derive an inferential definition.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (06/19/19)

1 upvotes · 19 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

What has motivated me on my lifts this week was my wife getting all hot and bothered making comments about some guy who is super jacked (probably 8-10% body fat) in a show we are watching

Once you're in shape, this will play out in the reverse.

The word "nice" comes from the root word "nescire" in Latin, which means "to not know"

1 upvotes · 19 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Sure, that makes sense - but where is that definition found in the Bible? Technically the word "patriarchy" doesn't actually appear in the Bible, right? So, we can look at several aspects of biblical history:

- As you note, men were the leaders and decision-makers in the home.
 - Does that mean that if a guy leads his home today, but raises his daughter to lead hers when she's married, that he is part of the "patriarchy" that everyone talks about?
- The Israelites tracked genealogy through the male heirs 99% of the time. To a smaller degree, even only the first born male heirs.
 - Does that mean that if I reference my father's father's father as my great grandfather who I really look up to, that I'm following patriarchy? What if I also reference his wife as someone I look up to and I'm proud to be her descendant too? What if my great, great grandmother was famous and I often tell people, "I'm her great, great grandson," and therefore people associate me with a female ancestor more than my male ancestors? Am I now spitting in the face of the patriarchy?
- The Bible also had a legal system of heirship that allowed a double portion to first born sons, and other men to inherit property.
 - If I leave a portion of my estate to my 3 daughters and don't give a double portion or 100% portion to my only son (who happens to be the oldest), then am I no longer part of the patriarchy?

See, the Bible doesn't define the word, and all of these contexts have been referred to as "patriarchy" by different people in different contexts.

So, while it's easy to say that patriarchy is "male led Churches and families," my guess is that 90% of the people in the world today who hear the word patriarchy will think you're talking about something a lot more than just that.

The Second Kiss of Death

1 upvotes · 19 June 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Oops ... good catch.

Faith, Works, Mission, Disciple-Making

1 upvotes · 19 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Tell that to Wayne Grudem.

The Second Kiss of Death

1 upvotes · 19 June 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Excellent. This should be a post of its own.

The Second Kiss of Death

1 upvotes · 19 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

You're speakin' crazy talk!

The Second Kiss of Death

1 upvotes · 19 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Good stuff, brother. Great addition.

The Second Kiss of Death

1 upvotes · 19 June 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Well said. +1.

The Second Kiss of Death

1 upvotes · 19 June 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Point well taken. I assumed we were talking about positioning.

I have fallen in love with my step sister and need advice

1 upvotes · 17 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

to some degree

Gravitational Centers - A Case Study on the MRP Journey

1 upvotes · 16 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I don't see that being the case from women to men in the majority of marriages I've seen. Dating, absolutely. Marriage, not at all. My range of observation, of course, is mostly from my divorce cases and what I see from couples in the church.

Gravitational Centers - A Case Study on the MRP Journey

1 upvotes · 15 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Aren't we to desire to please Christ, our groom? And while there's certainly an appropriate "fear the Lord" component to it, isn't it enough to say that Christ is so good that he deserves our effort to please him?

Gravitational Centers - A Case Study on the MRP Journey

1 upvotes · 15 June 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Nice. I did get through some of chaos theory in an abstract math class I took in college. We just never discussed strange attractors.

Gravitational Centers - A Case Study on the MRP Journey

1 upvotes · 15 June 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Agreed on all points, including that the lines in the graph could use significant reworking. While the graph is broadly descriptive of about a dozen and a half relationships I've seen that inspired this post, it's prescriptive value is only as good as the degree to which those dozen and a half relationships are typical of most other relationships. I think technically I'd have to have a sample size of 30 to be considered reliable under modern statistics, and my 17 doesn't cut it to meet statistical research standards.

The familiar phrase is an axiom you once dubbed "cholomite's law." I thought it was a staple phrase in MRP, but looking into it at the time, it turned out to be something cholomite randomly said in one of my first MRP posts that's just stuck with me ever since.

Gravitational Centers - A Case Study on the MRP Journey

1 upvotes · 15 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I didn't say Jane was stressed and insecure. I simply said she felt a need to please her husband and make an effort in the relationship. I think you're assuming some baggage into this type of relationship. Bob and Jane are absolutely "pair bonded." At least from what I know from them.

I have fallen in love with my step sister and need advice

1 upvotes · 15 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

The post on oneitis didn't help because out of the 4 solutions I gave, you tried the first one and it didn't work. Hmm ...

I need help, and I have no one to share my struggles with.

1 upvotes · 15 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

How far are you into the sidebar here? Starting points:

1. Get those lifts up. People want to be friends with attractive people. Your fitness will matter more than your height. One of the first guys I brought to Christ was 5'4", but benched 300+. People flocked to him even more than the smart or charming or witty people. Lifting matters more than you realize when it comes to influencing people and making friends.
2. What's your mission? You never said. That will singularly affect every possible insight I could give you into why you're having this struggle and how to fix it.
3. Have you gotten through my posts on social influence or evangelism? Those will be the biggest starting points.

On Marriage And Mission

1 upvotes · 13 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

That's not the right question. It is: How far are men willing to let women go?

Absolutely right.

I think the answer is "all the way to the 9th level of Hell."

And right again.

There's a saying: "Strong men breed good times. Good times breed weak men. Weak men breed hard times. Hard times breed good men."

This cycle was true for most of history when men had freedom to express their strength when times were rough and called for it. Now our society is trying to pussify men so that when the hard times come there is no one to revolt. No one to fix the problem. Those in power remain in power, even if it means the world goes "all the way to the 9th level of Hell."

The Pareto Principle of 80/20 will still apply

If by this you mean that there will always be a bottom 80% and a top 20%, then yes. But the pareto principle in itself is not an infallible law - it is a trend that people gravitate toward without a force acting on the system. Some systems can and do break the pareto principle. The *Underground Church* model of ministry that I've talked about a few times has an entire section in their book by the same name about how they have reversed their pareto principle: 80% of their people are doing what the 20% at any other congregation would do.

While I completely agree with you that hypergamy doesn't care, at some point the line between one guy and the next is too fine to see with the naked eye. Chad 1 has a 6-pack, earns \$100,000/yr, and his DNGAF attitude turns her on. Chad 2 is ripped, but not quite as buff; he makes \$125,000/yr though, is connected to people who she could brag to her friends about knowing, and is a grade-A smooth talker who gets her swooning. Which one's the higher value guy? That's really hard to say.

Women get torn between two guys all the time - and it's not the classic romance plot between "Great Guy Gus" and "Hot Hunk Hank." Sometimes they're both high-value guys, and hypergamy doesn't know which one to decide. They both give her the tingles. Eventually the men decide for her - and oftentimes that decision is, "I've had my fun. Good luck with the other guy." But if enough guys do up their value, the line between Hank and Gus becomes the line between Chad 1 and Chad 2 - and I do think that would have an impact on the sexual marketplace.

I also believe having a greater population of (birth control) "sponge worthy" males might even get them off the CC quicker and into the arms of a suitable husband/former Beta. Further, if the marriages are based on RP principles, they will last longer and be more fruitful.

I do completely agree with this. I didn't mean to advocate against upping the competition in the marketplace - only to note that there were more variables to consider.

I don't see the major downside to unplugging everybody. Of course I don't see the major downside to nuking the whole Matrix into melted radioactive rubble so grain of salt and all that.

Hah, I'm with you. I'd prefer everyone unplugged, personally. But it's easy for me to say that as a guy who isn't intentionally competing in the SMP right now. I'm also an advocate for truth, regardless of how the chips may fall in its wake.

On Marriage And Mission

1 upvotes · 13 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

True, true. [/u/skimthedross](#) should be there by now, but you're right that other guys might not be. Also, tactful communication of a bold concept eases the blow without having to pussy foot around the issue for months.

Gravitational Centers - A Case Study on the MRP Journey

1 upvotes · 12 June 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Interesting ... never heard of it, but if I ever get time I bet it'd be fun to learn about.

The world we live in

1 upvotes · 12 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Why wouldn't I? She's beautiful, follows my lead, doesn't deny me, helps me with my mission, is faithful to growing in Christ.

I said her interest in "going to church" is a sign of spiritual immaturity more as a theological point to make you rethink your own priorities that likely led to you asking if she went to church. If that were the biblical standard of maturity, she would be leaps and bounds more mature than me.

The fact that she has this fetish about attending a Sunday service doesn't mean she isn't actually mature. She does still live up to the biblical standard of maturity in many ways - more so than about 85% of the women I know, and I know some of the most spiritually mature women.

So to be clear, things are not "rough" by any means. I've got the best marriage and wife of anyone I know IRL and wouldn't trade her out for anyone else even if God gave me a free pass to do so :p

The world we live in

1 upvotes · 12 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

The short answer is that she's more interested in "going to ~~church~~ Sunday service" than I am. She is diligent about wanting to go each week and make sure our kids are raised "in ~~the church~~ a congregation." But this is actually a sign of spiritual immaturity, on that level.

What's more significant is the fact that she's on board with my mission to make disciples.

Gravitational Centers - A Case Study on the MRP Journey

1 upvotes · 12 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Yeah, the graph is more meant to be demonstrative than actually descriptive. If I were to be more accurate, the slopes of the lines would be drastically different and everything would be slanted way more in balance toward the vertical as having more weight than the horizontal axis (I think [/u/Deep_Strength](#) alluded to this) ... but again, I was short on time. You can figure it out from there.

Based on what I know of red pill thought it seems like this sub recommending marriage over living as Paul did being single is illogical.

1 upvotes · 12 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

As for hypergamy I thought the whole point of the red pill was that men need to out do women in every way including resource production order to win them over.

This is incorrect.

Who should disciple women?

1 upvotes · 11 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

For instance, the woman who thinks she doesn't have to love her husband if he isn't being "nice" to her.

"Honey, there are times my husband isn't nice to me either, but I show him love all the same. Here's how to show your husband love even when he's not nice." No doctrine.

Teaching doctrine is certainly *one method* of addressing the situation, but our personal testimony and example will always be more powerful in advancing the message of the Gospel in people's lives than intellectual doctrinal teachings - and I say that as an intellectual who has gained much of my influence both locally and online from doctrinal teachings.

My other concern with tackling such a situation without Scripture is that you are training her to look to someone or something other than Scripture as her authority.

In biblical times, that actually was the status quo. The New Testament wasn't compiled during the early history of the church, and Paul's letters arguably weren't considered Scripture until after his death (around the same time 2 Peter was written). Paul didn't write 1 Cor. 11:1 saying, "Read my letters and Peter's and John's letters and I'll read them to follow Christ too." He said, "Follow me as I follow Christ."

If Titus is followed, a more mature woman will lead a younger woman by showing her from her life. While pointing people to Scripture is likely a more ideal solution, perhaps there's a reason why God might want younger women to build relationships with older women to learn - a reason that is undermined if younger women believe they don't need older women because "All I need is me and Jesus," as the slogan goes. If 1 Cor. 11:3 is true, then it makes sense that men should learn directly from Scripture - but the implication is that women should learn from men.

Am I saying women shouldn't read the Bible? No. I'd assume that reading it is better than not reading it. But I do think 1 Cor. 11:3 seems to establish that the ideal context is for men to teach women, not for women to teach themselves directly from Scripture ... which is no doubt how a lot of feminist interpretations of Scripture came about in the first place.

It's the same thing with the apostles and the churches, by the way. When studying any of the epistles, I often ask: "Why do you think God told all this stuff to Paul? Why didn't he just tell it to the leaders of the church at Corinth or Ephesus or Galatia or Philippi? Why didn't he tell Timothy these things directly? Why work through Paul instead of all these other people figuring it out directly for themselves from their own examination of Scripture. After all, they had the Holy Spirit too, right? They could have been inspired to the same conclusions, right?"

The answer is, of course, that God values discipleship as his primary model of seeing the Gospel spread. This inherently necessitates a chain of passing information from one person to the next rather than each person going directly to Scripture to create their own personalized thoughts and interpretations.

A great example of this: churchianity's obsession with having a "daily quiet time." Is this a good practice? Absolutely. Go do a Bible study on the topic, though. Tell me how many times you see Paul or any other apostle - or even Jesus - commanding others to do this. We're told to pray continually - not just daily, but continually. We're told to obey God's Word. But this notion of "read your bible for at least 15-30 minutes a day" is curiously absent.

I'm not saying we shouldn't do it. I'm only saying that the way the Bible encourages spiritual maturity is not always identical to the way modern churchianity thinks a person should become spiritually mature. There's scant little about the importance of studying Scripture and a heck of a lot about learning from each other and following the example of others who are more godly than ourselves.

When Paul says "all of us who are mature should take such a view of things," it is not in saying, "read the Scriptures and know them inside and out" - it's in saying, "join with others in following my example, brothers, and take note of those who live according to the pattern we gave you." Discipleship. Not independent study.

Does Scripture indicate that she, Judas Iscariot, or those movie producers will receive an eternal reward for these works?

"Some people got saved" is not the same thing as "they were making disciples." A person is not a disciple the instant he is "saved" - if we can even pin point that exact moment for anyone in the first place. We can guess, but my study of Scripture often leads to different conclusions - even when there are extremely strong emotional experiences involved pointing to a particular time-frame.

Judas hung himself before making disciples of his own. The movie produces aren't discipling their viewers. The followers made from this people are not *because* of their efforts, but *in spite of*.

We are getting married next month

So ... you discipled a girl and now you are presumably excited to marry. And you're telling other guys this is a bad thing? Are you regretting finding a wife this way? If so, why not call it off? If you don't regret it and are glad you've built this relationship, why tell other guys not to go about finding a wife the way you did, which i believe is also the implied model of 1 Cor. 7?

Who should disciple women?

1 upvotes · 10 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

if they can't teach doctrine, they also can't teach application.

I see what you're saying, but I'm not sure I agree with your point. I'm not sure that any of the issues in Titus 2:3-5 are doctrinal in nature. He's not giving them a command to exegete the proper method of loving a husband or refraining from alcohol or why these things exist. It's simply a woman saying, "I've been married for some time now. Here's how I've loved my husband and helped him in the home. You do likewise." This requires no doctrine.

The woman could develop an unhealthy emotional attachment to him, become attracted, and begin following him not because he is teaching sound doctrine but because she is attracted.

And as long as he's clear about his intentions - what's the harm in this? Paul says, "Follow me as I follow Christ." Such a man would have a woman following him as he follows Christ. I'm not sure why her having romantic feelings for him somehow invalidates the fact that she's following Christ.

Someone says, "Because she's doing it for HIM and not for Jesus." That's a discernment for the disciple-maker to make, and if he decides this is somehow dangerous, he can cut it off at any point, right? Who says he must keep discipling her forever?

But the point of discipleship is to bear fruit. Is she bearing fruit for the Kingdom? Philippians 1:18 says, "But what does it matter? The important thing is that in every way, whether from false motives or true, Christ is preached. And because of this I rejoice." If she's not bearing fruit, there's no point in continuing to disciple her anyway.

Perhaps a man can disciple a woman in a more roundabout way. Compile a list of resources (solid teachers, books, sermon series, etc) and give them to the woman.

But that's not discipleship in the slightest - not even in a round-about way.

It may also be possible to do this in a group setting. A man teaches doctrine to a mixed group, and then they split into sex-segregated groups to discuss application.

This is still not discipleship.

I think the hangup people get about "men discipling women" is based on foolish notions from modern church culture that discipleship is some inherently deep, emotionally bonding relationship between two people. It can certainly become that, but it doesn't have to. I can disciple someone toward bearing fruit just fine without going into graphic detail about my past sins or crying on the floor together over some sorrow one of us has experienced.

I wrote in my 208 post a very basic outline of Jesus' discipleship method:

1. Tell someone how they ought to live.
2. Show them how by doing it in front of them.
3. Let them try it in front of you.
4. Encourage them to keep doing it when you're not around.
5. Show them how to teach the same thing to someone else.

I just don't understand where this pattern automatically translates to sexual temptation and intimate relational bonding. "OMG! He just explained the difference between spiritual baptism and water baptism. My panties are getting so wet right now, and not from the baptism!"

Who should disciple women?

1 upvotes · 10 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Fair enough. To that end:

- Priscilla AND Aquila instructed Apollos. There's no evidence that she was the one teaching doctrine.
- Mary worked hard. Junia was likely a dude. It also doesn't say he/she was actually an apostle (huge split on that subject). Also, no doctrinal teaching mentioned here.
- Deacons are servants, not doctrinal teachers.
- Lydia was a single woman with her own business. It doesn't say that she was prominent in the city or taught doctrine.
- Chloe was appropriately submitting to Paul's authority by seeking him to lead in the dispute at Corinth rather than trying to head it herself. There's no indication she was married or usurping her husband's authority or that she was teaching doctrine. Nympha's home was used to host a church, not that she was the one leading/teaching in it.

Yes, there are ways to interpret all of those passages that would imply women as doctrinal teachers. But there are also several ways to read those passages that remain consistent with the rest of the Bible. Which way is more likely true: the interpretation that's consistent with other Scripture, or the one that would imply all these women were breaking God's law, yet somehow still revered?

It's not like Paul said, "I do not permit a woman to teach or be in authority over a man ... except for the ones I like and send greetings to."

Experienced RP Newly Returned to Christianity

1 upvotes · 10 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

If you want to get technical, when Jesus says "but for *sexual immorality*" in his bit on divorce, the Greek word he uses is *porneia*, which was the broadest word in the Greek language at the time to encompass all forms of sexual sin - including denying a husband his conjugal rights. This was a form of sexual sin.

That said, on a theological level I believe this technicality lends itself to the wrong conclusion and that Jesus isn't trying to expand the scope of when people are allowed to get divorced; rather the entire context of that passage is Jesus showing them that more things are sinful than they ever realized. So, it's unlikely that Jesus was creating new law to let men divorce their frigid wives - just as all those pastors are wrong who preach that this verse gives women cause to divorce their husbands because of their porn problem. Jesus was not trying to give all women an excuse to get out of a bad marriage because virtually every guy has lusted and/or beat off at some point, nor was he trying to give every man an out because he has been denied at some point.

Now, that aside, I'm more interested in the fact that you're asking about technicalities of sin in the first place. I have this spiel I usually go through when someone asks, "Is ____ a sin?" I'm tired, so here's the short version.

Whatever "____" is, suppose I could look through God's law and find a justification for why it's not sin. A legitimate justification and not some hocus pocus word-play. In doing so, you have just looked to the law to justify your behavior. But when you submit to the law at one point, you submit to it at every point. You cannot say, "I didn't commit adultery, so I'm good!" and claim to be a law-follower while you're a closer serial killer. As James 2:11 says, "If you do not commit adultery but do commit murder, you have become a lawbreaker."

James 4:17 also notes: "If anyone knows the good he ought to do and doesn't do it, for him it is sin." Jesus told you to "make disciples of all nations" in Matthew 28:19-20. That's a good. Are you doing it? If not, then the question of whether the Bible justifies leaving your wife in some circumstance or the other means very little because even if you obey that command, if you're not obeying the command to make disciples, your other obedience becomes moot. You're still a law breaker all the same.

To put it more simply: if you look to the law to justify you at any point, you must also let it condemn you in every other point where you have not met its standard. That's an impossible standard to meet. I'd rather be judged by grace through Christ than by the law. So, I no longer look to the law to vindicate me in things I want to do; rather, I live for Christ, letting my faith prompt my actions and guide my decisions (Romans 14:23), looking little to the technicalities of whether something may or may not be sin, as nothing is inherently sinful anyway (Romans 14:14).

Now for the RP part. Is there a fundamental disconnect between the RP concept of nexting a frigid wife and the apparent biblical compulsion to keep one's wife around?

First, we have to remember that RP is about maximizing a person's sexual gratification, not his eternal well-being. The goals are a bit different. In the sidebar I wrote a post about "defining the red pill for Christians" and noted that the secular RP guys have certainly mastered the art of maximizing sexuality - but that as Christians we have higher goals than our sexuality alone. I'm confident that I could have more exciting sex by hopping from hookup to hookup than by maintaining a monogamous marriage, but that's not my real goal in life. So, does RP demand that sex be a man's highest goal, or is RP about helping men accomplish their own goals, whatever they may be? There's a split even in the secular community on this point, so I won't pretend to answer that here - only that the "next your wife at the first sign of frigidity" is advice purely for those guys whose goals aren't going to be compromised by taking that advice.

Second, the starting point to any question on marriage and relationship advice is: *What does Jesus model for us in*

his marriage to the church? I've often said that physical reproduction is parallel to spiritual reproduction. Is there any time that Jesus says "next" to a believer who won't reproduce with him? Luke 13 holds that answer. Jesus tells the parable of the fig tree. The master goes to get a fig off of it. The tree is alive. The master has every reason to believe there should be a fig on the tree. Yet there are no figs. Master's conclusion? "Cut it down!" The gardener says, "Give me one year to water and fertilize it and help it grow fruit. If it still doesn't bear fruit, then go ahead and cut it down." The fruit being referenced are the disciples we produce in our lives, just as the parable of the sower makes it clear that when the Gospel springs up in us the fruit is what causes us to "yield a crop 30, 60, or even 100 times what was sown." Are you seeing 30, 60 or even 100 people coming to Christ because of your life? Back on point: if you're not engaging in evangelism (i.e. spiritual sex) with your groom, he cuts you off. Does this mean a man can cut off his frigid wife who isn't engaging in physical sex with him? In doing so, he certainly still reflects the image of Christ to the world. In fact, to keep her around would be to confuse the world as if the parable of the fig tree (and many other such passages) didn't exist. It would communicate a false image of Jesus to the world - an image that is so lovey-dove that he never draws a line in the sand. Funny that the passage about Jesus drawing a literal line in the sand is one that modern scholars like to say may not have actually been true (see the footnote in virtually every translation of that passage).

Now let me be clear: I'm not using that as an excuse to say it's okay to leave your wife on a whim. You still have to account for 2 Timothy 2, which says, "If we disown him, he will disown us. But if we are faithless, he remains faithful." I'm not going to dive into balancing these concepts. I just want to put them out there to prompt your curiosity so that you'll engage with the Scriptures on your own to start looking into these things. These questions should give you a passion for God's Word and a renewed excitement every time you reach your conclusion - and don't let anyone else do all the work for you because most of the spiritual maturity growth happens not from learning a new answer, but from the time spent in God's Word alongside him.

Third, go ask around MRP and see if any of the endorsed people there recommend nexting a wife the instant she seems sexually disinterested. Of course not. They're going to advocate for keeping your options open, but to use your wife like a practice dummy or sparring partner. You train your skills in verbal discourse on her to prepare you for the world of women out there. And in the process, many men on MRP find that ... waddayaknow: RP actually works and their wives are suddenly with the program and there's no longer any real imperative to next them anyway. I remember the mods boasting in response to a critic at one point that only one of the mods/ECs was divorced after becoming red pill. This is a clear testament that the "is willing to next his wife" is more about the willingness than actually doing it. You can't fake the mentality, but the real deal (which I came to terms with myself) is itself what makes its own imperative moot because that mentality is one of the most attractive things to a wife in the first place. It's also one of the most attractive things about our God - that he is so glorious that if we didn't worship him, the rocks would cry out in our place. The fact that he doesn't need us is all the more alluring to the reality that he chooses to use us anyway.

You don't need your wife, and mine knows it. But the fact that I choose and prefer to accomplish my goals through her than directly on my own shows value. If I needed her, I might not value her because having her in my life is a compulsion rather than a choice - and having a woman who adds value to your life is certainly even MRP grounds for keeping her around. Jesus could post the message of his Gospel in the sky for all to see, so he really doesn't need the church. But he prefers to work through his bride anyway. He doesn't need us, but he does value us anyway.

Enough tangents. Hopefully this clears some things up.

Based on what I know of red pill thought it seems like this sub recommending marriage over living as Paul did being single is illogical.

1 upvotes · 10 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

you claim women would be abandoning their faith if they became head of household, but that's exactly what

effectively happens when they get a man to sign the worldly legal contract

Imagine a king on his throne. He holds no weapons. The general of his armies comes with an axe across his back, a sword sheathed to his belt, and a dagger in each boot. He asks the king, "Where should I attack next?"

Who is the ruler in this scenario? The one making the plans and delegating responsibilities or the one with the weapons? The fact that the general *could* overthrow the king if he wanted (because of his superior weaponry) doesn't change the fact of who is actually exercising authority in that situation.

But what you don't realize is that a proper understanding of hypergamy is actually an even bigger weapon that men have in their arsenal than divorce is for the woman's arsenal. As a divorce lawyer who has written much of the MRP sidebar content on the subject, I can say quite definitively that divorce is a relatively small threat to a man who knows what he's doing with his life.

To that end, your entire line of thinking is faulty because you give way too much emphasis to the divorce threat, like you're some scarey cat, and you give no credit or even an indication of understanding to the power that hypergamy gives to a man who knows how to wield it properly. I still don't encourage men to marry, and there are a wide variety of reasons for that. But "you'll get divorce raped" is a low reason on that list if the guy's willing to take even basic advice on relationships and life planning.

It's why women almost never "date down" and that the number of men who actually "win" in divorce is very low

I'm not sure how you see these things as related. Most men who lose in divorce courts are idiots. It's that simple.

Yet you claim the fix to men avoiding divorce rape is to marry a woman that would have the most direct authority over resources due to being the one earning more

You're definitely misunderstanding something I've said. It's also further evidence of your misunderstanding of hypergamy if you believe that it is entirely decided by whether a woman has a higher income than a man or vice versa.

My point is that I believe Christians should avoid partaking in a system that will do more to tempt them with sin than actually grow in faith

Right. Which is why we encourage men to avoid marriage if at all possible, just as Jesus did in Matthew 19 and Paul did in 1 Cor. 7. And yet they both (Jesus, at the very least) seemed to have a clear understanding that only a few people would actually be able to live up to this.

I don't see a red pill man being able to avoid being controlled in a prolonged relationship as pair bonding often makes men submissive even when they know this stuff

HAHA! That's hysterical. I assume this is simply because you are not a red pill man - and it seems you are more interested in the MGTOW agenda than the RPC agenda. So, at this point I'm going to assume you're just a troll and stop reading.

Who should disciple women?

1 upvotes · 10 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I think most men would be uneasy with their wives having one-on-one sessions with an attractive male "spiritual mentor"

Right. But note that I didn't leave room for a married woman to be discipled by a man other than her husband ;)

and wives wouldn't be too pleased with husbands having a Bible study with the attractive divorcee down the street!

True, but how much of that is simply a frame issue versus an actual biblical problem? Note that I'm primarily looking for biblical responses. I can, as you have done, give a laundry list of reasons why it doesn't make human sense. But I can also make a laundry list of reasons why it would be unwise and idiotic for Jesus to trust humans to get his Gospel into the nations rather than posting it in the sky ... yet God's Way is God's Way.

relationship begins but doesn't work out for some reason, and the mentee's spiritual growth is derailed in the process

I've heard you mention this before, and I'm pretty sure I get what you're saying. But let's elaborate on this point - because my gut reaction is to say:

- If the person doing the discipling isn't mature, he's not ready to disciple single women in the first place.
- If the person doing the discipling is mature, he's going to be clear and up-front about his boundaries in the first place.

So, if she gets hung up on the possibility of a romantic relationship, that's on her and not the discipler. That would be her blaming God for her own misinterpretation, right? Or how else would this play out that I'm not seeing?

To be clear, I'm not as interested in situations where the disciple walks away. Even in same-gender discipleship, I see disciples walk away all the time. I've walked out on someone. I've also had several guys walk out on me. It happens.

But as disciple-makers, it's our job to make disciples, not to avoid every possible thing that could keep someone from walking away, right? We make disciples from Christ's frame, not to please the person we want to reach.

It isn't hard to see how this runs contrary to a romantic relationship

To what culture currently says of romantic relationships, sure. But one of the first tenets of relationships we learn in RP circles is also the very first thing taught every time we preach the Gospel: OYS. We don't get Jesus to marry us by trying to impress him, but by confessing to him. Shouldn't we model this in our earthly relationships so that this is also the context in which human marriages are formed?

A person simply can't do both at once

Now, if you're saying this is impossible, I'm going to need more backing there. I agree that it's counter-intuitive for people to try to build a romance by being vulnerable and showing weakness ... but I've also seen this happen countless times - especially if the person can own their weakness, just as Paul says in 2 Cor. 12, "I will boast all the more gladly about my weaknesses. For when I am weak, Christ is strong."

For the same-sex-attracted, I suppose this may mean going with an opposite-sex mentor!

Now that's an interesting point! I'd be curious to explore that at some point.

Who should disciple women?

1 upvotes · 10 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I believe that's the exact question I'm asking ;)

Who should disciple women?

1 upvotes · 9 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Are there enough priests in the world to teach every woman in the world?

This also seems to deny the concepts from Hebrews and 1 Peter that we are a kingdom of priests - not just a few who go religious schools (which didn't exist in the early church), but all of us are meant to hold the office of priests to the world.

While I agree that priests should do this, it seems an unfeasible model if the priesthood is limited to only those who wear a collar.

Who should disciple women?

1 upvotes · 9 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Sure ... I don't think anyone here disagrees with that, and I'd wager most mainstream congregations would agree with this too. But this is a different issue from what I'm asking.

Who should disciple women?

1 upvotes · 9 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

What if they don't have questions? What if they're generally uninterested in growth? Should no one reach out to them?

In defense of the missionary position

1 upvotes · 8 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

There has never actually been a documented female-led culture

Governmentally that may be true. But I wouldn't say as much on a cultural level. America today is a female-led culture, mix-gender led government. There are countless scholarly works that attempt to show that Israel was both a matriarchal and patriarchal society simultaneously ([such as this one](#)) - not that this is by God's law, but how their culture organized itself anyway. When my dad was in seminary he was taught that God deemed Israel to be a patriarchal society, but that it was actually dominated by matriarchal influences in rebellion against God and that female influence was at the core of most major developments in Israel's history outside God's direct decrees (ex. God calling Abraham to leave Ur and move to Canaan, which was God's choice, not Sarah's).

Stories about women like Esther and Deborah and Ruth/Naomi further validate the way that men in those societies were culturally influenced by the women around them, constantly living in their frame. You'll notice the way those books are written to tip toe around the fact that these women really shouldn't have been doing this stuff, but God was going to use it to serve his purposes anyway.

- Esther clearly understands that she shouldn't be telling her king what to do, but if the King was going to reject God's people and let them be killed and no man was going to step up to save them, then what else is a woman to do?
- In one of Israel's lowest moments and without proper equipment for an oncoming war, Deborah recognizes that the man, Barak, should lead, but he refuses unless she leads at his side. She shames him for this saying that a woman (either herself or Jael) would get the credit for his victory because of his weakness.
- Ruth and Naomi are often preached in the church as shining examples of strong women who had a purpose

and that God used them - outsiders to Israel - for such a great function that he rewarded them with Jesus being born from their line. What, exactly, did they do that was so praise-worthy? Nothing, really. They didn't save Israel from a major battle. They didn't speak up against a king. They plotted to seduce an old man. So while the story may be about the women, the context is their efforts to respect and revere Boaz's position and that he was the ultimate decision-maker over whether or not to be a kinsman redeemer over Ruth.

So, was Boaz influenced by Ruth or was she submitting to his authority as a man when she slept at his feet? Was Esther influencing Xerxes or fearful of what it would mean if he found her behavior wasn't respectful enough of his authority? Was Deborah actively taking charge over Israel or simply filling in a void because the men weren't willing to lead without a woman telling them what to do? Can't we interpret from her words that she would have preferred Barak to take charge and get the credit?

I don't really know where I'm going with this other than to say that there certainly are arguments that cultural matriarchies existed - even to the point of Israel being governmentally led by Deborah for a time - but that this is still never God's plan anyway, and even the women who influenced their men knew that in the broader scheme (their individual circumstances notwithstanding), they were working against the grain of God's intent and were only vindicated in what they were doing because of unique and abnormal circumstances.

Based on what I know of red pill thought it seems like this sub recommending marriage over living as Paul did being single is illogical.

1 upvotes · 8 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Indeed, I can easily see the MGTOWs being the insurgents to start the next era of political revolution by force. I'm more just shocked to see you encouraging marriage at all.

I hope this guy can get some advice from this sub

1 upvotes · 7 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

In that case, it'll be eternity before the book holds any relevance, so you might as well wait eternity anyway ;)

OYS - Where Progress is Made (06/05/19)

1 upvotes · 7 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

This is an encouraging comment to read, brother. I don't comment on the OYS threads as long as I'd like - and haven't been on reddit much in the past few weeks anyway due to a lot of life circumstances. But I did appreciate reading your update here and the dedication you give to consistent OYS posts. Keep up the good work.

I have a problem with either ... (c) thinking about what I'm going to say next

I used to struggle with that. I found for most people this stems from one of two things:

- First, it could be because you want to sound brilliant (or at least competent), so you pick one thing to reply to that makes you look interested or interesting. This is usually an ego thing. Kill the ego, fix the conversation. If you look like a fool to someone else, that's just another opportunity to practice frame. In the meantime, you're also practicing thinking on your feet rather than engaging in a rolling premeditated conversation.
- The other reason could be because you're uncomfortable with silence. Everyone has a different silence threshold. Either they don't like the silence themselves or they're afraid that other people around them will think less of them for not breaking the silence. This is heightened in a 2-person conversation when they're done talking and you don't say anything, making it clear that you're the cause of the silence. Learn to increase your silence threshold - the amount of time that you're comfortable with before feeling compelled to speak - and this problem often goes away. I used to have a silence threshold of about 1.5 seconds. Now I'm near

infinite. This makes a huge difference in conversational skills and can also be a highly effective power-play conversational technique. It's also STFU 101.

Hope this helps.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (06/05/19)

1 upvotes · 7 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I encourage her to continue to cum again. She often complains of pain or the wetness making her itchy, basically significant arousal drop. I try all DEVI and nothing raises arousal. I guess it's attraction.
#justKeepWorkingTheMap

I assume you're talking about multiples here. Some women are inclined toward it and others aren't. I've heard of some who can do one right after the next, but other women who get so sensitive that they need at least 30 minutes for their bits and pieces to cool down before they can go again.

I've heard that the most effective strategy for moving toward multiples is letting the first be external then shifting to internal so the outside can get a break. But trying to force it through overt acts of dominance when she's not mentally on board with it can be tough. She has to want it if it's going to happen. You telling her to want it isn't going to be any more effective than telling her to be more attracted to you.

As for internals, this is something that my wife and I are starting to experiment with more, as she believed she was incapable for years. It's often blogged that some women simply can't have internal orgasms - and I'm becoming more and more confident that this simply isn't true, as I had bought into that about my wife for almost a decade before realizing I was wrong. My guess is that most of the people who write that simply haven't had good enough sex to get them there. There's a lot of techniques for stimulating internal orgasms, and that's certainly the most effective way I've seen of moving into multiples, but that's a much longer conversation.

All of that aside, it doesn't sound like this is her not being attracted to you; it's probably more a mental block in herself or a physical sensitivity issue. However, if you're talking about her not being able to have a first orgasm - that's probably an attraction issue.

I hope this guy can get some advice from this sub

1 upvotes · 7 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

There are better things to read for a single guy. Wait until you're in a relationship then go at it.

RooshV Forum is now essentially a larger alternative Red Pill Christian forum...

1 upvotes · 7 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I like this. This is close to a house church model, but with one crucial difference:

Once a church exceeds the 20, one of the people in that group who is considered a good leader goes out and starts a new church home

The traditional house-church model falters because it is still a "come to me until my thing is so large that we must split." This model isn't about splitting - it's about raising up a leader and sending. That's good stuff.

In a model like this, I would also encourage setting duration limits on how long a "house church" will continue to meet. Some people will never take up the mantle of making another disciple because they're content to spend their entire lives being participants - someone else's disciple. Jesus trained the 12 with the up-front calling: "If you follow me, you'll be fishing for men yourself by the time I'm done with you." He knew going in that it'd be a short-term endeavor - that after 3 years he'd leave and they'd scatter and not stay clustered. They were never to

invite the 12 until it became 24 and then 50 so they could divide out. Their group was always intended to separate so a new wave of leaders could be raised.

The standard house-church model of "grow, grow, grow, then give half of your people to one other leader" is still focused on using the few - the 20% in the pareto principle - to reach the many - the 80%. The model of "train, train, train, then we end our training group and start up a new generation" is closer to what Jesus did.

Good stuff, brother. I'll have to check out Letters to the Church. What you're describing seems very similar to the Underground Church model with some tweaks both good and bad.

RooshV Forum is now essentially a larger alternative Red Pill Christian forum...

1 upvotes · 7 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Haha, touche.

RooshV Forum is now essentially a larger alternative Red Pill Christian forum...

1 upvotes · 5 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Thanks for the reply. What's Francis Chan's model? I've always been a fan of his messages, but didn't know what he was doing in the grander scheme.

I lied to make myself look good, and potentially hurt a good friend/disciple in the process. Could use some advise.

1 upvotes · 4 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I'm not a "wonderful person"

That's the start of the Gospel, my friend. Recognizing that you're imperfect and need a savior in the first place. As Paul says, "I will boast all the more gladly about my weaknesses" - because our weakness proves God's grace and strength.

What do you guys think?

Apart from telling the truth to the guys, it really just depends on what you want to do.

What value is this girl adding to your life other than feelz? Is she a competent disciple-maker who can help you reach countless women that you'll never disciple but she can? Go for it. Is it just that you want to have sex with her and that's about it? You can easily find another girl you'll want to have sex with who also adds value to your life and mission in different ways.

Don't get hung up on feeling like you have any further obligation to her than to clear her name. What you do with the relationship from there is entirely up to what you want to get out of it.

I lied to make myself look good, and potentially hurt a good friend/disciple in the process. Could use some advise.

1 upvotes · 4 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

The fact that you keep calling it a church is amusing ;)

I lied to make myself look good, and potentially hurt a good friend/disciple in the process. Could use some advise.

1 upvotes · 4 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

That's the first thing that crossed my mind too.

I hope this guy can get some advice from this sub

1 upvotes · 4 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Have you read *Married Man Sex Life Primer*? Outside the Bible, it's the single best book I've ever read on marriage. While the author is a non-Christian, I found myself questioning consistently through the book if I was wrong about that because what he, as a secular person, has discovered from observing the ins and outs of functional marriages is so closely aligned with what the Bible says already.

He has a section in that book entirely devoted to the "I love you, but I'm not in love with you" speech and why it creeps up and how to handle it. As with all things, filter out the bad that comes with a non-Christian book, but do take the good.

While I don't know much of your specific situation, I've written most of the sidebar here (much of which does need significant revamping) and would be happy to help ... I'm just a bit late to the party. But MMSLP is going to be the place to start, unless you're already fluent with how to interpret the parallels between the Christ/church relationship and your marriage (which it sounds as if that isn't the case, given the situation you're in).

RooshV Forum is now essentially a larger alternative Red Pill Christian forum...

1 upvotes · 4 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Good stuff.

his frame had been about extracting things ... Jesus frame was about giving

This reminds me a lot of the stuff I've been harping on lately in regard to a decentralized church structure. [u/ruizbuja](#) has taught me a lot about this and made a comment [over here](#) that went more into detail, the most relevant part being:

This is why people are drained and don't feel filled attending ~~church~~ Sunday service. Because the ~~pastor~~ congregation leader is more interested in getting their money, getting their time, getting their energy, getting their skills, etc. - draining them of all of these things to serve the ~~church~~ congregation members who don't want to contribute, or maybe a few people in the community (hoping that a small fraction will start showing up on Sunday). Jesus was more interested in giving his time, giving his energy, giving his skills, giving his followers to the world. And these people changed that world.

When was the last time you ever heard of a ~~pastor~~ congregation leader who came across a spiritually mature person in his church and said, "You look like you could do great things for God's Kingdom. Let me share with you what God's given me, then I want you to leave my church and do the same with others"? How often do you see a ~~pastor~~ congregation leader find such a person and say, "I'm so glad you're here. You'd be a great fit to spend your time in this ministry we've got going. We could really use your skills on this project. Your financial contribution could really help with this need." Drain, drain, drain.

Those of us involved in the weekly RPC video conference/bible study have been talking about this for a few months now. If you have any thoughts on how to contribute to shifting churchianity structure to a giving/sending approach rather than a draining/keeping approach, share away!

Fiance withholding information about rape

1 upvotes · 4 June 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Good example.

Fiance withholding information about rape

1 upvotes · 31 May 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I had the same question.

On Sodomy by bonald

1 upvotes · 21 May 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I'm so confused.

New to the Forum, seeking insight

1 upvotes · 13 May 2019 · /r/RPChristians

If you don't have anything better to do, withdrawing time and attention doesn't actually work. The point of doing this is to communicate, "I have better things to do than spend time with you right now." If you don't have better things to do, it comes off as: "I'm mad and don't want to spend time with you right now." This is butthurt and is unattractive. A man with more important things going on is attractive. Getting the attention of such a man is valuable. Making a difference for eternity is the most valuable and important thing. Start there before going Rambo on any other course of conduct.

New to the Forum, seeking insight

1 upvotes · 11 May 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Lots and lots and lots to get in here - but before I waste time on an uninformed response:

1. How much of the sidebar here have you read? and
2. What is your mission?

This second question is the most vital to your situation - and the fact that it's not mentioned is very telling.

I swear, not lifting must be a sin

1 upvotes · 11 May 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Haha

I swear, not lifting must be a sin

1 upvotes · 11 May 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I know, brother. All the muscle it took to break that bread in half.

Women Feeling Threatened by Hyper-Sexualized Social Media

1 upvotes · 30 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

See my reply to your other comment.

Get Woke - Go Broke...

1 upvotes · 25 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

'The way the world responded (to the man tax) showed us how fragile masculinity is and solidified the necessity for us to confront and dismantle patriarchy,' the post said.

Wait ... who was the one whose ideals ended up broken here? I'm pretty sure masculinity still exists (in some form) and the shop that tried to fight it is the one that was fragile and broke.

App Review: BodBot - Two Thumbs Up

1 upvotes · 22 April 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

To be fair, by their picture you do get to brace your feet on a ledge, which takes some of the weight off. Personally, I walk my feet up an empty wall for balance.

Raiders of the Lost Covenant

1 upvotes · 22 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Correct.

Raiders of the Lost Covenant

1 upvotes · 22 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Trusts and whatnot can remedy this - not that I'm trying to persuade you of anything; just noting that there are options.

Ruined a relationship with female disciple

1 upvotes · 21 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Agreed to disagree, then. If they're just playing God, sure. But if they're both mature I've seen these types of separations work out just fine.

Ruined a relationship with female disciple

1 upvotes · 21 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Right, if the intent is to keep it platonic this makes perfect sense. But if he's attracted and wants to start a romantic relationship intentionally, there's no harm here.

Post cut rebulking

1 upvotes · 19 April 2019 · /r/askMRP

That's quite exciting and motivating.

Post cut rebulking

1 upvotes · 19 April 2019 · /r/askMRP

I lift au naturale, other than the occasional protein shake. Probably need to step those up a bit more too.

Post cut rebulking

1 upvotes · 19 April 2019 · /r/askMRP

Very helpful reply. Thanks. I noticed that after the first 2 weeks my ORM did go up from 290 to 295. But yes, I do see some tapering several weeks later, as 275 for 5 reps never used to be an issue before. I'll definitely work at beating the psychological game in this.

Post cut rebulking

1 upvotes · 19 April 2019 · /r/askMRP

Good to know what to expect. Thanks!

Are Christian women really different?

1 upvotes · 15 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I've seen this phenomenon since long before my red pill days. It's sad, but as you say: distressingly common.

Biblical marriage vows

1 upvotes · 11 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Third point was about a spiritual family and leave a spiritual lineage of children - not a physical one. Otherwise, good stuff here!

Discussion: Is it okay to masturbate to thoughts of your wife?

1 upvotes · 10 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Let's play a thought experiment. Can you find any verse that says masturbation or lust is sin? If not, why would we assume it's sin? No assumptions here - just questions for the sake of thinking.

What to do about boundaries being crossed?

1 upvotes · 8 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

True.

I'm a f@ggot.

1 upvotes · 8 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

exhasperating to have people think it's just in my head

This is the problem. Why do you care so much about what /u/egc6 or any other user here thinks? Whether your stories are true or not, there's a difference between getting a girl on the hook and keeping her by your side. Let's assume you do get her on the hook and you reel her in. This incessant DEERING and validation-seeking is going to cause her to run for the hills as soon as it creeps up. And if you can't bump elbows with other guys without getting butthurt, your prospects at avoiding butthurt with a prospective wife are very low.

At the end of the day, you can pull women, but you're making the choice to stay chaste until marriage. This means you're in a great spot, at least as far as starting relationships. From there, if your mission would be advanced by having a girl at your side, start inviting some of these attractive girls to join you. As you get to know them, if the temptation for sex gets too great, ask one of them to marry you. Beyond that, I'm not sure what else you're really looking for here, other than for a bunch of guys to pat you on the back for doing what you already should be doing anyway: staying chaste despite temptation. I haven't murdered anyone in my lifetime. Do I get a pat on the back too?

Discussion: Is it okay to masturbate to thoughts of your wife?

1 upvotes · 7 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Yeah, it seems like you missed the context of this post.

Discussion: Is it okay to masturbate to thoughts of your wife?

1 upvotes · 6 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Yeah, I don't see anything wrong with that.

Discussion: Is it okay to masturbate to thoughts of your wife?

1 upvotes · 6 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

True, but that's not masturbating to thoughts of your wife - it's masturbating to a live stream of her over the phone or video chat. The context is a bit different, but your point is well taken.

Masturbation when your wife withholds: Go, or no-go?

1 upvotes · 6 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

True. But proper tact in our communication can be effective in helping others receive the gospel through us.

Masturbation when your wife withholds: Go, or no-go?

1 upvotes · 6 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Sadly, those outside of RP circles would never understand the theology behind this and would assume it's degrading toward women. Yet people have no problem saying when a man has Adam's spirit - one defined by passivity ... or when women say, "what a typical man" as if that's not insulting.

Discussion: Is it okay to masturbate to thoughts of your wife?

1 upvotes · 6 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Definitely not looking for a green light. I have no need or imperative to this right now. But I can remember days when I did. This post was more prompted to separate out the rote theological discussion from the more directed advice in the original post by icy.

Masturbation when your wife withholds: Go, or no-go?

1 upvotes · 6 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Yeah, I'd definitely argue against racism being a new phenomenon, but that's beside the point.

Female rebellion is inherent in everyone who hasn't received a new heart from God, right? I mean, it's literally right there in the curse at the start of the bible. So why wait until Jezebel to name it? Why not just call it: "She has a woman's Spirit. AWALT."?

Masturbation when your wife withholds: Go, or no-go?

1 upvotes · 5 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

A couple questions to clarify:

1. When you say "Jezebel spirit" are you referencing an actual demonic spirit (of a particular type/specialization) with its own independent sentient thought, or character attributes in a woman that are similar to Jezebel's characteristics?
2. What do you mean by "even a little bit"? Either you have a spirit or you don't. It's just a matter of how capable someone is of controlling the impulses of their inner spirit that would make it look like she has only a "little bit" of the spirit in them.

Just curious. Especially on the first point I've heard people argue both sides.

Masturbation when your wife withholds: Go, or no-go?

1 upvotes · 5 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Why do you feel you need toys?

Discussion: Is it okay to masturbate to thoughts of your wife?

1 upvotes · 5 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Can you make it 2 days without release?

Discussion: Is it okay to masturbate to thoughts of your wife?

1 upvotes · 5 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Makes sense - especially from a single perspective.

Masturbation when your wife withholds: Go, or no-go?

1 upvotes · 5 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Body fat and lifts? Those are going to be the biggest prerequisites to getting started.

Masturbation when your wife withholds: Go, or no-go?

1 upvotes · 5 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Ah ... so this is a frame issue. I was in that exact same mindset for years before I found the red pill and started understanding what Jesus actually modeled about sexuality.

I believed that the more pleasurable I made sex for my wife, the more she'd want it - maybe even crave it. That strategy straight up doesn't work.

Worrying about how she thinks or feels about sex is the definition of being in her frame. Caving to her frame is highly unattractive.

I still love giving my wife orgasms - but not for her sake. It's because he orgasms turn me on like crazy. My frame. Totally different reason for trying to please her that results in an attitude she can respect and is attractive.

Discussion: Is it okay to masturbate to thoughts of your wife?

1 upvotes · 5 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

The faith question is probably better worded through a statement.

- Because I believe that Jesus is the son of God and that he died and rose to save me from my sin and build his kingdom through generations of spiritual disciples following from my life, I get the impression that I should masturbate to thoughts of my wife to help me accomplish this goal.

Is this how your heart is processing the situation? If so, how do you biblically rationalize that conclusion?

I can say this about watching TV or cooking tacos for dinner. But can you say it about this?

Discussion: Is it okay to masturbate to thoughts of your wife?

1 upvotes · 5 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Affection and reproductive climax are very different. Isaiah refers to God as Israel's husband, but his feelings toward Israel are not indicative of a spiritual sexual/reproductive relationship. That would come in the form of whether or not God actually reproduced through Israel.

Jacking off is also more tied to reproductive efforts that you know will not result in reproduction and without a wife. Does God ever try to create new spiritual life in a person: (1) Without using his people (bride) as the vehicle, and (2) without any actual intent to succeed?

I might be able to think of a rare example or two if I try for a while, but none come to mind off the top of my head.

Masturbation when your wife withholds: Go, or no-go?

1 upvotes · 5 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

threatened divorce and told her that her lack of sexuality was going to drive me to find someone else

Not ideal, but still has dread value. I'm not worried about that bit, as far as you saying it. If only be concerned if you acted on it.

I compared her to women on the internet

There's the problem. Even this wouldn't have been as damaging from an attraction standpoint if you were comparing her to your hot coworker: "Why can't you wear leggings like her?" It's still coming from a place of sin, but again, has some dread value.

But there's nothing attractive about references to porn, as even the ugliest beta chumps could watch porn. No attraction value there. Even if you're talking about Facebook or Instagram, if it's not a girl actually in your sphere of influence, it's unattractive and won't instill dread.

and tried to push her to do things she didn't want to do.

That's not much of a problem. You went about it the wrong way, I'm sure. But you should constantly be pushing your wife's sexual boundaries.

Discussion: Is it okay to masturbate to thoughts of your wife?

1 upvotes · 5 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I don't think I took a position, so I don't have a thesis. Nevertheless, the same questions still apply:

- How is your faith the one causing you to do it?
- How does it glorify God?
- As [u/deep_strength](#) alluded, is it going to make you less interested in pursuing a healthy sex life with your wife because now you have an alternative that doesn't involve her?

That last question is interesting. If it's not problematic, what's to stop a guy from marrying the hottest girl possible regardless of how sexually disinterested she is, just so he can claim biblical immunity whenever he masturbates to thoughts of her? Theology can lead to weird applications like this.

Masturbation when your wife withholds: Go, or no-go?

1 upvotes · 5 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

She's using 5 months ago as a copout. Have you ever had sex since then in a way that she enjoyed?

Again, this is an attraction issue more than anything. 5 months ago you called her out on it, but in a way that simultaneously made her less attracted to you and gave her a good excuse not to have sex with you anymore. Become attractive and all this goes away.

Materialist Hypergamy in the Church

1 upvotes · 4 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Right on.

3 Year Girlfriend with Sexual Past

1 upvotes · 3 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Either you want help or you don't. Enough people on this sub have met me in real life to vouch for my authenticity - and I extend everything I do through this sub beyond my keyboard. How about you? Defiance and snark won't get you very far here.

Gentlemen, we should take more risks - We are god's people!

1 upvotes · 1 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Those are certainly good passages that could refer to authority in heaven. While I'm certainly open to the idea

that they're talking about heaven, here are some other interpretations:

- 2 Timothy 2:12 - The most common interpretation I've heard of "reign with him" is that we will be part of his "reigning kingdom," not that we will be reigning over that kingdom as its authorities. This is consistent with Matthew Henry's commentary, which interprets the phrase: "set down at the right hand of the throne of God." Gill's Exposition of the Entire Bible also notes on this phrase: "they reign with him now in the kingdom of grace; grace reigns in their hearts, where Christ, the King of glory, has entered, and has set up his throne, and where he dwells by faith, they being made kings and priests unto God by him; and they shall reign with him in his kingdom here on earth, for the space of a thousand years." The eternal component, to Gill, is that we are part of his glory in heaven - that it is his reign of which we are a part, not that we reign over anything on our own.
- Revelation 2:26-27 - Benson's Commentary interprets this: "That is, shall share with me when I do this." Barnes' Notes says, "The evident meaning of what is said here, and in the next verse, is, that in accordance with the uniform promise made to the redeemed in the New Testament, they would partake of the final triumph and glory of the Saviour, and be associated with him. It is not said that they would have exclusive power over the nations, or that they would hold offices of trust under him during a personal reign on the earth; but the meaning is, that they would be associated with him in his future glory." Gill says, "this power over them may be understood in a spiritual sense, through the preaching of the Gospel, which being attended with the power of God, is the means of converting sinners, and so of weakening the kingdom of Satan, and of antichrist; and which had its fulfilment, at least in part, at the time of the Reformation, and onward."
- 1 Cor. 6:2-3 - Ellicott's Commentary says, "we may take these words as referring primarily to the conquest of the world by Christianity, which has since been accomplished, though by slower and more spiritual processes than were then anticipated." Barnes says that the "true interpretation" (after listing multiple others) is that it refers to the believers on the Day of Judgment, sitting beside Christ, not that it must be a judgmental authority in heaven.

It looks to me like we will have literal authority in the next life

That's one legitimate interpretation, but not the one I see as most likely. Most passages that refer to judging and authority seem to be referring to judgment day, not positions in heaven.

This is also supported by the common-sense view that there will be no non-believers in heaven to judge. Moreover, if all believers are to be rulers over nations in heaven, who would be in those nations? Surely some must be subjects and not rulers, but the passages referenced seem to imply that every believer will be a ruler, and the conditions for who gets to be a ruler and who must be a subject in heaven are curiously absent. While I recognize that some people believe in different rewards in heaven based on earthly conduct, and can point to a select few passages that seem to imply this, which could be interpreted as the conditions as to who gets to be rulers as opposed to those who are subjects ... this is also a concept I've generally disagreed with, as I most often see the "rewards" we get described as the crowns of glory, which the leaders of the tribes in heaven throw at Jesus' feet. I can't imagine doing anything otherwise. After all, it is not me who does the good I do, but Christ working through me - so who else should get that reward but Christ? And if I get to keep my crown(s) of glory instead of throwing them at Christ's feet, does that mean I have authority over the heads of the tribes who gave their crowns to Jesus?

I want to know the criteria for being the good servant that brings forth fruit a hundred fold and gets to rule in the large matters in the next life

And that's just the thing - the fact that there is no such criteria makes it clear that one of two options must be true:

- There's no criteria because it's not a position that actually exists.
- There's no criteria because God doesn't want us to do things just to get the position - it must come from a more authentic place in our lives. So, even if there are different positions of authority we get in heaven (which still seems to undermine much of the unity of the body of Christ preached throughout the epistles), we're better off assuming they don't exist because this guarantees that our lives are authentic and that we're not doing something merely to reap a reward.

Is it more generally influencing others toward salvation and righteousness?

If by this you mean evangelism and discipleship, this is the exact mission that Jesus gave in the great commission. But instead of "generally influencing," I'd say we must be intentional and purposeful.

Specifically, based on my study of Jesus' life, I define his pattern of disciple-making as: *Intentional and purposeful relationships designed to produce spiritual generations of disciple-makers into the nations.*

Hopefully this helps some. Again, I recognize that my view is not the only one - that your view also has some merit. It's just not the way I see it.

Gentlemen, we should take more risks - We are god's people!

1 upvotes · 29 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I'd love to study this topic more. What verses are you thinking about? Off the top of my head I can only recall passages that talk about those things in the context of the church on earth.

Open Letter to a Christian Incel

1 upvotes · 28 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Cool. Phone, reddit chat, or through DMs?

How to proceed in my relationship in God honoring way?

1 upvotes · 28 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

my girlfriend has been having doubts the last week or so

Because she's not as attracted to you as she once was. This is usually either because you have been slipping in your own attractiveness qualities or because she found out she has the ability to pull a more attractive man.

She said that she hasn't felt close and connected to me ... neither of us have done anything wrong

Part of charm/charisma is addressing a woman's feels. While you may not be doing anything bad, if you're lacking doing the good things, that's also problematic. "Not bad" just feels stale and like she's settling.

she's been searching for a solution for us to stay together and her still be happy, but she can't find one

Right, because you can't negotiate desire or will-power attraction.

I asked her if any of the closeness and intimacy was real

I.e. "Please, I need your validation! Give it to me!"

she said she thought things would be different

Code for: "It turned out you're not as attractive as you seemed at first."

we agreed to continue dating for another month

Translation: "I agreed to remain exclusive to her while she's already checked out and won't feel much guilt looking around for a new man; and if she finds one, she just has to keep him on the hook for a month while still feeling like she's maintaining her integrity."

Sadly, I don't have any stats to go off of. So, while you ask:

I'm writing this post in hopes of advice, prayers and comfort

Advice - I can't give any if I don't know where you're at currently.

Prayers - What do you think the prayers will accomplish? That's a big question and you haven't addressed that.

Comfort - "Please, validate me because of this hard time I'm having."

I desperately want this to work

You've pedestalyzed her and the relationship, which is almost certainly a contributing factor to why she's disinterested.

Check out Rule 2 and post again.

Also, this version is getting removed for linking to another sub. Let's keep the discussion here, as many guys who may reply might not realize they're commenting on [/r/Christianmarriage](#) instead of here, which can cause some hassle. The approach to relationships between this place and that is vastly different. [/u/Deep_Strength](#) can go more into that.

To be clear: I do want you to re-post this. I just want you to do it as an RPC post and with the Rule 2 information. This could prompt some decent conversation :)

Open Letter to a Christian Incel

1 upvotes · 28 March 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

You're confusing the red pill and the black pill.

You're only born with your looks and your sin. Virtually everything else is learned behavior. Even your looks are a product of your choices - how much you exercise, diet, etc. The aspects of your looks that you're born with are, in most cases, not things that women actually care about - they're only the things women say they care about, like a man's eyes or his cheek bones. In reality, if you've got a 6-pack with bulging biceps, etc. and are also mindful of your facial hair grooming, head hair styling, the clothes you wear, etc. these are going to do more to attract a woman than your facial features. Even an ugly face won't disqualify a man from top-tier women if the other aspects of his SMV are on point. As I often say, looks make the game easier, but in the absence of clear deformities, even an inherently unattractive man can get the same quality of women as the one born with natural good looks.

As for sin, this is something Jesus can change.

In short, a man's propensity to attract women is certainly NOT something he's innately born with. The innate things he's born with simply determine how much work he's going to have to do in other areas of his life to make

up for those shortcomings, if there are any shortcomings at all. Some guys are overly self-conscious about themselves without justification.

Open Letter to a Christian Incel

1 upvotes · 28 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Specifically, how would one tell if a woman's attracted to your body vs money vs game

What does it matter? They're all components of attraction. If you have money, she'll be attracted to it. If you have a 6-pack, she'll be attracted to it. If you have charm, she'll be attracted to it. It's all of the above, not one or the other.

Some guys have this false impression, as I'm sure [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) would agree, that women should be attracted to you for a specific, right reason. "She should love me for my ___, not for my money/social status/body/whatever." Get that notion out of your head. That's trying to change women. You can't change them. Accept the fact that they're going to be attracted to you in different ways from how you want to be attractive to them.

How can a man stay on track with his faith while "seemingly" everyone around him is either lying/still BP

By being mission-minded. That's how you get to the top of the totem pole in the first place. Secular men make sexuality their mission. Ours is disciple-making. As long as your mission is something you're actually living out and succeeding at, you're making an impact that is attractive and precludes her from being pedestalized in your mind, which is half the battle. If there's no pedestalization, there's not much room for giving way to seduction - she may want you so bad that she'll tempt you with everything she has, but if you've got an iron-clad frame you won't have any problem holding course on your mission, which will only increase her desire for you. OZ has also written about this in his posts on the sidebar for singles.

Open Letter to a Christian Incel

1 upvotes · 28 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Love the post, especially the unique perspective. I hope the guy you're writing to is a real person and not a general concept.

Gentlemen, we should take more risks - We are god's people!

1 upvotes · 28 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Good question. It's a metaphor for discipleship. That's why the reward in the end is authority in God's Kingdom. He's not talking about heaven, but God's Kingdom on earth - the church. He's saying, "I've given you a Gospel and placed people in your life who need it. If you share the Gospel, multiply it in those people (a la Genesis 1:28, among others), and are faithful to discipling them so that your investment comes to fruition, then because you have been faithful with these few, I will give you even more responsibility in my kingdom - authorities over whole cities even."

OYS - Where Progress is Made (03/20/19)

1 upvotes · 21 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I'm excited for it!

OYS - Where Progress is Made (03/20/19)

1 upvotes · 21 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

trip to Florida

Gotcha. Still not a fan, but I'll let you do you ... or you do her, or whatever.

evangelism

Good stuff. Seems like we have similar views. Tracts, street preaching, outreach events, etc. pretty much never work. At best, they point people to a congregation, rarely to Jesus. I don't use the roman's road or similar gimmicks either. It's more a "follow me" approach. I care more about who they follow than what they know. If they follow me and I follow Christ, they're following Christ - and eventually I can walk out of the picture and they just keep going. That's discipleship.

Normally I try to keep \$1000 emergency fund

Yeah, that just doesn't seem like enough. I try to keep 6-7k, which might be overkill, but it gives a safe enough buffer. Up that stash.

I am working down some debt and paying that off instead of saving more.

This part I do understand. When I had enough to pay off my student loans, it brought us under \$1,000, but it was worth it to see that gone.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (03/20/19)

1 upvotes · 21 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

No sex in three weeks. I've still not initiated. Last week I was 100% cool with it, this week I'm more frustrated

Hmm ... hasn't initiated ... no sex ... frustrated. Huh? Yes, you definitely need to relearn how to initiate. Don't expect her to initiate.

I'm finding myself frustrated that I'm working hard to improve and she doesn't seem to care much/isn't along with me - as I'm writing, it's clear this is partially validation seeking on my part

Definitely validation-seeking in there. But what I'm really hearing is: **"COVERT CONTRACT! COVERT CONTRACT! COVERT CONTRACT!"**

After the massage it was pretty funny, she was happy and kept asking what I was thinking because I was really quiet

You're rubbing her body ... she asks, "What are you thinking?" ... and you're not connecting the dots? Come on, brother. You're smarter than this. She's trying to reward you for the massage. Now, she interprets this as you still being in her frame, but sex is sex. You're not trying to convince her you're not in her frame by ignoring her advances or turning her down. If you want sex, have sex with her, regardless of how she interprets the dynamic.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (03/20/19)

1 upvotes · 21 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

she burned in the tanning bed

Eek. She's gotta get off that. Don't let her tan. So, so, so bad for you. I've known at least 6 people who ended up

with skin cancer by age 30 due to tanning beds. I've never known someone under the age of 65 who had skin cancer who didn't use a tanning bed.

Evangelism: 7 Anytime, anywhere, ready to preach Christ crucified, raised from the dead, coming back, his promises, his authenticity, his Holy Spirit, his power, and his gifts.

Curious - 7 because of your readiness, or because of what you're actually doing?

Career/Finance: 3 Unexpected car repairs are coming up and I don't have the budget for them

I just did my break pads last night. Tried to do it myself, as I usually do, but this is the first time since I got this particular car and I couldn't get the wheels off, so I ended up paying a buddy of mine who has all the equipment. Also need to do get an entire set of new wheels on both of my vehicles ... going to add up.

Do you have an emergency stash saved up for things like this? That should be worked into your budget and should be at least 3 months of your living expenses (some recommend 6, though that's too much uninvested cash, if you ask me).

The submissive wife

1 upvotes · 20 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Good word. I like this!

Solving a Foundational Problem on This Sub: Enabling Closet Bloops

1 upvotes · 15 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Yes, absolutely correct :)

Solving a Foundational Problem on This Sub: Enabling Closet Bloops

1 upvotes · 15 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Following Jesus is not a mission. It's a method. The great commission is the mission Jesus gave us. Following his life example reveals how we ought to do this. This is all over the sidebar, so I don't think more clarity is needed here.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (03/13/19)

1 upvotes · 14 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Glad to help, brother.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (03/13/19)

1 upvotes · 14 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Oh, I'm not concerned about them finding people - I'm concerned about not being able to use them to help me. If everyone were local I'd delegate some of the new guys in need to other guys I've discipled so I'm not doing it all myself.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (03/13/19)

1 upvotes · 13 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Good stuff, brother. I'm glad to read this.

YouTube Channels I've Watched/Follow

You've got a lot of stuff on your list here and if I correlate the amount of time you're spending listening to other people's thoughts on following God and managing relationships with the indicator you give of Bible study (i.e. learning from what God has to say directly to you through His Word), I'm a little confused. That number should not be right in the middle like that - at least not for long. I believe in one of the first couple 300 posts I talk about how the numbers should be either very high or very low, depending on what season you're in and how God is trying to connect with you. I'd wager this number should really be higher right now, but that you're placating it through hearing other people's thoughts rather than engaging with God in a critical, in-depth capacity yourself.

Just a thought. Evaluate on your own and decide for yourself.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (03/13/19)

1 upvotes · 13 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

PHYSICALLY: Cutting sucks. I can feel my lifts starting to fall off. I've been cutting for 2 weeks now and made some progress, and while my lifts are still at the same levels as earlier, I've had to compromise my form a bit to do it - not cool. Going to have to drop a bit until I'm done cutting. Hopefully not too much.

MENTALLY: Top of my game. I'm engaging socially with new people, doing well in my career - last few checks have been good ones (though the pipeline indicates a tapering soon, unless some of the initial consults we've had call in soon), and I feel with-it.

SPIRITUALLY: While I feel things are in a great place, I can see coming up soon that I'm going to be overwhelmed if I don't start delegating. The problem is that some of the guys I disciple aren't local to me, so I can't really tell a guy I'm discipling in Kansas to begin discipling someone new in my church who lives down the street from me. The guys I disciple locally don't have pre-established relationships with some of the new people I'm coming across like I do - my fault for not fostering that sense of community, as I should have started connecting guys more readily. The one guy who I could delegate to doesn't go to my church and he's already capping out on his capacity anyway. Long story short, I need to start fostering relationships not only between myself and others, but also among the others themselves. I need to start building a community that's focused on helping other people connect with each other so that these discipleship relationships can form naturally rather than me being at the pinnacle of it all - this is somewhat of a new revelation to me and I'm starting to feel a lot like an underground pastor in the types of ministry challenges I'm seeing coming up. My congregation is simply a dispersed web rather than a centralized community. I imagine this is a lot of how Paul felt traveling all over the world rather than ministering in a singular location. Anyway, it's wonderful for my mission, but I never expected to have this problem. It's a good problem to have, but I still need help.

MMG Part 1: Know Yourself

1 upvotes · 13 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Good call. Edit made.

Married Man Game Part 3: Sexting

1 upvotes · 13 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Good stuff. Thanks for the field report!

It took a couple tries for her to get the idea/in the mood

Probably because you opened with "What do you want me to do to you?" Don't ask her to lead. First, that's not her role. Second, it's unattractive. Third, this is a new thing for her so she's not going to have a clue what to do in the first place anyway.

Other than that opener, good work.

Breaking the Nice-Guy: Take Ownership, Ask For Help

1 upvotes · 13 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Ah, that's sorry to hear of his inactivity - I hope all is well. Unfortunately, while I do recognize some of his comments after skimming his profile, I didn't have a clue who he was until I did just that. I have no clue how to contact him. Keep me posted if you find anything out.

Breaking the Nice-Guy: Take Ownership, Ask For Help

1 upvotes · 13 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Strictly legally, I readily concede that point ;)

The submissive wife

1 upvotes · 13 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Haha - jars. My wife still hands those to me. To re-frame my earlier comment, the guy will still clean, just to a different standard than a woman. If his cleanliness threshold is a 5/10 and hers is an 8/10, he's going to clean it to a 7/10 - enough that it will stay past his threshold for a while until it gradually degrades back to a 4 again. But he may never clean it up to an 8. Or maybe he gets it to her 8 standard all on his own, but the very next day ordinary living fades it back down to a 7 and it's right back to below her threshold.

Yes, he'll clean. He just has a different standard.

For the record, we do hire cleaners, so maybe I'm not the best person to chat with on this subject anyway :p

Addressing the Blue Pill Hate: Manipulation

1 upvotes · 13 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

But "RPC" doesn't seem to even consider that a question worth pondering. I would argue that trivial fitness tests and irrational games are part of their sinful nature.

Oh, we've definitely had this exact conversation many times. I believe [/u/Deep_Strength](#) is on your side - that hypergamy, fitness tests, etc. are all a product of the fall. I'm not as convinced, though I'm certainly willing to accept that as a possible valid conclusion.

The point is less about where it came from and more about accepting the fact that we cannot change women - only God can do that. And, of course, we should pray for the sanctification of our wives regularly, as it's a task God has charged us with. But beyond that, I can't stop my wife from being a sinner. At best, I can curb certain sinful behaviors, though any other behaviors that take their place - even seemingly good ones - are still going to be sinful if not coming from faith (Hebrews 11:6, Romans 14:23). So, in the absence of effectuating an actual heart-change of our own power, the best we can do for the time being is learn to relate with a broken wife, the same way Jesus came to earth and related with broken people in order to accomplish his purposes.

It makes excuses for the woman's bad behavior ("that's just the way women are").

That's not an excuse any more than I would excuse a sinner for being a sinner simply because he was born with original sin and a sinful nature. Yes, that's just the way sinners are. But they're still guilty for it. They still need Christ. We just don't have the power to do Christ's work for him. So, until Christ moves, we accept that sinners will be sinners and women will be women - whether their hypergamy is sin or not is beside the point, though we have debated that exact point here, so I'm not sure why you keep saying RPC won't discuss that. Granted, it has been some time since anyone actually addressed that question.

It cow-tows to that bad behavior, just in a different way ("you gotta play the game.")

Right, in the exact same way that Paul says in 1 Cor. 9, "To the Jews I became like a Jew to win the Jews; to the Gentiles I became like a Gentile to win the Gentiles; to those under the law I became as one under the law (though I myself am not under the law) to win those under the law. I have become all things to all men that some might believe."

I've often compared evangelism and dating, as I believe they are directly linked. If the Bible encourages "playing the game" by understanding non-believers in order to reach them (i.e. God's method of drawing his spiritual bride to himself), I don't see why it would be inappropriate to do the same thing with a person you want to draw into being your physical bride.

This doesn't mean we become sinners alongside them, nor does it mean we become hypergamous like women. It does mean that we should attempt to understand our target culture and make use of the knowledge we glean in order to work within their context.

And it sets sex up as the ultimate standard of success ("well, it works.")

Beta. Beta. Blue Pill.

Well, it depends on who you're talking to and what their goals are. Go try telling anyone over at TRP or MRP that having lots of sex is blue pill. See what you get.

"Oh, but they're wrong about what it means to be red pill." I've heard many people make this claim. They come in with some novel idea of what the "real red pill man" is and how he behaves and thinks. They want to redefine the "red pill." This is quite idiotic, if you ask me. CS Lewis says as much in the preface of Mere Christianity, using the words 'gentleman' and 'Christian' as examples of how well-intentioned people end up ruining words by trying to change the common and actual definition of a thing into something that suits their own ideologies, rendering a lot of our language defunct because we can no longer tell if "gentleman" means "landowner who has a coat of arms" or "a really nice man," nor can we figure out if "the red pill" means sexual strategy or understanding the truth about intergender relational dynamics or being a true biblical man or any other definition that gets put out there. Personally, I say to let the people who created the concept define the concept, and if we want to change the concept, we carry our qualifiers at our side.

I'm looking for men who want to improve themselves AND not make excuses for their wives. I'm looking for men who realize that women have fallen natures too, and that we need to acknowledge that fact in order to lead them well. And I'm looking for men who want to work together on ways to lead their wives out of sinful habits and into a happy and healthy sexual relationship. I thought I'd find that here.

Then you are, indeed, in the right place. I'm pretty sure [/u/Deep_Strength](#) is also on board with me that an essential component and difference between TRP/MRP and RPC is the fact that we acknowledge that wives need to be rebuked and that it is perfectly appropriate to discipline one's wife in love, just as God disciplines those he loves.

Counterproductive Desire and the Fallacy of Unconditional Love

1 upvotes · 12 March 2019 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

Fair enough. Of course, the "values" are part of the bath water, as they're not going to get you into heaven, if heaven ends up being a real place. Organized religion is the bath water too - and dirty bath water at that. Faith itself is what saves - that's the significant component and would, in this case, be the baby. If we could "know anyway," it wouldn't be faith.

Counterproductive Desire and the Fallacy of Unconditional Love

1 upvotes · 12 March 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Cool story. I'm sorry you had to abandon your faith to reach this conclusion. Over at [r/RPChristians](#) we vehemently believe that the Bible actually contains all of the information to affirm and enhance your sexuality. What stifled your sexuality was not your faith, but unbiblical church culture. In that sense, I wouldn't throw out the baby with the bath water.

I recommend you post more of your story over there and see what the community has to say. You might just be surprised how compatible faith and sex are. After all, God is the one who created you as a sexual being with the capacity for mind-blowing orgasms and the ability to make a man hard just by bending over - regardless of which way you're facing.

As a side-note, I believe the mods have said they ban women on sight here. It's supposed to be a male-only space. Tread carefully.

Dealing with a girl who's intentions I don't know

1 upvotes · 11 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Glad to hear you want to change. Have you posted in the weekly OYS threads yet?

Dealing with a girl who's intentions I don't know

1 upvotes · 11 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

If she wants more, then I'll ruin her because I'm a pretty horrible person and not a good boyfriend at all.

Fine. So become a better person. What's the problem? Based on your other comments, you sound as if you're content in your sin and that you have no intention of changing. If that's the case, you have significantly bigger problems that you should be posting about rather than whether or not to ask out a girl.

To that end, I vote no. Do not ask her out.

Married Man Game Part 3: Sexting

1 upvotes · 8 March 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

How are those hard lifts going for you?

My First Successful Fitness/Comfort Test [FR]

1 upvotes · 8 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

True story. I enjoy that one too.

My First Successful Fitness/Comfort Test [FR]

1 upvotes · 8 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Not particularly. I just remember doing a report on him in college and I found his interpersonal strategies fascinating. He was the original master of STFU.

I may have messed up (F/R)

1 upvotes · 7 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Excellent strategy.

Question about reading in sidebar.

1 upvotes · 7 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I'm working through the sidebar.

Glad to hear. I'll assume you haven't read the posts on "mission" yet and not get into that until you do.

Moving on: I did a write-up on the first half of the poon commands. [Here it is, for your reference](#). I never did write part 2, addressing the others. Maybe I need to get back to it. This is not on the sidebar, so you may have missed it.

Should I think the GOLDEN RATIO suggests I should initiate and touch less than she does???

The golden ratio is predominantly about communication, not sexual initiation. It's okay to express yourself sexually however you feel appropriate.

Isn't punishing low value? Shouldn't we really be applying amused mastery, or just an I have more interesting things to do here?

Withdrawing time and attention to do something else IS your punishment, as far as non-Christians are concerned. From a biblical standpoint, God doesn't punish believers at all (1 John 4), nor do I have any interest in punishing my wife. But God does withhold his blessing and his felt presence from people who are walking in opposition to him, just as I will withhold my blessings or physical presence from my wife if the situation calls.

an apology as a tool to keep the conversation moving is almost like a fog I would think.

This probably deserves a post of its own. To be extremely brief, an apology recognizes an obligation. If you don't owe anyone anything, you don't have to apologize for failing to live up to that obligation. That obligation can be affirmative (I owe you \$10 and didn't pay it) or by omission (I owe it to you not to slash your tires). While we are conditioned by culture to affirm the existence of such obligations to other people, this is merely a social construct and not a biblical one. Our only obligation is to God.

So, if I want to punch my neighbor in the face, what's holding me back? Do I have an obligation to refrain from physical violence to him for his own sake? No. Do I owe it to society not to do so? No, I can accept the social consequences if I choose to follow through. But because Christ is in me, I do owe it to God - he does not want me to exercise irrational physical violence against my neighbors, so for God's sake I refrain - not for my neighbor's sake or the government's sake.

The same is true with my wife. If I yell at her and call her horrible names, did I have an obligation to her not to do that? No. But I do have an obligation to God and he would not have me do that. If I violate that obligation, my sin is against God's standards over my life, not my wife's standards. I can violate my wife's standards any time I want and have no concern for it. She is not my judge. I owe her nothing. But I do owe God something, and his standards include boundaries for how I must treat my wife - and just as David repeatedly fell in love with God's statutes in the psalms (especially 119), so also do I love and genuinely internalize and enjoy the standards God has for how I interact with my wife. This is a beautiful thing, not a series of boundaries I despise.

To go a bit further with David, Psalm 51 takes place after David caused Bathsheba to commit adultery, then killed her husband (one of his own mighty men and close friends), and ultimately was the cause of their baby dying. Did David sin against Bathsheba? Did he sin against Uriah, her husband? Did he sin against the baby that died? No, he says to God, "Against you, you only, have I sinned." David understood that Bathsheba was not his judge and he had no obligation to her apart from God.

For the secular crowd, there's never a need to apologize because they don't have God. Apart from God they owe nobody else anything. They are not bound by the judgments of the rest of the world, except to the degree that

physical force makes them. So, it makes sense to be entirely unapologetic. But for the believer, we do have an obligation to God, and this includes boundaries for interacting with his children - both the saved and unsaved ones, whether we're married to them or not. So, my apology is to God when I violate those boundaries.

That said, I agree with you in concept that that an occasional "I'm sorry," when appropriately warranted, isn't going to cause much harm and can demonstrate a degree of humility that can be advantageous at times - but I'm not sure the same would apply to secular relationships the same way, if we're looking at it purely pragmatically and not theologically. And yes, that's the short version.

aren't we supposed to make wives feel like H10?

Absolutely not. No pedestalization. As [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) said, there are times when it's good to reinforce good behavior when she dolls herself up, but you should not make her feel more attractive than she actually is. That is highly counter-productive.

Be irrationally self-confident

This is referencing the dark-triad trait of narcissism. Extreme self-confidence is attractive. I used to run experiments on people when I was younger, seeing how far I could persuade a person through sheer confidence alone. The typical challenge I'd give myself is to persuade someone that German soldiers under Nazi command were actually highly moral people and that we should all strive to be like them - even the ones who were in charge of the gas chambers. For most people, that statement alone is ludicrous - and it should be! But presented with enough confidence, I found I was able to persuade several people to agree with me and even more people to acknowledge that, while unpersuaded, there was enough of an argument that they had a newfound respect for Nazi sympathizers. And then I would tear them down and go off on how the whole thing was a set-up and they fell for it. I wasn't very kind in those days.

My point is: irrational confidence is highly alluring. Even today I can stand in court with a weak argument, knowing it is weak, but because I present it with extreme confidence, I can often persuade a judge to accept my theory of the case over the opposing attorney's. Logically, they shouldn't. But they do. That's what this commandment is about - that type of attractive confidence.

Give good sex ... more a goal than a commandment?

Right. I don't remember where I wrote it, but I know I have some content on how the secular world has different purposes than we do. Apart from God, evolutionary biology and psychology is all that matters to the rest of the world. If evolution is true, advancement of the species is the primary imperative of every person. This means sex, sex, and more sex. The better you are at it, the more people will want to procreate with you to advance the species. So, from a secular vantage point, making this a command makes perfect sense. It is commanded by evolution that we must procreate.

From a Christian vantage point, the command to procreate (Genesis 1:28) was fulfilled in Christ from physical procreation and transitioned to a spiritual procreation, giving life to new believers who would be "born again." And yes, this type of spiritual procreation absolutely is a command - and not just any command, but the "great" command/mission.

Is there a list of the MAP items somewhere outside the book?

Not here, necessarily, though our sidebar covers a lot of it.

Am I missing something about how the poon commandments break most of the RP tools/concepts?

I think so, see above.

Is it just me are a few of these books more focused on progressing through the relationship or understanding hypergamy instead of focusing on self?

There's a split on what it means to be "red pillled." Some people believe the red pill is purely about sexual strategy. Others believe it's about men's legal rights. Others believe it's about becoming your own man and being the best you can be. Others believe it's about knowledge-based awareness of the sexual marketplace. Your answer depends on how you define the red pill. For some definitions, understanding hypergamy and sexuality is the most red pillled thing in the world; from others, it's counter-productive and frame-breaking.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (03/06/19)

1 upvotes · 7 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

and get her input

Input is good. Just be cautious that her "input" doesn't turn into: "That's definitely what we have to do because once the wife has spoken, she won't change her mind or do otherwise." Especially in this area, you have to be the one to make the judgment call. Women often don't know what's best for themselves, spiritually. Left on their own, they will often pick and choose the comfortable, easy things that they like to do and not be willing to stretch boundaries into what God is actually calling them to. While her input is valuable, you ultimately have to be the one to decide what's best for your wife's spiritual well-being. Keep up the good work!

OYS - Where Progress is Made (03/06/19)

1 upvotes · 6 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Excellent questions. Before I respond, have you read the anatomy of butthurt post on the sidebar yet? For that matter, how much of the sidebar have you read?

OYS - Where Progress is Made (03/06/19)

1 upvotes · 6 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

We've typically re-worded it to Own Your Self. You could also use spirit, struggles, shortcomings, or lots of others.

I do have a lot of advice on evangelism and not being annoying. Have you read the 300 series on the sidebar yet?

Married Man Game Part 3: Sexting

1 upvotes · 6 March 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Tease away. Glad I could help with your case some.

Married Man Game Part 3: Sexting

1 upvotes · 6 March 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Nice. Not sure I understand the last line, though - what other guy's posts?

Married Man Game Part 3: Sexting

1 upvotes · 6 March 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I keep a general idea, but no specific tracking mechanism. I'd she's on her period it's obvious. I know ovulation is a couple weeks after that ends. Her cycle is not regular though, so even she can't always predict it when she's tried.

[F/R] That escalated quickly...

1 upvotes · 5 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

You had the exact same reaction I did. I like it.

RPC: a place to stay (or at least return to)

1 upvotes · 4 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Right. I'd suggest that whatever your way of "maximizing Christ" is, it's going to fall short of what God actually intends for your life if you're not accounting for how to maintain healthy biblical relationships and sexual expression in your model.

You're like a business coach trying to show guys how to have successful careers. You go to an AA meeting and say, "That's all good guys. Learn everything AA has to offer, because alcoholism can certainly get in the way of having a successful career. But I've never been an alcoholic. I haven't even had a drink before. I don't need AA to be a successful businessman, and you shouldn't either. After all, every businessman knows that being an alcoholic can ruin your career. If you just stuck to the fundamentals of business you'd learn that, so that's all you need to know. So, whatever you feel like learning from AA, learn it and get out before you get distracted from the real important stuff: being successful businessmen."

1. Do you think it's really good for those guys who have a life-time pattern of alcoholism to just abandon what's holding them accountable after they've acquired the tools AA teaches? Or do you think they should stick around and maintain relationships that are holding them accountable?
2. Do you really think that world-class business experts who have studied human nature through the lens of business techniques and practices will be more equipped to help a guy cure his alcoholism than someone who studies the same patterns of human nature through the lens of helping alcoholics conquer alcoholism?
3. Do you really think the true alcoholics who can't get their butt off the side of the street because they've blown every dime they have on booze, and they've lost custody of their kids, got fired from their jobs, had their family members disown them, etc. - that they care one bit about being successful businessmen in the face of this raging problem that's destroying their lives?

The way you talk just sounds unbearably arrogant and unsympathetic, like you have no clue what anyone here has struggled through. And you don't have a clue. But I tell you: those alcoholics, once they've mastered their troubles and have gone on to study business and advance in a career, will have a lot more to offer the business community than the guy who has only ever viewed business from a businessman's lens - and yet they will still be attending those AA meetings faithfully and be happy they never left.

RPC: a place to stay (or at least return to)

1 upvotes · 4 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

If we are talking about me, speak plainly

I didn't want to call you out and make you look bad, if I could avoid it. But yes, I'm referencing you.

what would be my bannable offense

Concern trolling. I have no problem with the message you preach. What I don't approve of is the way you present it as an either/or and encourage people to leave this sub.

Imagine if I walked into a church and started preaching to everyone: "We should love each other. This church likes to talk about a lot of other things, but at the end of the day we should really just be loving each other. You

don't need to stay at this church because once you've learned whatever this pastor has to preach, you can leave and be fine on your own by just knowing how to love people." No pastor will disagree with his message. But such an attitude is toxic to the community all the same. Such a person would be addressed calmly, as we have done with you for months, and then ultimately asked to leave if he won't stop.

Instead he's trying to say, "Oh you said you're leaving and you're not".

He's not trying anything. He was literally quoting you and noting that you didn't follow through on what you said.

Celebrate!

1 upvotes · 4 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

My thoughts exactly. I see this constantly.

Lifting Program for Aesthetics?

1 upvotes · 4 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

There's certainly a difference between strength and aesthetic training. Strength must precede the aesthetics and losing weight, even if it's just fat, usually means losing strength too.

You need a foundational degree of strength to make the aesthetic training workable, otherwise you end up getting the swimmer's build, which is "ripped," but too skinny to be attractive. From our 203 post by [u/RPChristof](#):

"Trust me when I say there is nothing worse than cutting to sub-10% and realizing that you just have tiny abs."

I'm reminded of [this article](#), which goes into a university research study on the topic and notes: "Even if you're a bit overweight, looking strong can buffer that. Basically, being a strong, fat guy is OK, which I think would bring comfort to many." I'd add emphasis to the "**A BIT**" part before "overweight," but no matter how many reports I found online on this study, they all wanted to couch it with some phrase to make it seem like it's okay if you don't want to get fit because girls will still love you anyway.

Long story short, get your strength levels where you want them, then go into cut-mode while maintaining that strength. You can't expect to improve strength during a cut, and improving it after a cut is almost just as hard. Take advantage of the extra weight-training you've got going on right now and get your muscle where it needs to be with a 5x5. For me, that's benching 300lbs. I'm close - closer than I've ever been in my life. Once I hit that goal, even if my bench drops back down to 290 (where I'm at now, almost 295) or even 275, that's fine because I'll still have a nice bulk of muscle to show through the skin after the cut. If my bench capped at 225 and after the cut I was struggling to pass 200, I wouldn't have much muscle to show through my newly lean figure, which would defeat the purpose of the cut. That's why we start with 5x5 before moving onto a hypertrophy routine.

Accidental Desire Negotiation and OYS, advice? and a bonus question.

1 upvotes · 2 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Such is the hand dealt to us

You mean such is the hand we picked when we chose to marry someone - and we even got to look at the cards before we picked them to make sure we were picking wisely.

Also, legal divorce doesn't mean spiritual divorce. It can often mean being wise in protecting yourself from someone potentially ruinous while recognizing the intact nature of the spiritual bond (in which case legal separation is the state's version). Remarriage after legal divorce is what makes it adulterous because you're still spiritually married.

In OP's case, divorcing for lack of sex isn't protecting him from potential financial or legal ruin, nor will it result

in him getting more sex without becoming an adulterer. So, there's no point to divorcing unless he's willing to commit adultery, in which case there's still no point divorcing because he can do that while married. All it would do is make him feel better about compromising his faith because he'd do it in a more socially acceptable way.

Tag: [u/deep_strength](#)

How do you guys view/approach ghosting?

1 upvotes · 1 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Solid.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (02/27/19)

1 upvotes · 28 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Think more "discussion" and less "lecture."

Amen. I made the same comment. While true open-ended discussion (where there is no predetermined answer) can be dangerous, using questions to evoke discussion that leads toward a predetermined conclusion is highly effective.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (02/27/19)

1 upvotes · 28 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I'll start training her on starting strength or SL5x5 next week.

Excellent story, brother! So glad to hear she's following. Is SL5x5 the best path for female lifting, though? I tried this up-front with my wife and she gave up on any form of weight-training for months afterward. She was afraid that a heavy-lifting routine would make her look bulky when she only wanted to look fit. Practically, that's ridiculous if you look at the way heavy-lifting actually shapes a woman's body, but she wasn't ready to get that through her head. Instead of SL5x5 I started having her do toning lifts, which she adapted to a LOT better. Not saying 5x5 is wrong - just recognize that women may not take to it as quicky as men because they're not as interested in strength; they care more about the aesthetics. Quite frankly, I care a lot more about my wife's aesthetics than about her strength too! :p

Bible Study - 9 - Reading the Bible in a year

I'll tell you the same thing I told [/u/rocknrollchuck](#) a while back - reading the Bible is not the same as studying it. Your quiet time is when you read the Bible. If you're having a quiet time and having additional reading time, you're just having more quiet times.

Bible study is spelled out more on the sidebar - are you researching the passage, looking into the context, reviewing commentaries (when you're desperate), listing out your observations, contemplating the grammar, looking for parallel passages, drawing inferences and asking questions about the things you notice, reaching interpretive conclusions, condensing the content into concise "tl;dr"-type statements of the purpose of the passage in its greater context, and ultimately making application points to live by? This is what Bible study looks like. I'm ashamed at what passes for "Bible study" in most churches today, where people might read a few verses and talk about them and think they're studying.

Evangelism - 2 - My weakest area.

When was the last time in your life, if ever, you would have rated it higher than a 5? It's okay to be weak/low for

periods of time - a few months here, a few months there. But if it's habitually low, that's when you know it's likely a sinful neglect issue and not a "God wants me focusing on other things right now" issue.

One starfish again this week

I wrote a post quite some time ago about duty sex (I think on MRP, not here). My conclusion was that duty/starfish sex doesn't actually exist. All you need are two things:

- You have to be strong enough to move your wife's body however you feel like.
- You have to have a frame that isn't shaken by her emotional level of enjoyment of sex.

If you can do those two things, you can have the kind of sex you want every time you walk into the bedroom.

Why does this work? Because women are emotional empaths. They feel what other people feel. If her acceptance to sex is weak/starfish and I am visibly unenthused, she will remain unenthused. If I don't care about her unenthused nature and I get excited about it anyway, she gets excited about it.

This works particularly well if you can get her on the verge of an orgasm consistently. Let her edge it out for a while. While she's on the edge, she'll gladly contort herself into any position you tell her and start bucking around however fast you like - anything to keep it going so you finally let her get off when you're done with her. In fact, this can often lead into a game where she wants to get off so bad that she tries to force me to orgasm so that my arousal will fade and I'll be more motivated to let her finish too. But it all starts with me being excited even in the face of her disinterest, and then having the physical strength to toss her around the sheets.

If you haven't yet, read Sex God Method. While I'm not super thrilled with everything in the book, there are a few strategies that once employed started changing the game radically. The book centers around the acronym DEVI - Dominance, Emotion, Variety, Immersion. Of the 4, kicking up the "emotion" game with talking during sex has been the single most influential thing in ramping up the quality of sex and turning starfish into five-star.

Who would have ever guessed that the sweet, quiet Christian good-girl would love to hear: "Your pussy is mine" and "I'm going to pound you until you're too sore to walk" and "No, you can't go yet. I want to taste it when you cum"? She objected at first. It was quite awkward because I felt like it was out of character for me to say those things during sex. Then I realized that I decide what my character is. Guess what: once I did it 5 or 6 times suddenly it's normal and in-character. Funny how that works, right?

I also noticed that those types of phrases - the dominant, highly sexualized, hard-core type comments - were even more potent and effective when I balanced them with: "I love you" and "You're might just get pregnant on this one." Something snaps in her. I don't engage in degrading talk (calling her a slut, whore, or anything like that), but there's something to be said for emotionally driving her up and down - rocking her back and forth between feeling loved and treasured by you and feeling controlled or even objectified by you. Yes, I said it: I objectify my wife during sex - and she likes it! Especially when in balance with other statements of positive emotional value toward her that communicate non-objectification.

This is where women are weird. She wants to know that you love and care about her and the thought of being a sex-object to her, when she's not Immersed (the I in DEVI) sounds repulsive. But when Immersion happens she wants to know that she is the object of your desire and she keeps chanting in her head: "use me. use me. use me." Beta guys will never get the idea that women want to be used. They just also want to be valued. It's not an either/or.

u/Red-Curious OYS this week and last was a big encouragement that I can change the dynamic.

Hopefully the above can give some better insight on how to do this. I will note that it only really works once you already have a foundation of attraction. If she's repulsed by you and the thought of touching you makes her

cringe ... go back to the fundamentals. But it sounds like that foundation is already there for your. Your stats are under control, she's following your lead, she respects your parenting. I don't see why she wouldn't be enthused about sex other than the possibility that she's not seeing high-energy enthusiasm coming from you, so there's nothing to empathically draw from.

Try this next time you get home from work: walk in, say hi, and take your shoes off to create awareness that you're home and a natural pause. Casually ask her, "How's it going?" while you walk up to her. Don't listen for her answer and don't give eye-contact, nod your head, or other signs that you're actually listening. Give her a hug, rub her back. Sway side to side a bit and turn it into a slight dance. Shift your hands from being around her to holding both of her hands, raise them in the air and start waving them around while you smile and laugh with her. Let her hands go, put both your hands around her cheeks and kiss her for 10 seconds. Walk away and tell her you're going to start cooking dinner for the kids.

This move works every. single. time. At least for me.

1. It gives her an incredible amount of emotional energy to siphon.
2. The fact that I'm proceeding with behavioral communication without regard for her verbal communication (I let her talk, but continue doing what I'm going to do) shows a clear dominance of frame.
3. It sets the tone for the rest of the evening. The last time I did this she was going on about how awful her day was and that she was ready to break down and cry ... then when I got to the part where I raised her hands up, instead of elaborating she stopped herself, said, "Oh, nevermind," and then just had fun with me. All of a sudden - in the span of only 7 seconds - her day went from "I'm about to cry" to "I'm happy and laughing. I love my husband. He makes me feel so good and I don't even want to think about those other things anymore because it'll ruin the moment." Yes, they came out later during post-sex pillow talk, but instead of, "Woe is me, my day was so bad ... whine, cry, whine," it was more: "This happened today. I didn't like it. Isn't that crazy?"

I really don't want to be a "facilitator" and just hit play on the video. I'd rather be a "teacher" and give the lesson myself.

I'm excited to hear you say this - but I wouldn't discount the facilitator approach just yet. My church has been pushing a "facilitator" model because we don't have many qualified teachers. As a qualified teacher, this greatly frustrates me. They also like to use the "push play for the teaching" model because it's easy.

But most people think of teaching as lecturing. I have a long rant I could go on, but this comment is long enough as-is. Suffice it to say that people don't learn through lecturing anymore. Don't tell them the answers. Learn to ask questions that evoke the answer out of them. If they can learn it for themselves through strategic questions they're far more likely to understand, retain, and apply what you're trying to teach. This is tough because most of us are used to a lecturing model, but I promise this is 10x more effective if you can learn to lead people down a path with questions rather than statements.

Interesting site...

1 upvotes · 28 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

do I look fat in XYZ dress then I would probably say no to my wife. I then said I would try to view the world as God does, seeing her as a child of God and focusing on my wife's inner beauty.

You're joking, right? Me: "Is that black-and-white striped horse looking thing a zebra?" You: "No, it is not a zebra. It is an animal, created and loved by God."

Are you that entrenched in the liberal agenda? A zebra is a zebra. Fat is fat. A woman can have incredible inner-beauty and still be fat. Deflecting the question asked to answer the one you wish was asked is not an answer. Do you think that God doesn't know when someone is fat and another person is fit? Is God incapable of discerning between the two? Does gluttony no longer matter to God? The theological dissonance is abounding here.

Here you have to go into a long discussion, strawman your "opponent", Garner likes and public approval (a successful response is the upvoted one!)

If you think any mods here give two hoots about how many up-votes or down-votes they get or about "winning" arguments, so much stuff is going over your head. We're here not to impress people, but to help people. You're one of the people we're trying to help - that's why I bother to write these replies to you at all. I believe you have an incredible capacity to do great things for God's Kingdom and a wonderful perspective on the primacy of following Christ and living by the Spirit. I hope and pray that God will use this in great ways someday. But I also want to see you growing physically, mentally, in leadership skills, etc. While we don't pretend to be the arbiters of every aspect of the Christian man's life, we do have a lot to offer that I think could hone your influence for God's Kingdom into greater degrees of effectiveness long-term.

This has nothing to do with trying to "win" an argument with you and everything to do with helping to point you in the right direction because I can't change the world for God's Kingdom alone. I'm going to need you and many of the men here to work in-tandem as one body for God's purposes. Why constantly fight against this? Why not be united in our common effort to advance God's Kingdom into all nations through spiritual generations of laborers, living and discipling among the lost?

There are 2000 subs, I doubt barely anyone will ever meet, ever talk to each other

There are at least 2 dozen men from this sub who I've had personal conversations with off Reddit. 3 of them I've had in-person face-to-face meetings, 1 of those regularly. 4 more guys I talk to by phone on a regular basis. These numbers are increasing every month. No, this is not just a random internet forum.

I know Warrior Jesus and OZ have also had some face-to-face conversations. I've also connected chuck with people I know IRL, which shaped where he vacationed with his family. I've connected other users to friends of mine in different parts of the country.

Don't project your own impersonal use of this sub on everyone else here.

There's little effort to make peace or come to agreements, instead you create a bubble of people who all agree and vanquish those who aren't in 100% agreement.

Are you even reading the same sub? I see lots of support and encouragement with random respectful differences being discussed from time to time. [Another post from a few hours ago](#) by [u/Adamjensen2030](#) and the replies in that thread show exactly what I mean and the opposite of what you're saying. Again, you're projecting your experience on the rest of the sub simply because you feel like you're always at-odds with the people here.

The Bible has enough. Jesus is enough. But it would be helpful to have a guide to show men they are being lied to by the culture.

What do you think this sub is? It's just a guide that you don't like, apparently. Or perhaps you prefer us to take Rollo's alleged approach: theory-only, no practical-application points suggested (though he does this anyway, despite saying he doesn't - the Iron Laws of Tomassi being a great case in point).

Jesus taught principles

You're telling me he didn't teach practical application points too? Are you kidding? You started with a reasonable premise, but the more I kept reading the more and more ridiculous this post became.

Tag: [/u/Deep_Strength](#)

Women are expected to do so much these days

1 upvotes · 28 February 2019 · [/r/RedPillWomen](#)

This all stems from the balance of privilege and responsibility.

Once upon a time, men had the privilege of dominance in the workforce, which compelled responsibility for maintaining the nation's economy and being productive in their careers. When that privilege was taken away and shared with women (the "rightness" of which I'm intentionally not commenting on here), men stopped having any motivation to bear the responsibility of maintaining the workforce. So, we see a lot of guys abandoning profitable careers to content themselves with dead end positions.

Men also used to have the privilege of headship in the home. This came with the responsibility of leading the home and providing for it. When that privilege was taken away and given to women to run the show, the men stopped taking the responsibility for being leaders or providing for the home either.

Men used to have the privilege of authority over the children. This came with the responsibility of staying informed about their needs, making decisions regarding their care, and setting up a plan within the household for how to meet their needs. When that privilege was taken away and given to women with modern custody laws, men stopped bearing the responsibility.

I know it's a lot more complicated than the simplicity I'm trying to lay out right here, and there's value in nuance and the way that women had privileges and responsibilities in the past too. My point is simply to say: women wanted all the same privileges men had in past societies, but this also means bearing a greater burden of responsibilities as well.

Today, virtually all societal privileges are either shared equally with women or are given overtly to women over men. And then many women are upset by the fact that men aren't stepping up to bear the responsibilities to earn the privileges that they couldn't get back if they wanted to. This is why there are so many man-children who treat their wives like mommy 2.0. If they're not going to get recognized and rewarded for all of their hard work, and in the event of a divorce she's still going to get all the custody rights, all the spousal support, half of all the assets that she didn't work to earn, etc. ... why bother putting in the hard work? While most men don't think this consciously, they still instinctually recognize that they have more to gain and less to lose if they shift all the burden on women, since those women are going to end up getting the privileges either way.

Again, I'm not commenting on the rightness or wrongness of any of this - just that this is what happened, explaining quite clearly why women are expected to do so much today. This is not how I run my home, but I also have a wife who is readily submissive and supportive of my leadership, which simply doesn't exist in most marriages today.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (02/27/19)

1 upvotes · 27 February 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

The naughty blanket is very similar to the "time out mat" that we use from time to time. I stopped using it when, as a test, I wanted to see how long my son would sit in it after being "naughty" and he made it over an hour without fussing or complaining ... showing that it really didn't phase him. That was when he was 3.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (02/27/19)

1 upvotes · 27 February 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Have you discussed sex and girls with him at all yet?

We've discussed general relationships, crushes, desire to kiss girls, etc. We have not had the PIV talk.

ask him what kinds of new foods he would like to try, and then maybe you could teach him to cook some of them.

This is something that I actually do with all of my kids (except the baby). I like to teach them how to make wise choices and resolve conflict, so I'll give them 3 options for some meals and tell them they must agree, then I guide them in cooking it. The 3yr old basically just pours the ingredients in, whereas the other two are able to mix, saute, bake, microwave, etc. - just not take things out of the oven yet.

The key here is Daddy/daughter reading time.

Right on. I probably frame it too much as "teach you to read" time.

Get her into a sport as soon as is practical

We just signed her up for ninja training classes ... should be good. Outdoor stuff is more difficult in the snow, but I may start taking her to the track with me and my son to burn off some energy.

I'm curious what kind of discipline you use when she acts up?

While I'm not opposed to spanking when necessary, it's pretty rare. My most common route is to sit her in her bed and say she is welcome to leave when she's calm and ready to apologize, after which I will employ any discipline suited to the punishment. For example, if she started the tantrum because I turned off her TV show, she loses TV the next day.

this is one reason I've battled my weight all of my life.

Me too. I've come to the conclusion that the worst thing my parents ever taught me was: "Eat everything on your plate!"

What do you Christians think of MGTOW?

1 upvotes · 27 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

There's value in the secular label, just as we are "RP Christians" and not just "Biblically masculine Christians." The key distinction for [/u/Adamjensen2030](#) to clear up is:

- Are you a MGTOW who happens to be a Christian, or
- Are you a Christian who happens to agree with MGTOW thinking?

MGTOWs are certainly welcome here, [/u/Adamjensen2030](#), and I'd guess you will agree with many of the things we say about the state of relationships in most first world countries. Just remember that our goal is never to affirm you in being MGTOW. It's to guide you into being biblical, which in practice may have the same practical conclusions that secular MGTOW thinking would lead you to anyway.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (02/27/19)

1 upvotes · 27 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

x8 ... x8 ... x8

Try upping the weight until you can only do 5. That should increase strength a lot faster. Once you're at 2 plates on the bench (i.e. 225) you can shift to a more toning-based model, which would be more like x10-12 ... x10-12 ... x10-12

I mentioned that in a post yesterday

While my reply may have been critical, it was a fun post to read and I appreciate that you put it up! Getting guys to recognize the framework issues in what their churches put out on marriage and relationships is very important and your post can help expose some of that.

The main thing I can do just to support my wife and let her know she is not going in alone and let god do the rest.

Pray with her before you go. Have a quiet time together. Soften her heart. Remind her that God loves your dad, despite all of his flaws, just as he loves her despite her flaws. If necessary, frame it as a ministry opportunity - that you and her have a voice in your father's life that can be worked for good and he will be won over by her gentle and quiet spirit and by love, not by sending nasty text messages outlining all of his flaws to his wife.

It goes to show how strongly The Great Commission is and how that is the main thing important for us to journey on.

Amen, brother. You're getting it! I'm encouraged to see where your journey takes you in the coming months.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (02/27/19)

1 upvotes · 27 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Background/Stats: 34 years old, 6'0", 225lbs, 16% BF. Married 10 years, 4 kids (1, 3, 5, 7). Read MRP, TRP, RPC sidebars.

7 BASICS (present cycle)

- AoS: 10
- Bible Study: 10
- Quiet Time: 3
- Scripture Memory: 1
- Prayer: 8
- Fellowship: 10
- Evangelism: 9

Physical/Lifting: Pushing boundaries. While I haven't tried to up my ORM in the last week, I have upped what I do for 5x reps. Bench: 275, Squat: 335, DL: 335, Curls: 60lb dumbbells, OHP: 175. I've been at the gym 5 times for the last couple weeks and on track again this week.

Diet: My usual area of need for work, but I'm functioning effectively on a calorie deficit, taking protein shakes again to compensate for the heavier lifting despite the reduced calories. Was stagnant in my waist size for months, but dropped a belt loop this week, so that's progress.

Career/Finances: Had one of my largest checks in a long time come in last billing cycle. Another high-end one

just came in today. Got a couple new cases in this week. Business is good.

Mission: Co-leading a conference this weekend. I'm not thrilled about the conference itself, but the follow-up series we're doing for the small groups should be highly connected to my mission and provide a solid platform to launch the church into a disciple-making model of ministry. Still need to get the lead pastor on board, but my red pill'd pastor fully gets it and is working to move things in the right direction.

Sex: Best it's ever been. Wife started shaving herself more diligently and even bought some hair-removal cream to get a smoother finish. She's initiating more than I am nowadays. She also downloaded an app called "kindu" that matches couples up with new sexual ideas to try (I had gotten it a long time ago and she wasn't interested back then so I deleted it; she remembered it and brought it back). I very much encouraged that type of thinking. Also, the sex has been so high-energy and gratifying lately that over the last couple months I've been legitimately shocked at how wet a woman can get. I'd felt high degrees of lubrication before, but to the point where she's just dripping down and drenching the sheets with her fluids (not mine) ... I didn't even know that was possible in the absence of squirting. Any signs of vaginismus from a couple years ago are now completely eradicated.

Parenting: Things are fantastic with a few areas of need.

- 7yr son - He is a certified genius. He just got into the gifted program for all areas, scoring in the 99.9 percentile in math and in the 96th percentile for reading, and his IQ test came back in the 99th percentile. Even within the gifted class, we're receiving reports that he's leaps and bounds beyond the other kids. While our gym won't allow him in the weights area, he does pushups and small dumbbells with me at home and he runs the track at the gym with me regularly and is excited to keep getting strong and developing his physical body, though he probably needs more caloric intake to keep from being too skinny. He's also the popular kid in all of his classes and at daycare. He's also showing early signs of having a crush and talks occasionally about the girl he likes. He's also growing in responsibility around the house and being a model to his sisters, though he still picks on them at normal levels as I'd expect for his age. He constantly asks questions and wants to grow in his understanding of the Bible and theology. His primary areas of need right now are to (1) open his palette so he's not as picky an eater, and (2) work on complaining less.
- 5yr daughter - She is a classic teenage ditz in a 5yr old's body. Everything to her is about looking fabulous, wearing the right clothes, having gorgeous shoes, and overall being beautiful. I did a post recently on 1 Peter 3 - she's the girl that passage was written for! That's a challenge for me: to take that passage to her this week. Other than that, she's not very interested in learning how to read. She can do basic 2 and 3 letter words, but things beyond that just aren't clicking for her. She gets bored of learning after a couple minutes. However, she is very practically wise and receives advice well. I taught her how to minimize getting in trouble when she makes mistakes and she has followed the advice very well ever since and even started teaching it to her sister saying, "Daddy taught me this and it really works!" She's also very mild and submissive in her general demeanor. She genuinely wants to be helpful and will offer to do chores even without prompting. If she can get over acting self-entitled and being so worked up about her looks, she'll make for a fine wife someday.
- 3yr daughter - She's a gorgeous nightmare. While her older sister works hard to look beautiful, this one has it naturally. She's a lot like her brother in that she's hungry to learn, highly intelligent, and socially popular. However, her energy levels are so exaggeratedly high that she can't focus, and it often comes off as being tom-boy-ish. I chalk this up to being 3, as our other kids went through this as well and managed to chill out by 5, but it's certainly a bear to deal with right now. Her biggest needs from me as a father, right now, are for clear and enforced boundaries (temper tantrums can be out of control) and to fuel her existing desire for learning.
- 20mo daughter - She's still young enough that her personality is only just developing. She has learned the word "no" and is willing to receive it. Her language development is excellent for her age, as she can say several words and even small phrases and isn't even 2 yet. She also understands far more than she can talk and will follow basic instructions: "Go upstairs and get your pajamas" - and she'll bring them down. "Go wash

your hands" and she heads to the sink. "Bring me my shoes," and she heads right to the basket and knows which ones are mine. She even goes to bed when we tell her to, without complaining or fussing. Areas of attention for now: my wife feeds her as much as the other kids, despite that she's so much younger, so she needs to slim down (it's not bad, but noticeable), and she could also use improvement on learning how to eat neatly (she's learning to use silverware, but mostly skips to smearing food on her face and in her hair).

Social Development: Solid. I've found a new group of men in my area who are 100% on board with the same mission I'm on and who want to revolutionize church structures in my area, some of whom are already pastors and elders, and others who are in positions of influence in prominent congregations in my locality. I've also built new relationships with the divorce care group at my church and am continuing my practice of meeting at least one new person every Sunday morning. I've also made new professional connections that should increase my income stream in the long-term - and all this in the last 2 weeks alone.

Personal Areas for Growth

- Ongoing diet management
- More intentional effort toward parenting in my children's needs rather than just having fun with them
- Follow up with several new relationships
- Need to follow up with the lead pastor at my church

Does this sub find it a good idea to wait until marriage?

1 upvotes · 27 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

There's a real incentive to close your eyes to potential dealbreakers because you don't want to lose access to that gratification

This is crucial. While it mainly applies to men who use sex as a validation-gratification device, that's pretty much the majority of men in the first place.

I'd hope that after internalizing what we teach here, a man could easily walk away from that gratification when a red flag arises because he has an abundance mentality, stoic frame, and several other virtues. Of course, somewhat ironically, once a man is free from his dependence on that sexual gratification from an RPC framework, he won't be pursuing premarital sex in the first place, so he'll never have cause to prove he has conquered its hold over him, and having sex just to prove that point would prove just the opposite: that he's outside of Christ's frame and separate from what we teach.

training information

1 upvotes · 27 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Hmm ... I was kind of hoping you'd actually elaborate with useful information rather than just posting a link. What did you learn from reading that content that was helpful to you? What in there do you believe other guys could find helpful? I'm not saying your thoughts are a replacement for good content, but there has to be something presented to show that the resource is actually worth the time invested to get through it all.

Should I be baptised at the beach rather than my local Church?

1 upvotes · 27 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

That's what my church does by default.

Spinning Plates

1 upvotes · 26 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Huh? I'm so confused.

Spinning Plates

1 upvotes · 26 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Right on. The first couple sentences raised my eyebrows in doubt, but by the end it became clear you were just saying: *An attractive man doesn't need to worry about attention games and isn't at risk of giving too much attention anyway.*

On this I 100% agree. The struggle isn't between too much and too little. It's between enough and too little because the attractive man has a mission that precludes oneitis type attention from ever occurring in the first place. While he may still have the capacity for too little attention, part of his being aggressive is knowing how to flirt, kino, be charming in conversation, socially active, etc. which all naturally implies communicating with his girl anyway, and a total failure of attention is ultimately an attraction disqualifier.

In short: be attractive naturally, not by playing games.

How do I pray?

1 upvotes · 25 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Given that it's a direct modification of 308, I just added it to the post itself. It won't be in the compendium, as I don't have access to edit that, but for anyone just clicking through the links, they'll see it that way.

How do I pray?

1 upvotes · 25 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

More to [/u/WarriorJesus1915](#) - I like your PRAY acronym better than the standard "ACTS" one. You're combining Adoration and Thanksgiving into "Praise," replacing the confusing word "Supplication" with "Ask," which makes a lot more sense, then adding "Yield" to show a general heart disposition.

But it still lacks the reason why I adapted ACTS into REACT, where the R is for "Relational" - recognizing that the purpose of prayer is not to get stuff from God, but to build our relationship with him. I had also replaced "Supplication/Stuff" with "Entrust" - which is basically the same thing as your "Yield" word gets at. In order to make a comprehensible word, I'd adjust "Entrust" to "Entertain." Hear me out.

- Praise
- Repent
- Ask
- Yield
- Entertain
- Relational

Now we spell the word "prayer." While I'm sure the E could be replaced by a lot of other words, this one seems best suited to the way people naturally talk with others in conversation. It gives a new emphasis on being relational, where most Christians can hear the word "relate" or "relational" and assume it means you must be emotionally invested or sharing some deep, dark secret, because that's what most of the church world thinks when they hear that word.

When I pray, people are often shocked. Something typical can go something like this: "Hey Jesus, what's up? I'm feeling kind of tired/happy/sick/whatever today. How about you? I'm sure you're feeling all kinds of things right now, as you're connecting with all kinds of people. I hope I'm one of the ones making you happy, though! Haha. Oh yea, I saw a really good show last night. It was about some superhero family trying to stop the apocalypse and these celestial agents were trying to make sure it happened. I was kind of torn because I want to empathize with the ones trying to save the world, but part of me is actually excited for the real apocalypse and I'm not sure why I would ever want to postpone your coming back! Do you know anyone who might benefit from talking about that tension? I'd love to have that conversation with them. Maybe they could grow a little closer to you because of it. Anyway, I feel like hitting the gym later. Want to come with me? My wife and I might watch a movie tonight too. You should totally join us. Are you thirsty? I'm thirsty. Let's get something to drink."

The way I chat with Jesus in this context is the same way I would a guest in my home who I'm entertaining. Maybe that's not the best word for it, but that's my mind-set.

In modern Christianese that same prayer would read: "Dear Jesus. You are so great and higher than us. Instead of feeling tired, please lift my spirits and give me energy to do the tasks you've set out for me. Your knowledge and wisdom and experience is so vast, and I'm amazed at how you know each one of your people. Please help me to be one who pleases you. Keep me from wasting time on TV shows, but please find a way to redeem all things to yourself. Keep my heart and my spirit aligned with your purposes, and bring people in my life who need you. Give me the perseverance and dedication to take care of my body, for it is your temple. Fill me with your motivation and your spirit to make wise choices with my life. Be with me always, and never leave my side. Let me remember your presence in every waking moment. And though I may be thirsty, quench me with your eternal love, and let your joy be what satisfies me rather than the water I drink."

Which one of those two conversations sounds like a person I'm actually friends with - the way God called Moses his friend, and then said "With him I speak face to face, clearly and not in riddles" (Numbers 12:8)?

While there's nothing "wrong" with the Christianese way of praying (at least not that I've noticed off-hand), and there are certainly times in prayer that warrant addressing Jesus like the king he is, if this really is a marriage relationship, I'd prefer to talk to him like I'd want my wife to talk to me. And maybe in the process, as she hears me pray, my wife can learn how to talk to me from the way I talk to Christ.

A Reply: Yes, the church and Christian writers really say these ridiculous things.

1 upvotes · 23 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Do it up! I'm looking forward to reading it and tweaking my routine.

A Reply: Yes, the church and Christian writers really say these ridiculous things.

1 upvotes · 22 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Within small boundaries, sure. When was the last time you heard of a woman whose personal taste was to have the hots for the elephant man as her perfect 10, though? Saying it's subjective can only take you so far.

For Single Guys - An Intro to the Red Pill, A few pieces of advice, and a Farewell

1 upvotes · 22 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Hah! That's crazy.

For Single Guys - An Intro to the Red Pill, A few pieces of advice, and a Farewell

1 upvotes · 22 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Nice

For Single Guys - An Intro to the Red Pill, A few pieces of advice, and a Farewell

1 upvotes · 22 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

RPC would not need

I long for that day.

For Single Guys - An Intro to the Red Pill, A few pieces of advice, and a Farewell

1 upvotes · 22 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I noticed that too.

Is it just me? Are modernist Churches very feminine oriented?

1 upvotes · 22 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Many of those are true for most other institutionalized incarnations of the church also.

Addressing the Blue Pill Hate: Objectifying Women, 1 Peter 3

1 upvotes · 21 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I'll make a post.

Addressing the Blue Pill Hate: Objectifying Women, 1 Peter 3

1 upvotes · 21 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Nice

OYS - Where Progress is Made (02/20/19)

1 upvotes · 20 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I agree with the other guy. A woman on her period isn't an excuse, unless you're personally that grossed out by it. You can still get a BJ, do mutual hand jobs, or just deal with the blood. My wife actually initiated with me last time she was on her period, which is a relatively new development, as it was usually me who would initiate during those weeks. She's getting less self-conscious about it and more interested in just having good sex when we know we both want it.

Addressing the Blue Pill Hate: Objectifying Women, 1 Peter 3

1 upvotes · 20 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Amen

Addressing the Blue Pill Hate: Manipulation

1 upvotes · 19 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Then we probably mean different things by the term "red pill." The red pill is the truth about how intergender relational dynamics work. The secular red pill is, by their own terms, an incomplete canon. They're still swapping notes. They're still experimenting. The bible is that closed canon, but it has yet to be fully explored in this context because it was written for many other purposes as well. The secular world is trying to figure out what the bible says on this subject without actually reading it.

What I'm guessing you mean by the red pill is the series of recommended attitudes and behaviors that are presented by guys who call themselves red pill. Ask any endorsed contributor on even the secular subs like MRP - especially Rollo - and they'll tell you the same thing: the red pill is understanding truth, not a set of behaviors. While the secular red pill subs will discuss the behaviors they observe, the bible tells us why people

behave this way and how we can best respond.

So, when guys who are having sex with tons of girls say, "He's what made those girls horny for me," and a bunch of other guys try it and find that it works for them too ... we can't say they're teaching falsehood. They're just sharing what they observed, and they're right. Those girls did have sex with them and they are teaching truth about their observations (unless they're just flat out lying). It's just an incomplete truth without the bible to fill in the full picture.

Any RPChristians Near Dayton, OH?

1 upvotes · 15 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I know a few throughout Ohio, including myself.

Michael's Story?

1 upvotes · 15 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

There's a reason I have significantly slowed down the frequency and quantity of my posts. If I don't have useful content to submit, I don't submit anything. Rollo, in order to maintain an active reader base, is compelled to submit periodic posts. I have no similar compulsion that would affect the quality and integrity of my posts ;)

That's not to say everything I post is a gem. I just commented to squizzo last night that my latest post was more an effort to flesh out ideas than it was to communicate a clearly refined diamond - and I'm okay with that from time to time. That's part of the beauty of reddit: it's more about the conversation than the teaching. But a blog is different. They're meant to be refined because the comments are not the highlight, whereas on reddit the comments are where the magic happens.

Aristotelian Categories: Essentials, Accidents, and Alphas

1 upvotes · 15 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Amen. I was already planning on writing a post on being alpha before I read this. I may use this to piggy back off of. Great post overall.

Michael's Story?

1 upvotes · 14 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

If you want to read Rollo on this subject, I'd recommend [this post instead](#). It's foundational from a time when he was almost always on point and not stretching boundaries to pretend he has something new to say.

Michael's Story?

1 upvotes · 14 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Why was he bombing things? That's the question that matters. Alpha and beta don't align with moral designations though. Many alphas are highly immoral.

Ideas to consider for men who follow Jesus...

1 upvotes · 11 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I just wrote this as ideas to think about

Makes sense ... but wouldn't that be better received and invoke higher quality discussion if you asked these as open-ended questions rather than presenting them as if they are teaching points?

behold, the kingdom of God is in the midst of you.". A better translation is the kingdom of God is within

you.

I've often heard "among" as the proper translation. That is, the Kingdom of God is the church on earth, not an army that would descend upon the earth. It doesn't have physical boundaries, but spiritual ones.

when we are beahving and doing exactly what God wills which is to become in the likeness of his son which is living and walking by the spirit

Great - and what does that likeness look like? In a modern society, what will a man look like who is in Christ's likeness? What types of things does he do? How does he talk? What is his mission? How does he interact with other people?

"Be Christ-like" is more vague speech. It's like asking someone what the color of an apple is and they answer, "It is the color of a fiery anger and the color of our hearts - the color of the blood that fills our veins." It sounds poetic and cool, but what the person really needs to hear is: "Red. An apple is red."

like how do I do that now and today? I don't know exactly but it's a target

Right - my exact question, haha. The problem is that this isn't a target.

Suppose I throw you out into the middle of the woods with no compass and I tell you, "You must go to Kansas City to accomplish your mission." Great: you have a target. But you don't have a map, you don't have a compass, and there's nobody around to ask for help other than the one guy who only knows how to say: "Go to Kansas City. It's that easy. Can't you figure it out? That's all you have to do: Go to Kansas City."

How do you get there? Well, if you're east of the city, you need to go west, but if you're north then you need to go south. But you have no idea where you are or where Kansas city is in relation to where you're at.

"Ah, but the Bible is like a road map," you may say. "Just read the map and you'll know how to get there."

Cool. So you take a look at the map and realize that you still don't have a "you are here" stamp on it. You take a good guess from some surrounding landmarks and start moving in a certain direction, but you find that maybe you're holding the map upside-down. Or maybe it's sideways. Or maybe that green area wasn't meant to be a grassy field, but a forest. Which is it?

You ask your friend: "Help me out here," and he says, "Just go to Kansas City, dude. That's all you gotta do." Nice ... so helpful.

This post was not an attack on RPC as much as it is a warning for men about the red pill and enhancing SMV as a centralizing life pricniple.

But you can see how an attack on "the red pill" would readily be interpreted as an attack on anyone who calls himself a "red pill" Christian, right? Certainly the label "red pill" should not be part of our core identity, but labels have practical value all the same.

And again: if you're preaching against "enhancing SMV as a centralizing life principle" and leaving your suggestion as to what we should focus on as something very vague, that's like going to a cooking sub and posting: "Guys, you might really want to consider this ... that some ingredients go really well together. I mean, that's what cooking should really be all about. You shouldn't make your central message about how good apples taste. I think we should all just focus on the fact that certain ingredients, when mixed together, taste really good. I'm not accusing you of focusing only on the taste of applies, but I still thought that avoiding that focus was something you should really consider. Oh ... and you probably shouldn't be too specific about which ingredients go well together in specific meals, because that might not apply to everyone. Maybe some people don't like those ingredients together. We should just stick to ingredients, generally and not talk about specific ones."

How quickly would you be laughed out of such a forum? And yet I get the impression that this is the gist of your post here. The mods over at [r/cooking](#) (and I know at least one of them), would probably ban you and say, "Hey, if you don't like a recipe, then don't make that recipe."

Ideas to consider for men who follow Jesus...

1 upvotes · 11 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Look at the mod comments on the post you linked. There's a reason I have chosen the mods I have and don't let every Joe Schmo be endorsed.

As for the book, you say with one side of your mouth that you don't care about popular opinion - only God Word, but out of the other side: "I will be interested to see how it is reviewed and received." I agree that all things should stand on God's Word alone, but don't be duplicitous like this. Pick one or the other. Reviews are not my measure of success.

Lastly, and on that line, I don't know what it is you think you're leaving toward? Are you saying you'd rather believe cultural lies and have a bad marriage because you think this is what the Holy Spirit wants? Or are you saying the Holy Spirit wants you to go MGTOW and abandon relationships entirely? I really don't get your end game here. Either:

1. You're giving up on relationships, so RPC has little application for you, or
2. You're going to pursue a relationship, but do it in a way that you believe is "Holy Spirit led," which somehow involves ignoring either pragmatic reality about relationships or theological consistency (or both).

Which is it? What is your model for what will bring about a successful marriage? Or do you think God doesn't care about whether marriages are healthy?

OYS - Where Progress is Made (01/30/19)

1 upvotes · 1 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Chuck gave a good reply, but this stood out to me:

To preach the gospel to all who will listen.

Don't limit it here. Part of the point of the parable of the sower isn't to move on from bad soil to people who are good soil. Jesus was speaking to an agrarian society who would have known that you should pull weeds and till the soil so that it's ready for the seed to be planted.

That said, don't merely preach to those who will listen. Take those who won't listen and prepare their hearts until they *are* ready to listen.

Finished the 200s, - Question Alpha Positive

1 upvotes · 1 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Acts 16 - It doesn't say that Paul yelled or shouted. It says he got annoyed and "said" to the Spirit to come out. I can see how it would be interpreted as shouting, and it may have been shouting ... but again, he's dealing with an evil spirit and not his wife. A stern rebuke is in order. It's not losing frame for a warrior to shout in battle.

The post you're referencing is about drawing attraction between men and women. The situation with Paul doesn't warrant an "alpha positive" response in the same way because he's not trying to seduce the evil spirit.

309 specific to RPC or does it also have a RP equivalent?

1 upvotes · 1 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Let me be clear: **There is no "Christian Version" of anything.** You're reading the 300 series as if I'm trying to create Christian versions of secular RP concepts. I'm not. I'm just reading the Bible and pulling out *BASIC*, *foundational* concepts of following Jesus. They're not a complete series - they're just the starter points. If they happen to have a secular equivalent, that's because the secular world has found in the physical realm a truth that parallels a spiritual concept. Given that physical marriage parallels our spiritual marriage with Christ, it's not surprising that those who study physical intergender relational dynamics will also discover spiritual truths about how God relates with his people.

If I try to force a connection, as you do, it would go something like this:

1. Bible study - "Read and internalize the sidebar"
2. Fellowship - "Spend time around other masculine men, not just around your wife/women"
3. Evangelism - Pre-marriage game (i.e. picking up girls)
4. Quiet Time - Meditation and reflection
5. Scripture Memory - Internalize sidebar content; meditation
6. Assurance of Salvation - Confidence and frame foundation both derived from your mission
7. Prayer - Our fitness tests to God; it's not about getting what we want, but learning to trust his leadership
8. Discipleship - Have lots of sex and raise your kids, don't be an absent father

Note: #8 is not an "8th Basic." It's another section entirely, and one I haven't written yet - the 300 series is incomplete. The 400 series has a lot I could add to it, but I don't have any plans to do so right now.

Finished the 200s, - Question Alpha Positive

1 upvotes · 1 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I don't understand what you're asking. Any examples I can think of where Paul may have come off as angry were situations where he was rebuking someone sternly for grave sins so they could receive correction and instruction. The situations you're describing in this post aren't things where she has sinned overtly, she's just been conditioned to act self entitled. Reconditioning is very different from harsh rebuking.

Is there something like "lifting weights" for your soul?

1 upvotes · 30 January 2019 · /r/askTRP

For Christians the RPChristians sub has content for developing spiritual disciplines much like you're talking about. Check out the 300 series.

Too Little, Too Much

1 upvotes · 27 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I can only speak to the laws in my own state, but I'm suspicious about the actual facts of these scenarios you reference. There's a difference between being divorce rape and feeling divorce raped.

Do feminists ever "see the light"?

1 upvotes · 26 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Every feminist sees and knows the red pill. They just think it's the darkness and that they're the light. They're not ignorant; they're just wrong.

Too Little, Too Much

1 upvotes · 25 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I assume you're not implying divorce in your last paragraph.

Also ...

If I pull the trigger and it turns out that AWALT, then that was on me for not vetting properly.

No, it just means that AWALT. Unicorns don't exist. Vetting is about finding a woman who has a track record for controlling her AWALT tendencies, not that sur doesn't have them at all. And everyone is liable to lose control at some point. It's not a vetting problem; it's a sinful nature problem in her.

Lifting Is Not A Suggestion

1 upvotes · 25 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Good answer.

Too Little, Too Much

1 upvotes · 25 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Is it possible that vetting is not about eliminating all possible issue, but about embracing and accepting great, more burdensome issue than before.

I normally appreciate any effort to think outside the box ... but no.

God rewards ... making strong those who accept a greater challenge than usual.

"My yoke is easy and my burden is light." I don't think God calls us to take on challenges for their own sake. Challenges from God are always associated with a clear purpose. If your purpose is the same as Hosea, sure, he's going to give you an incredible challenge through your spouse. But I do agree with the general principle of vetting, even if one can't do it perfectly.

Too Little, Too Much

1 upvotes · 22 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

All Women Are Like That - more info in our glossary on the sidebar.

Too Little, Too Much

1 upvotes · 22 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Not true at all. I call bull.

Too Little, Too Much

1 upvotes · 22 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Nice comment. I like it.

For Women: Getting Your Beta to Man Up

1 upvotes · 22 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Give me context.

Is My Girlfriend Wife Material? Need Help.

1 upvotes · 18 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I just had a conversation with my pastor two days ago about how all the high schoolers fell away over winter break, and he wanted my advice on how to prevent this from happening when they go to college. I gave him the same solution you present. Premarital sex is, in part, a product of the American dream as one's mission. They're trying to get the fruit of that dream early. Give them a better mission and they'll push for that fruit quickly as well. College is life on 10x speed. Wherever they're pointed when they go in, it's hard to redirect at those speeds.

Validation and Interdependency

1 upvotes · 13 January 2019 · /r/MarriedRedPill

No, I don't think most do, just as there are distinctions between things like being religious and being faithful that people don't often think about.

Validation and Interdependency [MRP Draft]

1 upvotes · 12 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I can see that. John Eldridge poses the opposite on your later example, though - that the child who gets no validation will never move past the phase of childhood life where parental validation is essential, so he'll seek validation as an adult in other ways to get what his parents never gave him. This is discussed in *The Way of the Wild Heart*.

Validation and Interdependency [MRP Draft]

1 upvotes · 12 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Haha, well played.

Validation and Interdependency [MRP Draft]

1 upvotes · 11 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Right on.

We've done it, guys. "Traditional Masculinity" is now officially deemed "harmful" by the American Psychological Association. High-five to culture!

1 upvotes · 11 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

This is a little too conspiracy-theory-ish for me, but I think you're missing the point. Nobody here is fooled by the article or thinks it's credible. The problem is that the world at large believes it's credible. Laws get made on these things, and decisions on who gets custody are made by psychologists, whether you want to call it a pseudo-science or not.

We've done it, guys. "Traditional Masculinity" is now officially deemed "harmful" by the American Psychological Association. High-five to culture!

1 upvotes · 11 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

They corner the market. The other groups are significantly smaller and less influential.

Instagram and Sex Robots - How Technology is Changing Male/Female Interactions...

1 upvotes · 10 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Right. There are certainly numerous unfair laws that all stem from no fault divorce. I think we agree there. But if someone like Bezos was dumb enough not to have a prenup, do you really feel all that bad? It's like the kid who kicks a frozen pole in winter. He's an idiot. I don't feel bad for him for doing something stupid in a dangerous climate. A prenup could save an overwhelming majority of property disputes in divorces like that, unless the guy

struck rich during the marriage and wasn't expecting it.

As for child support, my state has a cap. Once the joint income hits \$150k, the support numbers stop going up. The court can extrapolate the tables if they find it appropriate to do so, but I've had cases with people who earn over \$1m/yr and the court still didn't extrapolate, so support was the same as if the guy had only earned \$150k/yr and it didn't go up simply because he was vastly more wealthy. So again, there are some unfounded fears that guys have about divorce laws that can mostly be mitigated by a man who knows how to plan.

Instagram and Sex Robots - How Technology is Changing Male/Female Interactions...

1 upvotes · 10 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Good thoughts all around ... except the first bit. Are you really suggesting that no child support should be exchanged at all?

Dealing With Emotional Strong Arm Tactics.

1 upvotes · 9 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I'm pretty sure you're misusing those verses, but it's not a big enough deal to be worth getting into it on mobile. I'll leave you be for now ;)

Dealing With Emotional Strong Arm Tactics.

1 upvotes · 9 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

The only passage I'm aware of where it says to publicize someone's sins is when a leader of a church commits a sin (and many people interpret this predominantly to mean sins that would affect his capacity for leadership or which are against the body). I'm not sure where it says this over individuals who are not in church leadership.

Dealing With Emotional Strong Arm Tactics.

1 upvotes · 9 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

But this needs to happen at a legal or national level. It's a pointless battle in a small church.

The law can't get in this situation, nor can the nation. The way it becomes a legal or national issue is when enough "small churches" and individual people take action that the numbers start to show a trend that the law-makers can't ignore.

Quite simply: if this case is not news-worthy enough to get a lot of social media attention to reach the larger public and start law-makers thinking ... then only the cases that are news-worthy enough will ever get addressed by the law, and then cases like these are left by the wayside ... unless they can show value through consistency among individuals to push at the small levels.

For the unmarried - is marriage worth it today?

1 upvotes · 9 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

if you are married to a woman in a lower socio-economic class than you are, you will likely be forced to pay for her for many years

Only if you stay married for longer than a decade.

Hypergamy dictates that women will not be loyal if they see an opportunity to jump ship for a better deal.

It doesn't dictate this. It suggests that the desire to do this is inherent in all women. That's a big difference.

Different women are able to control their innate desires to different degrees. This is particularly true when God changes a person's heart. Don't impute secular tendencies on those who are renewed and restored by God. While the flesh is still present, their default desire is now to wage war against those desires and not to give in to them. Just don't assume that any girl who says, "Yeah, I'm a Christian," actually is a Christian and has a changed heart. I think we've used [u/ruizbuje](#)'s study a number of times here, where he found it to be close to 15% of church-goers would actually meet a basic definition of salvation ... or something like that. It's in one of [u/OsmiumZulu](#)'s posts on the sidebar where he linked to the study.

More marriages are sexless or have such infrequent sex that it's basically sexless.

A lot of your post is doing this. You're looking at marriage stats for the average beta and asking: "Is it worth getting married?" As a beta, obviously not. As a secular alpha, certainly not - you can get the milk without buying the cow, as the saying goes. As a Christian alpha, who is genuinely attractive and can lead effectively, the evaluation becomes different.

The real question in that latter scenario is whether or not the Christian alpha wants to or can't keep himself from having sex. At that point the question turns to a matter of value: are the risks associated with modern marriage worth taking on in order to (1) have sex, and (2) maintain integrity within their faith. Even this evaluation must account for the degree that the risks may be mitigated by his commitment to maintain attraction within the marriage and the mitigation of her having a reformed heart by God. While the risks are not eliminated, they are significantly reduced as compared with women from the rest of the world, if a man properly vets to find a truly saved woman rather than trusting her words or surface-level behaviors alone.

The woman you marry today might be perfect. But on 12 months or 84 months, you could be married to a card carrying feminist ready and willing to take full advantage of the divorce and alimony torture machine.

If he's a horrible leader and lets her walk down that path, sure. And if it happens in either 12 or 84 months he probably won't be out all that much, financially. If it happens after 120+ months, it starts to build gradually until the 300+ month mark, when he's really in the hole for life if they divorce.

Why should a man get married? To have kids.

Come on man ... you can't think of a single other reason? This seems like a ridiculously disingenuous straw man.

Follow the Red Pill but Do Not Sin...

1 upvotes · 8 January 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Right. This is sad but true.

Question - Book Recommendation on Finding Your Mission?

1 upvotes · 5 January 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

That's great to hear!

how do you guys get on the other side of your own anger/rage?

1 upvotes · 4 January 2019 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

"Want to know my secret? ... I'm always angry."

Anger is usually a result of one of the following:

1. A lack of perspective
2. Heightened investment in an outcome

3. Obstruction of one's goals
4. Confused passions
5. Failed standards

The cures are as follows

- Amused mastery
- Outcome Independence
- A strategically mission-oriented life
- Stoicism
- Maintaining clear boundaries

Not all anger is bad. Handling it inappropriately is bad. Those are appropriate ways of handling different types of anger.

We are all going to hell

1 upvotes · 4 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

My red pill pastor uses the line: "Who's your king?" Another disciple making church says, "What's your pledge of allegiance?" Mine is: "What's your mission?" They all come down to the same thing.

Michael Jordan was hailed as the best basketball player ever for a long time. But he quit to play baseball, even though he had everything going for him in the basketball realm. He was willing to change missions in life. Others will too, if they are unfulfilled, have maximized their current aims, or find something better.

I change men's missions by making them a part of mine. I disciple them - occasionally without their knowledge - and through that process instill in them the vision for disciple-making as well.

Question - Book Recommendation on Finding Your Mission?

1 upvotes · 4 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Lost Art of Discipleship, by LeRoy Eims

Master Plan of Evangelism, by Coleman

Sermon: **Born to Reproduce**, by Dawson Trotman

We are all going to hell

1 upvotes · 29 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Truth.

Humility in leadership. Opposites in distinction. Or not?

1 upvotes · 27 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians

It's not a post about a relationship issue. I specifically drafted that rule to make exception for predominantly theological questions.

Humility in leadership. Opposites in distinction. Or not?

1 upvotes · 27 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Good reply.

How do/will you raise your kids?

1 upvotes · 26 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Agreed on all counts, except the clarification that the person to "have control over the programming" oys not the parent, but the child, who is taught to control his own programming.

I don't keep safeguards on most of my kids' stuff. They know what they can watch and what they can't. At first they tested those boundaries, not realizing how easy it was for me to catch them. It's been almost 2 years since they've made that mistake.

Even with new shows I've overheard my 7 year old son telling his 5 year old sister that she shouldn't watch a show because he could "just tell" that it wasn't the type of show they should be watching. She agreed and they picked something else, never realizing I could hear.

I give my kids incredible freedom, but also teach them the responsibility to use that freedom wisely. This method probably results in significantly more blunders by the kids up front (which is ongoing), but I'm confident that it will pay off in the long haul, and I'm already seeing evidence of this.

How do/will you raise your kids?

1 upvotes · 26 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Teach them to develop frame. A strong frame is immune to psychological and emotional bullying. If it's physical bullying, off to the gym.

Best Man Speech at My Brother's Wedding

1 upvotes · 26 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Disciple, not discipline, though the two do go hand in hand. The word choice makes it easier for the mainstream to swallow.

Christian Redpill books

1 upvotes · 25 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians

A lot of that depends on beta readers. I will probably self publish.

Christian Redpill books

1 upvotes · 25 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians

It won't be well received by the mainstream, but it should be bearable, as it removes the red pill branding.

Help with over-controlling parents?

1 upvotes · 21 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians

We'll address an imbalance in the types of posts if/when it becomes a substantial problem. I agree that the personals ad post should have been removed, but by the time I logged in to see it, it had already been up long enough to be worth dealing with.

Responsibilities and Privileges

1 upvotes · 20 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Agreed. But now we're blurring the line between sex being a right that husbands can demand or a privilege that a woman decides to give. How is it a right if there's no legitimate way to enforce it against the other person's

discretion to deny you that right?

Responsibilities and Privileges

1 upvotes · 20 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Agreed. Then that raises the issue: does God have the right to force us into evangelism (spiritual reproduction) against our will, and if so - why doesn't he do that more often if it would result in more people being saved?

Responsibilities and Privileges

1 upvotes · 19 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I think we're mostly on the same page. I fully agree that privileges must be earned and warranted.

Not to imply a conclusion, but do you believe sex within marriage is a privilege a wife gives her husband when he has earned it (or vice versa) or a right that each spouse maintains that the other simply and sinfully refuses to comply with at times? This is a subtle distinction that can make a big difference to a man's frame, as proven on [r/deadbedrooms](#) constantly.

How did you reach the conclusion that marriage is the "primary physical representation" of making disciples? There are other means, such as proselytizing. How does marriage rank above the proselytizing?

You're confusing methodology with symbolism. Marriage is a symbol, not a method. The parables are great examples. Jesus wasn't saying that farmers are the best people to grow God's kingdom through seed planting in the right soil. He's saying that farming is symbolic of what spiritual seed planting is like. In the same way, physical marriage and child rearing is the tangible example of what our spiritual marriage and reproductive efforts should look like. When the physical representation is broken, the world can't figure out what God wanted on a spiritual level either, hence discipleship as Jesus modeled it (which is the best method on a methodological level) has become a lost art.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (12/12/18)

1 upvotes · 16 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Good call. I do meal prep when I'm in town, usually chicken, steak or salad. Part of the issue is that I've only been in town 2 weekends beaten October and the end of the year, forcing a lot of eating out. Also, even during weekdays there are a lot of mandatory eating out times. My fault for being careless with what I order, though.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (12/12/18)

1 upvotes · 16 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I've been struggling with maintaining a diet lately. I could type up a huge list of reasons why, but that doesn't excuse the regression in progress on my gut. My OYS for the week is getting my diet back under control, even despite all of the opportunities for delicious feasting that have been throwing themselves in my face for the last couple months - and that will keep coming up for the next 3 weeks. More self-control is needed.

Is repentance required in order to be saved?

1 upvotes · 14 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That's my point.

Do Looks Matter – The Maroon Pill and The Apex Alpha Predator...

1 upvotes · 12 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I'm out of time, but your reliance on this study about women not liking asians is misplaced. Watch what she does, not what she says. Those studies, by your own acknowledgement, are 100% what she says. Then she'll go have

sex with an alpha Asian and say, "I never do this. It just happened."

Do Looks Matter – The Maroon Pill and The Apex Alpha Predator...

1 upvotes · 12 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I should also note that you're conflating a few ideas inappropriately. For example:

Just like some women will never consider some races. They have a hard no. They won't even talk to them long enough to learn or know anything about them.

First, you're now talking about extremely unique outliers. If we're only talking about outlier women, I'm more open to the possibility that those random, obscure women really will follow things exactly as you say. But it's not the norm.

Second, you're also conflating SMV with RMV. A girl can be sexually attracted to someone who they will otherwise refuse to enter into a relationship with. If a girl is dead-set that she wants to marry a hispanic man and she won't consider white men, she may still find white men incredibly attractive. So, this type of thinking is really off-base.

Is repentance required in order to be saved?

1 upvotes · 12 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That's kind of my point.

Relationship agreement - what do you think?

1 upvotes · 26 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That type of agreement is completely different. He's getting consent up front so she can't sue him later for all the stuff he does to her, pretending she was raped. You want a "He didn't rape me" contract? Go for it. That makes sense. People have been doing that for long before that book. But what you're proposing is completely different.

Recommendation Pastor Charles Lawson

1 upvotes · 26 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I'm removing this. If you want to repost with more details that actually relate to this sub, feel free to do so.

Relationship agreement - what do you think?

1 upvotes · 26 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Always look to the parallel Christ gave us. You're getting it! :)

Disturbing Things in This Group

1 upvotes · 26 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

There's an ongoing study across thousands of churches in America that is looking at many things, but peripherally notes the divorce rates among believers with an active plan and lifestyle for evangelism and discipleship is around 2%. Mission. That's the difference between this group and the general church going population with a 53% divorce rate.

Worried about never being in a relationship

1 upvotes · 22 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

For curiosity sake, which OU is your name referencing?

What to do, now in business debt. How to communicate with wife about it

1 upvotes · 15 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Don't volunteer information she doesn't need. If she asks, OYS. Tell her what's what. Own it and move on. Don't pout or cry or try to evoke emotional sympathy from her to keep her from being mad at you. Tell her you're filing for bankruptcy, if it's appropriate. Nice guys hide their faults. But men aren't compelled toward disclosure either. Be a man, not a nice guy.

How common is this really?

1 upvotes · 14 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I'm pretty sure women surpassed men in infidelity since around 2010.

But that's really beside the point. All I'm really saying is that men don't act on their impulses as often. Not that they don't do it at all.

How common is this really?

1 upvotes · 14 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Absolutely. Just because AWALT is more popular to discuss in RP communities doesn't mean AMALT doesn't exist. They're just different tendencies.

What I will say is that in modern culture men have, generally, developed a greater ability to control their tendencies because of the social stigma if they don't. There's relatively little social stigma against women acting on their hypergamy. It's often encouraged by the media, movies, politics, divorce laws, etc. For men, we no longer have the same recourse, so we have been trained by culture to be more cautious in how we control our AMALT tendencies.

Some people would go so far as to say that men are innately better at self-control and that it's not merely a product of an anti-male culture, but I can't really speak on that point because I don't know how men act in other cultures without feminist influences to compare how they would express these innate tendencies under those circumstances.

Where's the best place for a 21 year old man to meet other christian singles?

1 upvotes · 14 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Yeah, between the two of you, you hit most of them.

I'd also add: on the street, restaurants, taking the bus/subway, hosting parties or social gatherings and asking people to bring their friends, concert, when depositing a check at the bank, grocery shopping, walking around the mall ... pretty much anything can be an opportunity to approach.

Tag: /u/11-Eleven-11

Online dating apps?

1 upvotes · 14 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

1. I'm not against them, but they're a cheap way of finding people. It takes away your ability to demonstrate confidence in the approach. It also guarantees you find someone who is more controlled by hypergamy than not - because those apps are 100% endorsements for hypergamy.
2. No. Mission first.
3. Depends on whether you want to bait-and-switch her or not. If you want to trick her into dating you, go for it - and then break up immediately when you find out she's not a Christian either, because the whole point of doing this would be to attract non-Christian women who otherwise would ignore you. Or you can just be up—

front about who you are and what you're looking for. Or you can just go meet people in real life like a confident alpha man who doesn't need his computer to do everything for him like he uses it for everything else in his life.

Long story short, it's a desperation move for guys who aren't attractive enough to find girls naturally. So, if you're desperate, go for it. It's just not what I'd recommend from an RP framework. But even the beta guy has to have an avenue to meet people.

The only other thought process I might consider is to use it for training purposes. While figuring out who you are and developing confidence, online dating can be a transition point between omega and alpha. It's better than the guy who's too afraid to talk to a girl at all because it actually increases your chances of starting those conversations. From there, you can get practice talking to women without having to cold approach because it gives you a context for the conversation in the first place. Once you are confident talking to women, drop the app and let your confidence direct you.

How should I handle these two disciples?

1 upvotes · 12 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

He ended up screwing things up with his ex ... and despite my best efforts things went South

If it's not a match-made in heaven, why are you helping him stay in a failing relationship? Marriage is one thing. When they're just dating, let it run its course.

After that situation he didnt come to church for about 5 months, citing that it was a long drive for him (45-50 minutes which I understand)

Then he can go somewhere closer to him. The fact that he didn't go anywhere at all affirms that he was only going *for her*.

I'm so confused by what's happening now.

You're too invested in the situation.

she thinks he has a crush on her and she just doesn't want that

Yeah, because she likes you, not him.

I told her to not lead him on and to be very clear with her intentions.

Great advice.

theres always the chance that she was being a bit flirty and enjoyed the attention she got from him and encouraged it until it became too much

Almost certainly the case. Even if you hadn't said this, I always just assume this is what happened. It's true virtually every time a girl gets unwanted attention from a guy. It's part of "plausible deniability." She acts fun and friendly - flirty even - but as soon as she changes her mind about something she can recharacterize her behavior away from flirting into just being nice and polite.

How did I handle this, and what should I do moving forward to deal with this?

You handled it fine. Offer to train her to disciple other women and revolutionize the culture of your church with a disciple-making ministry started by the two of you. That's what I'd do moving forward.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (11/07/18)

1 upvotes · 9 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

After reading 210 in RPC Compendium, I'm going to carve out a day in the coming weeks to do a mini-retreat where I'll pray, read the Word and get my mission, vision and core values written down.

I'd love to hear the results afterward :)

The King of Amused Mastery

1 upvotes · 9 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Sarcasm is a behavior, amused mastery is a mental framework. That mental framework is someone who sees things from a larger perspective and realizes that stepping on someone's foot isn't a big deal to get all huffy or even apologetic over. It's a trifle that can be laughed at. Having that mindset leads to certain behaviors, like cracking jokes, being sarcastic, or whatever, but it doesn't have to be.

In the reverse, someone without AM who employs sarcasm can, as you easily note, be viewed as a jerk - and not in the attractive way. This is usually because the sarcasm or joke comes from a darker place or is presented with a snippy attitude or even from an even-tempered mood, not a light-hearted "life's a game, so let's have fun with it" attitude.

I address a lot more of this in my "anatomy of butthurt" post. What you're asking isn't technically about butthurt, but the concept is still addressed there all the same, I believe.

Boldly sharing the Gospel - is it unloving?

1 upvotes · 7 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Good points and well said. You're right that my off the cuff allusion to the death and resurrection did not do it justice.

A question about tears in front of your LTR.

1 upvotes · 5 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Legit. So many opportunities to share the gospel with other fans who are nonchristians ... the show makes it too easy, not to mention how good it is.

Finding a Tribe, Rasied Weak, Lds, the one myth.

1 upvotes · 5 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Solid.

Finding a Tribe, Rasied Weak, Lds, the one myth.

1 upvotes · 5 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I know you're not going to want to hear this, but I cannot in good conscience give you any reply without mentioning that Mormonism preaches a false gospel that cannot save anyone. Most of the advice I give people here about the importance of their mission has, at its foundation, the assumption that it is a mission that God actually supports. Accordingly, following the advice of much of what I write on RPC may not achieve the same results if you are pursuing a mission that God directly opposes. Although I don't support everything CARM says or does, here are two links that provide information on this: (1) [an address to those who are mormons](#), and (2) a

resource library for information on Mormonism from a biblical perspective.

For the record, my brother is marrying an ex-Mormon in a few months. I've talked to countless Mormons over the years. I've had friends who are Mormon. I've known people who have converted both into and out of Mormonism. A lot of what I'm saying here isn't just something I read on a blog somewhere, like CARM - it's based on things that I've heard from people who have actually been a part of the church in different levels of authority and who have either been blunt in their honesty or who have left and later saw the error of what was going on.

With that out of the way, let's get to the heart of your questions. First off, I can't make sense of half of your sentences. The grammar is so bad that I literally don't know what you're saying or asking half the time, so here's the best I can make of it.

Would they be able to help if a conflict happen "Scratch" no

It doesn't sound like your existing community would have your back if you needed them. Mormonism is an inherently selfish religion that exists almost entirely for one's own eventual gain. This is starkly different from Christianity, where Jesus teaches us that we should not act for our own gain or what rewards God might give us for our good deeds (though those will certainly come), but because we love God and he deserves everything.

The appropriate biblical attitude is one shared by Brother Lawrence in *The Practice of the Presence of God*: "I did not engage in a religious life but for the love of God, and I have endeavoured to act only for Him; whatever becomes of me, **whether I be lost or saved**, I will always continue to act purely for the love of God." That is, Brother Lawrence appropriately recognized that our obligation and desire to love God is completely independent of what we get out of it. While Mormonism teaches that God will give you things in exchange for your devotion, the biblical attitude, as professed by Brother Lawrence, is that he would continue to love and serve God even if he knew he was going to hell for it anyway.

While Mormonism may teach selfishness as a bad thing, it's impossible to eradicate it when it is at the core of their theology. There is no intense camaraderie among brothers who would stand by one another to the death. There is only a sense of doing what needs be done to maximize one's rewards in the afterlife. Don't expect them to jeopardize their eternity for the sake of any love they say they have for you.

Are there not any women that have my standards or "the one myth" there is a young single adults 18-29 but i am 30 and it seems like a problem within the Lds "mormon" according to google

Mormonism is such a small niche within the religious sphere that you are very unlikely to find a single girl who meets whatever standards you may say you have. That said, based on your story, it sounds like you have a lot of work to do before you are a high enough value man to attract that kind of girl in the first place. Get your past traumas and communication skills in order and that can be a big step.

the one myth: sure i bet if look hard there will be a someone hiting the wall looking to snag me up born again virgins all that jazz and Ill get told i should be happy I am with them

You don't have to settle. I would never encourage you to try to convert a girl to Mormonism. But if you are a high value man, a woman who is attracted to you will follow you anywhere you go. In my single days, I had several girls who professed that they would convert to Christianity for me. The pool can be larger than you realize - just don't evangelize. At best, evangelize with the prospect of dating afterward.

They put on faces "or fake act" if you show up to any lds house it will be clean you show up unannounced you will see how they really live

Most people do this. That's not unique to Mormonism or any religion, though I will say that even with 4 kids I do a pretty darn good job keeping my house in order every day.

It seems like a lot of the members are putting on an act and if you try to break out of this act and show your true way of thought you would be shamed

Not to beat a dead horse, but that's because (at least in my view) Mormonism itself is an act founded by someone (Joseph Smith) who put on an act. There have been psychological studies done to demonstrate that if something false is repeated to a person often and frequently enough that their brain will actually rewire itself to believe the falsehood - even if they know it's false ([example study](#)).

A great example of this is in being sick. I remember a few days where I would stay home from school claiming to be sick. I got pretty good at faking it. I knew I was faking it. But after faking for long enough something started to happen by the end of the day: I actually got sick. Or at least I thought I was actually sick. My nose would run, my throat get scratchy, my chest congested, etc. Then suddenly the next morning I'd be fine again, as if I was never actually sick. I had psychosomatically developed the physical condition I had deceived my brain into thinking I had.

This same thing can happen on a spiritual level. That is why Mormons place an incredible emphasis on a person's emotions and feelings as a source for discerning truth. *How do you know the book of Mormon is true?* someone asks. "Because the Holy Spirit has affirmed it in my heart through a powerful experience and burning joy when I read it," is a common response.

But the Bible doesn't give any such weight to emotions. This concept of emotionalism in spirituality is very dangerous and one that I actively combat against in churches that I visit. I have had to fight against it in my own home church until the leadership finally got on board. When that much weight is placed on emotion, it is easy to deceive anyone into anything by manipulating their feelings.

And let me be clear: feelings are very easy to manipulate. I used to make it an intentional point in my life, back in high school, to discern how to evoke emotional reactions out of different types of people. My goal at the time was to use techniques of emotional manipulation to cause people to believe in Jesus. It was twisted and dark, but I essentially had the same plan that Mormonism employs: use people's feelings as a rope to drag them wherever you want them to go. Don't fall for it. Don't be like I used to be, and don't fall for people who do what I used to.

There for trying to act or talk of red pill without slamming bible in it some how will be looked down on.

The red pill and the Bible will always be frowned upon.

Family is Every thing. I do not want children/cant.

Family is everything in Mormonism because that's how they keep Mormonism alive. If two people have 4 kids, they just tripled the number of Mormons in their home. If those kids each have 4 more, that's now 22 Mormons starting with 2 people.

It is very cult like and if my parents were not this way I feel i would be more willing to go.

It's cult-like because it *actually is a cult*. Don't let your relationship with your family destroy your relationship with God or hold you back.

I have a few goals in my life but I am indifferent if going will help me achieve them

Without knowing those goals, I can't say. If your goal is to become the leader of the Mormon church, then going

will not help you achieve that goal. If your goal is to get into heaven someday, then leaving the Mormon church will absolutely help move you in the right direction. If your goal is to stay single for life (as it seems is the case right now), then leaving an environment where everyone is pressuring you to get married and have kids is probably a good idea.

btw i hate it when people give the advice pray and read the book because it seems like the answer when they do not know what to say also my friend got told that when i was around 14, she hung her self later that night.

I'm sorry to hear that. I agree with you that "just pray and read the Bible" is horrible advice - but it's common because many people don't know the answers in the first place, so all they can do is tell you how to find them on your own.

BF hasn't said I love you...

1 upvotes · 2 November 2018 · /r/RedPillWomen

Makes sense. I agree that there's a lot of semantics issues at play when we use the word "love," which is part of why I say that hearing the word doesn't actually mean much - because no one really knows what's being communicated when they say that word. The person hearing it might receive it differently than it's intended.

Again, that's not to say it shouldn't be said - only that it has no real value unless it's clearly defined, and any viable definition that could have actual meaning relates better to behaviors and priorities over emotions. That's all.

Part of this, of course, comes from the fact that I look at things from a biblical perspective, in which love does have a very clear and defined meaning. I do recognize that the way most of the world that speaks modern English has totally different conceptions that aren't biblical. I accept that and don't assume everyone must follow biblical standards of definitions who haven't otherwise signed up for that, but it does explain some of the semantic differences.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (10/31/18)

1 upvotes · 2 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I apply kino way too often. As in every time I'm near her.

It only comes off as needy if she thinks you're trying to touch her sexually every time. Try engaging in non-sexual types of touching instead and you can still get that physical contact without her feeling pressured or feeling like sex is another chore she has to check off her list.

How to date "evenly" as a Christian

1 upvotes · 2 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Excellent reply.

Intro + question

1 upvotes · 1 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

It was like 95% torn off. There were still a few ligaments attached to his body, which is why he miraculously still has some moderate mobility. They were just the right ones, apparently.

Fun fact: he started a business a few years back in which he travels the world training SWAT teams on how to locate and raid sex trafficking dungeons. His entire life is actually a list of fun facts and these are on the bottom of the list.

The Consciously Crazy Wife

1 upvotes · 1 November 2018 · /r/askMRP

Good stuff. Hysterical video. No clue when that became a thing.

Boldly sharing the Gospel - is it unloving?

1 upvotes · 30 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Amen on all that! I often use Matthew 12 as well, though I think he is speaking literally and not in a parable in that passage (unless you want to say that comparing us to a house is parabolic).

What's more interesting is the thought about what to fill our house with? If we can't leave it empty, what should go in? I searched the Bible specifically on that question and I could only ever find three things that the Bible references as indwelling within us that are of any positive value:

1. The Word of God
2. Jesus
3. The Holy Spirit

Now, to tie this back to my comments about discipleship/evangelism being the source of assurance, consider what the Bible says is the natural byproduct of each of those things indwelling us:

1. The Word of God - In Matthew 13, the parable of the sower, Jesus says that when the Word of God is planted in good soil, it yields a harvest 30, 60 or even 100 times what was sown. That is, other plants in nearby soil spring up because of us. That's evangelism/discipleship.
2. Jesus - In John 17 when Jesus talks about being one with his disciples ("I in them and you in me," v. 23) he says this in the context of commissioning them to go make disciples ("As you sent me into the world, I have sent them into the world," v. 18, and also all the other verses around it showing the outreach focus). In essence, Jesus modeled disciple-making as his method for spreading the Gospel to all nations and he implies heavily in John 17 that this is part of what it means for him to be in them. In Colossians 1:27 Paul also talks about evangelism to the Gentiles in connection with "Christ in you."
3. Holy Spirit - In Acts 1:8 Jesus says that when the Holy Spirit comes on you, "You will be my witnesses in Jerusalem, Judea and Samaria, and to the ends of the earth."

Conclusion? If we take Matthew 12 to mean that we should fill our house after casing out the evil, not leaving it empty, then we must fill it with one of those three things, and the natural byproduct is a lifestyle of disciple-making.

The Consciously Crazy Wife

1 upvotes · 30 October 2018 · /r/askMRP

I deal with BPDs on a weekly basis. I'm confident my wife doesn't have it. If this were weekly instead of less than an hour every 6 months, I'd be more concerned.

The Consciously Crazy Wife

1 upvotes · 30 October 2018 · /r/askMRP

I want her to reduce her hours during non busy season. She wants this too, but is unsure how much. I'm fine with anything between 50-85%. We've tried her stopping altogether between busy seasons and it doesn't work. She gets a ton of vacation time, which she uses liberally anyway.

The Consciously Crazy Wife

1 upvotes · 30 October 2018 · /r/askMRP

If I told her to, she would. The question is if I really want her to. She's also in the tax department and has no experience with the audit side.

The 16 Commandments - Part 1

1 upvotes · 29 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

You're saying Jesus is jealous for devotion that is rightfully his. This is differen from making an effort to inspire jealousy.

I think you missed the point. I may be willing to agree with the bottom-line conclusion that God/Jesus does not intentionally make people jealous - but that still only applies to active dread anyway. I was referencing a passive dread whereby people are innately jealous simply by virtue of the fact that they have something that's in high demand.

However, Jesus healed people, served people, loved people, etc. One could argue that's all discipleship I guess? Yet if I get a book on discipleship does it talk about giving to the poor, serving those who are less fortunate, giving away \$?

This is a framework issue. Most people have a very limited view of discipleship by assuming it merely means a teaching session between two or more people; whereas others have an overly broad view by assuming it means anything that leads someone closer to Jesus. That's why you're not going to read about this in very many books. *The Lost Art of Discipleship* is a good one where you absolutely will read a lot of this. Also: the book I wrote on discipleship.

In reality, Jesus gave a very clear example of what he meant by discipleship. The things you listed were things that he did not merely for their own sake, but in a manner that he was showing *his disciples* how they ought to live as well. Per my 208 post (I think), "show them how" is one of the prime steps of the discipleship process that Jesus employed.

So, yes, I do absolutely argue that all of those things are part of the discipleship process. Raking your neighbor's yard is not discipleship in itself. But doing so in order to develop a character that you're trying to instill on someone else - and especially when you are showing them your character by telling them about the time you raked your neighbor's yard, or by doing it in front of them, or by inviting them to join you in raking that yard - that absolutely is all discipleship.

When Jesus did all these things, they had value on their own, but only in an extremely limited, self-contained context. What gave these things lasting impact and value was the way that he utilized them in a discipleship context so that other people would practice these things the same way he did.

I do believe my point stands that Jesus did much more than vertically disciple people.

Correct. Because much more of the discipleship process is focused on horizontal relationships than the vertical connection. We never see Jesus teaching about how to increase one's faith. But when the disciples asked how to get more faith we do see Jesus responding, "If you have faith as small as a mustard seed [at the time, the smallest known organism capable of producing life], you can tell this mountain to walk into the sea" (paraphrasing). That's not to say we ignore the vertical relationship; rather, we recognize that the vertical relationship only has value if applied in a horizontal context.

if you use persuasion to get someone to do something for your gain that's manipulation. If you do something

to do something for their gain, that's leadership

Fair enough. Then you've inappropriately characterized my original comment/process as manipulation and should have called it leadership instead.

While I agree that the word "manipulate" often has a negative connotation to it, I don't believe it *has to* or even that it should. I very much despise the way that liberals have formed emotional connotations to words that should otherwise be neutral, and I will often do what I can to fight against this grain.

The Price of Sex...

1 upvotes · 29 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I remember that post. I think I commented back that given the circumstances of my marriage, she was paying me per hit.

The point is that the model doesn't make sense when converted into reality. Even if it did, it would only work in a setup where everything could be boiled down to a dollar figure and the husband is the only one working.

Learning from the life of Esau

1 upvotes · 29 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Good post. I'm a little shocked, though, that it's the third highest voted post on the front page right now, but has no comments ...? I suppose it's just not oriented toward discussion and the questions are a bit rhetorical.

I look forward to more posts like this. Just try to ask more critical-thinking (i.e. not yes/no or where you answer the question immediately after asking it) and application-driven questions.

The 16 Commandments - Part 1

1 upvotes · 27 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Several things you say make me think you missed that I'm providing a commentary on something else. Heartiste wrote in his blog the "16 Commandments of Poon." This post is commenting on the first 8 of them. So, I state the exact wording of his "command" first, then I go into my commentary on whether or not it's a biblical concept.

I just don't see jealousy as a positive, nor would I say that it's something Jesus exhibited

And yet there are several places in the Old Testament where God identifies himself as "a jealous God." I absolutely agree that it can be applied in very unbiblical ways, but it is also a concept that God identifies with himself and I believe it is appropriate to take after that model.

While I don't think I referenced it in my original post, an example of Jesus *being jealous* in the submissive role, is when he saw the way that God's purity was being tainted by the money-changers at the temple before he started driving them out.

point III - awesome, shouldn't this be #1

It's the third commandment of poon. I kept the numbering the same order Heartiste used.

I'm not saying discipleship isn't important but it seems like one element of many Christ taught

No, it was his entire lifestyle. Discipleship was not part of what he taught. Everything Jesus taught was part of the discipleship process. Too many people get hung up on Jesus' teachings and think we merely need to follow those, but then leave out Jesus' lifestyle. What did Jesus actually do? What was his ministry strategy while on earth? Is it enough to say, "Well, Jesus taught these x number of things, so I'm going to do that, but I don't need to live like

Jesus lived"?

You don't even describe what the golden ratio is referring to.

That's fair. I assume that most people on this sub have been through some of the foundational red pill reading material, and therefore would already be familiar with the 16 commandments of poon. Perhaps that familiarity would fill in the gaps where you believe certain things weren't explained clearly enough.

I wonder if manipulation is truly necessary? Maybe it is.

Let's be clear: we're always manipulating people all the time. The only real distinction is between styles of manipulation that are perceived as immoral and styles that are not. If I push someone away from an oncoming truck, I have manipulated their body against their will to save their life. Most people would agree that's a moral form. If I ask a friend to help me move a dresser and he agrees, I have manipulated him according to his will because he is now doing something that he would not have done had I not asked. Most people would agree that this is moral. If he said he did not want to help me move the dresser and I hold a gun to his head and ask him again, most people would agree that this is immoral.

But there are all levels in-between, sometimes on different scales entirely. If I am in a conversation with an atheist who hates God and I play a relational long-game with him, often steering conversations to things that will soften his heart and ultimately share the Gospel with him and he accepts - if I let him know up-front what I was doing, he would have said no and refused to be my friend. So, my long-game manipulation was against his will when I began the process. But is it immoral for me to have done so? I think not.

If I merely ask my friend to help me move the dresser, the fact of my asking puts certain social pressures and considerations into play that prevent his response from being in a vacuum. Because of my friendship with him, he may innately assume that friendship comes with occasional obligations and feel pressure from that social construct to help me, even if he didn't want to. Or perhaps he may fear that if he doesn't help me I may stop being his friend, and therefore helps me against his will. But is it immoral that I would have asked him?

More on point: I have 4 kids. They are often bad. As a parent, I am their leader and they are my followers. They are to follow my instructions. If I use a combination of positive reinforcement and negative reinforcement to train them up to be well-behaved and good followers, is that immoral manipulation or is it something that both the Bible and society instruct us to do? Clearly the latter.

Likewise, in the marriage relationship, the husband is to lead his wife and she is to follow. This means there has to be some type of pressure to elicit that following. It could be spiritual pressures, whereby she understands that it's her role as a wife from the Bible, and therefore she feels compelled, despite not wanting to. Or it could be that her husband is effective at teaching, rebuking, correcting, or taining in righteousness with his wife. Or it could be any other number of things. But at some point he's going to have to "manipulate" his wife in order to be an effective leader over her.

Or maybe if you are masculine, go on your own path and have your own purpose and truly don't need or desperately want her and let her join if she wants - maybe that is enough? I don't know.

I actually just had this conversation with my wife this morning. She was frustrated with me because: "I feel like you have your own life purposes and you're going down this path and I know you want me to follow you, but sometimes I just don't know how and I need you to help me figure it out. I need you to let me know what I'm doing right, what I'm doing wrong, and help me figure out what exactly I'm doing. I need you to actually lead me and not just expect me to follow all on my own." Pretty similar wording to what you used. She was right, by the way. I wasn't being intentional enough in the way I influenced her. I took the attitude, "I'm just going to go and she'll come when she's ready," but I had veered too far toward that mentality and too far away from the

intentional manipulation mentality.

your writing in this is not very clear ... I think in writing these commandments maybe you purposely made it vague so it could apply to a lot of instances, but it's just not clear and therefore not helpful

Another indication that you might not be familiar with the 16 commandments of poon. That's my mistake for assuming everyone would be familiar with them. I forget that not everyone here found this place after being on the secular subs first.

But when God acts in a displeasurable way toward us, how often does he apologize?

Apologies are an acknowledgement of wrongdoing, not of displeasing someone else. We can say, "I'm sorry" in an empathetic context, like, "I'm sorry that your dad died" - but this is not an apology. God has no need to apologize because he doesn't do anything wrong.

I don't know if we can use God as a model in all things - like, we can't create the world, we can't judge or condemn sinners - I don't think we can use examples of what God has done to guide our behavior. Now Jesus example on earth, I think we can use.

I agree that Jesus is the preferred model, whenever possible. But God the Father is also described as a groom to us. For example, Isaiah 54:5 says, "For your Maker is your husband, the LORD of hosts is his name." Also, the entire book of Hosea establishes the same parallel of husband/wife to describe the relationship between God and his people. While I agree that there are certain behaviors we cannot emulate, I do believe the character and principles that describe God's decision-making patterns should most certainly be emulated in our own lives.

He's my simple criticism, "what does love require of you?"

This is an absolutely appropriate thing to ask. But only if we have a complete picture of what "love" includes. Most people today have a romantic, emotionally fuzzy view of love that doesn't recognize things like, "The Lord disciplines those he loves" or that because "God so loved the world ... he sent his one and only son" to die for us or that "God is love" and yet that same God, who is love, ordered the deaths of countless people, demanded sacrifices in his name, whipped people at the temple, called his followers "Satan" for saying something dumb, etc. So, "What does love require of you?" doesn't necessarily mean some soft-hearted, squishy attitude that always sublimates oneself beneath another.

Say sorry when you think Jesus would say sorry or the Holy Spirit would lead you to say sorry.

That's a fair conclusion.

Many of these commandments are built on weak principles.

They're not weak principles. Truth is truth, whether we like it or not. But I agree that it is an incomplete set of principles. It only paints one side of the story - and I'm okay with that, as I'm not expressing these as an exclusive set of commands. I'm merely evaluating someone else's proposed set of commands.

Open thread

1 upvotes · 27 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Greetings to you too.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (10/24/18)

1 upvotes · 26 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I wouldn't sit them down to do this. Do, don't tell. Practice it as application opportunities come up or they won't take it seriously.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (10/24/18)

1 upvotes · 26 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Excellent thoughts here. You could easily develop this into an MRP post.

Based on things I've seen in the Bible, I've developed what I call "proactive obedience." The goal is to take all the "no no" things for kids and instead of being reactive/responsive when that negative thing occurs, you proactively address things more generally (which addresses your last comment on kids acting out).

So, if there's a rule in the house that kids are not to tell lies, I have trained my kids to proactively tell me things about themselves that they wouldn't want me to know. For a while it was from me asking them: "What's something you did lately that you don't want me to know you did?" and when prompted, they'd answer. Now my son (almost 7) has no fear of telling me when he gets in trouble at school or when he's mean to his sisters. He knows it will result in discipline, but proactive honesty is part of his character (at least for now), rather than "don't lie" being something we only think about when we're reacting to a lie.

For my daughter (5), the "no whining" rule used to be a big deal. She was punished for that one constantly, but the punishment never corrected the behavior. I contemplated how proactive obedience would apply and began modeling polite communication toward her (when I was careless in my speech, she was careless in hers) and would invite her to repeat certain phrases after me when I knew she'd want something, but before she'd ever ask - "Daddy, may I please have an orange?" in a bright and chipper tone, instead of, "I'm hungry!" By proactively addressing her speech patterns before she ever needs to whine in the first place, whining stopped becoming a habit (because she hadn't had a chance to do it in weeks) and now she know how to use the proper tone of voice by default without my needing to proactively preempt her anymore. Even better: her example is now rubbing off on my 3-year-old.

Rather than the dichotomy between active v. passive punishment, it focuses more on active v. passive obedience. It's not often that I have to discipline my kids anymore - and when I do, it's because they're with someone else (school/daycare) when they were misbehaving (which just means I have to work on consistency and not merely their behavior when around me).

My premise in all of this is that the goal of any rule and discipline is to correct behavior toward compliance with that rule. But if we're only talking or thinking about the rules after a violation has occurred, then rules become associated with punishment and are viewed very negatively. The child never internalizes the value of obeying the rules - only the lack of value of disobeying them.

In reality, (with limited exception) the rules aren't about enforcing parental preferences in the home; it's about helping my kids to become the type of people who will thrive and be successful in the future. It's not about bad-character-shaming, but good-character-creating. So, to break the association between rules and punishment, finding ways to create proactive obedience to what would otherwise seem reactive situations (i.e. all the "do not" things) has been, at least in my home, a far more effective way at producing the results I want of positive character development in my children.

Tag: [u/rocknrollchuck](#) - your kids may be older, but maybe this can still help in some way

Can't get physicaly strong: Advise needed

1 upvotes · 24 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Go for endurance lifting instead of strength building. You'll still get the size and shape of the muscle, but won't trigger any injuries. As you do endurance lifting, you'll notice that even with injuries, the muscles surrounding

the injury get strong enough that you can still increase the weights over time anyway. It's just a lot slower-going and you will reach a plateau. But that plateau will be after you have gained an appreciable size benefit, so you won't look scrawny anymore.

For Women: Getting Your Beta to Man Up

1 upvotes · 18 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

It sounds to me like you've been heavily conditioned by the "there is no I in team" philosophy. "A team is greater than the sum of its parts," they say. It sounds inspirational, but on a pragmatic level nothing in nature actually works that way. You cannot get more energy out of a system than what is put in. You cannot create new matter - you can only rearrange it into more convenient and useful shapes. Two people, when they get married, don't become 2+ - they're still just two people.

I do agree that on a spiritual level two people do become one, and that this temporarily happens physically during sex, which is a symbol of what's happening on the spiritual level. But that spiritual oneness between spouses is not something that directly affects the pragmatic realities of responsibilities and resource allocation in a home. I still have to eat X calories a day, and so does she. I still have to perform X tasks to keep the ship afloat, and so does she. I still have my emotions, and so does she.

The only place where it could be confused for a "we" is when there's a mutual agreement to reorient each person's individuality to better align - so that instead of trying to force two puzzle piece bumps to fit together, you put together a bump and a hole. Someone has to be reoriented for the pieces to fit together in harmony. That doesn't mean that you're suddenly one puzzle piece instead of two. It just means that you're two puzzle pieces that have now fit together better than when you were misaligned.

"The woman should live in the man's frame," is a bit pat and glib, also a recipe for resentment if the husband is the type to ride roughshod over his wife

Right. That's why for a long-term relationship to work, the man has to make his frame a desirable place to live in.

I think both parties need to feel their imperatives are being served in a marriage in order for there to be contentment. Probably the key is having (for the most part) the same imperatives ... then you are working as one to achieve them.

Yes, having the same imperatives is ... imperative. Trying to compromise between two different people's missions is what usually results in disaster, as I have experienced in my own life and marriage. The preferred (and biblical) way of addressing this is not to pursue two separate goals ("no man can serve two masters," as Jesus says), but for one person to set the goals and the other to submit.

In most relationships that I've observed (including my own), and also from a biblical perspective, it makes sense that the man would be the goal-setter. Most women I know don't even know what they want out of life in the first place, other than general concepts like ease, comfort, happiness, etc. - which aren't visions/missions, but emotional states that can be experienced along any mission path.

For Women: Getting Your Beta to Man Up

1 upvotes · 18 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

they still want to try what doesn't work: nagging, berating, and demeaning

Darn straight. It's the inverse of my 106 post on [what doesn't work for men](#).

OYS - Where Progress is Made (10/17/18)

1 upvotes · 18 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

OYS #3

PHYSICAL - After a few weeks off my diet, I'm back on. Lifting has been consistent throughout the whole time, so my body is back to aching with the lower calories. I'm thinking of switching from a heavy lifting routine to an endurance lifting routine to work on muscle shape over density, which will also balance well with the lower calorie intake.

My fashion sense has gone up. I bought a new line of workout clothes, specifically, noticing that I'm at the gym enough that I can't keep up with the laundry. This time I went for a size smaller than I've been wearing, which is nice in that it's more form-fitting, but given that I don't have a 6-pack yet, I can feel a little self-conscious about wearing the tighter clothes. Part of me wants to NGAF, but the other part wants to use that as motivation to keep slimming down to 12%BF, whereas I'm down from 16% to 15% right now.

Sex life hasn't changed much from last time. My wife is readjusting with being done with her busy season (Monday was the last day). She's struggling a lot with the adaptation back to being with the kids more often, so I'm not overly pushy, but she was responsive when I initiated, so that's good.

MENTAL/EMOTIONAL

Interestingly, my wife reports resenting me for being "superman" while she's in busy season - working full time, being a single-dad, handling all the housework (laundry, home repairs, cleaning, cooking, etc.), and still engaging in a ministry life-style. She gets off busy season, has the kids for one evening after daycare while I'm at a meeting, and starts falling apart because she can't handle them. I practiced passing comfort tests here. I assume she's still jittery from the insane work hours and that she'll renormalize soon. Either way, my plans haven't changed. It just means I get extra help doing what I always do anyway.

Reading is still researching. I have not been writing in my book as much this past week as I'd hoped. Part of that is laziness, part of it is meditation on the best direction to take certain components.

Practicing the basic relational techniques in the home has been going well. My frame is solid and my kids have learned to live inside even, which is excellent. It is part of what's causing my wife so much grief, though. They're so attuned to "that's how Daddy does it" that when I was at my meeting yesterday my kids were telling my wife, "We don't like it when you're here. We want Daddy back" and my daughter actually said to her, "You don't control me. Only Daddy does." That's obviously not cool, but it is an indication of the level of respect I've developed with them, as evidenced by their obedience when it's just them and me. Sadly, when my wife is present, they don't listen to me as much anymore. I'm not sure why that is, other than that they perceive a possible disconnect where they can get away with things - especially given that my wife doesn't approve of all of my methods and parenting style, so they feel like mommy will let them get away with more, even if I'm there. I need to work on this.

SPIRITUAL

AoS: 10

QT: 3 - I really haven't been having much passive time in the Word and with God as much lately. I'm okay with this.

Bible Study: 9 - I've been doing a lot more in-depth study on various subjects and meditating on some of the things I believe and why. I also just got another article posted on gotquestions.org to their public site (most of the questions I answer are private responses).

Scripture Memory: 1 - I haven't done anything with this lately, other than reviewing a few past verses. I'm okay with this.

Evangelism: 8 - My intentional relationship-building with non-Christians has been solid this week.

Fellowship: 10 - I'm connecting with other believers better than ever.

I've also told people before that one piece of my mission - a short-term vision - is developing a discipler-making ministry in my church. I've already red-pilled one of my pastors (he's even read NMMNG and WISNIFG and has posted his "Assertive Bill of Rights" in his house) and he's working with me on building a discipler-making ministry in our church. He has discussed it with the head pastor, but the response was, "We're already doing that. We're just not doing it your way." He appropriately took it as a joke and pushed back this week: "How many people in the church today would be competent to individually lead someone else to Christ and help that person be established in the faith, then cast a vision for that person to reproduce and do the same thing? The pastor didn't have an answer. He recognized that he would like to see that happening, but thinks it's an impossible goal and that the church should "outsource discipleship to the church systems rather than rely on the people" (RP Pastor's interpretation, not the head pastor's actual words).

Anyway, we had a meeting last night at the church among all the leaders of the church's primary "system" (of which I am one) and the RP pastor and I were able to steer the conversation toward a one-on-one discipler-making ministry in such a way that the other leaders all took ownership of the idea and thought they came up with it themselves. RP Pastor then communicated how overjoyed he was that there was near unanimous consent among the "systematic process" leaders in the church that the existing process the head pastor was relying on is not working and that we really do need a more targeted discipler-making ministry. We'll see how he responds, knowing that his team of leaders disagrees with his perception.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (10/17/18)

1 upvotes · 18 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Wife commented that I was looking slimmer the other day, so that's a win!

Be careful of that validation orientation. She's not your judge. The more those comments from her affect your measure of your own success, the more power she retains over you and the longer you'll be stuck in the blue pill.

Paul has an interesting phrase: "I care very little if I am judged by you or by any human court; indeed, I do not even judge myself. My conscience is clear, but that does not make me innocent. It is the Lord who judges me" (1 Cor. 4:4).

This concept could be applied to anything, including your body. Is your wife's expectations the standard of what shape you should be in? Some guys would say you should set your own standard and decide when you're happy with your body and not try to live up to someone else's expectation. While that's good, an even better standard: *What does God want your body to look like?*

A great place to start with answering that question: the end of Exodus (25 to the end, I think). I kid you not. You're God's temple. The tabernacle was the first "temple" God instructed Moses to build, and you can get an idea of how specific and intricate God intended it to look. 2 Chronicles 3 and 1 Kings 5-8 also go through the building of the actual temple. Let that sink in as to how important God cares about the design of his temple and then go to 1 Cor. 3, where it says that your body is the temple of God and ponder how intricately and intentionally God wants your body shaped.

We're also praying about planting a church with some close friends in a few years

Not until you figure out that social networking piece.

On the whole, though, it sounds like buying is a bad idea for you right now. Wait until you know where you'll be long-term, otherwise you'll lose any equity you put into it on realtor fees selling it 2 years later. It sounds to me like you already have a leaning on this issue, but your wife really wants to buy the house, so you're feeling pressure from her. Maybe I'm getting a wrong vibe on that though.

devote a lot of my free time while there to readying and working on some projects i've been long neglecting

Like Scripture memory.

Also when i'm away it's always more tempting to look at porn.

Because you don't have any higher priorities in the moment. Pick a goal for the weekend. Make it to "finish X book" if you want. Or make it to memorize the first chapter of Philippians (my recommendation). If you set a goal and make that a priority, you'll find it's a lot easier to avoid temptation when you have a higher priority.

Why StrongLifts over GreySkull for beginners?

1 upvotes · 18 October 2018 · /r/askMRP

And pulling. Gotta balance the pulling in there too.

For Women: Getting Your Beta to Man Up

1 upvotes · 18 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

How can "we" do anything without each person individually participating?

For Women: Getting Your Beta to Man Up

1 upvotes · 17 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I really like this. Good thinking :)

"I think I was just raped"

1 upvotes · 13 October 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Hah, that's funny. Makes sense.

Beta is always bad: Change my mind

1 upvotes · 12 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

God gives them, right? I'm not sold on this idea anyway ... just tossing out some gut reaction stuff and seeing what people say.

"I love you"

1 upvotes · 12 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

What would you say to my wife, who frequently says that she prefers her food bland with no spices, sauces, or seasonings? ;) No joke, that's how she eats.

"I love you"

1 upvotes · 12 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Yeah, that's not a joke reply. That's a legit one I use all the time. But as you allude to: *show, don't tell*. Telling is fine, but it's meaningless if it doesn't have the active history to back it up.

Help me out of this pit

1 upvotes · 12 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Excellent comment - the only change I'd make is to substitute "Lost Art of Disciple-Making" for Purpose Driven Life ... for many reasons.

Why would a foreign wife be a bad idea?

1 upvotes · 11 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

1 Cor. 7/Matthew 19:11 MGTOW is fine ... but don't adopt the secular attitude of MGTOW.

"I think I was just raped"

1 upvotes · 11 October 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Makes sense, I guess. I tried to keep the story in the context of showing how my wife lives in my frame and now views these issues the way I do because of my leadership, and therefore assumed it was perfect content for this sub. Oh well. No spilt tears over it. There just seems to be an incredible inconsistency in how my posts get moderated.

"I think I was just raped"

1 upvotes · 11 October 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

True. I just went through that with a case where my client had hundreds of hours of audio recordings of his ex-wife threatening him and the kids. She refused to settle, even after having listened to all of it herself and recognizing the evidence she was dealing with. Go figure.

Out of curiosity, why was this post removed?

On Biblical Justice and Rape

1 upvotes · 10 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

No pardon necessary, brother. You're just looking out for the good of the sub in an area where there could have been confusion. Thank you. Keep it up!

On Biblical Justice and Rape

1 upvotes · 10 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I agree with all of this. I think you may have misunderstood something, which is why I was making clear not to confuse soteriology into anything I was discussing.

On Biblical Justice and Rape

1 upvotes · 10 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Right on.

To expand a little more, hama was only the prefix/root. Hamartano was the archery term and it goes beyond merely missing the mark. Hamartano was a measurable distance from the exact dead center of the bull's eye to the place the arrow struck. Even if the arrow was on the bull's eye, if it was even slightly off center, it had a hamartano distance. This goes along well with my framework of sin being the default state of all people still living on earth, even when we think we're doing good, and that the only true "good" we can ever do (i.e. something completely devoid of sin) is when God does it through us - which is not a difficult state to achieve, but is impossible to maintain indefinitely.

The other major conjugation is hamartia, which was a literary term, not an archery one. It was used to describe a single flaw in an otherwise perfect character. Examples would be Achilles' heel or **Othello's jealousy**. Hebrew literature knew this term in the context that it only took one small flaw to ruin the whole of a man and his entire life, even his noble virtues. For example, if a man's one flaw was jealousy, the fact that he was an honest man, devoted to truth wouldn't redeem him; instead, his honesty and passion for truth would be redirected away from good pursuits toward hunting down an alleged lover who might not actually exist. Hopefully that adds some value to you.

As for "loving others as Christ loved them" - what's your view on how Christ loved them (in a John 13:34-35 context)? Because I very rarely see a good answer to that question.

"I think I was just raped"

1 upvotes · 9 October 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

The crazy thing to me is that she actually believed she was raped. I mostly assumed the girls doing this knew they were lying or exaggerating to some degree and on a power trip of some sort. Apparently it's worse than that.

"I think I was just raped"

1 upvotes · 8 October 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Good word.

"I think I was just raped"

1 upvotes · 8 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Yeah, I can see how that would look creepy. I debated including that for longer than I'd like to admit, but in retrospect, my reasons for keeping were probably unnecessary in light of how the rest of the post unfolded.

At the time, I was more concerned with my wife getting caught in the middle of someone else's drama during a time that she's already way over taxed on her time and stress levels. I wasn't thinking about the guy as much as I was her - to my own discredit.

Looking for a Relationship Tip

1 upvotes · 8 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

You should really read all of the sidebar content ;) Just because a lot of it references married people doesn't mean it's irrelevant to singles.

Our Appeal of the Quarantine to the Reddit Admin

1 upvotes · 4 October 2018 · /r/TheRedPill

I'm fully aware. But if you want results, there is a certain amount of tact that must be applied. That's all I'm saying. Here's a good example:

We see no terms in the content policy that we have violated. And yet you allege we have broken this unwritten policy.

You link to the written policy, then call it unwritten. You're probably referring to the unwritten standards that cause them to discriminate against one sub, but not another, but that's not made clear, so it just looks like you're incompetent.

Here's another one:

To me, this seems like an immeasurably bad way to run a social media site which depends on its users for long-term survival.

They have all the data about how this works. They know that even if the outright banned TRP a certain % would still stay on reddit and they wouldn't actually lose that % of users. As for those that do leave permanently (which would be very few), they're inclined to suppose they're the types of users they wouldn't want around anyway. So, you're not proving a point about the financial harm TRP can cause to reddit if the userbase leaves - you're only proving ignorance about how insignificant a ban on TRP would be to reddit's overall profit margins. There are good arguments to make (and you made some), but this isn't one of them.

Here's another one:

Misogyny is a very nebulous term, one that I disagree with heartily.

Your point about it being a nebulous term is a good one. It could range from anything like, "Women are evil and deserve to die" to "Every woman I've ever known has abandoned me, so now I have difficulty trusting women in my life." But when you say you "disagree heartily" with that term - what definition are you going by? You're undermining your own point about it being nebulous by doing this.

To be clear, I'm not saying your post is bad - just that there are lots of pot holes that could be shored up. I wouldn't want to see them miss your major points (which are good) because they get hung up on stupid stuff like this. But in argumentative writing, people will always focus on the small errors to discredit what you have to say rather than addressing the main thrust or admitting you're right.

Feminism changing the modern American woman?

1 upvotes · 1 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

They only die hard if they were the reason you're living. That means you have to find a new purpose in life.

If you're already fully satisfied in Christ you will be fine whether you're single the rest of your life, if your girlfriend dumps you, your wife dies, your kid becomes disabled, or whatever else.

Avoiding awkwardness. We see each other every Sunday.

1 upvotes · 1 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Yes, it's all available whether you use the main reddit app or "reddit is fun." They call it community info.

Feminism changing the modern American woman?

1 upvotes · 1 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

It's not that "many comments are true" - I'd wager virtually all of them are true.

Short story: I was on the road with my wife the other day, driving to my nephew's birthday party. I'm telling her about one of my cases and had to call the client mid-conversation. She was having an issue with the school, so I told her to text me their number and I'd make sure they did what we needed them to do. My wife was a little shocked about this, and said that "we'd be having a very different conversation" and that she "wouldn't stay married to a bully."

Now, I could have defended myself: "You mean you'd rather the school sit idly by while this kid is stuck going home with his abusive father?" and started an argument. I didn't. There was a deeper issue at play. I asked, "So you'd be willing to forego your marriage vows and biblical principles that easily - that if I were too aggressive with people you'd just up and divorce me?" I laughed, poking fun at the fact that she'd obviously boxed herself into a very bad spiritual corner.

Her answer: "No, I meant that I'm glad you're not that way all the time - only when you're on the job, and that you're more gracefully assertive about how you handle our personal affairs. If you were always being pushy in a forceful or blunt way, I'd have a really hard time being married to you. That's all."

See how evasive her answer was? More significantly: my "good Christian wife" is not beyond divorcing me if I deviated too far from her expectations - something she used to say she'd never resort to, no matter what. Her principles were high when we were dating, but hypergamy had its way with her mind during our low years. I'd be truly amazed if I ever found she had cheated on me during that time - but it wouldn't phase me at this point. Why? My shock wouldn't be that she'd have let her hypergamy get the best of her; it would be that she could have hid it from me so well for so long. I now realize that even the most spiritually mature women are susceptible to

their base programming ... just as my wife wasn't shocked when she found out I had struggled with porn for several years. She was only shocked that I'd managed to hide it from her for so long. My conversation with her this past weekend was merely another of many sobering reminders that AWALT - even the sweet, innocent ones who in my former judgement I thought could never have been like that.

What's my point here? Do you think I'm fuming at my wife for being so weak and unbiblical that she'd divorce me if I cranked up the assertive pressure on my son's school teacher? Of course not. If it bothered me, I wouldn't have screwed her that night. Women are women. Just accept that you'll never have their permanent, unconditional commitment and enjoy your wife while you can. Trying to keep her from being a woman - from being AWALT - will only increase the risk that she acts that way and leaves. Instead, just stop caring, have fun with life, and let her do what she's going to do. That's going to maximize the chances she wants to stay anyway.

Now, I'm not saying Christian women shouldn't be bent a different way than secular girls. "The Bible says so" can be a motivator for some - even if only slightly. Even more powerful is an in-depth personalization of the reasons why God says so in the first place. But I wouldn't ever become too confident. Embrace women the way they are, and don't try to control them or get mad at them when they're not living up to your expectations. Be happy that they perceive and make decisions in the world a different way than you. That's what makes them women and why we love them. Otherwise you'd have to marry a man ... and I can't endorse that either.

We're talking about practice!?

1 upvotes · 27 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

My favorite evangelism book is Robert Coleman's *Master Plan of Evangelism*. It takes a very in-depth look at how Jesus went about spreading the good news and how the apostles picked up his method in how they began the church. It also conceptualizes evangelism in a discipleship framework, so you kill two birds with one stone.

Another solid book on evangelism: *The Insider* by Mike Shamy and Jim Peterson. Master Plan is the framework, The Insider is more of a how-to guide.

Tag: [/u/bobbymckee](#)

We're talking about practice!?

1 upvotes · 26 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Paging [u/macmeeler](#)

OYS - Where Progress is Made (09/26/18)

1 upvotes · 26 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That's great to hear! Shoot me your phone number in a PM with some times you'd be available (convert to EST if you can), let me know what country you're in, and give me a bit of background on where you're at spiritually and with your current church as well as any questions you may have up-front.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (09/26/18)

1 upvotes · 26 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

At least a couple of them are old enough to be able to clean up after themselves, right?

Two of them, yes. I do this most of the time, but they're really slow and don't actually get a good job done. It's helpful, but there are still certain limitations. For example, if they're wiping the milk off the table, they don't have the strength or fingernails to scratch off some of the caked-on bits. So, I always end up having to do a second job after them.

dry-erase chore board

Only one kid can read fluently, so that would be highly unfair to him to have a board that only applies to his chore obligations. Good thought, though! I might have to find another way to communicate it. Maybe pictures to represent chores.

Perhaps you'll do a post sharing what you learned?

Yeah, I've been meaning to finish the 300 series and have just been incredibly lazy on that topic. Anything new I learned will be incorporated as I continue to flesh out the discipleship process there.

Wife pulled a knife on me last night

1 upvotes · 26 September 2018 · /r/askMRP

My response ended up being too long. I'll just make a post out of it. It may not be a popular one, but it's a strategy that can be incredibly effective when dealing with a mentally unstable and hostile wife in divorce litigation. Tag: [/u/jakethesnake5000](#)

OYS - Where Progress is Made (09/26/18)

1 upvotes · 26 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

OYS #2

Background: 33 years old, 4 kids, 6'0", 240lbs, 37 waist, 16%BF, Married 10 years

Physical

- Last week I upped my max bench to 290. DL/Squat: 365. OHP: 175 (new PR). Barbell Row: haven't tested max lately, but 170 for sets.
- *Goals:* 300 on the bench by the end of October, 14% body fat by Thanksgiving - I stopped my random interval fasting two weeks ago and need to pick it back up again. Life has been chaotic for the past few weeks, so I've been eating poorly, usually chipotle on the way back from the gym. I really need to get my eating back under control, but as soon as I stop dieting, it becomes twice as hard to pick it back up again. I'm not gaining weight, but I am noticing more inflammation and my old cravings have returned, which I need to kill again.
- *Fashion:* I bought a couple new outfits and am starting to increase my selection of "Large" size shirts rather than the baggier XLs I had been wearing. I hate the tighter feel to it, but it obviously looks a lot better when I'm wearing clothes that actually fit.
- Income was great during the two trials I went through recently, but took a small dive due to some days I had to take off for a conference. It levels out. Because the trials were so much, I'm probably slightly ahead of my goal for the past month.
- *Sex:* Due to my wife's 80-100hr work weeks right now, sex is acceptably infrequent. She makes up for it in quality about once a week. I had my sister over last weekend and the night my sister left she called me upstairs wearing lingerie saying, "I've been dying for this all weekend!" Good stuff.

Mental/Emotional

- Most of my reading has been research for my book, but personal reading has been more spiritually inclined than masculine inclined. These balance each other out well, especially given that I'm supplementing with red man group videos while working around the house.

- My frame is solid. I haven't had any real arguments in quite some time, though my wife has been testing how much slack I'll give her. So, my mission is to make disciples. I'll encourage her to join me in that mission. She'll say she doesn't want to, but that she's happy to support me doing it. She's not asking for anything from me or criticizing me - she's just testing how much laziness I will let her get away with. More on that in the mission section.
- I'm more OYS than I've ever been and it hasn't been bothering me, except as to my kids eating cereal. My wife feeds them cereal for breakfast every morning before she goes to work. They make a mess. It's all over the floor, on the table, milk splattered everywhere, etc. By the time I have them all ready for school and dropped off at daycare (or for my son, on the bus) and get back home to get myself ready, the wet cereal is dry and caked onto the table. This gets particularly bad if I have a hearing and don't have time to clean it until I get home from work. Sometimes it's so thick I have to get a dry wall putty scraper to get it off. I'm not sure if I need to set a "no cereal" boundary in the mornings until my wife's off her busy season to clean it up herself, but something's got to change. It's consuming too much time every single day to have to deal with this. So far I've just cleaned it up and don't give it a second thought by the time my wife's home because I've already moved on with my day. But I do notice a subtle frustration growing over time.

Spiritual

- *7 Basics*: AoS: 10, QT: 7, BS: 7, SM: 2, Fellowship: 10, Evangelism: 8, Prayer: 2
- *Mission*: Better than ever. I attended a discipleship seminar last Thursday and a 2-day conference the last couple days. Interestingly, the seminar was more helpful to me on a personal developmental level than the 2-day conference, but I got to bring our executive pastor to the conference, which went a long ways toward getting him on board with the mission of disciple-making and understanding that it's not one component of the Christian life; it's the context in which all other aspects of the Christian life fit in. His goal is for us to start a discipleship ministry in our church within the next 2 weeks, subject to the senior pastor getting on board, which could cause some slight delays. The conference also provided practical input on how to implement this at a church-wide level.
- *Mission*: Another part to note, per the bit on my wife, above, is that when I was updating her on how the conference went I urged her to look for someone to disciple as well. This was probably poor timing, given her work schedule for the next month. She said she just wants to be a sideline supporter right now and has no interest in discipling anyone. She listed other women in church I should partner with who she thinks would do a better job. This is somewhat absurd, given that I know these other women and my wife is far more equipped. She's thinking in the moment and not long-term. In the moment she can't take on more responsibility, so she can't perceive doing that long-term either. I'm going to have to work out a better strategy to get her on board again, as she used to be. I've done "tell her what" and "show her how," but can't cross the gap into "let her try." I think the solution is going to be joining a co-ed small group so that she can build relationships with other women organically rather than feeling like she has to find someone to disciple just for discipleship's own sake. Then, as she builds those relationships, I can encourage her to take one of the girls in the group out to coffee, then to a movie, then to invite them over for dinner, and let it naturally develop into a discipleship relationship without my wife realizing that's what she's doing - yet she will always come back and tell me what they talked about (she loves doing this) and I can give her better input on how to be more intentional with helping whoever this woman ends up being. I expect that once she's doing it organically again, she'll remember that discipleship doesn't have to be a high-commitment investment in a relationship like she's thinking now because everything else going on right now is high-commitment.
- *Mentorship*: My executive pastor is discipling me. Going to the conference together gave us some really good time to chat. We had 2.5 hours in the car each way, as well as the evenings at my mom's house, where we stayed while out of town. This also gave me a lot more opportunity to influence him even further toward

incorporating my mission of disciple-making as his own now. As I often explain it, I can be a firehose of information. Untended, a firehose sprays every which way. His job is to take everything I have to offer - all of my knowledge, experience, and unbridled passion - and point it toward the fire or throttle the flow to something more manageable.

- *Long-Term Goals:* While disciple-making is my mission, my vision for carrying it out is to have disciple-makers planted and actively reproducing in 60 countries from my spiritual line by the time I'm 60. I'm 33 now and have 15 of those countries covered - 4 of them having been added in the last year alone. If you want to make discipleship your mission and you live somewhere outside the US and speak fluent English, let me know and I'll make time to train you for a lifestyle of Kingdom building.

What do you think about Objectivism?

1 upvotes · 26 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Cool. I'll read and follow up soon.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (09/19/18)

1 upvotes · 26 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I'm glad to hear the changed orientation of your heart. When you get around to recording yourself reading the bible, that can seriously solve your scripture memory issue. I used to do that too, then listen to the recording on loop until I had it all memorized.

What do you think about Objectivism?

1 upvotes · 26 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I agree.

Women are pigs...

1 upvotes · 24 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I'm liking all your comments in this thread. Well done.

Dread levels and having an infant (told to chill tf out)

1 upvotes · 23 September 2018 · /r/askMRP

If it works for you, it works for you. I just wouldn't ever assume it's easy to meet a woman who would be naturally inclined that way. In my divorce practice, these are the marriages that end with both parties saying, "Things were fine ... we were just living two separate lives, so we figure it's time to make that official."

Dread levels and having an infant (told to chill tf out)

1 upvotes · 23 September 2018 · /r/askMRP

Ah, then I'd wager we agree. I wasn't suggesting a man tailor his mission to suit his wife; only that he can't expect his mission to contribute to her attraction of him if it's not something she can have any part in.

Imagine if Indiana Jones met the girl and said, "I know you want to come, but I'd really prefer you clean my house and water my plants while I look for the holy grail." Or even worse: he has a map to the holy grail and he tells her, "I'm not really all that interested. I'd much rather focus on getting tenure status as a professor! Isn't that exciting? Wouldn't you love to help me do that?"

Having career aspirations can be a noble goal ... just not an attractive one if that's all you've got going for you - unless what you're doing is truly novel, like starting the next google or something. "I want to qualify for a

challenging a competitive, yet relatively common position" just strikes me as normal self improvement, not a life aspiration. Now, if his goal was to use that position to invent a new medicine that saves thousands of lives or reinvent the stock market ... well, that might be a different story. And there are all kinds of scales in between.

But at this point I'm back to arguing against "vacuous missions" so I'll just stop there.

Dread levels and having an infant (told to chill tf out)

1 upvotes · 23 September 2018 · /r/askMRP

Absolutely, I can see many women being attracted to any of those things by getting caught up in the excitement of the competition on that level.

In the reverse, for a time in college I held the position of third in the world for fastest minesweeper time on expert ... but no one was orbiting me over the excitement over whether I could step it up the last place or two. It certainly wasn't going to cause any women to drop their panties for me. I do give a very small niche exception for people like [these guys](#) where they're engaging in legit tournaments, however cringe-worthy it may be. But these types of things are so niche that you're extremely limiting yourself to finding a girl in that niche or you're back to the blue pill hope of finding a girl who loves you for the star craft playing champion you are.

Now, when I first gave the world of warcraft example, I wasn't making that up. That was legitimately my neighbor's life mission (though his aspirations were actually higher). He went to Blizzcon (?) in San Diego back in 2015 and made it in some WOW tournament to something like 5th place. He had corporate sponsors who paid for his flight, lodging, food, etc. and bought him a \$20,000 gaming computer and contracted with him to pay something like \$25k/yr just to post weekly videos about his gaming strategy and plug them every now and then. Yet I often found him on my doorstep in tears wondering why his LDR girlfriend/in-game wife who he'd only met a few times in real life left him for a higher ranked player. If only I knew them what I know now, I might actually have been able to help the poor kid.

All that to say, even non athletic competitors can be exciting to follow if their competition involves actually leaving their basement. But in the context of this conversation, we're not even talking about that. We're literally talking about a guy who is trying to pass off general life obligations and self improvement as his mission - things that, on a categorical level, all men should be doing anyway. That's like a guy saying his life mission is to pass fitness tests and learn to be emotionally composed through his wife's temper tantrums. That's not a mission. It's just part of being a man.

Dread levels and having an infant (told to chill tf out)

1 upvotes · 22 September 2018 · /r/askMRP

Does that include the countless men who have told me their life mission is (to use one of many similar examples) to make the top 100 strongest players list on world of warcraft?

Qualities to look for in the men you spend time with

1 upvotes · 22 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Oooh, I like this! I may steal this sometime ;)

She liked me the whole time!

1 upvotes · 22 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Yeah, you're way too hung up on this. I just replied to [/u/RedPillWonder](#) with more info, if it helps.

She liked me the whole time!

1 upvotes · 22 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

You hit this one out of the park. I actually didn't look at your username and was getting super proud at whatever rando typed all this up, haha. This is the best part:

Finally, unless God has give you clear thoughts and impressions upon your heart about this girl, don't hang around waiting for her.

The clear ONEitis is the biggest struggle I see here. Even if he does start the relationship he's going to be in for some serious, serious disappointments. This post is the definition of "I want to stay blue and just sprinkle some alpha." Actually, I didn't even see the "sprinkle some alpha" part reflected here, other than that he got the confidence to approach. He wants to use red pill strategies to fulfill his blue pill fantasies. This is the danger. OP, this is what I meant when I said "I'm so sorry ..."

That confidence in the approach is great. But what's the point at the end if you're still living in fantasy land? It's just a setup for failure. I'm quite glad she shut him down - not because I wish ill on him, but because it gives him some time to kill the blue and get himself figured out before starting a relationship and ruining it. If she really is a great girl, I'd rather he have a chance when he's ready than to reflect one day, in the words of Tobias Funke, "I'm afraid I prematurely shot my wad on what was supposed to be a dry run, if you will, so I'm afraid I have something of a mess on my hands."

She liked me the whole time!

1 upvotes · 22 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I know ... that's the problem.

She liked me the whole time!

1 upvotes · 22 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Wads of cash like that can't get lethal doses of ONEitis. That's why she'll take the cash.

Purple Pill and the Christian Red

1 upvotes · 21 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Hah. I wish I had the time to engage in more of these conversations myself. Too much time writing my book on Christian dating and marriage ...

Purple Pill and the Christian Red

1 upvotes · 21 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Also [u/deep_strength](#) - reddit only allows three tags per comment

Purple Pill and the Christian Red

1 upvotes · 21 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is a great response. It reminds me of a lot of my old conversations on [r/truechristian](#) with guys like [u/fictitiousfishes](#) where we could talk circles around each other just for the fun of it only to discover that we agreed all along, but were coming from two very different avenues to get there. I respect everything you're saying, brother.

Let me also say, thought experiment aside, I also agree that we should not use the word selfish in these kinds of conversations when they come up organically because most people are not in the right spiritual place or frame of mind to utilize that language the way I have been experimentally discussing.

Has she hit a wall or is she really saving herself?

1 upvotes · 21 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Ah, I totally misread that. Thanks for the clarification! While the fruit of the Spirit can easily be faked by non-Christians (and often is), I do agree that it's one of the easiest filters we can apply to at least sift out the obvious frauds ;)

Has she hit a wall or is she really saving herself?

1 upvotes · 21 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Great response.

Purple Pill and the Christian Red

1 upvotes · 21 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Good thoughts again :)

I'm still a bit hung up on the word "selfish" though. So ... I'm a branch on the tree, right? So all I care about is what's good for the tree. Why should I care about what's good for the flower bed or the grass if it doesn't benefit the tree? If there's no glory in it for the tree, shouldn't I lack the consideration for those other things out there?

In case I'm not making much sense, should we really care about others in a capacity that doesn't glorify God? Does God do anything apart from his own glory? And if God has a "lack of consideration for others" to the extent that he derives no glory from such consideration, isn't that "selfish"?

This is, of course, related to the age old accusation that God is the chief of all sinners due to his immense pride, wanting to be glorified all the time. And then we say, "But it can't be pride if he deserves it." But yes, it is pride. It's just appropriately placed pride. In the same way, "Isn't God selfish?" Yes, he is selfish. But it's an appropriate selfishness. And if my innermost being is also fully aligned with God to the point that all the desires of my spirit (my flesh notwithstanding) are fully aligned with God's because of the new man he has made of me, then shouldn't I be selfish in those pursuits as well?

"But God loves everyone and wants everyone to be saved - even the people he knows won't be saved." Isn't that a blue pill fantasy, though? Sure, God wants all people to be saved. But at some point God puts his foot down and stops concerning himself with the affairs of many people.

- In the parable of the great banquet the nobleman is so frustrated with the disregard of his wealthy friends that he forbids them from entering. He stops having any care or consideration for them.
- In the parable of the unmerciful servant, the master forgives his servant, then after seeing his unforgiveness imprisons and tortures him for eternity, showing no more care or consideration for that man's well-being.
- There are a handful of passages that say God hates certain people. That's not an easy truth to swallow, and I know all the ways people try to pretend it means God really hates their sin ... but the Bible says what it says.
- Jesus instructed the apostles when they were rejected to wipe the dust off their feet and move on to the next town, showing no care or consideration for that town's salvation or spiritual well-being.
- The very concept of hell in the first place is evidence that at some point God cuts people off and shows no care or consideration.

What I take from all of this is that God's love, affection, and care for humanity only exists in the bounds of his own glory. If it stops glorifying him - if it doesn't benefit him in some way - then God cuts people off. I'm okay with that. Obviously many people are not, which is why there are various theories of universalism running around. But let's be real here: do you really believe universalism has any basis in Scripture? If not, then at some

point we must admit that God's selfish - that his consideration for others gets cut off.

To be clear, this doesn't necessarily mean that God stops loving people. Even in hell, God can love someone - or more appropriately: have affection for them. But he stops giving consideration to their wants, needs, desires, feelings, etc. and lets them to themselves for eternity.

I don't mean to propose this as an effort to prove you wrong or anything. I consider it more of a thought experiment. You seem to be quite intelligent and articulate and I'd love to hear what you think on this.

Purple Pill and the Christian Red

1 upvotes · 21 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That's for the thoughtful response. The only thing I'll note is that if you're in Christ - fully one with him - then yeah, be all the selfish you want. Because every inclination of your spirit is what Christ would want you doing anyway. The exception, of course, is what comes the flesh, ergo my brief caveat on the dual nature of the flesh and the spirit for Christians.

Purple Pill and the Christian Red

1 upvotes · 20 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I would guess not many. More importantly: have you crossed that line?

"I spoke to a lawyer on Wednesday"

1 upvotes · 18 September 2018 · /r/askMRP

I have a post for that:

https://www.reddit.com/r/DeadBedrooms/comments/760ehc/is_your_wife_disgusted_by_your_touch

Field Report: Beginner Moves - this works!

1 upvotes · 17 September 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Don't think I need the first

That's pretty ignorant. The title of the book isn't the value of the book. If the book were (more appropriately) titled "How to NGAF and be more alpha" would you think it'd be beneficial then?

An introduction

1 upvotes · 17 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Maybe we need a few posts on how to date for Christian guys

That's a good point. I'm making good headway in my book. Hopefully when I get to the dating section I can cross-post some content onto here. That will still be a few weeks away, though, depending on how quickly I write. My business for the rest of the year just finished on Friday, but now I've got to play catch-up on all the stuff I missed while in trial for 2 weeks. Writing is a fairly low priority at the moment but will rise again on the list soon.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (09/12/18)

1 upvotes · 13 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Thanks for the reply. I understand you may get more specific later, but right now this seems too vague to be useful. "Becoming the (blank) that God wants me to be ...

- What exactly does God want?
- who is that man?
- what does he do?
- how will you know when you become him?
- what impact does that man have on God's kingdom?
- what steps do you have to take today to grow into this man?

I used to be pretty vague with these kinds of things too. I later discovered that it created a subconscious copout where I could do whatever I wanted and not actually make measurable progress while still rationalizing not having an actual direction in life - because I told myself I had a direction, but it was so vague that anything could fit inside. Be cautious not to make my mistake.

When you're standing before God's judgment seat and he asks you, "What did you do with your life? What fruit do you have to show me?" How will you answer? That's your mission. Consider:

- "God, I was a good and moral person." God asks: *Okay, and what did you do with that morality to help me?*
- "God, I was a leader to my family." *Okay, and how is my heavenly kingdom going to be any better off because of it?*
- "God, I studied the bible a lot and learned a lot of theology." *You're about to have eternity to learn everything you ever wanted to know. What use to me was all that knowledge while you were on earth with very limited time?*

There are good answers to all these questions. Do you know them and are you living them?

OYS - Where Progress is Made (09/12/18)

1 upvotes · 13 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Good stuff here. What's your mission and what steps have you taken to advance it this week?

will there be a difference?

1 upvotes · 13 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That link only shows verses that say lust is wrong. Sure, we can all agree about that. Now what about flirting?

Field Report- Dropping the Betas, Standing my ground.

1 upvotes · 12 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I agree with pretty much all of this. Thanks for the reply!

The only thing that I still question is the viability of the shotgun approach for older men. I do still believe it's valuable - especially so in that an older man doesn't want to get stuck in a 2 year committed relationship with a woman only to find it's not working out and he had nothing else in motion all the while.

By employing the shotgun method, he's keeping his abundance, maintaining a good head about what his actual options are, not feeling "pot committed" on someone just because of the time invested, etc. - which can all lead to an over-commitment in a less than ideal situation. Of course, as you note, he should be up-front: "Until engagement, we're not exclusive." But from there, as you say, once he finds someone he's ready to pull the trigger on, it makes sense to hop straight into an engagement, which would be natural if they'd had that connection

beforehand.

What I'm suggesting is really a modified version of courtship. I've known several churches (including one of my old pastors) who preach this method and had found spouses that way. They just had a lot of "friends." It was understood that sometimes these "friendships" were looking to see if something more could develop, but there was no exclusivity. At some point, when vetting was done, it hopped straight from "friends" to engagement. I'm simply proposing that instead of hiding what's going on by calling it "friends" we just call it what it is: they're dating. And instead of saying to have lots of "friends" we simply say: "have lots of people you're dating."

Field Report- Dropping the Betas, Standing my ground.

1 upvotes · 12 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I can only go on the information you give.

Living in Christ's Frame - Defeating the Anger Stage and Finding Emotional Stability

1 upvotes · 11 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I look forward to it.

Lift, Faggot, Lift

1 upvotes · 11 September 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Good point.

Lift, Faggot, Lift

1 upvotes · 11 September 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Rather than using weight as a standard for cutting (which can be easily fabricated through overeating), I'd use strength benchmarks. I used to say to myself, "Don't even say the word cut until you're benching 300," but it eluded me for too long, so I eventually caved and started cutting. Now that I'm back on again, I'm seeing that I should have just stuck to my original goal, as the plateau wasn't as hard to break as I thought - 10lbs away now, then another cut.

[FR] "Lost" Frame for the First Time in a Long Time.

1 upvotes · 11 September 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Agreed, ergo my response to him ;)

OYS - Where Progress is Made (09/05/18)

1 upvotes · 11 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Thanks for the OYS! A few things to keep an eye on:

Cologne she loves, some new clothes that she likes

That's evidence of living in her frame. It doesn't matter that she likes it. It's more the fact that you seem to be proud of pleasing her with these things - enough that you commented here in a way that emphasizes this. Saying you wear cologne and some new clothes would have sufficed. Of course, it also could have hidden the frame issue that needed to be called to attention.

She told me this past week "you will be hotter than me soon"

Again, this is an indication that there's a frame issue - that her perception of your hotness is the standard you're using to judge yourself, which is why it triggers something in you that she won't admit your SMV is higher. Of

course, why would she? That would be ceding some of her power.

Never in person, I think she's afraid I might try to initiate

Well ... do you? Why would she be afraid of this?

she loves me, but she doesn't want to have sex with me ... emotional affair

Ouch. ILYBINILWY.

super horny, and then cold as ice

Any chance this is on a monthly cycle? Or are you talking hours/days?

Spiritual - not good

This needs ironed out first. What's your mission? What steps have you been taking to live it out? How have you been leading your wife to join you in that mission? These are the core questions that I believe will have the strongest impact on fixing your marriage. I wrote more about this earlier today in another comment [here](#). In short, your wife is bored. Yeah, you're a great guy, but she's lost the excitement. At 6 years of marriage, this is incredibly common. That's why 7 years of marriage is the most common time-frame I see people getting divorced (I'm a divorce attorney). Usually at 2 years they realize the emotional fuzzies are gone, they spend another 2 years fretting over why they're gone. They spend another 2 years being bitter, but trying to make it work, sometimes thinking that having kids will solve the problem. Then, by year 7, when they realize all else has failed, they file for divorce. Don't let it get there. Nip this in the bud. Find your mission, start pursuing it, invite her along, keep improving yourself along the way, give her something in you to keep chasing.

I have trouble maintaining my frame

Thank you for acknowledging this.

I'm known by all our friends to be "bear strong" "Mr fix it" "Crazy about my wife" (breakfast in bed multiple times a week)

Yeah, stop supplicating. Why isn't she bringing you breakfast in bed?

OYS - Where Progress is Made (09/05/18)

1 upvotes · 11 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Solid OYS. Just going through this after not being all that active for a few days.

struggle with depressive thoughts

How so?

Progress on the book I'm writing is slow this week due to ...

And you just reminded me to stop making excuses for my slow progress too! What's your book on? Writing is definitely tough when engaged in a long-project. It's totally different from posts/comments on reddit, which can often just roll indefinitely.

Am discipling a couple of people informally

That's awesome to hear! What's your strategy/plan to move them forward? What short-term goals do you have for them?

Memorization is doing better than it has in a long time.

This is wonderful to hear. Scripture memorization is incredibly under-valued in the church, especially in the age of cellphone bibles where people don't feel the need to commit things to heart because they can look it up. They don't understand the true value of memorizing Scripture - that it's not about being able to summon a passage at will, but it's about how you spiritually ingest it, mulling it over in your head periodically throughout the day, letting God's Word transform you. This just can't happen when you have the attitude, "I'll just look it up when I need it." Chances are, you won't remember to do so when you actually need it.

Field Report- Dropping the Betas, Standing my ground.

1 upvotes · 11 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Just because a feminist might say it doesn't make it a feminist statement. I'm sure feminists would say the sky is blue, but that doesn't mean the concept is a feminist one.

If one wants to argue that ending one relationship to immediately begin another time and again because she keeps finding something better or more interesting, they're welcome to it, I'd simply say don't be surprised if her actions after marriage mirror her dating life.

I agree with this concept whole-heartedly. I just didn't get the impression that this girl had a history of hopping from guy to guy to guy.

Besides, are you trying to make an argument that Not-AWALT and that the guy should keep looking for a unicorn who would never branch swing? Under the "premature commitment" model of dating, all of those women would be taken up or jaded once they have their first boyfriend, so you'll likely never find one anyway, unless you meet her in her mid-teens.

I suspect this strongly colors your opinion on this issue.

This could well be. I know my wife was adamant that she only ever wanted to date one guy in her life. She fulfilled that goal. She later decided it was a stupid goal and that she would raise her kids to get a better picture of what they like and not before blindly committing like that. Of course, I agree with the conclusion, but for different reasons, though I certainly understand where she's coming from, as I also had a very limited dating history before getting together with my wife (only 1 other). That's not to say we're unhappy by any means. It's merely to say that there were undue complications that neither of us were prepared for - things that weren't resolved until I stepped up to the plate and started taking care of business.

Not to mention human nature being what it is, it's not always easy for many to date and keep it casual without one's emotions getting intertwined with another, and then it leading to heartbreak and other negative consequences that may be carried forward into future relationships.

Perhaps, but I do make the assumption that men on this sub are sufficiently cautioned against this type of ONEitis.

Just be honest and upfront

I agree as to the couple in the relationship itself. The issue is that OP was a third party who wasn't in the relationship. He couldn't re-define the context of their relationship for them. So, he has a choice to make: (1)

treat them like they're engaged when they're not, or (2) treat them like they're in the exploratory phase of figuring out who's marriage-material and not. Between the two assumptions, the second makes more logical sense to me for the outsider to go by. Getting all wound up in what they might be thinking would be operating in their frame.

More to the point, *acta non verba*. Maybe the girl and her boyfriend had a verbal understanding of their commitment level, but if OP hits on her and she's ready to leave her boyfriend, how much commitment was there in actuality? And if she was only committed in word, but not in heart and behavior, then is there really any harm done? I get your point about character - that a man should be cautious of a woman who willy-nilly breaks commitments like that. But again, if the commitment was only in word and she was never actually invested as deeply in heart and action, then does this reflect as poorly on her character for commitment-breaking? Certainly it reflects poorly on her character for honesty about how committed she actually is, but she hasn't broken a strong commitment in the first place, so it's less cause for concern from that angle.

But again, a lot of this comes back to AWALT and whether a man should be looking for unicorns. I still agree that OP screwed up in how he handled the situation, but apparently on different grounds :p

When I talk about dating (unless I reference something casual), I think of an exclusive commitment in dating that person and seeing whether they are or are not someone to marry.

What you're describing is the sniper methodology of dating. Or maybe trying to use a shotgun to snipe. Giving the benefit of the doubt, I assume you're suggesting that one apply a shotgun mentality to getting a girlfriend - abundance, putting yourself out there, etc. If you differ on even that point, we've got bigger things to talk about ;) After the "getting a girlfriend" point, it seems like your view is once you actually hit something with a pellet, a guy should offer up all of his commitment, putting all his eggs in that one basket until he figures out whether or not that's the best long-term option. I don't know that I can support this method. It seems way too blue, relying on ideologies that are unlikely to be helpful, long-term.

It also seems to create more of a distraction than a help to a man's mission. If the man applies a true shotgun mentality, he (presumably, if he's high value) has enough abundance that any one relationship will not consume his time, energy, etc. away from his mission for Christ. As a practical reality, when a man prematurely commits to an exclusive relationship with a woman, life becomes about that relationship. In order that the couple aren't wasting their time, all of their energies have to be re-focused on figuring out whether or not the relationship is really a good long-term option - and that's even *IF* they can manage to avoid having ONEitis and infatuation with each other. If it doesn't work out, assuming the guy did have abundance, he's quickly in the next relationship. The result is that he engages in a pre-marital pattern of serial monogamy that ultimately has his life focused on hopping from girl to girl to girl until he can finally find his helper ... all the while, his mission is side-lined, crippling his ability to vet the woman for whether she'll be a good helper for that mission in the first place - which is why I suggest men use their mission as the context for meeting these women. But I also suggest that guys not enter into a string of committed relationships with exclusivity until they're really darn sure they've met the girl they're going to marry, at which point the exclusive bit should be merely to give them time to get things in order before announcing the engagement.

To be clear, I'm not saying I think a guy should never be in an exclusive committed relationship. There is certainly value in exclusivity as you approach the marriage phase. But, in my view, this phase is best reserved for engagement or a very brief time preceding engagement as the couple prepares for marriage.

If you continue to date them, it's with the understanding that you still consider them someone you're thinking of moving forward with, with an eye (but not an obligation) toward marriage and progressing toward that point.

I'm not sure why you would enter into an exclusive committed relationship without marriage being an explicit intended outcome of the relationship. What are you actually "committed" to if not to the concept of marrying the

other person?

- "We're committed to each other - to being exclusive" - okay, but why? What is that exclusivity actually accomplishing? I suppose you could be testing whether or not someone will break a commitment to exclusivity, but how long do you have to remain "exclusive" to really test this fully? Most women don't cheat within the first 5 years of marriage - only after things fall apart. Should everyone be "exclusive" for a decade before marrying in order to test this?
- "It's a way to test marriage before it happens" - you've got to know that argument is total garbage (not to straw man). In no world does any form of pre-marital relationship actually resemble marriage, even when the couple lives together.
- "It's to protect emotions. If there was no commitment to exclusivity, we'd all be worried about losing the other person to someone else all the time." First, what's so bad about that? Doesn't that cause people to strive to excel, as they should pattern themselves to doing before the marriage so they can keep it up during the marriage? Second, most relationships end because someone concludes a better opportunity is available (whether it's immediately present or not), showing that the commitment is a sham in the first place. It's merely a way of saying, "I'll be exclusive as long as you're my best option." This is true for both guys and girls - and if there are better options elsewhere, why would you want to commit in exclusivity anyway? That just doesn't make sense. Third, who are we kidding? The fact that pre-marriage, pre-engagement relationships have such great commitment is *precisely what causes so much emotional harm*. No one's emotions are being protected by maintaining commitment to exclusivity out of turn.

Moving on, let me note two things:

- I know your original comment was more about the character issue than developing a model of dating. But in the context of this conversation, I'm not sure how we really separate the two concepts when the character issue is directly tied to how one views a model of dating.
- Also, I'm speaking somewhat off-the-cuff here. I know there are holes in some of what I'm saying, but I'm saying it anyway - not because I'm committed to every view I've expressed here, but because laying out an idea, for better or worse, is how we flesh out truth, and to some extent I'm using you/this conversation to help me figure this out so I can give wise advice to other guys in the future.

Thanks, brother!

[FR] "Lost" Frame for the First Time in a Long Time.

1 upvotes · 11 September 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I haven't posted on it, but it certainly would make a good one. I suppose I'm just not as fascinated ... at least not enough to put in the time.

[FR] "Lost" Frame for the First Time in a Long Time.

1 upvotes · 11 September 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Indeed, a wonderful case-in-point.

[FR] "Lost" Frame for the First Time in a Long Time.

1 upvotes · 11 September 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Yes.

Field Report- Dropping the Betas, Standing my ground.

1 upvotes · 11 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Good response. The only thing I'll note is that "every appearance of evil" is a poor translation. It's more accurate to say type, kind, incarnation or the like. Or if one insists on the word "appear," you could say, "avoid every time evil appears."

Field Report- Dropping the Betas, Standing my ground.

1 upvotes · 11 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I very much respect this application of 1 Cor. 8. Indeed, OP is showing that he is not as mature as I assume of most men here. Perhaps I should just stop giving the benefit of the doubt altogether. Like Paul, I like to get to the meat, but it can kill a baby to do that if they are too young and can only take milk.

Field Report- Dropping the Betas, Standing my ground.

1 upvotes · 11 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This would make sense to me if dating was about finding commitment as fast as possible. That's a very feminist way to look at it though. Women want commitment, men want sex. Why do you think dating went from "figure out what you like and not" to "dating is about commitment"?

See my other reply to you on someone else's comment, but suffice it to say that we should not encourage a model of dating that emphasizes commitment earlier than it belongs, defeating the purpose of dating in the first place. That's very dangerous.

That said, the way OP went about it was tactless and wrong.

Tag: [u/deep_strength](#)

Field Report- Dropping the Betas, Standing my ground.

1 upvotes · 11 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

You're welcome to comment any time, Christian or not. The first half of this comment is rock solid. The second half has some good points too, though I question the level of actual commitment people should have prior to engagement.

After all, the main point of dating is to get to know what's out there and figure out what you like. Suppose someone (like my wife) views dating as a high commitment endeavor with incredible loyalty that must be associated with it. She finds her first boyfriend (me) and feels undue pressure from this hypothetical self-imposed obligation to stay loyal and committed. How likely is she to leave if it's a bad thing? How likely is she to be honest or hide things to make it work? If she does leave, won't that make her feel jaded for assuming there was more commitment than intended? Once they're married, will that leave her wondering what could have been if she'd only looked around and not jumped head first into assuming "dating" or being bf/gf meant high commitment?

By treating the bf/gf relationship like a mini pre-engagement we really do a great disservice to the point of dating in the first place. It creates unhealthy premature bonds. This presumptuous over commitment caused a lot of problems for my wife and our marriage that I'd rather others not bear through - and that's even with us getting married! How much harder or more destructive that premature over commitment must be if it results in a breakup.

Tag: [u/redpillwonder](#) and [u/deep_strength](#) - I'll let this serve as my response to your comments. I stand by my suggestion: if there's no ring, people should have the freedom to explore what they like and not. I wouldn't want to encourage people to have ideologies of commitment levels in dating that (especially en masse) can be very destructive in marriage, as was true in my case.

Field Report- Dropping the Betas, Standing my ground.

1 upvotes · 11 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Be cautious with the insults. Again: practice humility. Don't let your pride get the better of you. All you're doing is breaking frame by showing that their comments are getting to you. Remember WISNIFG. You have no obligation to respond. Practice some fogging here too. It will be helpful later.

Should a man be friends with women he doesn't intend to marry? Let's chat.

1 upvotes · 10 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I think you may be confusing preselection with passive dread. They're closely related, so I can see why. Preselection only occurs when one woman sees you in the company of other women. Passive dread is when a man's status inherently causes his wife/LTR to be conscious of the fact that other women would want him, whether she observes it or not. Active dread, by contrast, is when a guy actively causes his wife to believe this by some direct and intentional act. Neither active nor passive dread requires any other women actually to be involved.

Another significant distinction is that dread's power comes from the woman's drive to want to keep her man loyal to her - to give him a motive or reason not to go with the other girls she suspects he could get. Preselection, however, is more about the man himself. It tells a woman that there's more to him that she was previously aware. This works on LTRs/wives when a man improves himself and she isn't seeing it yet. The fact that other women are taking notice matters. To that end, it doesn't matter that the women show him a particular kind of attention, only that they show him attention at all, because most women know (without being willing to admit it) that they generally ignore guys who are unattractive in the first place, often finding them creepy or gross or awkward.

Should a man be friends with women he doesn't intend to marry? Let's chat.

1 upvotes · 9 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is a good point.

Introduction + Question

1 upvotes · 8 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I don't know how I replied to another comment in this thread without actually reading the post itself. Sorry about that - I must have been in a rush at the time.

So how do I build up my girlfriend?

The 300 series is the place to start. Get yourself there, then ask her to start doing all of those things with you. Read 205 and 208 for more information on the way you invite her to join you. (1) Find the most effective strategy for leading her, then (2) follow the step-by-step outline Jesus gave for how he raised up his disciples.

As for what values to instill in her other than spiritual maturity, I'll defer to any content that [u/RedPillWonder](#) puts out - he's got some good things to say on what to look for in a potential spouse. Even better is if you look at those things as to what you want to lead your potential spouse into.

I think my lack of knowledge in this area is related to my lack of knowledge around discipleship in general.

That's a fair point. Most people are relatively clueless. I can send you my book on it if you want to PM me your e-mail address. The 300 series covers the first phases of this process. I always spend the first 6-12 months with any guy I disciple working through the 7 basics. It's not just a matter of teaching people what it is - discipleship isn't about education, it's about transformation. They aren't ready to move forward until they've mastered each of those things and it becomes second-nature to them when a context arises for them to practice it. So, if someone

struggles with having a regular quiet time (assuming they're in season for it), then they haven't moved past that part yet, even though they may otherwise be fully aware of how to have a quiet time and have done many. At this phase, the 7 basics should be more geared toward instilling these spiritual disciplines as an underlying way of life than about merely learning what they are and how to do them. That's why it's impossible to disciple someone in an online forum like this.

Introduction and Backstory

1 upvotes · 8 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Well said.

Should a man be friends with women he doesn't intend to marry? Let's chat.

1 upvotes · 8 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I completely agree with the premise of what you're saying. But I do think you're talking about something that transcends friendship. As such, we're talking about two different things.

I'm also not sure how you interpret "cleave to your spouse" (or more accurately: "join with") as "separate from everyone else." Putting on my pants doesn't mean taking off my shirt, right?

Should a man be friends with women he doesn't intend to marry? Let's chat.

1 upvotes · 8 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Well ... that's true at least for friendships among men. "Girl time" is often encouraged on a societal level.

Should a man be friends with women he doesn't intend to marry? Let's chat.

1 upvotes · 8 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I understood Stryker to be using a far more intimate definition of friendship. I agree with most of your points, but still don't see the Scriptural basis for it. I do appreciate the attempted reference to Jesus - and you're absolutely right to point out that Jesus had *more* male friends than women, but that doesn't mean he didn't have close relationships with certain women as well. They're not going to be the *koinonia* "one in spirit and in purpose" relationships that Jesus was trying to foster with the 12 ... but that's way beyond friendship in the first place.

Should a man be friends with women he doesn't intend to marry? Let's chat.

1 upvotes · 8 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is an interesting response. Are you suggesting a man can't be friends with his mother or sister?

Should a man be friends with women he doesn't intend to marry? Let's chat.

1 upvotes · 8 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Agreed 100%.

OYS on Red Pill Christian

1 upvotes · 7 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Thanks! It looks like whatever the last thing I did was, it ended up working, as the post came through. I may just not have been giving my tests enough time. I do appreciate the offer, though!

Should a man be friends with women he doesn't intend to marry? Let's chat.

1 upvotes · 7 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

What you're describing far transcends friendship - even what I would call "close friends." You're talking about a

koinonia "one in spirit and in purpose" bond between two people. Even that is not prohibited in scripture between the sexes (I'd suggest it's even encouraged). Your argument so far is predominantly philosophical in nature ... so let me just ask: is there scripture to support this conclusion?

NoFITS September Update

1 upvotes · 7 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Are they joining you on your mission yet? Get them doing that first, then decide if you want to date them. If your mission isn't something that requires help from a woman, then you're thinking too small or you don't need a helper in the first place.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (09/05/18)

1 upvotes · 5 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I'm glad to hear this report! Have you always had a fear of heights?

Also, do you feel like God's calling you to improve your quiet time depth and frequency, or that he intentionally has you focusing on things like Scripture memory, prayer, and fellowship for now?

Props for the evangelistic effort with that kid! Whether he knows it or not, your influence in his life can be the single most important thing he's got going for him.

OYS - Where Progress is Made (09/05/18)

1 upvotes · 5 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

PHYSICAL

- My lifts are solid. I'm expecting to top my ORM on the bench this week (hoping to go from 285 to 290) with a goal to hit 300 by the end of October. My squat and deadlift has fallen since my car accident on July 4 (vehicle totaled), but my doctor cleared me last Wednesday to start doing those again and I'm right back to doing the same reps/sets I've always done, so I didn't lose much ... it's just harder to do it than it was before.
- I haven't checked my body fat % lately, but I know I'm down another belt loop from where I was last month.
- My diet has been per my post on "random interval fasting" - it's working quite well.
- **Struggle:** I'm not employing much kino or initiating sex often. Part of this is because I just don't feel like it with how busy I am (I have two cases going to trial between now and 9/14). The other part is that she's working 80-100 hours a week right now - and will be until 10/15. She initiates about once a week and gets really into it when she initiates. Beyond that, there are probably 1-2 times extra that I've gotten horny but haven't initiated. I'm not sure how to balance my sexual drive with her legitimately exacerbating work schedule. Am I in her frame for holding back so she can get stuff done? Maybe. It hasn't bothered me yet, it's just something I've noticed. I'll continue to monitor. Feedback is welcome.
- Time management and income are great. I've been more productive at work these last few weeks than normal, giving a needed boost to our budget as we prepare our house for sale next year.
- I am exhausted far more often, so with limited exception, I've been falling asleep a lot sooner than before, which is both good and bad. My most productive hours are after everyone else goes to bed, but my body is also needing the extra energy after the simultaneous work and gym fatigue, hitting me both mentally and physically almost every day. **Struggle:** I need to find a better balance of getting necessary sleep while also remaining productive between now and 9/14 when my trials are over. Perhaps less time on Reddit is the answer.

MENTAL/EMOTIONAL

- Most of my "reading" time has been redirected toward research for my book. So, it's very targeted reading with a specific purpose, often reviewing old content that I want to reference as inspiration. **Note:** This has been very beneficial in drudging up concepts that I thought I'd mastered only to realize I'd forgotten to keep applying them. Back to work.
- My frame is stronger than it's ever been. I feel in control of my own world and my wife readily joins me in it. She commented recently how happy she is to be with a guy who "has it all together" and how she gets to brag about me to all the other girls at work who whine, "How do you do this [busy season] with 4 kids? It doesn't even seem possible!" **Note:** This reminded me of my post on [the comparison game](#). She thought she was winning, which is fine. But at the end of the day, I'm not here to impress her friends. I'm here for my mission and to own my domain, and it's only a passive byproduct that she gets to brag to her friends. I'm continually pulling her away from other people's frame (i.e. trying to impress them) and into mine ... still some work to do there.
- Leadership in the home is going strong. My wife's work schedule has probably helped this a good bit, reigning in the 1,000 foot rope at super speed. She no longer has any interest in fitness tests or to question what I'm doing. There's no more stream of: "Make sure the girls brush their teeth" or "Don't forget to pack She just accepts that I have a plan and that my plan gives her sufficient time to get her work done, so she rolls with it. I'm hopeful that post-10/15 this ongoing precedent will continue and she will not regress into wanting to tweak and adjust and nitpick. Regardless, even before her busy season started, the nit-picking was greatly reduced from a year ago.
- I have a strong internal emotional security right now. Even in the midst of both of our crazy work schedules and the demands of having 4 young children, for whom I take primary responsibility, the stress just rolls off like butter. All my life I've been a low-stress guy, but in light of the present pressures I do feel like I'm breaking new ground.

SPIRITUAL

- **7 Basics**
 - Assurance of Salvation: 10 - This is generally unfaltering. I'm continually bearing good fruit and God is affirming me in this.
 - Quiet Time: 7 - I miss days here and there. It's not a strict routine for me every day, as I spend time with God in other ways.
 - Bible Study: 10 - Especially on days when I miss a quiet time, I'm spending focused time in the word, digging deep into new concepts. Sometimes this is researching for my book, but it's most often related to answering questions from the myriad of people who ask them, most often IRL, but occasionally here or through my involvement with [gotquestions.com](#) as well.
 - Scripture Memory: 2 - I haven't invested much into this lately, though as I study the Word I've been creating a better memory for where frequently relevant passages can be found so I don't have to look them up in the future - I just know, "Oh, that's John 17" or whatever. It's not actually memorizing the passage, but memorizing where things can be found in the Bible has been useful as well. I'm okay with this being a 2 for now.
 - Fellowship: 9 - A few months ago this would have been much lower, but I've started building connections with some of the other guys at my gym and most recently got a purple pill Christian friend of mine (not that he knows those terms) to start driving 25 minutes to work out at my gym with me at least once a week. This has led to some great conversation and male bonding that I had been missing for a while. Also, weekly meetings with the new (add-on, not replacement) pastor at our church has been very refreshing and

encouraging. I think I red pill'd him last week and I'm eager to see what he's been doing with that knowledge ... but it was somewhat mind-shattering for him in a good way. The concept of "treat my wife like Jesus interacts with the church" was somehow totally foreign to him, especially as to all of the hard-line boundaries Jesus creates for the church. His marriage could use a 3-part field report in itself, it's that complicated, but if he can avoid going Rambo I think he's on the right track. Either way, having two guys in-person who I can discuss RPC content with openly is quite refreshing.

- Evangelism: 1 - I have not been building new relationships with non-believers. Even the non-believers presently in my life are somewhat distant right now. Most of my efforts lately have been working with building up existing believers. Evangelism was pretty high about 6 months ago, so I'm not worried about it being in a low point today. After all, once people come to Christ there has to be a shift toward discipling them before going back to evangelism with others.
- Prayer: 5 - This is up from where I was a month ago, but still pretty weak. I'm being more intentional about lifting things up to God throughout the day as the thought crosses my mind, rather than letting it pass; but on the whole, I'm not making an intentional point to set aside time for this, nor am I incorporating it into my Bible study time - only quiet times, in which prayer is relatively short-lived.
- As noted above, I'm making giant strides in advancing my mission and getting others in my church on board. I also visited a church in my hometown recently (I disciple a guy who goes there and wanted to meet up with him) and they are trying to recruit me for a discipleship conference they're organizing later this month. I'm planning on accepting the invite, which should give me an opportunity to train several pastors on how to incorporate discipleship into their churches and also hone my ability to communicate the same message to the pastors in my own home church as well.
- I'm also going to be participating in (possibly co-leading, it's undecided) a small group leader training through my church later this month. My recently pseudo-red-pill'd pastor has asked me to oversee the small group ministry at our church alongside him, so I'm assuming this will be a starting point for working together in that role, which we'll discuss when we meet up in a couple hours.

I look forward to reading the other comments in this thread! Leave some feedback as you feel led.

NoFITS September Update

1 upvotes · 5 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Thanks for the update!

NMMNG

The point of the book revolves around breaking the nice-guy paradigm, which many men are stuck in. The core concept is that "nice guys" really aren't all that nice at all because they live with hidden expectations (covert contracts) and become bitter and act out when their expectations aren't met. They believe that by acting nice and hiding their flaws people must love them, give them affection, or somehow that they deserve more sex from their girlfriend, wife, etc. from it. The solution is to be a little bit more of a jerk - a concept that most foreign men (especially Christians) simply cannot fathom.

No, I did not do most of the exercises.

WISNIFG

Glad you're going through it! Interestingly enough, the concept of feeling guilty for saying no is really only alluded to in the first 3 chapters. The value of the book is in the conflict-resolution strategies presented, most notably being fogging and negative inquiry.

Alphaness

WISNIFG is another good starting point. Again, it gives techniques on being assertive, which is a base-line character trait to develop alphaness, though it's certainly not all-encompassing. MMSLP covers it a lot better and should be your next read after WISNIFG (I always recommend the trilogy in that order). Even though I get that you're single, it will still be useful in preparation - just be cautious in that it's a fairly explicit book at times, in case your self-control is pretty low.

STFU

Sounds like you've made good progress with this. I'm glad you're learning to employ this with a frame of humility and love. That can be tricky to do for some.

Game

So this area could use some work for you.

offered an neighboring female acquaintance the spare seat

That's a "nice guy" move. Clearly you missed the point of NMMNG ;)

More playfully, see her hovering, interrupt her, say, "I know you were dying to sit next to me, but this seat's taken by my grandpa's ghost. He should be back from the bathroom any minute now." Or just make up some other off-the-wall comment. The point of game at this stage isn't to learn how to talk to women; it's to learn how to talk to them in a way that lets them know you DNGAF.

obvious conversations but out of respect for the BP dude i avoided it

Why do you respect him? Your later statement makes more sense - that it wasn't worth it to you. But even then, your rationale is because of his potential white-knighting. I'm not sure you're using that phrase right (I think you mean mate-guarding - don't worry, the mods are working on a glossary to help!), but the concept puts you in his frame. Your actions are decided by how you think he would react. If you want to talk to her, go talk to her. They're not married.

hot atheist chick ... I started evangelizing, and she started thinking about Christianity ... again, not my priority, mission 1st

Well done on your priorities and sharing the Gospel! Perhaps she could be someone you "raise up" to be worth dating someday. Just make sure the evangelism precedes the dating (i.e. no evangedating).

What books to read for alphaness after WISNIFG, Rollos books? gimme something good.

It sounds like NMMNG went over your head or you just didn't know how to connect the deeper content to your personal life, so I'd go back there too. But MMSLP goes a lot more into the differences between alpha and beta. I'd recommend that before Rational Male, though they're both solid as far as non-Christian content goes.

Is it true Frame is more important than Game and Fitness etc?

In my view, game is a subset of frame. But yes, frame is probably the single most important thing in attracting women and keeping them attracted to you. It's what gets them on board with your mission. It's what provides

them the comfort they need to stay committed. It's what shows them how tough you are and how sexy that can be. Just don't confuse "frame" with being a cold, emotionless robot. Frame isn't about how you express your emotions. It's about your identity, reason for living, and determination to pursue that reason.

Any other things you can point out, let me know

See above. Also, the way you write communicates an incredible and unwarranted pride and arrogance (especially the Prov. 26:4-5 comment, but many other insinuations here too). I want to give you the benefit of the doubt and assume you're writing that way to try to impress a bunch of guys on the internet, but that you actually have some humility in real life. Don't feel like you have to impress us. We're not your judge. You're not even your own judge. That position is reserved for God. So, just be straight-forward.

Thank you for the September update :) I really appreciated reading this and hopefully this helps nudge you forward a bit.

I'm still single ... just married [MRP Draft]

1 upvotes · 5 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Thanks! Outline sent.

As for an interview, I'm happy to join in. I've really enjoyed your videos, and have even incorporated pieces from them into the outline I sent. Skype could be a little tricky, as I don't have a webcam, so I'd have to do it on my phone, though I'm willing to make it work if that's your preferred option. Recording with pics is fine too.

Will I see the questions/topics in more detail in advance to help prep or is it more spontaneous?

As for timing, due to a few trials coming up, among other things, late-October or especially early-November would be ideal. Let me know if you'd prefer to do it sooner than that and I'll see what I can do.

I'm still single ... just married [MRP Draft]

1 upvotes · 4 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Indeed. I'll be happy to get your assistance once I've got a first draft done. I may even bounce some ideas off of you before then. To that end, would you be interested in perusing my outline for structural issues and missing content? I'm probably 25% done with the first draft, but I'd rather figure out the overarching stuff sooner rather than later in order to avoid having to do major re-writes on structural stuff *ex post facto*.

As for [u/Rollo-Tomassi](#), I'd love to get insights from him as well. I tend to connect with his thinking style better than any of the other content in the manosphere. That said, I don't anticipate much overlap. He commented [here](#) that his book will be "From a secular perspective to Christian men." Mine will be from a biblical perspective to Christian men. That said, I did use Rational Male: Book 1 as a heavy source of inspiration for the first half of my final outline before I started drafting.

Phil's July update

1 upvotes · 4 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Props for another good update, Phil. I'm glad to see you're still making some good progress. Your OHP is now up to what I do for sets, so good job there! You're pushing me to up my game again and shoot for 175 today :) I am a little curious at the ratio, though - your bench is just shy of 100lbs less than mine (I'm back up to 285), but your OHP is at where I am. I must have weak shoulders!

I'm recognizing this and working on it

That's huge. Well done. Now, as you note, the next step is the follow-through.

If I should focus on all of them, just one of them, or none of them.

Pick one and start there. If you find you don't care for it, move on. If you do like it, keep doing it and decide at that point whether or not you want to add something else.

Married Man With Girl Friends

1 upvotes · 3 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Play, "Hi, have you met Ted?" with her ... just with other girls, not other guys. I've done this a few times with my wife. She felt like she was on the outside from the "popular" girls in church. Neither of us really ever talked to them. We walked by them in church one day. I introduce myself and my wife, then excuse myself to go talk to someone else, leaving her there to talk to them.

To be clear, my wife is insanely introverted and is an internal processor. That's the type of thing she's typically afraid of. But when she realizes (1) that she can hold a conversation with these girls on her own, and (2) that these other girls aren't as stuck up and snobby as she thought (only a couple of them were), she became far more comfortable and started initiating conversations more and more with some of them after that.

New Here and Relieved to Find This Sub

1 upvotes · 2 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Short on time right now, but I fully endorse the Navigators - and I was even on staff for a time. Not everyone there is perfect, but I've yet to find a better organization at helping people discover and develop a biblical life mission. Some of the content on this sub even originated from my time with the Navigators. I still keep in touch semi monthly with the Nav guy who first discipled me in college 15 years ago.

Curious: is the guy who contacted you named Nate or Ivan? It's doubtful they'd know me, but I'm familiar, at least by name, with a lot of the staff - especially those in Colorado. Last I knew, they were the guys doing Nav20s out that way.

Financial prep for marriage?

1 upvotes · 31 August 2018 · /r/askMRP

More to [u/JDRoedell](#) - that tactic would never work anyway. My office had a case exactly like that. The court considered it a technical defect to an otherwise legitimate marriage. Having a ceremony is enough that it can screw a guy if the court wants to.

Also, even if you don't have the ceremony, we had one where they started filing taxes jointly and that was enough for them to be deemed legally married. Common law marriage being revoked is merely a facade, based on some of the stories I hear and see.

Financial prep for marriage?

1 upvotes · 31 August 2018 · /r/askMRP

To [/u/wtg2989](#):

This is a good answer. A pre-nup is doable, but it is very difficult to draft them in a way that will actually be upheld. I've never had one of mine overturned (not to say it won't ever happen), but here's what I make sure to include:

- An exhibit at the end outlining all known assets and liabilities of both parties showing the institution, last 4 digits of the account number, amount, and date of valuation. This exhibit also has a stipulation for the other side to sign that they have personally reviewed your statements and assured with their own eyes that the numbers are accurate and that they have no reason to believe you have any assets and/or liabilities not

mentioned on the sheet. You'd have to be an idiot to hide a premarital asset anyway - the more you disclose on the sheet the better.

- It's got to have a paragraph defining "income" for support purposes. Do you want to include phantom stock options? Do you want to include personal injury settlements? Do you want to include untaxable sources of income? Do you want to include passive income from assets regardless of whether or not you withdraw it from the asset? Make your definition very clear.
- Still on support: make sure you have a mutual stipulation of each of your anticipated earning potentials. Inflate your earning potential as much as possible within reason. Have her agree, "I understand that with his career he may be able to earn up to \$400,000 annually as an accountant, and I still agree to these restrictions on spousal support even in that situation." But don't say "up to \$400,000 annually if he ever changes career paths from his current profession of being a janitor" - no court will buy that. If you're a janitor, put the maximum income a managerial janitor could potentially earn ... who knows, in some prestigious places that could well be over \$100,000 anyway.
- Make sure to include a provision specifically acknowledging that nothing in the agreement intends to limit or restrict child support, but that any child support award would be a dollar-for-dollar offset against any spousal support payments otherwise contemplated by the prenup. You cannot legally (at least in my state) prenup away your child support obligation, but you can do so constructively by taking it out of your spousal support obligation.
- Make sure the other side also has an attorney who signs the document. This is a mandatory prerequisite.
- Include a choice of law provision stating which state's laws will apply for the enforcement of the prenup - and make that state reasonable in light of where either of you are living at the time, but pick whichever state has more favorable laws for prenup enforcement (yes, there is a difference from state to state).
- Include a provision affirming that **BOTH** active and passive income from **FINANCIAL** separate property assets shall remain separate to the degree of any historically applied patterns. For example: if you have always contributed \$500/mo to your 401k, technically after the wedding day that's \$500/mo of marital funds and not separate funds, which could be construed as commingling; but I have managed to successfully argue to a judge that maintenance of a historical pattern of contribution to separate property pursuant to a prenup can still be qualified as separate property even after the marriage. So, if after the marriage you start contributing \$600 to the account, you either lose the provision entirely or you lose half of the extra \$100 (each judge will feel differently). Needless to say, the safer way to do this would be to create a separate account just before the marriage so that this continuation of historical payments doesn't present any risk of commingling the bulk of the assets.
- Include a provision regarding **NON-FINANCIAL** separate property assets that both active and passive increases in valuation shall remain as separate. Many times a guy will have his own business worth \$500,000 at the time of the marriage, then divorce with it being worth \$3,000,000. He thinks it's his business from before the marriage so he should just get it. Not so. He actively contributed to growing the business during the marriage, so the \$2.5mil of active appreciation is half hers. He could try to argue that a portion of it is passive appreciation, and a skillful forensic accountant could present that evaluation, but it certainly won't be all or most of it. By making active valuation increases a part of the prenup, what you're saying is that you get to keep the fruit of your labor as far as the asset itself is concerned, though the income derived from that is otherwise used to benefit both parties both during the marriage and after the divorce (pursuant to the restrictions you put in, per the above, of course).
- **NEVER** put a total bar to all support. That's a sure way to guarantee the prenup is thrown out. Always say, "support will be provided upon the following conditions ..." then reference the above.

- **NEVER** try to include custody and parenting responsibilities in a prenup. That's a sure way to get it thrown out as being overreaching.

I'm sure there's more, but I'm running late and that's all I could squeeze out in 8 minutes. Good luck.

FRs: Blue Pill Husbands Make Their Wives Miserable

1 upvotes · 31 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Excellent post. I enjoy the vignette style here.

I'm still single ... just married [MRP Draft]

1 upvotes · 28 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I'm not saying a guy can't adopt certain social norms. They're norms for a reason: because there's often wisdom in certain wide-spread behavior patterns. I'm just saying people shouldn't follow social norms just because they're social norms. People should decide for themselves what's going to work for them and not.

Trimming Down

1 upvotes · 27 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I've hovered in the 15-16% range for a while. I think I'm at 14% right now, after some of this dieting. The difference is huge. A woman can't see how strong you are. My wife doesn't watch me lift weights, so having muscles under my skin doesn't really help much. Now that I'm slimming, she's made comments about my pecs and likes watching them dance; she grabs my biceps and plays with them during sex; she bounces her fist on my thigh while watching shows and feels that there's no jiggle. These are all things that could not be done at 16% BF. The difference between 16% and 14% is quite enormous in my own marriage. It's the difference of me initiating 98% of the time and me initiating about 65% of the time. It's the difference of her needing 20 minutes to work herself up to get off and being able to have a 5 minute quickie for both of us in a short break before we have to pick up the kids.

If that's what 2% did, I imagine the next 2% will be even greater because that's when the 6-pack starts to show, which is usually considered one of the most attractive things on a man's body. In other words, yes, it can make a big difference. But ... I cede there are some outliers and every girl is different. I just wouldn't rely on being "bulky." I spent a lot of time in bear mode (high muscle, medium fat) and didn't really see any benefit to living there. My wife was uninterested in the fact that I could do hand-stand pushups or bench press 285lbs. Again, she's not at the gym watching me lift to get turned on. She wants to be turned on at home when I'm not proving my strength - when my looks are all the proof I have to go by.

Trimming Down

1 upvotes · 27 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

+1

Ready to get engaged (in light of past PMO)

1 upvotes · 26 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Maybe her being in my life has reduced the temptation

Before I was married, I struggled through serious porn use too. When I started dating my wife, I had a solid year+ without any issues. I had a goal to look forward to. Then I got married ... and it all came back. I'm living proof that this is a real paradigm. I'm not saying for sure it's your path too ... but in my observation of other men, you'd be a serious outlier if you didn't end up this way.

new reliance on God

This is certainly possible. That said, in my experience and observation, those who receive genuine freedom in this or any other area have a very clear and vivid understanding of how the Gospel changed them. It's not just a general, "I prayed and God helped me." It's, "The Gospel pierced my heart. I finally understood how Jesus' death 2,000 years ago still affects this particular aspect of my life today." And then they can elaborate on that. This one isn't as rare to be an outlier, though. The previous case is about 1% who don't fit the mold, this one's more like 20% ... because sometimes Jesus does do things in people's lives without them understanding what he did or how he did it. But that's still the rarer position ... just not quite as rare.

what do you mean by trusting Jesus as my cure, beyond what I'm doing already? Suggested reading?

That's what the 400 series is all about. It's a extremely condensed summary of 6-months worth of content that I usually go with guys who want to kick addictive habits and behaviors, whether it's porn, anger issues, gluttony, video game addiction, habitual guilt/shame, depression, etc.

My habit of praying when tempted sounds closer to your Orpheus description

That's great! For me, trying that method back in the day worked, but I didn't have a deep experience of God's fullness in those prayers. It was usually just a re-focusing and distraction that often increased my prospective guilt if I were to turn back to sin at the moment, making guilt my primary motivator for not sinning, rather than God himself. I remember thinking, "I just prayed for 10 minutes. I'd have to be horrible to turn around and masturbate now!" That guilt is what reoriented my desires away from porn and to God, but it wasn't a joyous experience with God in those prayers. I'm glad it's otherwise with you :) That's a blessing I wish I had.

How to people treat u when you're out in public with an attractive girl?

1 upvotes · 25 August 2018 · /r/askTRP

To the other guy who asked about mental maturation in another thread ... this is it.

Response to "were you flirting with me?"

1 upvotes · 25 August 2018 · /r/askTRP

Crap answer. You just told her you're a wimp and she's in charge. The grandma answer works just fine.

Do these count as mental masturbation(MM)?

1 upvotes · 25 August 2018 · /r/askTRP

MM is when you get all giddy thinking about the sex you're going to have someday, then not actually doing anything to get yourself ready to earn it. Is that why you're looking in the mirror or listening to this music?

What is love?

1 upvotes · 25 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That's good. I can't say the same of the toyota we were in on the fourth of July ... totaled by a drunk driver. Still working on that settlement.

What is love?

1 upvotes · 25 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Haha

If you knew then what you know now

1 upvotes · 25 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

They're being auto filtered and removed by reddit for some reason. It's not our auto moderator.

If you knew then what you know now

1 upvotes · 24 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Great question! But don't use it as a cheat to avoid having to read the sidebar ;) Except for #1 these aren't in any particular order.

1. Develop a clearly defined mission that has eternal consequences and incorporates the great commission. Everything else hinges on this. Your mission is your center-point for your frame. It's the basis for how you lead. It gives you a foundation for expressing alpha qualities. It sets your priorities rightly. I cannot understand the importance of your mission above all else.
2. The WISNIFG Bill of Assertive Rights (which is all about developing and staying in your own frame).
3. That being fit would not solve the problem; it was only a necessary prerequisite to solving the problem.
4. That it's not about how you behave; it's about who you are. You can't merely fake your changes; you must become them.
5. Complete and total outcome independence is the backbone of everything. This is a frame issue again (as pretty much all of this is), but if you're only changing to achieve a desired response from external sources, you're doing it for the wrong reasons and it won't last or succeed other than nominal improvements.
6. That I do not have an obligation - either biblically or internally - to respond to my wife's emotional state.
7. 1 Cor. 7 - "Let those with wives live as though they had none" - specifically in the context of pursuing one's mission, as Paul intimates in the same chapter.
8. The application of the Gospel in normative everyday affairs, beyond just its role in salvation.

I'm sure there are many more, but these are off the top of my head ... and there may be bigger ones than these even (exception #1).

If you knew then what you know now

1 upvotes · 24 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Tag: [/u/rocknrollchuck](#)

See ... he didn't delete his account. Reddit is just auto-removing his posts. I have no idea why. As I previously suggested, he may have software that deletes his account history that is mistakenly deleting his posts immediately upon posting rather than 2-3 days later like it normally does.

Married Man With Girl Friends

1 upvotes · 24 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Fair points. I guess I wasn't trying to read too much into OP's motives.

Trimming Down

1 upvotes · 24 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

My IF was 22:2 for most of the last year. Basically, I'd eat nothing throughout the day, have dinner with the wife and kids when I got home, put the kids to bed, then have something small to chill with my wife, like a bowl of

popcorn while watching a show or doing a puzzle or something. I did experience pangs of hunger, but not so many headaches.

To be clear, with my on/off method, it's not quite the same as ADF or IF because you can eat any time you want - you just have to watch your calories. So, keep a pack of crackers on you and if you feel a headache coming on, pop 120 calories there and save the other 380 for when you get home. Or carry around some veggies and it won't count against the 500 in the first place - like carrot sticks or broccoli. The goal here isn't to have lengthy times without food; it's simply to limit caloric intake in a manageable way. Physiologically, there's probably better benefits to other strategies, but psychologically this is what has been working for me.

It doesn't affect my lifting schedule either. You have to remember that during a cut phase, the purpose of lifting isn't to bulk up; it's to tone. So, if you want to bulk up, then don't do IF/ADF/whatever I'm proposing - just eat whatever you want. But if you're cutting, your lifting should be reoriented toward toning your muscles anyway, and thus your routine will naturally account for the lower caloric intake.

To be clear, most people agree that fat-burning exercise is usually lower intensity for longer durations. So, instead of lifting 90% of your max for 5 reps, lift 50% of your max for 20 reps. For example, my max bench is 285, so when bulking and trying to raise my max, I'd lift 265 as my first set and 245 as my low set over 5 sets for 5 reps each = 25 reps at an average 255lbs (i.e. about 90% of my max). When cutting, however, I do 135 (i.e. a 45lb weight on each side) and do it 20-25 reps per set until I hit a total of 125 reps. I'm not tearing the muscle as well, but I am engaging it in a way that starts the fat-burning process (I can't remember if that's called ketosis or something else).

Trimming Down

1 upvotes · 24 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I don't drink coffee or carbonated beverages or tea. Pretty much, it's just water. I do every now and then have a beer, but I take that out of my 500 calories on days I do. It's worth it! I only drink dark beers and I find that they often end up being more filling than food.

I limit myself to raw or steamed veggies. So, broccoli is fine with no butter. Stir fry wouldn't work because you have to put oil in it. Yes, you can eat enough veggies to screw it up, but the odds are very low. First, your body usually won't allow you to eat 2,000 calories of pure veggies. I've tried. At about 500 I just start getting disgusted by even the most delicious ones. Second, if you're working out as often as you should be, the veggies are good calories that will be more readily used by your body to help you restore yourself (just make sure to get enough protein too).

Married Man With Girl Friends

1 upvotes · 24 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is a very good point, but one must also remember the value that you can add to their life. If it weren't for my interactions with other women in the church, there would be no women's discipleship ministry happening. This is something my wife comments on often: "If you and the pastor are doing this with the guys, who's going to disciple the women?" Ideally their husbands, but that will be at least a 2 year lag before the women start getting any involvement with the church's new imperative, so there has to be a context for women to learn from men as well.

Married Man With Girl Friends

1 upvotes · 24 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

While I agree with your conclusion, you do have to account for the value of dread and post-marriage preselection.

Oh, also: my work compensation is based on how much I bill and I get paid more for work that I bring in. With

my line of work, I get most of my referrals from women, because women are more chatty and likely to refer a friend than a man. As such, there's a strong business incentive for a man to increase his social network among women even after marriage if it would assist his financial prospects.

Married Man With Girl Friends

1 upvotes · 24 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Deleted accounts usually show up as "[deleted]" on their posts and comments. I think he's using a history blocker that prevents someone from reading his post and comment history ... usually to avoid getting doxxed or mitigate damage when one is doxxed.

Need Guidance For a Kid in a Jam.

1 upvotes · 24 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I've heard this theory. On the balance of the possibilities I find it a reasonable interpretation, so I don't fault anyone for believing it ... but I find it to be a less likely option.

Trimming Down

1 upvotes · 24 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That makes sense. I'll assume a year of intermittent fasting broken up by a couple more hard-core fasting phases is sufficient preparation, as whatever I'm doing is working.

Trimming Down

1 upvotes · 24 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Cool, I'd never heard of that.

Do you mean that you shouldn't fast for the first 6 months of a diet, or that you shouldn't do a fasting diet for longer than 6 months?

Question on priorities.

1 upvotes · 23 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I like this.

Pastor's role

1 upvotes · 23 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

You've got a few fair points in there. All in all, it's not worth the argument.

Pastor's role

1 upvotes · 23 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Contraception isn't feminist - it's the man's answer to combat feminist laws that would otherwise obligate men for the care and support of children that they never wanted. But you're really stretching things here in the first place.

Pastor's role

1 upvotes · 23 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Haha ... contraception? In vitro fertilization? Willful sterilization? Ok, you got me there. Hahaha.

Pastor's role

1 upvotes · 23 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

But the overwhelming majority of protestants stand up against those things to ...

Pastor's role

1 upvotes · 23 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Or it's like Jesus said ... the world will hate us because of him. I'm not sure how that indicates a red or blue church. I mean, the world hates murderers more than Catholics, but does that mean they're more red pill than the church? That's a faulty metric in the first place.

Pastor's role

1 upvotes · 23 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I gave those percentages above. There's still a large disparity. You're grasping at straws to cling to your disillusionment. Be better than that. None of this proves doctrine wrong any way, so why does it really matter so much?

Pastor's role

1 upvotes · 23 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That seems intentionally short sighted. The data seems clear enough that for every one reported incident among protestants we should expect to see approximately 12 from Catholics ... if the media holds true to the actual facts. If they're biased against Catholics, I suppose I'd expect more of a 50 to 1 ratio or that the protestant numbers are just low enough that they don't warrant reporting.

Pastor's role

1 upvotes · 22 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Fair enough. We will have to agree to disagree. I'll only note that I don't reject tradition altogether, as most protestants do. I simply believe that it is subordinate to Scripture and that Scripture does, in fact, exist as authoritative separate from tradition. As such, tradition in my view is akin to those Piper or McArthur books ... you'll find lots of valuable stuff, but also a good bit of garbage too. To that end, I urge protestants not to throw out the baby with the bathwater, and instead to be wise and discerning in learning from the past.

Pastor's role

1 upvotes · 22 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That's a good answer.

What is love?

1 upvotes · 22 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

ONE

Suppose I learn Spanish and travel to Peru. I'm trying to translate a sermon from a guy named Bob, which I heard in English, for the Peruvians to understand it. Assume Bob knows Spanish, but his primary audience is English people in America. I use a lot of Spanish words in the way I translate Bob's sermon. Which language and culture most accurately expresses Bob's intentions in the sermon: English or my Spanish translation? Or let's go a step further: if there's a peculiar phrase that the Peruvians have questions about based on a Spanish word I used in my translation, would they be better off looking at the cultural terms of art used in the English language that Bob was most likely actually referencing, or at their own cultural terms of art surrounding the Spanish translation I gave them?

That is not to say that the Greek translations aren't inspired. They are. But the Greek culture and the implications

that culture would impose on those words aren't inspired. So, when a pastor, for example, looks to the *Odyssey* and other famous Greek texts to discern what Greek words meant in that culture at that time, it's like the Peruvians looking to their favorite pop culture references to discern what Bob meant by the English words he originally spoke in his sermon.

TWO

Yep, I'm fully versed with the Septuagint.

THREE

Show me a source that says Greek was Jesus' primary language of communication. I know how to speak Spanish, but that doesn't mean that when I'm speaking in English I want people to be using Spanish culture and language to interpret my English statements. I would rather them use my American, English-speaking culture, because my actual word-choices and intentions in communicating ideas are going to coincide more accurately with my target audience rather than some other language and audience that I happen to be familiar with.

FOUR

I agree that the Greek word choice matters. But how do we discern what those words mean?

The go-to answer for most scholars is two-fold: (1) look to other biblical passages for the ways those words are used, and (2) look to extrabiblical references to see how other people in that culture were using those words.

I agree with 1 whole-heartedly. And to the degree that we use Scripture to interpret Scripture, I believe this is perfectly accurate and appropriate. But in virtually all of my studying on the Greek words for love, I find that the predominant view is actually 2 - that most scholars look not to other biblical passages to define those words, but to the Greek culture at the time.

Again, this is fine for the epistles that were addressed to the Greeks. But if Jesus is trying to preach about a Hebrew concept and we're trying to use Greek culture to interpret that Hebrew concept merely because the language we're reading is in Greek, that's where the real danger is.

I will argue with your teaching on the language/authorship of the Bible. It is heretical. it is arrogant. It is born out of a deep misunderstanding of the origin of Scripture and the languages of the Levant in the 1st Century.

I'm pretty well versed. I simply hold a different view than you do. I believe that the Bible itself is inspired. It appears from your argument that you believe the historical cultural understandings of words were also inspired. I don't extend the inspired nature of Scripture that far.

I know many people who take "inspired" to incredible lengths. Some people believe that "inspired" means that there are no grammatical mistakes, no misspellings, no technical errors or misunderstandings, and the like. This has caused a wide theological rift between those who believe that the thoughts and ideas are what was inspired and those who believe that every molecule of ink put on the paper of the original texts (which, for the most part, we don't actually have) was inspired to be in that exact spot.

I tend to fall somewhere in the middle. I believe that God "inspired" someone with a particular thought or idea, and that this is the foundation of inspiration. I further believe that God sovereignly guided the various biblical authors to communicate those thoughts and ideas with specific word choices that in their own context did the best job conveying those thoughts and ideas that could be done - but not necessarily that a perfect translation exists.

To that end, is the Septuagint "inspired"? Most scholars would say no - the original Hebrew texts were inspired. Does that mean it's useless? Of course not. Should we rely on the Septuagint's use of certain Greek words to understand what the New Testament means when it uses those same Greek words? Yes and no. Yes, to the degree that there may not be a better source - and that is certainly better than using Homer's *Odyssey*, for example ... but no, not to the degree that we are using an uninspired text as a foundation for interpretation of an inspired text.

But maybe you disagree. Maybe you do believe the Septuagint was more inspired than the original Hebrew texts, if there are even degrees of inspiration at all. I really haven't fleshed out your full view on this, so it's hard to comment much further.

Pastor's role

1 upvotes · 22 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Hah, touche.

Pastor's role

1 upvotes · 22 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

To be clear up front, I don't mean to convince you from your view. I believe the Cathodox position is a weak one, but holds enough weight that I don't fault anyone for believing it.

That said, no, the biblical canon is not the only source of divine inspiration. It is merely the only source with near unanimous consent. I'm confident that God has divinely inspired me, for example, in many of the things I have done and said, but there is no consensus worldwide in this, nor am I looking for there to be such a consensus.

Scripture was written by the joint effort of God and the various biblical authors. In my view, humans in a historical council recognized what God had done, but neither I nor most protestants recognize their authority to be the ones to decide what's inspired or not. That's not to say that they got it wrong. At least as to the 66 books, there's sufficient evidence from the Spirit of their authenticity. Rather, it is not the council who decided what is inspired; that is for God to decide.

I have seen the forefathers make enough mistakes to question their decisions. Instead of looking to their wisdom in what they believed were inspired texts, I look to the Spirit Himself and follow the test that Jesus gave for discernment: *where is the fruit?*

Tag: [u/OsmiumZulu](#), as this conversation seems more up your alley.

What is love?

1 upvotes · 21 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Good points. This all goes to affirm the premise that love inherently involves an interconnectedness between two things and does not itself stand in isolation.

What is love?

1 upvotes · 21 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Haha ... not like that's ever happened, right? ;)

The Dangers of Pathologizing Manhood

1 upvotes · 20 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Solid article. It's a little basic, but I like it.

The Dangers of Pathologizing Manhood

1 upvotes · 20 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

It actually looks to be working again.

The Dangers of Pathologizing Manhood

1 upvotes · 20 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Weird, this was posted on reddit in a few other places too and the page is down. I think reddit broke it.

Man's Folly

1 upvotes · 20 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Applebees and Chili's have stated plans to do away with all servers. They will have all ordering done on tablets, and they've already converted the payment system to tablets. Instead of servers, there would be "bussers" who merely ship out whatever the queue tells them. They anticipate that the reduced labor cost will be very profitable, as one person could bus what would otherwise take 3 traditional servers to do.

Man's Folly

1 upvotes · 20 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I think [u/RedPillWays](#) was trying to take your analogy even further - that feminism has affected mankind not only on a political and family level, but on an economic level as well. Women are literally taking the jobs that men have been fighting over, but leaving men to do the garbage jobs that the women don't really care to do. That is, they want the right to have the top-tier jobs, but don't want the responsibility of the low-tier jobs.

Q&A on Divorce and Remarriage

1 upvotes · 17 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Ah, gotcha.

Q&A on Divorce and Remarriage

1 upvotes · 17 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

What's the project?

Q&A on Divorce and Remarriage

1 upvotes · 17 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Thanks for this thorough run down. I think I agree with the thrust of what you're saying. But what still holds me back is that God does seem to recognize and bless second marriages all throughout scripture. Two easy examples are Jacob and Rachel, and David and Bathsheba. So I have to believe there is some legitimacy to them, however sinful they may have been at their inception.

But this ...

For me it is relatively simple. Every one is technically in a state of continual sin, whether in thought or action, due to the fallen nature of mankind.

I couldn't agree more. None of this conversation makes much sense if we don't embrace this.

Q&A on Divorce and Remarriage

1 upvotes · 17 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

You should really post more of your stuff on here. I enjoy reading your blog and I think more people could benefit from this kind of insight into both the Bible and culture.

Q&A on Divorce and Remarriage

1 upvotes · 17 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Good thoughts. I like this. I still have strong scriptural objections to the catholic method, but I do appreciate the practical wisdom in it.

Can you explain the Erasmus thing? I've heard people mention this but no one could explain how that affects the Greek codex.

Question on priorities.

1 upvotes · 15 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I love your contextual breakdown of these verses!

We can never do this perfectly

Maybe not in our behaviors, but in our minds ... perhaps. Romans 7:25.

That is, we may hit a point where we never intentionally sin, though we may still do wrong without realizing it. 1 Cor. 4:4, "My conscience is clear, but that does not make me innocent. It is the Lord who judges me."

Question on priorities.

1 upvotes · 15 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Just to play devil's advocate for a second ... what if a man goes to work, spends time with his family, hits up the gym, etc. and doesn't once have a conscious thought: "I'm doing this for God's glory!"?

Or in other words, does our motivation to do all these other things for Christ have to be a conscious acknowledgment? And if not, how's that any different from the multi-theory?

Advice for a girl

1 upvotes · 15 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

One would think. I haven't really advertised there at all yet.

Wear a black arm band to church in August 2020

1 upvotes · 14 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I'd say if it's between a feminized church and a feminized society, I'd rather the feminized church between the two options.

But I agree with your sentiment. When I referenced the "church" in this case, I had conceptualized in my head what Christ intended, not the hollow shell that it is today.

Sex Addicted v. Sex Starved

1 upvotes · 14 August 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Personally, I'm not aware of anything a husband and wife can do in the bedroom by mutual consent that would be sinful as long as it just stays the two of them. The two operative conditions there:

- Just the two of them. Go beyond the bounds of marriage and the Bible would condemn it.
- Mutual consent. If you're beating her bloody against her will just because you get off on it, that's sin. If she likes some BDSM stuff and you're not actually causing permanent damage, go for it. Some girls are into that.

But again, the key here is to ask how you're honoring God in this. My simple answer in a lot of the sexual stuff that I do with my wife is that God created husbands and wives to enjoy each other physically. He wouldn't have created marital sex and commanded it to happen if he wasn't glorified when we do it. The fact that he didn't put any explicit bounds on marital sex is pretty telling about the extent to which God can be glorified by it - and I do it out of my faith in faith that God wants me to enjoy my wife, and her me.

[FR] Duty Sex Doesn't Exist

1 upvotes · 14 August 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

It's a waypoint.

Thanks for sharing your story. It sounds like she has undiagnosed vaginismus. My wife has/had that too. It doesn't matter how wet she is, there's still pain on insertion, although vaginismus is almost always psychosomatic. Like you, I used to cater to it and be overly cautious. I stopped caring or catering to her. Guess what ... she stopped complaining about it (including through body language) as soon as I stopped reinforcing it. Today ... I don't know if I cured her by being DNGAF or she's just not letting it affect how we have sex anymore. I don't care. She doesn't either.

But if that doesn't work for you, try looking into vaginismus yourself and see what you get. My wife's was definitely psychological based on the fact that her parents never let her insert anything in herself for her entire life, including tampons. Go figure that my psychological stability seems to have fixed hers. That's the power of frame.

[FR] Duty Sex - Analyzing my mistakes

1 upvotes · 13 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Nice. I must have missed that comment. You need to do more main posts. Feel free to cross from your blog when relevant.

[FR] Duty Sex Doesn't Exist

1 upvotes · 13 August 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

This is an interesting distinction. I'd define starfish sex by the physical disposition of a woman; and duty sex by the man's perception of his wife's interest in the sex they're having.

To that end, I've had it both ways:

- Duty without starfish is when my wife engages in various positions and tries to get me off but I get the distinct impression she'd rather be doing one of a million other things instead of screwing me - she's doing it just to appease me, which ruined it despite the skill she employed in the act.
- Starfish without duty is when she was totally into it, but like a good beta I just kept edging her and trying to make it better and better for her while she just laid there, covertly hoping she'd return the favor afterward, but she never did.

Of course, you can also have both or neither.

[FR] Duty Sex - Analyzing my mistakes

1 upvotes · 13 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is a solid field report. Thanks for posting!

nothing uniquely Christian about this post per se

That's fine. One of the main reasons this sub exists is to give pragmatic advice to guys from a Christian perspective. Although your situation may not directly reference the Bible, the answers you're looking for should align with the Bible, and that's why we're here.

I thought seriously about stopping, but I cut out porn/fapping two weeks ago and she just wrapped up shark week so I told myself that I needed the release.

So you're living in her frame still. You needed sex from her and decided to let her give it to you her way, on her terms (which was lame duty sex) rather than operate on your own terms.

What would happen if you literally picked her up in the middle of sex plopped her in doggy position and just started pounding? "Oh, I could never do that, she'd go crazy" = her frame. Or what if in the middle of sex you lay on your back, grab her hips, and slide her on top of you?

Here's the thing ... I'm becoming more and more convinced that duty sex doesn't exist. Tag: [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) and [/u/rocknrollchuck](#) and [/u/Deep_Strength](#) as other married men for insights on this, as it's only a working theory. But what I've found out is that "duty sex" only exists in a woman's frame. But I can have fairly exciting sex whenever I want. It only requires two things: (1) that I have the physical strength to move my wife's body in a way that pleases me, and (2) that I have the tenacity of will to keep going despite my internalized thoughts about what she must be thinking. Let me add in a bonus that really isn't necessary, but helps a lot: (3) that I can get my wife on the verge of an orgasm before starting all of this.

I've found that with the first two alone, my wife never actually objects. Even if she has in her mind that it's duty sex, she still goes along with it and any perception that she would disapprove of whatever the next thing is that I'd try to do with her, that is really just all in my head and I need to break out of her frame. If she tells me to stop, I stop - no getting any marital rape charges or anything. But that's never once actually happened for me. More often than not, somewhere along the way my wife starts getting into it - **ESPECIALLY** if I can hit that third point, because then she's trying to get me to cum faster so I'll let her finish - and that starts a fun little game where we're both trying to keep the other person revved up.

Covert Contract - I realize

I'm glad you realize this. This was a huge red flag in your post, and when I got to the bottom I took a sigh of relief that you spotted it already.

Kill Ego, Build Frame

See above. Good spot.

No more bad sex ... willing to say no to bad sex, rather than using any opportunity to get a release

That's the crux of the frame issue. But, if my theory pans out (I've only been testing it for a month, so I don't have a hard conclusion yet), then you don't have to say no to bad sex - you just turn bad sex into good sex.

When you say it's "bad sex" this goes back to your point on killing your ego. You assume that sex is only good if she's into it. I used to have the same problem. It drove my wife up the wall with fury because until recently she was just never into it. It turns out that when I get into it, she gets into it. So, if I go in with the mentality, "This is duty sex" and I just try to fake being excited about it to try to get her into it, (1) first off, that's another covert contract, and (2) women can see through faked emotions from a mile away. But if women are emotional empaths, like I often suggest, then my genuine excitement at using her like a sex toy, despite her initially not being into it, gets picked up by her empathic powers and suddenly she's hot and horny and I don't have to screw around to put her in positions anymore because now she's into it.

Seriously, only a year ago I would have said, "Not my good church girl. She'd never be that way." AWALT - even your good church girl.

Lift, bro

Go do it.

What has the church done to women?

1 upvotes · 13 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is important.

What has the church done to women?

1 upvotes · 13 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

She either found more alpha guys in Denomination B (unlikely) or she now prefers Denomination B because they do not judge her for pursuing alpha men outside the church entirely.

Or because Denomination B doesn't condemn the men for dating her, who is outside the church. So, a Denomination A guy might never give her the time of day in the first place because she's outside the church, skewing the statistics to explain why she only ever hears from Denomination B guys.

Fully agreed with your comment, though. I was just throwing out this one other option.

For Singles: Finding the Girl You Can't Keep Yourself From Banging - PART 2!

1 upvotes · 11 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Yeah, as [u/redpillwonder](#) said, FAT is an acronym for Faithful, Available, and Teachable.

Tag: [u/zeldafan1023](#)

Sex Addicted v. Sex Starved

1 upvotes · 10 August 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I think your view of glorifying God is probably too simplistic, which is at the core of the confusion. For example, Jesus and the apostles were well versed on their cultural trends in the places they ministered. This gave them a stark advantage whenever they could function as insiders or utilize that cultural knowledge for God's glory.

To that end, yeah I saw deadpool and watched a few seasons of game of thrones too - and I enjoyed them greatly. Neither of them violated my conscience - but that alone is not enough (1 Cor. 4:4). Our motive also matters. Are you doing it solely for your own amusement, or because being culturally versed gives you a foothold within that culture to reach others for Christ?

We now have RPC Chat!

1 upvotes · 10 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Sadly, I don't know much about the chat feature. It doesn't exist on the Reddit Is Fun app. It does on the main app with the bubble that has three dots in it at the bottom. When I click it, it shows a list of rooms that I'm already in as well as recommended rooms. It might be a connectivity problem for you. It could also be that you need to join on a desktop before it'll show up on the app.

Kicking Porn For Good

1 upvotes · 9 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I do apologize if I come off as arrogant and offensive. I do have some very strong feelings against seminaries, as I have seen many men whose spiritual lives were ruined by them, who were then thrust into leadership positions in the church, preaching from a very ungodly place. My dad was one of them.

Apart from those whose lives are a case-in-point, much of my view is also affirmed by 3 very specific and different seminary-trained pastors who have played a big role in my life, one who told me just last week in one of our one-on-one meetings that seminaries are, in essence, the Church's way of doing what Israel did in 1 Samuel 9 - they looked at the rest of the world and said, "We want our leadership to be just like the rest of the world," so Israel got a king and the church got its schools - but that Jesus never left a model of schooling and degrees; he left a model of discipleship. And although many seminary professors do disciple students here and there, the training methodology of seminaries is not modeled after the example Jesus set. I do believe that this is substantially responsible for many of the problems in the church today. I do not say this lightly, but after considerable research, many conversations with wiser people than myself, and through prayer to God about my prior desires to attend seminary. To that end, the same pastor who pointed out the above also said, "But it is a necessary evil because those of us who do want to do what Jesus did can't get a job doing that without the degree to qualify us," which he then went on a mini-lecture about how Jesus would have found the whole notion of having an academic degree in spirituality somewhat absurd and missing the point. And yet here it is as a virtually unanimous prerequisite to any position of ultimate authority in a church.

I don't write this to add to the offense, but hopefully to add to the conversation in the hope that maybe you can understand a little better my concern for the seminary trained.

We now have RPC Chat!

1 upvotes · 9 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Yes, I think it shows up on the sidebar. I'm not sure the normal way to switch to the redesign, but in the upper-left hand corner of my screen, sometimes (not always) there's a red banner that switches for you when you click it. Sometimes that banner only appears for a split second, so I literally just a few minutes ago kept refreshing the page and trying to click it before it went away. After 5 tries I finally got it to work.

Kicking Porn For Good

1 upvotes · 9 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That Brother Lawrence book that you reference is tilted towards spiritual mysticism

I've read it over 20 times and have no idea what you're talking about here.

You tried to distinguish between guilt and conviction but they are technically the same thing.

I just made another post about this. Guilt and conviction are most certainly not the same thing in the Bible.

should feel worse and worse everytime you sin

I would appreciate a biblical reference on this point.

no where in the Bible that states that physical reproduction is a parallel to spiritual reproduction

I disagree. I believe the clear language and connotation given in Scripture makes this somewhat obvious. Christ is our groom, we are his bride. It constantly talks about spiritual offspring in both the old and new testament. The apostles refer to themselves as spiritual "fathers" and to those who were saved through them as their spiritual "children." Jesus references saved people to Nicodemus as those who are "born again." The parallels between physical and spiritual reproduction and family processes are present all over - especially in the new testament. It is not limited to marriage alone, but to the parent-child relationship that is established through that marriage.

Spiritual sex ... is not the cure for physical sex ... There are many individuals who evangelize "effectively"

and still commit sexual sins.

I didn't say it was the cure. I said it's part of the cure. Notice the two sections before it, laying the Gospel as the foundation. I get that "spiritual sex" is not a phrase used in the Bible - at best I'm just using attention-grabbing terminology that I do believe flows with concepts that are found in the Bible. But evangelism/discipleship alone do not solve the problem - that's merely the result of filling your house with God. You still have to empty the house in the first place, and then you have to fill it with God in the second place, and then evangelism/discipleship flows from there. I wrote this up in far greater detail to someone else who made a similar objection [here](#).

I would think that a pastor that is involved in pornography (or was involved in it while a pastor) should be disqualified from being a pastor/elder since he is no longer above reproach

That depends on if he's repentant or not. If he's not repentant, you're absolutely right. Someone who repents and yet still fails from time to time with ongoing repentance is still above reproach. As some author once noted, "The measure of a man's spiritual maturity is not in how little he sins, but in how quickly he turns back to God after he sins." I wouldn't take that statement as dogmatic by any means (there are other measures of maturity given in the Bible), but I do find the sentiment to be far more Scriptural to measure a person's qualifications by the orientation of their heart toward God over their measure against the law, which is no longer over us.

You sound like a legalist. Is that a fair assessment?

Kicking Porn For Good

1 upvotes · 9 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Ah, but in my experience the reverse is what's true: someone can't legitimately get rid of their sin until Christ takes away their guilt first. That IS what gets rid of their sin.

Of course, I think we're talking past each other with semantics, as I addressed in a conversation with someone else over [here](#), after I literally just went through every single use of the word "guilt" or "guilty" in the Bible to figure out whether there was any basis for qualifying it as a feeling or emotional state. It turns out there is not.

Kicking Porn For Good

1 upvotes · 9 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Ah yes, as they approach the depraved mind. But is it talking about believers at that point or non-believers?

We're all trying to figure out what to do with our guilt one way or another. The non-believer, as you suggest, does so by convincing them that guilt isn't real in the first place. The believer accepts that it's real and places it on Jesus and has nothing to do with it ever again.

Kicking Porn For Good

1 upvotes · 9 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I can appreciate some of the differences in our viewpoint here. That said, I do strongly believe that God does not utilize guilt on the Christian, as that severely undermines the Gospel (unless one takes a view that a person hops in and out of salvation repeatedly based on his present sin - which I do not).

I wrote more on that in response to [/u/Rifleshoot](#) over [here](#). Hopefully that will provide greater clarity on what I see in the Bible as a distinction between guilt and conviction.

Kicking Porn For Good

1 upvotes · 9 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Amen to that!

Another thing he does, to use similar wording: *The Prince of Darkness sometimes wins, not by convincing us to do something we believe is wrong, but by distracting us away from that which we know is right.*

I imagine it like a circle with a singular line pointed upward (kind of like [this illustration](#)). Moving in the direction of that line is God's will. Moving in any other direction at all is not God's will, and is therefore sin. If one sin is causing a person to shoot straight over to the right, turning left won't cure him of his sin because he still won't be heading in the right direction. There is 1 direction that will save a person and 359 other directional degrees that are sin. If the Prince of Darkness can agree with you that walking in a 258 degree angle is bad and get you to walk at a 93 degree angle instead, he still wins.

Kicking Porn For Good

1 upvotes · 9 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I can see where you're coming from. Romans 1 gives a similar process of God letting people walk away from him. But I think this is very different from God actively giving people a sense of guilt. As humans walk away from God, abandoning the sacrifice of Christ in their lives, their guilt naturally returns because they have rejected Christ as their savior from that guilt. This isn't the Holy Spirit causing them to feel guilty; rather, the Holy Spirit is the one telling them they don't have to be guilty anymore if they'd only turn back to God.

Sex Addicted v. Sex Starved

1 upvotes · 9 August 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I don't see anything in the bible that would condemn it. So, I'd chalk that up to a disputable issue under Romans 14, where as long as it doesn't violate your conscience and you're not causing your wife to sin by violating her conscience, and per Romans 14:23 and 1 Cor. 10:31 you can glorify God through it... go for it. But don't just do it willy nilly just because you like it. Really contemplate how it is the product of your faith and glorifies God. It would be sin for me because I could not pass that test, but I can imagine scenarios where some men could.

Sex Addicted v. Sex Starved [MRP Draft]

1 upvotes · 9 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Yeah, I really need to crank out that post on women being emotional empaths ... I just keep getting too distracted with other stuff that comes up and seems more pressing in the moment.

Anyone here feel bad for being too hard on themselves re: chastity?

1 upvotes · 9 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

It's only frustrating to set aside worldly satisfactions when you don't have any genuine spiritual satisfaction in Christ.

Prager U video of a female discussing the downside of demasculinizing men. Presents what I feel to be a positive statement about the negative effects of demasculinization/feminization. Would like to know what the community thinks.

1 upvotes · 9 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Yeah ... the video in that dalrock post is disgusting.

Introduction/Accountability

1 upvotes · 8 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Fair enough. The red pill works a little different with parenting anyway.

Sex Addicted v. Sex Starved [MRP Draft]

1 upvotes · 8 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Great question. It comes down to frame.

When a man is blue pill, as we all often begin, we develop certain ideologies and fantasies about what sex will be like once we've swallowed the red pill, made our improvements, etc. For the Christian man, this includes fantasies about what sex will be like once he's married. This prospective look toward future sexuality is often at the root of their starvation, not anything in the present or (although this one is more common) their past.

As a result, even a man who puts on the external appearance of someone who has been red pill - through his bulging muscles, confident demeanor, DNGAF attitude, etc. - is still living on blue pill fantasies if his motivation is to gratify those ideologies he crafted in his blue pill days. Such a man is still controlled by his sexuality rather than being controlled by it, whether he has arrived or not.

By embracing that he is not actually addicted in the first place, and instead that he is merely starved of a good thing, the single man can regain control over his sexuality and sexual ideologies - most notably by casting aside his blue pill fantasies about what sex will be like one day and instead adopting a frame that presents himself as a man in control over his fantasies.

One way or another, a man's fantasies will control his behaviors to fulfill those fantasies, or the man will dominate his fantasies and ideologies with his own internal sense of self, which for the Christian is found in our identity through Christ. To that end, I ask single men: which is it going to be? Because most of them correlate their fantasies with their addiction and believe they have no control over their own desires, making us little more than mere animals.

How do you learn to truly let go of someone?

1 upvotes · 8 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

How is this post in any way different from this original post?

It sounds to me like he didn't like the feedback he got last time and is going for round 2 hoping we'll change our minds. You hear me OP? All I can do is ditto what I said last time.

Sex Addicted v. Sex Starved

1 upvotes · 8 August 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

There are hints of a couple of these in my motives, but my primary intention in posting this here is otherwise off the list. I'll simply leave it at that. But I do appreciate the clear reminder of the need to balance frame and value-add as well as peering into the way you look "beyond the obvious."

Few questions for this subreddit

1 upvotes · 8 August 2018 · /r/ExRedPill

I get downvoted (1) because I'm a Christian and this sub is unfriendly to that, and I've had many people specifically say to me in my other comments that Christianity has no place here; and (2) because despite my rejection of many of the childish and harmful attitudes espoused on TRP, I still do retain an underlying acceptance of "red pill" philosophy without compromising a moral high ground, and this sub takes an all-or-nothing approach that any retention of the red pill must be evil and that there is no compromise. As you note, this sub is equally cult-like as TRP.

MRP is a little better because it drops all the misogyny and anti-marriage sentiment (after all, it's "married red pill") and sticks more to the core, underlying philosophies, but even that falters from a moralistic standpoint. That is, they rightly acknowledge that RP is amoral - that the morality of it is decided by how a person wants to apply it, not by the truths revealed by the red pill itself ... but then they turn around from that *descriptive* truth by giving *prescriptive* advice and berate men who do not follow that advice based on moral principles. It's one thing to say

that a fact is immoral. But to argue that prescriptive advice has no bearing on morality is nonsensical.

Again, I created RPC to be a means of opening the door to that type of moral conversation, returning "the red pill" to a sense of the core underlying truths of the matters at hand and not viewing it as a certain pattern of behaviors as the secular subs have turned it into.

To that end, even though we're a Christian sub and u/rocknrollchuck will probably preach the Gospel to you at some point, atheists are welcome if you want to discuss some of these things without feeling a pressure to abandon the idea of marriage.

Prager video about the harm in demasculinizing men. Thought some would enjoy the fact that it is out there.

1 upvotes · 8 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Thanks, brother. I'm glad I could help. As for the video, I still say you post it. The post really only needs a 1-2 sentence introduction explaining what it is, then a simple question: "What do you all think about this?" or "Does this resonate with you?"

Prager video about the harm in demasculinizing men. Thought some would enjoy the fact that it is out there.

1 upvotes · 8 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

For reference: I asked for a brief description of the content and a discussion prompt/question in the post to give readers something to talk about. This isn't just for the sub's sake, but for the viability of the post itself. Most people don't watch links. As such, most people won't give feedback on them. Tell them what to expect when they click the link and they're more likely actually to do so and engage in conversation - especially if you ask them a question about it or give them a starting point for conversation.

I'm removing this until you comply with my original request to add these two things.

Sex Addicted v. Sex Starved [MRP Draft]

1 upvotes · 7 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I disagree. But I do appreciate the attempted insight. If you're right, I'm sure God will convict me one day - hopefully sooner rather than later.

My testimony and RP-imony

1 upvotes · 7 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Fair point.

Few questions for this subreddit

1 upvotes · 7 August 2018 · /r/ExRedPill

Why I never went into TRP

I like women

Me too :)

AWALT

Yeah, TRP grossly misunderstands this concept, which is explained better on MRP and r/RPChristians - that all

women have certain underlying tendencies, but every woman expresses these differently, and some can even overcome those tendencies entirely. As a Christian, for example, I embrace that God created men and women uniquely and differently, and that as a result of the fall, there are certain patterns of sinful behavior that we both fall into (not just women). So, it's helpful to know what those patterns are so that we can appropriately account for them in our relationships. But that doesn't mean that every man will act exactly like Adam or that every woman will act exactly like Eve.

Alpha/Beta

You're spot on. The dynamic isn't defined by caricatures, but by someone's internal point of origin. To that end, intelligent men can still be beta and idiots can still be alpha. It's more about whether or not you're able to make decisions for yourself and follow through (alpha), or if your lifestyle is one of supplicating to those around you (beta). Where it gets really murky is when you're dealing with subconscious influences, so a man might think he's making his own decision when in reality he has been played by someone else. I must do this frequently with my job, for example. As an attorney, it's one thing to argue a point to persuade something, but it's even better if I can cause the judge to believe he/she came up with the point on his/her own, in which case the point is far more likely to stand and result in a favorable conclusion. To that end, the "alpha" is the person less susceptible to manipulation and the "beta" is the one who is ignorant of the ways he is being manipulated.

MGTOW

I empathize with this group, but the whole notion is somewhat disgusting.

Who is average TRP?

I've been curious about this myself. You'll never find the average user, but for some of the moderators, you can look on youtube at places like the 21 Convention, where they post pics and speeches from some of the popular men in the red pill circles.

Ying-Yang

Although I don't subscribe to this philosophy in general, I completely agree with your conclusion about masculinity and femininity being complementary to each other.

N-Count

As you say, the raw number isn't the important thing. What's relevant is what it shows about a person's character and degree of trustworthiness as a raw matter of statistical probability. A woman who has had dozens of partners and been married 3 times before, statistically, is not likely to remain in a committed monogamous relationship - and the same thing can be said about men in the reverse.

On r/RPChristians we take a different stance than the secular view, as we account for things like "repentance," where a person recognizes the inappropriateness of their past behaviors and commits to living their life a different way going forward. To that end, a woman who has a high n-count who has genuinely repented may still very well be a reliable partner. The trick is evaluating the genuineness of the repentance.

Dropping standards

This is a real phenomenon, as you note. The reason you notice this as particularly true in the 30+ crowd is that at some point in life people start getting desperate, believing, "If I can't find someone soon, I'll never find someone."

As a matter of course, there is a real social stigma that people in certain age ranges who have never been married have stayed single for a reason. This is a very rational caution to be mindful of, regardless of the way anyone else may want to normalize it.

Marriage laws

I'm a divorce attorney. I can affirm that the marriage laws are pretty awful - but not for the men. They're awful for the primary breadwinner. The laws are internally contradictory. In my state, for example, we have two weird laws:

- Both spouses are deemed to have contributed equally toward the marriage.
- The higher-earning spouse must contribute financially toward the lower/non-earning spouse.

What makes this weird is that the non-earning spouse does not have to contribute anything back from her otherwise "equal contribution." So, during the marriage, suppose you have a husband who earns \$100,000/yr and a wife who stays home to watch the kids, clean the house, do the laundry, tend the garden, etc. After a divorce, the husband must contribute \$50,000 to the wife, who then gets this money without expending the time to get it, and then utilizes her time to clean her own house, watch the kids on her days, do her own laundry, tend her own garden, etc. The husband lives on the same amount, but must suddenly pay a nanny to watch the kids, hire a house-cleaner, gardener, etc., which means he's living on substantially less than his ex-wife.

Now, as a matter of statute, the same situation could theoretically play out in reverse, where the woman is the higher earner and gets screwed. However, deviating from the statutes, we still have a host of "older" judges and magistrates who have been on the bench since before the laws started reverting back to a more "equal" position and still make rulings based on the old way of doing things, which was that women always win. So, even though the statutes have gotten better at avoiding gender discrimination and now only discriminate against high-earners, the judges themselves still employ significant gender discrimination, except the ones who are under the age of 40.

Women's v. Men's Rights

I'm with you on this one. Even in the court system, the judges just don't want to hear it. Their usual deferral is, "Petition your legislature," as if even a horde of individuals petitioning their congressmen could stand a chance against the mass-funding put in by lobbyists who generally profit off of the issues that are more appealing to the media.

There was a post on r/writing a few months back about a female author who was starting a competition with a publication offer for the best crime novel *that did not involve a female victim*. She commented that she's sick of the way society cares more about female deaths than male deaths, but also that it's degrading to women to treat them like they're defenseless. Her whole rationale was really an interesting read and exposed a lot of the issues working against both the men's rights and feminist movements that really need to look toward better alternatives than the hate that gets spewed both ways.

Pareto distribution

There are general trends that follow the pareto rule, but it's somewhat fallacious to assume that because one thing does, another must - especially when you're crossing sample lines. For example, I can appropriately say, "I sampled 100 hurricanes and found that 10% of them did 90% of the total damage among the sample selection. I reasonably believe that if I sampled another 100 hurricanes, based on my dad and the confidence intervals laid out, the second set would provide similar results." But if we say, "Because of that result in hurricanes, it must also be true that 10% of the men are having 90% of the sex with women," now we're crossing an inappropriate line. New data needs to be drawn with its own conclusions that matches what the data points reveal.

Anyway, this has been fun. As I'm sure you see in this comment, I am not a big fan of most people on TRP and a lot of the stuff you read on there is going to be utter trash, but there are certain truths within the red pill which are worth retaining - and my personal belief is that those truths came from the Bible first, hence my starting r/RPChristians as a way of sifting out all the garbage.

Should I inform wife of job hunting?

1 upvotes · 7 August 2018 · /r/askMRP

So much of this stuff never pans out. When you mentioned that you were getting offers, but without an actual offer in-hand yet, she interpreted that as, "He's a hopeful dreamer with nothing practical to offer from keeping his head in the clouds." That wasn't a test. That was her pointing out how you screwed up. Oh well, keep lifting and move on.

Is my wife pregnant by another man (I need some advice)

1 upvotes · 6 August 2018 · /r/askMRP

What advice did you want that isn't plain obvious?

Insecure? Check.

Loser? Check.

More attractive men than you? Check.

Smarter men than you? Check.

Men with better futures? Check.

Ok ... what are you going to do about that?

Conditionally loving a unicorn

1 upvotes · 6 August 2018 · /r/askMRP

This sub often says, "We don't fix the marriage; we fix the man." This is slightly misleading, and your case explains why. You assume you were mostly fine, but had some issues that needed fixing. This is wrong.

RP makes a whole new man entirely. It sounds like you wanted to keep your foundation as a person intact and merely improve the structure atop that foundation. But if the foundation is weak, it doesn't matter how strong the structure above it is. It will topple.

Uproot your whole self and start again.

RPC approved books and podcasts?

1 upvotes · 6 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

What we are all waiting on is for [u/Red-Curious](#) to figure out he could make more money writing than representing.

Hah! Not this type of content. Feminism sells to a feminist world. Masculinity is shamed and only has a really small niche audience. After I finish going through [/u/Deep_Strength](#)'s book, I'll start working on my own again.

Introduction

1 upvotes · 3 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

In my non-Christian days I imagined that one day I would be a great evangelist and preacher - even greater than Billy Graham, for example. I thought I was a Christian at the time, but wasn't. Even after being saved, many of

these expectations still lingered, as I assumed this was what God used my upbringing to prepare me for.

At one point in the first month of meeting with my discipler he asked what I wanted to learn about and grow in. I said, "I want to learn about common attributes of the great men of the faith, like Abraham, Moses, Elijah, etc." He said, "That's a really good topic. But why do you want to know about them?" I said, "Because God gave them to us as an example and I want to be like them." He said, "I think your real motive is to be great like them." He was right.

He then asked me, "If you were sent out into the middle of the desert by God and he said, 'I want you to live here for the rest of your days - another 70 years - and you will never speak to or preach to another soul. And this will bring me more glory than anything else you could do with your life.' How would you feel?"

I said I'd go. He said, "That's not what I asked. I asked how you'd feel about it." I said I'd be lonely, bored, and likely feel worthless and unfulfilled.

He pointed out that this meant that my source of feeling "fulfilled" was not in God himself or his glory, but in my own ambitions and that God often chooses to do the biggest things through those who were first content to be made nothing. He then asked me to set aside my spiritual ambitions - even if I had in my head that I was doing it for God - and instead focus on what God can do through me right now and today.

We then talked through the parable of the minas/talents and how God only gives little bits to some and greater things to others and that we each have a role and it's not for us to decide or fantasize about how important we will be to God's Kingdom. But at the end of the day, if we are faithful with little now, he will give us more authority later, even though the servants in those stories didn't have any expectation of the reward of greater authority that followed their faithfulness. They only knew of the punishment for not being faithful (which even the last guy actually failed to understand) and what would give their master good pleasure in the moment.

I recognize that if I wanted to, I could probably quit my job, plant a church, get it to be mega, and be the pop Christian rock star. I 100% believe that I could do that if I tried. The growth of this sub is evidence of that - even with how little effort I have put into it, relative to other things. But that's no longer my ambition. I don't want to be a spiritual great. I want to do what God designed me to do, however big or small that role may end up being.

[FR] Fixing your SMV

1 upvotes · 3 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I addressed this in a previous comment

Sorry if I missed it. I'm still not finding it - can you cite it to me? All I saw was the bit about gluttony, not about fitness.

This was my response:

Yep, that's one of the parts I looked at. I agree with everything you said there.

- We shouldn't use our bodies as instruments of unrighteousness.
- We should not use our body to sin
- We shouldn't use our bodies for drunkenness and gluttony

Okay, you still haven't mentioned a single thing about God's position on fitness. You're avoiding answering question A by trying to make up another question B that isn't what I asked, then answering that instead.

What is God's position on whether or not men should improve their physical fitness? Is he for it, against it, or

does he not care?

My point was that the Bible does not address the status of one's physical fitness. The Bible tells us to not use the body as an instrument of sin.

What I read in this is that your conclusion is simply: "God doesn't care whether we're physically fit or not. That's why he didn't put it in the Bible." I disagree and think that he did put it in there and gave us distinct biblical figures to model our lives after for a reason. I have given citations to support this conclusion. You have avoided and avoided addressing the question or the citations I referenced. So be it.

Life advice and direction needed.

1 upvotes · 3 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I believe Matthew 28:19-20 is given to the church corporately

Where's the support for this in the passage? Or is there another verse you rely on to reach this conclusion? My guess is, as has been true for everyone else I've known who has made this argument, that there is only a philosophical premise for arguing this point and not a theological one. That is, there's no biblical support, only DEERING.

There are countless passages, however, that allude to the individuality of this mission, even if none of them explicitly states: "The great commission is for individuals, not the church corporately."

It would require every single believe without distinction to "go".

It does. The operation of the "going" isn't to go into the nations - it's to "go and make disciples of all nations." One must "go" do something to effectuate that result, such as going to the gym, or going to work, or going to church, or going to the mall, etc. to meet people to disciple. The cumulative effect is that the whole world will be reached, even if the extent of someone's going is little more than outside their own home.

It would require and empower all Christians to baptize believers, but this is (usually) the duty of the corporate church and administered by the elders

Phew, philosophy has certainly corrupted your theology. There is no biblical mandate that only an ordained minister can baptize someone.

It would require and empower all Christians to be teachers, but we know that not all are called to teach and some are prohibited.

There's a difference between leadership and teaching. You seem to have a very "informational" approach to discipleship. It's true that Jesus incorporated information into his approach, but his core was on modeling.

Even at that, we're all called to teach, even though not all of us are uniquely gifted at teaching. What you're referencing is someone who sits in a corporately authoritative capacity as a teacher.

Consider my wife. She is not spiritually gifted at teaching. Does that mean she is prohibited from teaching our children anything? Obviously not. Or are you arguing that as soon as someone becomes a parent God immediately bestows on them the gift of teaching?

This mentality also ignores the teaching of 1 Cor 12. We are not all evangelists, not all teachers of others.

Where is the "spiritual gift of discipleship" listed? If it's a spiritual gift, then I would agree - some people would

have it, some wouldn't.

Discipleship isn't a gift. It's a mission. Your spiritual gifts are the context in which you carry it out. So, some people will use their gift of hospitality to raise up younger believers by inviting them into their home. Others might use the gift of teaching to provide clear instruction to the people they're discipling. Others might use the gift of service to build relationships with the people who they'll disciple. But one way or another, we're all to be leading others toward Christ in an intentional capacity in some way. If God judges our hearts, I don't see him being pleased on Judgment Day when someone says, "Jesus, on reviewing my life I now see that I didn't make any intentional effort to advance your Kingdom with the people whose lives you placed in my path. That said, I did notice that I accidentally influenced some people for the better, so does that count?" If God judges our behaviors, he'd be pleased. If he judges our hearts, what do you think?

the hand is not greater than the foot, nor the eye greater than the ear.

Of course, which is why the context for each is different. But the hand, foot, eye, ear, mouth, leg, etc. all follow the same mission determined by the head, who is Christ. So, while the head may tell the nose to smell, but won't give the same command to the eye, he does certainly use all parts of the body to further his mission.

I don't see the head saying, "I want to do this today, but the eyes don't have to participate in that, so I'm going to gouge them out and leave them behind and pick them back up again when I'm ready to pursue another mission that actually involves them."

I would also note that (1) only the eleven apostles, not the entire church, received the "great commission"

I'm not sure where you're getting that from. Matthew 28:19 is the great commission. Matthew 28:16 specifically says that the "eleven disciples" were there.

there is absolutely no command given, other than to ministers

I really have no idea what you mean by this. There are lots and lots and lots of commands given in the Bible. Matthew 28:19 is among them.

Certainly some of us must do the work of an evangelist, and be pastors and teachers. But it does not therefore follow that all of us must do that.

If the command is to make disciples of "all nations" and we are instructed to teach every disciple ("all nations") to obey all the commands Jesus gave us, this includes the "make disciples of *all nations*" part. I'm not sure how much clearer that can get. Jesus didn't say, "Make disciples of all nations and teach them to obey everything I commanded, except that some people can ignore the all nations part ... that's only for a few of you."

The church is definitely an institution and not simply a fellowship. It has structure, authority, and a diversity of gifts and callings.

This may be a semantics issue. The way I'm using this term is described in more detail in [this post](#). To that end, I agree it is an "institution" in the modern sense, but it was not intended by God to be this way. For further reading, check out *Bridging the Great Divide* by Rob McCorkle.

pretty much everyone is commanded to at least disciple their own kids, and husbands to lead their wives, so that is a form of discipleship, although I don't think it's the one you have in mind

I agree, but very few parenting models actually emulate biblical discipleship. So, not every Christian parent can be said to be "discipling" their children just by virtue of parenting them. And I know many people who distinctly

fail at it. Either way, that's an argument, not a place in the Bible that says discipleship isn't a spiritual gift or that it's only limited to some.

"making disciples" is just shorthand for evangelizing them and teaching them

And there's the misunderstanding. Now your arguments make a lot of sense to me. If this were what Jesus meant when he said to "make disciples," then you'd be right about most things you've said here.

But Jesus gives the great commission after having spent 3 years with these guys. It's not just the way he evangelized or taught them - it's the totality of how he related with and engaged with them. He's saying, "You're my disciples. What I just did with you for the last 3 years, go and do that for others and teach them how to do that for others too until you've reached every nation." This is vastly different and beyond mere evangelism and teaching.

Sorry if this conversation has been cockeyed because of this misunderstanding. I probably should have addressed that much sooner, as most people have this mistaken understanding of what disciple-making actually is.

You're asking me to prove a negative.

Of course - and your cited 1 Cor. 12 is a great example where the Bible actually does prove a negative where it wants to. But "disciple-maker" isn't on that list.

Mental Point of Origin and Philippians 2

1 upvotes · 3 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Glad to help :)

[FR] Fixing your SMV

1 upvotes · 3 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I have no idea who Martin Lawrence is. Obviously I'm referencing the age-old classic, *Practice the Presence of God*.

However, your original post did not provide that context or foundation. That's why I responded the way I did.

That's because you're viewing my one post in isolation without the context of everything else I say and write here. That's the same thing as picking out one single teaching of Jesus's and saying he missed the point because you ignore everything else he said.

I stated my position and even provided Scripture to support it

All I saw was you evasively avoiding taking a position. Let me just pick out one point and see if you can answer this one directly: *Do you believe that God wants us to be physically fit?*

- If your answer is yes, then we agree and you've wasted all of this time arguing against me encouraging men to be physically fit.
- If your answer is no, please provide Scriptural support for the conclusion that God does not want us to be physically fit.
- If your answer is that God doesn't care if we're physically fit or not, then provide a passage that says God doesn't care.

What I've heard you say is, "God doesn't want us to be gluttons," for example. That's fine. We obviously both agree with that. But that's not what I'm asking about. We both already know that God is against us being "unfit" - but what's his position on us improving our physical fitness?

Life advice and direction needed.

1 upvotes · 3 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I understand what you're saying - and I think we agree, but you're reaching the conclusion from an unusual angle.

A man may have a further mission, but it can never be at the neglect of raising a godly family.

What about single man called into celibacy? Are you suggesting that he must still find a way to have a family and raise them to be godly? Obviously not.

If a man is married, he certainly does have an obligation to raise his family in a godly manner. But God's mission over us transcends this. The mission of discipleship is broken down into many sub-categories of contexts in which we disciple others. Husband-wife is one context, parent-child is another, neighbor-neighbor is another, coworker-coworker is another, etc.

It is certainly possible that the only person God ever calls someone to disciple is their own children. But it would be against Scripture to teach this as a sufficient mission in itself, as in the long-term it would inherently preclude our ability to "make disciples of all nations" if we took the position that our only obligation in disciple-making is to our own families. The only exception would be if God had some bizarre plan for population control whereby he had all non-Christians die out so that the world was only populated by the descendants of Christians, in which case all nations could be reached exclusively through discipleship in one's own family.

To that end, I fully agree with you that making disciples of our families is the first place we must start - and our highest priority. But this is only a subset of the mission of discipleship, not a greater mission than the one Jesus gave: "make disciples of all nations." It could be that a man's strategy to reach all nations is to disciple his children to be missionaries outside of the home - or to disciple his children to disciple their children to become missionaries outside the home. But somewhere along the way we have to embrace that we are called to reach outside of our own homes. And if discipleship as Jesus showed us is a relationship founded on modeling (which also flows with Paul's teachings on modeling), then how can we ever teach a next generation the importance of discipleship outside the home if we are not first modeling it for them? Otherwise, we are not discipling them into this mission; we are merely philosophizing to them about it.

A man's mission to disciple his family into godliness is one context in which he employs the mission of disciple-making. But it is not the only one, nor should it be the only one, lest we violate the "of all nations" part of the great commission.

Discipleship is the duty of the church corporately, not of us individually.

On this point we certainly disagree.

I've heard this objection many times, and I simply cannot agree. The language of Matthew 28:19-20 seems to clear. It was given to individuals and all of those individuals who were present lived it out. They did not take it as a corporation who assigns to one the role of discipleship and the other the role of marketing and another the role of raising financial support. They all adopted that role individually. And the command to do so was that they also share that command and responsibility with everyone else.

- Command 1: "Make disciples of all nations"
- Command 2: "Teach them to obey everything I have commanded you."

Command 2 includes command 1 ... and also command 2. If the apostles received the command to make disciples individually, and applied it individually, and were instructed to teach others to adopt and obey everything they were commanded to do, it is no longer a corporate mission, but an individual one. By making it a corporate mission, we are merely giving people an excuse to be passive. If they don't want to do something, they'll simply argue, "That's my pastor's job, not mine." And this is exactly what has happened and why the church functions today more like a corporation than a fellowship. We rally behind an institution we call the church rather than a body of people who are organized around a man who gave us a mission - all because of the "that's not my job, it's his" excuse.

Find me one place where the Bible identifies "discipleship" as a unique spiritual gift only given to some, or one place where it instructs that not everyone is called to make disciples. Do that and I may change my mind. But in my many years of searching I have yet to find that passage. As such, any conclusion along those lines is merely a philosophy of Scripture that runs contrary to the direct implications of Jesus' words and the writings of the apostles.

I should also note, when you cite Malachi 2:15 and say that producing godly offspring is sufficient for a man, or when you quote Genesis 1:28 and say that fulfilling this is a "fantastic and thoroughly Biblical mission" - what would you say about the other commands?

Could I quote Jesus' command to "pray for your enemies" and say that my mission is to pray for my enemies, and then ignore all the other commands in the Bible because I have found a passage, built my mission around it, and decided that this alone is enough?

"Of course not, it would still be sin to lie, steal, lust, etc. You still have to avoid all of those other sins." Sure, but what about the other affirmative commands? A man might have a specific calling of praying for his enemies, but that must still fall into the greater framework of disciple-making. If his prayer for his enemies is not contributing to his ability to make disciples of those enemies, or of those who hear him praying for his enemies, or anyone somehow somewhere ... then what good has he done?

Mental Point of Origin and Philipians 2

1 upvotes · 3 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

If you mean the one about your book, I'll PM you about it separately.

The Proverbs 31 Woman In The Modern Era

1 upvotes · 3 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

As [/u/Deep_Strength](#) said (tagging because I'm butting in on a conversation), women communicate covertly, not overtly. Don't expect them to be men. If they were, you wouldn't want to date them in the first place.

But what's more relevant here is the distinction between SMV and RMV. You're almost certainly evaluating your behaviors as "off putting" or "on putting" in terms of what would increase your SMV in her eyes. You may be right.

But what DS is talking about is the fact that women have a completely different and separate scale that affects her perception of a man's Relationship Market Value.

MMSLP is probably the best book for understanding this dichotomy. It explains what Athol Kay defines as "alpha" traits that affect a man's sexual attraction, and "beta" traits (misusing that word) which affect a woman's perception of him as a long-term relational prospect. On the AFBB spectrum, AF affects SMV and BB affects RMV. This is why the "oak" concept was developed - to help a man find a balance between the traits necessary to both attract her sexually and keep her invested relationally. As cholomite once said, "Tingles without fuzzies

won't last. Fuzzies without tingles are worthless."

So, if you think your SMV is real high, what can you do to enhance your RMV?

[FR] Fixing your SMV

1 upvotes · 3 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I got the pun, but I thought it was important to explain anyway.

I agree that all of these things are futile if they are an end in themselves. But the fact that we have a higher purpose does not mean we can be negligent in these areas.

My investment in those things is not for their own sake. It is to create a context for Christ's sake. Where do you think I meet many of the non-Christians I share the Gospel with? At the gym. How do you think I developed the confidence to approach them and overcome my timidity in starting those conversations and fear or rejection? By developing an alpha attitude. How do you think I got them to listen to me? By being charming and charismatic. Know where else I've found people to evangelize and ultimately disciple? Through my job, as my law clerk once noticed my work ethic and saw my successes and wanted to learn from me, giving me an opportunity to share Christ with him. Want to know where else? By having lots of friends and acquaintances who are drawn to what God is doing through me. I say this not to brag, but simply to say that there is value in being good stewards of what God gave us and I find that men who tend to neglect these things often tend to have fruitless ministries. As Jesus suggests in Matthew 7, we are evaluated by our fruit. I know what has helped increase my capacity to bear fruit. These things are not the only 5 things I do, but they are a starting point for many men who otherwise lack the ability to influence others for Christ. To that end, I do believe God's Kingdom does greatly value men who are diligent in these areas - and I have yet for you to provide a verse that supports the claim that "His kingdom ... does not value any of those worldly goals." You're making a philosophical point here, not a theological one, unless you can show me a verse where God says, "I do not want you to be in shape" or "I do not want you to be confident" or "I do not want you to have good jobs" or "I do not want you to have appealing personalities" or "I do not want you to have many friends."

You're missing the point and still refusing to answer the questions I presented. As Brother Lawrence once said, "The true work of sanctification is not in changing what we do, but in doing for Christ that which we have otherwise done for ourselves."

I get that you pursued all of these things in your past. From the way you talk about it, you did it for yourself. You did these things based on your own sake and your own motives. But if we were to redeem and reconcile these pursuits to God's purposes, there is immense value in that.

What it comes down to is that you're trying to box away and isolate everything. You're trying to say, "This matters, but not that," while failing to realize the way that this and that are interconnected. A basic example is home life and work life. Many suggest we should make our home lives a priority, others prefer to prioritize their careers. In reality, our performance in our career affects our home life, just as what we experience in our home life affects our careers. In the same way, even though you have yet to say what you think is an actual biblical pursuit, my guess is that whatever it is, you're trying to isolate it and assume that it is not at all in any way influenced by anything else other than its own little box. In reality, I'm fairly confident that improvements in the character traits I've mentioned above will likely have a significant affect on one's capacity to live out whatever hypothetical purpose you're probably dreaming of.

If I have been made complete in Christ, why do I need to find my "completeness" outside of Him?

When did I ever say to find our completeness in these things I'm asking men to improve?

Once again - your entire strategy is to pick apart what someone else is saying rather than presenting a position of your own. This is weak and shallow. It's luke-warm. Figure out what your own position is first and then pursue it.

Don't just live by picking apart other people's positions. I know my views aren't perfect and I'll embrace that. But until a better way is presented, I can only go with the best way I know, no matter how imperfect it may be.

[FR] Fixing your SMV

1 upvotes · 3 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Why, are you Curious?

It helps me figure out how well you're familiar with places like MRP and TRP. Because you stick mostly to the blogs, you probably have a rosier color in your eyes about what the manosphere looks like, which can explain why we have a difference of opinion on how to reach these guys.

The way to biblically take care of your body is not to sin (including drunkenness and gluttony)

In other words, there are situations where the condition of one's body in the negative is de facto evidence of sin - gluttony, sloth, poor health from self-inflicted substance abuse, etc. But in the reverse, there is no such de facto evidence of sin for having a well-built body. Or are you suggesting we be luke-warm and live in mediocrity with our bodies?

I am in support of men not being timid or lack boldness when it comes to sharing the gospel and/or publicly standing up for the Truth. Acts of worldly manliness for the sake of being manly is not supported by the Bible.

How do you think men will learn to develop boldness in sharing their faith? If we isolate the trait to one specific aspect of life (evangelism, for example), it will never be ingrained in us as a character issue.

The Bible encourages us to be gentle, meek, humble, not paying back evil with evil but with good, patient, suffering wrong, etc.

Of course, none of which are in conflict with being confident, assertive, bold, etc. - which were all modeled by Jesus also.

the love of money is the root of all sorts of evil. Thus earning a living should be a means to an end and not the end itself.

Right. Which is why I am giving men a starter-motive for making money that isn't related to wealth for its own sake. This trains men to recognize that money is a means to an end, as you've noted. But until men have a practical example, they often can't comprehend the spiritual truth ... which is why God gave us the Old Testament for 4,000 years before giving us the New Testament - so that we'd have practical examples to help us understand the Gospel when the time came.

No one can have more of an ideal personality and character than Jesus had. Did he gain the respect of outsiders or did they try to kill him?

Both. This is the parable of the great banquet. Jesus was both a charismatic and offensive man. People were drawn to his charisma, often commenting on the way he communicated - "as one with authority, unlike the Pharisees and teachers of the law." But they were also off-put by the way that he stepped on the toes of the people he knew were hardened against him already anyway.

For us, we will certainly face rejection, but not by everyone. As we develop a personality that earns respect, we advance our ability to make a difference in the world for Christ, hopefully decreasing those who would reject us

and increasing those who would accept Christ because of us.

Quite frankly I'm not into building personal relationships with the world (for the reasons stated above) so there really is no time to build those relationships.

This is the biggest and most fundamental difference in our philosophies of ministry. I believe Jesus' method of ministry and discipleship, including evangelism, was incredibly personal and relational. If you're more of a proclamational evangelist over a relational/balanced, then we'll have to agree to disagree on the importance of the points referenced in the rest of this conversation, as that explains fully why we're not seeing eye to eye.

My point is that suggesting improvement in the areas that you detailed in your post is not addressing the true need that the Bible says is inherent in fallen man. It's a heart issue.

Again, if you take this one post out of the context of everything else I've written, I can see how you'd come to this conclusion ... just as I could easily rag on Jesus for missing the "true need" of men when he preached about hell. But look at those passages in the context of everything he said and we realize that every word Christ spoke was useful, even though not every single word was specifically talking about the "heart issue" you reference.

not content with the gift of eternal life?

I don't think that's what men should be content with in the first place. Our contentment is in Christ himself, not the eternal life he gives us. Christ is our groom. Marriage is a parallel for the Christ/church relationship. Helping men improve their marriages gives them a better parallel to look at when trying to understand what God expects from them in his marriage to the church.

As a rule of thumb, RP says, "Women don't love you; they love what you can offer her." Your conclusion is the same: that Christ's bride should be satisfied with what Christ offers her. In my view, this is wrong.

I know God cares

And yet you haven't explained how he cares about any of these aspects of our lives. You're keeping your conclusions very nebulous, doing what I often see in courtrooms - people who would rather pick apart someone else's argument rather than figuring out what their own actual position is in the first place.

I had a lady do this to me recently. I sent a settlement proposal. She rejected it with a million explanations why it was wrong. I said, "Okay, if this isn't acceptable to you, tell me what is." A year went by of my pressing this issue and even her own attorney couldn't get her to say what her actual position was. She only wanted to explain why my client's position was wrong - never take a stance herself.

To that end:

Body - Do you think God wants us to be physically fit or do you think he doesn't care about our bodies as long as we're not committing gluttony, sloth, etc.?

Alphanness - Do you think God wants us to be purposeful people who set goals, pursue them, take initiative, etc., or that he doesn't care about our internal drive?

Money - Do you think that God wants us to work hard and earn a good wage, or do you think he doesn't care whether people have a good work ethic?

Charm, Character, Etc. - Do you think God wants us to be improving our ability to interact with others both inside and outside his kingdom, or that God doesn't care about our social skills?

Social Status - Do you think God wants us building relationships with his other children as well, or that God doesn't care about whether his people improve the scope of their fellowship?

Morality and Ethics - I'll assume your agreement means you do have a stance on this issue and it's the same as mine.

I'm just not sure how you could argue that God does care about these things, but then also be arguing that men shouldn't be taught to improve themselves in these areas. It's just mind-boggling to me.

Introduction

1 upvotes · 3 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

So better to stay single.

That's the right starting point there. Bravo. And if a girl comes along the way, so be it.

Low hanging fruit includes being alpha and passing tests. And dropping body fat.

So you mentioned that you've been working out for a while now. What are you going to do to adjust your workout and diet regimen beyond what you've done in the past?

What practical measures can you take this week to start practicing alpha traits and developing your confidence?

And yeah, i am gonna be picky as much as possible

Good for you! My point was simply to say that you're not likely to find better girls until your SMV is up, so the girls you would otherwise pick will be later on down the road.

this is not an attack

I didn't take it that way at all :)

evangelism and discipleship, encourage others, intercessor for those who are weak

Beautiful!

I won't go into details, but its something big for the kingdom.

I'd love to hear more. I used to have this ideology as well, with clear visions about what it would be like ... until I realized that it was really a message from the enemy manipulating my pride. I had to abandon that vision before God would finally allow my life to start bearing fruit. Hopefully yours isn't the same thing :)

Theory: Why The Average Christian Woman Is Unattractive

1 upvotes · 3 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Thanks. This is good, although still a few stories up in the air and not quite as down to earth :p I like the idea of helping my wife model this for the girls. It really prompted me to think:

Christ is our groom. Generally, in biblical times the wife was at home and the groom was away to work most of the day, just as Christ is away at work in the world, leaving his bride to tend to his children - his Spirit and instruction still with us, guiding how we should raise them.

I don't really like this conclusion because it takes a lot of power out of my hands and forces me to trust my wife to pick up from my lead to lead them. But I do see that as a direct parallel to the way that God empowers his bride and trusts her rather than doing all the work himself. So, then I have to ask: am I properly leading my bride to be trustworthy? Then when the time comes do I actually trust her?

Theory: Why The Average Christian Woman Is Unattractive

1 upvotes · 2 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That's a good point. Thanks.

[FR] Fixing your SMV

1 upvotes · 1 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

2/2

As for these qualities themselves, I'm hopeful that you do not disagree as to the biblical foundation for them, but let me share it anyway:

Looks

Although the context is sexual purity, 1 Cor. 6:19-20 does give an important principle: "You are not your own; you were bought at a price. Therefore honor God with your bodies." Our bodies are not ours to let fall into dilapidation. They are on loan to us and it is our obligation to care for our bodies. 1 Timothy 4:8 also acknowledges that physical exercise has value for believers, while still rightly prioritizing our spiritual maturity as a higher concern in the long-term.

If you want to be more direct on passages, Paul says in 1 Cor. 9:27, "But I discipline my body and keep it under control." Proverbs 31:17 encourages women to "dress herself with strength and make her arms strong." Proverbs 24:5 says, "A wise man is full of strength, and a man of knowledge enhances his might." Romans 12:1 says that we will present our bodies to God and that this is our spiritual act of worship. Hebrews 12:11-12 also says that there is value in being disciplined and in training, "Therefore lift your drooping hands and strengthen your weak knees." There are also numerous verses that condemn sloth, laziness, and not being a good steward of that which God has given us, which includes our bodies.

If you want to get in on fashion, although there's a deeper meaning, Jesus uses the tangible example for a reason in Matthew 22. In the parable of the wedding feast, the Father throws out a man who didn't come dressed in proper attire. There was no, "But inwardly I'm in a good place" argument to be made.

As a practical matter, go on YouTube or Google and search for the top preachers of our day. Look at how many of them are morbidly obese or have bad hygiene or are in slob-clothes. Joel Osteen comes to mind. He's one of the most influential pastors in the world today. I can't stand the guy and virtually anything he preaches. But he has earned the influence of the world, in great part due to his appearance, which is plastered on the cover of most of his books. To that end, 1 Thess. 4:12 encourages us all to live in such a way that earns the respect of outsiders.

I could go on, but I think you get the point.

Confidence

"God gave us a spirit not of fear but of power and love and self control" (1 Timothy 1:7). Hebrews 10:35 says, "Therefore do not throw away your confidence, which has a great reward." Hebrews 13:6 talks about the alpha mindset of not worrying about what others think or do to us - "So we can confidently say, 'The Lord is my helper; I will not fear; what can man do to me?'" In Joshua 1:9 God refrains, "Have I not commanded you? Be strong and courageous."

Acts 28:31 suggests that we should be "proclaiming the kingdom of God and teaching about the Lord Jesus Christ with all boldness and without hindrance." Proverbs 28:1 says, "The wicked flee when no one pursues, but the righteous are bold as a lion." Ephesians 3:12 talks about the boldness that we have because of our access to God and Christ's strength. 2 Cor. 3:12 says, "Since we have such a hope, we are very bold." In acts 4 we see Peter and John setting an example of boldness in how they preach the Gospel.

With regard to not being swayed by what others think of us, maintaining the DNGAF attitude, Proverbs 29:25 says, "It is dangerous to be concerned with what others think of you." In 2 Cor. 5:13 Paul says he's fine with the

rest of the world thinking the apostles are "out of our mind," as people were accusing them of being. Isaiah 26:3 says, "You will keep in perfect peace those whose minds are steadfast, because they trust in you," demonstrating that we should not be swayed by human opinions or what others think of us.

Perhaps most significantly: Galatians 1:10 says, "Am I saying this now to win the approval of people or God? Am I trying to please people? If I were still trying to please people, I would not be Christ's servant."

Financially Established

The Bible has much to say about being financially established as well. Proverbs 22:7 notes that "the rich rules over the poor, and the borrower is the slave of the lender." Likewise, Romans 13:7-8 compels us to pay what we owe and not to be indebted to anyone, also noting that revenue should be given to whom it is due. 2 Thess. 3:10 says, "If anyone is not willing to work, let him not eat," suggesting that a person should be encouraged to earn a living to meet their own provision and for the family they would like to establish. To that end, 1 Timothy 5:8 says, "But if anyone does not provide for his relatives, and especially for the members of his household, he has denied the faith and is worse than an unbeliever." That's pretty harsh.

Sure, we could also cite that "money is a root of all kinds of evil," but note that I'm not encouraging people to love money. I'm encouraging people to utilize money as a resource, which I do believe these and other verses encourages as well.

Charm, Charisma, Personality, etc.

Colossians 4:6 says, "Let your speech always be gracious, seasoned with salt, so that you may know how you ought to answer each person." Ephesians 4:29 says, "Let no corrupt talk come out of your mouth, but only such as is good for building up, as fits the occasion, that it may give grace to those who hear." Learning how to be a good conversationist and make people enjoy conversations with you is a positive life skill that is essential in ministry.

Social Network

Ecc. 4:9-12 says, "Two are better than one because they have a good reward for their toil ... but woe to him who is alone when he falls and has not another to lift him up ... a threefold cord is not quickly broken." Proverbs 27:17 says, "Iron sharpens iron, and one man sharpens another." Hebrews 10:24-25 says, "And let us consider how to stir up one another to love and good works, not neglecting to meet together, as is the habit of some, but encouraging one another, and all the more as you see the Day drawing near." In John 17 Jesus prays over his apostles that they would be sent into the world. In the epistles we see the apostles setting the example of building many relationships, addressing many such people by name. In short, if we are to have an effective ministry for God's Kingdom, like Jesus we must build a following of people who are drawn to us - especially if it is because of Christ in us.

Morality, Ethics

I assume I don't need to explain the biblical basis for this.

My point in going through the above is simply to note that I have given guys a tangible motive for developing in biblical attributes that will be immensely helpful when they start to take heed of the majority of everything else I say on this sub: get a mission that involves making disciples and start living it out.

So, when you ask, "Where in God's kingdom is that relevant?" That's how it's all relevant.

[FR] Fixing your SMV

1 upvotes · 1 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

1/2

This is a valid point to raise, and I appreciate that you did so. It's also one that I addressed in a couple other comments. The middle section of [this one that I just wrote](#) is a good example.

To break it down, a man (1) improving his appearance, (2) developing his confidence, (3) becoming financially established, (4) cultivating an appealing personality, (5) improving one's social network, and (6) developing a moral/ethical character - these are all biblical concepts.

As I've said before - even openly and unashamedly - my purpose in making this sub is not merely about improving masculinity and sexuality among Christian men. I created this sub to make disciples of guys who would otherwise be led astray by secular RP due to their desperation from failed intergender relational dynamics in their lives.

Sex and finding a wife are the main areas where most men here are hurting. That's what speaks to them. Those are the answers they're looking for. But what they don't realize is that the solution to their problems is not for their human relationships to be fixed, but for their spiritual relationship with God to be fixed - and that they live for his purposes and not making the pursuit of a wife/sex their purpose. I've made this abundantly clear on this sub many times.

But if I were just to hop into a post about how being a (1) good looking (2) confident alpha (3) financially established (4) charming guy with (5) a strong social network (6) and solid moral compass will help them reach the world for Christ ... nobody would care. So, I have to start with something that does actually matter to a man. It's by God's design that the things that cultivate a desire for physical reproduction among humans is parallel to the things that will cultivate a desire for spiritual reproduction with our groom.

To that end, if a guy wants to use a shallow motive as a foundation for developing godly qualities in his life, whereas a biblical motive wouldn't trigger something in him - then I'll let him start with the shallow motive and work his way up.

As I recently wrote to [/u/Uncommon_Sense_12345](#), in [this post](#): "in order to get men on an appropriate mission, they need a practical motivator." I also commented there that this is just like "turn or burn" or "hellfire and brimstone" evangelists. They're preaching a wrong motive for getting people to turn to Christ. But I also see that Jesus preached about hell a lot too - and used this as a specific motivator to get people to repent. Likewise, Paul even says in Philippians 1 when people were preaching from false motives, "But what does it matter? The important thing is that in every way, whether from false motives or true, Christ is preached. And because of this I rejoice." To that end, if a guy needs a practical motivator to start him on his journey that will help him find a right motivation for developing godly attributes in his life, then I'm happy to follow in the example of Jesus by giving them that practical first step. The important thing to me is that, at least for now, I'm encouraging Christian men to develop in qualities that will increase their social influence for Christ. Showing them how to utilize that social influence will be part of the ongoing 300 series, which I admittedly haven't written much in for a very long time.

Theory: Why The Average Christian Woman Is Unattractive

1 upvotes · 1 August 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Excellent thoughts here. I really enjoyed this read.

the reality in most churches is that women do not feel the need to compete for men

I think a more basic reason is that most women don't feel a compulsive need to marry within the church. I can't count the number of women who have posted on reddit, been in small groups I've led, or talk about it on women's forums - that they're with a non-Christian guy and they're struggling because they *loooooove* him, but he's not willing to follow basic biblical principles for living or leading the relationship. We literally just had a post on this here on this sub just the other day. Most of these women end up back together with these non-Christian men.

Why does this happen? Because the church fails to teach biblical headship. She thinks that she can keep her obligation to God separate from her obligation to her husband. If the women in the church were appropriately instructed on not being yoked together with non-believers and the fact that their obligation to their husbands is something of actual substance and not the feminist version of marriage, then (assuming these women actually follow their pastor's advice) we would see a stark change almost immediately in the number of women who become more competitive to snag those godly single men.

Shopping for a wife from outside the church (aka: importing) is generally frowned upon.

For men, yes. I have not yet seen this imperative directed toward women, or the women simply aren't getting it. There are multiples more women willing to date outside the church than men. I think this has something to do with the whole "men follow God, women follow men" thing in 1 Cor. 11:3, but I don't want to speculate too much on that.

Thus, Christian women, do not feel the need to compete with "foreign brands" in the market.

Indeed. But the men do. Yet they're also told not to step up to the plate and improve themselves; they're told to become more like women.

A highly attractive single Christian woman will be sexually pursued by men outside the church, increasing her abundance, while Christian men are largely limited to the bounds of the church in their sexual pursuits, decreasing their relative abundance.

Ah ha! And now I see that I was writing my response too early before finishing the post :p

While it seems counter-intuitive to elevate the competition, this could be a case where a rising tide lifts every boat.

My reaction to this is less about getting hotter women in the church and more toward the fact that higher SMV guys will simply have a greater influence on society for Christ. So, as a whole, regardless of whether or not it's wise to increase competition within a niche SMP, there are other reasons why this should be engaged in anyway. The fact that it also improves the quality of women we're around is an added bonus, if it actually works.

But again, as you've already noted, I'm skeptical of this potential solution because those women will still be told by the church leaders and the rest of the world that they're fine just as they are and that men should want to marry them for what's inside and shouldn't care if they're 50-100lbs overweight.

Now let me shoot one back. I have 3 daughters. Two of them are old enough to talk and even at the ages of 3 and 4 I can already tell they're going to be boy crazy someday - and they will be HOT. I don't mean to be too Donald Trump-ish in saying that, but when I look at my daughters and what they prospectively stand to be someday, they're going to be gorgeous.

They're also incredibly emotional - far worse than I ever thought possible. When hormones start kicking in to worsen this issue, if I'm raising my daughters to cultivate their beauty, what do you recommend in the way of also training them to honor and revere their purity without causing psychological damage about sexuality that my wife experienced?

My primary plan right now is simply that I be the one to satisfy their need for validation, just like our spiritual Father places himself in the place of fulfilling our need for validation instead of us looking to the world. To that

end, I have already started the process of giving them that validation in small ways and training them to rely on me so that one day they will trust my judgment when I decide whether or not to give their hearts to other specific men who come in their lives. But I'd love to hear your thoughts on this too.

[FR] Fixing your SMV

1 upvotes · 1 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Hah ... I debated even putting that in there at all. That criterion is less about how good a guy is and more about whether he's an inconsistent fraud.

[FR] Fixing your SMV

1 upvotes · 1 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That's certainly an interesting thought process. But a lot of that depends on how one defines a marriage. The going definition around here seems to be sex + covenant. A covenant is still valid and binding, even if one person doesn't know what they're getting themselves into when they sign up for it. But I do see your point, and it's interesting to ponder.

I'd be less inclined to assume that lots of genuine Christians are getting into sham marriages and more toward the view that lots of sham Christians are getting into genuine marriages. I'm more skeptical about their faith than I am in the validity of their vows. But I do believe the Catholic church's position is that non-Christian marriage is no marriage at all, so that may still lead to the same conclusion under your line of thinking.

[FR] Fixing your SMV

1 upvotes · 1 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

These are some fair thoughts. Here's my perspective:

are you really enjoying it if sex is contingent upon you keeping up your SMV for your wife

Yes, it's still enjoyable.

Does the sex stop if you gain ten pounds?

That depends on (1) whether or not the husband has room to drop in his SMV while still demonstrating a substantial enough value to be attractive, or (2) whether or not the wife has a biblical attitude about the marriage bedroom.

What happens if you become unemployed?

Then the man must return to work in some capacity. He still has a biblical obligation to his family independent of sex.

This focus is nothing but another form of a covert contract

I can see how it would appear that way. But that really only applies to married couples, whereas in a Christian setting married men aren't necessarily on the "market" in the first place.

Nevertheless, the underlying principles hold true. As I wrote in (I think) 106, in my experience and observation, what attracted a woman before marriage is still going to be what attracts her after marriage. As [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) once wrote, saying "I do" to a man or "the prayer" to God doesn't magically make a woman's biology change or cause her vagina to suddenly function differently from every other woman.

Accordingly, there is still value for married men to understand basic concepts of SMV, as it's an easier frame of

reference than the otherwise broad notions of "be a godly man and she'll be all over you," which can mean a million different things. Even at that, most Christians today don't understand that physical fitness is part of being *godly* or that being confident and assertive is an important aspect of our ability to live out our mission to God.

As I have said repeatedly on this sub, our mission to God is the most important thing. Once a man is living that out the way God intended, all other things tend to fall naturally into place. The problem is that we often want to cut corners and think, "It's okay if I've got a chubby belly. That won't affect how people view me and whether or not they'll respect me enough to pay attention to the Gospel when I preach it." But this is wrong thinking, on the whole, with only a few exceptional cases.

More to the point: in order to get men on an appropriate mission, they need a practical motivator. God designed the physical things of this world to be a starting point to get us oriented toward the spiritual things. I don't see a problem with a man using his motivation to have a healthy sex life with his wife as a foundation for improving in godliness. His motives should reorient in time as his spiritual maturity grows.

This is the same deal with hellfire and brimstone evangelists. I really can't stand them, most of the time. They often don't come off as genuine or authentic and they're preaching a "wrong" motive for coming to faith: simply to avoid hell, as opposed to wanting Jesus. But then I look at Jesus's preaching, and you know what I found? He has several passages where he preaches hellfire and brimstone. He also used fear of hell as a motivator to get people oriented toward God, even though he knew that wasn't the ultimate motive he wanted them to end up with.

Anyway, I'm probably off topic at this point. I'm simply trying to say that I think it's okay to give men a tangible motive as a starting point to orient them toward a bigger and better purpose down the road - and once they have the mission, confidence to carry it out, the physique that earns the respect of outsiders, and a frame that won't let them be tempted astray, they're well on their way to being incredible influences for God's Kingdom.

[FR] Fixing your SMV

1 upvotes · 1 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

There can, of course, be multiple contributing factors to someone who is generally sexually averse. It's not just one thing.

When do you or any other Christian man get to enjoy a truly Christian marriage?

In my life, that's right now.

With all the talk of SMV in a Christian marriage such as yours, what happens if you become disabled or suffer from ED not fixed by medical intervention?

As I've noted before, our personal happiness and fulfillment is not the point of marriage. Reproduction is. The physically reproductive aspect of marriage (i.e. sex) is merely a road. The destination is spiritual reproduction. Marriages that suffer from irreparable sexual issues can still be fulfilling by looking to the spiritual satisfaction of evangelism and discipleship as the reproductive aspects of our relationship with God, even in the absence of being able to taste this on a physical level.

There's a new guy at my church who I've met with who has been dealing with this for a long time. He has/had a sexual addiction and his wife has a physical condition that, despite surgical efforts to solve the problem, make any sexual activity painful for her. So, they've simply resolved to remain celibate for the past 10 years. I'm sure that was challenging - especially in the beginning. But I also see that they're doing wonders for God's Kingdom, sharing the Gospel and making disciples wherever they go, unlike many others I've seen.

To that end, the "SexMV" turns into the "E/DMV" (Evangelism/Discipleship).

[FR] Fixing your SMV

1 upvotes · 1 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

The usual kind, sure ;)

Recent breakup - emotional aftermath and conflict

1 upvotes · 1 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Well said

Recent breakup - emotional aftermath and conflict

1 upvotes · 31 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Indeed. He has done that for me too :) But I also don't believe that the apostles desired to be martyred, or Steven stoned, or Joseph kidnapped by his brothers and sold into slavery, or Moses wandering through the desert for 40 years.

I guess I just struggle against the view that "trust Jesus" can be used as a catch-all to assume that God will just give us whatever we want if we have enough faith.

Recent breakup - emotional aftermath and conflict

1 upvotes · 31 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I'm very sorry to hear about the pain you're experiencing. I know it's not easy. Something you said does intrigue me, though:

and how trusting in the Lord will give it fruit

I hear a lot of people use the phrase, "trust in Jesus!" or "have faith in God!" But what does that actually mean to you?

I know what it means to me, but most people I talk to interpret those phrases as merely having a higher degree of confidence that God's plan is aligned with their own desired outcomes. But isn't that conflating God's will with our own?

For example, what if God's will was for you to remain single? Or what if it's His will for you to get cancer and die? Or what if it's his will for you to vacation in another country where you're kidnapped by terrorists and martyred for your faith? Does "trust in the Lord" still apply in those situations? How do we correlate our trust in God and our own intended and desired outcomes?

I'd love to hear more on how you interpret and apply the phrase: "trust in the Lord."

Recent breakup - emotional aftermath and conflict

1 upvotes · 31 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I believe I love him

The way you say this makes me think that you're evaluating something inside of yourself to make this determination. But love is an expressive external thing, not internal. When we say, "I love you" to someone, it can have many meanings. The pop-culture definition merely means, "I have fuzzy emotional feelings toward you." If we say it in a biblical sense, it means, "I behave toward you in a way that is patient, kind, without envy or boasting, not rude, etc." To that end, even if I never had any emotional interest in my wife, I could still appropriately love her in a biblical sense by behaving toward her in a loving way. That is biblical love. Likewise, there have been many times (especially when we were dating) where my wife had warm, fuzzy feelings toward

me, but she did not behave in a way that was consistent with a biblical depiction of love. As such, she did not actually love me, even though her feelings may have caused her to believe she did - because she confused biblical love (what we do) with worldly love (how we feel).

Was it natural for me to be hurt by that - because I'd always thought that it was something to be respected for?

Yes, you are perfectly within your rights to be hurt by this. He's taking something that you value and that God values and undermining the significance of this. This once again shows his poor character and that he is not a good choice for a prospective spouse.

So...why is sexual relations wrong? (I have an answer but I would like to compare).

The easiest answer is simply: "Because God says so." But to understand why he said so, it's important to remember that what God establishes in physical, tangible ways on earth he means to parallel to a spiritual truth that only makes sense in light of the Gospel. That is, the way we conduct ourselves physically is a reflection on the spiritual truths about God and we are meant to reflect the truth of God to the world, not a lie.

Marriage is no exception to this. In both the old and new testament God calls himself (or Jesus) our groom and us his bride. Likewise, there are substantial parallels with the pre-marriage relationship. At its core, sex is a reproductive act. Malachi 2:15 says, "And why did the Lord God make them one with a portion of his Spirit in their union? To produce godly offspring." That physical reproduction was meant to highlight the type of spiritual reproduction that Christ wants to engage in with his bride - the Church - in a post-Gospel world. The command to "be fruitful and multiply" was a physical command to Adam and Eve, but today we understand it by virtue of Matthew 13 and a variety of other passages and parables, to be a spiritual imperative to multiply our lives through discipleship the way Jesus modeled it.

That reproductive act is always with the groom indwelling his bride. In a physical sense, a man puts his penis inside a woman and leaves some of his essence inside of her through the act of sex. In the process of spiritual reproduction, Christ gives us his Holy Spirit to indwell within us (or in some verses, he also indwells within us), and this is meant to cause spiritual procreation - that people would be "born again" as the fruit of our oneness bond with Christ.

Now, when we look at premarital sex, we're dealing with people who are not married. If a man indwells his penis inside of a woman before marriage, this communicates to the world that God will also indwell within non-Christians who are not actually married to him - that is, they aren't part of his bride, the Church. But God does not engage in reproductive acts with non-Christians. Matthew 7 is clear on this: "No bad tree produces good fruit." There are also a host of passages about Jesus' rejection of those who will not follow him.

So, when we engage in premarital sex we are reflecting a false image of God to the world. We are designed to bear God's image, but we're misleading people instead. When we portray through our physical behaviors that God is less than or different from what he actually is, this steals from God's glory and is sin.

Sure, there are lots of other practical reasons why premarital sex is sinful, like risk of unplanned pregnancy, STDs, etc. that God wanted to protect us from, but at the end of the day this is all about Him, not us. We must evaluate sinfulness from a perspective that accounts for God's glory, not just what benefits us and this world.

If I had approached the idea of marriage from that perspective, I believe we would probably have matured spiritually and emotionally together.

But here's the thing: you're assuming that if you started moving in one direction, he would have followed, ergo you and him moving in this right path "together." But that would be an unbiblical relationship. Your duty before God is also to your husband - to follow his lead, not to have him follow your lead toward God. If you were to be

the one leading the relationship toward godliness, it would be a self-defeating endeavor because you would actually be defying God's intended design for relationships. So, are you to displease God by defying his design for you in order to try to please him in some other way? It puts you in a weird catch-22.

The only rational conclusion here is that a man, as God's appointed leader in a relationship, has the ability to lead the woman he chooses into godliness, but the woman does not have the same right *when selecting a prospective spouse*. Of course, you can do this with men generally, for the sake of the Gospel. But if you're in a "moving toward marriage" context, your man is to be your leader, not the reverse. In that sense, women are intended by God to be somewhat hypergamous with regard to the spiritual maturity of the men they choose to pursue relationships with. A woman should never date or marry a man who is less spiritually mature than she is because that would almost always create a conflict between who she is following.

Consider this continuum: Coming from ---> Him ---> You ---> God.

In that order of things, if you pursue God, you're walking away from your man. Even if your man is pursuing God too and moving in the same direction, he's following behind you. So, if you were to follow your husband, you would have to abandon your pursuit of God for a time to do it, in order to let him get ahead. This is obviously not biblical or appropriate. So, no woman should put herself in the position where her man is less spiritually mature than she is.

But consider this continuum: Coming from ---> You ---> Him ---> God

In this flow, your man is ahead of you in his walk toward god. He is more spiritually mature. So, as you walk toward God, you're following behind him. It doesn't matter if you say, "I follow God" or "I follow my husband" because they are one and the same, as opposed to the previous model where you are torn between making your husband follow you so that you can follow God, or abandoning your pursuit of God in order to follow your husband.

Tag: [/u/Deep_Strength](#), [/u/RedPillWonder](#), [/u/rocknrollchuck](#) - because I'm interested in your thoughts on any of this.

Church Discipline

1 upvotes · 31 July 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Indeed. But it never happens.

Church Discipline

1 upvotes · 31 July 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Well said. Let me add something to this. Most women I've ever met are emotional empaths. I tried the route of self sacrifice. I put my happiness aside to give her what she wanted. She emphatically sensed my unhappiness and harbored resentment toward me as a projection of the resentment I had for her. No matter how hard I tried to please her, she was not happy, so my resentment grew and her empathic senses caused her resentment of me to grow proportionately.

When I stopped trying to please her and started leading along my own path, she started hearing the word no a lot. She didn't get her way often, but for some reason she was happy. She empathically sensed my happiness and it rubbed off on her so that she began to experience my happiness alongside me, even though she didn't get her way.

Authority and leadership, when employed within biblical boundaries, are better for the wife than all the freedom that feminism has to offer. Feminism really only benefits the woman who intends to remain single all her life.

Church Discipline

1 upvotes · 31 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Well said. Let me add something to this. Most women I've ever met are emotional empaths. I tried the route of self sacrifice. I put my happiness aside to give her what she wanted. She emphatically sensed my unhappiness and harbored resentment toward me as a projection of the resentment I had for her. No matter how hard I tried to please her, she was not happy, so my resentment grew and her empathic senses caused her resentment of me to grow proportionately.

When I stopped trying to please her and started leading along my own path, she started hearing the word no a lot. She didn't get her way often, but for some reason she was happy. She empathically sensed my happiness and it rubbed off on her so that she began to experience my happiness alongside me, even though she didn't get her way.

Authority and leadership, when employed within biblical boundaries, are better for the wife than all the freedom that feminism has to offer. Feminism really only benefits the woman who intends to remain single all her life.

Paradox of Marriage

1 upvotes · 30 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Sorry for the late reply. I've been on vacation.

Yes, sex is the primary core of marriage. I already gave three different passages in my previous comment to support that position and I stand by it. A man can lead a woman without being married to her. But the same cannot be said of having sex, at least in a biblical context. If a guy was merely looking to have a woman follow him, he would never have to marry her, and many women would be just fine with a platonic relationship like that. But once the two are tempted to have sex, then they're to get married, right?

Where does Eph 3:22-30 come into play?

I think you mean Ephesians 5, but I still don't understand the question. It's always in play. I could say the point of football is to score more points than the other side. You could then ask, "Well, what about the out of bounds line? Where do they come into play?" They're always in play. That doesn't mean that football is all about keeping the ball in bounds. Ephesians 5:22 et seq. is a boundary line that should not be crossed. It's not what marriage is all about in itself.

Malachi 2:15 actually specifically asks this question and then answers it: "And why did the Lord God make them one with a portion of his Spirit in their union? To produce godly offspring." The "why" behind marriage is reproduction, which is sex.

These verses teach us that marriage is an illustration of Christ's love for His church.

Absolutely they do - but in what way? I think you mistakenly interpret Jesus' love as some butterfly feeling he gets in his stomach when he thinks of us. But the Bible makes it clear what the foundation of God's love is for us. In his final ascent Jesus didn't tell his bride, the apostles who would be founding the church, "All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me, therefore let's have good feelings toward one another." He said, "Go and make disciples of all nations." This process of spiritual reproduction is the parallel of physical reproduction in marriage. That's why God established physical marriage in the first place - so that when Jesus came to enter into a spiritual marriage with us, we would know what he would expect in that relationship and what the purpose would be. To that end, why do you think God made physical reproduction the epitome experience of the physical world? To show that spiritual reproduction should also be the epitome experience of our spiritual lives. And just as raising kids is considered the most joyful thing a person can do in the physical world, giving meaning to their lives, so also is discipleship - spiritual child-rearing - the most joyful thing we can do in our spiritual lives.

Let me tackle this from another angle too. Marriage is defined by two people becoming one flesh. The husband enters his wife and physically indwells within her, and this prompts reproduction, right?

Now look at what the Bible says should spiritually indwell us. There are only three things that I could ever find in Scripture to answer that:

- God's Word: In Matthew 13 Jesus tells the parable of the sower, where the seed is planted inside of the ground. He explains the parable saying that the seed is God's Word.
- Jesus: In John 17 Jesus is praying over his disciples and notes, "I in them and you in me" - that he indwells within us. Colossians 1:27 also calls it, "this mystery, which is Christ in you."
- Holy Spirit: Acts 1:8 says that God would send the Holy Spirit to "come on" us, and we see other passages describing ourselves as His temple.

Now consider the outcome of what happens when any of these three (Father's Word, Son, Spirit - the trinity) indwells us:

- God's Word: That same Matthew 13 passage says that if we are good soil (i.e. saved), when God's Word is planted in us, it yields a harvest 30, 60 or even 100 times what was sown (verse 8). That's reproduction.
- Jesus: The John 17 passage is all about Jesus commissioning his disciples to carry on the work of discipleship that he started - spiritual reproduction. That very verse I quoted above (17:23) ends, "Then the world will know that you sent me and have loved them." Also, to give context to the Colossians 1:27 quote: "To them God has chosen to make known among the Gentiles the glorious riches of this mystery, which is Christ in you, the hope of glory" - that is, it's about them spiritually reproducing among the Gentiles.
- Holy Spirit: What does Acts 1:8 say will happen when the Holy Spirit comes on us? We will be God's witnesses.

No matter how we look at it, our marriage to God - no matter what context, Father, Son, or Spirit - is created by an indwelling of God in us, which is always oriented toward spiritual reproduction ... just as physical marriage is defined by two becoming "one flesh" - a husband entering his wife in physical reproduction.

This is also "interesting" advice and would sort of go against your point #2 above.

I'm not sure how that would go against point #2 at all. Point #2 is actually the very reason I give this advice: because all throughout 1 Cor. 7 Paul is advising people not to get married and that it's better to stay single and that the only reason a person should get married is if they're about to have sex with someone else before they're married. In Matthew 19:10-12 Jesus says the same thing - that if anyone is capable of staying single for life, he should. How do we know whether or not we're capable unless we try? And how quickly should we give up in trying to do what Jesus says is best?

I see too many men thinking, "I want to have sex. I struggle with porn. Therefore I'm incapable of remaining single and devoted to God, so I better start looking for a wife." This seems to flow against the grain of what both Jesus and Paul are preaching. I see marriage as a last resort to prevent two people from having sex with each other outside of marriage - just as God doesn't spiritually indwell in or reproduce with non-Christians ("no bad tree can produce good fruit," per Matthew 7, for example). So, people should avoid marriage at all costs to discern whether or not they have the God-given ability to resist temptation to sleep with someone else for the rest of their life; and if they are about to fail, that is when they should marry.

But I do not take "I lust after girls on the street" or "I watch porn" as good excuses. In my view, that's a cop-out, and I see 1 Cor. 7 as referring to a man and a woman together who are mutually about to engage in a sexual act. The words there are always in the plural, telling us that Paul is talking about two people in relation to one another, and not suggesting that any guy who has ever masturbated better find a wife to stop his masturbating. This is furthered by the fact that virtually 100% of men who struggled with lust, porn, and masturbation before marriage

continue to struggle with it after marriage as well - the marriage is never a cure. And it was never meant to be a cure. Jesus through the Gospel is the cure to that sin. So, I can't imagine Paul would be telling guys who are masturbating all the time, "Go get a wife so she can cure you of your sinfulness," when we know Paul's answer to that question is Jesus through the Gospel (Galatians 3:3, for example).

Paradox of Marriage

1 upvotes · 26 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Excellent comment. It's easy (especially for someone like me) to stay 50 feet in the air and forget to keep conversions down to earth in ways that are practical and matter. Theory is worthless without pragmatic application.

Unconditional Respect From Your Wife

1 upvotes · 24 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I just did a post on summaries of those books. Check my history. They're secular with strong Christian parallels and influences.

Ditching the "Honey Do" List

1 upvotes · 24 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Always bringing it back to the basics. It's not often that men actually have to go any further, but it's easy to think we can move on to more advanced stuff for faster and better results. No, the basics are best.

Every response he should stay with a checklist: is the a fitness issue? A frame issue? Is he failing tests? Etc. ... then move on to personalized responses.

Ditching the "Honey Do" List

1 upvotes · 24 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Nice. Solid laugh there.

Paradox of Marriage

1 upvotes · 24 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

So many good comments here already ... I'm loving it!

More to the point: everyone here already knows that I encourage all people to avoid marriage as long as possible, but the point of marriage ultimately comes down to sex.

1. Malachi 2:15 says explicitly that producing godly offspring is the point of marriage. How do we do that? Nuff said.
2. Paul says in 1 Cor. 7 that people shouldn't marry unless they're about to engage in sexual sin, at which point he starts to encourage the marriage.
3. Genesis defines a marriage by two people becoming one flesh. What do we call that?

No matter how you slice it, marriage is not about leadership; it's about sex. Leadership is an essential and important component of marriage, but it is merely one (very important) aspect of a functional marriage.

With that in mind, a failure of motivation for leadership or following isn't a critical issue that should be decisive in the "should I get married?" debate. A failure of healthy sexuality does win that argument every time. Leadership obviously plays a big role in sexual attraction, but it is merely a component or subpart.

Wish I didn't say anything at all...

1 upvotes · 21 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Haha. Good point.

Wish I didn't say anything at all...

1 upvotes · 19 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Agreed. And it becomes easier over time. The first time a guy asks out a girl, he's usually nerve-wrecked. After a few dozen approaches, it just becomes second-nature and he doesn't care anymore. The same thing happens with approaching new people and enhancing one's social circle, which also applies to evangelism.

Wish I didn't say anything at all...

1 upvotes · 19 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Indeed :)

Wish I didn't say anything at all...

1 upvotes · 19 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Can you expand on this? You say: "neither of those options are the choice God would have wanted you to make." Then later on you say: "What did God want you to do in this situation? I have no idea."

Most people want to create a false dichotomy: that you have two choices, and one is good and the other is bad. In reality, there are always an infinite number of choices. For example, if my wife asks me if I want chicken or steak for dinner, how many choices do I have? Most people assume: 2. But instead of chicken or steak, I could grab a knife and stab her in the eyes. That's also a choice.. It's a bad one. I could also suggest spaghetti. That's another good choice. I could do anything - there are infinite choices, many of which are good and many are bad; it's not just about deciding between the two that are presented to us. So, we have to break this self-imposed constraint of false dichotomies: "Do I talk to the patient about Jesus or not?" That's a false dichotomy of options.

Now, in every situation we also have half a million solutions that we automatically know are wrong. If OP had thought of finding a scalpel and performing unlicensed impromptu "surgery" on the patient in the elevator when no one was watching ... that would be a bad choice. OP already knows this. Our brains naturally filter out lots of "bad choices," and we tell ourselves that as long as we avoid bad choices, the remaining choices must be good choices. That's a pseudo-false dichotomy of categorization of options.

It's a true dichotomy in the sense that there really are only two choices: good ones and bad ones - there is no neutral. It's false in the sense that we aren't correctly categorizing our options. We assume that a "not bad choice" is the same as a "good choice," which is not true. A "not *THAT* bad choice" option is still *ANOTHER* bad choice" option if it's not otherwise a good choice. The Bible says, "Don't murder." It also says, "Take advantage of every opportunity." So, if I have an opportunity to share the Gospel with someone and I choose not to do anything at all, and just pass on by - have I made a "good choice" or a "not bad choice"? I've made a "not bad choice" - at least to the degree that we naturally conceptualize good and bad. I didn't do what would violate my conscience. But James 4 also says, "Anyone who knows the good he ought to do it and does not do it, to him it is sin." So, even though I avoided murdering the person, I have still sinned anyway by failing to make the "good choice." The fact that I thought that walking on by was "not bad" or "less bad" does not make it "good." Our obligation to Christ is to the "good works prepared in advance for you to do." Nowhere do we see a compulsion that our purpose is merely to avoid all the bad things God said not to do.

In OP's situation, he presents a trichotomy: (1) Saying something stupid, which he did; (2) Saying nothing at all; and (3) Witnessing to the patient, even in a small way. After saying something he thought was stupid, OP's solution is: "I shouldn't have said anything." Or to rephrase: "The good/better choice for me would have been to

avoid option 1." But if we understand the choice dynamic properly, both 1 and 2 were bad choices, but option 2 didn't register in OP's brain as a "bad choice." Less bad is still bad.

The parable of the Good Samaritan is a great example of this. The thief who robbed and attacked the man made a bad choice. The first two passersby assume that they have done nothing wrong for passing by because they were not the ones who attacked anybody. In reality, the implication of the parable is that they DID DO something wrong. The only one who did nothing wrong was the Samaritan who actually helped the man - who made the good choice rather than attempted to justify non-action as a "not bad choice."

I'd omit this

Iron Rule of Tomassi #9 Never Self-Deprecate under any circumstance.

That's fair. I disagree with the "under any circumstances part." There are certainly times when it is advantageous to convey to others that you are lesser than you are. This is just good strategy. I used to do this all the time in racquetball tournaments when I was in high school. People saw how young I was and assumed I wasn't very good. I'd tell them I had only been playing for a year or two, which was true. I would communicate in a way that downplayed my abilities. Then, when the match started, I would wipe the floor with them because they were caught off-guard thinking from the start that I would be an easy opponent.

Another fair situation would be one where acknowledging the truth of OP's status as "not a doctor" insulates him from liability for anything that might be said which would violate ethical rules that doctors have to deal with, but other hospital staff do not. This creates a buffer so that if the message is not received well, the patient is far less likely to make a grievance, as compared to if he thought this was coming from his doctor, who he rightly holds to a higher standard.

I think I have boiled it down to this. When your life is on the line and it's not a situation of denying Christ. I think the wise choice is to remain silent unless asked to speak, if you can leave then do so.

I think I agree with what you're saying. In this situation, because OP's life was not on the line, then the "good choice" would have been to witness. Perhaps an "even more good" choice would be to do so with appropriate safeguards/buffers in the way he communicates it so he doesn't have to default to the "you can always get another [job]" option ;)

Good thoughts overall, though :)

Obedience to him is not an economy, but...

1 upvotes · 19 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is a solid field report, brother. Thanks for sharing this. Keep staying strong. As OZ said, my only real reaction is simply to say that you probably care more about knowing that you can have sex with someone else than actually having sex with someone else. Your desire for sex is not merely about physical pleasure, which does not change greatly from one orgasm to the next; rather, it's the validation that you're seeking from the experience - the emotional power of knowing that someone desires you or that *you are enough* to satisfy them.

God is enough to satisfy us. When we are "as God to" our wives, it is our job to be enough to satisfy them. This is crucial. This is also why so many men are broken when their wives do not desire sex with them - because they have nothing to satisfy, so the man is left feeling empty, just as our relationship with God is empty when we are not looking to Him for our satisfaction.

Should I keep this girl around to potentially LTR later??

1 upvotes · 18 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That's one of them.

Should I keep this girl around to potentially LTR later??

1 upvotes · 17 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

It is not. I can't remember when I wrote it, sorry. Thinking back, it could have been a comment in OZ's post on evangedating.

I'm a Christian. I'm a "jerk." Deal with it.

1 upvotes · 16 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Indeed. That was the very first lesson my discipler taught me the very first time we met, which I'll reference when I get around to posting my testimony.

I'm a Christian. I'm a "jerk." Deal with it.

1 upvotes · 16 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

2/2

Cue my current church. My pastor right now is a die-hard feminist. He has said before, "If Jesus were alive today he would be tweeting, 'I support #metoo.'" That's how bad he's gotten. There are a variety of reasons I'm still there that are beside the point. He would not respond well to the same display of strength. What he does respond to is the squeaky wheel.

He's a logistics guy. Everything is about creating a smooth operation. We have over 700 people attending each week that he has to manage and he likes his management to seem flawless. All of this stands in the way of his pursuing a mission of disciple-making. He's more interested in sweeping the road than actually leading anyone down it. He would argue, "No one can walk down a road that's covered in debris," but "debris" to him would include a piece of paper that could easily be trampled over and doesn't need to be cleaned. He's a prime example of when God had to yell at Moses, "Stop praying and go lead my people!" He would reply, "Sorry God, but there's still too much other stuff that needs to be done to prepare them to lead," and just ignore God's calling altogether. It was rather infuriating to me.

With a guy like this I could not call him out in front of other people because that would lose his respect and I'd never get him to change. Instead, I started a covert, friendly competition. I would let him lead his hundreds and I would lead one or two and after 2 years we'd see who made more difference in our city for God's Kingdom. Throughout those two years, I'd push his buttons a bit. I'd ask him about all the great things he's seeing through his ministry - and I would rejoice with him at the good things he was accomplishing.

Then he would ask me about how I was doing and I'd tell him about what God was doing through me, the guys I disciplined, the guys they disciplined, and the guys those guys disciplined ... and he would be floored. I don't think it came off as bragging, but I made it clear that I was trying to show him up - because by the first time we'd had that conversation, I had done more with two guys at the church than he had done with 700 at the church (at least that he knew of).

At first he did lose respect for me. He tried to write me off as one of those jerk all-head Bible-thumper people who does ministry "the wrong way" through pressure and content. Then he started talking privately with the guys I was discipling and realized that I hadn't put on any pressure at all - that I merely built a relationship with them and loved them and modeled a godly lifestyle to them, which empowered them to want to do the same for others, which they did, and they taught those guys how to do the same for others - and we were stretching outside the church into other communities.

I had presented myself to my pastor in a way that forced him to look deeper into what I was doing. At first, it was

because he thought what I was doing was unhealthy. That's part of the "squeaky wheel" thing. Pastors don't investigate what's working. They only look into what's broken. So, I had to present myself to him in a way that made him think that what I was doing was broken. Then, when he saw that there was no fault in the way I was discipling these guys, he investigated why I was being more successful at his job than he was - especially when I'm a layperson who has a separate full-time job (which he thinks creates a distinction between him and me; it doesn't).

So, that was phase 1. I had to be a bit of a jerk to get his attention or else he never would have even glanced over at what I was doing (as was evident from my many efforts to get his attention before).

Phase 2 has been getting him to change his ministry strategy altogether. This is once again a "squeaky wheel" thing, but in a different way. I didn't have to present myself as broken because he already knew I was functioning very effectively. His response, though, was to bless what I was doing and take credit for the fact that he's the pastor and it's happening in his church - not to learn anything from what I was doing and adopt it for himself.

So, I started pestering him. I would invite him to lunch; I would ask him hard questions about how his quiet times are going and about how his marriage is; I would ask him to meet with one of the guys I was discipling; I would ask him flat out who he was discipling, and he would fumble around trying to make up an answer before finally admitting it wasn't the same thing as what I was doing. I'm confident he was more than a little annoyed with me. But I was like the man in the parable Jesus tells of the friend asking for bread in the middle of the night. Jesus says something like, "Surely he will not give you the bread because of your friendship; but because of your persistence, he will get out of bed to give you the bread."

Now, looking at that parable (Luke 11:5 et seq.), it's a pretty jerk thing to start pounding on your neighbor's door at midnight asking him to give you things. But this is what Jesus compels us to do. And that's what I did with my pastor. And that's what worked. Because after enough "persistence" - to the point of being a total nuisance that he wished he could be rid of - my pastor finally started listening.

As with my previous pastor, my current pastor also asked me to disciple him - and I did. I taught him how to make disciples, and he's now discipling guys. We're also working on putting together a team of people who can expedite the process to reach more people within the church and in our community. I'm excited to see what can happen when we can pull this off on such a large scale! I've only known one other church of this size that's done it, and it's amazing to watch (unfortunately, it's also over 150 miles away, so not practical for me to go there).

In the midst of all of the above, there were points when I had to lose credibility with some people. Initially that was with my pastor. But after that, I became involved in a little rift in the church. The people I disciplined were fine, but when they started discipling others, they didn't have the same *tact* yet, so when they were passing on this mission there was a sense of, "Why is our pastor not doing this!?" That caused a lot of people in my spiritual lineage to challenge the pastor and several of them (5 or 6) eventually left the church because of it - because the pastor wasn't listening to me. Three of those people were very close friends with the pastor and "higher-ups" in the church, so that was a very sore issue for a bit.

On the one hand, this is very saddening. I never intended to cause a small schism, especially among the "higher-ups" or to cause the pastor to lose friendships. On the other hand, some of that caused the pastor and advisory team (our version of an "elder board") to pay more attention. They didn't like me at first, but they also could not deny the effectiveness of what I was doing. The pastor has since reconciled with these people on a personal level, but none of them have come back - and he recognizes that his newfound goal of building a disciple-making church is not just to win them back, but because it's what God wants in the first place. It's just sad what we had to go through to get there and that I had to be a vehicle to instigate all of that.

Of course, to be abundantly clear, I did not ever act toward the people I disciplined in any way other than supportive of our pastor. I did everything I could to calm any divisive feelings and notions. But because I was not actually discipling the people who ended up leaving (the guys I was discipling were discipling them), I was too far

insulated from relationship with them to fully put out that fire - and part of me now is glad that I didn't.

Anyway, that's the full story on each of my last two churches, if that makes sense. The moral of the story is that I had to compromise how others in the church saw me in order to make an effective change. But as long as the actual integrity of my life and ministry was unphased, it forced a cognitive dissonance between the perception that got attention and the actuality of who I am and what I do. That's part of that balance I talked about in my initial post.

Tag: [/u/rocknrollchuck](#) - because you seemed to have some lingering things to ponder and this might help you flesh it out.

I'm a Christian. I'm a "jerk." Deal with it.

1 upvotes · 16 July 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

1/2

I get what you're saying, but alpha/beta is a different continuum altogether. I'm sure they run parallel, but they're not the same. Alpha/beta is defined by your own internal motivators and reason for doing things.

Doormat/douchebag is defined by how others view you. That's key.

If the reference point is of a guy during a flat-tire-moment and he is late for an appointment, he will probably slide more to the Alpha-Jerk side of the continuum

This is probably a great example of where the two continuums diverge. My guess is that this type of guy is sliding way toward the "douchebag" spectrum, but is still holding a very beta mentality about how he's going to address the problem.

Perhaps a far better example is the guy whose wife just rejected him for the 10th day in a row. He's going to start acting like a douchebag to his wife, but still maintain a very beta attitude about it. Conversely, you can have an alpha guy who functions like a doormat. Prisoners are a great example of this - many of them are true alphas, but they know how to cede to authority and don't think they can just do whatever they want, when they want. It can also play in whenever there's a higher authority that the alpha knows he must respect, either by choice or by force, such as having a strong-willed boss in a job you're not willing to lose.

The alpha/beta dynamic is more about why you do what you do. It represents an internal sense of character that will not allow other people's thoughts and opinions shape the decisions you make.

The doormat/douchebag dynamic is different. It's about how others view you. It represents someone who makes a conscious, intentional effort to present oneself as the kind of guy that others will see as compliant or the kind of guy who will step on people's toes.

In many situations, there is considerable value to giving yourself an image of the guy who steps on other people's toes for a purpose. If you do it just to do it, because you don't care about other people, that's probably sin. But if you're doing it because you need someone to interact with you a certain way or to have a perception of you that gives greater attention to what you say/do, then there can be real value in that.

At this point I'm moving into answering [/u/Knightfall21](#)'s question, so here goes.

Most of my life, I have been the compliant type. Internally, I'm a challenger, but I always believed I was supposed to go with whatever my church leaders decided, trusting them implicitly. Then I grew up and realized that my church leaders aren't necessarily any more spiritually mature than the next guy. They have a position of responsibility, but that doesn't always mean they're the most qualified people to fill it. More significantly: their gifts aren't always suited to their role. Many people become pastors because it seems like a noble job, not because

they've been called into it.

At my last church, my pastor was a fairly alpha guy. He had been in ministry for almost a decade, but it was clear that he wasn't designed to be a pastor. I have the gifts of teaching and possibly prophecy, among other things, so I could see clearly what God had envisioned for the church, including its eventual break-up 5 years before it ever happened. I knew I needed to communicate this vision to the pastor because he had lofty expectations about reaching hundreds within the first couple years of this church plant, whereas we had started with only 25.

Because he was an alpha guy, I knew he would not respond to a weak man. I couldn't be my old doormat self (this was in my pre-RP days), so I had to start changing how I approached him. I had to challenge him, sometimes publicly. In private, there were moments where I had to make comments or ask questions that made him feel a bit like an idiot. I wasn't doing it to be mean - and he knew that. And I certainly was not doing anything to cause him to lose credibility with the congregation. But I was pushing him, and hard. This didn't look cool to a lot of people - my wife especially. I looked like a bit of a bully. I came off as an arrogant know-it-all who wanted to show up the pastor. That was very out of character for me, but it was an intentional and calculated characterization I was building for myself. Most of my comments were directed toward the focus of the church's mission and whether certain decisions were oriented toward fulfilling that mission v. just trying to get numbers in the door.

Well, my alpha pastor responded quite well to that display of strength. He respected me for being the only guy in the church willing to call him out on his crap. He asked me to disciple him and defended me to the church and exhorted other men to be more like me. So, where I once was a jerk to my pastor and everyone else viewed me that way, after earning his respect he recognized the truth in what I was preaching and the people there went from being a crowd of pew-sitters into being trained as active disciple-makers - and that's something I'm very proud of.

How do you respond to threats from your wife?

1 upvotes · 14 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This has been temporarily removed. Please add the information referenced in rule 2, which is also stickied to the front page, and I'll reapprove. Thanks!

Expanding on a question asked in another post.

1 upvotes · 13 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

It's not a route ... it's THE route. All marriage is meant to be a discipleship of sorts. I'm simply suggesting that you can widen your pool of candidates by starting that discipleship before the marriage.

I'm a Christian. I'm a "jerk." Deal with it.

1 upvotes · 13 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Sorry to hear about that guy in your church. I would NOT say his heart was in the right place. His head was for sure. But his heart, if oriented in a godly manner, wouldn't cause him to behave that way. I've seen this all too often. They usually fall in the category of all head, no heart Christians. I used to be him.

Expanding on a question asked in another post.

1 upvotes · 13 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

So where does this leave the above average guy or gal that has been saved?

Sidebar, brother. Or maybe it's not on the sidebar, I can't remember. I say it quite often: *If you can't find what you're looking for, make it.*

In this case, if you can't find a hot, godly woman who's single and in your age range ... then find a hot woman who's single and in your age range and make her godly. Or maybe find a godly woman who's single and in your

age range and make her hot. Or find a hot, godly woman who's in your age range and make her single (unless she's actually married). Sorry, can't do much about the age-range thing.

I asked the question to invoke the thought that not everyone sitting in the pews is a genuine believer.

We had that conversation early on in the sub and [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) referenced a post by [/u/ruizbuje](#) in one of his sidebar posts for singles. That had some stats about how many people in church were likely actually "saved" and the number was around 15% ... and the number of "mature" was more like 2.5% (I'm guessing, can't remember without looking).

That's why I agree: you're probably not going to find a godly woman who meets the standards that will satisfy your sexual impulses. You're far better off mastering another thing I don't ever shut up about:

DISCIPLESHIP!!!

Find the type of girl you want to be with and disciple her. Start with evangelism (the first phase of discipleship), then move onto establishing her in the basics (300 content), then start equipping her with tools to join you in your mission of discipling the rest of the world too (unwritten 300 content), etc.

I'm a Christian. I'm a "jerk." Deal with it.

1 upvotes · 13 July 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

This is a "duh!" moment for me. Sometimes I get so hung up on discipleship that I forget that guys here also want to hear about how this stuff relates to intergender relational dynamics.

If you like, I could edit my original post, paste this in, you delete this comment, and we'd call it a joint post so more people read this who otherwise might skip the comments - because this is pretty much what needs to be said on that angle of the topic (at least for now).

Biblical textual analysis of why Adam had headship before the fall

1 upvotes · 13 July 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

How do you respond to the more widespread interpretation: that the man leaves his family to join the woman's family? Proponents of this theory reference figures like Moses and Jacob, who both lived with their wife's parents ... or even David, who joined Saul's household when marrying his daughter.

Textually, is there any indication that the woman is also to leave her family to join her husband?

To bring it back to the Christ-parallel, one could easily argue that we were in the world and rather than calling us to leave the world to be with him, Jesus joined us in the world, and even after our marriage through the Gospel, we are still called to remain in the world and he still dwells with us here in the world.

I ask because this is one of those passages that I've always struggled to oppose. In my heart, I don't feel right saying that the man joins the woman's family, when in reality it should be her joining him and his lineage. But the text does seem to say quite the opposite ... and then it shocked me when you use the passage in the way I want to read it, but I still don't see any exegetical explanation for how the passage itself can be interpreted in a non-feminist way.

Historically, I'm sure there's stuff that can be said about the father giving his daughter away in marriage also ... but I don't recall any passages that make this a theological, God-endorsed practice from which we could give context for interpreting the Genesis 2 line.

Biblical textual analysis of why Adam had headship before the fall

1 upvotes · 13 July 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Can you elaborate on your point 5?

Small Intro

1 upvotes · 13 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is a wonderful post. Thanks for setting a precedent for how things should look in light of the new rule!

How to keep strong faith?

Matthew 7:24-27 makes it clear that the strength of our foundation is in our obedience. Hearing God's Word is not enough - we must actually live it out. So, if you want to keep strong faith, it's not just about learning and loving, but living it out that's the pinnacle. What we know and how we feel about God are merely pillars meant to support our obedience.

To that end, I have often refrained: *Christianity isn't about what we're against, but what we're for. It's not about what things in life we avoid, but what things in life we do.* Jesus called us to make disciples of all nations. Are you fulfilling your part in doing that? If not, you're missing the point and have weak faith. If you're engaging in the proactive commands it defeats all temptations and adds value and meaning to your life. It refines the path and direction you're walking. That's how you keep your faith strong. Make disciples.

Lots of temptation in college?

Again, I'll refrain another thing I'm known for saying: The best way to avoid sin is not by *trying to avoid sin*, but by doing the opposite of sinning. The opposite of sinning is doing what God told you to do. "Stop sinning" or "avoid sin" are negative concepts. They exist in a void. You can literally do nothing and comply with what most people mean when they talk about "not sinning." But James 4 also says that if we know what we ought to do and don't do it, that's also sin. So, if you know you ought to be making disciples and you're not doing it, I'd wager that's a far worse sin than whacking it to porn. Why? Because other people's eternal souls are on the line. Jesus's parting words to his followers weren't, "Go and avoid doing sexually inappropriate things." They were, "Go and make disciples of all nations." Which one does that imply is more important to Jesus?

Obedying the proactive commands will always be more important than avoiding the negative commands. This is also the way to avoid temptation because, inherently, as you orient your life in the right direction you won't be oriented in the wrong direction.

Avoiding sin by *trying to avoid sin* is the same as not thinking about pink elephants by *trying not to think about pink elephants*. You're going to fail every time. The way you stop thinking about pink elephants is to think about something else. The way you stop sinning is by doing something not sinful. In any given moment, if God wants you doing X, but you're tempted to whack it to porn or screw a hottie you're not married to, it does you no good to say, "I'll resist the sexual temptation and go do Z instead." Even if Z isn't the sexual sin you were tempted with, if it's not X - what God wanted you doing with your time - it's still sin.

Of course, that opens up another can of worms as to how much flexibility God has with "X," but that's a longer conversation.

Steps to become less of a jerk and more of a Christian?

This deserves a post of its own. It'll be up in a few minutes.

TheRedPill is Feminist

1 upvotes · 13 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I agree.

Biblical textual analysis of why Adam had headship before the fall

1 upvotes · 13 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I'm in agreement. Romans 9 addresses this. God is responsible for humanity, shaping the clay as he sees fit, but we each still individually bear the consequences for our own actions regardless of God's sovereignty. Likewise, I'm fine with saying a man is responsible for his wife, but that she must still endure consequences for her actions that otherwise step beyond the bounds that the husband responsibly lays out for her and the family.

To that end, Jesus also bore responsibility for our sins through his death, bearing the ultimate consequences that his bride otherwise would have had to suffer. Whether we like it or not, Ephesians 5 calls us to the same level of responsibility over our wives. Sure, some could call that gynocentric. Big whoop. The goal here isn't to fight gynocentrism; it's to be godly men, doing what the bible instructs. That likely aligns with an anti-gynocentric agenda quite often, but let's not let the overlap confuse which master we serve.

TheRedPill is Feminist

1 upvotes · 13 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

By your definition of a "feminist frame" saying a girl is hot would be a feminist frame too. Being too broad is not useful.

TheRedPill is Feminist

1 upvotes · 12 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

With that definition I'm in full agreement. That just seems way oversimplified as compared to the way it would have to be addressed under other more complicated definitions of patriarchy.

And we must remember that even under this definition, a patriarchy only makes sense in the context of those patriarchs being beholden to God.

If patriarchy were imposed on nonchristians whose men would almost certainly in their sin abuse their power, do we dare ask whether God would prefer egalitarianism for those marriages as the only viable alternative to toxic patriarchs or radical feminists?

To be clear, we're on the same page regarding the church. But I'm here to reach those outside the church too, so I must also comprehend their framework for understanding the world and social dynamics.

TheRedPill is Feminist

1 upvotes · 12 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

And when Jesus came he made clear that their expectations of a return to physical power and authority didn't have anything to do with God's actual purposes, which were instead related to a spiritual kingdom instead of an earthly one.

TheRedPill is Feminist

1 upvotes · 12 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Most followers of the redpill are just trying to enjoy the destruction while they can through hedonism.

This is an apt way to put it. I often think of it as a city during a natural disaster. Everyone knows that the right thing to do is to aid in the relief effort. But the secular red pill guys are the ones looting the shops and stealing the abandoned vehicles and robbing people's homes in the midst of the storm because everyone's defenseless and they can get away with it.

True Biblical marriage is via the Patriarchy

Can you help me get a good definition of this? I've seen several where I could say, "Yes, God endorses that," but I've also seen others where I could just as easily say, "No, the Bible makes no comment on that at all."

The Bible clearly indicates a man's temporal mission is his family and taking dominion of the world in the name of Christ

I would argue "disciple-making" is the mission, but I can see how there's some overlap there.

TheRedPill is Feminist

1 upvotes · 12 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Now, I'm not disagreeing here at all - I'm merely asking for more information. Can you flesh out what you mean when you say "Christian world view of Patriarchy, established by God is Truth"?

Suppose a man argues that God doesn't endorse feminism or patriarchy in the Bible - that he merely implemented laws and gave us guidance for living within the culture that the world had already developed on its own at that time. And much like we could say, "Well, God never directly opposed patriarchy, and he says things that seem to suggest he thought it was a perfectly appropriate way of life," we could say the exact same phrase about what the Scriptures say about slavery.

I know many red pill guys get real hung up on this "patriarchy" concept and it's simply something I haven't studied much in the first place. I know men are to lead and women are to help/follow. But when we go much past that, what's the biblical foundation for suggesting that God endorses patriarchy as his intended social structure?

Again, I'm not saying this is a wrong conclusion, and I'm pretty sure I already agree with the conclusion. But it's one of those things where I agree because it makes sense, but I don't have a hard conviction because I haven't seen the evidence for the conclusion for myself yet. To that end, with your response please be patient as I almost assuredly will have to test the integrity of the support of this view with a devil's advocacy position.

TheRedPill is Feminist

1 upvotes · 12 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I don't see that jiving with Romans 13 at all. We're not meant to engage in a political secession. We're meant to have our own culture that trumps the secular governments with regard to our obedience, but we are also meant to infiltrate various cultures for the sake of the Gospel. This doesn't happen if we secede and try to become completely independent of all other cultures. "In the world, but not of the world" comes to mind.

TheRedPill is Feminist

1 upvotes · 12 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

The big question though is when you "when it happens" what is the "it" that we are to be anticipating?

I reference Judgment Day. We know that hasn't happened yet - all theological camps agree on that. What leads up to judgment day - whether it has already happened or not - is not for me to figure out. There's some value in the process of studying it and attempting to ascertain, but if Jesus himself said he would not know the day or hour, then I can't pretend I'm going to be any better off.

More to the point, it's all moot anyway. I can't stop it from happening. I can't change how it happens by believing in pre-trib or post-trib or pre-millennial, amillennial, or post-millennial views, etc. God's going to do what he's going to do and whatever happens, I'm going to respond consistently with biblical principles as anyone in Christ should. So, my behaviors won't change much at all, other than the fact that I may subtly know whether I was right or wrong about the order of things - and that's all assuming any of this precursor stuff happens in my lifetime at all. If preterism is right, it's already happened and there's nothing left for me to have to worry about anyway - I just

keep on living my life the way I always intended. If other views are right, but the precursor stuff is yet to come after my lifetime, then that still doesn't change how I live today. So, it's all academic.

What's even more funny is that if there is some pretribulational rapture yet to come, then what's the point in even adopting a theology of what will happen to the world after the rapture at all? I certainly won't be in the world or care what happens after that point. I'll have Jesus! I'm pretty sure I'll be more than preoccupied with greater and more important things at that point.

whereas I think there is a strong biblical case to be made that much of the end times prophecy was fulfilled in AD70

I'm inclined to agree with you on this.

trajectory of the unfolding of the great commission since then has been one of world conquest, spiritually, demographically, and politically

I don't see that part in Scripture, though. Even if we're in the millennial period or a post-millennial period, that just means that Jesus reigns over the world instead of Satan. It doesn't mean that sin will be gone from the world or everyone will become Christian someday before the planet fades away. I certainly don't see any biblical basis to believe in a political change based on spiritual dynamics. The world could (and very likely will) become more and more sinful until God brings about judgment day, even on a full preterist view.

With regard to 1 Cor. 15, I read all of that as happening on Judgment Day, not on earth pre-JD.

To be clear, when you say:

the end doesn't come until after Jesus destroys all of his enemies

Paul in that verse defines "the end" as "when he delivers the kingdom to God the Father." That is, when the Church (universal and across time) is commissioned to God and raised to the New Jerusalem. All this means is that God will judge the nonbelievers first, which is consistent with I think another part of Revelation that talks about us watching him judge from his throne (don't quote me on that, though - I'm going on memory).

To that end, abortion, human trafficking, feminism, etc. will all be defeated on Judgment Day. I'm not saying it can't happen earlier than that, only that I know for sure it will happen by then and that I don't see any Scriptural basis for the view that it MUST happen before then. And if it's not a Scripturally mandated view, then it's not one that I can accept in any dogmatic way. As for the Great Commission, I've heard arguments that it is already fulfilled.

Interestingly, the Joshua Project defines a "people group" as everyone in a contiguous region who have no unique hindrances to the sharing of information and who do, in fact, share information. Such hindrances would include geographical boundaries, language and dialect changes, etc. They consider such a group "reached" when that people group has a church established and run by people of their own locality and that such a church is accessible to all persons within that people group (accounting for things like transportation, geography, etc.).

With this definition in mind, they suggest that the "all tribes, tongues, and nations" prophecy has not yet been fulfilled. However, they do suggest that if every church gave \$0.32 per year (or every American church gave \$1.15/yr - or something close to these numbers) and 1 out of every 1,000 churches in America sent a missionary to an unreached people group, then the great commission could be fulfilled in less than 5 years. That's exciting! It's also off topic ... but exciting! I have been working on my church to do their part and try to make up for a few hundred other churches that aren't.

TheRedPill is Feminist

1 upvotes · 12 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Looked into these? Yes. But I don't take a strong stance on any eschatological views. My eschatology is: *We'll figure it out when it happens, but need to be ready as if it's going to happen today*. I'm pretty sure that's what Jesus preached.

Nevertheless, when I've researched it in the past, partial preterism seems to make the most sense to me, but even then I still have some disagreements.

NEW RULE - READ BEFORE POSTING

1 upvotes · 11 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Nice. I look forward to it.

RP Christians Sidebar "Handbook" (Download Links)

1 upvotes · 10 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I have no idea if/how that could be done.

RP Christians Sidebar "Handbook" (Download Links)

1 upvotes · 10 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Makes sense. I wasn't planning on sidebarring the IOI post unless enough people thought it was useful to include. You're welcome to do as you wish with the compendium though.

Understanding The Outliers?

1 upvotes · 10 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Huh ... I didn't know this was a thing. Usually I delete and ban bots, but is this one useful to keep around?

Book Summaries

1 upvotes · 10 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That's fair. Then again, some publishers do like edgy content that challenges mainstream thinking - especially if it can be backed by appropriate sources, whether that's reliable surveys and statistical data or, in this case, the Bible. Books on marriage advice for Christians are a hot commodity on the market - especially if you already have a blog/platform for selling it ;)

I feel like girls might see me as a player?

1 upvotes · 10 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is wise.

I feel like girls might see me as a player?

1 upvotes · 10 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I discussed this with chuck early on, although at the time it was more about when to start an [r/askRPC](#). We said we'd figure that out when the numbers warranted revisiting the conversation. I hadn't contemplated this sub getting as big as it did as fast as it did. I also didn't expect there to be so much interest from singles, given that sexual strategy to a Christian can mostly only be applied after marriage.

I'll have this conversation with the other mods. Perhaps we have been doing too much to accommodate the large wave of our single brethren who have found this place recently.

If we started an [r/marriedRPC](#) right now, my guess is it would be relatively inactive for several months, given the

spacing of posts prior to last month's subscription boom. Do you have any other ideas on how we can work to keep both sides of the coin healthy and have their questions and needs addressed?

Book Summaries

1 upvotes · 10 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Traditional publishing or self publishing?

Book Summaries

1 upvotes · 9 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is wonderful! I'll read it shortly and if it checks out, I'll probably add it to the sidebar.

Sex god method... RPC Perspective?

1 upvotes · 9 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

If it's all "Bible" or even "some from the Bible," what part of the Bible is she referencing? That's going to answer the issue real fast.

Was this girl interested or not?

1 upvotes · 9 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This.

For I am....

1 upvotes · 9 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Jealousy is an emotion. Mate-guarding is an action. A person can mate-guard without actually being jealous, or be jealous without actually mate-guarding.

God's jealousy is defined by a high standard against our prioritization of anyone else over him. But he does not mate-guard because his solution to his jealousy is simply to let us walk away (Romans 1:18 et seq.). He's there to take us back, but (soteriology aside) he will not entertain a relationship with us while we prioritize anyone else over him.

This is the ultimate example of RP's traditional advice: *If she's being a harpy, defiant, or giving frequent denials, go do something else; you have better things to do with your time.* Likewise, although God is jealous for us, he has better things to do than try to prove himself yet again as being better than our idols. That's why when the Pharisees asked for a sign Jesus basically said, "Screw you. You've had enough signs. You get no more. Either follow me or don't."

There's also a difference between God's affection for those who aren't yet his and those who are his, but are wandering away.

Also note the story of Hosea. As I seem to recall, he was very jealous over his wife - and rightfully so. He was so jealous that when she went back to her pimp and lovers, he paid a high price to buy her back to free her from her past life of prostitution that she had returned to. But even in the midst of this, we don't see him trying to ward off the other guys. He simply opens the way for her return - no mate guarding.

Sex god method... RPC Perspective?

1 upvotes · 9 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Well, if you don't want to do it, don't do it. It's that easy.

Sex god method... RPC Perspective?

1 upvotes · 9 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Good point on the perspective issue. Perhaps a better word would be nympho.

Sex god method... RPC Perspective?

1 upvotes · 9 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Perhaps. I usually think of the word in terms of what a woman will do, not necessarily who she's done it with.

A woman who looks "slutty," for example, gives the appearance of one who would do more sexually than someone who looks like a prude, em though the price may have actually had more sexual partners.

Sex god method... RPC Perspective?

1 upvotes · 9 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Does she still have multiple partners? If not, then she's yours now.

Reworking the Sidebar

1 upvotes · 7 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Absolutely.

Happy Belated 4th, men. Here's my bi-monthly example of what NOT to do. Link in comments.

1 upvotes · 5 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

My pleasure.

Dealing with ONEitis

1 upvotes · 4 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Thanks for the tip :)

Dealing with ONEitis

1 upvotes · 4 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Interesting. I'll have to contemplate this some more. I agree that men must fulfill a dual role as both God to our wives and a bride to Christ. Not sure what to think beyond that.

I'm fairly new to redpill, but with my Christian beliefs I don't fully trust redpill.

1 upvotes · 4 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Indeed.

I'm fairly new to redpill, but with my Christian beliefs I don't fully trust redpill.

1 upvotes · 4 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Our definitions of "game" aside, this is the answer. But it's not just having the foundation - a guy does still need to know how to initiate with a woman and have a big enough social circle to be in contact with the types of women who meet his standard in the first place. To that end, there is still value in the approach and learning how to talk to new people.

There are no women watching

1 upvotes · 3 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Sure. Deceit and weakness go hand in hand in this case. I'd posit that it started with weakness that turned into deception.

I'm fairly new to redpill, but with my Christian beliefs I don't fully trust redpill.

1 upvotes · 3 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Usually someone who is Red Pill under goes a divorce or something traumatic

To be clear, are you saying being "red pill" causes people to get divorced or experience trauma? Or are you saying divorce/trauma is what causes men to seek and become red pill?

There are no women watching

1 upvotes · 3 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Are you referring to the male/complementarian pastors, or the average man?

Both. The pastors simply have a higher obligation than the average man (James 3:1, among other passages).

Was the feminist rebellion a result of men "chugging their rum"?

No, it was the result of women looking for an opportunity to take control, and when the men let their guard down the women seized that opportunity. If the men never screwed up it never would have happened. If the women weren't rebellious, it never would have happened. There's mutuality. That's all I'm saying. You're acting like feminism would have dominated the world even if the men had been doing their jobs rightly all along - that the women would have been too strong for us to deal with no matter how hard we fought against feminism. I simply don't agree with that conclusion.

There are no women watching

1 upvotes · 3 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I think I agree with most of what you're saying. The sin with these men, though, is male passivity. It's the same deal with Adam watching Eve eat the fruit that he knew God commanded her not to eat. He's his leader. He should have stopped her. But he stood by and watched it happen. If God ordered the world that men should lead and men fail to lead, that's sin. The fact that women further sinned by stepping up to fill in that void is their sin. Initially, one could hardly blame them. If a ship is sinking and the captain is chugging his rum and giving up, his first mate is going to have to take over to save the ship. This is actually what a first mate is supposed to do.

The problem is that the captain liked a little too much being able to sit on his butt and let his first mate do all the hard work, and the first mate liked a little too much having the authority and command of the ship. Neither of them were willing to revert back to their proper roles - and that's where we are today, red pill men notwithstanding.

There are no women watching

1 upvotes · 3 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Indeed :)

There are no women watching

1 upvotes · 3 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

There's a lot of good in here. But your solution is still to call out women to have them repent. This is fine and right to do, as [u/Deep_Strength](#) acknowledged in one of his first posts here on rebuking women. But that solution still relies squarely on the women to respond. It strips the power away from men and puts us at the woman's mercy once again.

Suppose a woman hears the rebuke and decides to continue in her rebellion - even over a decade of being rebuked. At what point do we acknowledge that the man must foster a condition where she has incentive to receive the correction?

I feel like the two of you are arguing calvinism and arminianism. Did God predestine sin into the world or did man create original sin by our choice? What if it's both? What if both men and women are to blame and have a role in the situation and you're each just taking sides and insisting it must be one or the other?

And if I'm right about there being blame on both sides, doesn't it make sense that men should address the issues where they are at fault first given that it's the only issue we can really control - and then, with the conditions on our end fixed we no longer have a plank in our own eye and can rightly call out our sisters in christ.

Dealing with ONEitis

1 upvotes · 3 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is a wonderful comment - especially the last line. The only thing I'll note is that ONEitis isn't necessarily something we can manufacture, but it is something we can destroy. So, while I agree with the sentiment, developing the same emotional investment in our relationship with Jesus isn't quite so easy :p For many, it's a long process, as with a marriage ... because it is a marriage ;)

There are no women watching

1 upvotes · 3 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

But as /u/OsmiumZulu pointed out - they will. It's only the weak husbands who they won't obey - the ones who let them get away with it.

Your frustration is understandable. You're seeing church after church influenced by the droves of weak men and failing to recognize that if you're not like them, your wife won't be like their wives either. This comes to one of two conclusions: she'll either follow you or leave you. But you have to leave that decision up to her and make sure you're a man worth following. If that's the case, it's really a no brainer.

But there's no situation where a man must cave to tolerating a rebellious wife. You ask how you lead such a woman? The same way you do anyone else, "I'm going this way. Feel free to join me," and then start going. If she doesn't follow, that's her own business. Either she'll catch up or she'll walk away. Either way lends itself to a biblical conclusion for the man if the direction he's going is biblical in the first place.

There are no women watching

1 upvotes · 3 July 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That's not an irony. That's why RPC exists - because God came up with it first. The secular crowd is merely rediscovering what the church abandoned. They picked up the scraps of truth the church left behind and are now doing more with it than the church ever did.

Should I be approaching random girls? If so, where?

1 upvotes · 28 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I'm not sure if you read the majority of what I post here :p

There is no "Christian version" of anything

1 upvotes · 24 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This post wasn't meant for the secular crowd. It's meant for those who already understand and embrace the truth or are willing to assume it as true.

Desiring God Says Feminism Wants to Silence "Real Men"

1 upvotes · 21 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Why would I ban you? I don't ban for simple differences of opinion, and you're free to disagree with me. I'm just trying to help. If you don't want it, that's your business. No hard feelings.

Desiring God Says Feminism Wants to Silence "Real Men"

1 upvotes · 21 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Well said.

Desiring God Says Feminism Wants to Silence "Real Men"

1 upvotes · 20 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I wasn't dismissive of the concept of the DNotS. I acknowledge it as a real thing. In fact, I even said plainly:

I have experienced a DNotS. It happened over a 2 year period.

I know what you're talking about and have done much research on the subject, helping others who have gone through it too. While discipling my pastor, he was for a time in the midst of a DNotS as well, which he had studied in seminary and personally. It had been going on in his life for a period of 3 years before I started meeting with him. My advice to him was the same as to you. He took me up on that advice and within 2 months his full joy had restored and he hasn't looked back.

I don't want to be dismissive and critical of what you're going through. I know it's serious and difficult. I have great empathy because I have lived it and have counseled at least 6 or 7 guys who have been there. But at the end of the day, God does provide a way out, and it breaks my heart when people would rather wallow in the darkness than leap for joy in the light. This is usually rooted in a fear of some sort, like the fear of being wrong, or the fear of being right, but the obligation that comes with it. We can be lazy in the darkness. Our flesh likes it, so we have no physical imperative to get out. It's easier to stifle the yearning of our spirit than to discipline our flesh.

To that end, if you want to ignore wisdom and continue in your self-pity, you're welcome to do so. As is often said in both RP and Christian circles alike: *I can show you the door, but ultimately it's your responsibility to walk through it. I can't make you do anything.*

In the meantime, please do not spread the lie that God intentionally wants people to be sullen and depressed for extended periods of time. In brief moments, this might be a natural byproduct of God's will, but we always reads that God is the one who lifts up the broken-hearted, not puts them down. As such, as real as the DNotS might be, we should not give it the weight of divine appointment; rather, we should view it for what it is: an inability to receive the good that God is trying to do in and through us, whether prompted by the enemy or our own human limitations in understanding God's will - or a mistaken belief that we need to understand it at all.

Tag: [/u/rocknrollchuck](#)

Desiring God Says Feminism Wants to Silence "Real Men"

1 upvotes · 20 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Agreed. Of course, once again, her efforts were not toward the fruit of disciple-making, but of service and generosity. Those are both great things, but they are inadequate in that they are not the ultimate reason for why we're still on this earth.

Paul actually contemplated this very thing, suggesting that he wished he could die and move on to be with Christ, which he said was "better by far," but gave a very specific reason for God keeping him alive: his ministry of discipleship. His exact words: "But it is more necessary for you that I remain in the body. Convinced of this, I know that I will remain, and I will continue with all of you for your progress and joy in the faith" (Philippians

1:24).

As much as I respect much of what Mother Theresa did, and I have watched the documentary and read the blog posts and excerpts from a few books ... it's my clear understanding that she was not in the business of disciple-making. At best, she was an evangelist. I don't say any of this to discredit what she did or defame her, but to offer as an explanation for why she did not experience the fullness in life that God designed her for. To be simple, we can't experience the fullness God designed us for if we're not living the purpose God designed us for.

Tag: [/u/not-my-hands](#)

Aaaquad introduction, stats, and brief RP journey 6.18.2018

1 upvotes · 20 June 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

In short:

- Set high, but realistic goals
- Be intentional about setting and maintaining boundaries; do this now while you don't need them, because you won't be able to keep them if you wait too long
- Don't underestimate the importance of developing social status, and this is something that develops incrementally, so starting small now will make a big difference later
- Check out my immediately previous comment to [u/not-my-hands](#) for a bit more on "head to heart transition" and discipleship, but I agree that's worth a direct post and not just dancing around the subject in comments

Desiring God Says Feminism Wants to Silence "Real Men"

1 upvotes · 20 June 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

More to [/u/not-my-hands](#), I am well familiar with the "dark night of the soul" lore. It isn't found anywhere in Scripture; rather, it is a compilation of experiences that many Christians from the early church through the present have experienced above and beyond what nonchristians in similar circumstances experience. This differentiation causes many to believe that it is a uniquely spiritual phenomenon. I've heard people try to pick out a few select characters, like Elijah and David, and argue that their experiences are the biblical basis for this phenomenon, but their symptoms were fairly different, usually more akin to depression or despair.

I think [/u/not-my-hands](#) gave a great description of the DNotS mindset, very akin to my own, which is: "I know, but I can't." It's almost a sort of spiritual paralysis that inhibits one from experiencing joy or passion, especially toward outward ministry.

In my experience, this has never happened to the fruitful. Thomas Carlyle (1800s Christian philosopher) calls it the "center of indifference" in his philosophical fictional pseudo-autobiography, *Sartor Resartus*. This is the place where people exist between "the everlasting no" (a state of abandonment of God) and "the everlasting yea" (a state of joyous love for God). The closest biblical position I can muster up is Romans 7, where Paul talks about the stark contrast between what he knows is right, but what his flesh has him do anyway. But even that is different because he is speaking from a place of peace and resolve, not as one who is lost in turmoil. He's teaching the Romans about something he had been through and still goes through, not trying to ask them for help for him to figure things out.

I have experienced a DNotS. It happened over a 2 year period. Incidentally, that was also the only 2 year period since I became saved where I wasn't discipling anyone. One of those years I wasn't even being discipled, which was the worst year of my marriage and my life. I assumed I was intelligent, disciplined, and wise enough to be just fine on my own without a spiritual authority directly investing in my life. It makes me sad for the countless people who have never experienced this blessing in the first place and don't even know the misery they're living

in.

Ultimately, the solution to the DNotS is, as I suggest is the solution for many things, to begin bearing fruit: discipleship. In 3 John we read, "I have no greater joy than this: to see that my children are walking in the truth." So, first you've got to have some spiritual children (evangelism), and then you've got to start raising them. This is the exact rationale I give for why I have never met a single disciple-maker (and I've known hundreds) who was both fruitful and suffered from spiritual burnout (another concept not mentioned in the Bible, but which many Christians experience in a distinct way from nonchristians).

Or to put it another way: if we're not doing what God put us here to do, it makes sense that one would not feel satisfied with the life he's living. This is ultimately the core of the DNotS.

What makes it so frustrating is that virtually no church has an intentional plan of raising up disciple-makers. I only recently discovered one church about 2.5 hours away from me that has a terrific plan in place for this and actively trains people this way. I'm in the process of training my church to do this. In the meantime, it just kind of sucks for people who do want to bear fruit and make disciples, but who don't have anyone to disciple them or train them in how to do that, so they're just stuck with knowing what to do, but no way of actually following through with it. And without the option of being disciplined available (at least not the way Jesus disciplined people), one can't experience it for themselves, and without that experience the vision and joy behind it cannot penetrate their heart.

Was hit hard with some realizations, need input

1 upvotes · 17 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Agreed.

Was hit hard with some realizations, need input

1 upvotes · 17 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Then why is this even a conversation in the first place? 2 Cor. 6:14 - "Do not be yoked together with unbelievers. For what do righteousness and wickedness have in common? Or what fellowship can light have with darkness?"

You say you're compatible. The bible says you're not. I would trust the bible over your emotions if I were you.

Was hit hard with some realizations, need input

1 upvotes · 17 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Oh, I understand and assumed that. My comment remains unchanged.

Was hit hard with some realizations, need input

1 upvotes · 17 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That's the blue pill in you talking. "I'm not like all those other guys. I care about women for who they are deep inside, and I would never use them just for sex." The fact that you think this attitude earns you anything shows you have a fundamental flaw in your thinking, regardless of whether or not you're accurate in your self evaluation.

The Role Of Your Wife (Assuming You're OYS Already)

1 upvotes · 16 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Before Christ, God was trying to establish a physical representation of what he would expect to be true on a spiritual level. Once Christ came, all the physical things faded in their significance (not completely lost) in exchange for the spiritual parallel that those physical things were pointing toward all along. Sure, on a technical level you could argue that Adam and Eve had that in the garden too, but we're not in Eden anymore, and I'm

inclined toward the view that God proceeded in Eden pre-fall with full knowledge that the fall was imminent.

But I agree that it's often beneficial to look pre-fall to get a better idea of what God may have originally intended. But it's not nearly as conclusive as looking post-Gospel in light of the parallel that was being established all along.

EC on TRP explains why making sex your god fails

1 upvotes · 15 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

True. I'm not a black pill guy myself. There's just too much evidence to the contrary. But the black pill does get at least part of the story.

[Theory] Evangedating (AKA: Missional Dating)

1 upvotes · 15 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Literally 5 hours before you posted this I had written this in another thread:

To be clear, I DO NOT recommend evangedating. Don't engage in romantic relationships with non-Christians on the hope that they might become saved. But you can evangelize to a non-Christian on the hope that she might one day become date-worthy. The distinction is which comes first. In evangedating, the relationship precedes salvation. In evangelizing-to-dating, the focus is on a woman's salvation, which precedes any actual relationship. This can be quite delicate, but I'll tell you that I know many, many, many truly godly men and women who are only saved because an attractive person invited them to a Christian event. For many of these people, they never even ended up in a relationship with that person, but the invitation alone was enough to get them moving in the right direction. This includes the guy who discipled me.

I stand by that assessment. In short, I agree with a lot of what you've said. There's just no need to put it in a romantic context. You can go out to eat, take long walks on the beach, have a game night, hit up a movie - whatever. But as you say, there's no exclusivity or long-term intentions. Can this potentially lead her on? Sure, but as long as you're clear up-front about your commitment level, that's on her head, not yours.

Bad day at work

1 upvotes · 12 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

You are one with your wife in flesh. You are one with Christ in spirit and heart. If your flesh is having an issue, go be one with your wife. If your spirit and heart are having issues, go be one with Christ.

That said, you can tell your wife whatever you want to tell her. Just make sure you're doing it because you want to, not because you *need* to. If you do something out of an internal sense of compulsion, you're not coming from a place of strength, and thus you cannot maintain your frame in how you communicate. If you communicate things because it's what you want to do, then you're able to do it your way on your own terms and without weakness, so it's fine.

She wants God not you

1 upvotes · 11 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Or ... it's not settling if you can have both.

[FR] Calculate your "cost per fuck"

1 upvotes · 10 June 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

The same thing is true of a guy who owns a business. Whether it's a business, an IRA, a 401k, or whatever ... investments all work the same. The difference comes in whose income is invested and whose is flexible and who

has access to spend the flexible income at their own discretion.

Body fat % for Visible abs?

1 upvotes · 7 June 2018 · /r/askMRP

When I was cutting I ran a 0 net calorie diet. I could eat whatever I wanted as long as my active exercise for the day burned the same amount. I usually ate 1,200 and had a 60-90 minute workout session.

3,500 calories = 1lb lost. I naturally needed at that time 2,300 to break even. So in a 30 day month I consumed 0 net calories and burned 69,000 just by existing, which is about 20lbs each month. 3 months got me from 30% down to 15% ... then I stagnated ever since, working mostly on bulking muscle which requires a calorie surplus.

I felt healthy and after the first week I was even energetic. My cholesterol and glucose numbers got way better to. I hope that helps.

I need advice, good experienced Christian masculine advice.

1 upvotes · 7 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Nothing about this screams unicorn to me :p There are just some advantages to being with someone who is really bad at lying. That's really what it boils down to. The only issue of contention is whether or not she's lying because she wants to make him happy or if she's lying to placate him and to conceal herself until she finds a better guy.

I need advice, good experienced Christian masculine advice.

1 upvotes · 7 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Let me play devil's advocate and go against the grain here. Are these red flags? That really depends on what you're looking for.

Women, on the whole, are malleable. They are designed to conform to the man they're with. This is particularly dangerous if their man is putty, trying to conform to her because then instead of becoming a well-refined temple, you're just like if a kid clumps two blobs of play-dough together and meshes it around.

Most of what you're describing is this very concept: that she's trying to conform to you and your interests. This is actually a good thing. We're just not used to someone being so overt about it because most women are covert in how they communicate, and they're skilled at hiding what they're really thinking/feeling.

You have someone who wants to hide those things just like all the other women do, but she's insanely bad at it. That could be a good thing. Getting someone to be a good helper/follower is much easier if they (1) already want to mold to you and your expectations at a conscious level and (2) have trouble keeping it a secret when they have natural resistance to the direction you're leading.

Now, all of that aside, if you think she's just outright lying to you because she doesn't have any better options right now, or that she's just trying to placate you until another option is ripe and ready, that's a bigger problem. That's not a follower-in-the-making; it's covert disloyalty in-waiting. You know her better than we do, so I'll let you figure out where on that spectrum she might be.

[NSFW] Sexual Techniques, Strategies, and Games

1 upvotes · 6 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Nice list. Good food for thought.

[NSFW] Sexual Techniques, Strategies, and Games

1 upvotes · 6 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Dang ... maybe one day. I've fantasized about some of these things, but it'll be another year or two before she's

ready.

Expressing our Flaws With Strength and Humility

1 upvotes · 5 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

True, true.

Expressing our Flaws With Strength and Humility

1 upvotes · 5 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I agree with all that. The example was just the first one that popped up in my head, but the context should be that you're only having these conversations when you have committed some wrong against her that affects her, as I think I did say in my original post. Understandably, the losing weight thing probably wasn't the best example to fit that context :p

Expressing our Flaws With Strength and Humility

1 upvotes · 5 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Well, it doesn't force her to do anything. If she wants to hold a grudge forever, she's welcome to do so. But with the method I've communicated, what you're really doing is showing her that her unforgiveness is only hurting her, not you. That's the key. And that's also biblical. It maintains the core concept that forgiveness in most contexts is not about releasing the other person, but about making oneself internally right.

Rephrasing with some clarity

1 upvotes · 5 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I feel like you misread something here. I'm certainly not suggesting he fantasize about anyone else. I also said in my comment directly: "I'm not even saying you have to make this attraction intentional. You don't have to try to seduce Susan in front of your wife." I was just explaining the psychology behind the red pill concept for the purpose of reorienting him away from caring so much about what other men look like or from thinking he has to flirt around to convince his wife he's better than the other guys. My final line about "leaving room for the 'unknown'" was an encouragement to create even greater distance rather than increasing interactions with these women.

lol's from women at church

1 upvotes · 5 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Fair points.

Expressing our Flaws With Strength and Humility

1 upvotes · 5 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Yeah, the "RP is all about sex" camp seems to be the first one and the second probably goes more toward the MGTOW people who don't care to impress women in the first place. As much as I despise the attitude of the MGTOW people, I probably side with them on this point, although for entirely different purposes. It has nothing to do with proving your strong by not caring what they think or by facing your weaknesses in front of them. It has everything to do with being biblical and godly, confessing our sins to the appropriate people in the appropriate manner. Note that my post does leave plenty of room for not confessing weaknesses that don't need to be confessed for no reason.

lol's from women at church

1 upvotes · 5 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I agree with what you've wrote, except to the extent that the link you provided says repeatedly that negging is not an insult, which I think aligns a lot better with what I was proposing. The only difference is that I have re-purposed the concept for a marriage concept, whereas the PUAs have to use it in an initial-meeting context, which might explain some of the heavier differences you're seeing from what I describe and what they're doing. You can't manipulate your spouse with a quick neg the same way you can someone you've never met, but the underlying principles of why the neg works with a new person can still be employed with your spouse in a healthy, productive way, as you have described.

What is the problem with porn?

1 upvotes · 4 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

If we assume that God/Solomon's intention for SoS is to titilate

That, sure. But I seriously doubt God intended for boys or girls to be reading it and masturbating to it. Virtually all of the porn industry today has that intentional and express purpose. As for God's actual intention, I still feel pretty confident about my previous response.

lol's from women at church

1 upvotes · 4 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

though anyone who thinks that their charm will always produce the desired results is living in a fantasy world
haha

And that is the whole point of the red pill. Beta men have these false fantasies of there being "one trick that will cause all women to drop their panties when they see you," as Buzz-feed often promises. The red pill acknowledges that there are underlying concepts about women that can be helpful in understanding principles behind attraction, but that no "trick" is going to work every time - and those principles are not things that can be expressed in 5 minutes, rather they take months and years to develop. A guy can't just go get a 6-pack overnight. He can't develop a successful career in 5 minutes at the bar. He can't develop fluent wit and charm. At best, he can strategize a few one-liners that come off as charming, but once he's through his litany of memorized script, he's got nothing left to offer. That's the difference between red pill and blue pill game.

negging would be one way someone believes they have game, and it may often work, but it's not honest or genuine (unless that person is a prick with no filter)

In the Christian realm, "negging" - especially in the context of a marriage - is both essential and healthy. It's a form of playful rebuke. When my wife disrespects me in front of the kids, am I better off standing over her and telling her, "You were wrong! You apologize to me in front of the kids right now and pray that God forgives you!"? Of course not. Instead, I can be light-hearted about it, letting her know that she screwed up, knocking her down a peg, but in a playful way that lets the relationship go on in a light-hearted manner. Of course, if I'm lying about her having done something wrong, that's a bigger problem and would not be consistent with RPC principles (maybe secular principles, but certainly not any you'll find espoused here).

Either way, glad I could help some :)

Rephrasing with some clarity

1 upvotes · 4 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

The distinction may be subtle, but it's not trite. Subtleties can often be very significant. My main point in all of

this is not that you compete with other men or try to garner the attraction of other women. You can do that if you want. My point is more that your job is to be the best version of you - the guy that God created you to be rather than the sissified pussy the church wants you to be. If you can do that, all the rest will flow naturally. You may not be the hottest or most charming or wealthiest guy at your church, but you'll be the man God intended you to be, and with that comes the fact that your marriage will be more like what God intended it to be, subject to your wife's responsiveness to your godliness. Because women are generally responsive beings, this is highly probable.

But if she fails to respond, her sin is on her head and not yours. Yes, you will have to bear the consequences for her sin in failing to respond to you ... but ultimately her sin is between her and God. Read my most recent post (as a result of our conversation) and in the bit about forgiveness, flip the genders and you'll see what I mean. To be clear, in that scenario which debt is worse: your wife not being sexually interested in you or the totality of your sin against God? Any Christian would understand the latter to be the answer. And if God forgave you of that and never promised you a perfect sex-life in your marriage, then what would the parable of the unmerciful servant have to say about your attitude toward your wife in this worst-case scenario? And I know it's only a worst-case because you already acknowledged that your wife *is, in fact* sexually attracted to you ;)

Perhaps one of the reasons there is no marriage in heaven ...

If I'm right about much of the content here, it's because our marriage will be to Christ and not to one another. Rather than physical marriages, we will realize the role that our spiritual marriage with Jesus was always meant to have, and this will be perfectly satisfying of any longing we have on earth that foreshadows what Christ will fulfill in heaven.

What is the problem with porn?

1 upvotes · 4 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Because we don't actually know what Solomon would have done or if it would have been God-inspired had he done it. We know almost with great certainty that mainstream pornography today is not the inspired revelation of God. As such, we can't make that connection.

What is the problem with porn?

1 upvotes · 4 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Yes to what I'm saying. No to what Solomon would write today. It would probably be a 50 Shades of Grey movie with more nudity (? I haven't seen them) - lots of emphasis on the value of the man to attract the woman, and lots of emphasis on the physical attractiveness and submissiveness of the woman to attract the man.

Rephrasing with some clarity

1 upvotes · 4 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I just made some replies in your other thread and tried to tag you in them, so go there for more detail.

But what I'm seeing here is a fundamental misunderstanding of how you should be viewing the SMP. Go read TRP and MRP for a while and I'm confident you'll find virtually no posts suggesting, "You have to be better than all the other guys at the bar." Instead, they suggest you improve yourself in a variety of ways, which will naturally make you a better option than all the other guys at the bar.

The point here isn't actively to compete with other men as if they're your enemies on the SMP. Your job is to improve yourself, which has a passive effect of causing you to have a higher SMV than those other men anyway. Competition should not be your driving motivation. Being the man God created you to be should be. At that point, there should be no awkwardness with other Christian men because they are not your competition.

Another thing to note here is that preselection is the underlying component of dread, not merely hypergamous

comparison. Preselection is not based on how you compare to other men; it's how other women's interest in you compares to your wife's interest. When other women display interest that your wife might otherwise not, it causes her to question her own perception of her man and adopt that of her peers. Even if she does already have an interest in you, it validates that interest, causing her to feel more free in expressing it toward you.

I get that [/u/Rollo-Tomassi](#) likes to focus on the biological aspects of hypergamy, basing it off of a woman's biological imperative to reproduce with someone who will produce good offspring. But I'm not convinced this is the controlling aspect of hypergamy today. There are plenty of ways women can satisfy their biological imperatives with a variety of men. So what makes hypergamy choose one man over another? Psychological imperatives.

Psychological imperatives can have biological roots beneath them, but they're mostly born from cultural conditioning and historical inertia. There's a lot of stuff on TRP, MRP, RPW, etc. about the "crabs in a bucket" mentality of women, for example - that they always want to ascend higher, but end up pulling each other down. This isn't something that is prompted by a genetic code, nor is it something explicitly taught. It's inherited through historical inertia (i.e. the way things have always been) mixed with cultural pressures. It's this constant comparison among women that I believe is the driving force behind their hypergamous desires today.

This is why dread works so well. A few thousand years ago I doubt dread would have been a necessity at all. But it becomes significant today because of the psychological concepts that are at its foundation, which is ultimately rooted in preselection. Dread, at its core, is about a man making himself attractive to other women in order that their interest in him will pique his own wife's interest in him.

So, if you were living a few thousand years ago, it would almost certainly be about being a better man than the next guy. Biology dominated back then. Since feminism took root in culture, the impact of biology decreased and that of female psychology increased. So, it's less about being better than all the other guys in church and more about how much other female attention you can draw. This also, implicitly, makes you assumed to be "better" than all the other guys anyway, even if you're objectively not. After all, if Susan is showing you IOIs, then what does that say about how she evaluates your SMV as compared to her husband, Bob? And if your wife previously thought that Bob was more attractive than you and she sees Susan wishing she had you instead of Bob, how does that re-shape how your wife views you as compared with Bob, even if Bob is otherwise objectively the better man? As you should now see, it's not about you compared to other men; it's about how other women view you as compared with how your wife views you.

I'm not even saying you have to make this attraction intentional. You don't have to try to seduce Susan in front of your wife. In fact, this is another important aspect of general relational psychology (not just in women): we always assume the grass is greener on the other side, unless we can blatantly see otherwise.

If I see another woman who is equally good looking as my wife, I'll naturally be more attracted to her than I am to my wife. That shouldn't make sense, but that's how it works. Why? Because I long for something *different*.

For women it's similar. Instead of just wanting variety, they find value in mystery. Women are predominantly creatures of fantasy. Their perception of you matters more than the actuality of you. The more a woman gets to know every detail of you, the less room there is for her mind to fantasize about you. But your wife has no idea what it's like being married to Bob. Maybe Bob's not as attractive as you, but perhaps he takes Susan out on more dates than you take your wife out to. Maybe Bob buys his wife flowers every Wednesday. Maybe Bob has more interests in common with your wife than you do. Maybe Bob ... whatever. It's highly likely that none of these things are true - but as long as your wife doesn't know that, she's free to assume that, and the unknown leads to assumptions, which formulate perception, which is more powerful than reality.

The key here, which underlies the concept of dread, is that you're creating in your wife the view that what she thinks is "reality" about you is wrong. When Susan starts ogling you in church or putting her hand on your arm,

your wife thinks, "What's she think is there? What does she see in my husband that I'm missing?" She doesn't realize that Susan's interest in you is based on fantasy and perception. So, her stability in how she views you is shaken, which uncertainty leads to the breaking of your wife's perceptions about you, opening the way to fantasizing about you once more - the same way she did when you were dating and she didn't know you as well.

Of course, if you're a failure of a man she might instead just huff and say, "If only Susan knew what he was really like!"

But if nothing else, because women must tell themselves they are grounded in reality and will never admit to living in fantasy-perception land, Susan's ogling of you speaks volumes of your wife's view of Bob in comparison to you.

Long story short: you don't have to compromise your relationships with other men in the church by trying to compete with them on the SMP. They are not your enemy. Your job isn't to be more attractive than them; your job is to be more attractive to women whose opinions your wife observes (it doesn't even matter if she respects their opinion - women care about even the opinions of people who they don't respect). The best way to do this is to leave a lot of "unknown," which allows room for fantasy. Incidentally, leaving room for the "unknown" also solves the problem people invoked from your other post about not leading women on.

What is the problem with porn?

1 upvotes · 4 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I wasn't challenging that point in specific. I was simply saying that before people had wide-spread access to visual erotica all people responded to text erotica.

This all stems from an SMV evaluation stand-point. Men evaluate female SMV based almost entirely on their looks. Maybe 8 out of 10 points are assigned based on looks and the other 2 on miscellaneous other factors. But women might only calculate 3 points on looks and 3 on charm/wit and 1 on income and 1 on social status, etc.

When we look at the evaluation measures this way, when there is no actual picture to look at, text can just as well let a man's imagination run wild as a woman's. They're just looking at different things in the text. The young men would be seeing all the descriptors of the "beloved's" boobs and vagina and imagining what they look like, whereas the women would focus on the fact that Solomon was good looking, but also a king, wealthy, highly respected, flirtatious, etc.

The way the book is written makes this dichotomy clear. We have lots of passages talking about Solomon's social status, being followed around by armed guards, being kingly, having plenty of riches ... and a little bit about his body too. But virtually everything said of the beloved is about her looks. This demonstrates that in a pre-visual time-period it was pretty much equally targeted toward men and women, most likely given the fact that Solomon intimately understood the differences between how men and women evaluate attraction. After all, he is the wisest man ever to live and he clearly focused a lot of his wisdom on understanding how to get all those wives and concubines in the first place.

My conclusion is simply that SoS is not "female porn." It is simply "poetic erotica" in general in its own cultural context, equally addressing the attraction triggers of both men and women.

I get your point about the ancient Chinese, but are you really suggesting that those types of things were common in every home at that time? In fact, your own citation says: "Depictions of sexual intercourse were not part of the general repertory of ancient Egyptian formal art." It notes that these types of things predominantly existed in temples and among the privileged elite.

Notice it's always more skin (visual)

True, but when actual visuals are unavailable, text can do the job of painting visuals with words just fine.

Men don't go from looking at thighs to looking up a sex story to finish.

But if they never had thighs to look at to begin with ...

You're not really challenging this, are you?

In modern culture, absolutely not. But that's mostly due to female ASD and SMV calculations. If visual porn went more into the back-story of how much money the guy earns, how socially elite he is, and showed off clear displays of wit and charm rather than jumping straight into crude advances ... I'd suppose you'd see about as much female interest in that kind of stuff as the Twilight movies brought in even in light of the books.

The porn industry just doesn't believe there's enough of a market for it among women - and ASD probably assures they're right.

What is the problem with porn?

1 upvotes · 4 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

You certainly raise some interesting points - ones worth considering.

Song of Solomon is female porn.

In ancient times it would have been porn to anyone.

When is the last time we heard any preaching against women lusting after SoS? Never, of course.

That's because I'm skeptical of it ever happening. I've certainly never heard of it happening. I'm also of the impression that women weren't taught to read until during or after the medieval period (i.e. 500s AD), so throughout virtually all of Jewish and early Christian history common women couldn't have read Song of Solomon anyway (upper-class women possibly being an exception). Accordingly, it would be incredibly shocking to see in a historical record an epidemic of women rubbing themselves to Song of Solomon when they simply didn't even have that option available to them in the first place.

Scripture yet also erotic to certain groups of people

I'm not following. It was erotic to boys too. So if by "certain groups of people" you mean "pretty much everyone back then," then sure. Your premise seems to be that text is erotic to women and visuals are erotic to men. But that's based on you being in a world where visual erotica is openly available. In movies and media there's an occasional joke about young Amish boys looking at a picture of a woman's ankles as if it's naughty porn. Take culture back thousands of years before even the Amish and I'm sure you can see how text would have been the epitome of pornography to men in a pre-pictures world.

Even if a Scripture is "useless" (COUGH NUMBERS COF COF) it still serves as history.

Nah, Numbers is a great book. It shows the value God places on generational ministry. It gives us a clear picture of the type of spiritual generations we should be producing today - something that's often forgotten because *some people assume that the book of Numbers has no modern value beyond history*. Going in with that assumption causes people to miss how the content relates to a post-Gospel world.

So, what use is SoS then? Or rather, what did God intend for SoS to be? Why is SoS Scripture?

These are all great questions. This is what intrigues me most about your comment here. My historical answer has been that physical relationships between men and women are meant to foreshadow and parallel the type of relationship that God wanted to have with his bride. Men are highly sexually spontaneous and women are pretty much only sexually responsive. Similarly, we see the church being fairly uninterested in spiritual reproductive acts until God initiates with us, compelling us toward it, although he is spontaneous and desires spiritual reproduction constantly. Song of Solomon gives a more picturesque idea of what this parallel looks like, spelling it out far more clearly than other types of books do. Without it, the church would be devoid of its ability to appreciate physical sexuality - but even more important, it would fail to understand its imperative toward spiritual reproduction and the balance of God's role as our groom and our role as his bride in that process and the types of feelings and behaviors we should experience on our mission to make disciples.

What if tomorrow, someone is to find a video version of Songs of Solomon? In full 1080p/4k resolution of Solomon banging women?

Well, let's be clear that Song of Songs is mostly the build-up to their sexuality. I don't recall any verses saying, "And then he thrust in, and then out, and then in again, and then he made his O-face." Do they even get naked in the book? It's been a while since I've read it, let alone in the context of looking for specific sex acts happening rather than just being talked about.

What if God made SoS Scripture precisely to titillate?

I do believe he did. I think he wanted to spark people's libidos in a way that leaves them thinking, "I want to find someone to do that with!" I don't think he intended people to utilize it as porn, masturbating to satisfaction so that they never have the compulsion to find anyone else because that book is all they'll ever need. That's not to say people haven't used it that way - only that it's probably very rare and the only reports I've heard of people using it that way have been men, not women.

the OT doesn't condemn the acquiring of multiple wives, or concubines, yet always condemns promiscuous women

This is a fair point, which I've addressed at length in other threads on this sub. I usually run against the grain on biblical conclusions of polygamy, though I certainly see arguments both ways. Perhaps the best arguments I've seen are: (1) that Christ has one bride, the Church, and to allow multiple brides would break the imagery; and (2) that although there is no direct condemnation of polygamy and having concubines, virtually every example of a person doing it in the Old Testament results in some negative repercussion (Jacob being a rare exception, and even he had some life complications because of it). As to that second point, one could easily argue that Scripture wasn't written to appease the women in this regard; rather, it is trying to appease the men who would have revolted against Scripture if God had forbid them from their polygamous ways. Of course, I don't believe God is trying to appease anyone in the way Scripture was written other than himself, so that's more just a point of argument against people who think the Scriptures are only gynocentric.

the "but your wife!" part is added in. The Bible doesn't say "no lust for any woman but your wife!", the Bible says "no lust for any woman" (Matthew 5:28)

That's a pretty shallow look at the passage. Jesus doesn't say "no lust for any woman" either. He says that anyone who looks at a woman lustfully has committed adultery with her in his heart. Many of the early church fathers certainly did take the view that it was sinful even to look lustfully at one's own wife - a ridiculous point which [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) has addressed more thoroughly before. But the notion of committing adultery against one's wife with one's wife is ... illogical. The only rational interpretation is that if you're lusting after your own wife, it's not actually adultery.

We have seen the examples of the Jews, their typical gynocentric reaction is to forbid MEN from reading female porn.

Again, in those days it was porn to both genders, not just women. The men were the ones forbidden from reading it explicitly because the women didn't have the ability to read it at all.

Gender roles from an Orthodox perspective

1 upvotes · 2 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is everything I hoped it would be and more. OP, read carefully to gain better insights on how to flesh out blue pill talk from red. Nobody - not even me - is better at this than Whitified.

And the bit about *sola scriptura* - so true, yet I never noticed it. For centuries - millennia even - the church held and applied clear teaching on authority structures in a marriage, yet somehow this tradition doesn't matter. Only the traditions that don't offend women, like idolizing Mary and praying to her, are preserved.

You should post that bit as a question on [r/TrueChristian](#) and see what the Cathodox say in response.

Gender roles from an Orthodox perspective

1 upvotes · 1 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Yes, it's all of that. Husband/wife = Christ/church. A close example would be Jesus with his 12. But even this isn't quite right because they aren't his church yet. They weren't married. He was only preparing them to be his bride - which still gives great insight.

A better example would be to read the book of Acts and discern what God did from what the apostles did, as well as the motives in why certain things happened. For example, did God delegate authority to them in a particular passage? Or were they following the commission Jesus gave them? Or were they responding to the compulsion of the Spirit within them?

When you can rightly divide (without modern assumptions) the role of God from the role of the apostles in the book of Acts, that's when you'll have a complete understanding of what biblical marriage should look like - and that's not a task I have finished myself. I'm only a year into that study. But the apostles are the best representation we have of what Christ intended for the church to look like because the rest of the early church was constantly being rebuked for sin and the apostles had to keep saying, "Look at what we're doing and be like us."

When reading the epistles we have to take a slightly different approach. In that specific context the apostles were then functioning as the Christ figure to the church, much like Moses to Aaron in Exodus 4. Although this can be helpful, it doesn't make sense to look at the apostle/church relationship as a model with the apostles standing in the place of Christ when we already have pragmatic evidence of Jesus's life directly as well as the academic-theological statements of the apostles in the epistles about Jesus and his relationship with the church.

But at this point I feel like I'm now making the conversation more confusing than it is ripe for right now. So, I'll cut myself off there. I'll simply refrain that Acts is the key. It shows the pragmatic relationship between Christ and the people he commissioned to be his Church, which the apostles refer to as the "first fruits" of the church. The Gospels show the dating and engagement structures and the epistles are akin to reading academic papers that reference marriage in passing but are really about something else entirely. Ephesians 5 sounds really cool, for example ... but what does it actually look like in practice? That's what really matters.

Acts is the real deal in action modeled for all to see. It's beautiful and I want nothing more than to be that kind of bride to Christ and that kind of Christ to my bride.

Gender roles from an Orthodox perspective

1 upvotes · 1 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

He still emphasizes the roles within this framework.

Emphasize is a strong word. He mentions it. The underlying tone of the entire article is: "I want to show that the Bible isn't anti-women, but I don't want to contradict what the Bible says either, so I'll try to write a piece that highlights the power, authority, and equality of women as much as possible without compromising the black-and-white stuff in the Bible that I simply can't get out of."

It seems that there is some distinction between the hierarchy and the mutual submission to one another here.

Your question in the original post assumed that husbands should submit to their wives also, and you asked how to do that. The passage says the opposite: that submission in a marriage context is unilateral. It's not saying hierarchical structures should be broken.

I see the complete opposite really.

You're welcome to that :) Black looking at gray sees that it's too white for him. White looking at the same shade of gray sees that it's too black for him. If you're coming from a predominantly blue frame of reference, I can see how this would have the appearance of "red" - because the tid bits about authority structures in marriage are shocking to the deep blue culture we have. But I think if you were standing at a red vantage point in your own mind you'd see what I'm talking about a lot more clearly.

are men to lead in a tyrannical way?

Of course not. In that exact passage Paul explains how husbands should lead their wives.

how are we to lead if mutual submission is not our ideal?

The exact same way Christ leads the church. Mutual submission is not a part of it. Christ does not submit to the church's authority on anything. But he does love us with incredible grace, mercy, justice, discipline, wisdom, etc. all the same.

Would it be as Christ died for the Church, or?

That'd be part of it, yes. But that's only one bit of it. In love, Christ also disciplines us (Hebrews 12:6). God is love, yet he also lets people experience the natural consequences of their rebellion, even if it means leaving him (Romans 1:18 et seq., 2 Timothy 2:12, Matthew 10:33), among many, many other things.

Positive Aspects of Red Pill Compared to Bible

1 upvotes · 1 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is an overall excellent post and I'm shocked at how few comments there are here. That said, everything you have written about actually is already addressed on the side-bar content of this sub.

- Dread: 107 directly and several other places implicitly
- Lifting: 101, and 203 directly, and numerous other places implicitly
- Tests: 207 directly and it comes up in most askRPC-type threads
- Finances: 204 addresses it directly
- Sex: At least half of the posts on this sub and most of the sidebar addresses it directly

I do like that you're addressing things from more of an imperative perspective than pragmatic (not to say you're not being pragmatic). That is, my post on finances and the abundance mentality is directed at *how to* develop abundance, not necessarily an imperative on how we should use our abundance once we have it. The Bible has a lot to say on those things, which has been addressed *ad nauseam* in other Christian sectors, but it is genuinely difficult to filter out the vast numbers of opinions on the matter and which ones are right and wrong and the implications of being red pillled in how we apply those concepts. So, I appreciate the push here very much :)

Positive Aspects of Red Pill Compared to Bible

1 upvotes · 1 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Solid reply. As to your last paragraph, I wrote a post a few months back on the concept that **There is no "Christian Version" of anything**. The premise is simply that if God is the source material, all secular things - including secular RP - are just rip-offs of what God originally designed and intended. As such, secular RP didn't come up with this stuff. God did. They're just trying to understand what he did on their own while refusing to use the text-book he gave explaining it all.

As such, and more to OP (Tag: /u/capt_cj1), the goal of this sub is not to Christianize the secular RP concepts; it is to de-secularize what MRP and TRP have gleaned from the order of creation that God had set in place from the get-go.

Gender roles from an Orthodox perspective

1 upvotes · 1 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

To run through a few things off the top of my head, what I see is that in each section he's trying to minimize the differences and elevate the status of women in the face of passages that clearly imply the opposite:

- 1 Cor. 11:3-16 he talks about Christ and God being equal in power, therefore women must be equal in power to men, despite whatever technicality of roles there may be.
- 1 Cor. 14:26-40 he starts his explanation, "On first glance, it seems like Paul is forbidding women to speak publicly in church ... " and then plays the "but he didn't really mean what he said" game.
- Ephesians 5:18-33 he mistakenly drops the context of chapter 4 and 5:1-17 and treats the "submit to one another" as a command to husbands and wives also, as if the wife does have some right to demand that her husband submit to her, which only creates confusion and not clarity, as the question in your original post proves.
- 1 Timothy 2:8-15 he tries to create a work-around for the "Let a woman learn quietly with all submissiveness. I do not permit a woman to teach or to exercise authority over a man" part.

Literally all of his explanations except the Galatians section are oriented toward enhancing the authority of women in the church and in marriages from what was expressed when Paul wrote those passages. I'm not sure how you can call that anything other than blue.

You try to argue it's "red" simply because it has a conclusion about the leader/helper dynamic at the end, but even the most blue of all blue pillled complementarian pastors and preachers will say the same thing. That does not make it red, or else you'd have to start arguing that John Piper is red - and I'd love to see you make that assertion to /u/Whitified (yes, I'm intentionally calling you into this conversation).

it still is ambiguous to me how a man and women are to both mutually submit to one another while still keeping the structure in place from your response.

My whole point is that the mutual submission clause does not apply in marriage - that Paul intentionally exempts

marriage from the implication of 5:21.

As I noted toward the end of my comment (I did make some edits, so maybe you read it before the final edit), when Paul references the "church" he is usually talking to men. When he's writing his letters, without a specific address, the context is clear that he's talking to the men of the church on the assumption that they will receive the letters directly and communicate to their wives what he said. This is obvious by the way he talks broadly of circumcision, the gender pronouns he uses, when considering the consistency of his theology between his general statements and his statements about gender roles, etc. There is no evidence that the general portions of his letters were intended to be received by women the same way as men - and this is even made clear by the way he sometimes even says, "And tell the women ..." or "Help the women ..."

To that end, chapter 4 and 5:1-21 are not an address for men to submit to their sisters in the faith. It is for the men to submit to one another. You'd be really hard-pressed to find evidence in the passages himself that Paul was trying to include women in the mutual submission descriptor of being "filled with the Spirit."

Moreover, Paul's other writings address this concept quite clearly: that there are times that people must submit to the hierarchical authority of the church. Imagine if a pastor is disciplining one of his congregants and that congregant invokes Ephesians 5:21 and says, "You must mutually submit to me too! So, you command me to repent for what you think I did wrong, but I'm now commanding you to repent for what I think you did wrong." Who submits to who here?

Paul isn't trying to abrogate authority structures. The "submitting to one another" is like saying that an elder submit to a pastor, and a deacon to an elder, and a congregant to a deacon. It also implies that when people are on an equal authority level that we must submit to one another mutually. But nowhere do we see in the text an implication that these authority structures are to be ignored or abolished when Paul himself was partially responsible for setting them up in the first place.

The fact that one inherently assumes that women are included in the mutual submission language without deriving that conclusion from the text itself is a demonstration of the blue-pilled preconditioning inherent in the way we approach Scriptural interpretation. I do it too, so I'm not saying you're at fault. But I often find when I take a closer look that my culturally-conditioned preconceived notions about what I thought were implicit in a passage were actually wrong.

Men with high testosterone, less likely to be in church

1 upvotes · 1 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

My thoughts exactly. The closest we ever got was Driscoll's church - and even that had several problems while in its prime. But you did see a much larger following of machismo type men.

Gender roles from an Orthodox perspective

1 upvotes · 1 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Once again, I am unimpressed by the alleged Orthodox interpretations. This is blueish-purple, at best, with maybe a miniscule dot of red mixed in there. I would love to get /u/Whitified's feedback, as this article pretty much exemplifies everything that complementarians stand for - "Yes, there might be some technical authority structure here, but God really meant to equalize men in women as much as possible. All that stuff about head coverings and not talking in church and what not ... that doesn't really count. Let's focus on the equality part and just pay lip service to the authority stuff."

A lot of what he says is *legitimate* in the sense that it is possible to reach that conclusion and no one can definitively prove him wrong; but with the evidence available, many of his conclusions are significantly less likely than the alternative, which is that the author actually meant what he said.

It reminds me of a great Simpsons episode where Marge is being wooed by a literary professor. She reads a note

from Homer saying, "I love you." The literary professor takes the note and says, "Do you see how offensive this is? 'I' is the subject of the sentence, meaning he thinks of himself as the central actor. 'You' is the object, meaning you are nothing more than an object to him. Do you want to be with someone who thinks only of himself and considers you nothing more than a mere object?" That's obviously an extreme example, but it is certainly *a way* to interpret a sentence like that and there's no way to definitively prove that the author didn't actually mean what the professor is saying. But context shows us that it is incredibly unlikely that this is the actual conclusion.

All of that aside, to address the Ephesians 5 issue you honed in on (as I don't have time to cover the rest), he references in passing that we must all "submit to one another," but he mistakenly lumps this in with 22-33, as if it's part of the same mesh of thought. It's not.

Ephesians 5 is not in a vacuum by itself. Chapter 4 precedes it, which talks about creating unity among the whole body of believers. 4:32 uses the same "one another" language as 5:21 when it says, "Be kind to one another, tenderhearted, forgiving one another." He then says, "Therefore," in 5:1 to connect the two sections, suggesting he is still talking to the entire body of believers. 5:1-21 is then riddled with conjunctives to show the connectivity in everything he is saying to the previous content.

At no point in 5:1-21 does he reference husbands and wives specifically. The phrase, "submitting to one another out of reverence for Christ" is not its own sentence, as the NIV implies. This is clear from the fact that the Greek *upotassomenoi* (sometimes *hypotassomenoi*) is in the participle conjugation and not the verb conjugation. As a verb, "submit" would appear to be a command. As a participle, "submitting" is a descriptor about how one is to be filled with the Spirit - and it follows a series of other descriptors, also in the participle form: "addressing ... singing ... giving ... submitting."

The importance here is not to deny that this is a command. Even as a participle, we can assume that we must live up to the description of how we are to be filled with the Spirit. The point is to demonstrate that it is part of a series of other participles directed toward all believers - that this phrase does not stand on its own. Of course, it would be nice if the Greek actually used periods and capital letters to make our job of discerning all this much easier; but since we don't do that, we *MUST* use patterns in the text to clarify where thoughts are connected and where they stop. This is as clear a pattern as I've ever seen one.

Immediately after that, without any conjunctive (as was very common in the preceding section), Paul simply changes gears in a grammatically jarring manner. This is to show that he is starting a new thought that was provoked by something he had just said. "addressing ... singing ... giving ... submitting to one another out of reverence for Christ. <Stop, no conjunctive> Wives, submit to your own husbands."

The context here is clearly to prove the opposite of what your article proposes. It is not that wives and husbands must submit to one another. It is more likely Paul is saying, "Submit to one another within the body of Christ ... but let me be clear, I'm not changing the authority structure in marriage that I've already written a lot about elsewhere." The contrast is intentional. "Submit to one another. <Stop> But wives, don't get any crazy ideas here, For the husband is still your head, just as Christ is his head, just like I said to the Corinthians in 1 Cor. 11:3."

To that end, the totality of Paul's writings demonstrates a clear intention and understanding that the Church was referenced by the men who God meant to run it. When he sets up the authority structure in 1 Cor. 11:3, it goes God is the head of Christ is the head of man is the head of woman. Given the rest of 1 Cor. 11:3-16, 1 Cor. 14, 1 Timothy 2, and other such passages, we can assume that "Christ is the head of man" is parallel with "Christ is the head of the church," which is exactly what Ephesians 5:23 says. In fact, 5:23-24 itself makes this obvious by setting that clear contrast: "For the husband is the head of the wife even as Christ is the head of the church [man] ... Now as the church [man] submits to Christ, so also wives should submit in everything to their husbands." This is so parallel to 1 Cor. 11:3 and consistent with all of Paul's writings on church headship that I'm not sure how

anyone could miss it.

To read these two phrases in 5:21 and 5:22 as flowing into each other and not as a contrast to one another is boggling to me. It shows a preconditioned blue-pill mentality combined with an ignorance of Greek grammar and a failure to connect Paul's writings to one another, as your article treats each passage separately and not collectively.

Show me where Christ has ever submitted to the authority of the Church and I will be happy to reconsider my interpretation ;)

What is the problem with porn?

1 upvotes · 1 June 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I have no clue why this was down-voted. Per my comment, I'm in agreement with you that pornography is defined by the heart-orientation of the observer, not the object itself. Romans 14:14 makes this abundantly clear.

Phil's May Update

1 upvotes · 29 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

There's a world of difference between "I want nothing to do with her ever again" and "I really wish she'd call me but I know it'll never happen."

#MeToo church edition: Major Evangelical leader, Paige Patterson "removed" as Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary President

1 upvotes · 29 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

True.

Phil's May Update

1 upvotes · 29 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That's not ghosting. Ghosting = no contact at all.

Phil's May Update

1 upvotes · 29 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I made a comment on this recently in [r/TrueChristian](#), which was received very well. [Here it is](#). The answer of curing ONEitis is not to ghost her and try to move in. That will only leave a lingering fantasy in your head of what "could have been." I had strong ONEitis in high school that I never acted on - and to this day I still can't quash the gooey feeling of how great things might have been if I had gotten together with her. It's obviously something I can easily control now, but my point is that ghosting her isn't the answer.

Phil's May Update

1 upvotes · 29 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Everything becomes dull when you have a new obsession. Kill the obsession and you'll kill the dullness as well. Other things can have meaning again.

Mindset towards those who are not chaste

1 upvotes · 25 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Take your upvote.

Advice. Legal next moves. Etc.

1 upvotes · 23 May 2018 · /r/askMRP

Possible ... extremely unlikely. I've had it happen, but it usually only ends up being a fraction of the bill, unless you can prove malfeasance.

Advice. Legal next moves. Etc.

1 upvotes · 22 May 2018 · /r/askMRP

Pro se litigants always want to do this. You can file anything. You can file the New York telephone directory in California if you want. But filing a statement in advance is a horrible idea and makes you look like an ignorant noob. Don't do that. Plus it tips off the other side about all your arguments without you knowing hers.

Advice. Legal next moves. Etc.

1 upvotes · 22 May 2018 · /r/askMRP

No ... don't appear at all. Let her get a default judgment. /s Seriously? What kind of question is that?

Advice. Legal next moves. Etc.

1 upvotes · 22 May 2018 · /r/askMRP

Among other things. Look up your state statute regarding best interests of a minor child and just hammer the factors one by one. That statue is your cheat sheet. Take advantage of it.

Advice. Legal next moves. Etc.

1 upvotes · 22 May 2018 · /r/askMRP

Rehab is a magic word to a judge. You say that and your past troubles just vanish.

Advice. Legal next moves. Etc.

1 upvotes · 22 May 2018 · /r/askMRP

How do any of her supposed arguments affect the child? They don't. It's that simple. This isn't a case about arguing parental fitness. It's about best interests of the child. So her allegations about you aren't worth the porcelain bowl she's sipping her soup from.

What is the Greek word for “submit” or “submission” in Ephesians 5?

1 upvotes · 22 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Oh, there are countless other options.

What is the Greek word for “submit” or “submission” in Ephesians 5?

1 upvotes · 22 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Some women need that instruction. Of course, to be fair ... some men do too :p

Is RP it's own hermeneutic?

1 upvotes · 20 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

In a perfect world, we would interpret Scripture in a vacuum - considering only rote facts to ascertain what God intended to communicate through an author. Or more specifically, if the author's intentions in his writings were inspired by God, then we would be able to have an objective stance on how to discern the author's intentions by the words he wrote on the page, illuminated by peripheral knowledge about the historical context, culture, archaeology, etc.

This isn't a perfect world, though. I used to fight this assertion tooth-and-nail, but I have finally given up and

readily embrace the fact that **we all approach the Bible through our own perceptive lenses.**

This isn't a bad thing. God has given us different perspectives for a reason. One who is gifted at healing or prophecy or tongues will need to have an eye for the work of the Spirit in Scripture in order to hone his craft. Another who is gifted at teaching, wisdom, and discernment must have the ability to ascertain from an academic standpoint the finer things of word selection, grammar, cross-referencing and history. One who is gifted at hospitality, mercy, and helping must be able to find in Scripture the things that will make them more gracious and receiving of those in their lives who are in need. These are all different lenses through which we read and interpret Scripture. None of them are wrong; they simply focus and filter what we read to help us find that which is most advantageous and beneficial to our immediate calling by God.

What is very dangerous is when we assume that all other people must view Scripture through the same lens that we do, or otherwise that we deny the validity in other lenses. It is true that there are some very bad and harmful lenses. Interpreting Scripture through an atheist lens, for example, would certainly lead to many false conclusions. However, that does not mean there is no value in understanding how an atheist would read a passage.

To that end, I encourage everyone to read Scripture through an RP lens - but that this not be the only lens through which we read, interpret, and apply Scripture. Rather, meditating on God's Word involves a more complete approach in attempting to view it from every angle. Anyone who specifically rejects a particular lens is closing off a potential source of information that could be helpful.

[FR] STFU, just STFU

1 upvotes · 15 May 2018 · /r/askMRP

Feel free. No need to credit.

Help me analyze this situation. Am I being a dick?

1 upvotes · 14 May 2018 · /r/askTRP

Why do you care if you're coming off as a jerk or not?

To Marry or Not To Marry?

1 upvotes · 11 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I'm sorry to hear about your loved one. There's obviously a lot I could say in reply, but even with anything I might otherwise say you've gone a long way in helping me understand this viewpoint, if not actually persuading me a bit. Thanks for that :)

Regulating Sexual Desire

1 upvotes · 9 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

If someone has determined that their sex drive and thus sexual temptation is too strong then they should marry (per v8-9)

See the end portion of my other comment. I'll try to keep things consolidated over there :p

I agree that this is optimal. Real life is not optimal.

But that's also why those in the church are called to be set apart - to do things differently from the way the culture/world would have us do it. What you're saying implies that my model, which we both agree is biblically optimal, won't work - that God will somehow fail to be faithful if people follow the biblically optimal path, and therefore people will end up committing more sexual sin by devoting themselves to God rather than making an active search for a spouse. I'm guessing this isn't what you actually meant, but that's the only way I can see to

interpret this comment without further explanation.

The terrible divorce statistics in the Church.

Which is easily attributed to the fact that the church (1) compels people toward marriage and (2) urges them to get married quickly if they're going to start having sex soon. Both of my assumptions are met. And it's made even worse when we consider the large majority of people who self-identify as Christians who can't even articulate the Gospel or any way that Jesus has changed their lives (see [this comment](#) for a detailed statistical break-down of what I'm talking about).

Come on. If that's the case, how can we ever know anything with any degree of certainty then?

On the topic of marriage and sex, a couple can know with great certainty whether or not they're going to fornicate before marriage if they don't set a wedding date.

I'm not sure how the church/college/job/etc. line of questions relates at all ... maybe explain that a bit more if I'm missing something.

To Marry or Not To Marry?

1 upvotes · 9 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

It was prompted by a conversation I've been having with [/u/Deep_Strength](#) as well as a past conversation I had with [/u/redpillwonder](#) - both of whom seem to think it's perfectly fine for a Christian to date women with the intention of finding someone to marry.

They are both very well-reasoned and articulate when I have had this conversation, but most of the conversation has been either philosophical or explaining away passages that contradict their philosophical premise. I'm now wanting to see if there is an underlying theological basis to support this view in the first place. And I know there are several others here who share their view, so I want to open the conversation to all.

Regulating Sexual Desire

1 upvotes · 9 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

There's no way it does not refer to the sex drive.

I understand much better what you're saying, but I think "sex drive" is the wrong term. You mean the degree of horniness in a given moment - and if that's what you meant, then I may agree. "Sex drive" generally refers to long-term patterns of a person's sexuality, which the passage is clearly not referencing, as even an LL might in any given moment want sex more than her HL spouse who would then deny her.

The sex drive is the reason for temptation when the other spouse deprives them.

I would re-word this as "short-term horniness." A person with a high sex-drive has short-term horniness frequently. But even people with a low sex drive may have it and be tempted into sin, which is why the long-term patterns of a person's libido don't seem to be present in this passage to me. It applies regardless of whether it's from the HL or the LL.

couples don't have that gift

This is the crux of the whole thing. You seem to be assuming that anyone who struggles with porn or premarital sex must automatically "not have that gift." I suggest that many people struggle with these things not because they lack the gift of celibacy, but because they are psychologically conditioned by a culture to ignore their God-given

gifts in exchange for the things culture tells them they should want instead.

each man knowing his own sex drive and sexual temptations needs to determine if he can stay single for God or if he needs to marry

I agree here. But the prerequisite to this position is that a man must first have his own body under control. Otherwise he's letting his sinfulness define what he believes God's will is, which is dangerous.

If he needs to marry, start cultivating the roles and responsibilities of a husband sooner rather than later.

Agreed again. But I'll note that this doesn't mean hopping on dating sites or going to a church singles group to find a spouse. It's a matter of deciding if we should pursue God and accept what he gives us along the way, whether that involves a spouse or not ... or if we should be distracted from our pursuit of God in order to spend time finding someone who will be a life-long distraction of our pursuit of God because we don't believe God would bring us alongside such a person if we just made him our sole focus in the first place. To me that's a no-brainer.

I suppose the only point on your recap where we differ is rooted in your contention that a person can know their own sexual proclivity with a hypothetical spouse. I believe one must know who that hypothetical person is (therefore making it a non-hypothetical) before one can make that determination.

To clarify what I mean, as this is a slight change of gears from what we were discussing before: suppose a man has a very, very strong sex-drive. He can't stop looking at porn. He fantasizes over women he sees on the street. He decides he must be one of the ones to get married. But there are no women who he stands a chance with who make him horny - it's just the porn stars on the computer and the non-Christians who act all slutty walking around. He goes on dates, even with attractive women, but never has that "click" with any of them, even after dozens of dates. He still only gets horny for the porn star and sluts, who he could obviously never marry. Are you suggesting that such a man should marry one of these dozens of other women who don't make him horny, even though he has no temptation to have sex with them? And what kind of marriage would that produce - a fruitful, productive one that alleviates his sin, or a damaging one that makes him resentful and pushes him back to porn to get himself off? Or what if he marries someone who made him horny once, but shortly after the marriage she becomes fat and he loses all attraction and he thinks to himself, "If I'd known marriage would be like this, I would have remained celibate!"?

Or what about the man who has an incredibly low sex drive, has never struggled with porn, and has generally been uninterested in women all his life ... but one particular girl comes along in his late-30s and is just driving him up the wall with how horny he gets for her, and she can barely keep her hands off him too, but they both know it's just New Relationship Excitement and will assuredly fade in time ... what should he do?

Do you see how "sex drive" is a terrible indicator as to whether or not people should get married or start looking for a spouse? There are so many situations where people will mistakenly conclude, "I'm a high-libido, so God must want me to get married" and this mentality leads them into a lot of trouble ... unless they say immediately after, "So I'll just pursue God and hope that he'll either address my libido or bring someone alongside me with whom I can express it."

Regulating Sexual Desire

1 upvotes · 9 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I assume you are talking about Matthew 19

Correct.

Once men gain it, they can decide for themselves if they still want to marry or if it is controllable and the

mission is so important that they will stay continent.

Cross-reference this with 1 Cor. 7:37-38 - "But whoever is firmly established in his heart, being under no necessity but having his desire under control, and has determined this in his heart, to keep her as his betrothed, he will do well. So then he who marries his betrothed does well, and he who refrains from marriage will do even better."

A few points from this: (1) this passage is referencing men who are already engaged to be married, leaving the implication in Paul's mind: "If you're not engaged, why would you even be seeking in the first place?" This implication is actually directly stated in v 7, 8, 23-24, 26, 28, 33, 35, 40. (2) It also assumes that a man should make this decision as one who is sober-minded, as the one who is getting married because he cannot control his passion would be in violation of the principles of v23 that we should not enslave ourselves to others (as 25-35 implies is Paul's view of marriage, as it forces people to adopt the concerns of their spouse) and the principle of v32, which implies that we should be free of anxieties that compel certain behaviors. To that end, I refrain that a man should learn to control his passions before getting married, if it is an isolated passion (if it's a mutual passion that's different). (3) It says quite plainly that it's better not to marry. I'm not sure why we should encourage people to be seeking a spouse from scratch rather than encouraging them toward what Scripture says is the better option altogether. As Paul notes in verse 6, his statement about it being okay to marry in order to avoid premarital sex is made as a concession and not a command.

I can't see how we, in good faith, can encourage people to act on their desire because Paul conceded that there is a legitimate loop hole to his otherwise obvious advice against marriage.

marriage doesn't usually 'just happen' for most

You're absolutely right. But you're also describing a cultural imperative and adopting it as if it were God-ordained. It's not. Culture also says we should make lots and lots of money - that money should be a primary pursuit in life. It tells us that "making money doesn't usually 'just happen' for most" - that we must work hard and set goals and etc. etc. in order to fulfill all of our monetary dreams. But we know that this idolatrous attitude is sinful, despite the fact that there's a cultural imperative toward it and that it takes work and effort to get it done.

In the same way, you're saying that people have to work hard to find a spouse, and therefore this must be what God wants. That doesn't make much sense to me.

My model says that people shouldn't look to finding a spouse at all - that they should live in "undivided devotion to the Lord" (v35) until such time as their devotion to God puts them in a situation where marriage is the biblical next step (and if done rightly, one that is passionately desired as well). I simply cannot fathom how anyone could argue that there is any other better option than this.

Those who go into marriage without much preparation the Scripture's roles and responsibilities for tend not to do as well

What is this broad statistic based on? Almost certainly people who were (1) actively looking for a spouse, and (2) rushed into it due to sexuality. This is the exact opposite of what I'm proposing, as I'm suggesting people (1) avoid actively looking for a spouse, and (2) avoid rushing into anything just to have sex. Of the people I have observed who have followed my model (noting that I didn't come up with this model - I learned it from many older, wiser people than myself), 100% are still together and have never divorced. This is at least 8 or 9 couples (not overly common, but not as uncommon as you might think). The reason they attribute to their successful marriage (including their sexual satisfaction) is that their eyes have always been on God and never on their spouse - and that this orientation inherently assumes people are only getting married when they are spiritually and relationally mature enough to do so and naturally precludes most of the conflicts that other married couples (such as those who just rush in to have sex) would otherwise discover after marriage.

if a man knows that permanent celibacy for Christ is not his calling

How is a man ever to know that with any great certainty? How does he know if he's not gifted with celibacy, but that blue pill cultural conditioning has caused him to idolize marriage and sex anyway?

especially after he has become sexually continent

These are the only groups who I might suggest can pass the test above. To that end, if a man has full control over his sexuality I agree that he can make an informed decision about whether or not a lifetime of celibacy is part of God's calling over him. One who is enslaved to his own sinfulness is incapable of making such an informed judgment and will confuse his own sinfulness with the assumption that "because I keep sinning this way, it must be God's will for me to get married." We should not allow sin to define God's will for us in that way.

then it would be wise for him to start preparing for the roles and responsibilities of marriage and start to search for a virtuous wife.

Prepare for the role of being a husband, absolutely. But again ... where does the Bible compel a man to an active search for a wife? I see you explaining away passages with philosophical logic and reasoning, but I'm not seeing any biblical imperative toward your conclusion to replace the passages that you're trying so hard to undermine.

Regulating Sexual Desire

1 upvotes · 9 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

You quote the text, but then you don't use it as a reference point for your view. You start leaving the text to make separate assumptions. For example:

why would the husband and wife be depriving each other? Because they had different sex drives

You know just as well as the next guy that there are a million reasons why people deny sex - and different sex drives is only one item on that list. I have the higher sex drive, but there are still times when I've denied my wife's request - not because I don't want it, but because there are other reasons that get in the way. Now, as Paul says, this might have been sinful for me to do if I thought it would lead my wife to be tempted to commit sexual immorality ... but in my particular case I know better.

husband has a higher sex drive about 2/3rds of the time and wife higher about 1/3 of them

That would be truly shocking to me. I'd wager it's more like 95% and 5%, respectively.

If Paul is talking in context, then he's definitely talking about sex drives leading to temptations (as the person with lower sex drive is depriving usually)

First off, you're still referencing married couples, which he addresses in 1-5. Starting with verse 8 he says: "To the unmarried and the widows I say ..." This is a direct, "I'm changing gears" statement. Accordingly, we must interpret his comments to the unmarried in light of his other comments to the unmarried. To that end, your comment doesn't make reference to any of 25-40 (the section directed toward unmarried people) as an interpretive measure on verse 9. Instead, you're trying to interpret what he said to singles (after changing gears) in light of what he said to married couples (before changing gears) - and that just doesn't make any sense to me.

Second, to bring in the matter of "sex drives" as the "definite" reason why Paul tells people not to deprive each other is complete eisegesis. If you want to look to v1-5 for context instead of 25-40, in verse 2 he says plainly that it's "since sexual immorality is occurring" that people should get married. This inherently assumes a mutual sexuality, not a single one. People were having sex outside of marriage. The assumption is that they both wanted

it, as there's no mention of rape. I'm not sure how you make that leap from "stop having sex before you're married, you horny kids" to "only one person wants it and the other doesn't." As noted above, there are dozens of reasons people deprive each other that don't involve unequal sex drives. I'll play the eisegesis card on that claim a million times over. I get the impression that you have a particular conclusion that you want to reach in your head, so you do a cursory reading of the passage, pull out a few concepts that you could use to support your conclusion, and then make your case. In reality, we should be seeking what the Bible says for its own sake, looking to the words themselves as their own source of interpretation, not trying to prove any points. If we do that here, the meaning is much clearer.

Although I'm happy to give all of my notes on word-studies, grammatical tie-ins, cross-references and patterns and all that, for the sake of brevity, here's the section-by-section summary of the chapter that my Bible study ultimately reached:

1. v1-6 - You're quoting anti-sex propaganda, so let me clarify. Sex outside of marriage is bad. If you can't control yourself, sex within marriage is good because it stops you from sinning. Since sex is the main reason to get married, it doesn't make much sense to deny sex and let someone be tempted. But I really wish you could all just stay single in the first place, like me.
2. v8-16 - Singles should stay singles unless they're about to have sex outside of marriage, in which case you should just get married. If you do get married, don't think divorce will let you sleep with anyone else. In fact, just take divorce out of your vocabulary altogether, unless you've got an unbelieving spouse, in which case you're free to let them walk.
3. v17-35 - Whatever your status was when you were saved, that's how you should stay. If you're married, stay married. If you're engaged, get married. If you're single, don't go looking to get married. But even if you are married, you should be living in your commitment to God as if you were single anyway. After all, your devotion to God is what matters and marriage is just a distraction. I want you to live in "undivided devotion to the Lord."
4. v36-40 - That said, if you're around a virgin and your passion is strong, like I just said before, get married so you don't sin. But if you can get control of yourself and avoid marriage, you've done even better. Once you're married, you're bound until death, but you'll be much happier if you stay single.

I'm not sure how anything in this passage encourages people toward marriage just because they privately want to have sex on their own. Moreover, I don't see anything in the NT anywhere, and scant few passages in the OT that compel men to get married or to make marriage a goal/priority in life. Any claim that "God thinks it's good for single men to search among women to find a wife" is pure eisegesis. At best, it's as I say: "If you can't hold yourself back from screwing someone, vet her, make sure she's wife-material, then marry her - and this is a good thing."

Look at online dating, for example. Here we have men who just have a general desire to get married and to have sex, but don't have anyone particular in mind. Where is the biblical basis for their doing so? Because RP and general wisdom/philosophy tells us that this is a horrible idea for men under most current marriage laws. So a man either has to adopt blue pill mentalities or find a biblical basis for seeing the pursuit of marriage as a biblically-compelled endeavor. From my reading of the Bible, there are clear biblical passages that instruct people to avoid marriage if at all possible, but there are no biblical passages that instruct people to go looking from scratch.

Regulating Sexual Desire

1 upvotes · 8 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Thanks for sharing that again. I must not have connected the dots.

I do see where you're coming from in a lot of this. I think I just get hung up when I see distinctions between theological facts and philosophical reasoning. Most people I know don't ever pay attention to this distinction, so we see pastors getting away with preaching pop psychology or feel-good messages, finding a verse or two to support it, and then calling it a message from God. This failure to distinguish between theology and philosophy is at the core of how the feminine imperative infiltrated the church in the first place.

So, when I see a guy who claims to have escaped the feminine imperative and wants a return to "biblical masculinity" - I almost feel a sense of obligation to make sure that this is actually *biblical* and not just taking a philosophical conception of masculinity and using verses to support it.

From there, it should be quite obvious why this notion of "let's all be looking to find a wife" is a hot-button for me. The only direct biblical references to the need to find a wife are in the Old Testament, which was satisfied in Christ. The imperative toward physical marriage and having physical children was a roadmap to point us to the fact that in a post-Gospel world we are to have that same longing for a spiritual marriage to our spiritual groom and to have spiritual children through our union with Him by His Spirit entering and indwelling within us. To that end, the imperative toward marriage died with Jesus and the imperative toward spiritual marriage and child-rearing rose with him.

This is why we see both Jesus and Paul saying that people should avoid marriage if they are capable of doing so. But as a practical matter of biology, they also both accept that it's not sinful if a person does get married. I see this not as an urging: "Go find a wife! Search long and wide for the best one you can!" I see this as a concession, "It's better to avoid it at all costs, but if you must then you must. I won't stop you."

From what I can tell, this is the only view that is produced from Scripture and it takes some shaky theology to drudge up a select few proverbs to reach the point of convincing men that even today, post-Gospel, they should be seeking marriage. That, to me, comes off more as a philosophical position that people take to justify their own desires, then using verses to back it up to make it look like theology. It's philosophy covered in a thin layer of theological wrapping paper.

Sure, it could be easier if a man is older, but a man would also have to struggle through the temptation during that time too.

This may be going more to the other comment, but with 100% accuracy among the 30+ men I've discipled, if a man burned with passion while he was single to the point of pornography and masturbation, marriage was never a cure. Those same men still struggled with pornography and masturbation even after marriage. Sure, they had a legitimate outlet to express this, but it did not solve the problem.

So, I have for a long time now been advising men to figure this out before even contemplating getting married so that they don't bring that mess into the marriage with them. Once they are married, it will become almost impossible for them to find true peace in the situation because at a biological level their bodies cannot distinguish between sex with their wife or masturbation, so the internal addiction remains without any way of knowing if it has been conquered, other than through a long-term dead bedroom, which I would never wish on anyone.

Or to put it another way, it's easy to say, "As long as he's not looking at porn and is only engaging in sexual conduct with his wife, what does it matter?" But we know that sin originates in the heart and not in the actions alone (if at all). So, how do we know whether he's expressing a healthy desire for his wife through his sexuality or if he's feeding his addiction and using her as an object? Some people argue that this is only an academic distinction - that as long as his actions are right, it doesn't matter where his heart may or may not be. I don't find that biblical. But at this point I'm probably derailing the conversation too much.

You know what I mean. A job is also a mission field. Poor wording.

The job for the job's own sake, no. But the fact that our jobs expose us to new people who need to hear the good

news of Christ, absolutely :)

The traditional interpretation seems to support the fact that "to burn" is probably "sex drive" that is inspiring the temptation so it is wise to get married to avoid continual temptation.

I would love to see some exegesis that reaches this conclusion. I've studied a lot and have not found one. I see commentaries that say as you do - but again, they're only people who are musing on what the passage makes them think. I have not seen exegetical support for that conclusion from any commentary, blog post, sermon, etc. I've been through on the topic. That is highly concerning to me.

I don't buy what ifs.

Fair enough. But you can't then say, "Look at how my situation is wonderful" when you're not willing to entertain the possibility that something even more wonderful could have been around the corner. Or to put it another way: you can't tell men to use your life as a model of how things should be unless you're willing to rule out alternative models of doing things as lesser than how you did things. If you're not willing to deal with "what ifs," then the best you can say is, "I don't know if my way was the best way or not, but I'm happy with the results." To suggest anymore is to make a definitive statement that the "what if" scenario is ruled out as somehow being lesser than what you did - but if you're not dealing with the what-ifs, you can't rule it out, thus you can't make that claim.

That opens the door for temptation toward divorce/adultery and 'soulmate' theatrics which we see play out throughout the culture

I agree that it can be taken that way, but that wasn't my intent at all.

I hope you see that this is an enjoyable conversation for me and not me arguing just for the sake of arguing. You're one of the few who actually forces me to think more critically about my thoughts, and I may not word myself the best all the time, I have been contemplating your words deeply and seriously since I first read them yesterday (I wanted to sleep on it before responding). Thank you for being diligent in this, even if we ultimately do not see eye to eye.

Regulating Sexual Desire

1 upvotes · 8 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Here's how I see it:

- The verse speaks in the plural
- Nowhere else in the passage is Paul referencing masturbation
- The context is Paul leading people away from treating marriage as an idol, so I can't imagine he's saying, "If you have a really strong desire to be married, then go be married" - it's obviously sexual in nature.
- All his other references to sexuality in this passage are between a man and a woman.
- Most importantly, the entire second half of the chapter (25-40) is him going back and explaining what he meant in 9 by addressing the specific situation of the unmarried people, and everything in this passage is talking about two people in relationship with one another - not isolated people who are struggling with lust.

I feel like any other interpretation involving "solo-passion" is eisegetically imputing this thought while ignoring the context of 25-40. It's possible when Paul wrote 25-40 that he thought to himself, "I'm talking about something different now, this part shouldn't have any bearing on what I just wrote a few sentences back" ... but I seriously doubt it. All of Paul's other writings have a clear flow. So to assume he is abandoning his traditional pattern of

writing to put in a one-off verse that should be interpreted outside the context of everything else he's saying ... that just seems off to me.

I'm not saying it's impossible that Paul meant what you're saying ... just that it seems incredibly unlikely. As much as Chrysostom has a few good quotes every now and then, from what I've read of him, he is more of a spiritual philosopher than a theologian. His ideas are often his own, inspired by Scripture and not actually an interpretation of Scripture itself. This is how it was for most of the early fathers that I've read - they get their hands on one passage, but instead of studying they passage they just start writing everything that the verse makes them think about. That's dangerous and it's certainly not theology, although I admit it often leads to some pretty beautiful sounding quotes.

Regulating Sexual Desire

1 upvotes · 8 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I've done a ton of writing here on the importance of having a mission and what it should be. Most of it is on the sidebar. I also heavily advise all people to listen to "Born to Reproduce" - a talk by Dawson Trotman from several decades ago that still rings true today. It can be found [here](#) as the top talk on the front page. His talk "The Need of the Hour" is equally potent. Both messages are about having a mission and following through.

What parts of "Game" should a RP Christian utilize? Which ones should we not utilize?

1 upvotes · 7 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I don't see how that theology changes those requirements. It only applies to non virgins, so if you're only looking for a virgin it shouldn't matter.

How does a RPC deal with hookup culture?

1 upvotes · 7 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I agree entirely. And to be clear - what I meant was not that I had the book up, then later did my cross-off thing. I had it up as a joke in the first place. I didn't like that book when I read it 13 years ago, and I like it even less today :p

Regulating Sexual Desire

1 upvotes · 7 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This makes more sense. As long as we're agreed that your position is a philosophical one, we're on the same page with everything :)

The only thing I would caution, though, is not to present your belief system as a "godly" one. If it is rooted in philosophy or praxeology and only uses theology as a framework within which that philosophy/praxeology must operate, it is not "godly" or "biblical" so to speak - it is merely "not against the Bible." Those are two very different things. One communicates to others, "This is how God wants you to do it" and the other says, "I don't know what God wants; this is my own personal thought, just make sure you're not breaking clear biblical boundaries while you live it out."

To that end, I'd be highly cautious of presenting it the first way if it is not grounded in theological fact (and I don't think that position can be so grounded). I don't like putting words in God's mouth that he never said himself.

Regulating Sexual Desire

1 upvotes · 7 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

small age gaps tend to be the most stable marriages

I would really like to see the source material for this. I get that the vast majority of marriages have small age gaps simply because of social context - we often put people of like ages around each other for school, extracurricular activities, church classes/small groups, employment tiering, etc.

My guess is that the stats you're looking at are general and not specific to Christian culture. Statistics that involve biblical marriages often deviate significantly from the broader cultural numbers.

It's an error to apply male logic to women

I'm not sure what part of that was male logic. It's a common concept of female psychology - and not even from anything I've read on the manosphere. As a friend of mine used to say, "Women hope to change their men and men hope their women always stay the same; in the end, neither gets what they want." This notion that women want to change their men to suit their own expectations of who they think he could be is quite universal - and something that every woman I've ever interviewed (including my own wife) acknowledges as true.

Most women in their early 20s either have a "family priority" or a "career priority"

This is true. But that's only as it relates to their own lives. They assume that whatever man they end up with will supplicate to their imperative. If she's family-minded, she expects her man to be a hard-worker who can provide with a single income, and then often also expects him to do x around the house, y in the hard, and z with the kids, constantly pushing him toward her expectations. Likewise, a career-minded woman will marry a man with certain expectations of how he will be supportive in different ways of her career aspirations, and if she meets a guy who isn't she will expect him to conform to those patterns anyway - always looking to what he *could be* and never to what he *actually is*.

Mission is usually done alongside a career anyway, unless it's as a pastor.

And that is one of the deepest regrets I have for the modern church - that God's mission is compartmentalized and not seen as applicable in all ways at all times.

because I want to "rejoice in the wife of my youth" so to speak.

I get that, and I don't fault you for that position. But that was also in a pre-Gospel culture where people were pushed into marriages at a young age. I don't see God endorsing young-age marriage; rather, he is commenting on those who have engaged in it.

Marriage is the norm for most people across most cultures, so it is wise for Christian men to be proactive about finding a wife.

When I read this I see: "Culture says to do this, so as Christians we would be wise to do it too."

I would have never met my wife if I was not very proactive in going out of my way to asking other Christian men and women about Christian women who fit some of the criteria I was looking for in a prospective wife.

With all due respect, how do you know you would not have ended up with someone better and in a better timing of your life if you had waited until God brought someone alongside you naturally?

I'm not saying your model can't work - praxeology tells us it can. But it is not a theologically grounded model. There is no biblical imperative to seek a wife. There is lots of biblical imperative to put yourself out there and let a woman seek you. After all, this is how God is with us. He doesn't hide in a corner and hope we find him. He puts himself out there. But beyond that, when I last studied it, the ratio was approximately 1 passage about God

(groom) seeking us for every 25 passages about us (bride) seeking God. I'm not sure how to get around that theological framework, and I certainly don't want to let culture dictate my theology.

How to approach sex in the first weeks of marriage

1 upvotes · 7 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

My first week of marriage was a rough one. My wife came in with a lot of psychological conditioning with a negative attitude about sex. As she recounted on our honeymoon:

- "I was only ever told two things about sex all my life: it's sinful before marriage and it hurts a lot. That's how my parents and my church controlled me. Because I was never married until yesterday, my only context was thinking 'sex = sin.' I know it's not sin anymore, but I've spent the last two decades where it was sin for me."

And yes, it was painful for her too. Her parents never even let her wear tampons because it was "sin" to have anything in her vagina. As such, there was no stretching and it was highly uncomfortable for her to have anything inside of her. We were not able to have sex the first two nights of our honeymoon.

This set a very, very, very bad precedent. It took close to a year before the pain went away, and even today if she ever goes longer than a week without sex (which used to be often) there was an intense pain for her when we did have sex again. I'm pretty confident that she had a form of vaginismus, which is a predominantly psychosomatic condition.

How to deal with it? I have no idea. Most people don't deal with these types of problems, but they do happen and there are no clear biblical guidelines for handling it. I took the extremely cautious route, which was my first real introduction to a beta mentality with my wife. This established a precedent that sex was about making things as comfortable for her as possible and minimizing pain. Later on in our marriage she commented, "I wish we had done things differently - that you had just forced it so that we wouldn't have set such a bad precedent for our whole first year of marriage." I can't say for sure which was better other than to note that the RP Christian (as opposed to secular guy) must be mutually aware of her pain while also leading her down a path that will be fruitful for long-term sexuality, despite the short-term pain. Hopefully you never have to deal with that awful balance.

One might even consider initiating sex in the first weeks more often than one likes, in order to set a high standard when it comes to frequency

That won't work. Most women take the first weeks as a honeymoon period and expect that it will die down. You'd have to make it more like the first 2 years for her to develop an actual expectation that this is how it's going to be long-term.

Even if you do plan on backing down a little, if you play games like this up-front, as long as it's short-term she's always going to set her own expectation as the default and assume you will revert to her expectation.

The better plan is for the man simply to initiate with her as often as he wants and to develop a solid frame if/when she rejects him. This isn't about manipulating your wife into a certain frequency; it's about becoming the type of man who knows what he wants and goes for it.

But is it advisable from a RP perspective to initiate whenever he likes, maybe even regardless of whether his wives feels like it in the particular moment?

Absolutely. I played the "wait for my wife to want it too" game and it's a crap blue pill game that doesn't work. Eventually, over time, the wife will just never want it. Why? Because women have a cyclical sexual pattern and if you teach them that they have control over sexual frequency they will match it to their own pattern, learn to feel comfortable denying you, and then in the 3 or so days that they're ovulating and otherwise would want sex, if they

sense anything negative from you at all, they'll end up denying you anyway, pushing you into becoming her BB. In essence, you'd be training her *not to be* sexually attracted to you so that even on days when she would want it, she'd rather pass it up still. This is the fast track to a dead bedroom.

Women are very in-the-moment people. Whatever their current emotions tell them defines their reality, including when they look to the past and the future. If they're in a crummy mood now, they're going to look back on even their best sexual experiences with you with negative feelings. If they're in a good mood and feeling sexual, then they'll look back at their past sexuality - and prospectively toward future sexuality - very positively and desirously.

Simply put, if you want your wife to enjoy having sex with you, you have to initiate with her frequently. The more often she has sex with you, the more she will learn to enjoy it. The more she enjoys it, the more she has positive associates with those memories. But if you let that lapse for too long, she fades into neutrality and ultimately negativity about her sexuality, including her memories of having sex with you, which then makes it harder to get her sexuality going again.

The solution is obvious: engage regularly and often so that she maintains a positive attitude about sex. This is good for both you and her and is biblical (1 Cor. 7:5).

Regulating Sexual Desire

1 upvotes · 7 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Not that it makes me question her virtuousness, but more so overall spiritual maturity.

Correct. And she acknowledges that she had the qualities of a spiritually mature person, but that she was not actually mature. She had psychological pressures to express those virtues rather than inspiration from the Spirit within her. That's why I caution that the virtues themselves are not enough.

Regulating Sexual Desire

1 upvotes · 7 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

The quality women also tend to get snapped up pretty early, so it's a good idea to try to snap one up yourself.

This assumes that someone is actively looking for a bride. As I've noted many times elsewhere, I don't believe Christians should actively be pursuing marriage; rather, marriage should be a natural byproduct of men and women working alongside one another on a common mission for Christ, which proximity leads them into a mutual "burning passion" for one another.

I do believe most people will end up getting married, even in this model - probably over 99%. And one could certainly be selective about which people they pursue their mission alongside, only selecting those people they believe it would be healthy and safe to develop a burning passion with. For example, I would not want to start a discipleship ministry at my church such that I'd have a lot of alone time with another married woman, even if I were single. That's just spelling trouble. But if I were single, it would make sense to bring other singles alongside me so that I cannot be accused of doing anything inappropriate and I'm allowing a context for God to foster a relationship, even if I might otherwise not be pursuing it intentionally.

The model you're proposing makes it feel like you're saying, "There are only so many good fish in the sea, so you'd better get in there and grab one before all the good ones are gone." I just don't see this as a biblical framework for marriage. It makes a lot of philosophical sense. But our faith has never been rooted in philosophy before, as the foundation has always been theology, and I prefer to keep it that way ;)

Help with dating stuff

1 upvotes · 3 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Oops ... I just assume OPs here are guys. My bad ... should have looked at the username.

I'd love some biblical feedback.

1 upvotes · 3 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

And who does most of the initiating in those novels? Virtually always the guy. She's fantasizing about a real man (whatever that means to her) giving her something to react to.

How do I access the sidebar after the redesign?

1 upvotes · 3 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

It still shows up on the sidebar like always for me.

Help with dating stuff

1 upvotes · 3 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

What makes you so desperate to find a wife in the first place? Let's start there to ensure your motives are oriented correctly before we go to the next step.

I'd love some biblical feedback.

1 upvotes · 3 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

You're right. But it is true in the majority. Some might be more like 80% responsive and others 75% and others 99% and maybe a few who actually tip past the 50% line and are more spontaneous ... but if I had to create a bell curve, I'd wager the peak is right around 90-95%.

On Beards...

1 upvotes · 2 May 2018 · /r/askMRP

I track with you.

On Beards...

1 upvotes · 2 May 2018 · /r/askMRP

The question is how much to tailor my appearance to the tastes of what my wife finds attractive?

This was literally just said on [r/RPChristians](#) by [u/Deep_Strength](#):

My wife is noticeably more attracted and turned on when I have longer styled hair than short. Same if I wear more "hipster-ish" type clothing than what I usually wear. She helped me select out the glasses that she liked.

There's nothing wrong with catering to her particular tastes to help her along.

It doesn't quite sit well with me, as I tend to prefer the "do whatever you want" approach. But what if what you want happens to be unattractive? Should the man do what he wants, or should he be attractive?

My guess is the MRP community will tell you that having a beard is attractive to some and not to others, so it doesn't really matter, as long as you're not trying to cater your attractiveness to one specific woman, which demonstrates a lack of abundance and a shift into her frame. But I'd be happy to be proven wrong on that too.

Regardless, how would that analysis change if a guy just wants to lounge around the house in a baggy set of gym

shorts and a t-shirt that are objectively unattractive as a fashion style, but he likes them because they're comfy anyway? Do it or not?

Right now I just do whatever the heck I want. I feel like catering to my wife in the hope of "attracting her" implies a covert contract: "If I cut my beard like she wants, maybe she'll have sex with me more." Screw that.

I too would like to see this conversation more generally and not just about beards.

Homily on Ephesians 5:22-33 by St. John Chrysostom (On Marriage and Family Life)

1 upvotes · 2 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I believe that society should conform to the Church, not the Church to society

That sounds like a cool catch-phrase, but it's not the message I see in 1 Cor. 9.

Have you read the Church Fathers?

Many. Obviously not all ... there's way too much.

Homily on Ephesians 5:22-33 by St. John Chrysostom (On Marriage and Family Life)

1 upvotes · 2 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Christ is also the Head of the Church. Not just the Head of Man.

True. But the church is originally intended to be run by men (that has only changed significantly in recent years). Christ's headship over man comes in the form of his headship over the church, so we're saying and intending the same thing here, I think ... unless you intend women a more prominent role in the running and directing of the church than I'd otherwise take as biblical.

I do believe that the man is to be the leader, but not as a tyrant, but as Christ is the Head of the Church.

Completely agreed.

It only makes sense to me that way.

Fair enough :) I should be clear here: I'm not trying to convince you away from Orthodoxy. Part of me just enjoys these types of conversations. Another part is uniquely interested because I almost went down the EO path at one point too, before ultimately reversing course. There's a lot that the EO church gets right - and it's quite beautiful, and it's a lot of stuff that Protestants miss, and I wish more Protestants could see that.

I'd love some biblical feedback.

1 upvotes · 2 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Get past your mental blocks and assume she's into it until her actions tell you otherwise. You wrote elsewhere that she doesn't starfish you. If you start seeing starfish (for example), that's when her actions are telling you otherwise.

I'd love some biblical feedback.

1 upvotes · 2 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Ah, that makes a lot more sense. Thanks!

I'd love some biblical feedback.

1 upvotes · 2 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

his wife didn't love him and wasn't attracted to him at the outset

Ah, but biblically attraction and love are very, very different. Love is a code of conduct with an oriented direction. Attraction is more feelings-driven. I get the impression that she does love him deeply as a matter of behavior. I also get the impression that she has significant internal emotions for him, as he noted elsewhere her saying something about "You have my heart." But she just has a different physical type. I don't think his situation is as bad as he thinks it is.

I also think that for many women attraction is based on a bunch more things than physical appearance alone (which is a black pill principle, not a red one). So, she can still be highly attracted to him despite her disinterest in his physical appearance and he's just not seeing it because he's thinking from a black mentality instead of a red one.

It's even possible that she had an experience that frightened her -- perhaps she was attracted to an unsuitable person (say, a non-Christian)

Now that's an interesting thought! Care to elaborate on how this might affect a person? I know my own wife has been attracted to non-Christians more than me before and has felt shame over it.

I'd love some biblical feedback.

1 upvotes · 2 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Something's obviously not clicking here. I will say, I posted something similar as my very first post on askMRP and several of the responses I got were: "Some people are just too damaged to be fixed, even if you become RP." I got those responses because at the time I was trying to hold a pity party for myself, making it seem like my situation was more hopeless than it actually was. But you've been around the block enough to know this, it seems. Maybe yours really is one of those cases. Who knows.

Part of the disconnect I'm seeing is the whole catch-and-release thing mixed in with your professions of spiritual maturity. To be fair, I've made posts on this sub acknowledging that this type of conduct can be done in a non-sinful way, so I could give you the benefit of the doubt, but I have trouble doing it knowing that most guys probably do have sinful intent in why they're doing it in the first place, and I should probably go back and re-write some of those posts, if I had the time.

without changing my theology to suit my whims if I want to have sex again, I'm either going to wait until my wife dies or we're going to figure this out

As a man in the same boat as you, I can support and encourage this attitude. Don't back down from a theological conviction to appease your flesh. If you genuinely change theological views, that's fine, but don't let the flesh be the root of that change because you know it's always going to lead you astray. That's the whole point of the Spirit being the one to instill our convictions, not our flesh.

the church told me that God would make it all work out if I just found a godly man

There's a female version of the blue pill if I ever saw one. Matthew 6:33 is talking about daily provision, not all of our hopes, wishes, and dreams.

This is obviously normal comfort test garbage, so I reply in kind and pull her out of it and she offers to screw me again

Here's another part of that disconnect. She's saying she's not attracted to you, but she sees you handling your crap and being awesome and adding value to her life and pulling her out of her crazy woman feels and suddenly she wants sex with you ... and you don't believe her.

You say her words and actions align, but here's a clear example where her actions demonstrated that she got the tingles for you despite whatever she thinks of your looks, and you decided to listen to her words instead. Darn right you goofed!

Now, if you're really endorsed on MRP you'd know that a woman's SMV is based virtually entirely on looks and seduction. But you should also know that a man's is not. You're looking at how you evaluate women and assume she's evaluating you the exact same way. In reality, women do account for looks in a man's SMV, but they also account for his income, his charisma, his alpha/dominance/confidence, social status, leadership, etc.

In light of this distinction: **It makes perfect sense for her to say, "Your looks, for me, are a low factor, but all these other qualities about you are still really attractive, add to your SMV, and make me enjoy having sex with you."** You're saying you don't believe her anymore because she doesn't evaluate sexuality in men the same way you evaluate it in women. That's a big perception problem.

To be clear, you're expecting her to **LOOK AT YOU** and want to have sex with you when she's already said that **your looks are not a sexual trigger for her**. So what? Do you see how this makes no logical sense? Use one of the other attraction triggers that make up your SMV as something she can get into. You make good money? Go withdraw a few hundred ones and spread them across your bed and screw her on top of it. She likes that you're spiritually mature? Go read some racy passages with her and tell her you're going to do that to her right now as a way of "applying Scripture." You're a good leader? Like [/u/rocknrollchuck](#) said - you be the one to initiate and lead her into that bedroom. You should already know this stuff, but it's easy to forget it when in the midst of your own problems. If I had a dime for every time there was a simple solution to my issues that I couldn't see until someone with an outside perspective had to share it with me ... I'd have a big handful of dimes.

Now, you said elsewhere:

when I'm the one to initiate those are the times it's most common to get crummy sex that I end up walking away from. That fundamental responsive desire is not kicking in for her

I'm starting to wonder if you're not trapped in your own head here. You see this physical attraction issue as such an important thing that you're letting that shape how you perceive her during sex. Is she star-fishing you? What is it about that sex that makes it so bad? Or are you just perceiving it as crappy because she's not the one who initiated it, so you're assuming she must not be into it?

she is adamant that there was only one time where she had sex out of duty (which doesn't reconcile well to me)

Dude, that's exactly what I'm talking about. She's into it, you don't believe her, so you spoil the fun for yourself. Cut that crap out. Oh yeah, and ...

I've never faked an orgasm with you. The only reason I keep having sex with you is because you're so darn good at it.

So what if she doesn't find you physically attractive? You've got it made so much better than many other men here anyway. You've got no reason to be complaining. If this were [r/BlackPillChristians](#) that'd be a different story - but we're not for a reason.

Most of her "initiations" are things like ...

Yet you say that these are the times she's most into it. So, once again, is this a perception problem in how you're viewing her and she really is into it or are you lying to us about something?

She says it's not duty sex, but it sure feels like it a lot of the time, though we do have some passionate times too.

How is she moving her body differently between these two situations? Or is it that you're just not feeling passionate about it?

Look, I feel your pain. My wife was raised in that churchy culture too and it about killed our marriage with all the negative psychological garbage about sex that was impressed on her - and it still has an impact and causes problems for us. But you've got this stuff figured out. You've got a mission that she respects and presumably helps you with. You're leading your home, parenting your kids, getting crap done, etc. - and she sees all of this. She's not turning you down. You've got regular sex.

Things aren't perfect. They're never going to be perfect. If it wasn't your looks, it would have been something else. You're not a perfect 10 and you can't expect her to desire you as if you were one. If she's going to knock you down a peg or two for something, what does it matter if it's looks or any other of the factors that make up your SMV? The fact is that in her eyes you're still a solid 9 and she wants to screw you. Yeah, her initiations are weak, and you probably know the psychology behind that better than I do. But you shouldn't be looking for her to initiate in the first place - and be grateful you've got a wife willing to initiate at all!

Is this a thorn in the flesh scenario? I don't think your sex-life is. I think your perception about your wife's sexuality is. But who knows. Take that for what you will.

Homily on Ephesians 5:22-33 by St. John Chrysostom (On Marriage and Family Life)

1 upvotes · 2 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I guess I just believe that scripture came from the Church, not the other way around

Much of Scripture was written before the church. Its codification came from the church. That's a big distinction.

I don't believe in sola scriptura

I'm shaky on this myself. If people mean that the Scriptures are the only infallible authority, I'm not sola scriptura either. If they mean that it is the highest authority and the only one agreed en masse to be infallible, then I suppose I am sola scriptura. But I've heard the phrase used different ways. I do believe there are other authorities that are infallible, but that outside of scripture we're rarely ever going to reach a consensus on what those are.

Denominations are technically a heresy

You have to be careful with the word "heresy" because the Orthodox mean something very different by the word than everyone else. But overall, I agree with the idea that denominations are abiblical on the whole as a dividing line.

Do you mind if I ask what your disagreements with the Orthodox Church are?

There are many, but the two big ones are the necessity of baptism as a prerequisite to salvation and the incorporation of works into their soteriological framework. Apart from that, praying to the saints, emphasis on icons, transubstantiation, apostolic succession, etc.

Technically all the disciples and Church Fathers were "errand boys"

They were errand boys for Christ, not for one particular theological framework. There's a big difference there. As I've often touted on this sub, there's a fundamental difference between being devoted to the original mission from being devoted to the organization that allegedly attempts to fulfill that mission.

I feel that acquiring the virtues and leading by example through prayer, making sure the family goes to church, providing a moral standard (virtues) is the way to "lead" from what the homily says as well as what my priest said just now.

Prayer in that context is deferring leadership to God. That's why when Moses was praying God told him, "Why are you crying out to me? Tell the Israelites to move on." In other words, "Stop praying to me and go lead the people yourself."

Similarly, "making sure the family goes to church" is deferring spiritual leadership away from the man and toward the church. It's saying, "We should be following that guy." I mean, I guess you could say he's leading her to the guy who's going to lead her, but that doesn't do much for me. That's not to say we shouldn't involve our families in a local body; rather, we should not see that as an act of spiritual leadership in the home.

Providing a moral standard is much closer, but even then isn't going anywhere. It's just cutting off roads from where you shouldn't go. "Our family won't do this or won't do that because that's sin." That's the essence of morality. Leadership assumes an active direction with a path to follow.

But I do agree with the "leading by example" part. This is all covered in 208.

It felt like the Spirit

I know you mean well, but this is always a red flag in my mind - people connecting the Spirit with their feelings ;)

He emulates Christ better than most people I know, so that's why I respect his advice

Now that's a good reason :)

I do not believe that I am my own Pope

And I don't think Protestants think this either. We reject the concept entirely.

How do I know my interpretation is correct if I don't check what The Church teaches on the matter

How do you know the church is correct if you don't know what the Spirit teaches on the matter? *Because the Spirit speaks through the Church.* Okay, but how do you know the Spirit actually is speaking through the Orthodox church? *I can't know definitively, but I have faith.* So your faith is now in the church? That seems misplaced to me. This is how most conversations with Orthodox end up going.

I don't see it as "brainwashing" if I am conforming more to who Christ is in that "brainwashing"

I'm generally inclined to agree with you here if the message were pure. But when there are falsities mixed in with that process, it's a problem. After all, most efforts at brain washing involve reorienting people toward good goals with subtle, barely noticeable defects (what they want to brainwash you to believe) mixed in so that you take in the bad with the good. That's how it works.

We are all being "brainwashed" by something as we live life, aren't we?

Yes, but in some contexts it's more overt than others.

"how does one know what Truth is if they have no authority?"

The Spirit and sovereignty. Besides, and I know this is going to sound quite blasphemous: Christianity as a whole places way too much weight on truth and understanding. God is much less concerned with what we know than he is with what we do with that knowledge.

Consider when the disciples asked Jesus, "Lord, increase our faith!" Jesus said, "Sure, here's exactly how to do that" ... right? No. He says, "If you had faith like a grain of mustard seed, you could say to this mulberry tree, 'Be uprooted and planted in the sea,' and it would obey you." Translation: *Don't worry about learning and growing. Start making use of what you already have. You have enough already for great things. Let God figure out how much he'll fill you along the way.*

This is a very much RP concept as well: no more mental masturbation, start acting.

To that end, I will continue to engage with Scripture, but my focus is no longer to discern truth or attempt to understand the complexities of theology. I can coast on what I already know for that. My purpose is to relate with God as I apply what he's already given me.

The Church helps me discern that at times

This is a wise way to say it - not that the church definitively dictates this to you, but that it is a resource God has made available through which we should most often work.

considering scripture is apart of tradition, not the other way around.

And let me be clear again: no apostle wrote their letters with the thought process, "I am compelled by tradition to write this to you." Even if tradition was in their minds it would have been, "In my writing this I am creating tradition," and thereby Scripture is the creation of tradition (although I reject that view too).

The better conclusion is that Scripture is Scripture and the only thing that was produced by tradition is the canonization of Scripture. But when the books themselves were written there was no tradition involved in the act of the apostles putting pen to ink. Don't forget that distinction. Of course, I am very grateful for the tradition that canonized Scripture. I just don't give credit to tradition for having written the Scriptures themselves.

Homily on Ephesians 5:22-33 by St. John Chrysostom (On Marriage and Family Life)

1 upvotes · 1 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I hope I'm not coming across that way

I think it comes across that way due to your flair and the fact that you only post from Orthodox sources. I've really enjoyed our conversations, but there's a part of me that gets a little perturbed when I see a constant stream of Orthodox sources - not because there is anything wrong with being committed to the Orthodox Church (though I certainly have my disagreements), but because it makes you seem linear-minded. If you're getting 90% of your information from one source (the Orthodox church), it raises a question about the integrity of your knowledge and information. The Bible is the one exception, for God himself has said it is sufficient.

For this reason, you'll note that I often stick to quoting Scripture rather than any particular Protestant, Catholic, or Orthodox source - but that when I do address the different branches, I often read from all sources to ensure I understand all positions on a matter before I pray for discernment in the Spirit through Scripture which position is most sound. To that end, there are things I embrace out of Orthodoxy that the Catholics and the Protestants

miss, just as there are things that the Catholics have figured out that the Protestants and Orthodox are missing out on, and the same for Protestantism. But when you only post Orthodox information it makes it seem like you're an errand boy for the Orthodox church, which is basically inviting people to challenge everything you say, which degrades the integrity of the otherwise good and valuable messages that you're trying to communicate :)

I just feel that he is saying the external is less important than the internal qualities of a woman.

From what you write, you and I are in total agreement. But I interpreted the author's words as saying we must explicitly reject the external appearances of beauty as a factor for consideration. I didn't see him saying to treat it as "lesser," but that we should disregard it altogether.

I would say that we are to strive for the Kingdom of God above anything else

100% on board here!

It is forthright about the husband being the leader/head of the female, and that the wife is second in authority ... men are to not only love, but to govern the household.

Yes, these are all good things. But even the most blue-pilled pastors will still preach the same things. This isn't a "red pill" mentality. It's a recitation of what Scripture says that blue pill priests/pastors can't deny because the Bible says so.

To discern if a pastor is preaching from a blue perspective or a red don't look at what he preaches; look at how he applies his preaching and how he asks others to apply it. The *what* should always be Scripture, but the *how* reveals one's underlying philosophies as distinct from theologies. In this particular homily, the refrain is "love, love, love," which makes it seem very blue to me and that he's trying to explain away the "leadership" passages with male obligation toward the woman.

"Yeah, husbands should lead ... I suppose I must admit that God said that because it's in the Bible and all ... but let's not forget the real important thing here: that husbands should be loving their wives." That's the impression this gives me.

I'm actually going to talk to my priest about that very topic today.

That's a great idea!

So I will get back to everyone about what he says as I think it would be edifying to this community.

And we're back to you being the errand boy for the Orthodox church. Hear out what he says, but also search the Scriptures yourself to see what the Bible says. As is noted in Act 17, Paul actually *commends* the Bereans for challenging every word he said and testing it against Scripture themselves before believing it. They are called "more noble" because of this attitude. I encourage you to be the same way.

I know this attitude is contrary to the Orthodox and Catholic view of Scripture, which is usually that the church must do all of your interpretation for you and you shouldn't dare think you're wise enough to interpret Scripture for yourself. So, it's easy to look to what some author of a homily said or what your priest said, because they often condition you to see them as the only authority of what the Bible says. But the Bible itself says this is not how it should be - that we should be testing our authorities all the time to ensure that they are maintaining Scriptural consistency.

Don't tell us what your Orthodox priest says. Tells us what the Bible says. And if your Orthodox priest helped you figure it out, that's fine too. But maybe look into Catholic and Protestant resources on the matter also.

I'm not sure if I'm making much sense here, but I'm very much opposed to the brain-washing that goes on in most denominations, of which Protestant denominations are no exception. I oppose it all. But the Catholic and Orthodox churches do seem to make a specific point of it with their authority structure on who's allowed to interpret Scripture and not.

Homily on Ephesians 5:22-33 by St. John Chrysostom (On Marriage and Family Life)

1 upvotes · 1 May 2018 · /r/RPChristians

So, in a lot of your posts from orthodox sources I see individual quotes that you pull out that sound red enough, but when I read something like this, everything in the paragraphs after what you pasted is a litany of "love your wife this" and "love your wife that" and "she's one with you, so you should love her." That's not to say he's wrong; it's simply to say that his emphasis is no different than any other theologically-sound, yet philosophically blue-pilled church leader today. But maybe that's just my read of this. I just get the impression that the allegedly "red" bits of some of your posts are just picking and choosing a few key lines to make the orthodox church look better than other denominations.

As to your actual questions:

a single man should search for in a wife are "affection, gentleness, and humility" as those are the "tokens of beauty". What do you think on this?

He actually says "modest-mindedness" instead of humility, which I took more to mean an appreciation of and orientation toward modesty, although I could see how you could read humility in that too.

He also doesn't say they're the "ideal" traits to seek - he just says "let us seek [them] in a wife." He also immediately follows this with a rejection of "loveliness" as a thing to look for in a woman, basically crushing every RP sense of finding the hot wife and being sexually attracted to the person you're marrying. This seems to run contrary to 1 Cor. 7.

Of course, as he notes, affection, gentleness, and modesty-minded are all valuable traits in their own context, so I don't deny that we should seek them :)

How do you see "loving your wife as your own body"?

Well, the innuendo version of this would make it pretty darn clear how most men tend to love their own bodies ;)

As for the rest, we feed our bodies, we protect them from harm, we keep them in shape, we put them to good use and do God's work with them, etc.

Would love to hear your thoughts on other parts of the homily as well. What do you think?

I've already said a lot of it, but the gist of it is that it feels like more of the standard blue pill harping on how much we should love our wives as every other pastor preaches with very, very little imperative toward women on how to treat their men (it's there, but significantly less in comparison) and very, very little direction to men on *how* to lead other than saying in very vague terms, "lead her."

I do appreciate your submission here, as it's valuable to discuss these things. But this particular one did not resonate well with me. Sorry, brother - but keep up the good work on the search :)

Setting expectations for fat loss and muscle gain

1 upvotes · 28 April 2018 · /r/askMRP

Good to know.

My Story

1 upvotes · 28 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Good to know.

My Story

1 upvotes · 28 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I agree, but the rationale is much more fundamental. It's the distinction between popular vote and hierarchical decision. We do not get to out vote God on matters of the church because we have no right or authority to do so. It is not a democracy. It's not even our church. It's God's. Regardless of what we do with it, we will still be judged by God's standard in the end. So his standard is all that matters.

Why I am anti-game and pro godly masculinity

1 upvotes · 27 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

As I've mentioned before, I'm not a house husband. I work full time, my wife works part time.

Why I am anti-game and pro godly masculinity

1 upvotes · 27 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Give me a quote from my post that you just replied to that disagrees with something biblical. I'm not going to entertain harassment, so either back up what you say or get permabanned for trolling.

Why I am anti-game and pro godly masculinity

1 upvotes · 27 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

What biblical concept of masculinity have I disagreed with?

Musings After a Wedding

1 upvotes · 27 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I tried. In his mind, he's already 34 and doesn't want to wait much longer to have kids. He sees this as their one chance to do something like this before they start trying for kids. He's prioritizing his goal of having kids by a certain time in his life over his finances.

Setting expectations for fat loss and muscle gain

1 upvotes · 27 April 2018 · /r/askMRP

Good point here too. I remember when my grip capped out at 315. I'll have to start using my grip clamps more often.

Why I am anti-game and pro godly masculinity

1 upvotes · 27 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Hmm ... the link gives a 404 error. But I'd be happy to review your book :)

Why I am anti-game and pro godly masculinity

1 upvotes · 27 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I've never seen "dread" used outside of the context of "threat,"

Well now you have ;)

If everything is being ascribed to game

Again, game only relates to those things which increase (most likely intentionally) one's attractiveness to women. This isn't as wide-spread as you seem to be making it out to be.

Perhaps a better example is hitting an object into a net. Soccer was certainly invented well before ice hockey. So can we say that "hitting an object into a net" is not part of hockey because soccer came up with it first? That just doesn't make sense to me.

I mean, I do understand what you're trying to argue - that because the Bible said something first, we should attribute it to the Bible primarily and not to anything else. But that attitude would create so many problems with an us v. them mentality that Christians would be even more hated than we already are. All of a sudden Christians everywhere would have to object to Buddhists, Atheists, Mormons, Hindus, Muslims, etc., saying that loving other people cannot be called part of their belief systems and moral code because the Bible came up with it first. Just because the Bible said something first doesn't mean the Bible has monopolized the concept so that no one else can claim or use it.

To add to this, most of the aspects where "game" and "biblical masculinity" overlap are employed for entirely different purposes. The Bible says virtually nothing about how to be attractive to a woman. So, if we're talking about increasing attraction, "biblical masculinity" sounds good, but it's out of context because the Bible never prescribes this as a cure to attraction issues. "Game" draws from the Bible (unwittingly) to acknowledge the impact that this biblically unrelated quality has on attraction, thereby making the application of that concept toward attraction unique to game in a way that the Bible does not address. So, while I appreciate what you're trying to do in separating "game" from "biblical masculinity," and I appreciate that you think I'm over-complicating it, I feel as if you're overly-simplifying things in a way that is very off-putting to people in the manosphere who would do better to understand a proper context for application of game with the goal of reorienting their purposes altogether, rather than just being put in an "us v. them" position where they must choose a side between game and anti-game.

You don't need the rest of whatever is left of 'game' In other words, you only need what is in the Bible.

I agree.

I'm not arguing about the small sliver that is non-overlapping.

But by saying "you don't need the rest of whatever is left of 'game'" you are - you're saying that whatever doesn't overlap (i.e. that small sliver of game that remains) must be rejected, but the rest employed as consistent with biblical masculinity.

But here's the catch: that's no different than a secular guy arbitrarily saying, "My moral code rejects that sliver of red pill game, but I embrace all this other stuff" - and it just happens to overlap, but it excludes the biblical aspects that don't overlap. Are you suggesting that this non-Christian man will be just as effective at fostering sexual attraction from his wife by employing "game" because he is only employing those aspects of secular "game" that overlap with the Bible, and therefore he doesn't need the sliver of biblical masculinity that is distinct from "game"?

If we're not talking about "the small sliver that is non-overlapping" then this is the only other conclusion - that the non-Christian "game" proponent who has a basic moral compass can be equally as effective as the "biblical masculinity" proponent.

Setting expectations for fat loss and muscle gain

1 upvotes · 27 April 2018 · /r/askMRP

Thanks for the tip, I'll have to try that out.

Why I am anti-game and pro godly masculinity

1 upvotes · 27 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Mars Hill

Oh, I thought you were talking about Driscoll's old church :p I follow now.

I'd be interested in seeing it (if possible)

<https://thereasonforlife.wordpress.com/>

He's helped me write virtually all of the content for this sub, so I consider it co-content, ergo us both presenting it in different ways to different audiences. That said, he is not a regular poster ... he goes in bursts, so you'll see 4 posts a week for a few weeks, then nothing for months at a time ... basically whenever it holds his interest. But comparing what he has to some of the sidebar content I have you'll notice what I'm talking about in the way of identical content with different terminology.

The manosphere is limited in that respect

Indeed. It's a large audience, but still a niche one.

I'm mainly trying to be rid of most of the language of the manosphere now as I write the book that can be hopefully be given to people in Churches.

Yeah, I've started a book that abandons a lot of the manosphere language as well. We'll see if/when I finish it ... I've got 3 other finished books that I want to edit and start working toward publication before I spend too much time on unfinished products. Best luck, though. Writing a book to completion is a grueling task!

Why I am anti-game and pro godly masculinity

1 upvotes · 27 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I agree with most of the first chunk.

I prefer the definition of "dread" = making a woman aware of actions and consequences: "If she's not going to treat her husband right, another woman might."

That implies an actual threat, though. Most Christian implementations of dread don't require there to be a threat and can be quite positive and constructive in a relationship.

This is actually one of those conversations I've had with my wife more openly (not necessarily using manosphere terminology). She still jokes about the girl at men's warehouse who was getting handsy with me - and that turns her on, and the fact of her talking about it is what turns her on. That is, she openly acknowledges that other women being attracted to me makes me more attractive to her.

This form of dread has nothing to do with negative consequences. I hope I'm mistaken, but the way you communicate makes it seem like women are bad and need to be punished for their wickedness whenever they express it, and that this is most of how the marriage dynamic should work. My relationship with my wife is very different in that dread has nothing to do with negative reinforcement and everything to do with positive reinforcement. I believe this is how dread *should* be employed in marriages and that it's very fruitful for both,

ergo my sidebar post on positive dread, which scratches the surface of this.

I agree that 3 is the most ideal, but some men do respond to 2 and 1.

Agreed.

Evidence

I see what you're saying, and I agree that "game" rips off of many biblical principles, then adds a few non-biblical ones too. But all of your bullet points are part of that overlap. So, how do we know that it's the "biblical masculinity" part that's solving the problem and not "game"?

Imagine I've got bronchitis. I take two separate antibiotics, A and B, that overlap a lot in function, but also have a few distinguishing traits for each. My bronchitis is cured. It's determined that the function of the antibiotics that cured me was within the overlap. Both pharmaceutical companies want to take credit for having cured my bronchitis so they can advertise another success story. Which company has the legitimate claim to being the cure?

If the cure was legitimately only in the overlap, then they both are legitimately a cure, right? So we can't say that "game" is not a "cure" when the aspects of "biblical masculinity" that function as a cure all also fall within the category of "game."

I'm not arguing that game actually is a cure - only that if you want to claim that game is *NOT* a cure, you have to demonstrate that the part that's not in the overlap - the part that is unique and distinct to biblical masculinity - is an essential component to curing the problem.

Given that there is a massive overlap between RP prescriptions and biblical masculinity, you've got only a small sliver to work with, and I'm skeptical that there is sufficient praxeological testing that's been performed to demonstrate that this component is *vitaly necessary* to curing sexual dysfunction in general.

Now, from a theological standpoint, I'm inclined to agree on the basis of faith alone, assuming we're on the same page with what "biblical masculinity" looks like in its entirety, which is a much longer conversation than is worth addressing here and now. And in my view, theology trumps praxeology anyway. But if the theological conclusion, when applied, does not produce the praxeological result we intend, we're left with one of a few options:

- Our theology is wrong.
- Our theology is right, but we applied it incorrectly.
- Our theology is right, but was never designed to address the problem we're trying to solve, for which there is no theological solution, and therefore we're back to secular methods to accomplish that goal.

Setting expectations for fat loss and muscle gain

1 upvotes · 27 April 2018 · /r/askMRP

If I bought some straps, I might try that. Right now I'm capping out what my fingers can hold before the bar slips out of my hand.

Why I am anti-game and pro godly masculinity

1 upvotes · 27 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Having a priority list is a useful heuristic reminder to not let other things become an idol, which we are so prone to doing.

I see where you're coming from, but this has also been a source of confusion for many. A priority hierarchy

allows room for jumbling of those priorities. Having a singular priority from which all actions are derived leaves no room for confusion and makes it starkly obvious when someone is off-track.

Most Christian men there are opposed to anything to do with "red pill" or "game" as they've heard how "misogynistic" it is from various media sources.

I understand now. Yeah, as noted elsewhere, I'm a fan of using terminology that people will understand and receive. So, to those in the manosphere, using manosphere terminology seems appropriate as the most effective way to minister to them. To those outside of it, we're better off using terminology that they can receive and identify with. To that end, most of the stuff I've posted on the sidebar here is adapted for a non-mansphere audience on a friend's blog, which is shared with his entire church. The content is the same, but the word-choice and presentation is adjusted so that it can be well-received, and he has had a lot of positive feedback from it.

Whenever I mentor men in person I always do it from ...

I do likewise. But that's mostly because most men I disciple IRL have no clue what the red pill even is, so I use a framework that they can understand and communicate truth within that frame of reference and understanding. This is, after all, how Jesus adapted his communication patterns for different audiences.

The Mars Hill method

What's that?

the main issue I have seen seems to be a lack of discipling men away from the RP terminology and thought processes to more of a strict biblical thought process

Well, if they're to re-enter the manosphere to reproduce the process that I started, they're going to need to keep using that terminology. So, I don't see a reason for them to abandon the manosphere terminology while on this sub. But I do expect that they're not using that terminology in other contexts IRL where those they're ministering to are operating under a different mental framework.

To that end, comments and posts on this sub, even if directed at people like [/u/akohlan198](#) and [/u/cornthians12345](#), are still visible to the rest of the community and are often things that I actively want other people to read apart from the individual to which they're directed. So, I write comments as replies to specific individuals, but with an understanding that I have a broader audience of people who might not be ready for that transition. And to that end, I'm not sure why a transition would be necessary at all, as much as it's necessary simply for men to learn how to utilize terminology that communicates most effectively in the context in which they're speaking. If I go to Germany I'd probably be better off using German words than English words. If I go to church I'm better off using "churchy" words to communicate my points. And if I go to the manosphere, I'll be a more efficient communicator if I continue to use manosphere language. The issue is that I think your blog tries to blend the manosphere with the church, drawing from both to create something biblical and uniquely distinct from either, which creates a linguistic issue in how to be effective at reaching both crowds simultaneously. This sub doesn't try much to do that - it has a clear niche audience to the manosphere and does not attempt to pull the church-world into it, although the blog I referenced above which uses the exact same content does the reverse: it presents itself exclusively to the church and makes no effort to reach the manosphere. But I may be making assumptions here on you having a blended target audience :p

Why I am anti-game and pro godly masculinity

1 upvotes · 27 April 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I agree that biblical marriage is the solution. But as a rote matter of definition and categorization, that overlaps with "game" a lot anyway. Some people have natural game, some have to learn it ... just as some people are more

inclined to naturally live out biblical masculinity and others have to learn it.

But the notion that "both husband and wife has conjugal rights over the other at all times" is a little more troublesome. To be clear, I completely agree with the premise. But in practice it leads to a lot of crappy duty sex if the wife isn't attracted. As has often been stated - and something I can fully affirm as a married man, bad sex is worse than no sex at all. So, the rote obligation of conjugal rights does very little to solve the problem that most men are looking to cure through their sexuality.

If we want to take it to that deeper level, when men say they want sex, they really mean they want something else that happens to be provided during sex. That could be rote physical pleasure, but it's more often an emotional intimacy, feeling of empowerment, the enjoyment of being desired, the satisfaction of knowing he's "man enough" to please a woman, or some other psychological longing. These longings (physical pleasure notwithstanding) are really meant to be satisfied in Christ through the Gospel, which is the actual cure (as opposed to "biblical marriage" or "biblical masculinity").

Anyone, men or women, can repent of their sin at any moment.

Unless you're a Calvinist, in which case we have no power to do so and it only happens in God's timing at His will and discretion. I'm not necessarily a Calvinist, but I do acknowledge that there are legitimate lines of theology that indicate that humans don't have the power to repent on their own and that God doesn't necessarily always allow a person to repent or draw them to repentance at all times - that sometimes God lets people wallow in certain sins for a period of time for whatever purpose he might have for them in that.

I agree with the rest of what you said too. The only point of clarification is that if, as I believe, hypergamy is God-designed, then a man "adapting" to biblical expressions of hypergamy is not a man adapting to sin, it's him adapting out of his own rebellion to embrace God's original design for women and how to interact with them.

Why I am anti-game and pro godly masculinity

1 upvotes · 27 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

"Do we do what attracts women?" VS "Do we just be men?"

That clarifies a lot. I wish I was around for those debates.

this definition right here already puts the man who employs Game in the Frame of women

I agree. As I noted in another comment, one of my biggest complaints with MRP is the duality of (1) don't be in a womans frame, and (2) let female hypergamy define everything about how you interact with them.

The standard MRP response is that #1 applies to individual women and #2 is okay because it applies to all women as a whole, so if you have abundance you can just leave the individual woman you're with and find another whose expression of hypergamy is more aligned with your own interests. This obviously doesn't work in a christian context.

Why does it even matter what a woman finds attractive?

It depends on the goal. If a man's goal is simply to be the best man he can be - or for Christians, a godly man - then it doesn't matter at all.

If the goal is to get sex, then the conclusion of employing game makes sense. We all agree that the natural cultural influence leads to stifled sexuality. If we take AWALT to be true and that women won't change, the only rational conclusion is that the man must adapt to accomplish the goal. The only alternative conclusions are to deny the underlying premise (AWALT and won't change) or to abandon the goal of sexuality.

Why I am anti-game and pro godly masculinity

1 upvotes · 26 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Another thing I thought of ... it seems like your beef with proponents of game is not in the methods themselves, but in the goal those methods are trying to accomplish. You blur the line a lot with several comments about attraction, but it seems your primary goal is not to increase attraction in the wife toward her husband, but to increase submissiveness, obedience, and respect. Game proponents have an entirely distinct goal of increasing sexuality.

You then say you are anti game because it does not cure a problem it never promised to fix. That's like saying, "I'm anti advil because it doesn't cure brain cancer." Advil never purported to be a cure for brain cancer in the first place. But it is far more effective in its own context of curing a headache than a brain surgeon would be, right? Sometimes there is cancer causing the headache, but most of the time there isn't.

If a guy's goal is to fix a dead bedroom with his christian wife, for example, is there any evidence that the "cure" for rebellion and non submissiveness is also the exact same cure to sexual dysfunction in the marriage?

Why I am anti-game and pro godly masculinity

1 upvotes · 26 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Yeah, I agree with everything you've written here. The only bit I disagreed with before was your saying "women stay because of who you are." If who you are sucks, they won't stay. That's a proven fact, especially in my line of work. Also, even if "who you are" is great, the reason they stay isn't because of that - it's because of what "who you are" can offer them. That's what keeps them around. Even if you're the most amazing, impressive person alive and with a heart of gold at that ... if you're not offering anything to her from that - that you only direct your awesomeness to other people than her - then she will leave. You could be the best provider in the world, but if you direct all of your provision to the starving children in third world countries and you don't put food on the table for her and her children to eat, she doesn't care about how great you are as a provider - because it's not directed at her.

Who you are doesn't matter. What you have to offer her does.

Why I am anti-game and pro godly masculinity

1 upvotes · 26 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I'd be interested to see what you would define "game" as or what you think the traditional way it's been used in the manosphere.

I just did that in another comment, but the short summary is that game is anything a man does that attracts his woman, and some would add the requirement that he intends it for that purpose.

To that end, you act like red pill prescriptions (AA, AM, negging, etc.) are the definition of game, whereas the manosphere is much broader, calling even blue pill strategies "game" - they just say it's bad/ineffective game ... but it's still game because it's something they're doing for the purpose of attracting a woman. Then there's the question of "attracting to what?" because blue pill guys are exceptionally good at attracting women into relationships, but not into sexuality ... but that's another conversation :p

What you're really referencing is a philosophical foundation to a certain branch of methodologies within the broader categorization of "game." To be clear, nothing you've said even says those methods should not be employed - only that the philosophical premise for which they are utilized by the secular community is faulty. To that end, I agree with you, if that's what you really meant. But if I'm misunderstanding you and you really did mean that all forms of trying to attract a woman are "game" and therefore you are against all of them ... then we must inherently differ.

"spinning plates" is sinful ... "agree and amplify" almost every Christian would probably say is "benign," but doesn't dig to the heart of the problem: her bad attitude and/or bad behavior

But one major method of "game" is negative inquiry, which does inherently get to the bottom of sinful behavior - which is why it's my favorite to employ. I agree with you that most stuff prescribed by secular RP amounts to little more than deflection tactics, rather than actually dealing with the problem - and I have often criticized those tactics for being just that. But that doesn't mean they are devoid of all use or cannot be employed in a productive, God-honoring context that does further the mission to increase submissiveness on the wife's part. In fact, I would wager that most aspects of the game methodologies you're referencing do naturally lead toward that end.

From there I see an internal conflict. You say at one point in the original post that caring about her submissiveness and obedience is more important than convincing her from a mental/internal perspective. But when you talk about "the cure" it seems to be more about correcting an inward orientation of her heart - a rebelliousness from the inside and not merely her external behaviors. So which is it?

- If it's just about behaviors, then both "godly masculinity" and "secular game methods" (of which there is overlap) can both be very effective at accomplishing the end-goal.
- If it's more about the internal acceptance and understanding (which you said it is not), then deflection methods will not work ... but I'm not convinced your suggested method of employing "godly masculinity" will either - a simple rebuke and correction.

In the latter part, between the two I'm actually inclined to believe that the allegedly *secular* methods of game are actually more effective at reorienting a person inwardly than a rebuke and correction. Certainly a woman needs to be rebuked when the situation calls for it, but the other line of game methods creates a natural internal bent toward a submissive attitude by the woman toward her man. It is designed to facilitate her internalizing his spirit (in the form of his attitude, frame, etc.) of the relationship so that she is aligned internally with him, much like we internalize God's Spirit to adopt his attitude, frame, etc. and become aligned internally with him. I do not see "rebuke and correct" as being nearly as effective in this process.

To that end, depending on the maturity of the people and relationship, God handles things differently over time. When humanity was in its physical youth, God did a lot of rebuking and correcting, just as we do to our physical children, just as we do with those who are spiritually young and immature. But as humanity became older God became more example-driven. Instead of much rebuking and correcting of his followers, we see Jesus just living in front of them as an example for them to follow. He did rebuke and correct, but it was much less and he employed more of the aspects of "secular game" than what you call "godly masculinity." And after Jesus ascended, when humanity was finally ready and mature enough to receive God's Spirit, we see that God virtually never does a rebuke and correct (though he certainly leaves room for his church to do that for those who are spiritually young and immature); rather, he imparts his spirit to us and leads through internal transformation and not external behavioral modification. In the same way, I expect that we should treat matured relationships with a focus on internal transformation and not on external behavioral modification. The exception is if you are married to someone who is spiritually immature.

I guess my point in all of this is that if a man was to call his masculinity "godly" it must account for all of how God interacts with humanity and not just how God did it in the old testament.

a slave to passing her hypergamous testing

I agree with this entirely. I have often criticized MRP for having a split dual ideology: (1) don't get in a woman's frame; and (2) let the woman's hypergamy define how you interact with her. This makes no sense to me. They explain it away by saying that #1 applies to individual women, but #2 applies to women as a whole, and therefore a man can remain "masculine" because he doesn't have to submit to any one person's hypergamy - he can find a

woman who's expression of hypergamy is more aligned with his interests. Meh ... I'm not entirely convinced.

In other words, "biblical marriage" does everything "game" does but better because it calls out her behavior and helps her repent and learn to control and/or turn away from it.

Other than "rebuke and correct" I'm not sure I've seen anything else from you that describes how it affects her internal orientation to/from God and to/from her husband. I suppose if you elaborate on this we'd probably be much closer in agreement.

Why I am anti-game and pro godly masculinity

1 upvotes · 26 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I think I follow. I don't necessarily agree, but I see better what you're saying.

Why I am anti-game and pro godly masculinity

1 upvotes · 26 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I'm confused ... what?

Why I am anti-game and pro godly masculinity

1 upvotes · 26 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That was the same thought I had. The whole time I'm confused about how he's defining game.

Blue Pill after God

1 upvotes · 26 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is an interesting comment, but it raises a couple questions:

1. What causes you to believe hypergamy is sinful and not part of God's intended design for women? My review of scripture is the opposite - that hypergamy itself is part of intended design, but as with all things it has been applied in sinful ways.
2. Why do you believe it's a myth that godliness is attractive to [Christian] women? I would wholeheartedly disagree with this assertion with respect to authentic godliness. The issue is that godliness requires a proactive and eternal purpose and being disciplined to carry it out, whereas the church generally tempers the word down to mean simply "someone who doesn't sin often."

Thoughts?

Blue Pill after God

1 upvotes · 26 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Hmm ... this is certainly an interesting notion, and I applaud your creativity. But I think it is rooted in a fundamental misunderstanding of what it means to be "red pillled" or "blue pillled." Your presumption seems to be that women are blue pillled and that this is appropriate.

In reality, as is often acknowledged on MRP, women are inherently red pillled. They understand the fundamentals of game and attraction. Their own hypergamy is what controls most of it. Hypergamy is a red pillled concept when applied to women, and that is the foundation of where all their dreams and fantasies come from - wanting the alpha to reproduce with and the beta-provider to meet all their needs. The red pillled blend between these two qualities is the oak.

To that end, I would suggest that men should not be blue pillled with regard to our relationship with God. If

anything, Christ's bride (the Church proper and not just individual people) should embrace hypergamy - to want the best man who is an oak, who is both entirely alpha and attractive, but also a provider and protector. Simply put, that is God. There are none better. If Christ's bride were to have a hypergamous desire, it is already and only fully satisfied in God alone.

Once hypergamy is satisfied in its maximum possible potential, the fantasy goes away, as it becomes reality. In Christ we have that reality. We have no need to fantasize about what could be or what comes next because we already have the fullness of God available to us in the present.

Musings After a Wedding

1 upvotes · 24 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

She actually does a lot of speaking. She often has to give hour long lectures to groups of around 50-75. So, 150 seconds is really nothing, though she's never fully gotten used to it. It's more the other insecurities from the wedding as a foundation and this as the straw that broke the camel's back. It also had a short turnaround, being given this assignment late Saturday and having her mini speech this morning only 2 days later.

Musings After a Wedding

1 upvotes · 24 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

She was told she had to give a 150 second speech to 100 people and she gets nervous about public speaking. That was it.

What parts of "Game" should a RP Christian utilize? Which ones should we not utilize?

1 upvotes · 20 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I didn't say, "Set aside for Bob Jones." Someone else can mean anyone else. But yeah, she could potentially end up single for life. That's just very rare for women.

Phil's April Update

1 upvotes · 20 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Some people are natural thinkers and others are natural feelers. No matter which you are, you can - **and should** - learn to be proficient in the other. There should be no faking it. You should just learn to be a well balanced person regardless of where your default position is.

For example, every person's default position in life is to be an idiot who leeches off the provision of others (their parents). Then we go to school to become intelligent and self sufficient. There is value in being ignorant and dependent on others at times. There's also value in being knowledgeable and independent at times. We need to learn both skills - but especially the one that is not natural to us.

Do the same in your situation. Don't fake it. Be it. Only fake it if that's what you have to do to figure out what it looks like to make it.

Phil's April Update

1 upvotes · 20 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

By understanding I mean having a right perception of what's actually going on. Most people who are highly emotional in a given situation let their emotions affect their perception away from reality into fantasy. This is the core of all oneitis.

To be clear, it's situation specific, not person specific. So, you can be highly intellectual in most situations, but an emotionalist in this one case.

Phil's April Update

1 upvotes · 20 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

The cure to emotionslism is understanding. The cure to intellectualism is feeling. We all have our struggles. You're on one end, but you should see my conversations with intellectuals who have no heart and don't understand why their life sucks.

Phil's April Update

1 upvotes · 20 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

How does her sleeping with other guys or partying negatively impact your life?

Do you have bets going that she won't, so it will bring you financial detriment if she does? Is the hypothetical guy she's sleeping with your best friend, so it will affect your relationship with him? Is it that you think she'll go partying with your boss and say something embarrassing to get you fired? What actual detriment does her conduct cause to **your life** (as opposed to your emotional state)?

My guess is that it doesn't negatively impact your life at all. It's more about you not getting what you want. That sucks. Oh well. It's not hurting you though. Do you get this emotionally invested in not winning the lotto too?

1. "How does God feel about it?", or Feminine morality in dystopia

1 upvotes · 10 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Those whose "faith is strong" wouldn't make such rookie mistakes. Besides, all things are to be tested against scripture. If what he says isn't contrary to scripture, why should I care in the first place? And if it is, I have clear proof he is wrong. It's not as gray as you're trying to make it seem.

1. "How does God feel about it?", or Feminine morality in dystopia

1 upvotes · 10 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I wouldn't trust him. But that doesn't mean an immediate need for medication either. And to be clear: that's a scenario that had recurred many times in my life.

1. "How does God feel about it?", or Feminine morality in dystopia

1 upvotes · 10 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

It's more nuanced than that, but you seem to have the gist of it. It goes something like this:

- In OT times God spoke directly and audibly through the prophets as God the Father to tell us who he is and what he expects.
- In the gospels, God showed us who he is by action and example through the person of Jesus.
- After Jesus ascended, God now speaks through the Holy Spirit by indwelling within us, transforming us into who he is and to have the natural impulse to do what he expects.

In light of this, as I have often said on this sub, the Spirit rarely (if ever) tells us God's will. He transforms us into the type of people who don't need to be told in the first place - and His Word is the vehicle through which we travel to get there.

That's not to say God can't speak through verbal means; rather he doesn't. This part I wouldn't call impossible, but it's certainly rare, if it happens at all ... and whatever is said will never be inconsistent with the Word.

1. "How does God feel about it?", or Feminine morality in dystopia

1 upvotes · 10 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That would make it all the more suspect. God doesn't speak through voices like that anymore - not since before Jesus.

1. "How does God feel about it?", or Feminine morality in dystopia

1 upvotes · 10 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I then said immediately after that we were only talking about an abstract hypothetical - not reality.

1. "How does God feel about it?", or Feminine morality in dystopia

1 upvotes · 10 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

God won't contradict himself, especially as expressed through His Word. So, what you're suggesting is not God telling someone to do something. You're referencing someone wanting to do something and deluding themselves into believing it's from God. As noted previously, that is not a heart oriented toward obedience, so it's sin. Again, perception is not what defines the skin. Actual orientation does, which God weighs and measures.

1. "How does God feel about it?", or Feminine morality in dystopia

1 upvotes · 10 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I disagree ... not sure how your logic follows there.

1. "How does God feel about it?", or Feminine morality in dystopia

1 upvotes · 10 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

If it was a clear command from God, yes, I would do it. But we're only talking in an abstract hypothetical. The bible is clear that God will no longer ask things like that in a post gospel world. The wars of the past were only a physical expression of what Ephesians 6 now says is a battle against spiritual forces and not against flesh and blood. This transition from the physical to the spiritual is something I talk about a lot here.

1. "How does God feel about it?", or Feminine morality in dystopia

1 upvotes · 10 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That poll would probably be more appropriate for [r/truechristian](#). Although I've entertained the conversation, this entire thread has nothing to do with RP.

1. "How does God feel about it?", or Feminine morality in dystopia

1 upvotes · 10 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Yeah, if God says do it, I do it. There is no line. That's the whole point of the story of Abraham going to sacrifice Isaac.

Of course, I'm going to question some things a lot heavier than others. God asking me to pray with a stranger, I might do on a whim; but asking me to sacrifice my son ... I'd have to go through quite a bit to confirm the command was legitimately from God.

1. "How does God feel about it?", or Feminine morality in dystopia

1 upvotes · 9 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I'm not sure what you're asking then. Obedience to God at all cost is the line.

1. "How does God feel about it?", or Feminine morality in dystopia

1 upvotes · 9 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Yes, when God's will conflicts with man's laws, we are compelled to break man's law in order to maintain obedience to God. Those situations are rare, but ever increasing in America.

1. "How does God feel about it?", or Feminine morality in dystopia

1 upvotes · 9 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

The whole point of my position in this thread is that we do right by God and accept the consequences that brings in this life. If we break human laws we submit to the consequences of our human authorities.

1. "How does God feel about it?", or Feminine morality in dystopia

1 upvotes · 9 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I already told you: the police investigation is the example I had in mind. But you're still looking at the conduct to define morality. God looks at the heart. It's not even an issue of emotional state, as your previous question about guilt implied. I can feel guilty while never having done anything wrong. Morality is in the reason for which you do something, accounting for God's Word.

To be clearer, it's about the orientation of a person's heart. Regardless of how a person intellectualizes their behaviors, God knows when their orientation is toward genuine obedience and love for God, rather than justifying their conduct. And that is a standard I readily submit to, acknowledging that Jesus stands in my defense as often as I fail.

1. "How does God feel about it?", or Feminine morality in dystopia

1 upvotes · 9 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

anything a non believer does, if not for god's purposes, is evil. Anything. None of it is good unless god is involved?

- Romans 14:23 - "Anything that does not come from faith is sin"
- Hebrews 11:6 - "And without faith it is impossible to please God, because anyone who comes to him must believe that he exists"
- Isaiah 64:5-6 - "But when we continued to sin against [your ways], you were angry. How then can we be saved? All of us have become like one who is unclean, and all our righteous acts are like filthy rags."
- Romans 3:10-12 - "None is righteous, no, not one; no one understands; no one seeks for God. All have turned aside; together they have become worthless; no one does good, not even one."
- Romans 8:8 - "Those who are in the flesh cannot please God."

I could keep going ...

The discrepancy is that you're viewing morality as some abstract standard that transcends all things - even God. Your implication is that there are some things that are definitively right and definitively wrong and that these are universal.

In reality, all morality is subjective. I have one set of morals, you have another, the judge in court who decides whether we go to prison, pay a fine, or get off the hook might have a third, etc. Similarly, God has his own moral standard and he will judge the world by that standard.

To that end, God's moral standard is appropriately self-interested. That is, if something pleases him it passes his standard; if it doesn't please him it fails his standard. To say that this is "wrong" or "bad" is to act as if there is something higher than God that can exist as a judge over God - and I'd love to see whatever super-divine

revelation people use to reach those conclusions.

In reality, most people say, "Well, we humans all pretty much agree on some of these moral issues, and we think God's wrong, so God must be evil by our standards." That's all well and good, but you're still going to be judged by His standard whether you like it or not. God is the one who decides what is good and what is evil. There is no super-divine standard of good and evil that God just happens to claim to align with - He IS GOOD and IS NOT EVIL not because these things have a meaning of their own, but because his existence defines those terms for the Christian.

As a non-Christian I understand that you don't believe in God, which means you have to find another source for defining good and evil. When you've found that source, you then want to pit that source against anyone else's standard that doesn't align with yours. Again, that's fine for the limited context of living your own life, but you're still going to be judged by God's standard anyway. In a battle between your source for your standard and God, I'm confident God is going to win and your source material for your standard will not be able to excuse you or defend you against God.

So, if it pleases God, it's good. If it doesn't, it's evil. It's as simple as that. That is the entirety of morality. The fact is that most of secular morality is derived from the fact that God ingrained his character in our hearts through creation so that we would inherently share his morality. The ways we have deviated since then are as a result of our rebellion against God, thereby breaking the original intent for morality and rationalizing that somehow we know better, just as Satan did when he rebelled against God.

1. "How does God feel about it?", or Feminine morality in dystopia

1 upvotes · 8 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Your call. If it's between legalism and antinomianism, I'd suggest legalism is the better of the two, but it's best to find a balance.

1. "How does God feel about it?", or Feminine morality in dystopia

1 upvotes · 8 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I thought a sin was a sin

That's a common misconception. The new testament refrains in a number of places that some things are sinful for one person and not another. There is no hard list of sins, and even if there were, something like pirating intellectual property couldn't possibly have been contemplated 2000 years ago.

There are underlying principles that make every action capable of being sinful or not sinful. I've used examples here in the past of watching child pornography for non sinful purposes, and most people end up agreeing.

The bible is clear enough that sin is not from the law, but from our hearts. The law only exists to make us conscious of the sin in our hearts. Never confuse the law and sin as being unduly intertwined.

1. "How does God feel about it?", or Feminine morality in dystopia

1 upvotes · 8 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Agreed. Plus, there's a difference between rationalization, which comes from a philosophical premise, and a theological framework. Rationalization seeks to justify desired behaviors with scripture.

That is the very reason I repeatedly say in this and his last post that OP's heart and attitude make the result sinful no matter what path he chooses, even if it wouldn't be sin for someone else. He just wants to justify getting his way and not feel guilty.

A theological framework accepts our freedom in christ as a foundation and utilizes faith and acceptance of

practical consequences of our actions as a driving force for steering or behavior within the bounds of faith.

1. "How does God feel about it?", or Feminine morality in dystopia

1 upvotes · 8 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I can see how it comes off that way. But it all boils down to who you believe decides right from wrong. If the government dictates morality and God changes his will to adapt to whatever the government says, that leads to one conclusion. If God decides, then the government cannot legislate sin, so we must necessarily determine an alternate rubric. The totality of what I have proposed, and not just the isolated line you quoted, comes straight from Scripture.

1. "How does God feel about it?", or Feminine morality in dystopia

1 upvotes · 6 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Haha ... you're funny. But it's also sad how much you're lost in your own head. The sheer ignorance in this comment, despite your greatest efforts to sound impressive ... it's stunning. Stop being so defensive.

If you want to pirate, go pirate. But stop trying to use this sub to make you feel good about yourself. This isn't a sub about pirating and you clearly don't want a biblical opinion, only backing yourself up with human philosophies. This is clearly not the place for you if you just want to lead others down in your own stubbornness.

Is Sex Outside of Marriage a Sin? An Official Stance.

1 upvotes · 5 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Well said. This is very insightful.

1. "How does God feel about it?", or Feminine morality in dystopia

1 upvotes · 5 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I was reluctant, yet open with a lot of what you said up to the "taxing is robbery" bit. The line about not "owing" anything to the government, and therefore Paul really means we shouldn't pay them because we don't owe them anything ... I'm not buying it. That goes against the obvious plain meaning of what Paul is saying in Scripture (theology) as well as the basic philosophical premise of taxation in the first place.

Now, I'm about as conservative and small-government-minded as they come, but even I acknowledge that someone needs to pay for the roads we all drive on, to inspect the restaurants we eat in, to maintain a military to protect the country from invaders, etc. There are some legitimate expenses that must be met on a communal level. Asking the citizens to privately fund many of these things would never work. Yet the government provides these services anyway, and they are services that benefit us whether we asked for them or not. Is it robbery? You make a good case for it. But can we really say we don't "owe" it? I think not.

Similarly, when you bring up sales taxes, you're forgetting the contributions the government plays in the process. If you cut a deal with your neighbor and it turns out he defrauded you with the goods he sold, (1) who created the law that prohibits him from defrauding you, and (2) who are you going to turn to in order to prove his fraud, and (3) if he is found in fraud, who is going to enforce the penalty of his crime against you? The legislature, judiciary, and executive branches, respectively. Again, they're forcing you to pay them to ensure that this legal backdrop exists, and a case can be made that this is robbery. But it's not a blanket theft, where one takes and gives nothing in return. They are providing a service and if you want to use the threat of that service as a means of ensuring business transactions between private parties are generally safe to engage in with minimal risk of defraudment - that is a value added that the government provides, and there is something *owed* to the government for that service, regardless of whether or not we asked for that service.

Now, being an attorney I like to think in a legal context, so suppose I get a class-action lawsuit that comes through my door. There are millions of people in the affected class. Individually, each of them would only be entitled to

about \$100, but spread across those millions, there's a serious paycheck to be had in order to right a serious wrong that's been done. So, I take the case and work with maybe 50 people from the affected class who function as witnesses in quite a large case. We work on the case for 7 years and have 10 employees devoted exclusively to that case, who I pay at an average rate of \$150,000 per year (i.e. \$10.5 mil over time). We also spend \$10mil in legitimate business expenses to fund our operation on the case, including needing a bigger office to house the new employees to handle the case, utilities to run the place, internet access, legal research engines, pricey expert witness fees, etc.

At the end of the day, we win with a verdict of \$500 mil. The case is a smashing success. I have a fee agreement approved by the court that says I get paid my full hourly rate for the case in the amount of 10% of the verdict - \$50 mil. A normal fee agreement for something like this would be closer to 33-40%, so it's clear I'm working at a bargain price compared to every other attorney.

Now, everyone in the affected class is going to get an \$80 check. The 50 people I worked with on the case have no problem with this. Every other person in the protected class, by the millions, starts objecting saying that they don't think they should have to pay me because they didn't agree to my fee. Of course, it would have been impracticable for me to get a signed fee agreement from every person in the affected class. They want their full \$100 check for the case I just won them. Should I be paid my rightful fee?

The answer is an obvious and resounding: YES! It doesn't matter that they didn't agree to it. They got the benefit of my services, which added value to them that they would not have gotten if I had not done the work. The service I provided was something that they could not have possibly gotten on their own, unless someone in the protected class was willing to spend over \$20 million to win a case to collect a \$100 check.

I just forced my labor and services on someone else to their benefit and I expect compensation for those services. I believe it is both legal and moral that (i.e. your category 1) that I be paid my fair fee. If people were allowed to opt out of paying my fee, I would go bankrupt.

This situation happens every single day in law offices. It happens in the business realm also, even in a capitalist economy. It's not surprising, then, that the government does the same thing. In fact, it's most necessary from a governmental angle. As much as I hate governmental interference and push for a reduction in taxes, a total elimination of taxes altogether would not be good for society because there would be no way to fund the countless things that people would not otherwise privately chip in to pay for.

Intellectual property exists and can be interacted with but cannot be defended pro-actively but only re-actively.

First, reactive defense is still a line of defense. As I often tell my clients, the entirety of the law is reactive. We cannot accuse people of crimes before they have been committed. We cannot sue someone for breaking a contract that they haven't yet broken. We cannot make custody determinations based on what a person might do in the future. But that doesn't mean those crimes, contracts, and children aren't very important - enough to use reactive protection as a deterrent.

Also, you can note that virtually all intellectual property that is often pirated has encryption measures put on, which is about the same thing as a fence. But those measures aren't perfect. Piracy is someone pulling out their bolt cutters and chipping away at the fence so they can take what's inside, working around the encryption, or just climbing over to take it. Even the people who use video cameras at movies are working against the "fence" of movie theater employees who periodically patrol and look for this kind of stuff. The fact that the fence is easy to get around, in comparison to the piracy techniques, doesn't change the fact that it's there.

Here's the real deal: Paul wrote Romans 13 as a man who spent most of his life running from the law. If by "submit to your governing authorities" he actually meant, "Obey every law they ever make," then he would be

condemning himself for not turning himself in, along with every other Christian Nero (his governing authority) was trying to have killed.

Instead, we see Paul "submitting" to his governing authorities by setting his eyes on God as his primary aim, and accepting the consequences, wherever that took him. That doesn't mean he couldn't present a legal defense, as he did. But it did mean that he was okay with violating statutes and submitting to the penalty. That is submission.

In that sense, whether I'm smuggling Bibles into North Korea or cocaine into America, it doesn't matter. The act of my smuggling is unlawful, but it's not sin itself unless I refuse to accept the due legal penalty for my actions. Similarly, if I park in a handicapped spot, the act of breaking the the state statute about handicapped parking is not sinful; rather, it would be sin if I then refused to pay the parking ticket I got for doing so, unless I could legally defend it. Of course, there are likely other sins associated with many of these types of actions, but violating a legislative statute is not one of them. My heart and motive would be, along with the effect and implication of my actions.

To that end, I don't care if someone wants to pirate or not, as long as they're willing to accept the legal consequences for their actions if they are pursued.

What I'm more concerned with, as [/u/rocknrollchuck](#) alluded to in his reply, is the orientation of a person's heart. The fact of most incidents of piracy is that people are looking to consume more of the world, when in reality their hearts and minds should be oriented away from the world. Rather than increasing life comforts, which placate us away from a ministry of discipleship, we should be engaging in actions that advance that ministry. Watching TV could be part of that. Even pirating certain media could contribute to this purpose. But OP has made it clear that his purpose is his own entertainment, not to utilize the pirated content for the purpose of advancing a mission to make disciples. To that end, his intent in wanting to pirate is a sinful intent, regardless of whether it violates some biblical command or not. To that end, with regard to biblical law, he's probably in your category 2, or with regard to human law, in your category 4 - although the exact same actions with a different motive could fall into either category 1 or 3.

Piracy: Pharisaism or Libertarianism?

1 upvotes · 2 April 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I take it more as: *Let the chips lay where they fall. If God put you in one life context, accept it and make the most of it. Culture is screwed up. Don't go out of your way to ingest more of it.* I can't help but agree with the sentiment. The classics always become available for free when the copyright expires or if someone has a decent library within driving range.

Social Influence and Defying Context

1 upvotes · 31 March 2018 · [/r/TheRedPill](#)

The money you make off of new clients like him will, in the aggregate, contribute to you getting laid.

marriage prep: confront her with my past sexual sins?

1 upvotes · 30 March 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Of course. But that can't really apply where God's Word doesn't give a clear answer.

Is there anything we as young men we can do to slowly dispel a Jezebel spirit with RP principles?

1 upvotes · 29 March 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I don't feel compelled to greet her or to not greet her. Sometimes I say hello before she does, and she responds. Other times she say hello, and I'll respond. Other times, neither of us will say a thing, and we leave

it at that.

What about the situation where she says hello and you don't respond? Would that be awkward or feel unnatural to you? That's what I'm talking about - that's where you feel compelled.

My wife does this to me all the time. "I love you, honey," expecting an ILY back. Most of the time I simply reply, "Goodnight," and leave it at that. Why? Because I don't feel compelled to say "ILY" to my wife just because she said it. Sometimes I don't even respond to her at all - especially when she's just saying something in passing and isn't really interested in my attention. If she wants my attention, love, and affection, she knows how to get it. But these social niceties of "you must say ILY back to your spouse if they say it to you" is garbage that a man must learn to ignore if he wants to be his own man and not controlled by worldly ideologies.

That's not to say it's bad for me to say ILY back to my wife. What's bad is the feeling of compulsion that I *have to respond*. I don't *have to* do anything.

she definitely is not a christian

Then your speech to her needs to be modified: "Hey, things have definitely changed between us. I'm not sure exactly what happened. I was totally into you, but you're not a Christian, so I never pulled the trigger. Admit it or not, you seemed into me too and I'm betting you got upset when I never did anything about it, which has made things weird. Sorry if I led you on at all, but I do value your friendship. I'm grabbing lunch/coffee/whatever after class and I'd like you to join me. If not, no worries."

Although I strictly prohibit evangedating, there's nothing wrong with a guy having a female friend who he's trying to share the Gospel with over a long period of time. If this brings the friendship back where you want it, all the better. But if you think this is going to tempt you to be more than friends with her, then ignore this advice and just ignore her as well. Don't put yourself in a position of being tempted to sin (i.e. dating a non-Christian, I'm not even talking about sex with her).

I get that it is unique because for the first time I haven't been able to just ghost/run

Ergo the ancient saying: "Don't crap where you eat."

Maybe i'm projecting

Here's the thing about projecting: if you're uncertain whether or not you're projecting, you're projecting. Not projecting is when you actually know the answer with some degree of certainty.

my connection to God is weak

Find someone to disciple you. Go to a church on campus and ask around for a mature believer. Find a parachurch ministry on campus and get involved and ask around for someone to disciple you. You've got options. I know you've got a full schedule. But some things are too important to get dropped off the priority list.

Tag: [/u/rocknrollchuck](#) - because there's some unique information here that I didn't see elsewhere in this thread and it changes the game quite a bit.

Is there anything we as young men we can do to slowly dispel a Jezebel spirit with RP principles?

1 upvotes · 29 March 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

if you truly do, please let me know

I do.

walk away with whatever small dignity I still have

The conversation is how you get your dignity back. Your dignity is not dependent on whether or not she accepts you/rejects you. It is dependent on whether or not you can be your own man, not controlled by social stigma.

it is a bit late to have the talk.

You're the third person I've had to tell this to this week alone: **learn to defy context.**

Lots of guys like to complain, "There's no real context to talk about ____" or "I don't have a context to introduce myself" or "My wife and I don't have that type of relationship - there's no context to bring that up." Translation: *I'm a man who is ruled and controlled by context and social stigma.*

When I begin discipling a guy, I often give homework in the first few meetings: Go have a 60 second conversation with someone you've never met before and without any context for the conversation. One guy from a couple weeks ago explained that he did this by meeting a girl online and having a date with her. **NO.** That doesn't count. Setting up a date creates context.

I'm talking about coming up to someone on the street, walking your cart next to them in the grocery store, or chatting them up in an elevator. I don't care if it's a guy or girl. It doesn't matter. Just start conversations with random people for no apparent reason.

This is how you increase your social network. It's how you display an alpha "I DNGAF about social stigma" attitude. It's how you get ahead in your career. It's how you influence people. It's how you make a difference in the world for Christ. Learn to function without context.

When you say "it is a bit late to have the talk" you really mean, "There's no context for it, so it would seem weird for me to bring it up that way." So? It's obviously still bothering you. She might not see context for it, but you certainly do. Why should you care what context she sees or not? For all you know, she's had the exact same thoughts running through her head. It doesn't matter.

Learn to ignore context and just do what you want to do regardless of whether or not it violates social stigma.

Is the wife's desire in Genesis 3:16 affectionate or antagonistic? Let's explore

1 upvotes · 26 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Yeah, I usually use WLC: <http://www.scripture4all.org/OnlineInterlinear/OTpdf/gen3.pdf>

I also cross-reference that with biblehub.org for the Strongs numbers. It's the only one I know of that's free online. biblestudytools.com also uses the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia, which is also based on the Leningrad Codex and I think was the actual codex that the WLC was transcribed from (WLC is the online version of the BHS). From my understanding, the Leningrad Codex is the oldest complete manuscript, though there are some older partial manuscripts. I haven't looked much into those.

Pastor injects Feminism at Wedding Ceremony

1 upvotes · 26 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Women don't want to beta-fy their men; they want to know definitively whether or not their man is alpha or beta. Hypergamy's AF and BB sides gives her room to enjoy either aspect of their man, they just want to know what his character is to know how to take advantage of the situation. If it's an AF dynamic, they will enjoy and appreciate strong attraction to him and submit to his lead to maintain that attraction and healthy relationship. If it's a BB dynamic, they will enjoy controlling and manipulating him to get all of their comforts met. Whether the

man is AF or BB isn't her choice, but when she figures out which type of a relationship she's in, then she knows how to work in that system for her greatest gain. That's why she tests. And she keeps on testing to make sure things don't change, as they often do ... or that if things do change, that she changes her strategy accordingly.

I'm sure i read on married rp that marriage is dating mode on hard.

The saying is that MRP is RP on hard mode, not necessarily "dating on hard mode." It's harder to get positive responses in a marriage context because as you practice RP strategies, your wife learns and adapts to them. Pick up a new girl at the bar every day and you can employ the same 5 tricks over and over and over again and keep getting laid. Try those same 5 tricks with the same woman over and over and over again and you'll have a dead bedroom. You have to constantly change your tactics. You also have to work toward the softer oak qualities, which can be a difficult balance that doesn't need to be maintained in the dating realm, where you can just be in pure jerk-mode and do just fine.

Is Sex Outside of Marriage a Sin? An Official Stance.

1 upvotes · 24 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I'm on the same wavelength as John Piper on that issue. Feel free to skip to the conclusions, but the whole paper is solid: <https://www.desiringgod.org/articles/divorce-remarriage-a-position-paper>

Is the wife's desire in Genesis 3:16 affectionate or antagonistic? Let's explore

1 upvotes · 23 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Agreed on all counts.

Pastor injects Feminism at Wedding Ceremony

1 upvotes · 23 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Sin [bad] desires Cain [man], but Cain [man] should rule over sin [bad]. Wife [?] desires husband [man], but husband [man] should rule over wife [?]. If the passages are parallel (as I agree with you: they are), then the parallel position the wife is in is that of sin. So, I'm not sure how you can utilize that to say her desire for her husband is "not bad" when the implication of the parallel is clearly the opposite.

If you want to get really technical, the Hebrew reads as follows: *we'el isek tesuqatek we'hu yimsal bak*. Here's the breakdown (strong's ID in brackets):

- we'el [413] - the "we" is a conjunctive ("and," though sometimes silent); the "el" has a dual meaning, the two most common out of 404 uses being: 162 translations as "against" and 75 translations as "toward." Accordingly, there is no agreement on whether or not the author originally meant "and toward" or "and against," thus there can be no definitive conclusion.
- isek [376] - from the root "ish" for "man" (this is consistent with the two most common translations: 746 for "man" and 669 for "men," the next closest being "each" at 148. Some variation of "husband" is about 70. All 6 uses in the Bible of this particular conjugation of ish (specifically: *isek*) are within the 70 re: husbands.
- tesuqatek [8669] - longing/desire (nothing funny; it's only used 3 times in the Bible and all are consistent with this definition); the particular conjugation implies "you/your" instead of "my" or "his" or something else
- we'hu [1931] - again, the "we" is a conjunctive. "hu" can mean he/she/it/this/who; of its uses in the Bible, it's virtually always in the masculine
- yimsal [4910] - rule/control/have dominion. Its 4 most common uses are rule (27), ruler (18), rules (9), and rulers (6). This conjugation implies a "him/her/it" as the subject doing the ruling.

- bak - not referenced in the Strong's, but in this verse most translations agree: "over you"

If I put this all together it could read like any one of the following:

- (1) And toward husband you desire and he rule over you
- (2) And against husband you desire and he rule over you
- (3) And toward man you desire and he rule over you
- (4) And against man you desire and he rule over you

Given the context of child-bearing and the marriage between Adam and Eve, it's highly probable we're dealing with 1 or 2 (i.e. the "husband" options), but if it were 3 or 4 it would say quite a bit about why women through history constantly seek their identity through men (3) or why they are also simultaneously constantly trying to seek control over men (4).

But if I'm right about the "husband" translation, then the only other real distinction is whether or not her desires are to be directed toward her husband or against his interests. This is why some translations reference a positive desire for a husband (NIV, KJV), but others reference a contrary/controlling desire (ESV, NLT).

Now, the Genesis 4:7 parallel looks like this: *we'elleka tesuqatow we'attah timsal bow*. Here's the comparative breakdown:

- we'elleka - same as we'el, except it adds a reversing conjunctive ("but"), making it now mean "but toward/against"
- tesuqatow - same as tesuqatek, but with the subject of "it" instead of "you/your" - "it desires"
- we'attah - parallel to we'hu; where "hu" meant a third party (he/she/it), the attah references "you" - "and you"
- timsal - same as "yimsal" except the subject ruling is no longer a third party, but "you" - "you rule"
- bow - same as "bak," but presumably a change in directive from "you" to "it"

These two phrases are unmistakably meant to parallel one another, as they are virtually identical except as to conjugation. To that end, Genesis 4:7 should be very key in our interpretation of Genesis 3:16. Which one makes more sense (noting that "it" is a reference to *hatat* ("sin") from earlier in the verse):

- (a) But toward [you] it desires and you rule it
- (b) But against [you] it desires and you rule it

Between these two, does sin have a positive, affectionate desire toward us, or does it have a desire that works against us? If indeed these two verses are meant to be a parallel of one another, then the answer must be the same for both. Because sin's desire is a controlling desire against our interests, I don't see how we can contextually read a wife's desire as stated in the 'curse' as being an affectionate, positive desire for us ... unless we argue that Moses (the presumed author of Genesis) just accidentally used the exact same phrases a mere few paragraphs apart and had no intention of connecting the two, and God somehow has let the church mistake a connection between those verses for close to 3,500 years since this was put to writing without providing a prophet to communicate otherwise.

TL;DR - It seems pretty clear that the language in Genesis 3:16 references a woman having a desire against her

husband (not for him), which is evident both from the fact that the "against" translation has over 2x the usage as the "toward" for the operative word (162 v. 75) and also because the language in Genesis 4:7 is an incredible parallel with 3:16, but clearly means to be interpreted in the "against" sense, and therefore 3:16 should be interpreted in the "against" sense also.

Tag: [/u/Xoramung](#)

Pastor injects Feminism at Wedding Ceremony

1 upvotes · 23 March 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Agreed. I don't know why she keeps deleting solid comments!

Humility - the “mother of all virtues,” and pride, “the cause of all sin.”

1 upvotes · 22 March 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Indeed, Romans 14:23 being another solid voucher for faith as a secondary.

Is Sex Outside of Marriage a Sin? An Official Stance.

1 upvotes · 21 March 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

What was, then?

Is Sex Outside of Marriage a Sin? An Official Stance.

1 upvotes · 21 March 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

There's nothing different that would be done now that wouldn't have been done before [/u/Red-Curious](#) made this new post.

Exactly!

Open thread idea

1 upvotes · 21 March 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

spare time

Lifting, racquetball, biking/hiking, writing, playing guitar, reading/listening to audio books, a smattering of TV shows, musicals

sports teams

Ick ... never did understand the value of watching other men engage in physical activity. Most sports are too boring or repetitive for me to enjoy. Boxing and tennis are the two exceptions, but those are both for peripheral reasons than the sport itself.

Open thread idea

1 upvotes · 21 March 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Ah, boxing ... one of two sports I can actually bear to watch. Strangely enough, tennis is the other one. Hilly trails are solid too - especially on a bike ride with the kids in a trailer. That's better than squats sometimes!

Since men are the prize in a marriage, is a dowry a blue pill idea? I'm curious to know since dowry's are in the Bible, was that an example of the cultural shift towards hypergamy?

1 upvotes · 20 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

It sounds like you got it. I agree with pretty much everything you said, except maybe the one time you used the term "dowry" instead of "bride price" ;) Excellent write-up, and better than I would have put it.

Update to an update

1 upvotes · 20 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Well said.

Pursuing a Godly Woman - Advice Needed

1 upvotes · 20 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I was going to reply independently, but you hit the nail on the head too hard that I'll just up vote this instead.

How to transition into celibacy?

1 upvotes · 16 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I wasn't challenging what you believe. I was referencing your gross misrepresentation of my beliefs on the matter, which you're still doing by attributing an "end game" to me that I absolutely do not support. This is blatant trolling. Take your 3- day ban as a warning. This is not for whatever ideas you want to support or argue against. It is for trolling. Period. Now learn to suck it up and stop being so whiny all the time.

A Guide to Manipulation - Part 2: The Tactics

1 upvotes · 16 March 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Well said. I completely agree.

A Guide to Manipulation - Part 2: The Tactics

1 upvotes · 15 March 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

You're only looking at one side of the coin in the point of the post. Despite the original critique by [/u/creating_my_life](#), there's a reason I assigned the genders in the order I did (and internally debated doing it in the reverse).

How to transition into celibacy?

1 upvotes · 14 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This mirror's my thoughts and comment as well. Well said.

How to transition into celibacy?

1 upvotes · 14 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I agree, but would add one caveat: Paul's suggestion of marriage is when your sexual desire is mutual with another person, not necessarily a unilateral compulsion to masturbate.

How to transition into celibacy?

1 upvotes · 14 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Dude ... you just can't let that go. There's a difference between "It's a bad idea, but it's not sin" and "I want every guy doing this!" Stop mischaracterizing things or you will be banned as a troll.

A Guide to Manipulation - Part 1: Are You Being Manipulated?

1 upvotes · 13 March 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

It's not an either/or concept. As noted, people who are manipulated are also "weak, whiny losers." If they weren't, they likely wouldn't be so susceptible to manipulation in the first place.

In the posts you glossed through, I'd wager most of them do involve guys whose "weak, whiny" victim pukes stem from manipulation, even if it goes unidentified. Heck, most of NMMNG and MMSLP are about identifying how blue pill men have been manipulated by society and their wives and how to respond to that. Virtually every fitness test or comfort test incorporates a form of manipulation (otherwise it wouldn't be a test).

I do agree that there is no cabal of womanhood at the top plotting how to advance female hypergamous desires. Most manipulation is inherent to a person's fundamental character and not overt or intentional ... hence the book title referencing "covert" manipulative tactics.

A Guide to Manipulation - Part 1: Are You Being Manipulated?

1 upvotes · 13 March 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Fair points. It's worth noting here that these are not the techniques themselves (those are reserved for the next post, per my intro). These are, as you note, *symptoms* for identifying if you've been the subject of manipulation, which gives a better context for the subsequent post. So, you're spot on.

In addition to the books on the sidebar, what books have helped you develop a RP mindset?

1 upvotes · 13 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

With disclaimers, I'm fine with it as long as OZ approves, noting that I have not reviewed them myself.

In addition to the books on the sidebar, what books have helped you develop a RP mindset?

1 upvotes · 13 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I don't know that I've given an official "position" on the subject for the sub other than that the undeniable biblical conditions allowing for the termination of a marriage should not be rejected, which are: (1) death, (2) unbelieving spouse leaves, (3) cheating.

As to 3, everyone agrees that *porneia* includes cheating. If we want to interpret more into it than just that, we're leaving the realm of universal acceptance and entering personal interpretation. To that end, I won't deny a person from making such a claim or arguing that theological point, but if it's made as a recommendation to someone it MUST be supported with a theological rationale for why that's okay. BPP's book does provide that theological rationale, as I recall, and therefore it's still up on the sidebar, even if I did disagree with him.

To that end, I'm still undecided myself. I see so, so, so, so, so much in the Bible about how God treats those who don't produce fruit. As I've refrained over and over, I believe that fruit is defined by spiritual reproduction, which is parallel to physical reproduction. So, in the parable of the fig tree if the master is going to chop down and burn the tree that doesn't produce fruit (i.e. spiritually reproduce), despite the fact that it is otherwise a grown tree, the implication is that someone can technically be spiritually alive because as the soil the Gospel sprang up in them to produce a tree ... but if they don't allow that tree to reproduce, then Jesus will divorce them. In the physical context, you can be technically married to someone and that marriage is alive, valid, and genuine, but if there's no reproductive acts going on (leaving the birth control issue aside), then does that mean one's wife should also be "chopped down and thrown into the fire" metaphorically, which I take to mean divorced from the relationship? I'm inclined to say yes, and that's consistent with /u/BluepillProfessor's conclusion as well ... I just get there from a different angle than a strict broadening of the word *porneia*. But this is tying together so many passages in so many different contexts that I'm not confident enough to make it an official position.

Husband pastor & quite time

1 upvotes · 13 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I dictated the last response during a car ride yesterday. I finally have a moment to sit down for this one ...

Just because something falls within one's responsibility or purview doesn't mean they have to do ALL of the activities on their own.

I agree. But does that now mean that because the house is the wife's domain over which she is "despot of the oikos" ... that the man is to be her helper? That when he fixes the deck or mows the yard or whatever, he's functioning not in a leader capacity, but in helping her with her domain?

A woman today could call any number of companies with a wide array of services to have things done and she'd still be the one who makes sure it got taken care of.

Who's paying for that if she's a stay-at-home who doesn't earn income?

it's interpretation vs application

You say this twice, but I don't get it. It's an interpretation issue because we're trying to interpret whether or not God assigned (1) all of the housework as the wife's domain, (2) part of it, or (3) only the degree which her husband delegates to her. This isn't an application issue; it's an interpretation issue of what Scripture actually says and not. Once you answer that question, only then can you move into the application framework of how to get those responsibilities done ... but you have to figure out what the actual responsibility is first.

they're over that entire thing.

Good, consistency here :)

But as her head, the husband could overrule her on anything he wanted. It's like a general having someone heading up a different part of the military under his command

I don't see the analogy. Is the general also functioning in the same capacity as a private would in that facility? No, the general is off doing other things. So, are you suggesting that the man is okay to just go to work and never do any work around the house ever because that's the wife's domain? That seems to be what you're implying, but you're not saying it directly, so I'm not sure.

And if the man *does* have an obligation to take part in certain responsibilities around the home, how does that reconcile with it being *her* domain and him *helping her* with her assignment from God (assuming, as you suggest, that this actually is part of her assignment) rather than the reverse?

it was helpful to see how he views scripture so here's mine

Yep, we're on the same page with most of this, although it appears there are still some branching baths, and that's okay. Here are the couple exceptions/notes:

when He comments two, three or more times on a topic, it gives greater context and clarity.

Indeed. I used to maintain (I'm not as strict anymore) that I would not teach something as a hard theological truth unless I could prove it from 3 places with at least one from each testament. This is a good principle.

Interpreting passages literally doesn't mean they can't carry symbolism or other aspects

By definition this is impossible. Google the word *literal* ... "Taking words in their usual or most basic sense **without metaphor or allegory.**" As soon as you incorporate metaphor or allegory or symbolism or whatever, you've left the realm of literalism. I do agree with your two examples on that part though. But you're leaving literal interpretation to do it. You're just saying that *both the literal and the non-literal interpretations are true and*

valuable. I agree as to the examples given.

Understand the way we talk and communicate and if one wants to look at scripture and interpret through a particular "lens," this would be the best way to do so.

I still think this is an inappropriate lens when you're comparing how people talk and communicate today with how they talked and communicated in biblical context and the frames of reference and understanding that people would have had in those communications at that time as well.

going too far in either direction can lead to error

Completely agreed :) This is part of the "context" in the "authorial intent" model. And let's be clear: everyone uses a model/lens. It's impossible not to.

RC, on a personal note, I consider you a friend. Don't take the lighthearted jabs personally, nor do I take any offense to criticisms of my positions.

This is mutual :) Sorry if I come off as otherwise at different times. I try to be pretty flat in my communication tone online, and given the feedback I get from other subs I'm often highly praised through PMs and comments for my ability to communicate in an "unoffensive" manner in an online forum ... but on RPC I let myself go from time to time, paying less caution and attention than I should, assuming guys here should be tough enough to take it :/ Sorry if I let that go too far.

Husband pastor & quite time

1 upvotes · 13 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Excellent run-down!

In addition to the books on the sidebar, what books have helped you develop a RP mindset?

1 upvotes · 13 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

It would fit under "RP Reading Material," where we already have non-Christian content. I simply don't have the time to read all of these posts right now, but if both you and [/u/rocknrollchuck](#) acknowledge that they add value **AND** (language notwithstanding) that there is nothing biblically inconsistent or sinful being promoted, then I'll trust you both and add it, getting around to reading them all myself when I'm available. But this could certainly be a good addition.

The way I'd add it is simply as a reference to the comment itself, although it'd also be appropriate to re-create the comment into a post with a bit more description and some of the cautionary notes if there are aspects of certain things in the linked content that Christians would do well to ignore.

Husband pastor & quite time

1 upvotes · 12 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

What you're describing IS the principles/context model. The context tells us the author's intent and is usually discerned from the plain language of the text (plus cross references, understanding of history, etc.).

In your sports announcer example, you're still agreeing that when the announcer intends to be taken literally we take him literally, and when he intends to be taken metaphorically we take him metaphorically.

The whole "the way people talk" thing doesn't make sense to me because there's so much evidence that people back then had different communication patterns from what we utilize today. 10 minutes of watching sci-fi with a newly discovered species will show a great example of what I'm talking about. But even with that aside, "the way people talk" is still centered around authorial intent. We talk on the assumption that people will understand what

we're intending, not secretly hoping that they come to a different conclusion than the one we meant (unless you're being intentionally deceptive through implication, which my interpretation model assumes will never be the case with regard to the bible).

Long story short, 99% of what you're describing IS the model I propose and not some 4th interpretational structure (though I don't deny that others do exist). If I understand correctly, you're saying "I'm a literalist, but I'm okay with accepting things as non literal when it's clear that the author didn't intend to be taken literally." That's what I'm saying.

Regarding that last bit, I still see nothing in the grammar to imply these as present expectations. I'm not sure how you're pigeon holing me into "one application" when my interpretation of the passage leaves several possible applications and your interpretation (which I still believe is inconsistent with everything you said here) is the one that prescribes only one non sinful application: that women MUST take care of the house regardless of how their husbands instruct.

Looking at the other things listed in that passage and saying "are we to ignore these too?" is a smoke screen. It's like when my pastor tried to use 1 Corinthians 6:19-20 to preach on exercise, diet and physical fitness. Does God want us to exercise, diet and be physically fit? Absolutely. But that's not the passage to draw those conclusions from, as that passage is about sexual immorality. Assuming "Paul would have been cool if we took his words out of context" is a bad premise.

Likewise, the notions of chastity and being obedient to one's husband are good things ... But this passage isn't the proper place to draw those conclusions. You must leave the "literal historical- grammar" or "plain language of the text" to make that leap, which is why I believe you're being inconsistent here. No matter how you slice it, Paul simply didn't say "young women for all cultures throughout all of time MUST obey these things." If you said that to Paul he'd probably say something like, "I appreciate what you're trying to do, but did you even read what I wrote? I didn't say anything so extreme as you're implying.

What you're doing to Paul is the same thing that k-something777 guy was trying to do to me. I say a husband has the option of being a SAHD without it being sin and he jumps to "God luck with your society where women run everything - the government, businesses, etc." I said nothing of the sort - he just took something I said and interpreted/applied it to an extreme degree.

The same goes for much of the OT law. Some people like to hyper apply it to non Israelites across time. Paul specifically rejected that conclusion, declaring that it was only relevant in the actual context in which it was given: to the Jews, before Jesus's death/resurrection. He refused to extrapolate countless bible passages into his own context. He said they're still useful, but that they should not be obeyed literally. This even includes circumcision, which God called an eternal covenant ... yet he wished for the emasculation of those who tried to enforce it out of context. Accordingly, I'm very cautious about me being the one to enforce and demand obedience to one application of contextually questionable passages.

Douglas Wilson: Sexual devotion as a resemblance of Christ and the church

1 upvotes · 10 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That makes more sense.

Rollo Tomassi – Interviews and Video

1 upvotes · 9 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I'm done having babies. There's a difference ;) The spit-up, late night crying, gated staircases, etc. are all things I don't want to return to. I also don't want to go through my wife being pregnant again. Can I deal with it? Sure. Do I have any desire to? Absolutely not.

Rollo Tomassi – Interviews and Video

1 upvotes · 9 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That's a good word of caution. I don't think I'm doing that, but I'll definitely be more observant and self-aware going forward, so thanks for the warning. In this case I do stand by what I said - that we are God's creations/children returning to him, not someone else's creations/children being adopted in (although we were certainly under satan's dominion for a time, per John 8:44). The other things you referenced I don't believe are things I've ever said, though I can see some people here trying to argue them.

Regarding adoption, my view will never sway from James 1:27 - "Religion that God our father accepts as pure and faultless is this: to look after orphans and widows in their distress and to keep oneself from being polluted by the world." In my mind, adoption is a perfectly legitimate and appropriate method of doing this. One could also run an orphanage and not actually adopt the kids. Or one could financially support an orphanage or sponsor a family who can't otherwise afford to adopt, etc. I am currently contemplating adoption in my own life, which is partially why I asked the question I did.

All of that to say: I have nothing against adoption. I do have a frame issue if a guy is only adopting because his wife tells him she wants to (which happens to be the majority of cases). Although I respect Rollo's insights, and therefore find value in seeking his response, he's not my god and I'm not bound to do what he says; but that doesn't mean he has nothing to contribute to the conversation. I'm not sure if any of that makes sense, but that's where I'm at right now :p

Douglas Wilson: Sexual devotion as a resemblance of Christ and the church

1 upvotes · 9 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is certainly an interesting read. I do have a different take than the author, though. Here's my understanding of what he's saying:

- Christ is our groom; we are his bride.
- This relationship parallels the husband/wife relationship.
- If a husband looks at another woman longingly, because as the husband he is the model for Christ, that implies to the rest of the world that Christ is also attracted to others outside his church/bride as well.

When we word his argument that way, the answer becomes obvious: *OF COURSE Christ is attracted to those outside the church and wants to be in relationship with them too.*

Now, someone could bring up the fact that the Church as a whole is Christ's bride - it's not that he has several brides and he's looking at increasing his polygamous count by eyeing non-believers to bring into the fold. To that end, even when he brings non-believers in, he's really just refining his existing bride and making her whole, not cheating on her.

The parallel would more apply to Jesus looking at other things that he could have made his bride instead, like morality, politics, economics, businesses, etc. Those things are not Christ's bride and if Christ abandoned his church to focus on those things, then he certainly would be a cheater.

But here's the thing: Jesus wants "all things" reconciled to himself. Whether it's people or non-people, in the church or out of the church, Jesus wants *all things* reconciled to himself. In my mind, that's just like Jesus driving down the street and seeing an economic crisis and thinking, "Man, that's so tempting, I wish I could just go in there and make her mine! But ... I'll let her to herself and stay faithful to my bride, the Church, as the vehicle through which I'll eventually deal with that stuff."

Long story short: I think Jesus does look longingly at things other than "the Church" and has a great desire to see all those other things reconciled to and united with himself, just like a husband might see another woman and

want her united with him. That desire isn't anything bad. But acting on it surely would be.

The last bit about telling your kids when you're having sex with their mom, though ... hmm ... I'll have to think on that. I certainly like showing my kids when I give physical attention/kino to my wife and I think that's productive. But they're still too young for me to contemplate how they'd respond to the thought of us having sex with their knowledge.

Rollo Tomassi – Interviews and Video

1 upvotes · 9 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Well, that depends on how you want to look at it. Yes, we're adopted as God's children. That is clear. But it's not like we were born to someone else.

I think of it more like the prodigal son. We were born to a good father. We abandoned him and gave up all rights of sonship and any claim as heirs. From a legal standpoint, this would be like emancipating ourselves and then being adopted by the devil. Then, through the Gospel, God allows us to come back, adopting us back into the family from which we were originally born to begin with.

In that sense, we have always been originally from his line and the adoption is predominantly a legal snafu and not a claim that we're not "biologically" (or in this sense, spiritually) God's.

Rollo Tomassi – Interviews and Video

1 upvotes · 7 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Re: #2 - That doesn't sound odd at all. Makes perfect sense to me.

That said, I'm still unclear on how proactive cuckoldry serves hypergamy when the child isn't her own offspring, as would be the case in traditional cuckoldry.

Rollo Tomassi – Interviews and Video

1 upvotes · 7 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Having fished the video now, you talked about men having an imperative to ensure paternity and not wanting to raise another man's kids and women wanting to reproduce through their hypergamous imperative. How does adoption fit into this?

I've done some adoption work in my legal career and do acknowledge straight up that it's virtually always the woman who initiates the idea of wanting to adopt. Ignoring the cases of step parent adoption (which would be far more obvious) ...

1. How does this reconcile with hypergamy when she's asking her man to raise a kid that isn't even hers to begin with?
2. What do we make of the rare men who actually are the instigators in wanting to adopt?

Examples of Terrible Advise

1 upvotes · 7 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Definitely not :p

Examples of Terrible Advise

1 upvotes · 7 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I'm making up words here, but I'd say there are physical fetishes, like a foot fetish - it's about the size, shape, smell, texture, etc. A conceptual fetish is more along the lines of the pregnancy example where a guy thinks: because she's pregnant I know she's a sexual being, there's another life inside her and I want to put more put my life giving seed in her, etc. I don't buy the "I did that to her" thing because most guys with a legit pregnancy fetish feel the same way about pregnancy porn where it wasn't them.

And yes, it matters beyond just completion. As you've noted many times, sex is not just about having an orgasm and there is such a thing as bad sex even when you finish.

Examples of Terrible Advise

1 upvotes · 6 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Excellent suggestion. Sorry it took me until just now to get around to this post. Thanks for sharing this. It is certainly worthwhile to know what preconceived notions people have in their minds, and once you've been removed from that for long enough it's easy to forget.

Examples of Terrible Advise

1 upvotes · 6 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

who would find her physically attractive?

Well, there is a whole fetish around that. But I don't think it's so much a physical appearance thing as a conceptual fetish. But for the most part, I fully agree.

EDIT: Should have read the next comment down before posting this :p

Is working with kids at church worth the risk?

1 upvotes · 6 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I am sure the church would not pay a lawyer to defend us

Actually, the law suit would be defended by the church, as you are acting in a capacity as an agent when you work in a volunteer capacity in a children's ministry. That does not absolve you of any criminal conduct that is alleged, but it does mean that any civil suit would be against the church as well, and any conclusion on that claim would be bound to you personally as well by virtue of collateral estoppel. So, if the church was successful in its defense, you would be personally absolved as to any legal issues that overlapped. But again, criminal issues do not overlap. That also doesn't technically affirm that you were acting in your capacity as an agent for the church, thus you would have to participate in the litigation to some degree anyway. But most likely the same lawyer would handle your and the church's claim and you'd sign a waiver of conflict to let him do so.

Personally, I steer far away from children's ministry. I serve in my church, but not in that capacity because my gifts are more aligned with teaching and apostleship. Don't do children's ministry because you're pressured by the church to serve there. Serve where God has gifted you to serve.

Girl problems

1 upvotes · 6 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

No. It makes you look weak

Maybe you can help me with this. I've never understood this RP argument from the secular community. If you're dropping the girl and never intending to resume communication, why should a guy care about whether or not she

thinks he looks weak?

My thought is: "If you want to, then do it; otherwise don't. But don't do it because you think she *deserves* it from you."

How to approach "proposing"?

1 upvotes · 6 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Yeah, I posted that before you replied to Chuck. We're on the same page now :) I agree this all goes hand-in-hand. The communication can be what prompts the reactions that OP can observe. I wasn't trying to downplay verbal communication ... but actions are certainly superior to verbal communication and are our primary mode of honest communication. But I didn't see the "actions" part in your original comment and it was all talk, talk, talk ... so that was a quick red flag for me.

How to approach "proposing"?

1 upvotes · 6 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I think /u/Red-Curious said his wife did something similar to this on some issues.

I think you're referencing the way that my wife *ex post facto* admitted to having "tricked" me into marrying her. She knew up-front that my mission was disciple-making. At an intellectual level she knew that mission was more important than anything else and she wanted to leech off of my spiritual successes so that she could stand alongside me on judgment day saying, "I helped him do it!"

But at a heart level, she was still neck-deep in materialism as her primary aims and pursuits and tried consistently for years to get me to abandon my disciple-making efforts in order to gratify her materialism. As beta as I was for most of that time, that was the one thing I never really backed down on, though I certainly slowed down for certain phases.

All the same: you're right, and as /u/Uncommon_Sense_123 said, some girls will say anything just to get that commitment. I've lived it. AWALT in the sense that this undercurrent is in all women (though some can control it better than others).

pay attention to their consistent actions and not only words

That's what I was looking for!

I imagine kids are a very close third, though. Higher?

Surprising as it may be, I've virtually never seen a couple divorce based on parenting disagreements or over issues of how many kids to have or anything like that. The only times it happens is when one parent becomes abusive toward the children, which is very rare.

Sex and money are the two primary in-marriage fights. Kids are the #1 thing fought over in divorce, though. I'm not saying people don't fight over how to raise the kids or other child-related issues, but it's usually not something that riles them up enough to cripple a marriage.

Piracy: Pharisaism or Libertarianism?

1 upvotes · 6 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I understand all of that. The push back isn't about being mentally fit. It's about your heart condition and how you're pursuing that mental fitness. You get no push back about physical fitness because you're not proposing to do anything illegal. If you came in asking, "Can I forge an ID to my local gym to get in without paying?" I'm sure

you'd get similar push back. It doesn't matter if it's a "high brow" or "low brow" gym. The question isn't in the content; it's in the condition of your heart. That condition right now is one of "I'm going to do whatever I want and no one's going to convince me out of it; butt hopefully someone can justify it for me so I can stop feeling guilty." That's not cool. Even if there is a non sinful way to engage in piracy (as I believe there is), this bull headed attitude makes it sinful for you anyway. That's why there's no point actually answering the question.

Piracy: Pharisaism or Libertarianism?

1 upvotes · 6 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

And I explained why a direct answer would be detrimental. There are some contexts where its sin and other's where its not. The difference is the condition of the heart. With where OP's heart is, it's going to be sin for him regardless, so why should I violate Romans 14 and 1 Cor. 8 by saying something that might enable him in his sin? I'm not going to do that.

Piracy: Pharisaism or Libertarianism?

1 upvotes · 6 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Defensive much? I'm not suggesting 100% of your time has to be reading the bible or praying or witnessing, etc. I **AM SAYING** that if you haven't mastered those things as an active part of your daily life yet, you shouldn't be wasting your time on pirating things. Worry about the secondary things after you've first developed a lifestyle that revolves around the primary things.

Of course, your "personal development" argument is all hogwash, and I'm pretty sure you know it. I've played Earthbound too, but in no way am I better as a person because of it. I blew several hours on my own amusement, had some fun, moved on, and that was about it. I'm sure you can rationalize some deeper significance of you let your hamster run fast enough, but at the end of the day that's all you're doing: hamstering.

Even worse, you're coming in with your mind made up about doing something without regard for its potential sinfulness and then asking us to do your hamstering for you so you can keep doing it without feeling guilty. Even if we gave you that justification (and I could, with biblical reference) your heart is so far from the right place on this that it wouldn't do you any good.

I am thoroughly convinced that when it comes to piracy the proper and manly thing to do is to solemnly ignore the law.

This is what I'm talking about. If your mind is already made up, why bother asking in the first place? And what does this have to do with manliness? Worldly concepts of "machismo" and "stick it to the man" are not where you should go to define masculinity.

Piracy: Pharisaism or Libertarianism?

1 upvotes · 6 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Why are you so concerned with self entertainment in the first place? How many times have you read the bible the whole way through? How many people are you sharing your faith with?

Look, if you want to find some biblical technicality to justify your behavior under the law, I'm sure you can find it. But when you use the law to justify yourself the law will bite back to condemn you every time, and I know you have not kept all of it. Stop looking to technicalities to make the guilt go away and start living for Christ. If you have extra time, then worry about piracy issues.

Girl problems

1 upvotes · 6 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Meh, if there's no ring she's fair game. Hypergamy makes that clear enough, and you're not ruining a biblical covenant or anything. That said, I this particular case I agree.

How to approach sexaul relationships as red pilld christian entering my 20s?

1 upvotes · 5 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

But people do keep asking about it

To be clear, I included Rule 7 from Day 1 for a reason. I'm okay with occasional questions, "Is PMS really a sin?" Although most women do tend to sin during PMS, pre-marital sex is still a sin. I'm open for debating the topic of why it's sinful or someone trying to challenge that it shouldn't be classified as sin, but the fact is that until there is some clear evidence to the contrary, this incredibly long-standing interpretation of Scripture will remain. To use a Romans 14:23 argument, "Anything that does not come from faith is sin" - so if there's a dispute I err on the side of "yes it's sin" until someone can prove otherwise (more on that later), even if only to protect the spiritually weak. Anyone who encourages premarital sex is in violation of Rule 7 and the comment will be removed (although I have been lenient on this before).

[/u/Red-Curious](#) said he/this sub held the position of being opposed to non-marital sex.

I will affirm that position again here today and perhaps again in a stickied post, if necessary.

I still think the benefits of taking an official position outweighs anything else

I agree. The official position is that sex outside of the context of marriage is sin.

First ... Second ... Third ...

Fourth, even if someone could convince me that sex outside of marriage is not sinful (and good luck at that!) 1 Cor. 8:9 still applies on a communal level: "Be careful, however, that the exercise of your rights does not become a stumbling block to the weak." Or what about 1 peter 2:16? "Live as free people, but do not use your freedom as a cover-up for evil; live as God's slaves." Or what about Romans 14:12-14? "So then each of us will give an account of himself to God [on disputed matters]. Therefore let us not pass judgment on one another any longer, but rather decide never to put a stumbling block or hindrance in the way of a brother ... it is unclean for anyone who thinks it unclean." ... and so on.

Having an official position and censoring comments are two very different things, as you know.

I'm lax on my policing because I don't like censoring speech. That said, blatant suggestions toward someone that they should sin should be reported and the comment removed. Yes, some types of speech are dangerous enough that they do need to be policed.

Unless I missed something, your comments stand and he accepts other points of view

Correct - although [/u/Whitified](#) and I disagree on this point, this falls into the category of comments where policing would be inappropriate. I have also consistently in virtually all of my posts on discipleship acknowledged that people can decide their mission for themselves, and that it is only my own personal belief that discipleship should be mass-incorporated into all men's missions. This is my way of mitigating between "where I stand" and "where the sub stands," although I will continue to preach my own convictions, as I believe in this particular case that it would be sinful of me not to do so, given the severity of the language Jesus uses for those who are not spiritually reproducing. Nevertheless, qualifiers can help mitigate that whenever appropriate. And if I forget to use a qualifier here or there, oh well. People can deal with it.

I think the concern about policing is unwarranted.

I have never removed a single thread from this sub (except for the one time we were brigaded), and I have approved all but maybe 3 or 4 removed comments that were removed by the automoderator, and those 3 or 4 were clear trolls. Yes, any concern about content policing is highly unwarranted, except to the degree that if people do start suggesting sinful behavior and I notice it (I don't have the time to read every comment in every thread anymore like I used to, and sometimes I miss entire threads altogether) ... I will remove that.

Tag: [/u/rocknrollchuck](#) and [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) - just to make sure the other mods see this as my position as well, in case they want to weigh in.

Wife and I fight when I am ill.

1 upvotes · 2 March 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Yeah, I don't think we're saying anything differently. We're just coming at it from different perspectives and me perhaps having a bit more knowledge about OP's wife in particular than the rest of the sub might have.

I will say in general that I've known several women who really did see their men as children and felt like they were mommies. This type of "care, nurturing, affect," etc. was very different from the type that I'm guessing you give to your husband. If I know you as I think you do, your care, nurturing, and affection in his times of illness come from a place of loving respect.

In OP's case, his mom wasn't doing it out of loving respect. She was doing it out of (to put it crudely) condescending doting over her child. She sees her child as someone lesser who needs her care, so she can dote all over his every need when he's sick because she's the mother and it's in her realm of power, authority, and responsibility to care for her sick child. This is a very different mental state than the loving, submissive respect that you express for your husband when you help him out while he's down.

Or maybe I'm wrong. Maybe you are condescendingly doting toward your husband like a mother to her child when he's sick? I doubt it :p

Yes, wives nurture. But they do it in different ways and from a different internal place than when a mother nurtures. That's what I was really getting at. And I do think I noted several times in my comment "you're right to expect this ... she should be doing more, etc." :) I actually texted OP privately before commenting that your reply was probably the most on-point with my gut reaction to the matter. He has a right to expect wifely nurturing, but he also can't change her or force her into it.

Wife and I fight when I am ill.

1 upvotes · 2 March 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Decide whether you want to be her husband & lover or another one of her children. Choose carefully because you can't be both.

That's the most important thing he said. [/u/BirdManBrrrr](#)'s analysis is spot on. I'll comment separately with a more direct reply, though.

But yes, there is a harsh reality that is at play here. One that you'll have to accept and deal with.

Husband pastor & quite time

1 upvotes · 2 March 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Good stuff. DC makes for poor movies because their characters are conceptually cool, but with the exception of Batman (who has had PHENOMENAL! movies), their comics and story lines mostly relied on the characters

themselves to drive the story, rather than on the plot. Super man comics are cool because superman is cool, not because the plot was particularly ingenious.

Marvel had weaker characters (albeit still very cool ones), so they had little choice but to utilize plot mechanisms to drive the story forward - like the Age of Apocalypse series, or the Phoenix Saga, or Days of Future Past (if you can't tell, I was mostly an X-Men guy in my younger days :p).

Husband pastor & quite time

1 upvotes · 2 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This whole sub at times feels like a place where you play One True Man

I'm not sure exactly what you mean by this, but I'm guessing I'd readily embrace the concept. Jesus was the one true man. We are all meant to model and emulate his life, both pre- and post-ascent, to the utmost degree. In that sense, Jesus is the one true man and we must all adopt the character, attitude, mission, etc. of that one true man. I'm not sure how that's even a question or why it's a bad thing.

One True Man is the start of BluePill among men

Again, I'm totally unclear on what you mean here. What starts the "BluePill among men" is developing an imperfect or incomplete picture of the one true man: Jesus Christ.

I also take issue with your idea of "discipleship"

That's fair. As long as someone is following the model of Christ in principle, I accept that there is room for disagreement. As I often tell people: *What I propose is not "THE" way, it is "A" way - and one you should follow if God hasn't yet shown you a better way.*

in the meantime I hope you understand why people here at times may seem to not have much interest in some of your theological or "discipleship" posts: because the reason we fled the BluePill churches, is so we can stop having to listen to someone play One True Man.

Meh. I take it more as people just not wanting to feel a sense of obligation in their faith. They just want to get better sex and keep pursuing worldly aims. Nevertheless, I will continue preaching what I believe Jesus called us to preach. I also believe that marital sexuality and satisfaction are so heavily tied to this mission that I cannot rightly set people right in their marriages if I'm not giving them the tools to do so, discipleship being the primary one.

Basically the series will be devoted to analyzing and exposing the nonsense that Complementarian pastors preach from the pulpits

I look forward to reading it :)

Husband pastor & quite time

1 upvotes · 2 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Well, he wasn't born in Kansas, but certainly raised there ;) He's also the first massively popularized of all super-powered heroes (Doctor Occult and Mandrake the Magician notwithstanding, and of much lesser fame, albeit still quite popular). Cap Am lagged a few years behind. I actually heard once that Cap Am's character and personality was originally inspired by Superman. But that may just be conjecture :p

As far as the movies go, I'm more of a Marvel fan as well. I've always said: DC has the better characters, Marvel

has the better stories. Marvel simply cannot match the brilliance not only in function, but in the personalities and character histories as well of Superman, Green Lantern, Batman, Wonder Woman, etc. Most marvel characters tend to have cookie-cutter formats to them, at least in their early days (some reboots in modern times have added more depth) ... but Marvel has done a heck of a lot more in the way of story-telling using their characters than DC has done, especially in the movies.

Husband pastor & quite time

1 upvotes · 2 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Amen. And yes, I'm a bit of a super hero junkie myself, although Superman is the *true* American hero ;) Cap Am is cool too, though. He's my wife's fav.

Husband pastor & quite time

1 upvotes · 2 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Haha. I'm not saying the argument is the dark side. It's actually a legitimate viewpoint, albeit one I disagree with. I'm more concerned with kash's seething lust for debate in a condescending tone. It's just not enjoyable to maintain a conversation like that :/ You're humble enough that I can enjoy when we disagree and yet still talk about it. I'll get to your latest when I'm at a desktop.

Husband pastor & quite time

1 upvotes · 1 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Haha, well-put :)

A movement?

1 upvotes · 1 March 2018 · /r/TheRedPill

Fair reply, but I think you're talking about the MRA version of the red pill and not the reddit version, which I understand to be openly different in purpose.

Husband pastor & quite time

1 upvotes · 27 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

The answer, of course, depends on what you mean by the word "pastor." A biblical definition relates to the shepherding process. The shepherd's job is to keep the sheep safe, steer them from one pasture to another, keep them from wandering off, and bring them back when they do wander. To that end, yes, a biblical husband should be fulfilling this role. But if you mean that a husband must function like the modern job description of a pastor, then the answer is no.

Most of the content on this sub is about how to live that role ;) It starts with pursuing a mission outside the family, which I believe for all Christians must incorporate discipleship, and inviting the family along in that mission. It also means maintaining the ship to run smoothly in the pursuit of that mission.

I do not have joint quiet times with my wife. Although this is not a bad idea, it has historically not been a beneficial pattern in my own marriage. Rather, we hold each other accountable to spending time with God by discussing with one another what God has been showing us in our time with him at different phases of life. Of course, this might not necessarily be from a quiet time. Instead of a quiet time, I may have spent 2 hours studying a passage, or 45 minutes in prayer, or an hour memorizing scripture, etc. There are other ways to connect with God than just through quiet time, although it is a staple that should not remain absent in exchange for other methods for too long.

207 - Perseverance, Sin, and Fitness Tests

1 upvotes · 24 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

He actually isn't pastoring anymore. He opened a cigar shop out there as his primary means of meeting and ministering to non-Christians. I'll reach out to him, though I can't make any promises.

RP Biblical Compendium Favorites

1 upvotes · 24 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I thought she was Saul's daughter.

RP Biblical Compendium Favorites

1 upvotes · 23 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

True dat. Some people take it as an implication that it wasn't God who made her barren - it was that David wouldn't have sex with her ever again.

RP Biblical Compendium Favorites

1 upvotes · 22 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Well said.

Jesus defined masculinity

1 upvotes · 22 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

"Pastor" is not a word found in scripture.

Okay, the word "love" is not a word found in scripture either. Neither is the word "God." Technically they're all words that we translate into "love" and "God" just as Ephesians 4:11 is often translated to use the word "pastors." This is an idiotic argument.

I'm also not sure the word "church" is pluralized in scriptures

Well, we only have one collective "Scripture," so I'm not sure I'd pluralize that either. But 2 Corinthians 11:28 certainly uses *ekklesion* instead of *ekklesia*, pluralizing the word. See also 2 Cor. 8:18, 19, 23, 24; 1 Thessalonians 2:14; and Revelation 1:20. Of course, there's a difference between when *ekklesia* is used to reference the global church as compared with the local congregational church.

Yes wives and husbands should both submit to one another in love as scripture commands(according Ephesians 5 if I'm not mistaken)

Nah, the context of Ephesians 5 is quite clear that the "submit to one another" is a continuation of the previous sentence, when Paul is speaking to our peers in our congregation. He then goes into marriage as a stark contrast; "Wives, submit to your own husbands" as if to say, "Just because you're peers in your congregation doesn't mean I'm changing the authority structure God intended for marriage." This is fairly obvious from the context of the passage itself, especially in the original language - as has been the interpretation for two millennia. It wasn't until the church feminized that people utilized the English translation to create ambiguity, then afterward tried to rationalize that translation through grammatical acrobatics in the Greek.

Jesus defined masculinity

1 upvotes · 22 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

We are not the main red pill sub.

Jesus defined masculinity

1 upvotes · 22 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

He's a troll. I made a stickied post to remind everyone of this, as that affects how they engage.

Jesus defined masculinity

1 upvotes · 22 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Troll or not, here's my reply ...

I like looking to Christ as a model of masculinity as well, but we must incorporate his time before birth and post-ascent into that model, lest we make the grave mistake of assuming Jesus' identity and model to us is only based on his time on earth.

Before birth, John 1 tells us Jesus was the Word of God. He was the one who put into action what the Father spoke and decided. So, when God spoke into creation, "Let there be light," John 1 tells us that this creation was actually through the Word and by the Word - Jesus was the one who did it. I suspect this also means that when God takes action in the Old Testament, if the Father spoke it, the Son is the one who did it.

In a post-ascent world, Jesus now models masculinity in how he deals with his bride, the Church. So, when Jesus says things like, "Disown me and I'll disown you before my Father [the judge]," that's an example that we know to be true about how Jesus engages with his bride, despite the fact that we don't see him doing this much during his actual time on earth. The same thing goes for how Jesus disciplines, guides, and corrects the church, or how he casts some people out and doesn't even let others get started in the first place. It also models how we should be spiritually reproductive, compared to our physical reproductive drives. The list goes on.

With that in mind ...

He didn't use violence.

On-Earth: He did also say, "I did not come to bring peace, but the sword." Also, he specifically tells them in Luke 22:35-38 that they should NOT follow the model he gave them while he was on earth of "don't take anything with you on your ministry journey; just trust God," but instead, "Let the one who has a moneybag take it, and likewise a knapsack. And let the one who has no sword sell his cloak and buy one." To be clear: Jesus is saying, "Don't just focus on what we did while I was here, but prepare for the times to come also."

Pre-birth: God is constantly ordering wars and acts of violence as a means of modeling God's intolerance for sin and provision for his bride at the expense of those who aren't.

Post-ascent: He does condemn people to hell and eternal conscious torment ... so there's something to be said for that. Of course, he would never do this to his bride, but he's fine with kicking other people in the butt.

RP Praxeology: We don't teach to use violence either. I don't think TRP or MRP do either. I'm not sure why that's at issue. "Get buff" doesn't imply "so you can punch someone in the face."

He expressed his emotions.

On-Earth: Absolutely. But he wasn't controlled by them. When Jesus had compassion on the crowds because they were "like sheep without a shepherd" (Matthew 9:36), he didn't let that compassion change his plan to become their shepherd; he instead deferred that responsibility to other people so he could continue on his mission (v37-38). When talking to the rich young man Jesus "looked at him and loved him," but he didn't compromise his

standard of discipleship to make an exception for this man. When "Jesus wept" (John 11:35), it was over Lazarus whom he loved - but he had been warned 3 days earlier that Lazarus was dying and instead of going to heal him, Jesus continued doing his own thing and *let Lazarus die* because his emotional disposition toward Lazarus did not control his mission.

Pre-birth: God's emotional disposition is communicated through the prophets, and it is most often an emotional state of anger. We don't see a clear emotional disposition from Christ during this time.

Post-ascent: Jesus' emotional disposition toward the world is communicated through the Spirit within us, who not only affirms, uplifts, and encourages, but also convicts and condemns.

RP Praxeology: Go ask anyone on MRP - RP isn't about concealing emotions; it's about controlling them. Go read my post on butt-hurt too.

He didn't marry, he didn't pursue women. He stayed single and even Paul said this is far better..

On-Earth: Well, Jesus said so too: "The one who can accept this [indefinite singleness] should" (Matthew 19:11).

Pre-birth: Through the creation process, he created woman for man and said that this is "very good." So, we can't entirely say that Jesus is opposed to marriage. If anything, his on-earth statement makes it clear that "not many" people can follow in his singleness and that he doesn't expect those to do so who can't.

Post-ascent: Yes, Jesus is married. He is the bridegroom, the church is his bride. I'm not sure how you can argue around this. He didn't marry on earth, but his oneness bond with his church that the Bible directly calls a marriage is fairly clear.

RP Praxeology: Secular and biblical RP agrees: we shouldn't be making marriage a primary goal in life. So, I'm not sure the issue here. RP says marriage is unwise, but that if someone wants to get married anyway, that's a man's decision to make.

He showed affection.

I lump this into the "he expressed his emotions" thing. It's just a technique for *how* he expressed emotions.

I will simply note that kino and game are all about this.

He showed complete forgiveness to the adulterous woman.

On-Earth: Let's be clear: he didn't forgive her; he simply declined to condemn her, then he compelled her to stop sinning. We don't know if she did or didn't. It's like the parable of the Barren Fig Tree - the tree had no fruit for 3 years, so the master wanted to cut it down; but the caretaker said, "Give me another year; I'll tend the soil and fertilize it, and if after that it still doesn't bear fruit, then go ahead and cut it down." Jesus was giving this woman her extra year after cultivating something in her. The ball was in her court at that point.

Pre-birth: God struck many people down with little to no opportunity for conviction to lead to repentance. If Jesus is the Word who put into action the Father's decrees, then he very well may have been the one doing it.

Post-ascent: All sins and blasphemies are forgiven of someone who actually is Christ's bride, if his bride is repentant. But when someone ceases to repent, 1 Cor. 5 and Hebrews 10 share some harsh words about such

people being expelled and being subject to fiery judgment and wrath.

RP Praxeology: This is part of being an oak. Secular RP takes the position that women are just the way we are and we should accept them at that rather than trying to change them. This means forgiving women for doing the stupid things women do, and appreciating the wonderful things that women do. RP has never suggested we shouldn't forgive women who make mistakes. In fact, even in secular RP threads where a guy has been cheated on, only part of the crowd condemns him for staying with her, and the rest embrace the fact that he wants to make it work and advise him on how to operate under that framework.

Some of his closest friends were women.

On-Earth: None of the 12. His deepest relationships were with them. This is fairly undeniable. Although the women were the first to preach of his resurrection, it was the 11 who were given the great commission (Matthew 28:16), and not these women.

Pre-birth: The only person God ever called his friend was Moses. Deborah is the rare exception of a female prophet and virtually everyone else God utilized in a major way was male. When Melchizedek appeared (who I believe was a manifestation of Jesus, although I accept that this is debatable), he spoke with Abraham, a man. When he appeared in the fire with S, M, and A, they were men. When he appeared to Gideon, that was also to a man. We don't have any Christophany experiences with women that I'm aware of.

Post-ascent: Absolutely Christ works with women. Paul models this to the men: "I entreat Euodia and I entreat Syntyche to agree in the Lord [these women were catty]. Yes, I ask you also, true companion, help these women, who have labored side by side with me in the gospel." But we also see the authority structure given by Paul, setting the context for how that "side by side" labor was done: "I do not permit a woman to teach or to assume authority over a man" (1 Timothy 2:12). Given that Paul says in 1 Corinthians 7 that his authority in writing his letters is as "one who is trustworthy in Christ Jesus," I have to assume that Jesus not only adopts Paul's words, but was the one who through the Spirit inspired them.

RP Praxeology: As most secular RP men will tell you - RP men love women. That's kind of the whole shtick. We want to be around women constantly. In a feminized culture, women flock to other women and men flock to women - it's men who no one cares to be around. Secular RP on reddit doesn't seek to change this; rather, it seeks to embrace it to a man's advantage - how to be around even more women all the time. This is good for a man's confidence, social value, preselection, dread, etc.

Long story short, it sounds like you're trying to do some kind of "gotcha!" post about how RPC is somehow inconsistent because Jesus embraced women and adopted traits that look at first blush to be inconsistent with what you think RPC is proposing about masculinity. This comes from a place of ignorance about RPC and secular RP as well.

Now, with the context behind what you've said, let's add back in all the other attributes about Jesus that we also reference on this sub that you left out ... and now we're starting to get at a complete picture, as opposed to the grossly misleading one you're trying to set forth.

Introduction and a FR

1 upvotes · 22 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Hello past me. Nice to meet you :) To be clear:

- Grew up in the church; became a Christian in college; heavily involved in college campus ministry; staff with

campus ministry after college; got married shortly after college as a horny idealistic virgin; wife threatened divorce periodically; married about 10 years; several little ones (I have 4); dead bedroom (although your 10x/yr surpassed my 0-3); together almost purely for biblical reasons; struggled with porn; made changes, wife was slow, but other women responded fast

That is where we diverged. You went down the road I wanted to take - and one that I know works from a sexual standpoint. You escalated past the levels of dread that I was willing to go and saw two things result, although you only alluded to the second: (1) your sex life revitalized quicker than mine, and (2) your capacity for disciple-making tanked (if you were doing it at all) and now you're on the road to earning that respect back with your church and spiritual peers.

Whether you realize it or not, it's this second point that is at the core of your struggle to reconcile RP with your faith. Your RP-ness appears in your mind to have been the cause of your reputation change within church leadership, so you perceive this as a conflict - that it's RP or ministry, and you've only recently found this sub as a means of seeing that the two don't actually diverge :) Unfortunately, this sub was created 7 months ago and your story started 8 :/ I apologize for not having been 6 months ahead of where I am now - and how much better I would have been for it too!

I know it sounds weird for me to apologize about that, but I firmly believe that our obligation is not only to those we actively minister to, but also to those people who we failed to minister to because we had our head up our butts for too long. If I had been more faithful in my calling to Christ, I would have discovered and started RPC not just 6 months sooner, but years sooner. I wonder that many people here today might have followed your path if I had waited another 6 months before getting started. That's on me. And that same obligation is on you for the people whose lives you could have changed had you not tarnished your reputation. Fortunately in our faith there is always room for redemption :)

My biggest encouragement to you is not to waste time. Sometimes it's easy to think: "Okay, I screwed up big. Now I need to wait a year or two to re-earn trust before I can get going again." In reality, the very moment we repent is the best place we'll ever be in spiritually. A year later, even if we're generally moving in the right direction, we'll probably notice our path looking like a drunk man's walk - it's wobbling back and forth all over the place. But immediately after repentance, your eyes are exactly where they need to be. "Yes, I just cheated on my wife last week. Yes, I know you probably don't trust me. I'm happy to earn your trust in time, but until then I'm going to keep doing God's work all the same." That needs to be your attitude ... of course exchanging "last week" with "8 months ago." I'm just trying to illustrate the point that you don't need to wait :)

one thing I was taught on MRP was to never apologize, because its weak. That has proven to be poor advice

Here's the thing: secular RP is men swapping notes. Christian RP is people reading straight from the textbook. Secular RP claims to be a praxeology, but muddles in a lot of philosophy too. Christian RP is predominantly a theology that muddles in praxeology to fill in the gaps and tries to limit the work of philosophy to structural frameworks in our thinking, rather than fact and application discernment.

The "don't apologize" thing is a philosophy. It is a statement of what "should be true" if the world worked in a logical, rational way. But the Bible tells us plainly that in a post-fall world, things are not always logical and rational because man's broken thinking is different from God's original design. However, original design only really makes sense in a Christian marriage. So, in a secular marriage where both parties are trying to live out praxeological realities of how the world is post-fall and neither is regenerated in their heart, the "no apology" thing actually makes sense and works.

In a Christian relationship, we know that confession and repentance is at the core of the Gospel for anyone who is in sin - and it is something that should not be abandoned. Why? Because a heart oriented toward Christ will be attracted to other hearts that are re-orienting themselves toward Christ. If you're married to a non-Christian girl,

that's a different story because she's still operating in the framework of the sinful nature. But to a woman who operates on godliness as the standard, there is nothing more attractive than a man who is as Christ-like as possible.

The vicarious repentance theory of the cross ([see 402](#)) says that we're incapable of repenting perfectly, so Christ took our sins on himself to repent of them for us. Similarly, the moral example theory states that we are to live in the example of what Jesus laid out - and so if he repented of our sins on our behalf, we should still follow in his example and continue to do the same. When he confesses our sins for us because we're too ignorant to do it ourselves if left on our own ("Father, forgive them for they know not what they have done"), that is a reminder that we need to do so as well.

So, when you say your apology is "from a place of true ownership and strength" that's what I think you mean. It is not a plea to her. It is an acknowledgment of your godliness - that you know who you are before Christ and readily accept that inferiority and reorientation. That's attractive. That's powerful. That builds trust. That's what alt-OYS is all about, as opposed to the blue pill mentality that we must hide our flaws to impress people into loving us.

My wife chewed me out for something the other day and she was right. At first I blew it off and moved on, but later was convicted to return and acknowledge the issue. That acknowledgement got her horny enough that she actually woke up in the middle of the night for sex when I went to bed - something that's somewhat of a rarity.

In RP terms this is the push/pull dynamic. You're positive and affirming at some moments, and shaky and unpredictable at other times. She knows you have the capacity to go off the deep end, and every now and then something you do reminds her of that capacity, so she perceives you as an unknown quantity, but you also provide enough pull to give her the comfort and security she needs to open up to you and trust you, despite her insecurities. As I often note to people IRL who are doubting their faith: *doubt is a good thing*. We don't want to let it control us, but it also affirms to us that our salvation actually does rest on faith itself and not heady arguments or philosophical understandings. Over-confidence in eternal security is often the downfall of many Christians, who then become ineffective and fruitless in their lives - a thing that might actually prove their confidence misplaced altogether. Over-doubt leads to the same problem from the other end. But a nice push-pull dynamic is healthy in our faith and self-evaluation and it draws us closer to Christ, just as it draws our wives closer to us.

All in all, this is an excellent FR. Thanks for sharing :)

Misogyny is a sin?!! <https://www.russellmoore.com/2018/02/12/teach-boys-respect-women/>

1 upvotes · 21 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

The arrogance is strong with this one.

Misogyny is a sin?!! <https://www.russellmoore.com/2018/02/12/teach-boys-respect-women/>

1 upvotes · 21 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Again ... total ignorance and twisting what I said to some idiotic extreme.

Misogyny is a sin?!! <https://www.russellmoore.com/2018/02/12/teach-boys-respect-women/>

1 upvotes · 21 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Meh ... you're just young and ignorant. I'm okay with not reaching an agreement.

Misogyny is a sin?!! <https://www.russellmoore.com/2018/02/12/teach-boys-respect-women/>

1 upvotes · 20 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Totally inaccurate. My wife wants to quit her job and I tell her to keep working. That's how she can best serve

our family right now. The blue pill church would tell me, "If your wife wants to quit her job so she can stay at home to clean and play with kids all day, you should make that sacrifice for her - work yourself twice as hard to make up for her lost income."

No thanks. I'll take time with my kids instead.

Misogyny is a sin?!! <https://www.russellmoore.com/2018/02/12/teach-boys-respect-women/>

1 upvotes · 20 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

So basically you're her help meet

I have no idea how you got this even remotely out of anything I said. I out earn my wife. I set the mission for our family and how to accomplish it. I lead, she follows. She doesn't have a mission or agenda other than the one I give her.

If you want to continue clinging to this idiotic notion that a person's job or economic gain is the only mission they can possibly have, then this conversation is over. The bible is clear enough that money is not our master, so stop acting like the bible is all about who earns what.

Misogyny is a sin?!! <https://www.russellmoore.com/2018/02/12/teach-boys-respect-women/>

1 upvotes · 20 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

he chose to limit it to adam.

Who says he limited it to Adam? I get the impression that if women tried to work in the fields it would be just as hard for them as well. The fact that he spoke a universal curse in Adam's direction was an indication of the practical reality that Eve would not be able to do the type of groundwork that needed to be done if she was to bear enough children to "fill the earth and multiply." Her pains in pregnancy would prevent this, creating a practical imbalance in each of their economic functions in the marriage - not a God-mandated one.

Throughout history the home role as always been seen as the support role, a woman demanding to work just because she earns more is now Godly?

The man working and the woman staying at home was never "godly" either - it was just a practical reality. You're making a cultural argument, suggesting that "because the culture at the time of the Bible did this, that must mean God wanted it done that way." But the Philistines, Babylonians, Ninevites, etc. all had similar cultures. There was nothing uniquely "godly" about men working and women staying at home. It was just the practical reality of the world and at no point did God ever say, "I endorse this culture, all other cultures must be just like it."

I know our culture likes to think staying at home is harder, but it is not.

You're right there!

Misogyny is a sin?!! <https://www.russellmoore.com/2018/02/12/teach-boys-respect-women/>

1 upvotes · 20 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Again, that's not his mission - and if it is his mission, he's missed what God was actually calling him to. If they are not making disciples and bearing fruit for God's Kingdom, then yes, they did it in vain.

It sounds harsh to say that, but I literally just met with a guy over lunch whose job is to train church pastors. In one of his meetings last week he had a pastor tell him with a grave, solemn face, "I have been wasting the last 28 years of my life pursuing the wrong things in my ministry. All of my efforts were in vain because I have no fruit

to show for it - I have no genuine disciples living today from my ministry." He had lots of people showing up on Sunday mornings and going to Bible studies and whatnot - but no one who was actively reproducing their lives for Christ because of his efforts. This is the sad reality of most pastors who have missed the model that Christ laid out for us.

Misogyny is a sin?!! <https://www.russellmoore.com/2018/02/12/teach-boys-respect-women/>

1 upvotes · 20 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

your example with a wife earning 250k is all based on money not what we were created for it means that that family is money focused.

That's because your arguments have all been about economic provision - that the husband must out-earn his wife or else he's not a "provider."

a man;s job is more than making disciples if he is married Paul states this is a disadvantage for married people as they have to focus on providing and caring for a wife and kids

Let's be clear about 1 Cor. 7 - it does not say that "providing and caring for a wife and kids" is the man's "job." It says "the married man is anxious about worldly things, how to please his wife" (v33). It lists this as a source of anxiety and distraction, not as biblical obligation. To the contrary: "From now on, let those who have wives live as though they had none" (v29). Now, there are other passages that condemn a man for failing to "take care of/provide for" his family, but 1 Cor. 7 isn't one of them.

you really think God would swap roles and give men the mission to be workers at home, and help meets to their husbands?

I think you mean "help meets to their wives" in the end there. But again, as I've said in other comments, you're confusing the authority structure for the economic function of each spouse. It would be a sin for a man to be his wife's "helper" or "help meet," if you prefer that term. But a wife can still be a man's "helper" if she is the breadwinner and he stays at home. It's all about the mission and who's leading it. If she's working, isn't her financial income helping the husband as well? Economics has nothing to do with it.

Misogyny is a sin?!! <https://www.russellmoore.com/2018/02/12/teach-boys-respect-women/>

1 upvotes · 20 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

it is like the head covering verses- of course we do not practice it literally but we still need to practice it

You're arguing against yourself now. Either be a hyper-literalist or not. But make up your mind. Either both 1 Timothy and Titus are to be applied literally without regard for cultural context or they are both to be applied understood literally, but applied within appropriate cultural context. Don't pick and choose.

The purpose of the head covering isn't to respect her husband. It is to demonstrate a cultural symbol of her husband's headship over her. Culture at that time would have known what the head covering represented. Cultures today in middle-eastern countries still understand this - and they are right for wearing head coverings in their own cultural context. My wife demonstrates this in an American culture not through what she wears (because the verse isn't about the cloth itself), but by how she conducts herself in public and how she speaks of me. Back then, women were scarcely alone and uncovered in public and were not speaking to men - that's what the head covering was for, in part. So, they didn't have the opportunity to display their husband's headship through their actions the same way that is available today, which in modern culture is obvious and sticks out like a sore thumb.

Tag: [/u/redpillwonder](#)

Asking wife's consent?

1 upvotes · 20 February 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

and you think that is not a feminist utopia?

Of course that would be a feminist utopia. The question isn't whether or not feminists would be happy. Feminism is not the enemy. Sin is the enemy. Feminism just happens to overlap with sinfulness in most of its ideologies (albeit not all of them). Accordingly, feminism itself is a sinful ideology on the whole because it incorporates sin as something they want society to strive for.

That said, "men running the home ... while women work and run businesses" is fine ... "and society" is not. Men should be running society. The trick is, of course, that it's hard to differentiate between business leadership and societal influence. That's why men need to maintain a prominent role in business leadership as a whole. But on an individual level, I don't see the problem with a few employees here and there being women whose husbands stay at home and lead the family from there.

God is all powerful and can do anything, if he really believes some men's mission is to serve God and make disciples by running the home there would have been examples in the bible.

Nah, that's a logical fallacy. First off, disciple-making is the mission of **ALL MEN**, whether a man wants to embrace this or not. That's something he'll have to answer to on judgment day. Second, you don't make disciples "by running the home." Your job is only a context, not the method by which you do it. Third, by your logic no one could ever perform surgery on a dying patient. "God is all powerful and can do anything, if he really believes some men should be performing surgeries to save lives, then there would have been examples in the bible." There are a billion other possible examples of things that God wants us doing today that could not have worked in a past society. So, this is a really, really weak argument.

Misogyny is a sin?!! <https://www.russellmoore.com/2018/02/12/teach-boys-respect-women/>

1 upvotes · 20 February 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I think I'll join in the conversation

That's why I tagged you :)

I'm always leery of cultural arguments

Me too. That's exactly why I take the position I do. Proponents of returning to a historical culture look at how things used to be and say, "God put his stamp of approval on that culture and even today we should follow exactly what they were doing." This abandons theology and puts cultural philosophies in its place.

they are easily used to alter an interpretation of scripture

Agreed. And that is dangerous. But consider that (1) scripture can be re-interpreted based on changing culture, but also (2) scripture can be re-interpreted to support a static culture. Both are equally dangerous forms of eisegesis.

complementarians (and I know you're not one)

I can't even say that I fully grasp what "complementarianism" is. By my understanding of the definition, I am one:

someone who believes that men and women have equal value in God's eyes, but who were created to have different authoritative roles that are not equal on a hierarchical level. But many self-identified complementarians are really egalitarian, which I am certainly not.

That purpose can be accomplished by interpreting the passage literally.

You're confusing interpretation with application. The literal interpretation is that at the time Paul wrote the passage, , , and ____ would cause the word of God to be reviled. That is a literal interpretation. A literal application would say we are to obey the literal text regardless of context ... i.e. the Westboro Baptist Church ;)

No it doesn't. It talks about the characteristics of a virtuous woman, and asks rhetorically, "Who can find a woman like this?"

Good point. But the same context still applies. On an interpretational level P31 is suggesting that a godly woman in that culture would strive to this standard, much like Titus 2 doesn't command young women to work in the home, it only asks that older women teach younger women that as a standard.

A woman can obey the words mentioned in Titus and do (or not do) some of the things the Proverbs 31 woman did.

Sure, but you're entering a theological inconsistency when you do that - *unless* your point is simply to say that women *can do the Titus 2 things* **but don't have to**. To that end, I totally agree. There's nothing wrong with a woman working in the home, just as there's nothing wrong with a woman planting a vineyard. But those are not things she is obligated to do - they are things that in their own cultural context would produce the intended result. But if there are other ways of producing that intended result, then that is acceptable as well. The intended result is what matters, not the means of how we get there - unless it's something where the Bible explicitly says, "It must be done this way."

For example, when Jesus lays a pattern for disciple-making, he clearly shows us how he intended it to be done and the church is wrong when we abandon his methodology in favor of our own philosophies of ministry. But if we look at Matthew 10:5-6, for example - "Go nowhere among the Gentiles and enter no town of the Samaritans, but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" ... are we to interpret this literally too? That's why Matthew 28:19-20's great commission is so potent - the words themselves drive the application as being culturally transitive and transcendent. We do not have similar language in many other passages, which is why we need the Spirit to give us discernment. I do not follow the line of theology that says, "This must apply today because it's in the new testament."

A great example is 1 Timothy 2:9-10 - "women should adorn themselves in respectable apparel, with modesty and self-control, not with braided hair and gold or pearls or costly attire, but with what is proper for women who profess godliness - with good works." This passage doesn't discriminate between private and public settings. In fact, it says plainly: "in **every place**." Yet women braid their hair all the time - and I find it attractive, especially when my wife does it (it's one of my kinks). I also like it when my wife *does NOT* adorn herself in "respectable apparel" and I even enjoy it when she shows off cleavage in public. That most certainly would have not met the standard of "respectable apparel" in Paul's time. If we apply this passage literally today, so much for the whole "create your slut" and having a "sexy wife" - those go right out the window. And to be clear, this is literally the exact verse before the part about "let a woman learn quietly with all submissiveness. I do not permit a woman to teach or exercise authority over a man." So, are we going to accept a literal interpretation of one, yet cast out the other? Do you see how just trying to take things literally causes intense cognitive dissonance in the application process?

What makes sense is that Paul is talking about the type of flashy attire that would intimate a woman was a prostitute or otherwise dressing in a prideful, showy way. Today, braiding your hair and wearing gold and pearls

aren't things that only whores and rich girls do. Doing these doesn't impugn a woman's character in many parts of the world because it is commonplace. So, I let my wife wear her gold wedding ring and braid her hair for me. But in the very next verses about leadership, Paul then connects them to creation, suggesting that this part transcends culture, just like the great commission.

Does this make sense? Who knows, maybe you will actually forbid your wife from braiding her hair or wearing jewelry or any clothes that cost more than \$x (whatever you define as "costly"). I know my wife braids her hair, wears gold and pearls, and has some expensive lingerie and dresses. Maybe she's in sin. I don't think so.

What's with the "hyper?" Literalist fits fine

Because I consider myself a literalist most of the time. Like the whole "cut off your hand if it causes you to sin" bit ... I believe Jesus was speaking literally, not figuratively. Similarly, when Jesus says, "If anyone does not hate his father and mother, etc. he cannot be my disciple," I believe he was speaking literally and not in hyperbole. But the literal interpretation doesn't make sense until you actually understand the context of the passage. To break it down:

- Non-literalism is when someone ignores context in order to reach conclusions that make sense to them
- Literalism is when we look at the context of a passage to find the most clear, direct, and literal interpretation of what the author likely meant
- Hyper literalism is when we look only at the exact letter of what's being said and ignore the context

So, a "literal" reading of Titus 2 would say that , , and **are things Paul suggests are ways of preventing the Word of God from being reviled. A hyper literalist says that we must do , , and** regardless of the context in which Paul said it or the context of the person trying to apply it. For reference, a non-literal reading would suggest that Titus 2 is speaking of general principles that are valuable for us to understand, but that we can apply them however we see fit. These are not the only 3 interpretive frameworks, but they are common ones.

Titus clearly states that young women are to be taught to do these things

I addressed this above: it's not even a command that young women must do these things - it's merely a command that older women are to teach the young women to do them. My point is that it's not as simple as "This passage says young women should 'work at home,' so all women should work at home." You can't remove the thing being taught from the reason for which it is being taught.

a wife's primary concern should be working at home.

Where'd you jump from "working at home" to "this must be her primary concern"?

If she can do both, great! But if her career gets in the way of being a keeper/worker at home, that's a problem, and the word of God is reviled.

Let me be clear: in a modern culture a man would be a fool not to facilitate his wife's earning capacity in some way. A failure to do so is drastically shifting the balance of power in the relationship and is the primary reason people are afraid of divorce rape in the first place. As you note, the Bible does not put an economic quota on husbands or wives or suggest who must earn more. This is a purely cultural argument that is simply not found in Scripture, which was the point I believe [/u/Kashmon777](#) was predominantly trying to make.

But I also don't think there is anything sinful if the wife works and the man stays at home. Even outside exigent circumstances, I don't see a command: "Husbands, thou shalt not stay at home and work; instead, thou shalt earn more money than your wife." It's simply not there.

I fully agree that a woman should not **ONLY WORK** and *do absolutely nothing around the home*. That would certainly be sinful. But to say that work around the home must be her "primary concern" is taking it too far. I believe the "primary concern" of the wife should be what her husband tells her should be her primary concern.

Right now my wife is in busy season. As a tax accountant before April 15, she'll soon be working close to 80 hours a week and come April that will ramp up to over 100 hours per week. I have instructed her not to worry about the housework. I'm all OYS anyway. It's my house. I'm responsible for it, not her. When she's not in busy season, I delegate a lot of that responsibility to her, but it's still my responsibility and not hers. Am I in sin for telling my wife to focus on work during busy season and to let me deal with the housework? I don't think so. I don't think Titus 2 condemns either her or me.

Is woman created in God's image? Let's explore.

1 upvotes · 19 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Good point

Husbands lead by supporting wife's dream career?

1 upvotes · 17 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Some of it is just the fact of where the media is at right now with #metoo and church responses.

The feminism in the church problem isn't so much about church structure as it is about family structure. How are men taught to run the families? Most blue pill churches will only emphasize Christ's sacrifice and issuance of free will and suggest that men do likewise. They will pay lip service to the concept of men leading the home, but if the man leads in a direction that the wife doesn't like, he is shamed for "not considering her feelings" in his leadership decisions.

In short: "Men, you must lead your families, but all of your leadership decisions must be aligned with what your wife thinks is best or else you're not being a good enough servant."

When evaluating your church followed the same principle you do at home: look at their actions, not their words. Most churches preach the right things, but very few people actually live it out - even the pastors.

Husbands lead by supporting wife's dream career?

1 upvotes · 17 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I second this.

Husbands, love your wives - Interpretation?

1 upvotes · 16 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is true.

Christian Beta Book on Manhood

1 upvotes · 15 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

but some in the ancient Roman culture interpreted the indignant anger of Jesus in the temple as an effeminate characteristic

i.e. "Model your life after Jesus, except for when he was being emotionally aggressive and physically rageful, like a woman." I cannot even comprehend the hamstering it takes to concoct this type of idea.

The idea of mutual submission has always been something I've heard preached but, I do not tend to agree with this anymore.

It comes from Ephesians 5 and is a textual ambiguity. In the original Greek, there was no punctuation. In the first half of the chapter Paul talks about relationships with other believers/peers, then he says "submit to one another in love" and then he says "wives, submit to your own husbands" and talks about the husband-wife dynamic.

The blue pill preachers have argued that because there was no punctuation, the "submit" language should really go with the second half of the chapter. They suggest this because they believe the two "submit" languages are obviously an intention to pair together ideas. As such, they believe Paul is starting with "submit to one another," and then extrapolating, "Wives, submit to your husbands this way," and then explains the husband's obligation to love his wife as a "husbands, submit to your wives that way" kind of thing. There is no definitive textual proof that they are wrong. But the text doesn't prove them right either - it is a genuine ambiguity where the argument is a legitimate, albeit weak one.

Many others, myself included, believe Paul is referencing the mutuality among believers when he says "submit to one another." He is literally talking about unity throughout the whole book of Ephesians. Cutting down the barrier between Jew and Gentile was a major point of the book (IIRC). So, it makes sense that he'd conclude his diatribe on how to interact with one another with a statement of mutual submission, much like he said in Philippians, "Consider others better than yourself." This is consistent. But then he doesn't want to confuse anyone, so he immediately changes gears and says, "Oh yeah, but that 'submit to one another' thing - that wasn't for marriage. Wives, you still have to submit to your husbands," and then he explains this in 1 Timothy, 1 Corinthians, and other places - that the mutuality in the relationship with other believers does not change the authority structure in the marriage. That's why we see the sharp contrast between: "submit to one another. wives, submit to your husbands" with no follow-up for husbands to submit to wives. That contrast clearly indicates that the "wives, submit to your husbands" was a clarification of his intent on writing the "submit to one another" line - that it was not to extend to marriage.

There's also the possibility that the specific conjugation of the word *hypotassomenoi* is a direct connector to the prior sentence, but I don't know enough about Greek to confirm or deny this. If its conjugation is "submit" as an active verb, then it tells us nothing. If it is "submitting" as a gerund, this would definitively connect it to the prior section and greatly weaken the argument the blue pill's alleged connection to the marriage context. The ESV, KJV, and Young's Literal and Biblos Interlinear Bible (i.e. a translation similar to the Young's Literal that tries to go pure word-for-word) all translate it as a gerund, the 2011 (i.e. post-gender-neutralization) NIV and the NASB translate it as an active verb. The only other example of that identical conjugation in Scripture is in 1 Peter 2:18, where both the Young's Literal and Biblos Interlinear Bible translate it as a gerund, but the ESV, NIV, and KJV all translate it as an active verb. /shrug ... I tend to rely on the Young's Literal on matters like these, as they are more text-for-text adaptations rather than thought-for-thought adaptations, which is what the ESV, KJV, and NIV are more attuned to.

Jesus never submits to his church, although he does serve her and give himself for her good.

That's the right conclusion, as long as we remember that his purpose was to do God's will, and that his purpose for his bride is to do God's will - and he both modeled and told us plainly that God's will was to make disciples. His bride's purpose is not his highest priority: God's purpose for him is his highest priority, and the fulfillment of that purpose is where his glory is found, just as a husband is glorified in God's eyes and man's (on judgment day, not in this world, of course) through the fruit that he bears while making disciples.

Misogyny is a sin?!! <https://www.russellmoore.com/2018/02/12/teach-boys-respect-women/>

1 upvotes · 15 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

2/2

Genesis paints a picture of women now having pain in child birth and men having to toil to feed himself and

family- why would God have gendered it if men were not meant to provide

This is probably where most of your confusion is. You're assuming the curse is a command. It's not. It's a description of how things would work from then on. "I will surely multiply your pain in childbearing" is not a command: "all women must bear children" - or else what do we do of the many women throughout Scripture whose wombs were *closed by God Himself!*? Is God forcing them to break the command given to them in the curse, and thereby God is forcing them into sin? No, because the curse is not a command.

Likewise, "cursed is the ground because of you; in pain you shall eat of it" is not a command that men *must work the ground*. It is simply a saying that the ground itself is cursed, which affected men because men back then (and today still) are the primary farmers.

"But then the whole bit about 'your desire shall be to control your husband, but he shall rule over you'? So God's not commanding that men must be the leaders?" Some people make that logical leap, but the authoritative structure actually comes from the creation narrative itself (i.e. Genesis 2), not the curse. /u/RedPillWonder reminded me of that early on in this sub when I had overlooked it in one of my comments.

Long story short: don't look to the curse to find any form of command of what men and women should be doing - look at it as a series of descriptors of how God determined the world would function. Also ... is it any surprise that in the early/mid-1900s we finally see the curse reversing for both men and women?

- Men: Because now women are working more too, easing male obligation for labor. Also because we started using factories and mechanized processes for generating food rather than farming the land.
- Women: Because feminism started to rise, giving women more authority in the household. Also because medications were developed to ease the pain in child-bearing.

For approximately 6,000 years the curse was in full-effect. Only today has the passive descriptive nature of what God set in motion been predominantly thwarted, only existing in minority subsets of society. But all of that is just a side point to what we're otherwise discussing.

you say that we can ignore Titus 2:5 because of that cultural context why then can't we interpret the verses against homosexuality to be only for that culture?

I never said we ignore Titus 2:5 - I said we look at the purpose for the examples Paul gave. The purpose is what is to be fulfilled, not the examples, just like with the P31 woman - we look to the character traits of that woman, not the specific examples of what she was doing. When we look to things like homosexuality, the biblical narrative is consistent in the purpose for why it is seen as an abomination: because it breaks the image of God that is meant to be reflected through the family.

That's a much longer point to reach, but let me boil it down to the essentials:

- God created the family unit to reflect his relationship with the church.
- In Malachi 2:15 God said that the primary purpose of marriage and sexuality is to "produce godly offspring." It is not enough to produce physical offspring (as God proved by wiping away the ungodly with a flood) - they must be spiritually alive offspring, not spiritually dead.
- The Spiritual parallel tells us that the primary purpose of our union with Christ is to produce spiritual offspring - not just warm bodies in the seats on Sunday, but people who are spiritually alive.
- If the primary purpose of the church is spiritual reproduction (i.e. "make disciples of all nations") and the marriage unit is meant to be a parallel and reflection of that purpose, yet reproduction is impossible in a homosexual context, then it clearly breaks the parallel God is trying to establish.

- If homosexual marriage were permissible, it would imply that God's relationship with his church is more about intimate pleasure than actual spiritual reproduction, which would set a bad precedent and undermine the imperative of making disciples of all nations.

In all of this, the purpose of God condemning homosexuality is an eternal one. No matter what culture, time period, or life context, God's relationship with his church will never change and the marriage relationship will always be a reflection of that relationship. However, the way that culture might be led into reviling God's Word is something *that actually does change* throughout different cultures and time periods.

Note in all of this that I'm not referencing the Levitical law about homosexuality - I'm merely referencing the general spiritual condemnation of it. The Levitical law is no longer applicable today, so I do not call for the deaths of homosexuals, as many fundamental literalists attempt to do.

I find this interesting- throughout almost all cultures the woman looking after the home was always as in support to her husband- not one man in the bible was a house daddy while his wife ran businesses or plowed the fields and that was 6000 years of culture.

Well, I guess that sucks for all the wives of the men who came home from war physically maimed and incapable of working in the field or generating income. Seriously, though: you're again trying to compare a culture where the *only income-generating jobs* were jobs that *women were inferior to men at performing*. Until technology rose to level the capacity of women to generate income with men's, it makes sense that in such low-tech societies virtually all the examples we see are of men. But don't confuse "there are no biblical examples" with "God mandated it to be this way."

There are also no biblical examples of men working with computers. So, are you going to make the same logical leap and say: "For 6,000 years of culture men never worked with computers. And now today most men do - this is obviously sin because we don't see any examples of it in the Bible where God approves of it." That is a huge logical fallacy.

caring for the home has always been the support role.

No, submitting to her husband has always been the support role. If the husband tells his wife to leave the home and go buy a vineyard and plant it (per Proverbs 31), would you suggest that she's doing wrong and being unsupportive? Don't confuse cultural context with biblical imperative. This is a very, very dangerous thing to do. Unless God puts his stamp of approval on a culture and says, "Yes, that's exactly how I want things done - everyone should model this," we cannot say that just because Israel did it that way, we should do it that way too.

if what you say is true a lot of feminists would love this- they can have their careers and take on the world and think they are supporting their husbands

Haha, quite the opposite. If the husband tells his wife to get a job and she does, do you think feminists will support that? No, they're going to say, "You don't tell us what to do!" You make the mistake of assuming all feminists want high-paying careers. It's not about career advancement. Feminists want opportunities - they want the ability to choose for themselves whether they stay at home or work without a man telling them which it should be. If the husbands ask their wives to work, it's not that the wives "think they are supporting their husbands" - *they actually are supporting their husbands*.

while their husbands can run the home thinking they are the leader

If this was at the husbands' discretion, then they're not "thinking they are the leader" - *they actually are the leader*.

even though everything they are doing is really to support the wife's work and mission.

Phew ... you're really hung up on this idea that money and mission are tied together. Jesus said it plainly: "You cannot serve both God and money" (Matthew 6:24). As long as you keep thinking "money-maker = mission-maker" you're going to be in a very spiritually dark place. Our mission is to make disciples, not to make money.

there are now even single women Christian clubs that encourage women to be breadwinners and find men who want to be at home....

Now this I agree is sinful. It's not women looking to be submissive and supportive toward their husbands. It's women looking for men who will be submissive and supportive of the women's intentions. This defies the leadership structure because she is saying, "I will only 'follow my husband' if he is going to lead where I want him to go anyway." As my former pastor used to say: *It's not submission until you disagree.*

I still believe God created men to take on the world, not support his wife while she takes on the world

Again, you're confusing mission and money. Having a job isn't you "taking on the world." Advancing God's Kingdom through a lifestyle of discipleship is. Whether or not the man or the woman - or both or neither - has a job is all just context for that lifestyle.

I guess I am in the minority on this earth.

I would hope that mistaken theology is in the minority ;)

Misogyny is a sin?!! <https://www.russellmoore.com/2018/02/12/teach-boys-respect-women/>

1 upvotes · 15 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

1/2

gendered curse to Adam making it difficult for him to provide. He did not give it to Eve

Are you suggesting women should never grow fruit and vegetables in their garden at home because this is the "man's job"? Or are you suggesting that God is concerned about money (which didn't even exist in Eden) and who provides it?

Eden had no money back then, so we can't look at the curse as a form of monetary provision issue. To that end, there's no prohibition against a woman earning an income (and Proverbs 31 specifically encourages this). Instead, the curse says that the man would have trouble growing food from the ground. So, if all house husbands also managed a garden in their back yard, would that satisfy you?

Do you see how absurd this line of logic sounds? You're trying to connect points where the text makes no connection - pitting labor with economic gain.

Here's how the curse worked: While in Eden all of the family's needs were handed to them on a silver platter. Adam was responsible to lead his wife and ensure the family unit was safe and healthy, which was easy because God did all the work. After the fall, the curse withdrew all of the provisions of Eden so that the responsibility of keeping the family safe and healthy would now be difficult work and not come naturally.

Whether a man is a house husband or a working father doesn't change the fact that he has hard work to do - that his responsibility to keep the family safe and healthy is more difficult now than it would have been in Eden.

Now, suppose two men have an earning capacity of minimum wage and they're each married to a woman who has an earning capacity of \$250,000 per year (this happens all the time). Man 1 forbids his wife from working so that he can work two full-time jobs at McDonald's and Burger King while she takes care of the house. Man 2 lets his

wife work while he manages the family finances, takes care of the household, and devotes his life to sharing his faith with those in his neighborhood. Which of these two men is exercising wisdom in his leadership of the home? Which of these two men will be more fruitful at carrying out the task God has given us of making disciples? Which of these two men is more likely to be neutralizing resentment and earning his wife's respect and admiration?

You see, you're trying to set aside all pragmatic wisdom just to satisfy your preconceived notion about who should earn the money in the household - and using a passage to justify your position that was written about a time before money even existed. Provision can come in any other number of ways, most notably through leadership and management of family resources. Both men and women are consistently expected throughout the Bible to generate resources for the family. Why does it matter who generates the money and who generates the food and who generates the clothing, etc.?

Titus 2

You're trying to throw the baby out with the bath water. "I have carrots, peas, corn, and rat killer in my kitchen pantry. I'm cooking dinner. I can't use the rat killer because that's meant for a different context, so I guess I can't use anything else in the pantry either ... we'll just have to go without food tonight."

It's not about isolating one thing and throwing it out. It's about looking at the purpose for what was being included in the first place. In this case, that purpose is: "that the word of God may not be reviled." Back then all of those things were necessary to ensure that the word of God was not reviled. He was giving examples of things that would keep the word of God from being reviled, not making an exclusive list of things that must always be done.

P31 says a wife should buy real estate and plant a vineyard, Titus 2 doesn't. If Titus 2 is an exclusive list of mandates, how do we reconcile that? Or with P31 saying she should also give to the poor, sell things in the marketplace, or make deliveries to merchants. Titus 2 doesn't mention those things either, so should we erase those things from the P31 woman?

Or, if we're taking hyper-literalist interpretations of Scripture, why aren't you going around condemning every woman who hasn't delivered goods to a merchant? What about all those families out there where the wife hasn't bought real estate and planted a vineyard? We better condemn them for that sin too, right? See how ridiculous that sounds? Anyone would look at P31 and say, "Obviously those are just examples of what a godly woman does, not a list of things that all women must do." But for some reason when you get to Titus 2 you're taking the opposite approach: "This is a list of things all women must do, they're not examples of what keeps the word of God from being reviled." This is a severe logical inconsistency.

If Titus 2 does not matter anymore because the instructions were for that culture/context

I'm not saying Titus 2 doesn't matter. It matters immensely. It matters that the word of God is not reviled among outsiders. It matters to know that Paul believed we should think in practical, specific ways about what would cause an outsider to revile God's Word. What I'm not interested in are legalistic, literalist interpretations of texts that ignore the meaning behind what is said - *especially when the meaning is given right there in the text itself*.

I can at least understand the "greet one another with a holy kiss" people taking that literally. There are actual people (I had a friend who was one of them) who would kiss every Christian - man or woman - he spoke with on the belief that this is what Paul was commanding. At least in that verse there's no given meaning. Paul doesn't say, "so that you set a positive context for your interaction." That's probably what he actually meant, but without those words in the text, I can understand skipping to a literalist interpretation (even if it is a dumb interpretation). But you're taking a text where the actual intent is given and erasing that intention from the context of how you're interpreting the rest of the passage. That's dangerous.

God commanded Adam to work- if he is not working and playing the role of mother is he then not fulfilling

his duty?

You're confusing "work" with "earn income." Again, these are not the same. House husbands do work hard - and if they don't, they're sinning. They should be exercising labor for the good of the family, and orienting the resource generation capacity of himself and his wife in a manner that most efficiently provides for his family. If that means having her generate monetary resources and him generating labor around the home, such as dinner to eat, raising godly children, fixing the deck, ministering to the neighbors, etc. - *that is actual work*. Maybe you just have the idea in your head that "stay at homes" just mope around watching TV and playing video games all day. That's not how it works in a biblical context - and if the guy is doing that, it's sin.

so you are saying God can command a husband to be a house husband and support his wife's career and ambitions? That can be his mission....

Finally - we get to the **MOST IMPORTANT** distinction in all of this: the mission. No, this is **ABSOLUTELY NOT** his mission. Want to know what else is **ABSOLUTELY NOT** his mission? Making money. That's a horrible mission - and one that the Bible clearly says should **NOT** be our mission. Our mission is to make disciples.

If a man can be more effective sending his wife to work a day job while he devotes his life to ministry, for example (as is the case for countless pastors and missionaries), he is fulfilling his role and duty. He is **WORKING** toward the mission that God has in mind for him. In Eden the mission to make disciples didn't exist because anyone who would have been born sinless wouldn't need discipleship. So, God gave Adam other things to do. After the fall, God's primary priority was no longer on naming animals and tending the garden - it was on reconciling humanity to himself. That was, is, and always will be the mission for so long as this earth exists.

To be clear: the man's job is to orient the family toward the goal of making disciples. **THAT** is the only "work" that matters. The context he does it in - be it as an income provider or a stay-at-home-dad - doesn't matter. He should do that in the most efficient manner possible. But we do see consistently throughout Scripture that if the man fails to account for the provision of his family in pursuit of that mission, he will fail in his mission as well.

1 Timothy 5 says this plainly: "But if anyone does not provide for his relatives, and especially for members of his household, he has denied the faith and is worse than an unbeliever." This is not a verse about "men must work." It is a verse about a man ensuring that while he's on mission for Christ he's not neglecting the needs of the family - that he's still fostering an environment where his wife and children are provided for. Whether that is through his direct provision or his leadership decision to have his wife be the income-generator doesn't matter.

Asking wife's consent?

1 upvotes · 15 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

There are several in MRP. I just don't remember their names.

"Author is Giving Writers \$2,800 If They Write a Crime Novel Without a Female Victim" - What to make of this?

1 upvotes · 14 February 2018 · /r/askMRP

Yeah ... a rule I've been employing since day 1, although its origin for me was a beta place: to avoid temptation to cheat. How things have changed ...

"Author is Giving Writers \$2,800 If They Write a Crime Novel Without a Female Victim" - What to make of this?

1 upvotes · 14 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That was my first thought.

"Author is Giving Writers \$2,800 If They Write a Crime Novel Without a Female Victim" - What to make of this?

1 upvotes · 14 February 2018 · /r/askMRP

Indeed.

"Author is Giving Writers \$2,800 If They Write a Crime Novel Without a Female Victim" - What to make of this?

1 upvotes · 14 February 2018 · /r/askMRP

True, true.

"Author is Giving Writers \$2,800 If They Write a Crime Novel Without a Female Victim" - What to make of this?

1 upvotes · 14 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Gosh ... kind of sounds like being married.

But men are still predators in this scenario ... they're just even worse predators because now they just kill anyone and everyone.

"Author is Giving Writers \$2,800 If They Write a Crime Novel Without a Female Victim" - What to make of this?

1 upvotes · 14 February 2018 · /r/askMRP

What's #MentorHer?

"Author is Giving Writers \$2,800 If They Write a Crime Novel Without a Female Victim" - What to make of this?

1 upvotes · 14 February 2018 · /r/askMRP

Good point. Of course your citations are significantly outdated and it could be a reference to a modern market. Nevertheless, I agree with you. It's not that these books don't exist today ... it's that a feminist nation didn't care to buy them, so they never made it big.

"Author is Giving Writers \$2,800 If They Write a Crime Novel Without a Female Victim" - What to make of this?

1 upvotes · 14 February 2018 · /r/askMRP

- women get's her vicarious vagina tingles seeing other women being dominated by dark triad mofos, then
- turns around get's here guilty feelz assuaged by seeing said dark triad mofo get his commupance

Brilliant connection there - especially given the growing popularity of the sympathetic villain today, where authors are intentionally trying to foster an emotional bond with the dark triad perpetrator.

"Author is Giving Writers \$2,800 If They Write a Crime Novel Without a Female Victim" - What to make of this?

1 upvotes · 14 February 2018 · /r/askMRP

Meh, this has relatively little to do with #metoo other than to clarify that the original motive behind the competition is coming from a feminist agenda.

I thought the context of the article was quite a novel idea worth discussing, distinctly different from anything addressed by the barrage of #metoo posts. Of course, this is why I posted it here rather than on the main MRP sub - so as not to clutter things over there with something that's little more than a point of amusement for me.

Misogyny is a sin?!! <https://www.russellmoore.com/2018/02/12/teach-boys-respect-women/>

1 upvotes · 14 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Fair point. To be clear, the context of "all things are permissible, but not everything is beneficial" is Paul quoting a philosophical mantra that the Corinthians used to justify their sinfulness in a book where his primary purpose is to rebuke them for that sin. He's trying to show them that by their own philosophy of hyper-grace (or anti-nomianism), there's still a pragmatic value in getting bad behavior under control.

More to the point, Romans 14:23 is clear: "Anything that does not come from faith is sin." Romans 14:14 (same chapter even!) also says, "Nothing is unclean in itself; but it is unclean for anyone who thinks it unclean." In other words, *nothing is inherently sinful* - but if we do it for any reason other than faith, then it is sinful. I interpret this to mean that "all things are 'wrong' unless definitively redeemed as 'right'" [and I should have added] by virtue of being done as a product of our faith in Christ. In that sense, if done in faith, nothing is sinful. But doing something while separately having faith does not mean something is done "in faith." So, while "all things are permissible" for the one who is acting in faith, once we leave the realm of "in faith" ... not so much. Most people cannot in good faith steal from their neighbor and say, "I did it for God!" I'm guessing the same is true of homosexuality: "I had to put my penis in that man's butt for God!" But for more innocuous things, like vegging out to TV, there are certainly ways that can be redeemed for God's purposes, as you may meet someone the next day who loves whatever show you watched and you now can build a relationship with someone who needs Jesus. In such a case, if someone's heart is in the right place while doing it, he can "Netflix and chill" with no sin.

intelligent people can be distracted by philosophical arguments

Agreed - and that's why I try to avoid philosophy and stick to theology. There are a billion things that can be philosophically determined to make sense and be good ways of thinking/living ... but Scripture and theology only have one actual conclusion.

Gotta go clean my MIL's house now, which is probably a more productive use of my time, lol.

Haha, most certainly. Thanks for the entertaining conversation and a new perspective on a criticism of Christ's ministry! I love being educated on these things, as I learn best through hearing new opposition.

Misogyny is a sin?!! <https://www.russellmoore.com/2018/02/12/teach-boys-respect-women/>

1 upvotes · 14 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is a really good reply. I haven't heard that criticism of Christ's role before.

My gut reaction is two-fold: (1) Jesus did have real-world concerns, he just knew God would meet them apart from his seeking. This is clear from Matthew 6, where he gives his "don't worry about how your needs will be met" speech. And yes, Jesus did have a job too, as everyone knows he was a carpenter. He also lived off of the support of others throughout his active ministry, staying in people's homes, which is how many active missionaries today live. These are practical real-world ways of living in a ministry setting. He modeled both for us because not everyone is called to be a traveling missionary and not everyone is called to have a day job, so he showed that both are appropriate through his lifestyle.

(2) Christians would do right to abandon real-world concerns just like Jesus did - and in the same logical context Jesus did. The spiritual is what matters. So, when he says, "Go and sin no more," he's deferring to God's judgment against her for whatever she may do after the fact, not man's judgment in imposing some legal penalty on her. But we don't see Jesus saying, "Go and sin no more" to the Pharisees. We see him condemning them and

engaging in a ministry that undermined their authority, causing severe practical consequence to their power. So, if secular judges had the same divine wisdom as to who could be trusted to "go and sin no more" as compared to those who need to be knocked down a few pegs, I'd bet the secular system would work just as well.

To that end, although Jesus was not exerting physical authority over those who did continue to sin (like the rich young ruler, as a popular example), he does defer to spiritual authority. If human courts looked to God's role as judge as a model, I do believe the world would be in a far, far, far better place. To those who are truly repentant and reformed, God sets them free. To those who are hardened, he sends them to the lake of fire. And these are just for the guilty people (for in the spiritual realm no one is innocent). There would be less prison crowding issues and a greater encouragement for people to reform.

The only point where this becomes impractical is in the fact that a human judge cannot know with definitive certainty whether a person is truly repentant or not. He can only go on his best judgment.

Well, I'm in the same position as Jesus here, lol. I'm not running anything beyond my own life

True, but all men are biblically called to more than our own lives. So, while this works quite appropriately for your purposes, when talking to another man I cannot impart the same sentiment.

but at the end of the day, it's ultimately between them and their Creator. Who am I to judge?!

As to non-believers, you're right - it's not our role to judge. In fact, 1 Cor. 5 specifically says, "Who am I to judge those outside the church?" yet he concludes that it actually *is our responsibility* to judge those within the church. Of course, as you said, that judgment is often reserved for those within the church who have the authority to do so and not necessarily the casual attendee.

Misogyny is a sin?!! <https://www.russellmoore.com/2018/02/12/teach-boys-respect-women/>

1 upvotes · 14 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

what about protection, provision and spiritual headship are those stereotypes?

Protection and provision yes, spiritual headship no. Spiritual headship is something God directly commanded in a manner that transcends cultural context. Protection and provision are not directly commanded outside of cultural context.

so even though Christ provides for the Church and God commanded adam to work before Eve came along men do not have to provide?

Sure, Christ provides, but the Proverbs 31 woman also has a job - she makes things and sells them in the marketplace. And yes, Adam was commanded to work first, but then God created a "helper" for him - not that she wouldn't have to work, but that she would help him do the work.

What about Timothy and Titus where women are asked to be workers at home?

I don't remember Timothy mentioning this, as his focus was more on authority in the church and that women should learn from their husbands. In Titus, if we applied your logic of taking a statement and stripping it from the point that's being made, then we'd be back to endorsing slavery a few verses later. The purpose in that section is: "that the word of God may not be reviled." In other words, "I don't want God's word reviled, so here are things you can do to accomplish that purpose." At the time it was a fact of life that women were working at home. This was expected. But many women (as is even more common today) were lazy and not actually doing anything. He's saying, "Don't be a lazy bum. Be diligent with your duties, otherwise people might hate God's Word because the

people who profess it aren't living the kids of lives we want."

wait why is same sex a sin ?

Because the Bible says so.

but women get to ignore Titus 2

They don't. Culture just picks and chooses which verses they're going to impose on people. In the end, "God will judge each person according to what he has done" (Romans 2). So, regardless of how culture judges people, God's judgment is what matters. Women will not escape judgment for ignoring their sinfulness any more than homosexuals will escape judgment for trying to justify theirs.

I think your big confusion here is that you're assuming culture itself is the judge. It's not. God is. Just because culture says something doesn't mean God will follow suit.

P31 (HER husband was not a house husband as so many people think- she was caring for her home as well) and go and have careers?

What's P31 and who is the "HER" you're referring to? This part confused me.

since you said men and women can swap roles in the home (but it will be challenging) is there then no difference between male and female?

Of course there is. Any biologist will tell you that. There are hormonal distinctions, body build distinctions, muscular distinctions, psychological distinctions, etc. There are all kinds of differences. On the whole, men are better suited for certain types of jobs, including anything that involves heavy lifting. On the whole, women are suited for certain types of jobs, including things that involve a tender touch and an eye for beauty (i.e. caring for a home). But there are some tasks where men and women are equally capable because their natural biological leanings and God-given qualities simply don't have a preference.

A lot of these neutral positions are things that did not exist in biblical times. Back then, virtually all jobs required some form of hard manual labor. People were hitting things with hammers, building houses, tossing bales of hay, rearing large and small animals, fighting battles, etc. These are all things men are better suited for from a purely strength-based standard alone. So, it made sense that they would do these things and women would help by filling in the gaps, doing the things the men did not have the time to do, which often involved the housework and caring for children.

In a modern society, the vast majority of jobs do not require similar levels of hard, manual labor. In fact, many jobs today are better suited for women. Being in sales, for example, is typically far more profitable if you're a woman because her good looks can entice men to buy things. As is often said, sex sells. Particularly in a feminized culture, it's a lot harder to tell a woman no than a man. Although one could argue that women should be secretaries and men should be supervisors and CEOs because of an alleged intelligence difference (noting that this is not something the Bible specifically states; rather, it is a practical observation that is rapidly changing in a feminized world where most college attendees are women) ... but many companies are shifting away from raw intelligence as a standard for hiring supervisors and CEOs, noting that the smartest people don't make the most profit; rather, those who are relationally sensitive enough to foster interoffice relations are the ones who are maximizing efficiency. Guess who happens to be biologically more attuned to relational sensitivity?

I'm not saying this is how it should be. I'm saying this is how it is. There's also no biblical mandate that things cannot be this way. All we see is the example of a culture where all of the money-paying jobs required a degree of physical labor that women simply could not perform.

God did not make Eve to help Adam?

Correct.

they can be swapped?

No. You're confusing "employment" with "God's purposes." Eve wasn't created to help Adam produce income. Eve was created to help Adam do what God put Adam on the earth to do. Before the fall, that was simply maintaining what God had created. After the fall, that job became redeeming what God had created. Employment wasn't even a thing at that time. So, I don't buy into the notion that God cares which spouse is employed or not (other than to the degree that it increases temptation); rather, is the husband rightly on God's actual mission for him, and is his wife helping him with that? A man's job is not his mission from God. His mission from God is to make disciples of all nations.

as long as the one with the male genitals is in authority?

Yes, as long as the man is the one who is in authority on how to pursue the mission from God, it does not matter who is employed and who does the dishes. 1 Cor. is clear enough that God gives the mission to the man and teaches him how to fulfill it, and the man is to invite his wife to help him and teach her how to help him. Who has what secular job really doesn't matter.

Misogyny is a sin?!! <https://www.russellmoore.com/2018/02/12/teach-boys-respect-women/>

1 upvotes · 14 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

it is wrong to question if these people are saved even though they preach feminism

Now, we should always question the authenticity of someone's faith. That said, although feminist ideologies do not disqualify salvation, it does bring about a great reason for doubting someone's theological understanding.

it just seems like Christians hate anything male or man like and want to weaken them

To play devil's advocate briefly, you've got to have an extremely air-tight theology before you make a statement like that. The things the world calls "masculine" may, in fact, be the exact opposite of what God intended of men. We can't use the world's definition of "masculine" and get mad at Christians for refusing to embrace it. That's the same as the world trying to define marriage one way and then getting mad at the church for disagreeing because the Bible says something else.

That's why I'm trying to take greater care on this sub going forward to ensure that everything I say is sourced in the Bible first and not trying to "Christianize" RP concepts, as if the Bible must adopt secular notions.

some of our friends in my youth group happily are planning to get married with him being a house husband. I was like are you even Christian but apparently that is wrong to ask.

I used to have this ideology and had strong convictions about it. I've swung the other way now. The important thing is not the specific tasks each person does, but the authority structure within the home. So, if the husband wants to cook and clean while the wife goes off to work, I don't see anything sinful about that. The reason that these family structures often fail on a biblical level, though, is because society ingrains in us that money is power and authority. So, whoever is providing the money has the power. So, if a wife is the breadwinner, she will inherently understand that she has the ability to control the allocation of finances regardless of what her husband says. He can't redirect her paycheck to himself, but she can redirect it to make sure he has no access. So, the ultimately practical authority rests with her in that case. She must voluntarily humble herself to submit to her

husband, which is hard for many women to do when the Bible is the only reason for them to do it. In addition: just as women struggle with control issues, men struggle with passivity and being a house-husband gives him too much opportunity to fall into this ingrained passivity.

So, although the structure itself is not sinful, when you have a working mom and a stay at home dad the inherent temptation toward female control and male passivity is exponentially increased by the fact that they each are now in a context where the most natural thing to do would be to live in light of those sinful patterns that they already want to live in anyway.

Which got me thinking can I be Christian and have sex with a man?

No.

What should one do, should we still worship with these people?

Not alongside them as peers, but in front of them as leaders paving the way for them to walk toward the truth.

Is woman created in God's image? Let's explore.

1 upvotes · 14 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I have to admit ... I stopped after 5 or 6 paragraphs when I realized he wasn't anywhere near answering the question. Can you paste just the relevant part?

Is woman created in God's image? Let's explore.

1 upvotes · 13 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I agree with the second part. Although I didn't get into this in the original post, I'm more inclined toward the view that the "image of God" phrase relates to having a trinitarian nature - a body, like Christ; a soul/spirit, like the Holy Spirit; and the intangible workings of our head and heart, like the Father who is the intangible "head" of the trinity and whose heart the Gospel reconciled us to.

The Wisdom Series: Proverbs; Part One

1 upvotes · 13 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

"Does Job fear God for nothing" means "He fears you, but hasn't he benefited from this?" It doesn't change the nature of the fear Job had for God.

Let me throw out another example. Consider a zoo worker with some of the more deadly animals. They interact with those animals daily. There's YouTube videos of them going up and giving hugs to bears and lions and stuff. They totally love those animals. They also fear them. It's not just a reverence for the majesty of the animal - it is an actual, honest to goodness acknowledgment of the danger they're in while with that animal.

God likens himself to a lion many times. Like Aslan in the Lord of the Rings, we should have a healthy fear that the Lion of Judah could tear us to shreds if he wanted. But that fear works alongside, and not in conflict with, a trust. That's why when Lucy asks of Aslan, "Is he safe?" Mr. Beaver can answer, "Safe? Of course he's not safe. But he's good."

I do believe that Job had an appropriate fear of the Lord. I also believe that the entire rest of the book of Job after the part you cited is *EXACTLY WHY* Job had a fear of the Lord - because God was responsible for all of the calamities that befell Job by virtue of withdrawing his "hedge" of protection.

And then the last several chapters of God chewing out Job - that is once again a beautiful picture of the healthy fear that *God was intentionally trying to instill on Job*. I don't imagine God was quaking at Job with that type of a rant the way he did just to get Job to revere him. Job is genuinely terrified, and it's clear from God in those

chapters that this was the intended result.

Misogyny is a sin?!! <https://www.russellmoore.com/2018/02/12/teach-boys-respect-women/>

1 upvotes · 13 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

The operative word there is "believes." If one truly believes the Gospel the way I outlined it in 401 (the whole "killer slides a note under your door" analogy), then yes, they are fine regardless of their mistaken theology.

The issue is that some people claim genuine belief, but turn around and intentionally choose which theologies to believe based on what suits their interests and advantages most. This is evidence that a person is not concerned with the truth, but with his own interests. As such, his "belief" in Christ as savior is equally as shallow as his interests in discerning truth in the Word of God.

Or to be more clear: one cannot claim Jesus and yet reject the Word of God, which John 1 says is Jesus.

So, to those who have read, researched, studied, and come to a resolute conclusion that feminism is good, blue pill ideologies are what Christ intended, and homosexuality is not a sin, etc. - I'm confident their salvation is secure, however misguided they may be. Even more so, to those who learn under such a person and have good reason to trust the conclusions of the person under whom they are learning, I'm confident they're fine too, from a salvation perspective (obviously there are other serious dangers in believing bad theology that I won't get into here).

But when we get people who decide first what they want to believe and then try to find a theological support for it - those people probably won't pass muster on Judgment Day. I can't say for sure, but that's my suspicion. I should add: this is also true of men in the red pill arena. If men come here not looking for truth, but for biblical support for their worldly convictions, that is equally shallow and condemning as those who try to find biblical support for their blue pill convictions. The fact that one or the other happens to stumble across the correct answer doesn't change the fact that his heart was not with Christ in the first place - it was with the idol he has made of his own ideologies.

This is why Jesus says, "Whoever has my commands and keeps them is the one who loves me." Translation: "If you try to justify your own way of life instead of trying to figure out what I actually expect, you don't love me."

Misogyny is a sin?!! <https://www.russellmoore.com/2018/02/12/teach-boys-respect-women/>

1 upvotes · 13 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

So we're dealing with a definitional difference. It's like liberals saying Christians are "intolerant" because we refuse to support and encourage sinful behavior, even to the point of some dictionaries changing their definition of "intolerant" to coincide with their new meaning.

At least as far as I'm aware, the dictionary definition of misogyny is "dislike of, contempt for, or ingrained prejudice against women." I suppose you could call gender bias a "prejudice against" in certain contexts ... but if we really want to split hairs, of those three forms of misogyny I would suggest that the "dislike" of women is not sinful, the "contempt" of women is, and the "ingrained prejudice against" is not.

Is woman created in God's image? Let's explore.

1 upvotes · 13 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Note: Man is the "image and glory of God" but woman is only referenced as the "glory of man." Whose image is she in, if the image of man is specifically excluded? I'm not saying this is a definitive conclusion here either, but this verse, if anything, seems to reaffirm that woman is in God's image, but still reaffirming the God > man > woman chain of authority and "glory."

What is the actual danger?

1 upvotes · 13 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Then they scratch their heads and wonder why the fruit is crap

I don't think they see it as crap though. I think we're the only ones who recognize it for what it is. A sinner loves their sin. Only the Christian knows how disgusting and rotten it is.

What is the actual danger?

1 upvotes · 13 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

My point in referencing the authors wasn't to prove who was right and who was wrong. It's simply to say that the modern day leaders of the church are still reading and drawing from that 1800 years of church history that you said they are entirely throwing away. They're not. They're accepting influence from these men, but doing their best in wisdom and the Spirit to discern what's true from false. Unless you're proposing that one of the early church fathers actually had 100% of all theology correct and no one should ever disagree with him? Other than Jesus, of course. Even in their own day, the fathers of the church throughout time constantly disagreed with one another. So who do we trust? Are you shocked, then, that people today agree with some things that some ancient guy said, but disagree with other things? There is no unanimous opinion here.

Such as this entire paragraph:

I have no idea what you're talking about. It seems to me like you're looking at media coverage and a handful of bloggers. I don't count people pressing the "like" button on facebook as a legitimate protest ... otherwise most people on the planet would be considered protesters and activists. In reality we know they're just lazy bums who spend too much time on social media.

the religious Right is the only group opposing (or used to) legalizing of gay marriage in the West

Sure, a select few "used to" actually do something to oppose it, and countless others were opposed to it in their hearts but did nothing to show it. But at the same time, once the law is changed, no matter which country, it's really, really, really unlikely to get that reversed immediately. Prohibition is about the only time I can think of that happening on a national scale like that. Even Trump's alleged repeal of Obamacare was really just a series of tweaks and adjustments.

But it won't get into secularism, feminism, and all other manners of perversions and destructions.

So you think the seculars, the feminists, and perverts are going to think society is better under the fruit of the Church rather than under leaders who promote secularism, feminism, and perversions? Your point before was that if the world saw the fruit of what the church could do, they would likely agree the world is a better place. I'm simply not buying it - the secular will always want the secular.

So cool! Whats the problem then?

The same thing as within Protestantism: other theological differences.

Here's the thing: the Catholics and Orthodox set themselves apart because they believe tradition gives them some extra right to do so - that they're better than everyone else because they're somehow descended from the apostles (as if Protestants aren't). From their perspective and how they understand ecclesiology, that makes sense.

But from a Protestant perspective, the Catholics and Orthodox aren't any different from the Baptists and Pentacostals and Nazarene and Methodists and Presbyterians and Lutherans, etc. They might as well be just another Protestant denomination. The only reason they're not is because they object to that label.

The one exception is the hard-core Calvinists, who often suggest that the office of the papacy is the seat of the anti-Christ (i.e. whoever the pope is at a given time *is the anti-Christ) and that all Catholics are therefore serving the anti-Christ to the degree that they know and pursue actual Catholic doctrine. I do believe they grant broad leniency to those who attend Catholic mass, but are clueless about Catholic doctrine and just love Jesus. I'll let OZ speak on that more, though, as I'm sure he's more familiar with hard-core Calvinist culture than I am.

What is the actual danger?

1 upvotes · 12 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Mobile, so can't respond fully, but you're confusing past with present. Didn't preach the gospel and don't have it today are two different things.

There was corruption before Theodosius I, but nowhere near the same degree.

Nobody abandoned 1800 years of wisdom. Everyone still built off of what came before. They just abandoned the man made structure. Also, a lot of that wisdom was actually corruption, so someone had to sort it out at some point.

I agree that tradition is fallible yet important. I have often made my claim that every denomination has received a genuine revelation and goes awry when they center all theology around that revelation. Tradition is that revelation for the Catholic church.

A return to patriarchy would certainly be one potential solution, but you're only looking to the worldly impact, as the Jewish zealots did. I'm more interested in the impact on God's spiritual kingdom in heaven, not as much the physical kingdom on earth.

What is the actual danger?

1 upvotes · 12 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Back then they couldn't serve God. They could only serve what a corrupt hierarchy told them was God. That's why people like CS Lewis started arguing that God would judge people by what they did with what they were given rather than expecting them actually to serve him.

But no, I'm not saying all Catholics and Orthodox are going to hell or that they lack the true Gospel. I'm only saying that throughout most of three church's history they weren't preaching the true Gospel. They were preaching whatever kept them in power. People were being saved not through the church, but despite it. Today people can find genuine salvation through the church, although they choose to live despite it.

I actually attribute some of this benefit to a concept you condemn: separation of church and state. When Theodosius I mandated everyone to be Christian, communing church and state, he invited three corruption to come in. When the church tasted power, we saw that even the church is not immune to the concept that power corrupts. When in America there ceased to be a direct political power connected with the church, we saw the church starting to straighten itself out for a while ... until culture degraded so far that it undermined the progress the church had made, as the church then attempted to follow culture to appease it to keep numbers in the door, per your 20 year lag estimate and my post on the denominational life cycle.

TLDR: withdrawing time & attention, the last ditch, roommate, not wife

1 upvotes · 12 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I agree - that our mission to God is above familial obligation.

TLDR: withdrawing time & attention, the last ditch, roommate, not wife

1 upvotes · 12 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

7:29 - "From now on, let those who have wives live as though they had none"

What is the actual danger?

1 upvotes · 11 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Meh ... I'm not convinced. As bad as things are now, there were some seriously dark times in the church's history before sola scriptura became a thing. Although culture has continued to degrade, I do believe the church today is in a better place than where it was when Martin Luther seceded, for instance.

How Institutions Die

1 upvotes · 11 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

What do you have to do to renew a institution to get back to basics without founding another one?

In [this comment](#) I wrote the following:

Specifically, I hold that there are 6 contexts in which we can engage in a mission with respect to the church:

- **Despite the Church:** This is when the church is directly opposed to what you're doing and you find no support; so you must leave the church to pursue your mission
- **Outside the Church:** The church isn't opposed to what you're doing, but they won't endorse or support it and they won't allow it in their walls, so you've got to do it on your own separately while otherwise continuing to attend.
- **Within the Church:** The church isn't opposed, but they won't endorse/support it, but they don't object to your engaging with its members toward your mission.
- **Utilizing the Church:** The church isn't opposed, but they won't endorse/support, but their existing independent functions offer a useful opportunity to work toward your purpose in tandem with them working toward theirs.
- **Transforming the Church:** The church thinks what you're doing is good and they're willing to learn from you and adopt your mission as part of their vision for the entire congregation (i.e. not just "cool idea, go start a ministry for whoever wants to join).
- **Alongside the Church:** The church is already on board with your mission and have adopted it in their vision and you're supply spurring one another on.

The institution becomes the way it is because of the leadership. Most visionaries choose the "despite the church" path because most church leaders are very stubborn and not willing to change. Some visionaries work outside the church or within until they gain traction. If the visionary utilizes the church's resources for his purposes, there's a good chance his influence will rub off. If the visionary makes his focus to transform the church, that's what will recycle the institution back to the original vision (or a new one, for good or bad) without causing a split. I could give several examples of this type of stuff happening - both with good visions and bad ones - but I'll just assume this makes sense unless you say otherwise :p

How can you achieve a big organisation which puts vision first from start to eternity?

The only way I know of is the way Jesus modeled: discipleship. Size only becomes a hindrance to the vision if the leaders are the only ones trained to carry out the vision. Under the current church model, the leaders in the church treat are only occasionally trained to make disciples. They are more intentionally trained at keeping people in the church and bringing in small numbers of people just to keep them in too. Most of it is a placation game. Because the members of the church are not trained to carry out the vision on their own, and the only people who *MIGHT* have that training are the people who are preoccupied with administrative/organizational obligations.

But imagine if every person in a church was trained at disciple-making. Most people's first reactions to this suggestion is to assume that there would have to be some course or curriculum to put all the walk-ins through. Why? Because most newcomers to churches today are walk-ins (whether by invitation or on their own) who have never been discipled before. But if everyone in the church is trained at disciple-making and has actually been discipled, then the church's primary form of growth will not be from walk-ins, but through the next generation of disciples.

If a church were to start from scratch, this would mean very slow growth in the early phases and incredibly fast growth in the later stages. But there would also be more than sufficient leaders among the people to sustain the growth. Under the current church model, there are only a select few who are employed to manage the growth - and if the growth exceeds their capacity, the solution is not to train the people to manage themselves through intentional disciple-making ... it's to hire a new staff member. Given the ratio of congregants to staff members at virtually every church, it's impossible for each staff member to have an appreciable impact on the lives of the congregants toward the great commission. Instead, they're just *maintaining people* and hoping that God teaches them what they need to know to advance the great commission or make disciples ... or some churches just don't even expect that from their congregants in the first place.

That's some of the theory behind the issue, anyway. There's a lot of more pragmatic stuff, if that's what you were looking for, but I chose to address the question by giving a bird's eye model rather than a specific methodology ... but I could share that too ... it would just take a while :p

How Institutions Die

1 upvotes · 10 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That was the whole point of the institutionalization phase - that after enough growth and organization a shift happens away from the vision and toward the betterment of the institution itself. As noted in the original post, some Christians allege that this is actually a good thing. I think otherwise.

Of course, my one anecdote does little to prove that God would be faithful to all other churches as well, if we relied on his provision rather than secular means of keeping the institution alive. Fortunately we have clear scripture on point for that one ... But it's easier to trust the proven methods of the world than God's Word.

What's even worse is that the world's institutionalization method actually works so darn well ... But it kills the vision in order to work. Yet the institution says, "If it's working, why mess with it?" And they wrongly attribute as God's provision what the enemy is giving. Better to Satan than a dying church living in God's power for God's purposes is a thriving power dependent on his provision placated beyond the point of being effective.

How Institutions Die

1 upvotes · 10 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I'm confused. What was your point?

What is the actual danger?

1 upvotes · 9 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

It is, indeed, beautiful. My best friend from jr high/high school's father was an EO priest and I attended his services occasionally. I do remember loving the marvel of it all. Of course, a local EO church building is nowhere near what you see in the video.

As for the beauty in the rest of it ... remember that the producers are intentionally trying to frame it to bring a tear to your eye ;)

If converts is all you want, being "light of the world" is still the best way to maximize converts.

Agreed.

and while we are on this topic: the past 400 years~ has proven that Sola Scriptura is incapable of leading societies... something to think about

Hahaha ... Oh, I look at it more as if the first 1,600 years proved that tradition did a far, far, far worse job. We know that society will degenerate into greater depravity over time until Christ's return, so I'm not expecting society to improve ... but I do think we're far better off today on a spiritual level than where society was for the first 1500 or so years of Christianity after the apostles all died. Or, more pointedly, the 1300-ish years following Theodosius I's reign as Emperor of Rome - the guy who screwed it all up by culturalizing the church in the first place.

How Institutions Die

1 upvotes · 9 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Cool, you already know then ;)

How Institutions Die

1 upvotes · 9 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Do you mean from the time of Theodosius I through the reformation? You've got google at your fingertips.

What is the actual danger?

1 upvotes · 9 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Top result on Google: **critical decline in orthodox church membership**. After being nearly bamboozled by the Orthodox church when I contemplated joining, I'm very cautious about claims made about them or by them.

Even from a purely numbers perspective, being not feminized is how you maximize converts.

I don't understand this claim.

Other than that, I agree with the heart in what you're saying. The blue pill does set a terrible example and #2 really is a huge "if."

What is the actual danger?

1 upvotes · 9 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I'll probably come back to give a more full comment, but for now I want to respond to something you said to [/u/rocknrollchuck](#):

Those same people, before Christ, would not have attended a feminist church because their socio-political ideologies were more important to them than a prospective faith. So, if the church had not feminized itself those people would have gone to hell. Right?

Correct. Men are designed by God to be natural leaders (i.e. alphas). The church right now is targeting women and beta men to join the flock. This makes sense, given that "it is the sick who need a doctor, not the healthy" and like the Pharisees, most alpha men assume they are healthy. That's not to say alphas can't be humble too; rather, it's that it's harder to steer an alpha - to get him to follow you, because he's more naturally bent to lead and to want to bring you into his frame. It's extremely hard for the church to target alpha men. Is it better to save countless women and betas or a select few alphas?

Suppose the church changed its strategy and started targeting alpha men instead of betas. What would happen?

This is the connection to discipleship here. The disciple-maker asks: *Is it better to add thousands of followers to the church daily or to multiply through a few leaders annually? I know for a fact that you know the math on this: if you add 1,000 people every day for 30 years of ministry, you've just saved 10,920,000! That's a lot of people in a somewhat exaggerated example, as we know it would be virtually impossible to maintain that pattern, which is why most churches taper off in size. Now, suppose you target one alpha who will adopt the mission and run with it instead of those 1,000. And suppose you spend an entire year on just that one guy, pain-stakingly reorienting his life toward the mission of disciple-making. At the end of year 1 you have 2 guys, at the end of year 2 you have 4, at the end of year 3 you have 8 ... by year 30 you've reached 1,073,741,824. That's 10x more people! And if a person's ministry starts in his 20s or 30s, he's probably got more like 60 years of ministry to put in - and on an exponential scale. So, even if he does have some dud disciples he makes, I can all but guarantee that the ministry that flows from his life will be far more effective than the ministry of addition when targeting followers instead of new leaders.

But I'm not even done yet! The beauty in what we're trying to do with this sub is that we're not just trying to bring alphas into the faith (although that too); rather, we're trying to help the beta men who have already been indoctrinated into the church *become alpha*. It's a nice little double-whammy there, and there's a giant pool of beta men floating around who, if they alpha-ed up and adopted the mission of Christ, could radically change the world from one end to the other.

Does theology triumph over biology?

1 upvotes · 9 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Ah, I didn't notice that. Thanks for the heads up.

The Feminine Imperative has replaced the Holy Spirit

1 upvotes · 9 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

True. Though I do think there's a difference between intentional service and unwittingly passive. Otherwise we'd all have thousands of masters.

The Feminine Imperative has replaced the Holy Spirit

1 upvotes · 8 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That's not spontaneous, though. That's reacting to the unstable environment the guy is fostering (whether intentionally or not). He creates sexual tension. She reacts.

If he's a supplicating beta, how often do you think he'll be creating that sexual tension as compared with trying to avoid tension hoping that will increase sexuality?

To be clear, it's certainly a scale. Women can and are spontaneous at times. But it's maybe 95% responsive and 5% spontaneous.

Does theology triumph over biology?

1 upvotes · 8 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Now I see where you're coming from.

If he's referencing actual sinful conduct, then I agree with what he's saying, though I would word it more that Christ triumphs over biological impulses toward sinful behavior. The theology itself doesn't do anything if not through Christ in us.

If he's using "biology" as a reference to all sexual desire, that's certainly inappropriate, as not all sexual desire is sinful. But I believe Piper would also agree that sexual desire is healthy in the context of marriage, and not necessarily sinful outside of marriage, otherwise 1 Cor. 7 would never give a context for people to get married in

the first place.

It's not "Fitness Test", it's a Sh*t Test

1 upvotes · 8 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I agree with you in concept, but in addition to what the words imply, we also have to select words that adequately convey what we're trying to say.

So, if we called them "evil sin women are depraved tests," that would certainly convey the type of sentiment you're going for. But no one would have any idea what we're talking about. It could be a reference to a high school biology exam, for all they know.

Calling it a "fitness test" might not convey the sentiment, but it certainly addresses the concept appropriately.

In a battle between the two, communicating the right concept is a higher priority than communicating the right sentiment, although I agree that both have immense value. I still have yet to see a suggested alternative that other RP men could read and say, "Oh yeah, that. I know what he's talking about." In the meantime, MMSLP called them fitness tests. The greater RP community knows them by that name. That name avoids profanity, which regardless of what you say will continue to be a priority to me. So, I think it's appropriate.

As to the rest of your comment, I do not equate masculinity and harshness as being the same, nor do I find a Scriptural basis for this. I'm happy to entertain any Scripture to show me otherwise, though.

It's not "Fitness Test", it's a Sh*t Test

1 upvotes · 8 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

"Punish" and "discipline" is one and the same.

No, they're not.

The only difference, if there is one, is the motivation behind it.

That's one difference. The other is the utilitarian purpose of discipline as opposed to the retributive function. The way you "punish" someone from a retributive perspective will be very different from how you "discipline" someone from a utilitarian standpoint.

Yes, "fitness test" is but an attempt to make "s.../compliance tests" sound moral.

No, it was merely a method of finding an alternative to a cuss word. I seem to recall making this a primary point in the beginning. You're trying to impute a motive on me that simply wasn't there. If you want to come up with some other name for it that is more direct, be my guest - call it "sinful requests made by women as a test tests" for all I care. I wish you well in trying to get whatever you come up with to catch on.

But let's not pretend actual "fitness tests" aren't a thing at all. Yes, I get that you only believe in compliance tests, but you will not persuade me that "fitness tests" don't exist too, or that the two don't often overlap.

The Feminine Imperative has replaced the Holy Spirit

1 upvotes · 8 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

But words matter. Although it may seem like splitting hairs, this distinction is highly relevant. This word choice makes the tacit implication to the rest of society that the church - and even God himself - places identification with an institution as its primary aim.

To add to my previous comment, and more to /u/Rollo-Tomassi, this is one of the stark dangers in how this

woman is thinking and communicating. It shows that her own soteriological framework is centered around self-identification and not around Christ. But it also shows that her misguided framework can affect how society understands the Gospel itself. When we detract from Christ himself in favor of an institutionalized label, the church very much works against God's interests in advancing the Gospel and only promotes the interests of advancing the label.

The fact that she answered "no" doesn't change the impact that this framing of the question has toward adopting an institutionalized view of the "church" to begin with, as compared to the actual spiritual bond that Christ meant when he prayed "that all of them may be one, Father, just as you are in me and I am in you. May they also be in us **so that the world may believe that you have sent me.**" Remove this spiritual bond for an institutionalized identification and we also lose the "so that" part of the passage.

It's not "Fitness Test", it's a Sh*t Test

1 upvotes · 8 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

aka Emperor of the Universe.

Sure, but Christ doesn't act the way you're describing a "well-respected Emperor" would act. He doesn't "relieve you of your post and smear your name all over the news the next day" simply because you prayed for something stupid. I really have no idea how your brain is trying to connect all this right now.

"If you are God, you will do X"

That's not a compliance test, though.

admit that it is disrespect. And disrespecting your husband is a sin.

Of course I admit this. I literally just said it in the part you quoted. But different sins warrant different responses, and those responses should be modeled after how Christ interacts with his bride. You've given some great examples of how sinful men have responded to these types of things. I'm not interested in that. The goal isn't to punish women. The goal is to increase godliness - both in the man and in his wife. But I cannot change another person. I cannot change women. You cannot change women. Only God can do that. And even God often opts not to change people in the absence of their express request that he do so. So, why do you keep going on and on about punishing women? Didn't John say, "There is no fear in love, but perfect love casts out fear. For fear has to do with punishment, and whoever fears has not been perfected in love"? (1 John 4:18). Didn't Paul write, "There is now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus"? (Romans 8:1). So, where are you drawing this idea that a wife must be punished for her sin?

If you want to go punish people who aren't your wife when they test you, go for it. How does God punish them? He withdraws his presence from them and does not let them into relationship with him. Great. Go do that. But show me a biblical basis for the model you're proposing and I'd be happy to reconsider. But that basis had better be reflected in how Christ interacts with his bride.

It's not "Fitness Test", it's a Sh*t Test

1 upvotes · 8 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I'm not defending women. I'm just describing how they behave. I'm not saying it's a morally right thing. In fact, I've said the opposite - that it is the product of sin. But it is what it is. RP is not about changing women. It is about understanding the truth of how they function and utilizing the system for our purposes. RPC simply assumes "our purposes" are "God's purposes" if we are in Christ.

try to ask a well-respected Emperor

Meh, you're just advocating that men should be violent and aggressive now. I don't see those as being biblical principles in this context. Other contexts, sure ... good luck on this one. Besides, I'm not supposed to model myself after a "well-respected Emperor." I'm to mode myself after Christ. We ask him to do stupid stuff for us all the time. "Jesus, please heal my grandmother's hung toe nail. It's really hurting her." I haven't seen such a Christian be smitten with lightning yet.

Wow, so sh.../fitness tests are a "help" now?

I'm so confused on how you are reading what I wrote.

Why the Church is Dead

1 upvotes · 8 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

It can start nice and easy as a weekend bible study with friends then it turns into more.

This is worthy of a post. I've already got the content written ... I'll paste and adapt it soon.

Yet I have yet to meet a male christian in my community that is worth talking to. they are mostly vapid, or lack depth.

Isn't that why we were given the mission to make disciples? We're not called to "Go and find disciples from among all the nations." We're called to go and *make* disciples of all nations. If people don't meet your expectations, you disciple them into becoming someone worth relating with.

Why the Church is Dead

1 upvotes · 8 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

At least you're honest.

It's not "Fitness Test", it's a Sh*t Test

1 upvotes · 8 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

But a wife tests his husband, hey that's fine. Yep.

Nah, I've acknowledged a few times that this is a product of the fall. But there are "sins" in the proper sense, which are morally condemnable, and there is "sin" in the general sense, which is found in the way the world functions. Just as men had an operating system overhaul after the fall, so did women. Fitness testing is part of that overhaul. Yes, it's a product of sin. Pre-fall they wouldn't have to test at all because men would actually be who they were designed to be. But the fact that they operate like this now doesn't make it morally condemnable behavior. It just labels her a "sinful person," just like the student is labeled a "rebellious kid." The treason example is totally off-point. Testing through requests is very different from acting defiantly. Active defiance should have consequences. But asking the government to regulate something like **cow farts** ... that's not treason. Of course, that would fall in the category of compliance testing and not fitness testing.

But then you have situations like **the bill passed by Texas lawmakers to commemorate the Boston Strangler for his "unconventional techniques involving population control**. This guy wasn't trying to get away with anything. He was testing his colleagues to see if they were fit to be passing legislation. They were not. It's also not treason.

It's to be a helpmeet to her husband, and serve God.

The Bible is pretty clear that (unless she's single) her purpose to "serve God" is defined by her help to her husband.

So if her husband doesn't "Man up!", she doesn't have to or can't fulfil her purpose and direction in life? WTF?

No, it just means that she's fulfilling a moot purpose. It's still her purpose. She's still being faithful to what God asked of her. It's not her fault her husband is squandering the resources God is having her throw at him vis a vis her help. And that's not to say she can't do other things ... I just don't see much of imperative that she *must* do other things or have her own independent purpose outside of what God has called her husband to lead the family in doing. Do you have any passages in mind? Admittedly, I'm not super well-versed on passages where God gives women an independent calling that diverges from her husband's leadership.

Why the Church is Dead

1 upvotes · 8 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Excellent post - both the original and SE's commentary.

I could give one anecdote after the next, but the most recent is from three weeks ago, when my pastor said from the stage: "If Jesus had Twitter, he would be writing right now, 'I support #metoo.'"

I had a talk with him afterward about that comment and he agreed that was a dumb thing to say and that he's in total ignorance about all the ridiculous garbage the #metoo campaign has caused. He said he'd edit the video afterward to remove that part ... not sure if he ever did. At least he's willing to listen to reason, even if his foundation is in the wrong place to begin with.

More to the point, as I noted to /u/ReddJive, there's a difference between the institutional church and the *koinonia* and *ekklesia* referenced in the Bible. One can reject the institutionalization of the church, yet still embrace relationships with other believers.

That said, it's often said that the purpose of "the red pill" is not to change the system, but to use the system to make it work for us.

So, my response is not to abandon the institutionalized church. Rather, I use my "church" for my own purposes - purposes which I believe are straight from God, which the institutionalized church has otherwise abandoned. I have found great success in this method, as have several of my IRL peers.

Why the Church is Dead

1 upvotes · 8 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Thanks for referencing this. I hadn't seen that one - and although I may differ on a few points, it is on the whole a work of art.

Why the Church is Dead

1 upvotes · 8 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Personally, I don't buy into the view that the institutionalized "church" is what the Bible meant when it referenced the words *ekklesia* and *koinonia* (although I know my Cathodox friends would disagree). To that end, I don't fault you for leaving the institutionalized church.

That said, do you still have a network of believers with whom you meet regularly for the purpose of building one another up and spurring each other on toward love and good deeds? Hebrews 10:24-25 and all. If the answer is yes, then you have a *koinonia* bond among believers, which is your "local church," and when you consider the

network they have with other believers, who are networked with others, etc. that's how you fit within the greater ekklesia.

Just make sure you're not abandoning all real-life, in-person connections with other believers in an intentional environment.

It's not "Fitness Test", it's a Sh*t Test

1 upvotes · 8 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Never seen it. Is it good?

It's a classic. A nerdy teacher goes into a classroom of all the "bad kids" who are "too cool for school" and tries to teach them math. They try to walk all over him, but it turns out they really did want to succeed all along - they just didn't believe anyone was willing or able to help them do it. He does it. These "troubled youths" end up going from failing grades and being sentenced to summer school to passing AP Calculus by senior year.

It's actually a true story. And as the movie also reflects, the school board thought all the kids cheated because no one believed any of them could pass the test ... so they had to re-take the test several months later in a more controlled environment, and they passed again.

Exactly. Which I mentioned in the OP: "S...-tests" are to see how much she can get away with, and how likely she is to get her way

And to see if her man will actually take charge and give her a purpose and direction in life and boundaries to fulfill it. It's not just about getting her way. It's also about knowing her husband can lead.

210 - Mission Matters. Nothing Else Matters. Only Mission. Go.

1 upvotes · 8 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Indeed. I've always seen AM as a mind-frame/perspective and not as an actual response. But that perspective might inspire someone to poke fun at the situation too :)

It's not "Fitness Test", it's a Sh*t Test

1 upvotes · 8 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Oh, come on. I'm sure you've seen Stand and Deliver. At first it was about the kids doing whatever they wanted. But it quickly turned into a test of whether or not this guy could actually teach them something - and they tested him hard about it. In the end, they wanted to learn under a good teacher - and they did.

This is how it goes in real life too. Ever read a book on child psychology? It's virtually unanimously agreed that children *do not want to get their way all the time*. Instead, virtually every child psychologist accepts that children have an *affirmative desire* to have their parents set rules and boundaries. Those boundaries give the children comfort and security, knowing that they will be loved, protected, and safe as long as they don't stray, and that it will benefit them long-term.

It's the same with wives. I can't count the number of times throughout the first 7 years of my marriage when my wife would get upset with me over this very issue. The most common example was the quality of housework. I had a very low standard. In my blue pill mindset, I believed that maintaining a low standard would take the pressure off of my wife to have everything looking perfect and spotless. Good, right? She gets away with not having to do a ton of housework. This is your concept of "seeing how much she can get away with."

What was her response? At least once every 3 months freaking out at me. Over what? "Why won't you get angry at me for leaving the house like this?!? I get that you don't want to put pressure on me, but that's not what I want. You need to start caring. You need to figure out what things should look like and yell at me when it doesn't happen." I kid you not. This happened at least 4 times a year.

So, no. My wife's nagging me about certain household issues weren't to see how much she could get away with or lightening her load or increasing mine. It was 100% about wanting me to take charge and seeing if I would do it, then getting furiously mad when I wouldn't.

210 - Mission Matters. Nothing Else Matters. Only Mission. Go.

1 upvotes · 8 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Outcome Independence: *I'm going to do this even if she doesn't respond the way I want. Why? Because that's what I want to do and I'm not going to be controlled by her responses.*

Amused Mastery: *In the grand scheme of things, this isn't a big deal. No matter how severe her emotional reaction is, I've got a good perspective on the situation.*

I used to get reamed on MRP for applying OI on a larger scale and was repeatedly put in my place, being told by mods and ECs alike that OI is only about isolated incidents. AM is more about a larger perspective.

211 - An anatomy of butthurt and the impact on frame

1 upvotes · 8 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Consider a wife who doesn't even have to ask because her husband takes care of that for her.

This is, of course, the ideal. And I do this type of stuff all the time, personally. The problem isn't in doing the task. It's in *why* you're doing the task. If it's because the guy is a leader who gets stuff done, props to him. If it's because his wife/mommy had to tell him to do it and he's afraid of what might happen if he says no ... that's not so cool. A guy can't do things of his own volition until he first learns to say no to doing things of someone else's volition. Once he has that freedom to say no, then he can choose whether to comply with requests or do his own thing - and whatever he does, it's from a right motive.

It's not "Fitness Test", it's a Sh*t Test

1 upvotes · 8 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

"See how much we can get away with" = "See how capable of a leader he is." They're the same. The only distinction is that you're saying her motive is to maximize her freedoms (which we also agree with: the BB side of hypergamy). We're all saying that she has a second motive as well: she wants to be with a strong leader.

The sinful nature causes women to want to maximize their freedoms with a beta bucks. But original design is still mixed in there as well, which is the desire to have a man lead - to be with an alpha. How can a woman know if he's alpha? She can't ask him because most guys would give false impressions to get in her pants. Instead, she has to observe his behaviors. But how's she going to do that when she just met the guy at the bar? She has to concoct a situation where he will display those behaviors. Ergo ... she tests him to see which he is.

In marriage it's a bit different. They do get to observe behaviors, but the routine of daily life puts both people on auto-pilot a lot of the time. So, when the husband doesn't have opportunity to show his alpha, she doesn't know if he's gone beta because of the routine nature of marriage, and therefore has given up leading in exchange for that routine, or if the routine is a product of his leadership. To that end, she must do things periodically to remind herself - and it's a win-win for her. Either she gets her requests met (BB) or she is affirmed that her husband is a capable leader (AF).

So yes, both the fall and original design are mixed up in women, just as is the case for men (though we obviously follow a different pattern).

211 - An anatomy of butthurt and the impact on frame

1 upvotes · 8 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

True, true. But those are not tools new guys should be playing with.

Self-Righteousness, Pietism and RP

1 upvotes · 6 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

True ... but I don't see all of it.

Self-Righteousness, Pietism and RP

1 upvotes · 6 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

It amazes me how parents' lives nowadays seem to revolve around toting kids to various activities.

This is how millenials were born ... everything revolved around them all their lives, and now they think it still should.

When I was growing up, we were expected to amuse ourselves and not pester the adults unless someone was bleeding copiously, lol.

Me too.

The thread I alluded to on MRP definitely struck me as an "I stood up to Mommy!" brag.

It did have that tone, but I like to give people the benefit of the doubt.

Sad when a relationship descends to that level, IMO

Agreed.

Self-Righteousness, Pietism and RP

1 upvotes · 6 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

In the world in which I grew up, the husband got first pick off the platter of fried chicken

That's definitely different. Everything has always been in the reverse for as long as I've ever known it. Kids went first so that they had something to keep them occupied while the adults served themselves. Then the men always had to let the women go first, and the guys went last. It was passed off as being a "servant," but it really was just more of a social convention, as very few of the men actively contemplated service through this structure ... they were just doing what had always been done. I've never been in a social environment where it wasn't "ladies first."

terrible twos

Oh, I'm fully aware of the concept. I have 4 kids and my profession has me working alongside child psychologists and experts on child development constantly, and as a *Guardian ad Litem*, I'm constantly taking courses teaching me the cutting edge information on child development. So, I agree entirely that the "terrible twos" is a thing (although my personal experience says that the 3s are the worst).

My point wasn't to contest the idea of the terrible twos. It was to challenge the notion that this can in any way remotely be tied to a marriage relationship. A person only has context to shame someone with, "You're acting like a child," if she considers herself to have authority as a mother.

But the reverse is the same too. My kids often ask me for things. As their father I have to tell them "no" almost as often as they try to play the "no" game with me. Does that mean I'm acting like a child when I constantly tell my kids "no ... no ... no ... no ... no" when they want to do dangerous things or when they ask 100x for a piece of candy before dinner? No, that's me acting like an adult.

Likewise, how often does the government want to do stuff and the president has to say no? How many CEOs have to repeatedly cry "no" to their employees who want to get away with more and more? When children say "no" it's usually to legitimate requests. When people in positions of responsibility say "no" it's usually because there's a greater purpose behind the decision - even if that purpose is nothing more than to foster respect for authority. Sure, you could probably come up with several examples where a CEO does this with wrong motives. But that doesn't change the fact that many do it for right motives.

Similarly, we can't just automatically conclude a man is acting like a child when he constantly says no to his wife, unless we are also concluding that his wife is trying to treat him like a child or act like his mother. And if there are alternative and legitimate examples of men learning to say "no" in a right context, we must explore those possibilities too before drawing a cheap comparison to a two year old.

Self-Righteousness, Pietism and RP

1 upvotes · 6 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That would all make sense if, in fact, we did live in an ideal world. But the fact is that boys are taught from a young age that they *must* serve women. Outside the church there is no reason given. Inside the church there is a reason given, but it's lost on most because it's easier for parents just to pass it off on the secular world and sari that's just how the world should work.

That said, the terrible twos analogy is lost on me. It only makes sense if you treat the words wife and mommy as synonymous or if you believe deep down somewhere that a wife should have authority over her husband. Take that foundation away and there's nothing wrong with a man saying no to every request.

Now ... will that type of behavior get him his intended result if perpetuated ad infinitum? Probably not. Even MMSLP acknowledges that some requests are reasonable and should be complied with. The only time when the answer should always be no is for actual compliance tests. If she's not testing and just needs help ... a guy is free to say yes, as long as he first internalizes that he also has the freedom to say no.

Self-Righteousness, Pietism and RP

1 upvotes · 6 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Why are you still funding her? Take her name off the bank accounts and credit cards. If she's not going to contribute to the marriage, why should she get to leech?

If you cut her off, she'll either make the decision to leave for you (hint: if she's as pious as she thinks, she won't) or she'll start to realize how good you've been to her (more likely but not a guarantee) or she'll resent you even more but you won't care because you'll be enjoying the financial freedom. Plus, as you start spending the money on yourself, the less she'll get in the event of a divorce, the less motivation for her to leave, the more motivation to shape up.

Self-Righteousness, Pietism and RP

1 upvotes · 6 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Good questions here. I'll just add to OP that roses and chocolates and supplication don't make you a hero ... they

make you a meal ticket. What types of guys did she used to fantasize about as a teenager before she got so up tight? That's not to say you supplicate by becoming that man. Rather, you look for principles that you can incorporate. And don't defer to professions. Women aren't attracted to professions. They are attracted to the kinds of men who do well in those professions. Those traits can be carried into you as a man no matter what your profession.

Self-Righteousness, Pietism and RP

1 upvotes · 5 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Hard indeed. That's why it has value. Nobody greatly values something that's easy.

Self-Righteousness, Pietism and RP

1 upvotes · 5 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Hahaha. That's funny. It's rare for someone to directly negotiate like that. Women are usually covert in their bargaining.

Also, "not butthurt" and "robot" are mutually exclusive. Stoicism doesn't mean to withdraw all emotion (which is butthurt). It means that you can tolerate intense torture without being affected.

- negative emotional reaction = butthurt
- No emotion = butthurt
- positive emotion = not butthurt

The only way to be not butthurt is to react with positive emotion.

It's not "Fitness Test", it's a Sh*t Test

1 upvotes · 5 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Secular RP organizes them differently, but yes. Secular RP uses the term "fitness test" as an umbrella over all such circumstances. Beneath that they have s tests and comfort tests.

Due to my refusal to use the s word, before creating RPC it was recommended I say "fitness test" instead of "s-test." To distinguish, I started using the terminology "fitness tests" and "comfort tests" as the only two in my paradigm. What you're referencing as a dichotomy between fitness tests and s-tests I have just called fitness tests regardless of the differences between them.

In reality, better terminology would be: (1) comfort tests, (2) fitness tests, and (3) compliance tests.

For secular RP purposes, 2 and 3 make sense to be called s-tests. For RPC purposes, I can see responds for distinguishing or grouping.

It's not "Fitness Test", it's a Sh*t Test

1 upvotes · 5 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

It depends on the motive at the time. If it's done for the purpose of testing fitness (as in the case of the several examples I gave you), then it's not wrong. It's like Gideon testing with the fleece or Thomas testing to see Jesus' hand-holes, or God saying, "Bring the full tithe into the storehouse, that there may be food in my house. And thereby put me to the test, says the Lord of hoes, if I will not open the windows of heaven for you and pour down for you a blessing until there is no more need" (Malachi 3:10). Those kinds of tests are fine. Women do fitness test along these lines. Like Gideon, they want to make sure they're following someone who can come through when the going gets tough before putting them and their children's lives on the line. Yes, divorce is favorable to a woman by comparison ... but it's also still worse than if she had married the right man in the first

place.

If her purpose is simply to be a nag and get her way, that's sin and needs to be responded to as such.

Wife had abortion without telling me

1 upvotes · 5 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

So you're on board with me: just tell people not to get married in the first place :p

It's not "Fitness Test", it's a Sh*t Test

1 upvotes · 5 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Haha, I'll still disagree. I think it's both, as I've already said.

No. You punish her. You shall not test the Lord... even if he passes/ignores your tests.

How does God punish people in a New Testament, post-Gospel world? Romans 1:18 et seq. - "God gave them over to ..."

If God's form of punishment is to ignore us and let us waddle around in our own sinfulness until we return to his headship, we as husbands do the same. Wife doesn't want to follow? Ignore her and keep on pursuing your mission until she's ready to come back or irreconcilably runs off, which 1 Cor. 7 also allows (after Matthew 18 if she calls herself a Christian).

It's not "Fitness Test", it's a Sh*t Test

1 upvotes · 5 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

any speech-limitation is by the Feminine Imperative to tone police

Non-feminists can limit speech too. Just look at North Korea or most of the middle east.

More to the point on this, you'll note that I approve virtually every comment with profanity in it (including this one, which triggered the auto-mod filter). Nevertheless, there have been several incidents in the past where trolls came in here mouthing off ... and trolls virtually always come with profanity. So, I'd rather have the post removed and manually approve it rather than risk getting troll spammed and have to manually look for and remove all of their comments.

And yes, she is testing his fitness. I'm not sure how you're missing this :p

sigh ... it was only 14 minutes

Wife had abortion without telling me

1 upvotes · 5 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Because the theology of "complementarianism" isn't what's bad - it's the application of those who ascribe that label to themselves. If we followed your logic, we should say, "Don't marry Christian women" because 99% of Christian women fall under hypergamous AWALT models. In reality, you **WANT** a true, genuine Christian woman, even if most people who self-identify with that label are not actual Christians. In the same way, you **WANT** a true, genuine complementarian, even if 99% of people who self-identify with that label are not actual complementarians in practice. See what I'm saying?

There is no "Christian version" of anything

1 upvotes · 5 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Well said.

Self-Righteousness, Pietism and RP

1 upvotes · 5 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Where they all are now? I don't know

Go [here](#) and listen to the top sermon: "Born to Reproduce." Dawson Trotman tells a story exactly like this. He went every day for over a year on the principle that he would not go to sleep without sharing his faith with at least one person each day. One day he comes across a man walking along the side of the road and picks him up to give him a ride. He shares Christ with that man only to realize that he had already shared Christ with that man a year ago ... and the man said the prayer and confessed Christ as Lord and said all kinds of great things ... and here he was a year later and could hardly remember the Gospel and wasn't living for Christ. That's when Dawson adopted the mission of disciple-making as Jesus modeled it for us, as opposed to the church model of "Get them to say the prayer and invite them to church." I had a very similar story of people constantly saying the prayer under my witness, going to church for years ... and eventually dying away. I had literally a decade of my life invested in that kind of ministry - and I was highly praised by numerous pastors, elders, and teachers in the church - and not a single fruit to show for it from that decade today. It wasn't until I started the mission of disciple-making that I now see people several generations down from me who are still reproducing new generations and bearing good fruit. My past ministry predominantly ended up like the bad types of soil, but only after intentional disciple-making did I see a crop 30, 60, or even 100x its yield.

I wouldn't call it formal discipleship, but it seems to be heading that direction.

Excellent! You already have a starting point, which is further than most :) Take hold of this and keep driving forward.

I can definitely see how my following God on his mission has suffered since leaving full time vocational ministry.

It's possible. But I also see that most people in full-time vocational ministry end up doing it out of obligation, not out of desire. Notice those words? Evangelism is like spiritual sex and discipleship is like spiritual child-rearing. Do you like your wife to be functioning out of desire or obligation? When it's not a job, it's a lot easier to show God where your true passion is :)

It has been these last few years after the transition out of Pastoral ministry that my marriage has really been sinking.

As you appropriately note: because she doesn't respect you if you're not producing on mission. Now, there's probably also an undercurrent of her wanting the prestige of being the pastor's wife, which assists in her feeling righteous in her piety.

So naturally with all of this exercise over the last couple years, my testosterone and sex drive has greatly increased. Meanwhile, my wife's has declined from sub-average to straight boring and nearly nonexistent especially after having two kids.

Ouch. I went through that pain in my blue pill days. I even got to the point of having the rock-hard 6-pack abs, but she still had no sexual interest. After killing myself for a year to maintain that I eventually concluded that my physical fitness didn't affect her attractiveness to me, so I gained a ton of weight in the following years. Interestingly, I'm in good shape now, but still don't have that 6-pack (15% BF), yet I gave up on her and just started pursuing my mission ... and whaddaya know ... sex is back, and experimenting with new things is on the table. BTW, we just had our 4th kid 7 months ago.

Wife had abortion without telling me

1 upvotes · 5 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Once again, 99% of the Church are either Egalitarian, or claims to be "Complementarian" but supports disgustingly bluepill/contradictory pastors. This is what people like Dalrock exposes.

This I can agree with - and they live out blue pill ideologies in their own lives as well.

Yes, in a way you can say we RedPilled Christians are the true "Complementarians". But I won't identifying or associating with such a group where 99% of the group has "veered off-course".

Well ... that's why I refuse virtually all Christianese labels in the first place. I dare you to find one example on this sub where I identify myself with a particular denomination, for example. You won't find it.

It's not "Fitness Test", it's a Sh*t Test

1 upvotes · 5 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

see how much she can get away with, and how likely she is to get her way

Okay ... that's the same thing, but from a different angle. Hypergamy is AFBB. Or as /u/Rollo-Tomassi put it in his 21 Convention interview: "Alpha Seed, Beta Need."

Your author is looking at the BB side of hypergamy. He's absolutely right. With a beta husband, she wants to get away with as much as she possibly can.

But when you consider the AF/alpha-seed part of hypergamy, she likes being told "no" because it affirms the authenticity of the man's perceived alpha-ness. It makes her attracted to him because if he can **pursue his mission** without being swayed away by her antics, then he is that much less likely to be swayed away by the world in other areas affecting the well-being of the family. He knows what's best and right and he does it. End of story. That's very attractive to a woman.

So, if your author is beta or stuck in the world of purple, it would make perfect sense that hypergamy is just about her getting as much as she can out of the relationship. But when a man is alpha in a marriage context, that drive changes.

Although I don't take it as conclusive evidence, I have actually asked this exact question of several women, including 2 sisters, my mother, 3 female co-workers, and 3 other women in my church. I phrased it like this: "Are you ever frustrated at how often your husband/ex/bf/guys in general tell(s) you no?" Here were the results:

- Older sister (Christian) with an extreme beta husband: "You see how whipped he is. I can get him to do anything I want, and it's really annoying. I don't think he's ever said no to me. Sometimes I wish he'd say no, but in the meantime I'm just going to keep taking advantage of him." [I kid you not, these were almost her exact words. My older sister is blunt.]
- Younger sister (Christian) with an alpha husband: "I ask him to do things all the time, secretly hoping he'll tell me no. I really like that I have a strong leader for a husband and when I feel like seeing it, that's when I ask him for things like that."
- Mom, divorced Christian: "Hah! I wish your dad told me no more often. We didn't get along great, and part of that is because we never really had any boundaries for how things should go."
- Co-worker, divorced Christian: "Oh, I think it's very important for a man to know how to say no to his wife. My husband was actually very good at that and I really appreciated that he had a good grasp on how to lead

our family." [They divorced for other reasons unrelated to any RP issue.]

- Co-worker, single non-Christian: "Aw, some guys are just really nice like that. I like guys who know how to make a woman happy. I've never dated one, though, so I guess I can't really know what that side is like. I just know that I've always liked the guys I dated, who were the kind who already had their own direction in life and it's just never worked out."

I'm low on time, so I'll skip the others. You get my point. There was only one person who said that she didn't like it when her husband told her no, and she was married to a career beta, so his saying "no" didn't come off as alpha attractiveness ... it came off as a "BB" not doing his job.

This is of course a feminist Frame, and must be rejected

How do you reject it? You ignore the test and do your own thing (i.e. you pass it).

To be clear, I've made the argument before that all of RP is about subjugating to the frame of women. It's all about understanding how women think, act, what makes them horny, etc. and then working within **THAT** framework instead of creating one's own framework.

But here's the thing: when a man creates his own frame and lives it out, prioritizing his own interests ... that's exactly the same answer as the conclusion of the person who is trying to figure out how to game women from a praxeological viewpoint. From a secular standpoint this is a weird and humorous overlap - that a man living out his frame and not buckling to his woman's is the best way to operate within her hypergamous framework. But from a Christian worldview it just looks like God creating men and women in a way that works together in perfect harmony ... until society adopts sinful attitudes in the form of the feminist imperative.

Wife had abortion without telling me

1 upvotes · 5 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Gotcha. That makes sense.

Wife had abortion without telling me

1 upvotes · 5 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I've read some Dalrock, albeit not those posts. Nevertheless, on a quick skim I'm still not persuaded.

If I had any hint at all that what you're saying is true on a theological level, I'd be more inclined to accept it as a simple difference of observational experience. But I get the impression you're taking literature away from actuality, and I'm not sure how rooted in fact Dalrock is, as compared with argument and hypothetical impression. Maybe I'm missing something and didn't scour those posts deeply enough, though.

Nevertheless, I'm incredibly active on a prominent Christian sub larger than MRP, I'm constantly reading commentaries, listening to sermons, reading books by Christian authors on-topic, etc. - and I don't get a hint at what I think you're implying about the complementarian view on any theological level. Theologically, virtually every Christian I come in contact with is on board with the notion that men lead and women follow/submit/help.

The biggest sentiment I get which skews the application of this concept is when someone says, "If the husband is a good leader, then he will put his wife's interests above his own." This is the rare position - less than 5%. The more common version (maybe 25%) will say, "If the husband is a good leader, then he will put the family's interests above his own." I think this is a sentiment that even other secular RP authors have affirmed. Of course, I expect you and I reject even this.

I'd say at least 2/3 Christians acknowledge that the purpose of male headship is to place God's interests as the highest priority and that the man is to adopt God's interests as his own, if he is to call himself Christ-like in how he leads his family. I find no fault in this attitude and this application of complementarianism. But again, this is based on observation of thousands of comments from different Christians across the internet and in-person. I'd be curious where the opposing facts come from that are so drastically in conflict with what I've seen going on.

God Punishes Beta Men

1 upvotes · 5 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Ah, I see it now. I assumed the link was meant to go to the comment that appeared at the top, but it was 3 comments below that and just off the page :p

Self-Righteousness, Pietism and RP

1 upvotes · 5 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

My wife WAS where your wife is at. She had an insane "holier than thou" attitude about everything. If she heard a couple cuss words in a movie, she'd walk away. Anything with a pg-13 sex scene was turned off with the comment: "This is too dirty. We shouldn't be watching this." Similar things to you as the whole "drinking is sin" and "any position but missionary isn't what God intended." Don't even get me started on the judgmentalism against other people (though she always hamstered herself into thinking it was righteous conviction). I'd suggest that my wife was far worse than you think your wife is ... but I doubt you'd believe me.

How do you deal with this?

You don't. I played my wife's game for a while. It started out by trying to live up to all of her legalism to impress her. Yeah, beta strategy didn't work. Then I moved into trying to convince her that she was wrong about all the things she thought were sinful. That was idiotic too. She simply argued back that I was trying to rationalize and justify my sinful desires because I wasn't willing to give them up and that God would be happier with us if we hold ourselves to extremely high standards (theologically inaccurate, but she wouldn't admit that).

Then I shifted to convicting her of her sinfulness because of her self-righteous behavior and for replacing God's actual standard with "rules taught by men." That is, instead of defending my behavior as "not-sinful" I went on the offensive with her. **LET ALL MEN TAKE NOTE:** this strategy also fails because women are meant to learn through following their husbands. She should derive her convictions from following me. Instead, she assumed she was getting her convictions straight from God. Because women are (in all but a few cases) incapable of discerning between their emotions and divine inspiration, she would not back down and acknowledge her own sinfulness.

Solution? **I stopped playing the game.**

Self-righteousness is **ALWAYS** rooted in a comparison game. The focus of 107 is on comparison between husbands, but the concept extends further into all comparisons women make. In this case, it's a comparison between her spiritual piety and that of other women. My solution is always the same: *stop playing the game*. Don't even engage.

What do you do instead? Lead her.

How do you lead her? [See 208](#). The sidebar exists for a reason ;)

You keep trying this process and it's not working? Because **you haven't adopted God's frame** and you **haven't developed how that will be implemented in your life** (see also: **the lower-right quadrant**) and you **haven't been practicing maintaining frame in action**.

Let me summarize all of this for you very plainly: (1) Get a mission; (2) Orient every aspect of your life around

fulfillment of that mission: (3) ... actually, that's it. It's just 1 and 2. Everything else on this sub just naturally works itself out if you **live within your marriage as if you're single and wholly devoted to God**. Seriously, that's it.

So, as much as I appreciate [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) asking for stats, which are a great indicator of how independent you are of your wife by a demonstration of your commitment to physical fitness, personal hobbies, and other stuff ... the stats I want to know most are these: *How many people are following Jesus today because of your life? Who are you discipling today? Which non-Christians have you shared your faith with in the past month?

If you're not living out this mission that God gave you, then you're not following God. You're telling God, "Sorry, but I've got better things to do than follow your lead." If that's how you follow God, why would you expect your wife to follow you any differently? She's only doing what you're modeling for her.

Self-Righteousness, Pietism and RP

1 upvotes · 5 February 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I AA'd and said, yes, maybe I am hiding something

That's actually just A. The amplify would have been: "Hey, if you know about all the girls I'm flirting with, it'll just take the fun out of it." Now you've amplified it from "hiding" to actually flirting with other girls.

You could also mix it with escalation: "Of course I'm hiding something ... just not on my phone" <point to your penis>. My wife used to be a spiritual prude too. It was so infuriating. She's learned to laugh at this stuff now ... it just took time.

Broken Record'd her for the next 20 minutes "I am not going to submit to your use of fear to interrogate me".

This is a solid move. It does show that you're starting to break out of her frame - which is good. But it's also a defensive move. It shows that you're guarding yourself against her frame (and appropriately). Your next step is to get her into your frame, which is where several NIs followed by a well-placed AA can really help. ~~Do a Ctrl+F search in my comment history for~~ ... nix that: **here's the comment I was going to have you look for** ... and no joke: it was already written to you back then too.

I sat there, STFU and listened to her tell me that I was being manipulative and hiding something

Well ... you were hiding something. You were hiding the fact that you had nothing to hide ... just to prove a point.

The fact that it ever escalated to this point is very problematic. You got butt-hurt over her nagging. Butt-hurt = broken frame. So, I guess the "broken record" wasn't enough to guard against her emotions. Rather than going to your car, stick the phone down your pants and say, "If you want it, you're going to have to play around down there to find it." Then, if she tries, jostle around a little and act turned on, and eventually let her have your phone. Then laugh at her when she finds nothing on it.

You say you "knew this was a perfect dread moment" - but you tried to hype up the dread. This is the definition of going Rambo: you've got a tiny little pistol to do a bit of damage, but somehow when you shot at a tree the whole thing exploded and caused a chain reaction that blew up the whole village. Ease up. Have fun with her and don't get butt-hurt.

I went back in, put my phone on the table and said, here...look at Instagram...but on my terms, not on yours.

Haha, it's cute that you think it was on your terms. You only did it because she threw a fit. If she wasn't screaming and whining you never would have done that just because you felt like it.

She ignored me the rest of the night and didn't look at it.

Because in her mind, by the time you came back in the house after her, or at some other point during the whole ordeal, you deleted the incriminating evidence so she knew she wouldn't find anything anyway. You already lost her trust. Alpha men increase trust by being an oak. Beta men decrease trust by any number of ways, but being butt-hurt and controlling are two of the most common.

Self-Righteousness, Pietism and RP

1 upvotes · 5 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

The fact that you even utter the phrase "enough for her" is a bluepill ideology. I know Willow-girl provoked it, but don't even entertain that idea. It presumes that you're not already enough for her and that she doesn't have to be enough for you. As [/u/TonyProvelone](#) said, this is evidence that you're living in her frame. I'll write more in an actual reply.

Self-Righteousness, Pietism and RP

1 upvotes · 5 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I hope you have this comment saved as a text document on your desktop so you don't have to re-type it every time. It always needs to be asked!

Wife had abortion without telling me

1 upvotes · 5 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is true except as to the 99% thing. I find that the overwhelming majority of Christians in America profess: "Equal value, different roles." Those "different roles" don't mean "she must stay in the kitchen and he must go to work"; rather, it means that he leads, she follows. The theology is correct.

The problem is, as [/u/RedPillWonder](#) suggested, there are so many non-Christians in the church calling themselves Christians, influencing how the crowd mentality views an application of the leader-follower dynamic that even with the correct theology, their application is way, way off.

I have not met many Christians who would describe themselves as egalitarian. Although many would call themselves "complementarian," at a theological level I don't see the problem with this. Complementarianism endorses the leader-helper dynamic, which is biblical and appropriate. It's how people apply complementarian principles that starts to get off-course. Or maybe I'm misunderstanding what you mean by complementarianism?

And yes, we do refrain "don't marry a feminist" quite frequently here.

Wife had abortion without telling me

1 upvotes · 5 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

never marry anyone who's not red pill

My understanding from [/u/BluepillProfessor](#) and several other ECs on MRP (which I tend to agree with) is that women are naturally red pill. They don't need anyone to teach them how the game works because it's in their nature, particularly in a feminist society where women are taught that they have the choice to do whatever they want - stay at home, be a CEO, be a porn star, raise kids, etc. To that end, their default position is: "Dominate me like I want, or I'll trample you with hypergamy." Every woman gets this instinctively - and they really don't have any other option *but* to be red pill.

Men, on the other hand, have to learn it because our options are: *Dominate like they want or get trampled over by hypergamy*. With women, either option works just fine - they either get their AF or their BB, and sometimes

both. But with men, we are taught to be trampled by hypergamy and the option to dominate is suppressed as much as possible. Most men must intentionally learn to be "red pill" because they never knew that dominating a woman was even a legitimate option in the first place. For women, all options are legitimate, thus all women are red pill - there is no stifling that they must learn and overcome.

Wife had abortion without telling me

1 upvotes · 5 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

True dat.

Wife had abortion without telling me

1 upvotes · 5 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That was my thought as well. Troll or not, there's still use in processing hypotheticals and learning from what others would recommend in different situations. Right on, [/u/RedPillWonder](#).

There is no "Christian version" of anything

1 upvotes · 5 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

it doesn't matter how the structural relation of government works

This is a lot of how I see it too. It's incredibly rare that the Father in the OT or Jesus in the Gospels tries to change government or economics. Their focus was on changing culture. I can't imagine after the Father and Jesus rejected governmental and economic uprising as a means of instituting their plan that the Holy Spirit would be any different in a post-Gospel world today. Instead, just as the Father and Jesus transformed cultures for their purposes, I imagine this is the goal of the Holy Spirit as well.

To that end, the institution of slavery was a predominantly governmental and economic institution. How the culture treated and interacted with slaves was a cultural issue - and that is, not surprisingly, where we see the Bible intervening.

Feminism, on the other hand, is different. It started as a political movement with very little cultural traction. When it did gain political power, then big-business saw the money in it and decided to make it an economic affair. When big-business then advertised these feminist ideals to the masses, it became a cultural phenomenon, that cyclically gave rise to more political power, giving rise to more economic gain from pushing the agenda, etc.

To that end, there is certainly a cultural component to feminism itself, not just how we should treat feminists. Where the Bible was silent on the political/economic institution of slavery, there is direct command as to rejection of the cultural infestation of feminism.

I'd rather have a good and wise dictator any day than a corrupt bureaucrat in the White House.

This is why my former pastor (and the only truly masculine/RP pastor I've ever known) used to say frequently: "The only form of political governance that God ever endorsed was a benevolent dictatorship."

FR: Crawling back to RP after some struggles, wife kicks me while I am down.

1 upvotes · 4 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Haha ... It's an old joke. I won't try it again.

Even Jesus debunked the Soul Mate Myth.

1 upvotes · 3 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Agreed ... and I felt that honor to.

Thoughts on my family vs. my wife

1 upvotes · 2 February 2018 · /r/askMRP

Agreed. I can't count the number of times my family has said of my brother in law, "Why can't he stand up to her?"

How to deal with silent treatment

1 upvotes · 2 February 2018 · /r/askMRP

My thoughts exactly

There is no "Christian version" of anything

1 upvotes · 2 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I'm not sure why God would have Noah build an ark big enough for people he knew would never be on it.

There is no "Christian version" of anything

1 upvotes · 1 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Fair points. I don't agree on every point, but I do understand where you're coming from.

There is no "Christian version" of anything

1 upvotes · 1 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

but because the Church has been conforming even on things I'm sure you'll consider "clear biblical mandates" since the 1800s

Bear in mind that I was only referencing a minority of the church. The majority of the church has never conformed on the "clear biblical mandate" issues.

Which is fishy, isn't it? Because after some time has passed, the overall church is one which is more progressive/liberal than the one it was.

That depends on how you define "more progressive/liberal." I wouldn't say the overall church has been this way. But I suppose you could argue that *any change at all* is "progressive/liberal" simply because the conservative stance implies a maintenance of the status quo.

The most progressive/liberal change in the church is on the issue of feminism, and that's one of the rare exceptions that has taken root on a clearly mandated biblical issue - and even at that, the church has not adopted the feminist imperative in full; it has only compromised. That is, the church on the whole still verbally professes the "leader/helper" dynamic and male headship.

The way they compromised is by adopting the feminist imperative whenever possible in that it does not violate Scripture. So, on all theological issues, they have held true to God's Word. But if God's Word gives any room for interpretation, they have given women the benefit of the doubt rather than the patriarchal tradition that was in place when those Scriptures were written.

Now, you and I agree that this is a very dangerous thing to do. It violates *my interpretation of Scripture*, as well as that of most every guy here. But most of the issues within the feminization of the church are not in opposition to the "clear biblical mandates." It more has to do with culturalization of non-biblical issues. So, you'll get a pastor who preaches male headship, but then still comments: "make sure you run that by your wife first." There's no

biblical mandate that husbands must not run things by their wives first. But the implication is where the danger is because the common attendee cannot discern between the clear biblical mandate and the implications of cultural terminology being used from the pulpit. Accordingly, they will reach incorrect conclusions on those biblical mandates without understanding the delicate (albeit incredibly misguided) line that the pastor is trying to walk in appeasing both Scriptural authority and cultural agenda.

Anyway ... I'm ranting at this point and have had 4 phone calls while trying to write this and forgot where I was going. My point is that feminization of the church is bad, but the ways that it's feminized are mostly a discredit to healthy marriages and practice of biblical principles and, at least as I have seen it, do not directly compromise on the language of Scripture itself in the vast majority of churches. I'm not sure if that makes sense or not, though.

Looking in the US as a foreigner, it sure doesn't seem like an "overwhelming majority" of churches is against female pastors/priests.

Admittedly, I'm going from personal experience here, not statisticians. That said, **the stats** do show that for mainline churches (i.e. the bulk), there are only 10% of female clergy. This shows an overwhelming majority. Even the Nazarenes who explicitly allow female clergy still only have 11% - 1% higher than the average. So yes, I think 90% is a justifiable number to say "overwhelming majority."

In terms of your paint analogy. I can only say it's taking black paint, and placing a Christian label on it. It's Christian black paint! Hardly surprising the Christian who wants to buy black paint, asks himself "Is there a Christian version of this?"

Agreed.

There is no "Christian version" of anything

1 upvotes · 1 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I agree that the actual secular/spiritual dynamic is far more sinister. But I can't help but notice that the types of issues brought up are things that were never part of the "white" to begin with. The white wall is issuing moral judgments about whether or not the gray bits of paint are more white or more gray.

So, in the case of slavery, there is no compulsion in Scripture to prohibit slavery, nor is there a compulsion to employ it as a socio-economic device. The same goes for female voting rights. The Bible is conspicuously silent on the matter of telling human governments how they should run themselves, and thus makes no statement on whether or not women should be able to vote in a secular governmental election (noting that such elections didn't even exist in the time the Bible was written).

On issues where the Bible does have a clear mandate, we do see a sharp division of the church. The minority trend is toward liberal theology, which I think is much of what you're referring to: those who interpret Scripture through the lens of culture such that as culture changes, so does the actual meaning (rather than just the perceived meaning) of Scripture.

Because the overwhelming majority of churches today are theologically conservative, we have yet to see the church violate a clear, direct command. I do see the issue of female pastors/priests being one where even some conservative theological churches have given in, but this isn't a 20-year thing ... it's been going on since the Methodists in the 1800s. Not surprisingly, my home church (although I do not subscribe to the denomination, personally) is Nazarene and holds a predominantly conservative view of theology, but did have a female associate pastor for a time. They justified this on the grounds that there was still a male head. Also, the Nazarene church was born from the early methodists, so it's not surprising that some of that liberal theology was carried in.

Nevertheless, the overwhelming majority of churches have stood firm on this issue despite over a century and a half of increasing cultural pressure. Why? Because there are clear biblical mandates, as opposed to the other

issues you referenced, which were purely cultural issues that the church had not yet processed a position on.

Now, one could argue that we should expect an increase in theologically liberal churches to account for the change in culture ... but the data shows otherwise, as virtually every news source is actually reporting a decline in ratio of theologically liberal churches as compared to theologically conservative ones.

There is no "Christian version" of anything

1 upvotes · 1 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

My thought precisely.

Facebook

1 upvotes · 1 February 2018 · /r/askMRP

My thoughts exactly.

The interplay between theology, praxeology, and philosophy on human behavior

1 upvotes · 1 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Yes, someone argued that

The interplay between theology, praxeology, and philosophy on human behavior

1 upvotes · 1 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I don't dispute that. And if the bible had said, "The Egyptians were so distraught over what God had done that they ..." then I'd be more inclined to agree that God did not miraculously change their disposition. But when the bible says, "God made them favorably disposed," I feel like I must believe God did change their disposition. I have a hard time believing God inspired Moses to write something in a way that clearly says one thing when he really meant something else that could have easily been communicated with different language.

She's getting chubby...

1 upvotes · 1 February 2018 · /r/askMRP

Amen

Even Jesus debunked the Soul Mate Myth.

1 upvotes · 31 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Under the new definition I would still reject the concept on numerous pragmatic grounds, but I might accept it as a valid biblical belief under Calvinist theology.

She's getting chubby...

1 upvotes · 31 January 2018 · /r/askMRP

People just don't like the word dread because it implies the goal is to weaponize fear to get sex. Some suggest that the fear component implied by that word undermines the genuineness of her desire in exchange for something artificial, akin to hysterical bonding. Most guys here don't care if the attraction is genuine or artificial. Better sex = better sex.

If we called it "cultivating the effect of preselection post-marriage" the entire concept might be far easier for most of the world to swallow. But then /u/BluepillProfessor would have to rewrite his book and none of us want to make him do that just to appease the bloops.

Even Jesus debunked the Soul Mate Myth.

1 upvotes · 31 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I'm not saying anything about his case other than that we don't have enough data to draw any conclusions.

- we only see 4-5 cases in scripture of God intervening to get two people hitched.
- we don't know if God does this for others or not, but the implication of 1 Cor. 7 is not - that most marriages should originate with two people lusting after each other, not some divine miraculous story or plan
- of the 4-5 we only know God's purpose in why he drew them together: Hosea ... We cannot draw any conclusions on the others as to whether they are more akin to Hosea's story, where God prioritized a specific purpose over romance, or if they are more akin to a Disney romance fairy tale idea of soul mates who ate paired by divine providence
- we have zero confirmed examples of God intending romance as his purpose for drawing two people into marriage.

For reference, the 4-5 in thinking of are (1) Adam and Eve, (2) Isaac and Rebekah, (3) Hosea and Gomer, (4) David being given Saul's wives by God, and (5) Mary/Joseph (who are iffy ... God didn't bring them together, he just told Joseph not to leave). In which of these did God say, "I'm putting you with that person because they can make you happier than anyone else possibly could"? #2 is the only one we could possibly infer that from. For 1 and 3 God tells us his purpose for putting them together and it's not romance. We don't know the purpose for 4 except by assumption (ex. Solidify David's position as king). I don't really count 5 but any inference of romance there doesn't come from God's words ... at best only by his approval of the relationship which they themselves may have experienced romance in (we assume but don't know).

I think we're saying the same thing but thought I should clarify anyway.

Even Jesus debunked the Soul Mate Myth.

1 upvotes · 31 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Let me clarify: the soulmate concept implies that God has predetermined two specific people to pair up and intervenes to cause this to happen. We see maybe 4 or 5 examples of this happening in Scripture. It's very, very rare. The majority of people seem to have no clear, direct divine intervention directing them toward a specific individual.

So, in Hosea's case we see one clear example where God goes cockeyed and puts him in a crummy marriage for a bad purpose. In the other 4 or so examples, we don't have any information on whether or not God did it for their feels and happiness in the relationship or for a specific purpose that advances his Kingdom. Sure, God could do both, but we don't know that either.

To that end, with only 4 or 5 examples to look at, we can't say that Hosea is an "exception" to the rule of how God treats marriages when he intervenes to put two people together. We know that he is the clearest example and the only one where we know the specific purpose for why God chose *that* girl (or rather *that kind of* girl). So, Hosea might actually be the rule and not the exception, when considering only relationships where God acknowledged his intervention, and we just get less explanation for the other examples.

That's what I meant. God's intervention in the first place is the exception. And if God doesn't intervene directly very often, then the concept of a soulmate doesn't make sense to rely on for the vast majority of people on the planet.

Even Jesus debunked the Soul Mate Myth.

1 upvotes · 31 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I've been thinking more on this. You're right that the definition of a soulmate matters greatly. I'm going to assume

that everyone who believes in a soulmate means that their soulmate is the person with whom they will have the greatest possible degree of relational happiness in the marriage as compared with anyone else that they could have married. Is that a fair point? It doesn't mean everything will be a Disney happily-ever-after, but it does mean that you'll fare better with that person than you would with anyone else.

With that in mind, we do know for a fact from Hosea's story, if nothing else, that not everyone gets that type of a soul mate. So, there is no Scriptural basis for any individual person on earth today to believe that they automatically have a soulmate either. To that end, believing in the concept of a soulmate is useless because there is no way to know (1) if you're one of the ones who does get a soulmate, or (2) if you are, who that person will actually be and if the person you married actually is the one God had assigned for you.

The other fallacy in that "best relational match" mentality is that it assumes God's purpose in assigning someone a spouse is always for the good of the relationship. This is a nice blue pill fantasy, but I'm more inclined to observe from Scripture that God is more concerned with the functional purpose of relationships than with the feels of the people in them. That's not to say God wants you to be unhappy in a marriage; rather, it's that having his purpose in putting you together fulfilled is of greater significance to him than your feelings - and your feelings are not that purpose. To that end, we also know that God wants us to rest on Him for that degree of satisfaction, validation, and support, not on our spouses, making idols of them. So yes, it's good to have feels for your spouse, but I'm more persuaded that God has higher purposes for marriage and any possible conception of a "soul mate" that I know of to exist on a mass scale is not aligned with biblical principles.

Thoughts?

Even Jesus debunked the Soul Mate Myth.

1 upvotes · 31 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

How do we know Hosea is an exception? There are so few examples of God intervening to bring people into marriage that we can hardly even establish a rule in the first place. That's my point: we simply can't know.

Even Jesus debunked the Soul Mate Myth.

1 upvotes · 31 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

The vast majority (359 times) it is translated as "find."

"Find" is fairly neutral. It doesn't imply a searching. It usually comes across to me as, "Hey, look what I found!" as if someone came across something without looking. The "I found you!" hide-and-seek context seems to be the rarity, including when you skim the verses, like Cain saying "if anyone finds me they will kill me." He doesn't mean anyone is looking for him; rather, that they will happen upon him.

While I readily agree that an argument could be made both ways, I see very few biblical passages where a man makes *searching for a wife* a significant priority.

God can be involved in the process of a man's search for a wife

I agree for sure. But why the man would be actively searching for a wife in the first place is beyond me. Once upon a time it made sense. Post-marriage, the cognitive dissonance set in and I changed my tune pretty quickly. But that's a longer story than I'd care to get into here, chock full of caveats and exceptions, and I'm confident you already know it anyway.

Do you believe God wants, let's say the majority of people to never marry?

I do build a lot of support around 1 Cor. 7, but I do also believe God intends most people to get married. This

view actually comes from the Matthew 19:12-ish passage when Jesus is speaking on point. Two things to note from that passage: (1) Jesus implies that only a small percentage of people can actually follow through with the perpetually single life; (2) The only people who can successfully live that way are those who have been specifically given that ability by God.

From the first point, we know that most people will end up married, but the second point is what proves that this is God's intention. If God only expects people to remain single if he uniquely empowers them to that life, and he only uniquely empowers a few, then it follows that God's will for the majority of people is that they should marry. Of course, Nothing in the Matthew passage explicitly states that celibacy is a gift given only to the few. It might be given to the majority. I'm just going off of implication.

My point, though, was not about the numbers of how many people should be rejecting marriage. My point was simply about the method of getting married. I don't believe (though I am open to correction) that there is any clear New Testament biblical mandate to get married, and that any OT mandate that may have existed was predominantly for the purpose of filling the earth in number (i.e. fulfilling the first command to humanity), which is really now a spiritual command to fulfill and not a physical one. In the absence of such a compulsion, I believe the preferred method of finding a spouse would be Paul's suggestion in 1 Cor. 7 - Pursue God full-heartedly as if you're destined to remain single forever, then get married when you and a woman find yourselves having trouble holding back your lust. This not only maximizes a person's ability to focus on their relationship with God throughout their single life, but it also maximizes the amount of time they get to spend doing that, and it also maximizes their ability to prepare for marriage through more intentional effort toward spiritual growth, and it maximizes the man's capacity to lead his wife because he has been in her role (a la his relationship with Christ) longer before being confused by a dual role, and all kinds of other benefits. So, not only is this view (at least in my understanding) biblically compelled, but it is also incredibly advantageous on a practical level to both God's Kingdom and the man himself, as well as to his wife.

the statement that God hasn't or doesn't aid anyone unless they are in that state isn't accurate in every situation, or at least could be worded better

I don't think we can know definitively one way or the other. I will say that the majority of casual Christians still do end up getting divorced. So, of the people sitting in the pews, the overwhelming majority of them were probably not aided by God in finding their spouse in any way, as I doubt that God would lead them into a relationship that he knew would end in them doing something he hates. I'm more inclined to think that God would lead such people away from marriage until they're ready before offering his sovereign services.

As for serious Christians, the divorce rates are significantly lower. But that still doesn't guarantee that God actually did assist them in finding one another. Have I shared the Arthur/Merlin dynamic on finding a wife before? That's a perfect example of how I see God's role - not that he aids in bringing people together (unless he actually wants them together); rather, that he warns people of potential pitfalls, then lets them make up their own minds anyway.

Wife wants to take Girls Weekend to Tahoe

1 upvotes · 31 January 2018 · /r/askMRP

Okay ... so suburb prices or downtown prices?

Working on the Sidebar

1 upvotes · 31 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I'd love to review a pdf. Thanks! Is it a file or a link? PM me details.

Even Jesus debunked the Soul Mate Myth.

1 upvotes · 31 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Good timing on this. I literally just last night finished the ONEitis and sniper/shotgun sections of my RPC book. I contemplated converting parts of it into a post, as I hadn't written on the subject directly here yet. I'll let the conversation in this thread do that for me instead. I hadn't considered this passage, but will review it more closely now.

I'm confident that the soulmate myth (and the concept of ONEitis as a whole) was one of three leading contributors to the mass feminization of the church. The second was the confusion of philosophy and theology, which I just posted on today (though without getting into the historical impact).

Even Jesus debunked the Soul Mate Myth.

1 upvotes · 31 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Understanding the context that you appropriately reject the soulmate myth on the whole, in light of your post, how do you fit Hosea into all this?

She was not what anyone would call a soulmate. But God told him to marry her anyway. And she brought him great distress (though I'm sure marrying a prostitute brought incredible sex as well). So, if she was appointed to him by God but defied traditional notions of a soulmate, how do we know the other women appointed by God to other men were given to them to meet a Disney style soulmate either? What if God had another purpose for those marriages?

The interplay between theology, praxeology, and philosophy on human behavior

1 upvotes · 31 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That's precisely what I linked. I enjoy Adam4d

The interplay between theology, praxeology, and philosophy on human behavior

1 upvotes · 30 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

As you appropriately note, ontology is a subset of philosophy, not an independent school of thought. Even at that, I don't think it's about truth as much as it is about what it means to "exist" or to be "real." So, the laws of science, for example, would not be ontological truths; rather, trying to understand what it means for the laws of science to exist would be an ontological subject.

Similarly, as you also noted, epistemology is also a subset of philosophy. Its focus isn't necessarily on figuring out perceived truth; rather, it's about analyzing how humans develop perceptions in the first place and what the purpose/meaning behind our knowledge/perceptions is. So, what humans perceive about morality would not be an epistemological subject; but studying how humanity develops those perceptions in the first place is.

Again, both of these are subsets of philosophy and rely squarely on logic and reason to make any claims. Theology and praxeology use logic and reason as a tool, but always make them subservient to divine revelation (in the case of theology) or observable patterns (in the case of praxeology). So, if logic/reason say, "Women should want to be faithful to a good beta-provider" (a blue pill philosophy) but praxeology observes that she'll go screw Chad anyway, and this is shown repetitively across countless scenarios, then the practical result defies the logical conclusion, and therefore trumps the philosophy.

All of the above in mind, I'm doubtful that an ontologist or epistemologist would have any unique insights to offer on the subject of intergender relational dynamics, and instead their representatives would agree: "We don't study that kind of stuff. But what we *would study* is how intergender relational dynamics came into being and the nature of their existence as an intangible concept (in the case of ontology) or how different men and women have come to the conclusions they have about intergender relational dynamics and the thought processes necessary to reach those conclusions and the purposes we can utilize that information for (in the case of epistemology).

More to the point, because both ontology and epistemology (as subsets of philosophy) are not grounded in actual fact, but logical conclusions about ideas, they are still grounded in what "should be," as I suggested was the function of philosophy in my original post. To be clear, I'm not talking "should be" in a moralistic sense. I'm talking about it in a logical sense. Logically, betas may conclude that if a man is nice to a woman then she will like him. This is philosophy because it follows a natural logical chain of events that if A occurs, then B should result.

As such, your dismissal of philosophy as concerned only with "what should be true" is not only an undue criticism - it is itself a philosophical statement, and so ought to be rejected on your view.

Let's be clear: I'm only dismissing philosophy in regard to its value in helping men improve their position in intergender relational dynamics. Philosophy has incredible value in many other areas of life - including in the sense that I utilize philosophical thinking to discern when philosophy, theology, and praxeology should be employed. To that end, you're very right in that my entire post is philosophical in nature. But that's because I'm cultivating a philosophy for how RPer's should prioritize the branches of knowledge. To that end, my philosophical rationale for my post should not be rejected because I am not philosophizing about intergender relational dynamics themselves or suggesting what a person *should* do in order to achieve a particular result.

Now, I suppose I could argue that I don't need theology to prove anything I've said. Consider: Praxeologically, I could argue that there's enough observed evidence that trusting a praxeology over philosophy will get better results in intergender relational dynamics (ergo success rates of red pill praxeological strategies as compared with blue pill philosophical strategies). So, praxeology is self-affirming as to its own effectiveness and I don't need philosophy to prove that. But because RPC is relatively new, we have yet to develop observation to prove its effectiveness, and because we cannot observe eternity, heaven, hell, etc., we could never utilize praxeology to validate theology in its role in this hierarchy. Instead, we can take the theological conclusion that "God's thoughts are higher than our thoughts" and that "the wisdom of the world is foolishness in God's sight," and thereby conclude that because both praxeology and philosophy come from worldly sources, they must both be deemed subservient to theology. Add in Proverbs 14:12 and we see that theology has significance into eternal consequences as well, which should under all schools of thought transcend all other purposes. Of course, as with praxeology, these theological statements are also self-affirming.

Anyway, thanks for your comment! This has been the most useful reply in helping me flesh out my thoughts on this some more :)

The interplay between theology, praxeology, and philosophy on human behavior

1 upvotes · 30 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Well, if you ask a Calvinist, "it's not a salvation issue," but somehow if you disagree with their deterministic views, you're a heretic who will burn in hell for eternity ;) (Don't worry, OZ, I know you're not a **cage-stager**!)

The interplay between theology, praxeology, and philosophy on human behavior

1 upvotes · 30 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

But then that kind of spits in the face of free will. It is more like He impressed on their hearts and they did with it as they will.

Ah, I go the other way on this. I do believe that God has the ability to cause a person to act without regard for their free-will in specific moments when he so desires. Or, in the case of the Egyptians, causes them to experience a situation or a mood/sentiment that they ordinarily would not have chosen to submit themselves to.

But ... this is a minor issue and I'm okay with disagreements.

The interplay between theology, praxeology, and philosophy on human behavior

1 upvotes · 30 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Good thoughts. But this goes back to the age old question: is a man "red pill" when (1) he embraces the truth and adjusts his behaviors accordingly to suit his own purposes in light of that truth, or (2) is he "red pill" when he follows the prescribed behaviors of other "red pill" men and how they believe a person should respond to the knowledge of the truth?

The interplay between theology, praxeology, and philosophy on human behavior

1 upvotes · 30 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I've certainly seen that. And in some theory, what you're saying could be true. But in this case we see direct divine intervention: "God made them favorably disposed." I mean, you could interpret that as the plagues being God's method for doing this, but I would expect the passage to have said something like, "The Egyptians were so upset at what God had just done that they gave the Israelites everything." But Moses wanted to clarify, emphasizing that this was an unusual and unexpected thing, defying ordinary praxeological assessment.

Thanks guys

1 upvotes · 30 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Something you said prompted me to make a post that I had been contemplating for some time, but was never inspired actually to put up here. Thanks!

FR: The Spousal Support Scam

1 upvotes · 30 January 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I see what you're saying. It's probably not worded the best. Nevertheless, the point is that under an equal contribution law 100% of his paycheck going to the family means 50% benefits her and 50% benefits him. So, in that legal framework, no matter how much or little she had a say on where the money went, 50% is attributed to her.

FR: The Spousal Support Scam

1 upvotes · 30 January 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

After the divorce "the family" doesn't exist.

How Can I Bring My Girlfriend to a Relationship with Jesus?

1 upvotes · 30 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I also don't believe God has put me in this position for almost 2 years to ...

Because God didn't. You did. But I also believe God gives us free will, so maybe [/u/OsmiumZulu](#), our resident TULIP-peddler may have a different perspective ;)

to simply break up with her now without even attempting to minister to her

You've had 2 years to try. Mission failed. Move on.

when I'm in a better position to get through to her than anyone else has ever been

And you've been in that position for two years. [/u/RedPillWonder](#)'s comment is spot on point here. You dropped

the ball. That's cool. We all do. I failed at leading my wife properly for the first 7 years of our marriage. That's hard to recover from. I also failed to "save" my ex-girlfriend Rachel, despite that I was the only person actively speaking Christ in her life - and that was with intentional effort and being highly skilled and trained in evangelism and discipleship and spending 3+ hours a day 5 days a week in the basement of a chapel praying over her with tears down my face. Trust me, I know where you're coming from. I know how important this is. But OZ is right - "You can't" save her. Only God can. By trying to usurp that authority and place the responsibility on your own shoulders, you're doing a very dangerous thing both for you and for your own relationship with God.

To that end, it *IS* a helpful statement because it's the truth. God must be the one to work in her.

hearing from many of you that I should leave the relationship is hard to swallow when I have loved this girl for a very long time

And there confirms my suspicion, as articulated in my other comment in this thread: your real reason for wanting to stay is not to "save her" (although I believe there is some truth to this as a secondary motivation that you have escalated to the forefront in your effort to maximize your DEERING position); rather, it is to preserve all of the time and affection you have invested into the relationship ... to spare yourself the emotional impact of the breakup.

My response notwithstanding, heed the words of [/u/RedPillWonder](#) very closely. I respect him greatly, as I do OZ, and we are all just trying to help you. I know OZ's brevity sometimes leaves too much to implication, but we are all replying here because we care about you and seeing God's will done in your life both for her good and yours. Peace, brother.

404 - The Lens Part 2: The Empty-Full Dynamic

1 upvotes · 29 January 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Yeah, I've contemplated an askRPC sub, but we just don't have a large enough user base to justify its existence yet. But my hope is to get there someday. In the meantime, I do think most Christians are currently utilizing askMRP as their first option, either due to a lack of awareness of RPC or in fear that they'll get purple advice rather than red. If you have any ideas on how to promote the sub to move on that direction, I'm all ears :)

404 - The Lens Part 2: The Empty-Full Dynamic

1 upvotes · 29 January 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I was wondering if you'd come back around after I finally started posting some of this stuff :) You have commented a few times about looking forward to this. In the next one I'll actually post the image file of the illustration, which should help give more clarity too, given that most people today are visual learners.

How Can I Bring My Girlfriend to a Relationship with Jesus?

1 upvotes · 29 January 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

My thoughts exactly. I almost summoned you to say exactly this, but saw you beat me to it!

How Can I Bring My Girlfriend to a Relationship with Jesus?

1 upvotes · 29 January 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I'm convinced this is the girl God has put in my life for me to spend the rest of my life with.

What makes you convinced of this. As [/u/sdrawkcab_kaeps_i](#) noted quite appropriately, marrying a non-Christian is sin. James 1 says that God will not tempt anyone to sin. Period. So, I can say with 100% confidence that if she is a non-Christian, you are severely confused about how to discern God's will, attributing your feelings

to the prompting of the Spirit, which is an incredibly dangerous endeavor. As Proverbs 14:12 says, "There is a way that seems right to a man, but in the end it leads to death." Don't follow what feels right to you. Follow what the Bible says. I don't mean to be harsh, but you're treading down a path to certain doom.

she thinks Christians are judgemental, hypocrites, and overall believe things that she doesn't agree with

And yet she wants to marry a judgmental hypocrite? This is the definition of cognitive dissonance - the land where hamsters thrive.

So, either she doesn't really believe this about Christians because of her relationship with you ... or the alternative is that you're not living like a Christian should, thus you're hiding and suppressing all the things that if she knew them about you or exactly how serious you are about these issues, she would turn tail and run.

Her parents are also divorced ... mom is not religious ... he was also the one taking her to church

I.e. Christian and non-Christian fell in love and got married, but dad's faith was a downer on the relationship and they ended up getting divorced. I know there are other factors in there too, but you're walking into a relationship where this is going to be a significant factor for you too - and it's always exacerbated when you have kids.

she says she would never want to be like them

Ah, the old "Hypocrite!" fallacy. As Dawson Trotman once said, in order to hide behind something, you have to be smaller than it.

I don't think she is truly saved

I don't say this lightly, but with a heavy and solemn heart: given what you described this is a certainty.

how can I bring her into a relationship with God when her attitude is already predisposed to be against it due to her life experiences? How can I bring us closer together in God without seeming pushy or accidentally pushing her away from me?

If you're RP aware yet, you already know the clear answers.

- Don't have ONEitis. You've got it bad for this girl. You think she's special and you're afraid to lose her. You think that no other girl in the Christian dating pool can be as good as her, or that if they exist you're not likely to bag one of them. This stems from a total lack of abundance mentality.
- As the man, you need to set the clear boundaries for the relationship. If you're also a Christian, you need to set those boundaries in a way that does not conflict with biblical teaching. Because the Bible prohibits being with a non-Christian, you need to set a clear boundary: "I have been studying my faith and come to the conclusion that we should not be together. I would like nothing more than to maintain our relationship, but our spiritual differences are only going to bring us trouble in the future if we don't call this off now. Our relationship might end up just like you're parents - especially given that you side with your mom and your dad's and my faith is one of the reasons why. I love you, and I hate the thought that this may further push you away from Jesus, and I hope that someday you'll see your perception of Christians is misguided. But I need to do what my conscience convicts me is right. I care about you, but we cannot love each other the way we each need to be loved. Goodbye."
- The fact that you're afraid of coming off "pushy" or "accidentally pushing her away from me" is troubling. First, it shows that you're less concerned with pushing her away from God than you are in ruining your

emotional connection with her. Set your priorities straight. Second, you should do what is right regardless of how it comes off. Once you've determined what is right, then you can start thinking about tact in how to act on your decision in the most effective manner possible. Biblically, the answer is clear: do not marry a non-Christian. even for those who are already married to non-Christians, in 1 Cor. 7:15-16 Paul says to let them go. You're thinking, "But isn't it better if I can save her?" In that same passage says, "How do you know, husband, whether you will save your wife?" That is, you can't make a decision to pursue sin on the hypothetical chance that it might become un sinful if she becomes saved.

Let me be clear: I'm speaking from experience here. In college I met a girl at a party named Heidi. She was totally hot and totally into me. After that party she constantly tried to meet up with me to walk to classes, grab a meal, etc. I was totally into her too, by the way. I was not red pill aware at the time (this was before reddit even existed, much less TRP/MRP), but was pretty darn alpha anyway. She was a non-Christian, so I drew a clear boundary. She still orbited me anyway. Eventually she started saying she would convert for me. When I told her that "for me" wasn't an option because it wouldn't be genuine faith, she changed and said, "No, I've been looking into it and I think I really do believe it. It makes sense and it's starting to change my life!" So, I decided to play a test. I'd give a hard no and see how she responded over the next few weeks. If she continued to pursue her "newfound faith," then I would go back and give the relationship a chance. After all, as I said, I was totally into her too. Sure enough, as soon as I drew that hard line she abandoned all pursuits of the faith IMMEDIATELY. A few weeks later I started dating the girl who is now my wife.

Don't screw around with non-Christians, either literally or figuratively. Don't just be a man - be a *godly* man. Set clear boundaries consistent with biblical principles and follow through.

THE FOUNTAIN OF TRUTH

1 upvotes · 29 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is really interesting and good to know! I'm excited for the eventual release of the book. As has been suggested numerous times on this sub, I have already begun work on such a book myself and don't anticipate it being too much longer before a first draft is finished. Of course, the more material on the subject the better. I hope for anything we do to compliment one another, not compete.

I believe this is true "frame" rooted in the Fear of the Lord.

1 upvotes · 28 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Glad to hear it :)

Rollo Tomassi – The 21 Convnetion Talks

1 upvotes · 27 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Good to know. Is that 75% of just the 2017 convention or of all content on the site available to subscribers?

Hypergamy in the Bible (Song of Songs)?

1 upvotes · 27 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Agreed entirely.

FR: Crawling back to RP after some struggles, wife kicks me while I am down.

1 upvotes · 26 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Fair point. I'll edit the post to clarify.

Christian dating: Good book 2 read together?

1 upvotes · 26 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

[/u/TheGlassStone](#)'s original comment was on point. You need to be making the decisions, not responding to her suggestions. That said, I side with Athol Kay in MMSLP when he says, essentially, "Sometimes my wife brings up things that are genuinely good ideas and I go along with it. That's why she's there - to help me, and making good suggestions is helpful for me in running the family. I just need to be okay with saying no if it's not helpful."

In this case, her suggestion is helpful ... but ONLY if the book isn't going to reinforce blue pill ideologies of marriage and gender roles. If it does, it's not going to be helpful. I'm going to summon [/u/BluePillProfessor](#) to this thread, as he's far more well-read than any of us and will probably have the perfect recommendation.

Rather than reading a book together (as there are very, very few directed at both men and women jointly that are any good), it might make more sense for you to read MMSLP and her to read one of Laura Doyle's books, like *The Surrendered Wife* or *First Kill All the Marriage Counselors*. If you must, suggest that in your own independent readings for your own gender, you can get together at different times to discuss what you've been learning. This will give you a time to lead and guide her, while knowing that she's going to be reading helpful content instead of blue pill garbage.

Christian dating: Good book 2 read together?

1 upvotes · 26 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I had a post on it a while back. Can't remember if it was here or on askMRP, but the consensus is that the entire book promotes covert contracts. "If you fill her love tank the way it needs to be filled, then she will ____ in return."

The love languages have value in that it gives 5 new ways to conceptualize gaming your wife. But that can be summarized in one chapter. Literally everything else in the book exists solely to promote the covert contracts.

Christian dating: Good book 2 read together?

1 upvotes · 26 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Yeah, those are definitely not books to read together.

How to Handle a Veiled Threat of Domestic Abuse?

1 upvotes · 26 January 2018 · /r/askMRP

Thick skin wasn't the point. Suppose I'm asking Tanner Guzy about an outfit I'm trying on, but I have a giant mustard stain on the shirt. Chances are I'm only going to get comments about the mustard stain. I'm going to be left thinking, "I know there's a mustard stain, don't worry about that thing, I'm looking for commentary on the other aspects of the outfit, I can figure out the mustard stain on my own," but they still only bring up the mustard stain anyway.

That's what I was suggesting might happen, which for many commenters is what happened ... they honed in on that one singular issue and ignored giving commentary on the rest :/

Hypergamy in the Bible (Song of Songs)?

1 upvotes · 25 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Good points.

How to Handle a Veiled Threat of Domestic Abuse?

1 upvotes · 25 January 2018 · /r/askMRP

True. But if they're ridiculing you for the wrong reasons then they might not share the legitimate ridicule you need to hear ;)

Hypergamy in the Bible (Song of Songs)?

1 upvotes · 25 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Well said. The other thing I'd add to the Bathsheba case is that she probably knew her bath was visible from the king's window ...

How to Handle a Veiled Threat of Domestic Abuse?

1 upvotes · 25 January 2018 · /r/askMRP

My other comment on point notwithstanding, /u/SteelToeShitKicker is right - don't trust that the church elders will side with you, and she may not worry about her reputation with them if she think they'll believe her over you ... and she even said that's her stance directly, per your post. So, the threat is not a credible one if she thinks she'll come out on top, and instead you're subjecting yourself to someone who might cave to protect the woman.

Now, my church has recently had a few situations where it sided with the man. But in those cases the evidence was clear ... you can't really hide getting pregnant by Chad and having an abortion. In your case, if it's your word against hers, you'd better have a darn good reputation with those elders before making that claim.

Hypergamy in the Bible (Song of Songs)?

1 upvotes · 25 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Gotcha. I can see that implied in there now. It's been a while since I've read it, so I didn't recall it being flirtatious, but I'll take your word at it :)

FR: Crawling back to RP after some struggles, wife kicks me while I am down.

1 upvotes · 25 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Good response on the whole, but I will note that he did take his disciples to Gathsemene with him, where he did show some serious signs of weakness. That said, I think he went off alone during those parts, hence coming back repeatedly to find them sleeping.

106 - What doesn't work

1 upvotes · 25 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Thanks for sharing this.

I desire validation for pretty much everything

My latest post should resonate clearly with you, then: [404 - The Lens Part 2: The Empty-Full Dynamic](#). The entire post is about where to find fullness and validation and how the Gospel is the answer (which is set up more in Part 1 and will be explained more clearly in Part 3).

Question about dating - denominational question - (22 y/o male)

1 upvotes · 25 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Sex in general, or specifically, sex within marriage and only with your spouse is viewed as very good.

On a theological level, absolutely. But when was the last time you heard a sermon openly preached that talked about the wonder and beauty of sex without giving at least equal or more time to the sinfulness of sex out of context? It doesn't happen. Ever. Of course, this is rare among most other denominations too. I just hear the rumors of Southern Baptists treating it as more taboo than most.

THE FOUNTAIN OF TRUTH

1 upvotes · 25 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I second that :)

Having my mother NOT come out for the birth of our child due to the way my wife treats my mother?

1 upvotes · 24 January 2018 · /r/askMRP

Agreed.

Having my mother NOT come out for the birth of our child due to the way my wife treats my mother?

1 upvotes · 24 January 2018 · /r/askMRP

That depends on how well you've trained your mom and your wife. My wife loves my mom more than her own mom.

Filtering RP through a Christian Worldview

1 upvotes · 23 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

My understanding of MGTOW is that rejection of women is their core tenet. You can't be MGTOW if you pursue a romantic relationship with a woman in any capacity. Is this wrong?

I have no desire for my wife. I cheated. What is the end-game?

1 upvotes · 22 January 2018 · /r/askMRP

Interesting. Is Jack back? Last I knew he'd been gone for a year and a half. I only know TFA by his blog. W&S is the guy who routinely condemns me for choosing not to cheat on my wife or divorce her even though things are good. I really don't understand him.

Watching her world fall apart post separation. MRP fixes the man, not the relationship.

1 upvotes · 16 January 2018 · /r/askMRP

As smart and insightful as he is, /u/Red-Curious is still wrestling with this fact of life. Without the credible threat of ending it, any Dread is greatly attenuated at best and completely worthless in most cases.

This is where many of my statements are taken with severely limited or otherwise wrong context altogether. My wife occasionally expresses serious concerns that I'll just up and leave her, specifically because she sees how much I'm like my dad and that's what my dad did to my mom. In her mind the threat is real. In my mind, my options for divorce are broader than most other Christians typically give (and theologically I believe I'm right), and my wife knows this. On top of that, I've expressed multiple times that if staying in the marriage is going to lead to a greater degree of sin than leaving, then I have no problem taking the better of two bad options - and my wife knows this. I also fully embrace the idea that a credible threat of divorce is essential toward her desire for me (as opposed to mere fear at the possibilities) because women always want what they can't lock down and what another woman might get.

If I'm purple because I choose in my own life to exchange "divorce her at the drop of a hat" for "divorce her when the situation calls for it," so be it. But since I've started leaning red, the situation has never called for it or even come close ... so I'm not sure why my views on divorce are constantly criticized - **ESPECIALLY** when my most publicized contributions here are specifically on that subject.

Blood sacrifice? Really?

1 upvotes · 12 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I follow you. I'm just strongly against censorship as well. Mud-slinging like this really only gets dirty when it happens both ways. When one person does it and the other takes the high road, onlookers simply say, "Okay, there just happen to be a few jerks here like everywhere else," but don't condemn the whole community for it.

Working on the Sidebar

1 upvotes · 11 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

NMMNG, WISNIFG, and MMSLP for sure. Beyond that, they're hit-or-miss. They all have great information from a secular vantage point, but you're going to have to filter out a lot more information.

Specifically, NMMNG addresses Christians as most of his examples. So, although he's coming from a secular worldview, Christianity is a big part of the book and is highly relevant.

WISNIFG is just a typical psychology book. There's some evolutionary stuff in there that might not align with Scripture, but the bulk and meat of the book are still relevant and nothing is contrary to Scripture.

MMSLP has some content that Christians should directly reject, but I often found myself wondering if Athol Kay wasn't a closet Christian just because of how often some of his views align with ours. Again, the good outweighs the bad.

The other books tend to be far more philosophical in nature, which makes them inherently more dangerous. Although there's positive value in each of them, it would be a lot harder for a new Christian to filter the good from the bad than with the 3 main ones, which is why I haven't added any more of them to the sidebar.

I hope that helps :)

Blood sacrifice? Really?

1 upvotes · 11 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Of course. How a Christian should behave is fairly obvious. How to moderate those who disagree or just happen to slip up is what the whole conversation has been about - not what should have been done in the first instance.

Blood sacrifice? Really?

1 upvotes · 11 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I agree that's the preferred course of action. The issue we're discussing here is not what a Christian participant should do, but what the moderation team should do. To that end, every Christian should live out #1, and I doubt you'll ever see otherwise from me.

But when someone else, who I can't control, makes an offensive statement, should I cater to every person who says, "I'm offended! The authorities better do something to stop people from offending me!"? That's the exact attitude in America that the liberals take and I'm sick of the government trying to police everyone because of how "offended" someone else might get.

It's ridiculous that a CEO or politician or whoever has to lose his job and disassociate with a path that he's invested decades of his life into because he said something that offended a woman. How much worse would it be if a law was passed that compelled the government to remove that person from his job if he chose not to buckle to the social pressure!

Now, you and /u/TonyProvelone are telling me to do just that: pass a new law on this sub (or enforce old laws new ways) that censors content that someone else might find offensive ... and on an RP sub, no less. This is the liberal agenda all over again - and one that the feminists employ as their primary weapon. And now you're telling me that it's actually a good, rational idea? That's not like you to give so much credit to the prime weapon of the feminists, that simple phrase: "I'm offended!"

What kind of example would that set if this community falls into the same trap that the rest of the world falls into? Wouldn't that be serving to advance the feminist agenda if the feminists could point to us and say, "See? You do it too!"?

Long story short, Christians should be respectful in how we communicate things. [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) is no exception. Something that's blatantly and intentionally disrespectful should be removed. But I'm not going to cater to every person who shouts, "I'm offended by that!"

Blood sacrifice? Really?

1 upvotes · 11 January 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Dang ... and there it goes. I hope you're just misunderstanding Catholicism on all of this because it's contrary to what I've heard from a dozen other learned Catholics, including a priest.

But if what you've said here is true, I'm 10x more persuaded to agree with [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) that Catholicism is a non Christian cult that so far distorts the Gospel and twists scripture with absolute zero regard for context that it's leading people away from Christ and should be labeled a threat and banished.

For the sake of the fact that you are the only Catholic I've known to express such an extreme view, I'm just going to assume you're the one who is mistaken on the true bounds of Catholic doctrine, particularly on soteriology. So, as to ongoing policy of this sub, I'll continue to embrace Catholics as fellow brothers as I always have. But I'm going to have to keep a watchful eye on any theological statements that may compromise the sufficiency of the Gospel.

Blood sacrifice? Really?

1 upvotes · 10 January 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Because we're all brothers in Christ, are we not?

Well, if they're going to hell, then they aren't a brother in Christ. So ... no. Or are you saying someone can be "in Christ" and still go to hell?

Blood sacrifice? Really?

1 upvotes · 10 January 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Sorry, not sure how the link applies. Are you implying that every single person as part of BSF International agrees with each other on every single theological point in advance so there is no conflict at all?

Am I butt-hurt? No.

To be clear, I was only referencing your original reply to OZ, which certainly came off this way. Sorry if I made a mistake on that.

My point is: is this the proper forum for such debate, or is it best left to other subs and forums?

I'm not familiar with any other subs that encourage people to tough it out and accept criticism. The hard-core type of debates where feelings might get hurt are pretty much universally rejected on other subs. For example, I frequent [r/TrueChristian](#), and I can tell you there that any type of direct insult is removed immediately.

So, as far as forums for hard-core debate, this is probably one of the few places where men are trying to be trained to deal with that kind of criticism and attack. So, it's more appropriate than other forums.

Do I want this forum to be exclusively dedicated to that? Absolutely not. But I'm not sure why we should censor it just to protect a man's feelings either.

How much energy has been wasted going round-about with denominational issues, when we all could have been rallying together to help the OP in a loving and constructive Christian manner?

One of the few things I actually found valuable from my capstone class in college over a decade ago was a repeated insistence that true knowledge comes not from discussing one point to completion, but from starting with a point and seeing the implications that point has on countless other issues - following the rabbit trail from one intellectual concept to the next.

So, should OP get his question answered? Absolutely. Does that mean every single thread must be devoted solely to OP's issue and not ever rabbit trail onto other tangential topics? Nah, I'm all for rabbit trails - when they are productive.

To that matter, I don't think any "energy has been wasted" on this conversation. I've enjoyed going back and forth with you on this and I'm learning a lot about you and your perception of Catholicism, and it's causing me to re-evaluate what I believe and why and how firmly I'm convicted in those beliefs and what actually constitutes a soteriological issue and not all kinds of other stuff. There's no waste in that, otherwise I wouldn't engage any further.

Blood sacrifice? Really?

1 upvotes · 10 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I know Your Son said it and all, but I reject it

That's not a fair characterization, though. We simply believe that Jesus spoke in metaphors sometimes ... like all those parables he constantly told. He didn't start the parable of the sower with, "Hey guys, just so you know, I'm about to tell you a story about a farmer. This isn't a real farmer. It's just a metaphor. I want to make that clear up front." No, he just said, "A sower went out to sow."

I can stand in good conscience before God telling him, "I fully embraced what I believe Jesus meant when he said that." I'm not rejecting what he said by any means.

turning your back on me after I gave my life for your sins, my response would be to shut the door and leave you in the darkness where there is wailing and gnashing of teeth

Dang. That's harsh, and I certainly don't see Jesus doing that. So, a Protestant missionary who has devoted his whole life sharing the Gospel of Jesus all across the world is going to be sent to hell because (assuming the Catholic view is true) he misunderstood what Jesus meant on one doctrinal issue? Jesus was certainly harsh, but the Matthew 7 test of bearing good fruit seems to weigh more heavily here. Jesus specifically said that was a soteriological issue: "If you fail to bear good fruit, you're cut down and thrown into the fire." I don't see, "If you misunderstand what I meant about whether the cracker is actually my flesh or metaphorically my flesh, you're going to hell - so get it right!" That totally does not seem like the Jesus of the Bible.

If an agnostic ...

The agnostic here would obviously be condemned - because he rejected Jesus directly. You're extending not just the core tenets of the Gospel as soteriological issues - you're saying every theological point ever made is a theological issue if someone disagrees with the Catholic position.

Maybe this is unique to Protestantism, but in a Protestant framework, if someone (A)dmits they're a sinner,

(B)elieves that Jesus died and rose from the dead to save them from that sin, and (C)ommits their life to becoming more like Jesus, then they are saved and the finer points of theology don't affect salvation.

So, if you take that exact same example, but replace "chooses to reject Jesus Christ as the Son of God" with "chooses to believe that shellfish are still unclean," the answer is obvious: no, that's not a salvific issue, so the person is still saved despite their theological misunderstanding.

You must be baptized as a Christian.

Agree or not, I can at least understand why some people take this as a salvific issue - the Bible directly says as much.

Also, when you die, your soul must be in a state of grace. In other words, no unconfessed mortal sins which separate you from the grace of God.

Again, agree or not, confession of sins is obviously a salvific issue in Scripture, so I can at least understand this.

Blood sacrifice? Really?

1 upvotes · 10 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Sure, that sounds like a great model on paper. But at the end of the day, how much growth can be had if you're only talking about things on which everyone already agrees?

then denomination should only come up if the OP is trying to discern how RP and their own denomination's teaching can co-exist

Which is exactly what OP did in this thread. He noted, "I had a Catholic upbringing" and highlighted numerous doctrinal qualms, several of which exclusively apply to Catholic teachings. He then referenced how his being RP seemed at odds with faith and was pulling him away. I think this is exactly what you're describing - which is why it was left up.

Here's the deal: RP or not, my goal on this sub is to develop godly men. It just so happens to be that godly = RP and vice versa as far as the descriptive aspects, and even with much of the prescriptive as well.

I don't owe anything to "RP" as a concept. If theological discussion helps men become more godly, even if it's not part of the "RP" prescribed checklist, I say we do it anyway. No one on TRP or MRP would ever say: "You're not allowed to go to a comedy club because RP doesn't every explicitly say to do this." Or for that matter, when RP prescribes things, there's no implied: "You can only do these things and nothing else." No, a guy can go to a comedy club if he wants to and not violate RP. A guy can talk theology if he wants to and not violate RP. If that theological conversation can cause one party or the other to be more aware of their faith, then there's value in that. So, from a "Christian" standpoint, I'd promote that kind of conversation anyway, even if it's not RP-prescribed.

As to the way that conversation is held out, getting butt-hurt violates RP and getting mean or nasty toward people violates our faith. In the RP forums they don't remove comments that come off as butt-hurt, they just call it out for what it is. I would assume if someone is being mean and nasty we can do the same - call them out on it and not expect the comment to be censored. But, as previously noted, there are some lines to be drawn where censorship should start taking place. I think I've given an outline of where that should happen. But you telling me in a previous comment that I'm going to hell because I don't believe in transubstantiation ... well, should I remove that too? That's highly offensive to any Protestant who has ever heard that word. Yet it added value to my understanding of how Catholics think, despite the extreme nature of the accusation and potential for offense, so I leave it up - and I don't get butt-hurt or emotional about it. Instead, I can write this with a smile. And I'd hope we can all maintain that amused mastery in the midst of these conversations :)

Also, if all Protestants who have ever heard a Catholic teaching they disagree with are going to hell ... why engage/interact with Protestants in the first place? Genuine curiosity there.

Tag: [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) - just to keep you aware of this conversation.

Blood sacrifice? Really?

1 upvotes · 10 January 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

So does that mean: salvation = faith + never rejecting a Catholic teaching once you've heard it? That seems bizarre to me.

So, because of the fact that I'm fully fluent with the doctrine of transubstantiation but choose to believe otherwise, I'm condemned to hell? I was not aware that this was a soteriological issue in Catholicism.

What other requirements are there on salvation in the Catholic church that don't involve Jesus's death and resurrection?

Blood sacrifice? Really?

1 upvotes · 10 January 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Did that group ever have someone up front asking questions like OP?

Blood sacrifice? Really?

1 upvotes · 10 January 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I think the best course of action here is to avoid ALL conversation that is divisive among Christians.

That's nice on paper, but it's a practical impossibility. I can barely say "don't cheat on your wife" in this sub without someone trying to raise a huff about what "porneia" and "epithumeo" and "moicheia" mean. I do it too :p And I think that conversation is fruitful to have, even if it stems from theological disagreements.

What you're saying here is, "There are subjects that I'm just too emotional about and I can't handle any criticism, so I'd like it if everyone could just cater to my emotions and not say anything that might set me off." That's pretty much the opposite of the RP attitude. When our wives try to do that to us, that's where we're advising one another: *Don't be manipulated by other people's emotions.*

Now, I know you don't mean it to sound like that, but that's really how it comes off. There have been times I have wanted to remove comments and posts from here because they so strongly oppose what I actually believe that it's somewhat offensive ... but I don't. I leave them up. And I don't get all huffy with a snide reply to wave my emotions in their face. Instead, I give a calm reply grounded in sensible spiritual reflection, prayer, and a desire to see my opponent drawn closer to Christ.

An impassioned, emotional reply (which the Proverbs speak against doing) only shows concern to defend an intangible idea and treats the other person as your enemy. In reality, without compromising on the idea, we should treat the other person as a friend who is misguided and needs to be set in the right direction. And if you know any such effort will fail based on the severity of his own demeanor or past interactions, then the "pearls and swine" concept comes up (or the parable of the Great Banquet is my preferred), which is where [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) landed in declining to let the conversation escalate any further than it already had. Although I agree his original comment was very harsh, his conduct after-the-fact in refusing to escalate has been appropriate :)

Of course, I'm not accusing you of escalation either ... I was just noting this because OZ already used in this thread the exact "pearls/swine" reference that I was getting at.

Blood sacrifice? Really?

1 upvotes · 10 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

to Catholics, you just said ...

I'm not saying the "true body, blood, soul, and Divinity of Jesus Christ is ... meh ... an inanimate object" - I'm saying that the doctrine behind this system of belief is an inanimate. If someone were to say "Jesus' body and blood" is stupid or "the communion bread and wine themselves are stupid" then I'd be more inclined to agree. But your belief that these things are the actual body and blood of Jesus is not itself animate. A belief, idea, doctrine, etc. is by definition inanimate and intangible.

If someone doesn't want to believe in transubstantiation, that's fine. We'll all have to answer for what we believe or don't believe on judgement day.

Genuine curiosity: do you (or Catholics in general) believe that God will change how he judges someone based on mistaken theology of transubstantiation? If so, what will that judgment be? A lesser heaven? A loss of salvation and condemnation to hell? God saying, "Aw, that's silly - you got it wrong. Now you know the truth. Be on your way"?

To us, the Eucharist is Jesus.

Correct. But your beliefs about the Eucharist (including the belief that "the Eucharist is Jesus") are still beliefs, which are inanimate ideas. Whether they're grounded in truth has yet to be seen, and I'm okay with that. But, of course, whether or not a Catholic can be okay with that really depends on the answer to my last question, which was a point I've never heard anyone try to make before.

when people call the Eucharist a lie, we have an emotional reaction and take it personal because, well, it's personal.

I don't think the Bible calls us to have an emotional reaction like this, though. In John 15:17-18 Jesus says, "This is my command: Love each other. If the world hates you, keep in mind that it hated me first." I take this to mean, "When people get all huffy, chill out. Keep on loving each other. Remember, I took the brunt of all that hate, so you don't have to be upset by it."

Nowhere in Scripture do I see a compulsion: "Get emotional when you see people who misinterpret theological points!" At best Peter says to prepare a defense for why we believe what we do. That's a far cry from "have an emotional reaction and take it personal."

I mean, I have to imagine the apostles were ridiculed all the time for their beliefs. 1 Cor. 4 goes into detail about all of this and Paul concludes that they were the "scum of the world, the refuse of all things" because of how bad it got. But never once did have have an emotional reaction or take it personally. Instead, his very next words are: "I do not write these things to make you ashamed." Then he goes on with a sound admonishment, not born from harsh emotional reaction, but with calm, cool, and collected words designed to appeal to their more positive senses. This is how we should respond - take after Paul's example. Never let someone rile you up. Never break frame because someone mocks your faith.

Blood sacrifice? Really?

1 upvotes · 10 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

You wouldn't know it when the standard operating procedure around here whenever Catholicism comes up is "bash Catholic teaching and dogma, call them pagans and idolaters, and downvote all comments by Catholics."

Yeah, I don't know that this degree of response is warranted. There are certainly more protestants here than otherwise. But I don't get the impression that this type of response - especially to that degree - is as common as your comment would imply.

The problem is, most people who are quick to condemn Catholics don't even know the how's or why's of what Catholics believe, and stick their fingers in their ears when a Catholic tries to explain it.

There are, of course, some who really do understand it, but still present it in the most negative light possible in order to create an emotional reaction to an otherwise intellectual conversation. I see this happening a lot too.

Compounding this is the fact that most people who call themselves "Catholic" are doing it wrong.

This is a serious problem as well, and probably the real culprit. People who don't understand their own faith trying to fill the role of apologist and simply making mistakes along the way that gets the whole denomination in trouble. This is basically the plot of the musical *The Book of Mormon*.

(unless someone wants to enter a theological debate.) In an environment like this where Christian men are supposed to be coming together to help each other as Christian men

I don't mind theological debate here either. I think that's necessary for men to grow in their faith. There's a difference between learning something through sound teaching and learning something because your beliefs were actually tested and you had to defend them or otherwise realize they were wrong. The latter is usually far more effective at promulgating long-lasting change in behavior.

hurling insults around only results in infighting as people stand up in defense of what they believe

Correct. The way the "insult" is "hurled" is of particular significance to me. As a baseline, with exceptions, I usually mod Rule 1 based on who the insult is hurled at and whether or not the post, even with the insult, adds value to the conversation. If there's no value, the comment is gone. Period. If there is value, then I look at the direction of the insult. Saying, "Transubstantiation is a stupid doctrine" is fine. Everyone has the right to their own opinion and I prefer not to censor commentary on inanimate objects. If someone wants to take that personally because they believe in transubstantiation, that's their own problem for choosing to take it personally.

Now, if the insult is thrown at a person or people group, that's different. For example, "Anyone who believes in transubstantiation is an idiot" is different because now you're inviting people to take it personally. You've left the realm of criticizing an idea into criticizing people. I also extend this to people groups. So, saying, "Catholicism is idiotic because they believe in transubstantiation" is out of line. Technically "Catholicism" is not a person, but people so closely identify with that categorization that you cannot legitimately separate someone from this label, if they've chosen to identify with that label.

Personally, I think it's silly to identify with any such label in the first place. The Catholic church doesn't save people any more than the Nazarenes or the Baptists or the Pentacostals. Jesus saves us. So, I'm not a "[fill in denomination]" - I'm a *Christian* - a mini-Christ, or a follower of Christ.

So, although I attend a Nazarene church (despite some theological differences), I don't get all huffy when I hear people mocking them for some of their more bizarre views. Why? Because being a member of a Nazarene church is not part of my identity in Christ. But if someone "slanders the noble name of him to whom I belong" (Jesus, per James 2:7), that's where I get up in arms and will defend the name of my Lord - the name that is above every other name ... and the guy who mows my lawn is very appreciative of these efforts at defending and glorifying the name of Jesus ;)

I doubt if I said “reformationists are followers of Satan via his puppet Martin Luther” I doubt others would sit idly by and say nothing

Yeah, I literally just had to remove a post where someone was claiming that George Lucas was a Satanist and that anyone who watched Star Wars was going to hell. People get hyped up over stupid crap all the time. Things that blunt are not tolerated ... *unless they add value*.

Condoning such behavior is troublesome enough, but when a mod engages in it it's even worse.

For the record, I did have a private chat with OZ last night about this. He is now aware of the standards I utilize for Rule 1 and I think he's on the same page now. I can't guarantee his loose words won't slip out again, but to some degree I just assume guys here can have an amused mastery mentality in some of this, or otherwise can take it as practice developing that mentality.

Blood sacrifice? Really?

1 upvotes · 10 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Yeah, I removed his comment.

Blood sacrifice? Really?

1 upvotes · 10 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

The break of frame is the emotional way in which he got worked up about the situation. A rote apologetic response would have looked very different - from both of them!

Blood sacrifice? Really?

1 upvotes · 10 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Okay, now that I've got some time in front of a desktop, here's what I'd like to say.

FIRST: [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) and [/u/TonyProvelone](#) have some good points on both sides, albeit communicated somewhat tactlessly or emotionally charged. It's clear that what you're struggling with is based on your influence from Catholicism. But it's also a gross misunderstanding of a lot of Catholic teachings. To that end, I do believe Catholics are genuine Christians (excepting those who just sit in the pews and fake it, which Protestants have as well). So, it's worth either looking into other denominations whose views might be easier to take in, or otherwise have some lengthy conversations with a Catholic apologist who can help you understand what's really going on.

SECOND: When contemplating leaving the faith, always ask yourself: *Am I feeling this way because of who God is and what the Bible actually says? Or am I doing this because of what his people have done?* The fact is, as you seem to understand, that God is real. The truth is truth, whether you choose to turn a blind eye or not. If you reject God because you have read and understand the Bible for yourself and are making an informed decision to turn the other way, I can respect that. I think it's a really unwise decision. If you stand on the railroad tracks and see a train coming, but look it dead in the eye and say, "Come at me, bro" ... so be it. You've made an unwise decision that cost you your life, but at least it was an informed one. But if you're saying, "Bob got off the railroad tracks and he's a douchebag and he's telling everyone else to get off the tracks too, so I'm going to stay on because I can't stand all those stupid things Bob says, and I don't believe a train will ever come anyway" ... well, now you're gambling your own life on an emotional reaction to someone else. Or to convert this concept back to reality: why risk your eternal fate on an emotional reaction to what other people say about God? Why not go to God Himself, through the Scriptures, prayer, fellowship, evangelism, etc. (basically the 7 basics from the 300 series so far) and make that judgment call based on the facts? Don't let your distaste for God's screwed up people (Catholics and Protestants alike) be the stakes upon which you gamble eternity.

THIRD: As [/u/redpillwonder](#) pointed out, it seems as though the foundation of your faith was an intellectual

assent to a certain set of assumptive principles. Now you're deciding that maybe those assumptions didn't make as much intellectual sense as you first thought. I get it. Faith isn't meant to rest on intellectual acknowledgment or assumptions. 1 Cor. 2 specifically says that Paul avoided using "wise and persuasive arguments" to convince people to the faith because that makes the foundation of your faith little more than sand. The next time you hear a "good point," the sand starts to shift and you can never have a rock solid foundation. Instead, he says that the foundation of the faith should be from a demonstration of the Spirit's power. In some cases this could be a miraculous sign, but we don't see Paul doing miracles to convert people, so I doubt that's what he meant. Instead, we see him telling people his testimony. He shows people the incredible change that God had done in his life - something that all others would have called impossible, given where he had come from. That is the testimony of the power of the Spirit. This testimony won't persuade intellectual skeptics, but when someone sets aside that skepticism and pursues a genuine *relationship* with God themselves, the transformative power of the Spirit in one's own life becomes undeniable.

I hope this helps, brother. I wish you the best!

Blood sacrifice? Really?

1 upvotes · 9 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

To [/u/Flagfootball99](#) - this is a solid reply. Heed his words well.

Holy crap, life is good ! What are some of you thinking ?

1 upvotes · 8 January 2018 · /r/askMRP

Well ... that affirms my last paragraph then :p

I don't want to go to church anymore.

1 upvotes · 8 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

As [/u/redpillwonder](#) noted: "It's not about you." This is the biggest thing to remember in all of this. But let me give more context to this statement.

"Church" as we know it today isn't what the apostles had in mind or were trying to establish. They did have regular meetings back then, but they functioned very differently. They often started in a group gathering, but filtered into people's homes to build genuine relationships - and that's where the good stuff happened. That's what Jesus modeled with establishing communion. Feel free to look at 103 for more on what that kind of fellowship/communion/*koinonia* is supposed to look like.

With that in mind, *koinonia* is the word often used in Scripture to reference local congregational gatherings or small groups. *Ekklesia* is the word used to reference the larger, more global understanding of the church as a whole. *Koinonia* was never associated strictly with a set weekly time to gather. It followed more along the lines of what Jesus said: "Where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I with them." To that end, your *koinonia* - your local church - is made up of those people with whom you are in relationship and gathering together for the purposes of the faith.

To that end, my *koinonia* involves several people from my local congregation, some of my family, some friends from other congregations, people who live in my area, colleagues, etc. These are all people with whom I meet for the intentional purpose of expanding the Gospel in our own lives and among those around us. Do I need to attend a Sunday service to do this? Absolutely not.

Having established that Sunday services are not a biblical mandate (including in light of Hebrews 10:25, which is

fulfilled through intentional relationships on a smaller scale) and highlighting the incredible danger of making a Sunday morning service your primary means of connecting with God and other believers (some of which you alluded to in your post), let me add this ...

- The current Sunday morning service routine is something that God has allowed to go on for centuries. We shouldn't spit in God's face by rejecting something he has tacitly approved.
- This structure of "church" originated with the Jewish synagogue movement, where the Jews in captivity under Babylon and Rome had to hold secret meetings to teach each other the law so that their history would not be forgotten. The Jews who converted to Christianity adopted a similar structure, which worked well when the early church had to meet secretly also, to avoid Nero. There is no mandate that we adopt this structure, but it did have value - particularly in times when information about the faith was suppressed and difficult to learn, legally. Although it doesn't convert well to a free-exercise of religion form of government, some of the value can still be retained - as long as it is not one's only or even primary source for advancing the Gospel in his/her own life or for others.
- The current structure is a very convenient tool for those with a right understanding of ecclesiology to utilize for the fulfillment of their mission. Specifically, my mission is to make disciples and advance the Gospel (which is the first part of the disciple-making process). Given that most of the pew-sitters in my church are self-deceived about their faith, and that an even greater number of people are not actually practicing their faith daily or actively participating in the mission God gave them, what better place do I have to find people with whom to share the Gospel and to begin discipling than a local congregation?
 - Do I limit myself to my local congregation? Certainly not. Do I treat the local congregation itself as "my church"? No way. But do I use it as a resource to find people who want to know and grow in Christ and to have a platform for advancing the mission God gave me? Absolutely.

Once you find your mission in the faith, I think you'll also find that the best way to accomplish that mission in light of the cultural climate of the first-world church is to work through a local congregation. At times I almost feel machiavellian about it, until I remember who's following who. That is, I'm manipulating my congregation to suit the purposes God gave me. I have no interest in the pastor's "vision" (if he even has one). I'm just using them for my own vision. Doesn't that sound wrong? But then I remember how culturally assimilated the church was before my influence and that sense of "manipulation" and "using them" turns into redeeming and reconciling them - especially when the leadership started seeing the influence I had and adopted my vision as their own. Before me the church's vision was simply to get people in the door. I kid you not, their mission statement was: "To provide a spiritual home for the unchurched." Their mission today? "To make disciples who make disciples." Do they admit that this mission-change came from me? Probably not. I think pride causes the pastor to think he came up with that on his own. I'm okay with that. I don't need the credit - I only want the win for Christ.

But the key in all of this is to look at the local congregation as a tool for you to utilize on your mission to make disciples. If your pastor has wrongly bought into a false vision or a misunderstanding of a *koinonia* gathering or ecclesiology, ignore his vision, but use his platform to advance your own. This is, after all, much of how Paul and Peter functioned in converting the Jews.

Christian Plate Spinning ... Seriously? Sure. Let's do this.

1 upvotes · 8 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I agree with you there. But not everyone does.

Not a virgin

1 upvotes · 8 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Good to know. That said, we do have to be conscientious of how our actions affect others. So, if you're

intentionally stringing along a girl who you have no interest in "pursuing anything with" - that's a problem. I address this a lot more in my plate spinning post.

Here's how I see it:

- If you're not interested in marriage, just avoid girls altogether. Jesus and Paul are both pretty clear that this is the preferred route for those who can handle it.
 - To be clear: those who "can't handle it" I define as those who have an actual girl in their life who they can't stop themselves from screwing if they don't get married. "I'm a porn addict" is not a good reason to get married and doesn't invoke 1 Cor. 7 - and 99.9% of men find that marriage does not cure a porn addiction like they hoped it would.
- If you are set on getting married, that's fine too, but Paul calls it the lesser options. In this case, go build a wide network of women who you might be interested in and start getting to know them. This could be going on dates one-on-one or hanging out in groups. It doesn't really matter. There's no problem with dating many people at the same time, just don't lie to them and say you're exclusive when you're not - that would violate RP principles anyway.
- If someone isn't marriage material, drop her as one of your plates. Let her move on and find someone else. Don't waste her time. After all, if you're not marrying her, you can't have sex with her, so what are you getting out of the relationship that you can't otherwise get by just being friends or by finding someone else?

In my view, if you are stringing someone along on the false premise that she thinks the relationship has a chance at ending up in marriage, that's sin. If you make it clear to her that it's not going anywhere and she hangs on anyway, that's her fault, not yours.

Thoughts on "premarital sex" and polygamy

1 upvotes · 6 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Yeah, I agree that the sermon on the mount is not about updating the commands. As a whole, he's preaching the gospel. It follows a pattern like this:

1. Here's what you should look like (beattitudes)
2. God expects perfection. Here's all the ways you fail.
3. Even when you try to do good, you still fail. You can't succeed your own way.
4. I'm the answer for you.
5. Once I'm your foundation, build on that.

The point of sections 2 and 3 aren't to lay down harder laws, but to set the stage for chapter 7 when he reveals that he is the answer.

EDIT: How the heck did the auto-mod remove this?!?

Thoughts on "premarital sex" and polygamy

1 upvotes · 6 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Good thoughts. I'm going to have to re-read the passages now to refresh on what it says exactly :)

Thoughts on "premarital sex" and polygamy

1 upvotes · 5 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That's quite a bluepill way of looking at it.

Not everything is red and blue. Sometimes the truth is just the truth.

SMV. If something cause a woman's SMV to drop... of course God would be concerned about it

How do we know that God cares about SMV though? I don't see him ever referencing such a standard. He creates ugly people as well as hot people. There's no assumption in Scripture that God wants everyone to strive to have some optimal SMV.

"Why would God be concerned if a woman is raped?" - said no one today ever

I wouldn't say that either. But there are all kinds of moral ways SMV is affected.

Surely you're not making the point that God does not value virginity in unmarried woman? Surely you're not making the point that sex before marriage is good/not sin? Or that virginity is a social construct...?

I might be saying that virginity is a social construct, possibly derived from God's expectations. Specifically, I don't think God ever said, "You should marry virgins if at all possible." I think God simply doesn't want people having sex outside of marriage. By definition that makes them non-virgins, but God's interest in virginity stops there. I might be missing something in Scripture about this, though. I just don't remember reading anything beyond the concept of no premarital sex.

But at the same time you're hesitant to endorse any view that demands/requires a woman stay a virgin before marriage.

I'm just trying to figure out what God actually said and not. As I've said in other threads, virginity was quite important to me when picking my wife, and I do encourage other guys to maintain that standard as well. But there's still value in discerning whether that standard is something God-endorsed or a man-endorsed. I agree it's a wise standard all the same.

Thoughts on "premarital sex" and polygamy

1 upvotes · 5 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That's too bad. I used to go there a lot. I'm not sure I ever saw that much dogma to begin with.

Thoughts on "premarital sex" and polygamy

1 upvotes · 5 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Haha, no thanks.

Not a virgin

1 upvotes · 5 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Eek

Not a virgin

1 upvotes · 5 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I d x

Not a virgin

1 upvotes · 5 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Good point. But I don't like to assume every guy here takes the wise advice given, which in this case would be to get out. So, I still like to ponder making the best of the alternative.

Not a virgin

1 upvotes · 5 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Excellent comment here. In short: be patient, rob the cradle.

Thoughts on "premarital sex" and polygamy

1 upvotes · 4 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

As for God's Bride, yeah, God does demand her to be unblemished, nothing less. Kinda why Jesus has to die

True. But the point there is that God took the responsibility on himself and took his bride as she was - "While we were still sinners, Christ died for us."

More significantly, is that a man might care. And a woman should care that men might care.

Might and should - absolutely. But do women have a motivation to care in modern society? If this is proven true, will that really given men more power in some way, or will the women still say, "Too bad, if you want to hit this you're going to have to accept me as I am"? If women are as empowered as you suggest, "should" turns into "I don't really feel like caring about this."

If something would cause a woman's marriage value to drop in a man's eyes, of course God would be strict about it. I think that's what RPWonder was trying to say.

I'm confused here. When does God talk about marriage values?

Ever asked a Bluepill pastor "why was virginity so emphasized in the Bible?" He'll struggle to answer, it's hilarious. An idea like telephony will help us to understand this Biblical emphasis.

Was it all that emphasized, though? I see passages about not lying about being a virgin, but not much more. The references to virginity seem to be more cultural in nature.

It would also expand our thoughts: What other consequences of promiscuity could people be suffering, without their knowledge, that they could have prevented if only they had listened to the wisdom of the Bible?

Good point!

Thoughts on "premarital sex" and polygamy

1 upvotes · 4 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

But if a woman wants to get married, a man's sentiment is everything. Especially if a woman wants to "lock down a mate", so to speak. She has to care about a man's sentiments?

As you often note, women have all the power. So, why should she bother expending her time, effort, energy, self-denial, etc. to "lock down a [particular] mate" when she can just move on to the next guy? She doesn't *have* to do anything if she has the power.

RP is about truth. RP has to go where no one dares to go. It's within the spirit of RP to explore even possible truths.

Try telling that to the guys over at MRP every time I try to introduce an idea that has proven to work in my life and with others I've observed ... yet is something they haven't tested themselves. It's a constant recitation of: "No, only mod-established dogma applies. New ideas are not allowed."

I once did a post on personality disorders with a "Part 1" tag on it. I commented that part 2 would address how to handle a woman with each type of disorder. An EC told me something akin to, "The answer better be to improve yourself the RP way or divorce her. If it's not, I'll tell you off." People don't want to explore new ideas there. I'm even okay if my ideas, observations, and experiences are proven to be wrong or outliers - I just like the conversation for what it is. They don't. Oh well. And TRP is such a joke with wannabes that I can't really trust anything they do in the way of exploring theory. I probably should have referenced MRP as the one to assess all this.

TRP has no agenda, other than possibly to best serve one's own interests.

I don't think that's true, from what I've read there.

Whoever, dishonestly or with a fraudulent intention, goes through the ceremony of being married, knowing that he is not thereby lawfully married, shall be punished with imprisonment

I can't speak officially, but my impression is that this isn't for what you're describing with a mutual endeavor - it's to prevent a man from tricking a woman into thinking they're legally married when they're not, thereby cheating her of her rights under a divorce. It's a work-around to common-law marriage.

Thoughts on "premarital sex" and polygamy

1 upvotes · 4 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

so why mention waiting for them to "approve" it?

My point was simply that it's more of a secular topic, so I'd expect secular RP to address it before we do. That said, my response to [/u/Whitified](#) retracts this a teeny bit. I just see this as something that'd be more up their alley than it would be ours. So, why would I harp on a topic that hasn't even made its way through its own natural environment first? That might just be coming from my ignorance and doubt, though. To that end ...

I'm simply saying it's better not to claim it as truth OR outright dismiss it.

This I agree with. But then should we start bringing up claims of people's children being affected by alien probing? I mean, there's no science to prove this doesn't happen either, and there are a lot of scientists that do believe in the existence of aliens. I know I'm being ridiculous and facetious with the comparison here, but that's the slippery slope we go down when we start allowing pseudo-science to take the center stage. I try to avoid getting people worked up over "maybe this might have a chance of possibly being true." There are enough hard facts to worry about that hypotheticals are usually on my back-burner. But ... as I told [/u/Whitified](#), I'm totally not opposed to a fair and balanced representation of the subject as its own thread :) I think that could make for fun and enlightening conversation. There just needs to be some kind of bolded disclaimer that it's pure theory based

on implications from scientific findings, not proven facts.

It does interest me, however, in trying to get a better understanding of God's heart and the reasons why He feels so strongly about women being virgins before marriage

That's a good point. But does God really feel that strongly about women *actually being virgins* - or about them lying about it to induce a man to marry them? I take from those passages that it's more about the fact that marriage is an eternal bond and tricking someone into marrying you and becoming one flesh with you under false pretenses has life-long implications, and thus should have life-long (or rather, life-shortening) ramifications.

More notably, if I'm right about death being the only thing that frees someone from the bond of marriage to remarry, then it makes sense that if she got the guy to marry her under false pretenses, the only way he could get out of that marriage to undo the harm is if she died.

I haven't seen much in the Bible coming from God demanding women be virgins before a man marries them.

If it's true, it does shed greater light and give a better understanding of why He was so strict and why He feels so strongly about this

What light, exactly does that shed? If you or /u/Whitified does make a post on this, that's what I'd like to see answered :) Why would God care if trace amounts of DNA of a past lover are present in another man's offspring? We already know that God is not very concerned with blood lineage (per Romans 9 and other passages) as compared with spiritual bonds. Of course, 1 Cor. 6 and 2 Cor. 6 both talk about what is commonly known today as "soul ties," which are formed by becoming one flesh with someone outside of a marriage covenant. How does that factor into all of this? What's the real spiritual implication today? Or are we back to saying that God really does care about whose blood and DNA a person happens to have?

All good thoughts ... I just have too many questions about this right now and not enough time to process it without help :p

Thoughts on "premarital sex" and polygamy

1 upvotes · 4 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Especially if it's potentially a big deal.

True, but the evidence among genetic tests on humans (at least from my cases and observations first-hand) proves that it is not a "big deal" to the actual genetic makeup of a human being. It may be a "big deal" to a father's sentimentality on the matter, but sentiment is so subjective that I can't quite quantify that or push one idea for all people as if everyone must also think it important.

Nevertheless, if you want to make a post on it, I would most likely not take it down - as long as you do as you say and label it appropriately as "pseudo-science."

But at the same time, by encouraging this to be another factor, you're even further pushing men to a standard where they are less likely ever to find a spouse in the first place. Or to put it another way, you're encouraging them to adopt your standard, saying "Here's another reason why you should be super careful about who you marry." That's fine - we all do that. Just be aware of what it is :)

It's enough to turn a potential husband's stomach inside-out

I suppose that depends on the man. I'm not sure that would really have an impact on me the way you seem to be reacting to it. But it's also something where I'm not at risk of having to deal with it, so I would only take my commentary in its limited context.

Someone once commented that TRP is merely a complementing position to Feminism.

I think that was me. I know I've said that before.

This theory is completely against their goals. RPW or RPC will have to be the pioneers here.

Perhaps. I suppose you're right that it would have to come from someone who endorses an RP worldview while simultaneously still embracing marriage and child-rearing in some capacity. To that end, have you changed your view on this?

The reason I think TRP would be a more apt fit is because it furthers their goal of avoiding commitment. It tells a man, "If she's been with another guy, that's another reason not to procreate with her - because your kids might be part him too." It doesn't prevent a man from having sex with her. If women frequented TRP, then sure, it would have the negative impact to their goals by decreasing female sexuality. But I simply don't see that being the case. It only serves to promote their anti-marriage, anti-women agenda.

I just find your rationale... bad. That's all

My rationale is simply that I've seen the DNA testing numbers with my own eyes when performed on humans. 20+ year marriage numbers don't have any more impact on the degree of genetic matching than a one night stand. I'm not sure how direct, personal knowledge on tests involving humans is a "bad rationale" as compared with pseudo-science performed on fruit flies.

(Now if only there's a way for a sub to promote a theory, without actually endorsing it... hmmm)

You could make a post on it :p

Not a virgin

1 upvotes · 4 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Date younger. Don't try to find someone your own age if you want your standards met. If you can, great. But if you're 30, date a 20 year old. If you're 40, you can still get away with dating girls in their mid-20s. My dad's 61 and dating a 33 year old. My boss married a girl over 20 years younger than him. My wife's parents have a 9 year age gap. My grandparents were 17 years apart. Just stay legal, of course. But younger girls tend to bring less baggage with them. If you can find a winner your own age and that's your ideal, go for it. But if you're restricting yourself to, say, a 4-year age gap, you're really cutting off a lot of options.

Christian Plate Spinning ... Seriously? Sure. Let's do this.

1 upvotes · 4 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Sorry to hear that. My parents went through that too. I've seen it play out first hand as well as with many of my clients/cases. Maybe I just wrongly assume other people are as hyper aware of this issue as I am, so I might not be giving it due concern even with my guidelines section.

Christian Plate Spinning ... Seriously? Sure. Let's do this.

1 upvotes · 4 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Sure, with an innocent until proven guilty attitude that makes sense. And to be clear, I never suggested cultivating these orbiters - only that as one's value goes up one should see this type of thing happening from innocuous interactions and that at the outset, as long as you're not intentionally trying to get yourself or someone else tempted, there's nothing wrong with a little, as secular RP calls it, "catch and release."

As to my specific circumstances, I'd be shocked if my wife processed things as you suggest. She often struggles

against being quite condescending and assumes other people don't live up to her standard until proven otherwise. Guilty until proven innocent. Sadly, this attitude even carries into the handful of times she's had actual jury duty. This is part of the reason why I'm the only guy she ever dated.

Thoughts on "premarital sex" and polygamy

1 upvotes · 4 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

The Deuteronomy passage only references the king, much like Timothy only references an overseer.

I do tend to agree that polygamy was not part of God's original design in Eden, but neither was Netflix and Chill. Perhaps a better example is divorce. Jesus comments that it is permissible in the event of martial unfaithfulness, implying it is not sin; rather it is an inevitable natural byproduct of being in a world tainted by sin. Yet no one would argue God intended divorce for humanity even before sin, right?

Thoughts on "premarital sex" and polygamy

1 upvotes · 4 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Good reference. I quote verse 15 so much I forgot about 14 :p

Thoughts on "premarital sex" and polygamy

1 upvotes · 4 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I'm inclined to agree. But is this ever spelled out in scripture, or is the scriptural reference about fathers having the right to deny simply a convention God put in place due to cultural issues, much like God saying to treat slaves well not necessarily being an implicit approval of slavery?

Christian Plate Spinning ... Seriously? Sure. Let's do this.

1 upvotes · 4 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

My thoughts exactly.

Thoughts on "premarital sex" and polygamy

1 upvotes · 4 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is a good reply. But where do you see in scripture a clear statement that a covenant is required?

I do agree that God must join the people for it to be valid. But who's to say he doesn't do this every time two people choose to become one flesh? This is what genesis seems to imply to me. That and OZ's questions are mine as well.

Thoughts on "premarital sex" and polygamy

1 upvotes · 4 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Agreed.

Thoughts on "premarital sex" and polygamy

1 upvotes · 4 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Agreed.

Thoughts on "premarital sex" and polygamy

1 upvotes · 3 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Haha ... not upset by anything. Just enjoying the conversation. Sorry if its feeling heated on your end.

Christian Plate Spinning ... Seriously? Sure. Let's do this.

1 upvotes · 3 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

She already has those guys in her life. I'm okay with it. I know she won't cheat, and I'm higher value than her orbiters anyway. Sometimes the balance of my value and reliance on her faith to keep her faithful tilts one way or the other, but either way I'm not worried about it.

Christian Plate Spinning ... Seriously? Sure. Let's do this.

1 upvotes · 3 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I think you're assuming more than I mean in a lot of this. Where you draw the line is fine for you. I have given a clear no. What she does from there is her responsibility. I'm not going to be mean to someone or switch gyms to avoid leading someone on who has given me IOIs.

And yes, my wife also has orbiters. I'm okay with this and accept it as a fact of life. Attractive, high value people will draw the attention of other people. That's how life is. We're not going to hide in caves to avoid every person who might possibly develop feelings for us just because we're nice, outgoing people.

Thoughts on "premarital sex" and polygamy

1 upvotes · 3 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I am not Catholic, and protestant "acceptance of church fathers" isn't that we treat them as having divine authority ... they just have some really good things to say at times, so we respect them. But they're not infallible and we reject the ideas they preach that don't find their basis in scripture.

To refrain what I said in my post, since you seem to like to ignore things that don't fit in with the characterization you want to portray: I'm not after a polygamous relationship nor do I recommend anyone else look for one. I'm merely trying to figure out a genuine scriptural framework for marriage. Don't imply more than I mean.

As for Adam and Eve, you're confusing a scripturally compelled view with a scripturally consistent one.

- Compelled = three bible says it directly and to deny it would be to deny the bible.
- Consistent = the view is not compelled by the bible, but nothing in the bible denies it either.

"Your desire shall be for him but he shall rule over you" and the litany of corroborating passages are compelled statements. "He created Eve and not Eves" is a true observation (unless you buy into Lilith), but the interpretation you make from this is merely consistent and not compelled. One could just as easily use the same logic to say, "Because God didn't create Adam with two wives, men shouldn't have two wives ... because God didn't create us with clothes we shouldn't wear clothes ... let's all be nudists."

Christian Plate Spinning ... Seriously? Sure. Let's do this.

1 upvotes · 3 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That depends on what you mean by "enjoying."

- Do I have butterflies in my stomach whenever she's around? No. That is more of a woman's response to these types of things. Assuming you are a woman from context, you may have mistakenly assumed your natural reaction would be a man's natural reaction as well. To your credit, most guys are beta and cannot control their emotions, so you might be seeing a lot of guys fitting that stereotype anyway.
- Do I assess what's going on, evaluate the implications of the exchange, and appreciate her effort in wanting to connect with me? Sure, who wouldn't?

Now, anyone who knows me knows I'm not a cold, analyzing robot any more than I am an emotional wreck. It's

not all or nothing. But I do control what I feel and when I feel it, for the most part. That includes romantic feelings.

Christian Plate Spinning ... Seriously? Sure. Let's do this.

1 upvotes · 3 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Haha, nice.

Christian Plate Spinning ... Seriously? Sure. Let's do this.

1 upvotes · 3 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

On the mass whole, this is true. The problem is when Romans 14:14 comes into play, along with the litany of passages that reference doing something for the wrong reasons.

So, saying "hi" and having a conversation wouldn't be sinful in 99.9% of cases, but there's always going to be that one guy who is totally doing it for all the wrong reasons. Maybe he really wants to cheat on his wife, but he's so fat and ugly that it never actually happens - he never gets past "hi" and a basic conversation. Does that mean his "hi" and conversation wasn't sin just because she eventually shied away before ever letting him actually hit on her? No, it's still sin because of the intention he had going into the conversation. Just my thought, though :p

Even this would meet Dalrock's test as being "otherwise sinful."

As to the test itself, I must ask:

- loving to who?
- what are the bounds of the role of the biblical husband?
 - For example, is it part of the biblical role that the husband have an abundance mentality, and thus his efforts are furthering that role? I doubt such a case could be made legitimately, but that doesn't mean it isn't profitable anyway.
 - Or does he simply mean that it's not a violation of the biblical role assigned to the husband? In which case it doesn't necessarily have to be an affirmative attribute of that role and it's not really necessary to mention that role to begin with.

Christian Plate Spinning ... Seriously? Sure. Let's do this.

1 upvotes · 3 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

That's exactly why I included a section on guidelines.

Christian Plate Spinning ... Seriously? Sure. Let's do this.

1 upvotes · 3 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

If someone got to that point where the spinning thoughts are mutual he has gone too far and crossed a line that shouldn't be crossed. He has started to develop a ONEitis for this new girl, wondering how great she would be over his wife. That ONEitis is, of course, dangerous ... but often the cause of divorce ... and also the reason why second marriages have an even worse success rate than first ones. A man with true abundance doesn't have to think about the other girl.

Interesting article from 2011 I thought would be beneficial to share | Her Desire, His Rule

1 upvotes · 2 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is a good response. That said, a husband does accept moral agency for the actions of his wife and she loses moral autonomy when she is directly acting under his authority on a gray area. So, if I tell my wife to do something that God later determines was sinful, I'm responsible for her having done it because I am the one who

told her to do it and it would have violated her obligation to me if she had refused without cause.

This, of course, changes when it is obvious sin. If I tell her to murder my boss after a bad day at work, no matter how serious I may be, she has a clear obligation to remain faithful to God first. Although I still accept moral agency and responsibility for her act in killing my boss, she does not lose her moral autonomy because she followed through while knowing it was wrong.

The RP is tearing me apart. Don't know what to do.

1 upvotes · 2 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

[/u/macmeeler](#) probably has some good stuff to say on this, as I know he's gone through some serious ONEitis problems.

As [/u/RedPillWonder](#) said, RP is first and foremost about understanding how the world works. Where secular RP is "men swapping notes," in the Bible we have a textbook where God waves his big divine hand and says, "But guys, I'm telling you how I created the world!" As I said in [this post](#), it's up to each of us to decide what to do with that information and how best to utilize it. If your primary goal in life is to maximize your sexuality, then "hard-core red" makes the most sense. This, of course, does require compromising your faith. That's why your title says, "RP is tearing me apart" - because you see where the hardcore position requires compromise. Hardcore = "sex is the highest priority in life."

Most men here are not hardcore. We acknowledge that through our faith we have higher priorities than sex alone, although sex is certainly up there on the list. That doesn't mean we're "less aware" than our hardcore friends or that we're "less willing" to utilize our knowledge of how the world works. It simply means that we're applying that knowledge toward a different allocation of priorities. To that end, I highly recommend reading that entire post I linked above - it really addresses much of what I think you might be struggling with.

As for spinning plates, this is a big enough topic that comes up often enough that I'm just going to have to do a post on it.

For those who are married or want to marry: Why?

1 upvotes · 2 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

the question "What's in it for me?", which still hasn't really been answered yet

I think I tagged you, but in case it didn't go through, I replied to [/u/Whitified](#) with my response.

For those who are married or want to marry: Why?

1 upvotes · 2 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Let me be clear: I wasn't suggesting marriage as a first-choice thing that should be desired. Remaining single is always better. But his question was not "what's in it for me?" as you suggest - it was "why do you do it?" The latter question assumes the marriage is happening and is trying to discern the motive behind the action.

As to the question you pose here, "Why should I marry?" - to [/u/redthrown18332](#), my answer is: *You shouldn't*. It's that simple. I advise this to everyone I disciple.

As to the question you pose below, "What's in it for me?" - to that I say: a lot. Anyone with half a brain can create a giant list of ways that marriage is beneficial. But the cons outweigh the pros, in my opinion - unless someone is lacking in their ability to make disciples or is otherwise tempted into sexual sin, which tips the scale.

So really, how are you any different from the Trad-Cons so desperate for men to marry in this time and age? Like them, you basically admit that it's a raw deal for OP, but then use the "it's not about you!" angle to get him to accept a bad deal anyway.

I was answering a question. Again, I would never encourage someone toward marriage who isn't already married, unless they are struggling with sexual sin or are otherwise incapable of grasping how to make disciples.

As you said, marriage is about preventing sexual immorality. We agree on this. So definitely, if one is to marry, that has to be the reason.

That's one of the reasons the Bible gives - specifically the 1 Cor. 7 one. I append Malachi 2:15 onto this, which states that the point of marriage is to produce "godly offspring," which I believe (in conjunction with several places in Romans) is about spiritual offspring in a post-Gospel world and not merely physical offspring.

So a man can think he's marrying for sex (to prevent sexual immorality), yet end up having no sex in his marriage anyway.

This is one of the many reasons why I interpret 1 Cor. 7's compulsion to marry in a very, very limited context: *only when that temptation is with another actual person.*

Most people interpret it to include masturbation. They think, "I can't stop looking at porn, so I'd better get married to get this sexual sin under control." This is faulty thinking and it virtually never works. Marriage is never the relief that these guys think and in 100% of cases I tell men that they should resolve their pornography addiction before considering marriage - and only then decide whether they still want to pursue marriage. Of course, I have a 0% success rate with getting guys to follow-through on this particular bit of advice, so there's that :p

Or more specifically, why the modern legal contract of marriage?

If you recall from other threads on the subject, I distinguish between spiritual marriage and civil marriage. Ruiz's [A History of Marriage](#) post (which should really be sidebar material) also does a good job making this line pretty clear.

To that end, I have no problem if someone wants to be spiritually married before God, but never signs the legal document with their government. They, of course, should not then file jointly for taxes or receive other similar benefits. But that's a choice they're free to make. As independent parties with no real bond, they're free to craft whatever "spiritual marriage contract" they want, which can be a way for a couple to make up their own divorce laws (although you do have to be careful with the idea of including sex as a contractual obligation, which I think is illegal in most states).

I believe your friend [/u/ruizbujc](#) agrees with me when I say that legal marriage is not the same thing as God's marriage.

There it is ... same page here.

Let's assume that all men "who cannot control themselves" indeed MUST marry, like you said.

I would add: "...with another woman physically present in their lives."

why can't the OP [/u/redthrown18332](#) have standards as to who he wants to marry?

Absolutely he should.

So what is wrong with OP deciding that, should he marry, he wants a wife who will 'love' him the way he wants to be 'loved'?

Nothing.

Such exceptions among women do exist, according to your comments above. Most of RP agrees.

I'm not sure I said that. Women are capable of loving a man the way God prescribes men should be loved. But the way God prescribes and what we, in our sinfulness, actually want are two different things. That's why I said in my original comment that from a secular perspective (taking God out of the picture), I agree with the RP principle that a woman cannot love a man the way he wants to be loved. To quote myself: "From a secular worldview, they're absolutely correct."

Yet according to your interpretation a man who doesn't or never meet this woman, still **MUST** marry someone (aka settle).

According to my interpretation, if a man only "MUST marry someone (aka settle)" if he's about to have sex with her because he cannot control himself.

Simply put, OP is about to have sex with a girl who doesn't meet his "standard" for marriage - he has already compromised his standard. Because I equate two people becoming one flesh through an intentional union (i.e. not rape, which might still apply anyway) with spiritual marriage, if OP has sex with a woman he has just married her in God's eyes and his standard is pointless - because *he himself did not enforce it*.

Or to be more blunt, as /u/BluePillProfessor forever refrains: *acta non verba* or "look at what people do, not what they say." So, to say he has a ridiculously high standard of what he'd expect before marrying, but then going off to become one flesh with someone who doesn't meet that standard ... that just tells me from his actions that his verbal standard was worthless to him.

I hope you see how this interpretation, taken to it's logical conclusion, basically = settle

Quite the opposite - it's a call to speak with one's actions, not just one's voice. Verbalizing a standard means nothing if a person is quick to drop it. If a person has a very high standard and is able to remain sexually pure until he meets someone who fits the bill, then that's the better option. But if he compromises his own standard to have sex with someone, then he has shown his true standard.

Hopefully your response would not be "But they are selfish standards!!!"

I would never :p A guy needs to be a little selfish every now and then - especially when choosing who he will and won't marry.

And it was actually pretty well-received. I still stand by it

I would stand by that too :)

For those who are married or want to marry: Why?

1 upvotes · 21 December 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Touche.

For those who are married or want to marry: Why?

1 upvotes · 21 December 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Oh, my main comment in this thread was too long and I had to edit it down :p

For those who are married or want to marry: Why?

1 upvotes · 21 December 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I follow what you're saying, but the ECs at MRP say otherwise and I agree with them.

Be the Judge

1 upvotes · 21 December 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Of course - and I still do in *most circumstances*. Don't assume that just because I'm saying "in some situations explaining or rationalizing can be beneficial" that I think we should always explain or rationalize. It's still the rarity when we should do those things. But to refuse to do them ever under any circumstances - whether with your wife or when defending yourself in court - that's just nonsense. After applying RP principles strictly for a few months and seeing great results, I started adding wisdom and discretion back into the mix on a few small things like this and found that with the foundation of other RP practices already in place, having adjusted the framework of the relationship, both submissiveness and sexuality were enhanced by selectively engaging with my wife's ability to understand what I'm doing, how and why. Just don't go overboard with it. You don't always explain the how and why. In most cases the "what" is enough. But sprinkle in a little "how" and "why" and my experience has been much, much better than when I was withholding these things altogether. "How and why" = explanation and rationalization.

To be clear: I still don't see much use for defending or making excuses in any marital context, but you do need those in other contexts in life. It sounds macho and manly to say, "That makes someone else your judge and you should never do that," but there are situations where someone else actually is your judge and has authority to enforce their judgments. A man would be wise not to ignore that every time.

Be the Judge

1 upvotes · 21 December 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

She doesn't just want you to do it in advance - she wants you to do it without asking her for permission when you do get a plan together. Don't ask for permission or approval unless failing to do so may land you in legal trouble.

17 year old Catholic

1 upvotes · 21 December 2017 · /r/RPChristians

In a pre-Gospel world that functional dichotomy made sense. Today, the goal is to have spiritual children (i.e. "make disciples"), not necessarily physical ones. In Romans 9 Paul makes it clear that physical lineage no longer matters - only spiritual lineage. That's not to say it's bad to marry or have kids. I have done both myself. But both Jesus and Paul say that in a post gospel world this is the lesser option.

Be the Judge

1 upvotes · 20 December 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

The best followers/submissives are the ones who internalize the directive of the leader. They can anticipate the leader's needs and function independently without the need for micromanagement. This is much easier accomplished if the follower understands the why behind the what.

It has nothing to do with a man "needing" her to understand. He can function just fine if she doesn't. But his life is a lot easier if she does. Demanding that a man avoid all explanations and rationalizations in all contexts reduces her ability to follow, doing a disservice to the efficiency in running the ship.

Again, you're only addressing the context from a frame of need or weakness in a man, but ignoring the advantages these things can and should serve - and I'm abundantly confident that if I watched your marriage for any appreciable length of time I'd see several incidents of you doing exactly what I describe.

Be the Judge

1 upvotes · 20 December 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Best advice I got? Assume the reader is stupid, don't be too proud to walk them through something.

In other words: "Explain more, not less."

Be the Judge

1 upvotes · 20 December 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I agree with what you're saying - but you also have to realize that you're talking about DEERING in one particular context. The sentiment I was responding to was made clear when bogey said: "DEER is always a bad choice in every situation." This is simply and obviously not true. As you say: "in context of the sexual marketplace" - I'm more inclined to agree in the majority of cases.

But even then there is room to waver. As I noted to /u/Rian_Stone, I might want to explain to my wife why I'm telling her to do something because that explanation gives her additional useful information and context for following through. I might want to rationalize a decision I'm making so that she can receive it and internalize it, which helps her enter my frame, as opposed to an unexplained decision where she might otherwise try to object or argue or even secretly resent me for insisting on something she doesn't understand. Now, you might say, "Go ahead and let her resent you," but that doesn't seem like good sexual strategy either. Helping her conform to my likeness, my frame, my way of perceiving the world - that does.

As Alpha-Providers, we neither care what she thinks in the moment, nor do we want her validation.

I wholeheartedly agree. But you can explain or rationalize things from a different place that isn't rooted in succumbing to her judgment or validation. I think for most people it does come from that place and you're so used to seeing it that way that it's hard to conceive of alternatives.

she is inherently an emotional not rational being

I fully agree here too. But just as men are capable of being emotional at times, so are women also capable of being rational at times. We can and should use that capability to our advantage when it suits us. To that end, an appeal to her emotion can still take the form of a rationalization.

In the case of Rollo he's not seeking validation of those he's explaining too, in fact he is teaching.

Correct. And what is wrong with explaining and rationalizing things to our wives at times, when necessary to teach them our worldview and how to live within our frame? Acta non verba, sure. But being mute on all matters except sexual advances and issuing orders is just going to make you seem mentally challenged.

17 year old Catholic

1 upvotes · 20 December 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I disagree.

You're right. I stand corrected. I was more referencing the RP concept that his options will rise with his SMV,

which will rise with age into mid-30s.

The nuclear family is not the only way of doing family.

You're right on this as well. But in America I make certain assumptions about what level of support a family will give to a child who wants to get married before it's socially acceptable to do so. The answer is generally: very little.

17 year old Catholic

1 upvotes · 20 December 2017 · /r/RPChristians

not sure if this is the right place ... I can't seem to find an askRPC subreddit

Simply put, there aren't enough people here to warrant creating one yet. Hopefully this place grows and in time we will develop one. For now, this is the right place.

are the views expressed here Roman Catholic views or Christian (any denomination) views?

Although it's not a perfect standard, the Nicene Creed is what I use to filter Christian users from non-Christian ones. That said, even non-Christians are welcome to participate here. So, for mormons, as an example, I wouldn't allow them to call themselves "Christian" or promote theological viewpoints inconsistent with the Nicene Creed (see Rule 3), but they're certainly still welcome to engage in conversation without doing those two things. I'm not aware of anything in Catholicism that violates one of its own core creeds, so you're good to go :) Just expect theological differences from the non-Catholic users. I'm told a lot of RP men are Orthodox as well, if that means anything to you.

I see a lot of posts concerning people who are married. Am I in the wrong subreddit due to my age?

No, this is still the right place. This isn't exclusively for married people, but because most people find this place through MRP instead of TRP (I've never advertised on TRP) our existing user-base is mostly married men. I do know several singles, though. Get some more on in here and I'm sure you'll see more posts about the single life creep up. [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) has some good stuff posted, one of which is on the sidebar.

Does this subreddit require an in-depth understanding and knowledge of the Bible and Church teachings before participating?

No, but receiving benefit from this sub does require teachability. If you're not willing to learn, apply, and grow from viewpoints that are different from what you already think and have established in your mind, there's really no point. That said, there are some people here who are very knowledgeable in the Scriptures, so if you happen to say something that's theologically inaccurate or correct, be willing to receive correction or engage in productive discourse to get to the bottom of the issue.

how does RPC address a situation in which an individual is keen on self improvement, sexual strategy and staying committed to the faith in an area where Christianity isn't the majority, and most of those that do identify as Christians do not take it seriously?

You're describing virtually the whole world. Most people in the church are only self-proclaimed Christians, but are likely not genuinely saved. At least in America, I can assure you that Christianity is not the majority. So, most of the advice here will apply.

A lot of the Christian women (and men too) don't care about the teachings on pre marital sex and marriage

etc, choosing what bits to believe in

You're talking about the distinction between "I believe in Jesus and God's Word" and "I believe in my own ideology of Jesus and God's Word." Only one saves.

The odds of finding one who is a Catholic, takes their faith seriously, and is physically, mentally, and spiritually compatible with me are very slim.

Check out some of the earlier posts here. The "odds" have been addressed a lot in the first couple months of RPC. See the links in the last paragraph of my comment on [this thread](#) (which was also directed toward singles, by the way). You're right, it's dismal. But I also explain that if you're not hopeful of finding a unicorn, you're better off finding a decent horse and raising her up to be the kind of person you want as a wife. Disciple her.

I am considering actually adopting that TRP mentality as it seems to be the only viable option in this case

In other words: *I can't find a woman who is (1) attractive, (2) spiritually mature, and (3) single. I realize that the "spiritually mature" part is the bottleneck, so I have to compromise there. Rather than finding someone who is spiritually young and disciplining her into spiritual maturity, I'd rather abandon my own spiritual maturity to be on her level.*

Now, let me be clear: you're just starting your journey too. You can't expect to find a woman who's more mature than you and then have her follow you. You must be ahead of her before she can follow. So, if you want an RP relationship where you're the leader (rather than BP where she leads because she's more mature), you've got to work on yourself first. That's why self-improvement is such a big thing. The 300-series is all about developing your own spiritual maturity. Read, internalize, and apply. Then go find a girl who is attractive and single and, when in a relationship with her, begin disciplining her to become the type of godly woman you want. If you sacrifice your values to have a TRP relationship, you're ironically abandoning TRP principles by dropping your frame to live in the spiritually immature framework that she would set for the relationship. It's an interesting conundrum - but sleeping with the non-Christian hot girl when doing so would violate your own standard of who you want to be (i.e. a godly man) is both non-Christian and a violation of frame, and thus non-RP. Solution? Don't break your frame; find the immature girl and disciple her into maturity.

Please keep in mind that I am not yet in a position to make any major changes to where I live or how much money I can spend on certain things

You're also too young to be thinking about marriage. Your SMV will go up and up and up as you age - probably into your mid-30s before it levels out. If you want to get married young, go for it. I was married at 23. But for my kids, I wish I hadn't. Even if I would have married the same woman again, I would have done it later in life. Right now you're prone to get ONEitis and succumb to sexual temptation when you find your "one," which is really the only reason to marry young. You're better off going into monk mode and working on yourself rather than looking. Hit 25? Sure, start the search. But until you're able to live independent of your family and financially support yourself along with a wife and kids, you shouldn't be thinking about anything long-term. In fact, most people your age don't really understand marriage. You've observed it from your parents, friends' parents, media, etc. but you don't really have a good picture of what it's like - and you can't. Instead, you're drawn to an ideology that culture tells you should be a high priority and desire. In reality, Jesus and Paul both say that if you can avoid marriage, that's the better option (Matthew 13; 1 Cor. 7). Who are you going to listen to, culture or Jesus/Paul? Who do you think had a more accurate understanding of what biblical marriage entails: culture or Jesus/Paul? So who's more informed to give you an opinion on that matter? See how that works? I'm sure [/u/Whitified](#) would agree here - and he has a lot more to say on avoiding marriage than even I do. But if you must marry, at least put off thoughts of marriage until you're mature enough to make wise decisions and stable enough for all the nuts and bolts to work out.

Be the Judge

1 upvotes · 20 December 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

What would you do if you end up judge-vs-judge?

What you're saying is, "What if my frame says I'm the judge and her frame says she's the judge?" Now it's frame v. frame and the answer should be more clear, as there's tons of content here already for battling out frames.

Or if it is your own grievance you want addressed?

I.e. "What if I want to change my wife?" There's plenty of content around here to address that question as well. Short story: you state your boundaries (what she shouldn't do) and expectations (what she should do) and follow through with any necessary recourse when those are violated. If you've followed the principle that *she needs you more than you need her*, then you're golden.

The issue that most people get into is that they develop the mentality of "I need you less" when the factual reality is otherwise. For example, someone might develop a "fake it" abundance mentality, but in the event of a divorce might not be able to pull through on the "make it" because he's so financially strapped. Or put another way: he forgets that even if he doesn't *need her* he does *need to stay married to her* to maintain the lifestyle that lets him experience that abundance. That's a much more difficult mental spot to be in ... but I think I'm getting rabbit trailed now, so I'll just move on.

Book Suggestions?

1 upvotes · 18 December 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Where would you recommend I start?

For what it's worth, I recommend to every man I disciple that until they believe they have mastered fluency with most of Scripture, it's better to ignore man's words and focus on God's Word. I take the view that these other books and writings are about studying what God wanted that guy to know, whereas reading the Scriptures directly opens me up to what God wants *me* to know.

This, of course, tones down a lot once someone knows the Scriptures thoroughly.

Should Christians Care About Physical Attractiveness?

1 upvotes · 18 December 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Let's get God's thoughts

Hah! I used to use a saying: "Let's Scripturize this." Great references!

Is speaking harshly to your wife a sin?

1 upvotes · 18 December 2017 · /r/RPChristians

The overwhelming majority of uses I hear of when people are using harsh words are not the "would be helpful" moments. You have to have an iron frame before it can ever be helpful - and harsh words don't make the frame iron, as some people seem to think. Your frame should typically involve you being a good-humored, fun-loving guy who's generally relaxed through stress and can smile through torture.

If you're using harsh words or tone, it's usually an indication of a broken frame. But when you do have that iron frame, where you could look her dead in the eye and smile and kiss her and snuggle her because her yelling and screaming tantrum is just so cute to you - that's when you first develop the capacity to use harsh words correctly.

Until then, just don't do it. God always has that attitude toward us, so it's easy to look at him and think we can do it too, but we're also not at the same "above it all" level God is most of the time.

As an example what I'm talking about, my son (6) got mad at me yesterday because I sent him to his room for hitting his sister (4). This was the angriest I've ever seen him. He was yelling, screaming, stomping up the stairs, pounding against the wall with all of his strength. I followed him up there to give him the stink eye, but he kept crying and screaming and yelling - and eventually I accidentally started laughing at him. I didn't mean to do it, but his antics were so obnoxious that I just burst out laughing.

This, of course, upset my son even more, causing him to scream like a banshee. I thought he was going to destroy his throat. After some time, I sat next to him to ask why he was so upset (especially given that he was the one clearly in the wrong and he knew it). His answer? "Because you were laughing at me when I was crying." I had to talk him through that, of course.

Now, with your wife, I don't recommend actually laughing at her. Have more restraint than I did. But that's the attitude you need to take through her antics before you're allowed to have harsh speech. Through that I knew that my harsh speech toward my son was not coming from a bad place, but one where I was perfectly happy and content inside and his obnoxious antics were not phasing me one bit - they actually had a positive impact on my mood with how humorous I saw it.

That's a lot harder to do with our wives because society tells us to treat them as authoritative equals. But even among adults, if an employee were to act like that and the boss is worth his salt, the boss will laugh it off, fire the employee and say, "Can you believe that guy?" as he becomes the laughing stock of the rest of the office. Sans the firing part, that's about the attitude you need to take with your wife. But if a co-worker, being an authoritative equal, were to do that to you, you have no ability to rise above it. You kind of have to take it seriously or ignore it because you have no authority to stop it or address the problem. The fact that people give so much credence to their wives' antics is that we've been so trained by society to see them as authoritative equals, when the Bible tells us that this is actually a rejection of God's design - that we should be able to rise above this emotionalism. When we do, that's when we can know our harsh words are coming from the right place - and we can stop and exercise sound wisdom to know whether those words are calculated to help or if they would best be reserved.

The one with no frame just assumes harsh words will be helpful, never actually challenging this assumption against wisdom.

402 - Impact of the Cross

1 upvotes · 18 December 2017 · /r/RPChristians

The one I'm writing :/ Other than that, this is really just a piecemeal of theories that I've heard over the last couple decades. I compiled the list while trying to understand the Gospel one day, then I started noticing consistent personality traits among people who adhered to different theories more strongly than others and went where the rabbit hole took me.

How much to value physical attraction in dating

1 upvotes · 12 December 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I agree.

How much to value physical attraction in dating

1 upvotes · 12 December 2017 · /r/RPChristians

That makes a lot of sense too. I'm inclined to agree that things like gluttony, self mutilation, and other uglifying things wouldn't exist. But does that mean there's no merit to the saying "beauty is in the eye of the beholder"? Would everyone have the same taste or different tastes yet be able to appreciate the beauty outside our own tastes anyway?

How much to value physical attraction in dating

1 upvotes · 12 December 2017 · /r/RPChristians

The fact that we see ugliness at all, and ugliness in something made in the image of God is very possibly a result of the Fall. Basically it seems to me that we don't hold a Biblical view of beauty anymore.

This is an interesting theory, and something I hadn't thought about before. I'm inclined by my gut reaction to agree! But there are so many variables that I simply can't process it fully in the absence of Scripture on point :p I mean, there's the 2 Peter passage about "your beauty does not come from outward adornment, but from inner character" (paraphrasing), but I'd really have to keep thinking on this.

How can a man not be a beta bux if the woman is traditionally supposed to stay home and raise children, buy groceries, etc.? Doesn't the man have to provide for her to take care of the family?

1 upvotes · 6 December 2017 · /r/askTRP

That might be an easy quote to remember ... but the real point is that women want to feel like a girlfriend who's with the guy who has his life sorted out. That's where the attraction will come from. As soon as they start feeling like a wife, it's game over.

207 - Perseverance, Sin, and Fitness Tests

1 upvotes · 6 December 2017 · /r/RPChristians

He did. I think he closed it to open up a cigar shop as a means of engaging more with the community and leveraging the "chat over a cigar" time for the Gospel ... tracking with the principles of the book *The Insider* by Mike Shamy and Jim Petersen.

How can a man not be a beta bux if the woman is traditionally supposed to stay home and raise children, buy groceries, etc.? Doesn't the man have to provide for her to take care of the family?

1 upvotes · 6 December 2017 · /r/askTRP

Could be.

Working on the Sidebar

1 upvotes · 5 December 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Good idea. I'll try to process something about that and get it up eventually. I think I'd like to get a little further in the 300-series and start the 400-series before doing much more with 100-level stuff though.

Thanks for the suggestion!

Alpha = Sexual | Beta = Survival

1 upvotes · 29 November 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

This is an interesting read, but I'm having trouble figuring out the point. How can men use this information to further their mission or interests?

It sounds like you're saying that "going beta" can be a good thing in the right circumstances. I don't doubt that. It's bad sexual strategy, but has other positive aspects that a man can utilize. But be cautious in suggesting the "go beta" approach on a sexual strategy sub. This isn't r/interestinglifestrategies.

As a side note, one of those "holes in my scientific accuracy" might revolve around the length of time the survival instincts kick in - and for men, whether they kick in that way at all. The abandonment of the need to procreate is

a woman's biological imperative. Physiologically, her libido drops and her hormones change all the way through breast feeding. Once that's done she normalizes again. I'm not aware of this happening in any man throughout history. Male biology (being predominantly polygamous) continues to be interested in sexuality all throughout pregnancy and the child's infancy. That doesn't go away while he chooses to adopt beta traits. That doesn't mean men don't adopt beta traits - but when they do it's usually because of a pressure to conform to their women, not part of a biological/evolutionary reproductive strategy.

She's not your's it's just your turn

1 upvotes · 28 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

My point exactly.

How to respond to a marriage ultimatum?

1 upvotes · 25 November 2017 · /r/askMRP

Right.

FR: Major Event

1 upvotes · 25 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Thanks! I probably wasn't clear though ... I meant I'd prefer if you do it :p If you have time, of course.

FR: Major Event

1 upvotes · 25 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I'm up for it if you'd like to :) I'm still out for vacation until next Wednesday with only mobile access.

Discerning God's will - emphasized for singles

1 upvotes · 20 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Yeah, I just get fairly sensitive about the "just do whatever makes you happy in the moment" mentality among Christians. That's the mentality that led to my parents' divorce, so it's somewhat personal for me. It's also one that goes against the grain of genuine saving faith. So, I'm glad that was just a misunderstanding :p

With that said, I do take the view that sin doesn't really matter to the saved. We're already forgiven. "Everything is permissible, but not everything is beneficial," Paul says twice to the Corinthians. It's more about the heart (see also Romans 14:14). But the heart that is oriented toward sin and attempting to justify their sin is on very shaky ground. So, we've got to find a balance between not experiencing judgment or condemnation over ourselves when we do sin, while simultaneously orienting our lives away from sin - and this in the midst of remembering that failing to follow affirmative commands is also sin (i.e. "Go and make disciples" - avoiding sin isn't just about not doing bad things, it's also about actively doing what is right ... see also James 4:17).

209 - Developing and Articulating Your Mission

1 upvotes · 20 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

This was really fun to read. Thanks for sharing how you processed this and your ultimate conclusion!

She's not your's it's just your turn

1 upvotes · 20 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

The assumption has nothing to do with actuality. It's about the frame of mind necessary for oneself.

Think of it like a basketball coach. His team is pretty good and he's about to go up against a team that has a pretty poor record. It's useful for him to assume his team will win and make coaching decisions based on that

assumption? Or is it useful to assume the game will be challenging and the opposition is prepared to put up a strong fight? Obviously the latter is the more useful assumption. Now, suppose the opponent is the top ranked team in the league. It is now absolutely critical to follow the useful assumption and reject the non useful one.

So, **regardless of the truth about what's going on with the other side**, for the team's own betterment only one assumption really makes sense. Are there times when there might be some advantage to assuming your team could beat the opposition without trying or practicing? Sure. But the "this is gonna be tough" assumption will virtually always be more worthwhile anyway.

In the same way, I wasn't commenting on women's aptitude for faithfulness. I was commenting on the frame of mind a man needs to maintain.

FR: Why having a mission is so important

1 upvotes · 17 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I'll make a post on that tonight or tomorrow.

The guy you're describing wouldn't happen to be named Joel, was he? I know a guy who fit that description perfectly ... also died too young :/

113 - A History of Feminism

1 upvotes · 17 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Indeed. The left is more intolerant than the right ... but they utilize shame tactics more than the right, so the right still comes off worse.

FR: Why having a mission is so important

1 upvotes · 17 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Maybe I missed it in previous discussion?

Phew, that must be really hard to do - I talk about it pretty much every day :p

What's your mission?

Disciple-making. This starts with evangelism and carries into the follow-up and maturing processes after someone is spiritually "born again."

How do you exude it and live it?

This entire sub is one example - helping men move toward physical, spiritual, and emotional maturity. Of course, actual biblical discipleship requires a lot more than is possible in an online forum, so this is really only a shadow.

More specifically, I meet with guys one-on-one or in small groups and lead them toward Christ. Sometimes these guys are non-Christians and I'm building a relationship and share my faith. When they choose to pursue Christ, or if I am working with someone who had already made that decision before I started meeting with them, I then take them through the 7 basics (see 301) to give them a foundation in spiritual maturity so they can continue growing on their own if something were to happen to me or our relationship (ex. they move away). After that, the direction is really personalized to the unique needs of every person, although certain principles continue to apply, which will be addressed later in the 300 series, which is all about becoming a godly, spiritually mature man (again, I'm still in the basics, so some of it may seem common-sense right now if you've been in the faith for any appreciable length of time).

My life "exudes" this mission toward others in several ways: most notably in that I teach classes at my church on

the subject, I model discipleship for others and teach them how to employ it, I lead small groups where I employ somewhat of a group-discipleship path and train the group to become disciple-makers, I talk about it with friends, family, and neighbors constantly, and I even wrote a book on the subject that I hand out freely to those who are looking to become more effective (1) in their own walk with Christ, and (2) in how they lead others toward Jesus. Other than passive acquaintances with whom I have never had longer than a 15 minute conversation, there's not a person in my life who doesn't know what my mission is and how I'm living it out. Of course, I communicate it tactfully so as not to sound obsessive or psychotic, as this self-description would otherwise imply. That's part of why people tend to flock to me rather than running away :p

113 - A History of Feminism

1 upvotes · 17 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Good point on defining the term. I tend to think of the word in a medieval context, like the Knights of the Round Table. It's not directed toward women exclusively; rather, it's the notion that men want a purpose higher than themselves to invest in (see 102's section on Relationship and Impact), which they pursue with traits such as "courage, honor, courtesy, justice, and a readiness to help the weak" (to steal from Google's definition). Or, to put it more simply, it's understanding that some things are more important than ourselves, so we adopt those things as part of our mission and pursue them as a cause beyond our own interests.

Holding a door open for a woman is not "chivalrous" because, as NMMNG points out, it's usually really just virtue-signaling or functioning on a covert contract, not dedication to a higher cause. I suppose if the man truly did believe that women were higher beings worth serving for their own sake, it could be called chivalrous ... but let's face it, 99% of people engage in these types of behaviors not for chivalry sake, but because of covert contracts, so I don't really count that. It's not chivalry if you harbor a secret hope to get something in return. An Arthurian knight would have been free of covert contracts like that.

But stopping to pray with a homeless man, or diving after a kid about to get hit by a car, or helping a battered woman find a shelter from an abusive husband - all of these things can be chivalrous if done without seeking a reward, and most people who do these things aren't interested in anything the homeless man, child, or battered wife have to offer anyway. They do it because (particularly if they are Christian) they believe it is "right," or because it fits within their MAP of the type of person they want to become. This is the Arthurian knight. This is chivalry.

Of course, the Arthurian tales incorporate a lot of Christian principles, as Christians obviously do as well. So, when God tells us things like, "Religion God our Father accepts as pure and faultless is this: to look after orphans and widows in their distress and to keep oneself from being polluted by the world" (James 1:27) - we know that this comes from a higher calling and can be incorporated into our MAP as such. But when the church perverts this into, "Men, you should marry widows and single moms," now they're creating the covert contract, telling the man that they'll get something out of it - that God will reward them for their nobility, or that they will have some prosperous marriage because the woman will see them for the white knight they are, or whatever. But now I'm just babbling and repeating myself.

113 - A History of Feminism

1 upvotes · 17 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Coming from BP I thought woman voting was a good thing but started to question it recently.

For the reasons in my post, I'm not totally against it. Again, the world can do pretty much whatever it wants and I'm not one to try to force political change from the top-down, though I don't reject those who prefer that method.

More to the point, though: If we look throughout Scripture we see that every society, including God's holy

people, did not include any voting power at all ... so the concept of a "female vote" simply doesn't make sense. But neither does the concept of a male vote. But God wasn't endorsing a monarchy of kings either - which he actually opposed in 1 Samuel 9. It's always been, "Just follow me. Do you really need anyone else?" And, as with all things, we screwed it up. Even so, I wonder if Israel had been a democracy if God would have allowed a female vote - or if he would have wanted one, but as with many OT interactions God had with his people, he simply withheld his true intentions because humanity wasn't ready for it yet.

question about chivalry

The Bible certainly lends itself to a chivalrous character. That said, there's a strong argument to be made that most of our chivalrous efforts are to be directed toward our brothers and sisters in Christ and that our obligations toward non-believers are quite different. Proponents of this argument note that most of the examples talk about how to treat your "brother," whereas the good Samaritan seems to be a somewhat isolated example that extends this to people outside one's own faith (as would have been the stark contrast between the wounded man and his helper).

All of that said, it's a common RP principle that men actually desire to be chivalrous - that it's in our nature to want to be this way. I don't see it too often, but I've certainly noticed at least 3 endorsed contributors make that comment. More notably, MMSLP makes reference to instinctual male chivalry.

The key thing to remember is that one is being chivalrous out of his strength, not his weakness. Most acts of "chivalry" today are actually based on covert contracts - someone acting a certain way with the expectation that others will respond positively to his actions. The true alpha is chivalrous because he wants to be and he has no care for validation from others in return for his chivalrous behavior. Needless to say, I don't see God praising the former, whereas the latter is exactly what Christ modeled in how he "chivalrously" campaigned across the country helping and healing people wherever he went.

Romans 15:1

"bear with the failings of the weak" = don't look condescendingly on them. I'd have to check the context more, but at a first glance this appears to be more about positive-attitude tolerance and not provision and servitude. But the example of Christ certainly demonstrates, if not by clear command then implicitly by the command to be like Christ, that we should maintain a sense of chivalry. But again: your motive for being chivalrous is what characterizes you as an alpha or a beta.

love others as yourself

Correct - not love others more than yourself. If you don't love yourself or aren't taking care of your own needs, you have no real capacity to take care of others either. After all, if you are God's temple and the Holy Spirit lives in you, and the Holy Spirit working through you is the only good you can really do (for all that we do of our own apart from God is sin), then it makes sense that we should take care of ourselves to make ourselves appealing to God as one who He would desire to work through, just as the alluring femininity of a man's wife causes him to want to work together with and through her rather than in isolation on his own.

The example of a soldier is helpful here. A soldier's job is to protect others both defensively and offensively by combating the enemy, just as the Christian's job is to protect the souls of others both defensively (i.e. for the spiritually young) and offensively (taking ground from the enemy by winning more souls). But a scrawny wimp who can barely fire a gun without the recoil knocking him to the floor, or who can't lift and swing a sword because of his toothpick arms - that guy is worthless on the front lines. He has to take care of himself first. He has to eat properly, exercise, develop his disciplines and strength of character - these things make him a good soldier who is capable of helping others out of his strength. In the same way, we must take care of ourselves first so that the "as yourselves" part actually has substance to it.

113 - A History of Feminism

1 upvotes · 17 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

What you're describing is actually the bottom-up approach, though. It's not like some elected official enacted a law that set the wheels in motion. Some person saw a photo (maybe was even the one who took it), internalized an emotional reaction to a cause because of it, shared that with others who internalized an emotional reaction then shared it with others who did the same, who did the same, who did the same ... until it was big enough that the top had to take notice and do something about it.

The only difference between this type of bottom-up from what I preach is that the "flash awareness model" as a subset of the bottom-up approach doesn't leave a lasting impression. It dies out as people get bored or forget. This is why the church's model of reaching people for Christ fails so darn hard. Without follow up and discipleship people fall away. They never actually internalize the commitment into transformation - they're stuck at inspiration or motivation, like Ruiz described in 202. This is why the media doesn't give a crap about refugees anymore - they lost their profit in it when people became fickle.

113 - A History of Feminism

1 upvotes · 16 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I see the reverse: technology has done more to undermine the narrative coming from the top because it's so easy to hear opposing points of view, challenge the facts, and collect evidence to disprove false claims. For every leader who wants to spin the facts, there are a dozen other people (sometimes eye witnesses) who are ready to offer opposing views, and they have the power to offer those views because of ... technology.

Just look at what the media is doing to Trump every time he speaks. Being a political leader does squat if the media is heavily against you. Where does the media get its power? The people ... not the politicians. Consumers make them money, so they spin the narrative that consumers want to hear. Get enough consumers on the same page and the media will take notice and adapt to appeal to the new movement, as long as they believe that movement can make them money, otherwise they try to crush it.

What is the value of femininity?

1 upvotes · 16 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

As you say, this is a repeated issue/pattern

Repeated, yes. But it's also not frequent enough to really bother me beyond a few minutes when it happens. I think I was more just noting that it does happen, and slightly more often since the baby was born - up from 2x per year to 2x in the last 4 months. On the whole, given how much other men seem to complain about wives nagging over chores, I feel like 2 problematic occurrences in 4 months is actually pretty darn good.

men have a third category, "clean enough," that is not recognized or acknowledged by females, lol

Well stated.

T. Rex mode

That does sound funny!

What is the value of femininity?

1 upvotes · 16 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

it's rare for a man to see running the household as his responsibility -- most want no part of it

True, but we're also on an RP forum where this is one of the underlying principles - that as the captain the man is ultimately responsible for the ship and not just the steering wheel.

it seems the couples who were happiest had clear expectations as far as who would do which tasks

Correct. The failure in my marriage is that my wife likes to change these expectations unilaterally without telling me or getting my approval. That's when she starts getting upset when I haven't done things as often as she likes and I get frustrated when she hasn't fulfilled her end - because she just decided she didn't feel like it one day.

That said, I don't communicate these frustrations through yelling or screaming or emotional withdrawal or passive-aggressiveness or anything. I simply tell her, "Hey, here's what we agreed on. Let's stick to the plan." She doesn't like it at first because she wants me to convert to her way of doing things, which would shift even more of the burden of the workload toward me ... but she gets over it quickly.

resentment that comes when couples silently wonder, "Can't he/she see that something needs to be done, and why doesn't he/she do it?"

Here's the thing - everyone knows and sees what needs to be done. We all just have different standards for when we'll actually step up and do it. 95% of the time the woman has the higher standards. So, if the guy will do the dishes when he sees 50 things in the sink, but the wife's threshold is 35 things in the sink, rather than waiting until his threshold is reached, she'll start getting mad at him once there are 35 things in there and he's done nothing about it.

For the man, doing dishes when there are only 35 things in there doesn't add noticeable value. He doesn't appreciate it until it gets to his threshold. So, he doesn't appreciate the higher standard that she maintains because she is working at a level where he doesn't see the value. If she adopts his standard - lets it get to 50 dishes and then does it, then he values it. He thinks, "Dang, the dishes really needed done and she got it done! What a great woman!"

This is what's at the core of a lot of the "you don't appreciate me" mentality women have - because they're doing things that *they see value in*, but their husbands don't value, then they get mad because their husbands don't notice or seem to care. And why would they? Why should I thank my wife for something that doesn't add any value to me? It's like if she were to buy her sister a new scarf and she got mad because I didn't thank her for doing that. It makes no sense - someone else experienced the value of the labor, not me, so I have no reason to express gratitude or appreciation.

Now, in some nominal way, doing the dishes when there are only 35 in the sink does add value because it postpones how long it will be until the next time it's at 50 dishes. But it's a value that goes unnoticed because I haven't yet hit the point where I see that the dishes actually need done. So, it doesn't mean the same thing.

I'm not sure if that makes sense, but that's how I view the whole chore interplay and satisfaction levels. When I've learned to make this system work for me - and specifically when my wife has accepted where my value levels are - both of us are much happier. She knows when she does certain things before they reach my threshold that she's doing it for herself and not for my appreciation. But she also knows that if she wants to feel appreciated, she can focus on the areas that I do find value in - and there is always something.

So, if there are 40 dishes in the sink, she's going to get antsy about it, but not me. But suppose the mail has piled up on the table and it's beyond my threshold and not hers (she can put off sorting the mail indefinitely). She knows that either I'm going to sort the mail myself, or she can do it preemptively, even if she is personally fine with leaving it there, in order to get my appreciation. She also knows that if she chooses to do the dishes instead, I'm not going to value that because she chose to do something that I didn't think needed to be done yet in order to avoid doing something that I did see as an immediate need - or if not to avoid it, then to appease her own sense of

balance among household obligations. To that end, she's serving her own interests and not mine, functioning in a way that adds value to her perception of the household and not mine. So, my ability to appreciate the contribution is extremely limited.

perhaps you need to have a sit-down and communicate those expectations

We've done this many times. And she agrees with the expectations. And then she unilaterally changes them because on a whim she doesn't feel like following through with the agreement. This is why RP frequently notes that women desire commitment from men but are often incapable of returning it - that women believe they have the freedom to change their minds when their feelings are no longer consistent with the original agreement. Now, I'm not an idiot. I know that some agreements are considerably more powerful than others, which is why many women will stay committed in dead marriages even though their feelings aren't into it. But allocation of household chores is one of those things where my wife feels the freedom to change her mind at will and then get mad at me when I don't read her mind to know it's been changed, or even when the change of position is communicated to me that I don't agree and insist on the original agreement.

I'm not saying we have a bad relationship or that this happens all the time. It might be a couple isolated incidents a year ... there have maybe been 2 times this has happened since the baby was born, more frequently because having a newborn does cause unpredictability in a routine.

Or maybe she's afraid that if she does more of the housework now, she'll be expected to maintain that level of performance after she goes back to work.

I don't think this part is the case. We are usually fairly fluid with our allocation of responsibilities by circumstance. There are 5 months out of the year when she's in busy season, working 80+ hours a week. So, I work my 50-60hr/wk job and do 100% of the housework (literally 100%, I don't mean that figuratively). During the other months, she's either on maternity leave (we've had 4 kids in 5 years, so there was a lot of that) or is only working part-time, and we've found different balances for those times too.

it's probably healthier for you to express your frustration than to bottle it up and be silently resentful

Absolutely. That's why all of this is openly communicated. She knows exactly what I think on these issues and when expectations aren't met I let her know openly - not in a demeaning, condescending way, but as a soft reminder, escalating the degree and tone of my response as the problem continues unanswered.

What is the value of femininity?

1 upvotes · 16 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

men are seldom eager to adopt the traditional feminine one (housework and childcare)

This is why RP teaches men to OYS. It's why I wrote the post on the **biological step-mother** - because men need to start taking responsibility for all aspects of their domain. She's there to help him, not the other way around. If he sees the housework as her responsibility, he's already lost. It's his responsibility and if she doesn't have the capacity to accept delegation of additional duties, that's his problem to figure out. An over-worked first officer is an ineffective one (ergo my second ever MRP post on **dealing with the stressed wife**).

Another woman who wants to keep her career might hire household help or a nanny, etc., instead.

This has, in part, been part of the solution. The other part is that I just man up and get done what needs to be done around the house. Does my wife notice or care? Not really. But I don't care that she fails to notice. It's about me giving myself the type of lifestyle I want - and making sure the dirty dishes don't sit around in the sink for a

week (noting that my wife is still on maternity leave, thus at home 100% right now) is part of that lifestyle.

Now, what does cross a line is the fact that she is home 100% right now and every now and then seems to want to get ticked at me because the dishes haven't been done in 2 days. My threshold is what the sink looks like after a week. Hers is apparently 2 days. It's her responsibility to get it done (something I have specifically delegated to her), yet she blames me when she fails in her job. That's when clearer boundaries need to be set - and it hasn't been an issue for the past couple months. But the irrational expectations and allocation of responsibilities can be tiresome on the guy every now and then when his wife just wants to play with the kids all day and then get mad when her husband isn't pulling that double-shift to do what she was supposed to get done in the first place.

Because that's only "fair," right?

Who said life is fair? It's not about fairness. It's about efficiency in accomplishing the mission. Most often, if there's any unfairness, it's against the guy's interests.

Hypergamy for the Married Man

1 upvotes · 15 November 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

It's only a fallacy **when made as rhetoric for its own sake without providing any actual support for the claim.**

To say, "No true American spits in a woman's face" is a fallacy because there is no actual support for the claim - it's opinion only.

To say, "No true American kills people for sport" is not a fallacy - the nation as a whole has actually taken a stance on murder and this can be supported by reference to the laws. Likewise, to say, "No true Christian ____" is not a fallacy if the Bible actually speaks on the issue and the statement can be supported with Scripture.

Now, if there is controversy over interpretation, that's a different matter. But it doesn't fall under the *no true scotsman* fallacy.

Preempting the DV charge.

1 upvotes · 15 November 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Fun times. I will always say: criminal and domestic attorneys have the best stories to tell.

What is the value of femininity?

1 upvotes · 14 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I was going to say the same thing. Because women have stifled men for so long, they're really happy with quite little. If all men were acting like real men, putting dirty socks in the hamper and plates in the dishwasher wouldn't mean squat because that would be a dime a dozen. A guy who OHS is rare nowadays.

What is the value of femininity?

1 upvotes · 13 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

What a beautiful reply.

Greetings! Some information about me and the girl I like, and some questions.

1 upvotes · 13 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

You can't force someone to follow Christ; and you can't make a girl, who isn't willing, to become your ideal bride.

True, but if you can find someone who is faithful, available, and teachable, you can do just about anything with

such a person. Not all women meet those requirements, but a lot do. Just avoid those that don't.

Greetings! Some information about me and the girl I like, and some questions.

1 upvotes · 13 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

You dumped her because she was not at your same level of religiosity? That is not one I have heard before.

This is actually a weird trend among spiritually immature guys - particularly those who overestimate their own maturity. They have a lot of biblical knowledge, but they're not actively practicing it in the context of a lifestyle of evangelism and discipleship. They're stuck in the, "I don't sin as much as other people" definition of *spiritual maturity*, which is a farce.

In reality, as I will forever proclaim: it's so rare to find a woman who is already spiritually mature and walking by the Spirit that if one has really high standards for this, he's better off discipling a woman into becoming like that. Secular RP uses a similar concept: "create/mold your slut." In Christianity it's more: "Disciple her into the ideal bride." That includes sexually, in addition to spiritually (as well as mentally and emotionally).

What is the difference between an "alpha" and a sociopath?

1 upvotes · 10 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I'd say it's more that God conforms us to be like him, so what we want is naturally aligned with God's will anyway. So, we're not just mindlessly following someone else's plan (God's); we're following our own plan, which as we mature in Christ is aligned with God's anyway.

Put another way, God wants us to internalize His character, His identity, His plan, etc. as our own, not just doing it out of obligation or because he said so.

Hypergamy for the Married Man

1 upvotes · 10 November 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

If my life is already on track for exactly where I want it, why would I screw with that? Maybe I'm wrong and I really am purple ... But if purple gets me the sex I want and maintains all my other goals and priorities ... what's so bad about that?

More to the point, though, I don't see any actual advice here. I see generalities and accusations, but nothing practical. There's nothing here where I can walk away saying, "That's something I can try tomorrow."

Hypergamy for the Married Man

1 upvotes · 10 November 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

No need to get butthurt.

Hypergamy for the Married Man

1 upvotes · 10 November 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

She follows my theology, not the other way around.

MRP tries to force one threshold for "GTFO" on me and tries to ridicule and shame me when I decline. God proposes another, no shame or condemnation of I reject it ... and I happen to like his threshold better. My wife has tried to convince me to follow her model too, which is bizarre and a huge double standard ... but I've rejected it and she went with my standard instead. That's about where things are.

Red Pill Betas

1 upvotes · 8 November 2017 · /r/TheRedPill

It's also worth noting that they only had posts put up for 3 days then died ... nothing in the last 3 weeks.

Rian Stone Full Video Interview on The 21 Report

1 upvotes · 8 November 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Solid video all the same. I do a lot of public speaking and the hand motion thing still gets to me periodically. But you carry yourself well enough. More importantly: your content was spot-on. When the meat is filling, minor dings in the package don't really matter. I'll look forward to catching the full talk.

Working on the Sidebar

1 upvotes · 7 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Interesting. I appreciate her comments in the article, but the author of the article him/herself is clearly just dripping wet with feminist froth and didn't like the idea of having to write the article in the first place :p Anyway, thanks for the reference!

Wife addicted to weaponized sex; impending divorce

1 upvotes · 7 November 2017 · /r/askMRP

I wouldn't make her verbalize it in the form of a book report!

Of course, I was just speaking as to my agenda. It was more, "Give it a read and let me know what all the fuss is about." I'll definitely take a read when she's done, though.

Wife addicted to weaponized sex; impending divorce

1 upvotes · 7 November 2017 · /r/askMRP

Funny timing ... I just bought her *The Surrendered Wife* a couple days ago. It's not in yet, but she's been asking me what it looks like to be submissive ... complaining that the church says wives should be submissive but gives no practical advice on how to do that. So, I took that to be a pretty solid opportunity. I also told her a lot of people talk about the book and I've never read it, so I want a book report to know what everyone is saying.

[FR] Emotions

1 upvotes · 6 November 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I think this is really an askMRP post. You didn't come out and say it, but you're asking us all if you did a good job, hopefully with a pat on the back.

No, your wife did whatever the hell she wanted to, functioning in her own frame while you did all the work ... then she said thanks to you for being her work mule. I don't like this one bit. I mean ... good on you for dabbling in OYS a bit, but how are you leading and where is this a sign that she's following? All I'm seeing is that you added to her comforts and got nothing in return.

Part of my mission is helping bring out happiness in people

That's not a mission; it's a vague airy concept that sounds cool. Get some concrete and measurable action steps, then carry them out.

Suggestions on how to undermine the crab bucket

1 upvotes · 6 November 2017 · /r/askMRP

If you want more info that makes sense from a Christian context, [this post](#) goes into far greater detail on that

topic. I also address it toward the end [in this post](#).

[For Singles] Getting Laid Like a Christian (part 2)

1 upvotes · 3 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Bluepill Churches (conservative and liberal) these days routinely tell their men to marry post-wall, former CC-riding reformed slvts, that it's somehow holier to marry single mums... basically asking men to be Captain Save-a-h0e.

To be fair, Paul does note: "But refuse to enroll [in church support] younger widows, for when their passions draw them away from Christ, they desire to marry and so incur condemnation for having abandoned their former faith ... So I would have younger widows marry, bear children, manage their households, and give the adversary no occasion for slander ... Let the church not be burdened, so that it may care for those who are truly widows" (1 Timothy 5:9-15, edited down).

Now, that's not a compulsion that the church should be encouraging the men to marry these women. It's an encouragement for the women to find men to marry them. This is a huge distinction.

the lie that it's somehow your job/privilege to reform a former slvt, that "good wives are not found, but trained".

Haha ... no, I'm more of the mindset that you want to do the opposite - reform the legalistic "good girl" into your own personal slut. I think [/u/BluepillProfessor](#) talks a good deal about this and I'm on board. Of course, I'm speaking crassly on a delicate subject, but I'd love nothing more than for my wife to be thinking naughty things about me all day long, waiting for the kids to go to bed. Will she ever be this entirely? Probably not - but steps in that direction are worthwhile, as it makes it easier for me to stay pure (as opposed to the sexually denying "good girl" who avoids every possible inclination of lust, even for her husband, as if it's all sinful) and stay focused on my mission.

Also, the "Save-a-hoe" thing doesn't really apply to what he's saying. Puppies are pure and innocent (per the metaphor, at least), they're just inexperienced. You're not saving anyone from their baggage. You're finding a blank slate and painting on a clean canvas. I think this is what [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) means. To that end, they might not need to be broken of anything - just taught.

[For Singles] Getting Laid Like a Christian (part 2)

1 upvotes · 3 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

To use an offensive analogy.

I use the "she's like your dog" analogy a lot too ... but I always preface, "This is going to sound crude, but because humans are the highest form of sentient life, any possible analogy is going to sound offensive, so I'm just going to do it."

As for [/u/Whitified](#)'s abundance mentality bit, this only applies when actual abundance is possible. This post is about finding someone who can be made into a unicorn. But the point is that actual unicorns don't exist in the wild (or are at least are so rare that I've never seen one or even known someone who has seen one). It's like me trying to have an abundance mentality about rock samples from Mars. If I even try, someone's going to know I'm faking, which undercuts the interpersonal benefits of the mentality. So, while one can have an abundance mentality with regard to their ability to attract 8s and 9s, having abundance about the ability to attract unicorns in the wild is just absurd and counter-productive.

[For Singles] Getting Laid Like a Christian (part 2)

1 upvotes · 3 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

good wives are seldom found and often built

This is actually straight from MRP. The advice is usually, "If you're going to marry find someone who's 18-20, is a virgin or has a really low n-count, and teach her how to be your slut. You're the man, don't expect to find her. Lead her to becoming who you want her to be."

FR: Why having a mission is so important

1 upvotes · 3 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Thanks for the insights, brother. I always take your word to heart! Glad to hear from you.

The World vs Faith

1 upvotes · 3 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

On the matter of the divorce rates I would say that it is a problem for all men that want to get married, whether they are of the faith or not

The statistics don't support this, though. For nominal Christians and casual attenders, yes, the divorce rates are the same. But for people who have an active lifestyle of evangelism and discipleship, the actual stats are insanely low.

I think women like that would be extremely rare

Agreed. Go read the posts by [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) for single Christian guys.

if you can talk to other women and it not be sexual and it is still considered as spinning plates. Then aren't they technically just acquaintances or friends if you decide to pursue a long lasting relationship with them?

If you read Rollo's content on spinning plates, you'll gather that at its core it's more about how many people you have interested in you at a given time. Some plates spin themselves (orbiters) and others require nominal effort, while others require immense amounts of effort. A Christian should never put an immense amount of effort spinning a plate who he's not married to (which at least in America should only be one woman). And as long as you're not intentionally leading another woman on, making them think you'll leave your wife for them or something, there's also nothing wrong with having a friendly conversation with other women - even if she finds herself attracted to you as a result of that conversation. Remember, you can't negotiate or force your wife to be attracted to you, and you can't negotiate or force other women *not to be attracted to you*. Whether or not a woman is attracted to you is her own business. As far as plates that spin themselves, if you have orbiters there's nothing sinful in that ... otherwise how could any celebrity ever be a Christian and not sin when people are attracted to them? Just don't give them false hope.

The information itself can cause people to go the wrong way if they don't have a good grip on their faith and can resist the temptation to use all the tools that the redpill has for their own goals.

This is absolutely true. It's also one of the main reasons why I started RPC in the first place - to give Christians a safe outlet for studying and discussing these principles, free of temptation toward sin.

I need to further deepen my relationship with God and reorient myself.

Awesome conclusion, brother. The 300-series should be your home base for a while, then :)

FR: Why having a mission is so important

1 upvotes · 3 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

What's the context for the question?

I need some encouragement about remaining sexually pure.

1 upvotes · 2 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Well said.

FR: Why having a mission is so important

1 upvotes · 2 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

A truly RP man on a mission won't care so much about his interactions with his wife haha

That depends on if you buy into the notion that RP is sexual strategy. I understand that you don't. But 99% of the rest of the reddit RP community does.

As for the rest, I realize that in a vacuum that statement could have come off as placation - just telling me what I want to hear. But in the context of the greater conversation, I'm heavily inclined to believe otherwise.

the "slight 'I'm not really attracted to you' dig" thing makes sense. I contemplated that, and it's probably where the "You drive me crazy sometimes" line comes from. After all, I'm still on my journey - I've made it clear several times that my sex life isn't perfect and exactly where I want it to be right now. But the improvements I've seen and the general direction we're moving in seem to imply that the attraction level is increasing - and far stronger now than it has been in the last 9 years we've been married. Or to put it more clearly: *her actions* tell me that this statement wasn't about attraction level, however else her words might be interpreted.

And so my journey must begin

1 upvotes · 1 November 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Meh, I've seen that type of evidence admitted at trial before. They didn't use velcro, but threw a recorder in an open window sneakily as the guy's wife was driving away. The court didn't care.

I need some encouragement about remaining sexually pure.

1 upvotes · 1 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I'd love to hear your thoughts as you read :) You'll get a sneak peak at the yet unwritten parts of the 300 series and one of the the 400-level posts as one of the later chapters in the book (assuming I didn't revise it out; I can't remember if it was still in the version I sent you).

found this on facebook

1 upvotes · 31 October 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

Good point.

[For Singles] Getting Laid Like a Christian (part 1)

1 upvotes · 31 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Sure thing :)

They are indeed one in a million

Fully agreed. Finding a Christian girl who is already spiritually mature, of appropriate age range, in your locality, and generally relationally compatible with you ... is quite rare. The part that makes it most rare is the "spiritually mature" bit. Sacrifice some of that on the premise that you can lead her into spiritual maturity and options do open up. But most Christian single men don't enter a relationship with that mind-set. They want someone ready-made.

Bae ain't bae if bae don't pray.

Needless to say, prayer is a cornerstone of finding relationship satisfaction - because that's how we find satisfaction in Christ first. Once we are satisfied in Him and know how to make Him our center, he's more likely to expand our horizons with what he thinks we can be trusted with. That is, if we can't be centered on Christ first (including through prayer), and thus we aren't appropriately orienting our own lives, why would God go out of his way to give us someone else's life to be responsible with?

Sorry for saying "bae". She wouldn't put up with that.

I have no idea what you meant by that, but it was kind of funny. At best, I figure you're saying, "Don't be a weirdo who acts in a way that turns off mature Christian women."

Unless you are the kind of guy who already has the answer to this question, you're probably not up to snuff for that woman.

This is really what I was getting at when referencing your comment to [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) - that a guy has to be spiritually mature and pursuing a God-given vision first before he's ready to have a spiritually mature woman in his life.

At any point in our relationship, I can point to any time in the past and say this: if I met her then as me today, I would not have married her ... But I would happily marry her again today.

This is simply brilliant - to acknowledge the necessity of growing together in Christ. If my wife from the past were around today, yeah, she's not the kind of girl I'd marry now either - because I'm mature enough to filter through what I didn't know back then. Even today I'd still have that struggle, but when I look at how much she's grown alongside me and where she's at now, I can much more confidently continue in the relationship knowing that she isn't the same immature person I once knew. Now, to some degree, I wish she retained some of her youthful qualities, but I see that there are more important things that have developed in their place - things that other women, if I were to start all over with someone new (if that were even biblical), would sorely lack.

My advice is to stop looking. Heck, after you find her, you'll never be looking again, so why hone that skill?

Excellent point!

Live your life toward Christ and if marriage comes, so be it. It is a huge blessing to be single, just as it is to be married.

This is what I've been preaching around here for a while. [This comment from yesterday](#) goes more into it.

Advice to a married recovering beta on initiating

1 upvotes · 31 October 2017 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I fully shave myself, so no body hair to deal with on my end. She has some, but keeps it somewhat trimmed (she's too nervous to shave that part of her body deeper than she can get with scissors) ... not enough that it would get in

the way.

And no, there's no difference in pain either way. I think the pain is that she gets sore really fast from the constant contraction of the muscles inside her vaginal cavity. I've tried to get her to do kegel exercises, but she's generally not interested and thinks that doing anything "down there" by herself is sinful.

[For Singles] Getting Laid Like a Christian (part 1)

1 upvotes · 31 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

There are two angles to this sub:

- Christian information to help RP men grow in.
- RP information to help Christian men grow in.

Between the two, Christ is always the precedence and priority and everything must be filtered through that lens. But where there is nothing inconsistent with Scripture, posts unrelated to Christianity but still helpful in developing people's ability to engage in intergender relational dynamics in a healthy, productive way are still welcome. But even then, he targeted the post to issues that are more common for Christians to struggle through than non-Christians, so it's even more on-point than the minimum.

Broken beta asking for help with RP career advice

1 upvotes · 31 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

It's been a long time since I've read his stuff, but I'd think of him more as being purple, which is about the best you'll get in the existing realm of Christian publication.

More to the point, I seem to recall *The Sacred Romance* being more about fitting into God's bigger story and having little to do with intergender relational dynamics. To that end, the book itself can't really be blue or red.

Advice to a married recovering beta on initiating

1 upvotes · 31 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I despise condoms. I'm using them right now to keep her off the pill, but I was mostly referencing being bareback, as the condoms are a recent switch until I get my vasec next week (it kept getting pseudo-unintentionally delayed).

I need some encouragement about remaining sexually pure.

1 upvotes · 31 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

With limited exception, on an RP forum I just assume that guys are fairly well unplugged from porn by now. It's so counter-productive to sexual strategy that I'm not sure how most men can expect to have sexual success while placating their libidos like that :p

Broken beta asking for help with RP career advice

1 upvotes · 31 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

my reasons are really just excuses

A reason is a factual statement about why something acts the way it does. An excuse is a rationalization to ease emotional ramifications of doing what you want to do. Sometimes the two overlap, but rarely.

So, if I want to rob a bank, an excuse might be "because my family is starving and I have no money to feed them." The reason is stated in the first sentence: I want to. This is the core of how male and female hamsters

operate - we function predominantly on excuses, whereas a trained leader operates primarily on reasons. He doesn't need excuses because the leader doesn't need to justify his actions to anyone else (except God, of course - but even then, it is God who justifies us, not us who justify ourselves to God).

a purpose wear something matters to me so much that it doesn't matter where I live, in what city or country, whether a house or an apartment or a backyard, it doesn't matter what I'm wearing in order to impress someone, I don't care what the well dressed women or men have to say about me, and it doesn't matter how much money I make or where I make it. In fact I kind of want to mission where I can look like a fool and no one will understand me.

Beautifully said! And the key thing here is that the purpose of discipleship that God gave his church (us) is something that can be accomplished no matter what your life context.

But it has to be deep, it has to be really real and really deep, deep enough and real enough so that when the whole world mocks me or doesn't understand what I'm doing, it doesn't matter.

Like the apostles, when they were on a mission to make disciples all over the world?

- *For it seems to me that God has put us apostles on display at the end of the procession, like those condemned to die in the arena. We have been made a spectacle to the whole universe, to angels as well as to human beings. We are fools for Christ, but you are so wise in Christ! We are weak, but you are strong! You are honored, we are dishonored! To this very hour we go hungry and thirsty, we are in rags, we are brutally treated, we are homeless. We work hard with our own hands. When we are cursed, we bless; when we are persecuted, we endure it; when we are slandered, we answer kindly. We have become scum of the earth, the garbage of the world - right up to this moment. I am writing this not to shame you but to warn you as my dear children. Even if you had ten thousand guardians in Christ, you do not have many fathers, for in Christ Jesus I became your father through the gospel. Therefore I urge you to imitate me. For this reason I have sent to you Timothy, my son whom I love, who is faithful in the Lord. He will remind you of my way of life in Christ Jesus, which agrees with what I teach everywhere in every church. (1 Cor. 4:9-17)*

That's a long passage, I know ... but it emphasizes the point perfectly. Timothy was Paul's disciple. The entire concept of discipleship revolves around (as I said in another post) living your life as an example to others **and intentionally training others** to follow after your example. The church always misses that "intentionally training" part, which is what Paul is talking about here - both in his he intentionally trained Timothy and is sending him to intentionally train the Corinthians, and also in the way that he modeled his "way of life" and urges them to "imitate me." This is discipleship ... and it's all wrapped up in the package you described - something so important that they don't care if the world thinks they're fools. You literally described exactly what Paul is saying!

Where do I go from here?

I think I just left you another comment to PM me about some things to see if I can get you some initial help.

Broken beta asking for help with RP career advice

1 upvotes · 31 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

look at Link in Ocarina of Time ... Where is the adventure?

Check out the book *The Sacred Romance*, by John Eldridge. Totally on point here, although he uses lots of movie references rather than video games.

I need some encouragement about remaining sexually pure.

1 upvotes · 31 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Oh, I wasn't talking about porn ... I thought the post was about pre-marital sex. Of course, the two are closely related. Any references I made to pornography were merely demonstrative of a cultural context in a given time period.

I need some encouragement about remaining sexually pure.

1 upvotes · 31 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I can't protect myself from demons. They're too strong and smart

That's just what they want you to think ;)

Seriously, we have been given power and authority that at the name of Jesus, if the Spirit is in us, we command them.

- *I have given you authority to trample on snakes and scorpions and to overcome all the power of the enemy; nothing will harm you. However, do not rejoice that the spirits submit to you, but rejoice that your names are written in heaven.* ~ Jesus (Luke 10:18-20)

Nobody even at church really talks about this.

There are a few reasons for this:

- Most pastors don't understand it
- There's a lot of debate among scholars as to what some of it really means (the concept is universally agreed upon; the specific are not), so it opens the door to lots of questions
- There's a strong risk that young believers will either (a) get intimidated by the concept and fall away, or (b) get too enveloped in the mysticism of it all that they'll lose their grounding in what God has for us to do in the physical realm.
- Some pastors are just too scared and weak

I am soooooo hungry to learn about this mission stuff, to get a purpose more than money, women, pleasure, and impressing others and being popular.

This is the key to life right here. Literally nothing else matters. When I was in college I devoted my life to learning and growing toward the mission of disciple-making. My mom would complain that I wasn't studying as much as she liked. My response? "Mom, even if I flunk out, I'm sure the homeless man lying next to me on a cold winter's night will need to hear about Jesus - and that's why God would have me there."

The mission is all that matters. "Money, women, pleasure, and impressing others and being popular" are all just different contexts in which we can carry out the mission. There's nothing inherently wrong in having any of these things - they just can't be our ultimate aim or be lived out as a higher priority than our God-given mission to make disciples.

You said that everything derives from the first principle about being a child of God (in another post)

Yeah, I really need to stop being lazy and move on to 400-level content.

I want to learn more but am so ignorant I don't even know what to ask about.

Two things:

- PM me where you live and I'll see if I can connect you with someone who could potentially disciple you. I have a network that spans the country and even some into other countries. I can't guarantee you'll be with someone in my network who has availability, but it's worth a shot and I've been able to help others through this type of connection before.
- PM me your e-mail address and I'll send you a copy of my (unpublished) book on discipleship (free, of course). It will give you all the tools you need to get started (a) growing yourself, and then (b) helping kick-start your path into discipling others.

I hope that helps!

I need some encouragement about remaining sexually pure.

1 upvotes · 31 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I'd be interesting in hearing your take on this.

It conditions people to focus on worldly pleasures; it desensitizes people to the impact of sin; it demoralizes a person internally to the point where he loses a sense of right from wrong; it causes people to question salvation; it prevents someone from growing spiritually; it hides deeper, darker sins; it holds people back from making disciples; it opens the door to other forms of spiritual attack; it lets the enemy know your weaknesses; it burns memories into your brain that cannot be forgotten; the desensitization components lead to escalation; it averts one's spiritual orientation from Christ; it bonds your wife (or future wife) to your sin; it disrupts the spiritual unity in marriage; it hinders prayers; it causes male hamsters to begin justifying and rationalizing their actions ... and I'm doing my best to avoid the physical and psychological issue.

At some point you don't care about cheeseburgers, you just want to not feel so hungry.

Indeed ... like Jesus being tempted to turn rocks into bread after 40 days without food, only to reply, "Man does not live on bread alone."

Now, there is no question that men have a biological impulse toward sex. That said, this biological impulse is, in my view, nowhere near as strong as the world makes it out to be. Instead, I'd wager that at least 75% of the sexual urge you feel is coming from cultural influences telling you what you should experience and trying to entice that urge out of you.

Imagine living in biblical times where women were generally much more heavily clothed, internet pornography did not exist, there were no scantily clad women on billboards or in TV shows or movies, no dirty magazines running around, etc. The compulsion to masturbate for the first time would be much lower, and even after that first time, the constant bombardment of pressure toward repeating would be minimized. That's not to say people wouldn't give in ... but there's a reason we don't see the Bible (or historical records, in general) referencing this type of behavior to the mass degree that we have today.

So, in a sense, there's some excuse for men today, who have a harder struggle than existed back then. But at the same time, this excuse causes us to over-estimate the struggle to a degree where we treat it like an absolute *necessity*, like food ... when in reality it's just an innate desire, much like I have the innate desire to decompress to Netflix at the end of a hard day.

Believe me - I've lived in the midst of a pornography struggle, and I had a nympho girlfriend in college who was constantly trying to get me to engage in premarital sex. I know the struggle is real. But again - there's something

so much better in store. I think I talked about this in the Odysseus v. Jason post in 208 (?).

And so my journey must begin

1 upvotes · 30 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

There are good divorce lawyers out there who are women. I'm not denying their existence. They're just much, much rarer.

In my experience, female attorneys have a serious inferiority complex, so they end up being over-zealous to a degree that disadvantages their clients. Think of the feminazi who wants to prove that women are better than men at everything ... and that's most of the female attorney population. The fact that the whole job is about winning arguments heightens the feminist zeal in women - especially when they develop an emotional connection to their client's cause and can't separate their feelings from what's actually best for their client.

A quick anecdote is the guy who hired a woman attorney who bragged to me about being called the "ice queen" (no one actually calls her that; I think she just made up the title herself) - who spent over \$50,000 on his case (as compared to my client's \$18,000) only to have her drop him when he ran out of money and we steamrolled him into getting our way. Or a similar situation where the guy actually went to trial, only to find out that his woman attorney was being bull-headed just because she didn't like a man telling her she was wrong ... when, in fact, she was wrong and the female judge affirmed it. Or the other guy who hired his woman divorce attorney who pranced around like the boogey-man trying to scare everyone in her way into backing down ... only to give up the case *mid-way through trial* because she saw it wasn't going her way - and we ended up getting better than what we asked for in our last settlement proposal. I could list at least 3 dozen more stories like this. I can list exactly 2 stories where the woman attorney worked hard to get a great settlement, viewing trial as a last-resort rather than the intended destination - and in both cases they did well enough that their client was better off than if they had gone to trial with what the judge would have given.

Sometimes the hard-ball approach works and is necessary. But, again, I've only ever met 2 female attorneys in my career so far who were willing to play any game other than hard-ball. Given that 95% of cases settle before trial (actual statistic there), if you hire an attorney who's just trying to *prove that she can play with the big-boys*, you're going to waste a lot of money assuming you're the 5% when there's a far greater chance that you could be in the 95%. Even at that end, the majority of male attorneys are equally capable of working at the 5% of cases that go to trial too ... so by going with a male attorney you're not losing any "skill" or "talent" that the woman has and the man lacks ... you're getting extra skills at settling cases that most women lack. To be fair, there are plenty of "hard-ball only" male attorneys out there too. They're just, proportionately, a much smaller breed.

Now, I've said in other posts/comments before that it is actually better for most men to get a woman judge. A woman attorney is probably also truly great for things like social security, workers' comp, personal injury law, etc. - things where you need someone who has a chip on their shoulder ... who will fight just for the sake of fighting or to prove how "tough" she can be. That attitude flourishes in that type of law. That's not to say they're *better* than men at these things ... it just means your case won't be disadvantaged in those types of law. In family law, I find the opposite - that people actually have an *advantage* on the whole if they work with someone who is willing and capable of thinking collaboratively and toward reaching amicable resolutions. Not only is this generally better for everyone (especially the kids) ... even if your case does end up going to trial, the judge will see that one side was trying to play ball and the other side was trying to play daggers and grenades. Who do you think the judge is going to have sympathy for when writing her decision?

And so my journey must begin

1 upvotes · 30 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Much appreciated. Glad to help.

I need some encouragement about remaining sexually pure.

1 upvotes · 30 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

very vague ... What is an example of a mission?

Sorry, I meant to link to [this comment](#), which I wrote at about the same time explaining the whole concept to someone else.

I feel like my life has direction.

The direction you have is attractive to non-Christian women. Christian women (at least those with any modicum of genuineness and appreciation for their faith) want a Christ-centered mission. So, having a great career becomes a quality about you, not a purpose or direction in life. The same thing goes with a hobby - "He has a good hobby" isn't the same as "He's living out the purpose for which God put him here and I want on board!"

low quality christian women

This is a legit frustration. I attribute it to the fact that most people in the church aren't legitimately saved to begin with - and even fewer are actually mature (men included). My guess is that you've got some spiritual maturation to do first, and then the mission will follow as you "seek first His Kingdom and His righteousness."

That said, as you start to grow, you will be able to find a woman who may be "low quality" at the time, but you can disciple her into maturity - lead her spiritually to become the type of woman you want to be with.

You talk about unplugging as if its a physical switch that can be turned

You're right, it comes off that way. In reality, it comes through spiritual growth. The more you pursue your faith and begin functioning as a spiritual soldier, the clearer the battlefield becomes.

I just ask that he would show me his plan ... I need physical, actionable steps.

It's in the Bible: "Go therefore and make disciples of all nations" (Matthew 28:19-20). God typically doesn't repeat himself with direct divine revelation when he's made something clear in Scripture already. The frustrating part is that most Christians want to ignore this compulsion because it's *uncomfortable* to share our faith with others or because it's *hard work* becoming mature so we can disciple others into maturity. So, we make the great commission a vague, general concept while ignoring the fact that Jesus gave clear guidelines for how this mission should be accomplished. Pretty much everything he did is an example to us. Here's the general pattern:

- Jesus started by telling people what to do and why to do it.
- He then showed them how to do it by doing it himself.
- He then let them try in front of him and gave feedback.
- He then sent them out and had them report back.
- He then commissioned them to go on their own and to show others how to reproduce this process.

These can be summarized in: (1) Tell them what, (2) Show them how, (3) Let them try, (4) Send them out, (5) Pass it on.

I've also written a book on discipleship. The entire thing has a one-page illustrative summary that's a little daunting/confusing on its own, but should give some degree of context: [Here](#) (illustration adapted from LeRoy Eims' *Lost Art of Discipleship*). I'm happy to send the whole book, which gives clear, physical, actionable steps

and has chapters that give a fictional account of what it looks like for a person to live this stuff out in practice. It's not an RP book by any means (i.e. has nothing to do with intergender relational dynamics), but is on point nonetheless [if you want a copy send a PM with your e-mail]. Or if you want another, more credible source, the LeRoy Eims book I referenced above is also solid and extremely practical (albeit a bit dated).

The lack of THINGS for me to do to improve my situation drives me nuts.

I totally get this. The problem with Christianity is that it's not about the "THINGS" we do - it's about letting God work through us, which changes shape and variety greatly.

That said, the 300-series (specifically 301) should be very relevant in the foundational things to get you started with your own growth.

I need some encouragement about remaining sexually pure.

1 upvotes · 30 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Almost all the Christian guys I know who got married come back after a year or two, exhausted, and tell me marriage is such a challenge forcing them to grow outside themselves.

Indeed - I mentioned this in [108](#), where after 6 months to 2 years the honeymoon phase dies and reality sets in. Guys often think, "Oh no! What did I do? I got married on fleeting emotions and sexual desire only to find out that both of those are mostly gone now!"

For women, the reaction is more: "Oh no! I married this guy because I wanted a husband, now I'm discovering I don't actually like *him*, I just liked the idea of having a husband, and he's not living up to my ideology!"

If you really want a wife (or if 'wife' is your code word for 'sex')

This is important too. I've found a consistent pattern: **Most women don't care about their husbands; they care about the idea of having a husband.** What you've identified here is the male version: *Most men don't actually care about their wives, they care about having sex with someone.*

Now, this is an overly broad, sweeping generalization. But I've also found it to be true on a grand scale. Take sex out of the equation and most men stop feeling all those emotional flutters for the girl. And for women, when marriage doesn't turn out to be what she expected, it's that the man isn't being a good husband - not that her expectations were wrong. Result? She feels like she has to change her husband (usually through nagging) to get him back to her ideal of what a *husband* should be - again, she's more interested in the ideology than the man himself.

The only caveat I'll make to your comment is that marriage legitimately isn't for everyone. Both Jesus and Paul have said that if a person is capable of remaining single, they should - and that this is the better option. Paul even clarifies that it's not just general burning lust that should prompt a guy to marry - it's when a guy and girl have burning passion for one another that they should marry. If the "burning passion" is unilateral, Paul's recommendation is still against marriage. Or to put it another way, the point of marriage is if you're so tempted with one specific person that you can't hold back and failing to get married would result in sexual sin with that person.

I need some encouragement about remaining sexually pure.

1 upvotes · 30 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

You don't want your body to bond with a irresponsible moron.

1 and 2 Corinthians 6 truth right there! More to [/u/thoughtproject](#) - those passages literally say that having sex with a non-Christian is like you (being united with Christ) are trying to force God to unite with a demon (the non-Christian being united with "Belial," per the assumption of 2 Cor. 6). It comes off as crude imagery - but it's also a spiritual reality.

You don't want to ...

Excellent string here. As I often tell people, certain sins are like doing meth. I know it must feel amazing. But I'm also not sitting at the edge of my seat wondering all the time how great it must be to do meth - because I see all the negative consequences that come with it and my immediate reaction is: "No thanks. Not for me." I'm content in that.

A legitimate temptation toward a particular type of sin (and sexual sin is no exception) is usually tied to an inability to perceive and/or internalize the negative consequences of that sin. We assume it's just a "God said so" kind of thing. With premarital sex, our hamsters rationalize the harm away: "That made sense in Bible-times when contraception wasn't available today and STDs weren't the same and there were no treatments; but virtually all of the negative consequences of premarital sex are gone now, so the only thing holding me back is 'God said so.'"

Now, you pointed out some of the more crucial negative consequences that go into interpersonal relationships and the impact on one's life beyond just pregnancy and STDs (i.e. emotional, legal, relational entanglement). But there are a list of spiritual ramifications that could be brought up as well - ones that are even more daunting if understood appropriately.

How do you guys handle living with a wife/teenager?

1 upvotes · 30 October 2017 · [/r/askMRP](#)

was this Rambo?

Rambo is usually doing the right thing before you're ready or doing the right things in the wrong way or all at once, out of turn. Getting butthurt is not "Rambo" - it's just butthurt.

Was it a healthy boundary?

You decide your own boundaries. Just know that boundaries work either to push people away or to keep people in. Figure out which kind you're trying to set and whether or not your boundary is having the intended effect. If you want *her in*, but *her cold feet out*, figure out if there's a way to draw a line that accomplishes both goals (not likely). Otherwise, choose the one that's more important to you and set a clear line.

whiff of commitment

What is this whiff you keep speaking of? Is it that you're living together? Did you threaten to propose to her? Is it just sleepovers? Why do you care that she thinks you're committing in the first place?

Working on the Sidebar

1 upvotes · 27 October 2017 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I'll add it to my list of books to get through :) Thanks!

Advice to a married recovering beta on initiating

1 upvotes · 27 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

That height-weight ratio isn't bad, but if your BF% is that high, it means it's all in fat, not muscle. Ideally, you'll want to maintain your weight where it is now (i.e. don't cut your eating), but lift enough that you start gaining muscle and ultimately slim down to a 30-32 waist size. A solid goal might be 190lbs and a 32 waist. If you start gaining weight as a result of lifting, deal with it for a while and do a cut diet once you hit an important lifting mile-marker for you, like being able to bench 250 or squat 300+ or something.

Make this your top priority. I'm sitting at about 15-16% BF, but just started a cut diet, hoping to get down to 12% by Thanksgiving. But I waited to do this until after I could bench over 275 (current max: 285). Why? Because the more you lift, the more calories your body burns while idling, which means (1) you can get away with eating more food, in general; and (2) it's easier to lose weight, so the cut diets go faster. So, get on that lifting.

Around 19yo for me being saved and her shortly after. We were dating for a few years before we were saved. Had some sexual baggage from it.

I'd love to hear more on this story sometime!

[7 basics from 301?] Not too often across the board. Working on changing that as part of the new changes I am making

Other than lifting, this should be your home base for a while. If she's having daily quiet times, regardless of what each of you are getting out of your time in the Word, she's going to assume she's more mature than you because she invests more time in it.

In reality (and I haven't gotten to this post yet), you can't do all 7 basics all the time. They go in cycles. I've had times when I've gone a couple months without a quiet time, but during that time I was spending immense amounts of time in prayer or Scripture memory. Other times I've lacked any meaningful prayer, but my Bible study was through the roof. Other times I've had no time spent studying the Word, but my evangelism efforts were bearing a lot of fruit, so I was investing my time in other people.

So, don't beat yourself up over being weak at a few. What you do need to be mindful of, though, is that you should be *proficient* in all 7 before trying to develop a healthy rotation - and God should lead the rotation at any given time, rather than our own sinfulness and laziness. So, if I go an entire year without a quiet time and claim it's because I'm doing other stuff ... there's a serious problem there. Likewise, if I go a year without evangelism, but say it's okay because I'm praying, reading and studying all the time ... again, I'm kidding myself and God's not fooled.

Get these basics in order, become extremely proficient, and then live them out - and if your wife is faithful, this will become incredibly alluring to her. Simply put, Christian women are taught to have an emotional craving for God. Although this really ends up being a craving for *their perception of God* instead of God Himself, the fact remains that if you are presenting yourself as someone like God, she will start to crave you as a middle-man on her way to how to get God and experience God. This is actually biblically ordained that the wife's way to have a relationship with God is ideally meant to be through her husband and not necessarily directly. God relates with her directly when a woman is not married or her husband is a spiritual infant (or not yet born again in the first place), but once you're able to lead her spiritually this is where your relationship will thrive because it will finally be functioning as God intended.

After me being passive so long, it mostly is rebellion in reaction to me taking the reigns from her or making decisions for me instead of covert contracts of me trying to get something from her. All new territory for her.

This is a good sign. She sees the boundaries are changing and wants to know if the new boundaries are for real or

just your wishful thinking.

OYS? Non-existent a few weeks ago but now as high as I know how currently

Good. The key here is that you're taking the lead in what needs to get done. My relationship followed this path over a period of years from my extreme beta days to now:

- She created the chore list and assigned me tasks.
- She created the chore list and I picked which tasks I would do.
- She and I just kind of knew our general responsibilities, but she'd tell me when she wanted something done outside the usual pattern. At one point we tried to write all the main stuff down and just assign roles, but this always failed.
- We just kind of did our own thing and she'd get resentful if I wasn't doing the things she thought I should be; she did most of the work.
- We just kind of did our own thing, but both learned to be okay with asking each other for help. We evenly shared the work load. She'd often have to remind me when stuff needed done.
- I started doing my end of the stuff on my own without reminders; she did the same.
- I started doing whatever needed to be done, regardless of whose "job" it was to do it; she filled in the gaps.
- I started doing whatever needed to be done and asked her for help as needed.
- I internalized responsibility for the house and all necessary upkeep and repairs and began delegating to her things that needed to be done and trust her to get done additional things as she has availability; I took responsibility for what wasn't done (either by doing it myself or if I did not have the capacity, delegating it for the next day).

Not that I intended this, but reviewing this path, I see a clear trend in how this was processed over our relationship: She ... she ... she ... we ... we ... I ... I ... I ... I.

It has improved vastly since this post the past few days. Likely in response to some changes I have made. Just hope for it to stay that way but also not putting my full hope there.

Yeah, in the first month of RP it's common to see some immediate changes and assume it's because of your newfound RP-ness. As I commented recently elsewhere, a lot of new MRPers will see some immediate responses and believe that their wives are changing in reaction to their changes. In reality, the wife hasn't changed at all - they're just finally being more assertive to get from her what she was always willing to give in the first place.

My guess is that's where you are. The improvements you've seen are things that she was happy to do already, you just weren't previously engaging with her in a way to get it. If she's out on the proverbial 1,000 foot rope, rather than her just floating at sea doing whatever she wants, you've finally started moving the ship and the rope felt a tug, so she's now moving the same direction as the ship - but is still just as far out there as she ever has been. The key from here is reeling that rope in until she's on board with you and can actually function as your first officer. That's the hard part and is what will take time.

Advice to a married recovering beta on initiating

1 upvotes · 26 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Excellent advice and suggestions. I haven't read all of those yet, but am looking forward to when they're next up

on my queue.

Question I always had about Christianity (but every pastor/priest is too bluepilled to answer)

1 upvotes · 26 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Brigading is when people from one sub invade another sub, causing vote manipulation, spam, trolling, starting arguments, etc. Linking a post from sub 1 onto sub 2 does not constitute brigading of sub 1. Because I didn't see much in the way of vote manipulation and any comments were limited to a nested part of one comment of one thread, it could hardly be called brigading.

We have been brigaded before, but I took care of it fairly swiftly and banned all of the appropriate users.

I don't remove legitimate discussion points, no matter who the source is. So, even if BPP was a girl, it wouldn't make a difference to me as long as the conversation has some merit to it. Usually if a person sees fit to reply, I leave the conversation up anyway because it's beneficial for others to see the reply to the challenge to understand that there is an appropriate basis for maintaining our views in the face of disagreement.

108 - Life-Path of a Relationship

1 upvotes · 24 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Agreed.

Advice to a married recovering beta on initiating

1 upvotes · 24 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

But before that it was a schedule of twice a week only she would decide last minute that something was wrong or any variety of excuses.

Yeah, at one point we had sex two weekends in a row and my wife was set: "Let's just agree to once a week to get started and see how things go." When that next weekend came around, nothing happened. I neglected to initiate and she didn't bring it up. The weekend after that, I did initiate and she turned me down, saying she had a headache and that we should re-schedule. I commented about the "once a week" thing being a commitment that she's fine with ignoring and she threw it back at me, saying it was my fault for not initiating the previous week and that if I had it would only be one missed week, not 2. Then the week after that we had company over, which for her means no sex. Then we were at company's house the weekend after that. At one point in the mix I tried to suggest switching the day from weekends to weekdays because we're out of town or have company over so much on weekends, but she didn't like that idea because of morning obligations the next day and not wanting to be too tired.

All in all, the "let's schedule sex" thing has never worked for me, no matter how many dozens of times I've tried to humor her on that point. She keeps saying it'll work because then she'll know to expect it and get herself in the mood, but it really turned into: *I don't have to worry about sex 6 days out of the week, so I only need to come up with an excuse once instead of feeling like I need one ready all the time.*

Also, scheduling just kills the fun in it for me. I like the lusty pre-foreplay that gradually builds desire over hours before actually having sex. It adds an element of risk. It feels a bit again like the *chase* from when we were dating, wondering, "Will she? Won't she? I don't know! Let's find out and see how good I am to close!" When it's scheduled, the end-game is clear and the thrill of the chase is gone. It's just not fun.

To be clear, though ... most of the above was stuff I did/said during beta days. I'm not endorsing my behavior as something other men should mimic - quite the opposite.

She would deliberately lie about things. While it's nothing now she kept me believing she never had an orgasm

and being teh BP idiot I was I worked at it ... I just didn't want you to get a big head.

Now that is just cold. Seriously, that's new level garbage. That said, what I hated was when my wife would orgasm, but purely internalize it and give no outward sign of it at all. Watching a woman orgasm is my primary kink, even more important to me than how well I'm being rubbed or what position we're in or whatever. So, it was totally demoralizing when, for over 7 years, she (I think intentionally) avoided giving me any show to enjoy, and I'd be left asking at the end, "Was that it? Did you orgasm?" How pitiful.

Who says that?

A heartless crazy person.

SOMething they call a closet narcissist. I don't know though it's a hard disorder to diagnose to begin with but she has all the traits to be sure.

I see these diagnosed all the time, including in women (though it's less rare than in men). According to the DSM-V she has to show 5 of the following 9 traits to be officially diagnosed as a narcissist:

1. A grandiose logic of self-importance
2. A fixation with fantasies of infinite success, control, brilliance, beauty, or idyllic love
3. A credence that he or she is extraordinary and exceptional and can only be understood by, or should connect with, other extraordinary or important people or institutions
4. A desire for unwarranted admiration
5. A sense of entitlement
6. Interpersonally oppressive behavior
7. No form of empathy
8. Resentment of others or a conviction that others are resentful of him or her [in the absence of factual reality]
9. A display of egotistical and conceited behaviors or attitudes

Virtually every woman meets 4 and 5. Your story demonstrates 6, for sure. I'll let you muse at the other two.

I do find it interesting that secular RP specifically teaches men to adopt:

- 1 - "You're on the awesome train; others can get on or off, but it's their loss if they leave"
- 4 - "You are the prize" - and guys are told to maintain this attitude even if they're noobs and have an objectively low SMV
- 5 - Pretty much everything centers around this in the manosphere; specifically: you're entitled to the sex you want, and if she won't give it to you, you'll get it somewhere else
- 6 - Nuking, negging, treating her like a child, etc.

TRP arguably adds 7 to the list (unless I'm just reading too much from the children with dynamite), making a true TRPer a narcissist by definition. MRP rejects 2, 7, and 8. So, the only things separating MRPs from having narcissistic personality disorder are (a) whether or not they believe only other exceptional people can understand them, or (b) if they come off as egotistical and conceited. RPC compromises 5 (the whole grace/mercy thing), but

also specifically rejects 3 (we're to relate and connect with all) and 9 (humility).

Anyway ... that's enough musings. Sorry to hear about your sucky situation. My heart goes out to you.

108 - Life-Path of a Relationship

1 upvotes · 24 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

This makes a lot more sense now. The thing is, though, as with the "AWALT" statements, there's usually a principle of truth behind each of these. It just sounds like the feminist versions of AMALT is much harsher than the RP world means when it says AWALT. I've heard it said several times on MRP, "AWALT isn't mean to be taken literally; it just means all women are capable of acting this way, and don't be surprised if your woman ends up following suit." If that same qualification is added to the statements about men you referenced, I'd probably agree with most of them. Specifically:

Mrs. Smith left his wife and children in poverty for another women.

Men do inherently have polygamous desires. If left unchecked, this is what we'd do every time.

You can never please a man ... never satisfy him

This is true, just as you can never satisfy your hunger indefinitely. You eat one good thing and you're instantly wishing you had room left to try another. Again, this is a desire that is inherent in men that must be intentionally tamed.

use you and toss you aside for the next women. He cannot commit.

Pretty much the same as the first.

Men are controlled by their impulses. They are like children.

We do have impulses that, if left uncontrolled, are quite childish. Many men do act out on these impulses - and if we did not have restraint or higher purposes, we certainly would be controlled by these impulses.

Men are selfish

By default, we are. We must consciously fight against this.

when fatherhood becomes inconvenient he will walk away.

Indeed, without some greater ideology directing our lives, this is what we would do every time. I do find it interesting how secular RP totally rejects developing any commitments to women as an ideal (and I totally understand their viewpoint on that), but even the hard-core ECs will turn around and talk about committing to their children as a goal worth maintaining.

man as aggressor who is prone to violence

Again, these tendencies do exist in all men (though many are psychologically conditioned away from it from a young age).

My point is simply that the AMALT/AWALT statements are based on underriding truths about how each gender's core impulses function and are not to be totally discounted as a myth. What feminists say about men has actual validity and merit, but must be filtered through life context. Similarly, what Vilar says about women has actual validity and merit, but must be filtered through the practical realities of day-to-day life. Theory doesn't

exist in a vacuum.

108 - Life-Path of a Relationship

1 upvotes · 24 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

she seems to be angry with women for not being men, IMO.

I got the impression that it was more anger at women for trying to be men - to replace men.

I've heard her type of language used against men. And, I used to buy into it up until about fifteen years or so ago.

Can you explain this? I'm not sure how that fit in the context of what you were saying.

It is really hard to "talk" over forums

Agreed. But I appreciate your efforts anyway :)

It would seem to me that the only way sex could truly be used as a weapon in a marriage was if the rate of premarital sex dropped drastically.

There are two main situations where the rate of premarital sex won't affect the weaponization of sex, though:

- Religious/spiritual compulsion toward faithful monogamy
- A beta mentality boxing someone into an ideology that faithful monogamy is a desirous goal that trumps one's desire for satisfying sex

Because the overwhelming majority of the world falls into one of those two categories, the secular RP mentality that "Sex is like candy now" and you can just go get it whenever you want it is actually the rarity.

108 - Life-Path of a Relationship

1 upvotes · 24 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

What I got out of it was that women generally have an idea in their minds about what their lives should look like and they use sex as one of many currencies to get it. I do get that there are exceptions, and you have demonstrated many times that you very likely are just such an exception. But I also see this close lipped negotiating going on all the time, to a degree I can't ignore, including in much of my own marriage.

I do agree with all you said about the nature of why women get jobs being different today, but that seemed beside the point.

The matter of having comparable education is not to talk shop at home. It's that a more educated person is better able to engage in critical thinking and more stimulating conversation, generally, regardless of the subject.

I hadn't thought about the social class thing. How would you differentiate those more clearly?

112 - Alpha Scripture

1 upvotes · 24 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I don't know that David refused relations with her. It's possible, but I'm inclined toward the view that the statement "she had no children until ..." only makes sense if there's some expectation that she should have. But that's an interesting theory nonetheless! I'll have to think on that some more.

I do agree that there's a lot of laziness, though. Most Christians (or rather, "Christians") would rather let someone else do all the work studying the bible for them, then hear what God told that person rather than what God wants to tell them directly.

Working on the Sidebar

1 upvotes · 23 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Second, you need information on passing Fitness Tests in the sidebar. I don't think there is a Christian source for this but Jesus gave us plenty of examples how he responded to Fitness Tests from the Pharisees and so on.

This one's for you.

Also, although Jesus gave some great examples, I tried to stick to ones in a male-female relationship dynamic, which emphasize things like:

- Withdraw presence/attention
- AA/AM/OI
- Not getting butthurt

108 - Life-Path of a Relationship

1 upvotes · 23 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Well said, indeed.

108 - Life-Path of a Relationship

1 upvotes · 23 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

How did you reach this point?

I made my mission (discipleship) clear and pursued it vigorously as a higher priority than all else in life and showed her that I would never give up no matter how much she had temper tantrums about it. That said, I did this with a soft temper, kind heart, incredible patience, and prolonged prayer. I wasn't trying to beat her over the head with my mission. I was simply living out something that was more important than both of us.

At one point she started to get it. She would whine about some stupid thing - like not getting to go to the movies with our daughter one night. Then she angrily blurted out, "But how can I complain? You're off saving people's souls for all of eternity. It's not fair that your mission trumps everything I want to do in life." It was only within a few months after that when she finally realized that she could work alongside me and have the same eternal impact rather than getting all fussy over missing a movie.

It's as [/u/bluepillprofessor](#) says - the vision most women have for life is petty. I suspect it's because as little girls they started planning out their future - to do all the things with their kids someday that their parents were doing with them at that time. Then, when they're older, they're still trying to live out the fantasies they had when they were little girls. That's why it's not "mean" or "being a jerk" to treat your wife like a little girl when she acts out - because most of the time her acting out literally comes from the fact that she wants to fulfill some little girl's fantasy.

Can you explain it more, how do you transition from each having your individual mission to one invested alongside one another?

For a time, my wife and I both had the same mission but were living it side-by-side. We assumed that because it was the same (discipleship) that it must be a joint mission - and we both took turns caring for the kids, doing housework, etc. to enable the other person to carry onward. That went for bust pretty fast - but it was a necessary starting point. Until she personalized my mission for herself, she wouldn't be able to join in on it as my helper.

For the most part, praying for her was the biggest thing - something I was neglectful of doing for years. Once I noticed her heart softening, I started asking her for advice with guys I was discipling. Now, I know that I'm far more skilled at discipleship than her and generally (as a matter of fact, not as an insult or arrogant statement) am more intelligent than she is. She wasn't going to say anything I hadn't already thought of. But I played along and gave her an open ear and implemented the good things in what she said. I didn't mention the fact that I had already thought of those things and planned to implement them - I just did it and when it worked, I would update her, "Hey, good thinking on that. I did just like you described and it really helped." Once she had a handful of successes under her belt in feeling like she had a hand to play, I would up the ante on how difficult the situations were that I'd be bringing to her attention - and eventually she developed the skills to be effective. At that point, she had been so invested in the lives of the men I disciple that she really felt like she was a part of it and started thinking, "I want to disciple someone too" - and now she felt ready for it because she saw what of her suggestions worked with the guys I met with and what didn't (by virtue of the fact that I didn't actually employ those tactics - not that I tried them to prove a point or to let a brother fail due to her bad advice).

Once she started working with other women, she then started asking me for help, realizing that doing it vicariously through me as the real actor in the whole thing wasn't the same as being in the field herself ... and so I became invested in the lives of the women she disciplined. As her skills grew, she actually began having competent, valuable insights to share. It's still fairly lop-sided on the whole, but she does give a fresh perspective and we now value our conversations together on how to further help those we're meeting with.

We're planning on starting another small group soon. The last one I led alone and she just participated. This one we'll co-lead, and it will mostly be made up of people that she knows and will be inviting (the last one was all people that I knew and invited). So, that will help her be more invested and will make it feel more like a team effort because we'll be doing it together under my supervision and guidance.

Working on the Sidebar

1 upvotes · 23 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I'll definitely check that out! Thanks for the reference. Good analysis on that passage too. I'll definitely keep looking into this.

Working on the Sidebar

1 upvotes · 23 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Definitely not - another good reason for having removed the book. Again, I had found value in it back in the day, but didn't remember most of what was said and Christian books about sex are pretty darn rare - at least to the degree that they have any value. Good story, though.

Any podcasts similar to this sub?

1 upvotes · 22 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Yes. If you use the main reddit app you go to the sub itself (not your front page), click on the three dots them community info. If you're on the reddit is fun app, go to the sub and press the circle with an i in it.

Failure, not sure why

1 upvotes · 22 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I don't disagree with that hierarchy, but mature believers are also disgusted by sin. Disgust is more powerful than attraction. That's how I see it.

Failure, not sure why

1 upvotes · 22 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Nothing can change that, it's nature

Oh, I wouldn't put that limitation on God. The more accurate way to put it is that there are certain traits that God wants wives to be attracted to because they help maintain his established marital equilibrium, so he won't change those things about what she's attracted to.

But at the same time, disgust overpowers attracting every time. So, if she's attracted to those traits in a non-Christian man, but disgusted at his sin or at a sinful expression of those traits, the attraction will be more than nullified and desire will never have the chance to cultivate in the first place. I've seen this happen repeatedly.

Failure, not sure why

1 upvotes · 22 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

That there are circumstances and factors that affect desire and attraction - many of which can be controlled. For example, a woman might not be able to control that she is attracted to muscular men over fat men, but the man can control whether he is muscular or fat. If we deny this then RP ceases to have any value as sexual strategy.

More to the point of my comment in this line: the Holy Spirit can change our hearts, which changes what we desire.

108 - Life-Path of a Relationship

1 upvotes · 22 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I'll PM you about the last part and respond to the first bit when I'm not on mobile.

105 - Non-Negotiable Attraction

1 upvotes · 22 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

That's all 400 level stuff. I haven't gotten to writing that content yet. I do have 40% of a book written in that particular subject, though, as well as a detailed plan for the 400s ... will probably finish the book commensurate with posting the 400 series.

104 - How to compliment your wife and make her feel sexy

1 upvotes · 22 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Connect the general compliment to a memory. The general compliment should always be true in the first place. Sharing a memory that personalizes the compliment isn't dishonest - you're just stating facts about what you're reminded of. She just likes being reminded that you found her sexy once upon a time - and that she put that feeling fresh in her mind.

From your other comments I gather that your wife, like mine was, has been conditioned by you to be averse to sex with you. It's not just a matter of learning how to turn her on (most of RP), but also a matter of unconditioning the harm you've done. I've found the most success in this by cross referencing present situations with past times when she wasn't as sex-averse - that way she remembers what it used to feel like and can relive/experience that "pre-sex-aversion" state in a present context.

For her this comes off as just a fun memory that makes her feel a little sexier and a bit aroused, but that's okay.

The association must feel natural.

Now, my wife has always been fairly sex-averse, so even this is a little crippled for me and I accept that my sex life may never be 100% perfect/ideal. OI. I'm okay with that. No covert contracts, although I have every reason to believe progress will continue. But there is still value in connecting her to a time before I screwed her up even worse than her parents did.

Failure, not sure why

1 upvotes · 22 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I agree. But it doesn't happen in a vacuum either.

How does this advice change for dating?

1 upvotes · 21 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

completely wiped away every time ...?

Yes, but Matthew 12 also references that it can return if "the house" is found empty - and it's always worse on recurrence at that point. 2 Peter 2:20 is also on point. I usually find that after freedom, serious temptation hits about 1-2 weeks later. If that test is passed it generally remains permanent unless the person falls back in of their own accord (i.e. without external temptation/ pressure from spiritual warfare).

so that she can emotionally pair bond as deeply and tightly as a virgin woman?

Yes, absolutely. But let me be clearer: freedom in the gospel comes first, discipleship is what keeps a person free afterward. Often times these overlap so that discipleship is the catalyst for freedom, but they are still distinct.

interested in delving deeper into effects of things

Me too :) And I know there's stuff that happens beyond what I've personally observed too. I'm only speaking as to my own experience and observation. I don't discount other aspects of what God can do too!

Is it because they aren't F.A.T. enough ...?

Freedom really only requires a receptivity to the gospel, humility, and vulnerability (as opposed to mere transparency). One can get freedom without being FAT, but keeping that freedom indefinitely without those traits will be impossible (or extremely difficult), per Matthew 12 again, so I don't help people find freedom who aren't ready and willing to be discipled. That's dangerous and usually leads to a worse reversion.

Because the discipler isn't good enough?

It just depends on if the discipler has experienced freedom and is equipped to help others prayerfully in the Spirit find it too.

Question I always had about Christianity (but every pastor/priest is too bluepillied to answer)

1 upvotes · 21 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I am aware, but it's certainly not all - and I was also referencing people in my personal life who I know to be actual women.

How does this advice change for dating?

1 upvotes · 21 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Now these are truly good and fascinating questions! It makes me want to skip ahead to 402. I'm on mobile until Monday, but I'll try my best on this.

50/50 men to women ... sub 10%

The way %ages work assumes an even spread. So, 20% of women + 20% of men = 20% of the whole, not 40%. So you can't say "half are women" to cut 20 down to 10. But because about half of genuine Christians are FAT already, it's still about a 10% number anyway.

spiritual gifting and one being a great discipler

To be clear, discipleship is a skill, not a spiritual gift. Your gifts are the context in which you practice discipleship. Someone gifted at hospitality will invite their disciples to relax in their home. Teachers will orient their time with their disciple around lessons. Those gifted in prophecy may emphasize conviction and vision. But discipleship is a universal skill that everyone can learn and apply no matter their gifting.

both of the aforementioned stipulations

To make sure we're on the same page, I assume were talking about a fully skilled discipler and a very FAT disciple.

consequences of **every** sin, or negative action ... wiped away?

The gospel is what does the wiping. Assuming the discipler is also trained and skilled with freedom through the gospel in his own life (a distinct thing from discipleship itself), then the negative internal implications will be removed, not the memory or physical consequences - and it is usually one issue at a time, not all at once.

So, if you find freedom in the midst of premarital sex, a girl's hymen will not regrow and she will still remember the act itself, but that past act will no longer have any internalized consequences on her relationship at present or in the future.

I know a couple who had a rocky marriage. The guy was an alcoholic. He had, by general effort, done fairly well avoiding alcohol, but he still felt the internal compulsion. After finding freedom in Christ, that internal compulsion was gone. That same man had also cheated on his wife early in their marriage before they were saved, and she had cheated on him too. This had huge implications on their intimacy. They eventually confessed to each other, hoping it would solve the problem ... it made it far worse, even after significant time and their lives restabilized. After prayerfully applying the gospel in the situation, they both received freedom and now have the best sex of their lives. They remember having cheated - and all their past lovers - but none of it negatively impacts their marriage at all anymore.

I can share the same stories in my life about addictions to video games, porn, food, etc., or about emotional insecurities, or significant past mistakes - single of them having radically altered my personality overnight, like going from extreme introversion as the guy who hid in the corner and thought "that's just how God made me" to realizing the role of sin in causing me to be that way and literally the next day - and everyday since - being an extrovert.

Now, I have heard of miraculous physical transformations too. Last year a couple in our church had a miscarriage - baby pronounced dead in utero by 2 different doctors on 2 different days ... yet God brought the baby back to life (reminds me of David weeping for his child). But these are rare and at God's discretion. The other stuff I've been talking about is universal and available to all. The difference is made clear in 2 Cor. 12 where Paul describes the wonders God has done in and through him - but that God would still not remove his "thorn in the flesh." From this, I take that anyone who claims to have guaranteed powers of healing or miraculous transformation is a phony.

and not working through Scriptural concepts.

I hope that helps clarify.

How does this advice change for dating?

1 upvotes · 21 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Good point. That said, among Christians, God gives us the mission: "Go and make disciples of all nations" (Matthew 28:19). Every Christian man should adopt this as his mission at some point, though I give lots of leniency in letting men fumble around with other missions until they're mature enough to realize this.

Point being: Christian women should know the mission of every Christian man before she marries him - before she even meets him. So, there's never a surprise. The only surprise is if she marries an immature Christian man who never adopts this mission. Then everything you said rings well and true :)

How does this advice change for dating?

1 upvotes · 21 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

This is RP. We can handle harsh. Just make sure it's truth too. That's what this is. Well said.

How does this advice change for dating?

1 upvotes · 21 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

My heart goes out to men who can't seem to find one to work with. They're out there, but are a smaller percentage IMO.

Smaller, certainly. But still very common.

but as you noted in another thread, there's only a small percentage who are truly Christians within the church and even less who are faithful, available and teachable

The percentage of truly Christian is definitely small - again, somewhere just shy of 20%. So, I'll give you that. But I think you misunderstood the second point - it wasn't about F.A.T. people, it was about people who are already mature - who already are living out the great commission through an active lifestyle of evangelism and discipleship - that's the 2.5%.

Things like a very high N count, whether her parents are divorced, childhood/emotional traumas, and many more.

The average discipler cannot address these things, you're right. That said, someone even mildly fluent with Gospel-centered freedom ministry can certainly, through prayer and the help of the Spirit, help someone who is F.A.T. to conquer these issues - sometimes even overnight.

Now, good luck finding many of those people. Myself aside, I've probably only known half a dozen others. But this isn't just a spiritual gifting thing - it's purely a matter of receiving personal freedom from Christ through the Gospel oneself and partnering with the Spirit to repeat that process in someone else. But again, that's where the F.A.T. part comes in - they have to want it and be capable of following through.

Of course, if the n-count issue is a problem for the guy because he has standards (and rightly so, I believe), then that's a different story. You can't undo the past - you can only break its hold on you going forward.

Each of these on their own are correlated to ... and on and on

Among couples who have not found freedom in Christ, absolutely. To be clear, I don't mean general salvation-level freedom. I mean the freedom that comes with spiritual maturity and not mere intellectual/theological understanding even. Someone who walks alongside Christ and lives as he lives.

even finding ones to work with isn't as easy as it may sound

I agree there. Among the 18.65%, I'd wager (and this is not based on actual research) maybe half of them have the F.A.T. qualities. So, about 1 in 10 girls at church can be discipled into marriage-quality. Of course, you can always broaden this pool by finding someone outside the 20% (i.e. someone who thinks she's saved, but really isn't) who is F.A.T. and leverage that both for her salvation and eventual wifedom. This is a much riskier play, but at the end of the day it's really hard to figure out who's actually saved and not until you really get to know them (unless you have context for asking pseudo-invasive questions, like, "Hi, I'm doing a research study"). The ones who are obviously saved are the 3%. but those who are between 3-18.65% are virtually indistinguishable from those who are 18.65%-50%. So, unless you're looking for the pre-made woman, the "raise one up" women are going to come in a much larger pool - and there's no way of knowing which ones are saved and not until you actually spend the effort getting to know them - and by that point you might already have the influence in their lives to lead them to Christ anyway. Of course, I must be abundantly clear here: *I DO NOT endorse evangedating.*

I should probably also note that the F.A.T. qualities are so important because *if you find someone with them* you can literally instill any other quality in that person. They will be putty in your hands, if they respect you as a leader. I have proved this with over 25 guys - and I have also shown with 9 guys that if they lack even 1 of these qualities, the effort is doomed to fail. My discipler can cite the exact same pattern, but is probably closer to the triple digits. I also know 2 women who, collectively, have discipled around 30 women and shown the exact same pattern among the female population as well.

I'm not saying this just to contradict you or anything - I'm saying it to get you excited! I have seen more evidence in my own life that discipleship with a F.A.T. person *works* than the effectiveness of RP.

That said, taking someone without the F.A.T. qualities and trying to instill those in them is ... very difficult, extremely long, and comes with no guarantees.

Now, if a guy has a wife who is F.A.T., he won't need RP to begin with. The problem is that even if a guy married a girl who was F.A.T. at the time, betaness will inevitably kill one of those three:

- Faithful = Not sexually, but in the sense that she's not going to follow through with your instructions because she doesn't believe you're strong enough to enforce your word.
- Available = Because she has better things to do than try to appease a weak husband.
- Teachable = Because someone who can't be secure in his own life can't teach her how to find the security and satisfaction she longs for.

So, to some extent a guy still needs to be RP enough to keep his wife F.A.T. - but RP (and I'm speculating here) cannot make a woman become F.A.T. who is not already - and that's why we say constantly, "Fix the man. The woman may respond or may not; we can't control her, so her response doesn't matter."

That said, I suspect the reason RP works is not because of all the biological imperatives or AWALT stuff (although I don't discount this either); rather, I'd wager a lot of it comes from the fact that you're conditioning her to become F.A.T. again. Once you generate those qualities in a woman you can get her to do anything, if you are skilled (and the same applies for men in a discipleship relationship). But because you can't force someone to acquire these traits (you can only create the conditions where they will be most likely to develop them), the hard reality is that "nexting" does start to make sense at some point.

The good news is that if someone was F.A.T. at one point, you know they can develop those qualities again. But if they've always lacked one of these, then there might be something deeper wrong with their brain chemistry or mental health that will create a much, much deeper long-term problem.

Personally, my wife was F.A.T. at one point while we were dating/early marriage. When I lost my alpha, she lost her teachability. Faithfulness and availability never left, but without being teachable, I hit a wall with her. Through RP I'm starting to gain some of that back. But the older people get, the harder it is to change their ways of thinking ... so it'll be a long process undoing the damage I had done to our relationship. Fortunately, I don't have to wait until the product is finished before the benefits show up - they trickle in gradually over time.

Working on the Sidebar

1 upvotes · 21 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I haven't. Thanks for the reference!

Anyone have experience with NMMNG groups?

1 upvotes · 21 October 2017 · /r/askMRP

Good to know.

How does this advice change for dating?

1 upvotes · 20 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I'm not gonna argue and justify

Good for you! You are learning ;) Though there is a place for learning by argument. The justifying yourself to others is where the danger is found.

Not sure weather to next or stay

1 upvotes · 20 October 2017 · /r/askMRP

Not sure what I want to do.

This is your problem right here. You don't have a purpose in life. As a result, you're just aimlessly wandering waiting for a purpose to fall in your lap. When a guy's like that, girls become his default. And when you make girls your default purpose, they become your emotional center. When your girl is your emotional center, your relationship jumps from *want* to *need*. When you feel like you need her, that's where you become totally subservient to the feminist imperative.

Now, you're not fully down this path. In fact, you're probably making some nice steps back. But right now you're somewhere between "she's my emotional center" because you're so worked up about whether you should keep her or leave her ... and "I need her" because you're showing clear signs of panic about the whole thing.

Like /u/red-sfpplus said: no ring or kids = demote. I'm not sure why you'd put up with stupid crap like this hoping that women will magically change if you can just hold onto them longer.

The reality is: women do change. But rarely for the better over time. Accept that as a fact (even if it's only a generality) and you'll have a much better perspective on when to continue in a relationship or move on.

How does this advice change for dating?

1 upvotes · 20 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Check out 108 - the section on the lower-right quadrant, specifically. Also, the 300 series is moving toward

individual participation in the mission God gave his church, which must be personalized by all Christians at some point in life.

But I agree with [/u/Willos-girl](#) - finding your mission first is crucial. I take it for granted that I've always been pretty clear on that since before I started dating. But this is probably one of the main aspects where most Christian men really struggle the most.

Anyone have experience with NMMNG groups?

1 upvotes · 20 October 2017 · [/r/askMRP](#)

Good point - and well taken.

111 - "As I Say" v. "As I Do" and the Polygamy/Hypergamy Divide

1 upvotes · 20 October 2017 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Good point.

Anyone have experience with NMMNG groups?

1 upvotes · 20 October 2017 · [/r/askMRP](#)

Good point. With how I typically lead groups, it's usually more content-driven than therapy. After all, I'm not a mental health professional (yet - will probably be going back to school for that in the next year or two). So, I'd probably have a "spill your guts" session every 5-6 weeks, but most of the time it would be conversations of substantive issues, not just personal life stories.

The life stories would filter in each week, of course, but predominantly in the context of the content. So, per my self-musing reply to [/u/BarracudaRP](#), if I'm on week 4 and we're talking about recognizing fitness tests, I'll have the guys share times they think their wife is testing them and prod them to try to recognize this. But I won't let them just start complaining about an argument they had with their wife or their most recent sexual denial. I'm good at keeping people on-point.

I would also want this to be a limited series - somewhere between 3-6 months. In the comment I referenced, I laid out a potential map for the first 3 months, which could technically be the entire duration of the group. But I know that things come up and when people get seriously sidetracked it adds delays. So, those 12 weeks would probably really end up being more like 16, covering about 4 months.

Anyone have experience with NMMNG groups?

1 upvotes · 20 October 2017 · [/r/askMRP](#)

Per the note in my post, yes. I've asked him about it before, but it was a short conversation and before I had any concrete plans to start something. That's also why I tagged him here.

Failure, not sure why

1 upvotes · 20 October 2017 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I think you meant this for me ... randomly stumbled on this when reviewing new comments in this thread.

I have talked to RDW briefly about this, but he's not on much anymore.

For instance with announcing your opposition to divorce or affairs. Why? Was it necessary?

Assuming you're referencing the comment that got me banned on MRP, the reason I said that in my [r/deadbedrooms](#) thread was to keep my post from getting deleted by the mods, as some people were calling for it. They have a rule against posting RP content there. Non-RP people truly hate us with a deep and fiery passion. If they smell a whiff of RP, they ignore what's actually being said and just slap a label.

I was trying to demonstrate that although I run an RP sub and the post (in my view) was consistent with RP principles, nothing in that post was unique to RP. I was trying to show that what I posted was not consistent with the (technically false) stereotypes that people have in their minds about the RP communities - stereotypes that I personally reject in my own life. Not sure if that gives more context.

Perhaps one day I'll explain my decision

Please do!

I created so many walls to meeting my goals in life that I needed to start clean

I totally get this. Personally, I believe that the only true fresh starts come from Jesus - when he literally wipes your slate clean. But, there are harder ways to achieve a similar result, just without the eternal benefits ;)

Question I always had about Christianity (but every pastor/priest is too bluepilled to answer)

1 upvotes · 20 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Please address the issue of the minority of women who only need very low level dread

I didn't say "most women want to feel high-level dread" - just some degree of dread. Even my own wife talked about this before my RP days - that she wants to know she got a good catch. But no way in the world would she consciously admit to wanting to be fearful that I might cheat on her. To that end, you're right - this may cause some women to get self-protective and clam up rather than try harder. I've seen this pattern happen repeatedly too. That's why on RPC we have to be careful about how we approach the topic of dread. We can't reject it in its entirety, but we have to be wise with how we're using it. Not every tool is a sledgehammer.

If I am correct this small group of women will experience dread as an issue of trust and it will destabilize her and stunt her emotional, spiritual, and sexual growth.

I wouldn't even call it a "small group of women" - at least not within the church context. It's much larger there. I've seen several examples of men who delved into some of the upper-levels of dread and their wives went totally sexless - they were so mentally scarred thinking about what their husbands might be doing with other women that the lack of trust precluded them from engaging in any intimacy at all. So, I didn't mean to discount these circumstances in anything I said.

IMO they are the ones that crossover into BDSM easily

My wife is one of these women, I'm confident. And as you know from our past conversations, she does tend to have some of these tendencies.

Working on the Sidebar

1 upvotes · 20 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Cool. I'm a little concerned about endorsing Rollo - not because I disagree with him, but because he speaks from an obviously non-Christian perspective and I'm afraid new believers may have difficulty filtering the truth he shares through a biblical lens. I'll have to ponder that some more. Thanks for the reference on practical female psychology. I'll definitely add it to my reading list for consideration!

Failure, not sure why

1 upvotes · 20 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Absolutely.

update: how I do approach this

1 upvotes · 19 October 2017 · /r/askMRP

throwing up. Legit because I went in and saw it in the toilet.

Actual victim puke. Interesting.

I see it as I need to stick with my guns and potentially lose her. Or maybe realize some side pussy isn't worth the loss.

You've already screwed yourself here. Think about it - in what circumstance can you take back what you've said and decide to be faithful to her in order to regain her trust without losing frame? We've got some good minds here ... I doubt anyone can come up with a legit way to do this.

Besides, I speak from experience when I say that you don't ever want your girl reassured that you'll never cheat on her. That's just idiotic. (1) Because that's a promise you don't know if you'll actually keep. You might mean it now, but how do you know you'll still be strong on it 2, 5, 10, whatever years down the road? You're still human. As you said, you have "hormones" and all that. (2) Because absolute comfort and security doesn't drop a woman's sexual defenses - it drops her imperative to try to please you. I was actually just talking about this on RPC [this morning](#).

If you want to stick it out with her, pretty much the only thing you can do that will actually work is to pull a George Costanza.

- *Boss*: Didn't you quit yesterday?
- *George*: Who? Me? No, why would I do that?
- *Boss*: Yeah, you insulted me and stormed out.
- *George*: I have no idea what you're talking about.

Obviously she's going to know better, but if you can just pretend the conversation never happened, that's the only way I can see you staying together while minimizing the impact on your frame. Otherwise, you said you're fine if she leaves. Time to make good.

Question I always had about Christianity (but every pastor/priest is too bluepillled to answer)

1 upvotes · 19 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Dang, I had no idea you read so much! I thought I read a lot :p

Failure, not sure why

1 upvotes · 19 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I have discussed this stuff with BPP quite a bit. I agree that there are countless women in the church who would easily be led astray by an RP guy - but that's because most people in the church aren't spiritually mature. They're still living by the sinful nature and "Christianity" is little more than a name-tag they put on to make them feel like they're headed toward heaven. My heart breaks for when these people will wake up. There was actually a post on this exact topic this morning on [r/TrueChristian](#): [here](#). One of the commenters ([here](#)) suggests that less than 20% of church-attenders are actually even saved (4% if you go by all self-identified Christians) and less than 3% are "spiritually mature" (half a percent, if you look at all self-identifiers).

If these statistics are even remotely representative of the whole population, those are tough numbers to abide by. It also means that the "church girl" can probably be pulled away by the RP guy 80-97% of the time. But note my

qualifier in my previous comment: "if a Christian girl is even half way living by the Spirit." I'm talking about that 3%. Those are the ones who will be disgusted at the non-Christian RP guy - not because of anything RP-related, but because she has no attraction to someone who is spiritually immature. This is basic hypergamy at work. If she's half-way mature, she's going to be attracted to guys who are more than half-way mature. How else will her husband be able to lead her in her faith? And if she's mature, that's going to be a primary characteristic. It's certainly not the only one - but a significant one nonetheless.

What you find in TRP in general are angry boys

That's why I don't go there anymore. I read when a title sounds interesting, but the comments are mostly worthless.

steadfastly Christian YET so much so that she cannot submit to male leadership even under the best circumstances

This is a maturity issue in her. It certainly is a problem among many Christian women ... and men too, of course.

I might go into that here for others to see and perhaps learn....I many not.

Please do! You have me interested now.

And don't give me that talk about teamwork.

I'm not even sure what talk you're referencing. I thought Jesus once said something about how a kingdom cannot survive with two rulers ... but I can't find it with a quick google search, so maybe I'm crazy. Either way, I agree that someone always has to be in charge.

The thing also to remember about RP before the vilify continues is that, being amoral, it makes no judgement on how a man implements it in his life.

I didn't mean to vilify anything about RP itself, and I fully embrace the amoral aspect of the tools themselves. In fact, I just wrote a post on that a couple nights ago, which is now the top link on our sidebar material - to emphasize that very point. As you say, Christians do have a higher standard in how we use the tools, but I agree that the tool itself is amoral. Romans 14:14 makes that pretty darn clear.

What I do note is that some tools cannot be used in a biblically moral way, absent extreme circumstances. Pornography is a great example. There is nothing inherently sinful about video footage. I mean, if a husband and wife create a sex tape, there's nothing sinful about that. It's what people do with it that becomes sinful. So, if that tape gets uploaded to the internet, in 99.999% of cases it would be sin for anyone who looks at it. In that sense, it's easier to simply say, "Watching porn is sinful," when in reality there are rare exceptions, like the forensic investigator who has to watch a pornographic film because it has clues on a missing person's case or in finding a human trafficking ring.

He approach the other from a position of an equal.

Does this mean that the only masculine displays of bravado that can work must come from police officers or club owners who actually have the authority to stand up to people? Aren't most "defending my wife/family/etc." displays of bravado coming from a position as an equal? The result he describes makes it clear that the other guy backed down by the display of dominance. Does that not demonstrate the authority behind it? I'm confused by this point.

Question I always had about Christianity (but every pastor/priest is too bluepillled to answer)

1 upvotes · 19 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Show me a single "scientific" study that even mentions female fitness tests

The response, I'm sure, is, "There aren't any because that's something you all made up. Women don't really do that." Early on, I had that exact same objection when first feeling all this out (i.e. first week). So, I asked my sisters. Both of them affirmed, "Oh yeah, women do this all the time. I love it when my husband tells me no. I often ask him for things not because I want it but because I want to know that he's not just a pushover."

Now, I wouldn't encourage what I did. But when even the women don't deny this ([r/redpillwomen](#), for example), that's quite telling.

Question I always had about Christianity (but every pastor/priest is too bluepillled to answer)

1 upvotes · 19 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I get that. It's just interesting when literature is endorsed, but then people are condemned for agreeing with certain aspects of it. The same thing happened when I once tried to reference MMSLP's entire chapter on why it's important to have a balance of beta traits mixed in with the alpha. I get what the objectors were saying now - and I agree. But it's still causing a lot of unnecessary confusion, and a passage like this isn't mere confusion - it's straight objection. And that's fine too. We all pick and choose what we take out of what we read. But it's annoying when you're told, "Read this book," and then when you cite that book for some of your beliefs you're ridiculed with: "Obviously you shouldn't have believed that part of the book," when there's no source telling you which parts to reject and which to keep. Know what I mean?

I don't run into this a ton anymore because I think I have a pretty good grasp about what RP rejects and accepts from each book by now. But I can go through most books on the sidebar and point to things in each of those books that the MRP community (especially the hard cores) would blatantly reject. This tells me that the foundation is less about the sidebar literature and more about the preferences of the endorsed contributors. The sidebar just gets people most of the right information to make the final tweaks easier for the endorsed contributors.

111 - "As I Say" v. "As I Do" and the Polygamy/Hypergamy Divide

1 upvotes · 19 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

teenaged girls tend to prefer ... teenaged boys

This effect *does* shrink drastically when people hit 18, though, and they're (1) not going to risk getting a guy jailed for statutory rape, and (2) out in the real world where they have to start thinking about the long-term implications of who they're with on their lives.

If they're going to college, this might delay things for a while because of the sheer inexperience to older men and over-exposure to others of the same age. But once you're out of the education system, that's when we see people really quit the whole "date the same age" thing as a general priority and women really do start looking for older men.

111 - "As I Say" v. "As I Do" and the Polygamy/Hypergamy Divide

1 upvotes · 19 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I couldn't agree more. Emphasis on the word "generally," though. There are exceptions. It's just impossible to discern the genuine article from the one who's gotten really good at crafting the sob story.

What is going on in the head of Christians that give BP marriage advice?

1 upvotes · 19 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Well said.

Defining RP for this sub - and understanding the toolbox

1 upvotes · 19 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I look forward to hearing about it :)

Question I always had about Christianity (but every pastor/priest is too bluepilled to answer)

1 upvotes · 19 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Ah, different person then.

Question I always had about Christianity (but every pastor/priest is too bluepilled to answer)

1 upvotes · 19 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

So, why is there an MRP in the first place, then? What distinguishes MRP from TRP?

Question I always had about Christianity (but every pastor/priest is too bluepilled to answer)

1 upvotes · 18 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

We've asked them to stay, as a big part of it is the guys fear of divorce

This aspect makes sense.

I still get the impression it ends up being TRP advice, but from what I gather, the hard-core position is that "MRP" doesn't exist anyway - it's all just "RP" and if a person happens to be married, they should live as if they're not. Maybe I'm misunderstanding that, though.

Question I always had about Christianity (but every pastor/priest is too bluepilled to answer)

1 upvotes · 18 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Three hips and a hoorah for truth here!

Literally only 1 has been divorced after unplugging and that was at the very beginning with a BPD wife.

True, but if he's who I'm thinking of, he hasn't been married since either, and is currently a single guy giving advice on MRP. Not that I have anything against him - I very much enjoy our conversations. But it's TRP advice on MRP, not MRP advice.

Working on the Sidebar

1 upvotes · 18 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Good points on this. Consider it removed. I read the book the week before my wedding, 9+ years ago - and I remember it being very helpful, as someone who had never had sex before. I didn't recall any truly beta stuff when I put it up there, but reading your excerpts, I'm inclined to agree.

Any podcasts similar to this sub?

1 upvotes · 18 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

That's not a bad idea. I used to have a youtube video series I posted on Facebook for faith-based issues, including a lot of stuff on dating and marriage. Haven't thought about doing that since joining the manosphere.

Thanks for sharing your podcast too! I know this was a great resource early on. I'll have to add that to the newly updated sidebar.

Question I always had about Christianity (but every pastor/priest is too bluepilled to answer)

1 upvotes · 17 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Yeah, the 12 levels of leadership ... was such a joke that I don't expect any real science to come out of there. That said, I am curious about what the place develops into, and if you or I can have a hand in molding it into something actually mildly productive, I say go for it!

To that end, I planned to cross-post my post on RPC from last night over there as a means of reigning in some of the emotional outburst into an appropriate context of what the whole thing is all about. I just didn't want it to get lost in the flood of posts that popped up yesterday.

Feel free to utilize anything I've said in your post, if it's helpful.

Deconditioning the wife who is disgusted at your touch - 10 Levels of Kino

1 upvotes · 13 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

There has to be a name for this?

Not sure about a name, but it's certainly not a new phenomenon. I was first exposed when reading an article about denominational lifecycles in the church. It goes something like this:

1. **Visionary** - The process starts with a man with a vision that's deeply true and impactful.
2. **Growth** - As the man lives his vision, other people flock to it and want to learn, so the vision spreads.
3. **Organization** - At some point, to keep the vision from being tainted at the fringe edges of that growth (think of playing telephone on a mass scale), leaders must rise up to oversee the growth and expansion of the vision, implementing rules and structure to keep the vision progressing under its original purpose.
4. **Institutionalization** - Those leaders inevitably always get on a power trip and start caring more about the organization as an institution than they do about the vision itself. The rules become more important than the result. Getting more people in the door becomes a higher priority than staying true to the original purpose.
5. **Death and Reincarnation** - People get so fed up with the rules, power struggles, bureaucracy, etc. that eventually the institution loses its power over the people. A new man with a vision (whether the same or slightly different) rises up and starts the cycle all over again.

I fear MRP is on the cusp of shifting from organization to institutionalization, if it hasn't fully done so already. If something doesn't change, that will mean death at some point and we'll see the next wave of RPer's will start something else. In fact, I'm pretty sure this is how TRP separated from reddit to birth the RP movement in the first place.

Deconditioning the wife who is disgusted at your touch - 10 Levels of Kino

1 upvotes · 13 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Good question - short answer is no. If I did, we'd be having that conversation too often that it'd just get old or annoying. Shortly after reading some of the comments in that post I had that conversation with my wife and simply said, "You don't want to hear about every woman who gives me a look and I don't want to feel like we have to have some big conversation every time that happens. You're just going to have to trust me." That was the end of it. Of course, the "trust me" line was still a rookie mistake back then. But more recent events having

nothing to do with us have shaken that trust anyway. So, props for other people creating dread for me without me having to compromise my own values in the process.

Deconditioning the wife who is disgusted at your touch - 10 Levels of Kino

1 upvotes · 13 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Haha, I totally get the rejection of Christianity - especially coming from a Catholic origin. You do you. This isn't a forum for evangelism of that stuff anyway.

But I do note the similarities in the frustration between religious teaching and dogma and RP teachings and dogma. It'll probably get him banned, but /u/ruizbujc just wrote an interesting piece on point [in this comment here](#) - and I couldn't agree more, quite honestly. I think the mods have found a happy comfort-zone with what they've already learned and the notion that someone else other than them could come up with new ideas that are also helpful and useful threatens their security and power, so they have to fight against it. "If it's not within our core, pre-approved dogma, it's anti-RP. No exceptions. Nothing new is allowed."

I'll look forward to reading your post and seeing the replies it gets ;)

Deconditioning the wife who is disgusted at your touch - 10 Levels of Kino

1 upvotes · 13 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Well, I'm still in the beginning phases of this, but I have noticed that what you did is an effective strategy. In fact, MMSLP even talks about it. Don't reject sexual initiation by your wife (otherwise you're psychologically conditioning her just never to initiate and to see sex as a source of frustration - the very heart behind this post). But if sex is bad, it's perfectly fine to walk away if you're not enjoying it. This affirms your approval of her initiations, but also shows her that she has to start raising the bar to keep you interested.

Like I said, I'm just starting down this road, but I do see some progress already. It's just going to be a long, long haul. I'm okay with that and find enjoyment in the journey. Apparently most everyone else would say I shouldn't enjoy the journey, I should just divorce her and want sex with someone else instead where there is no journey. Screw them.

Deconditioning the wife who is disgusted at your touch - 10 Levels of Kino

1 upvotes · 13 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Level 9 = overcoming tests and LMR.

Deconditioning the wife who is disgusted at your touch - 10 Levels of Kino

1 upvotes · 13 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

What I would like to see is in this post is the change in internal game and frame too

That's a good point - but I already get enough heat for how long I write as-is. Trying to add even more just wouldn't fly. My thought-process, though, is more that things like "internal game and frame" get enough attention here that people should already have that "internal point of origin" and this is more directed toward guys who have a unique situation in their marriages. Remember, I began the post with acknowledging that it isn't for everyone - only a targeted group. So, when people outside that target group complain about the post, screw them.

Deconditioning the wife who is disgusted at your touch - 10 Levels of Kino

1 upvotes · 13 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

You have to remember, I was beta as heck when she said that. I didn't know what I know now.

Even if objectively that's not true, it sows doubt in her mind.

This I like, and that makes a lot of sense to me.

Deconditioning the wife who is disgusted at your touch - 10 Levels of Kino

1 upvotes · 13 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

"I want you" is unattractive

SGM seems to say otherwise, as it encourages talking in the bedroom. MMSLP makes the same recommendation as well. The "E" component of the DEVI system really encourages this type of emotional word-play. I do agree that words are not a substitute for action, but they can be a nice supplement in the right context.

Deconditioning the wife who is disgusted at your touch - 10 Levels of Kino

1 upvotes · 13 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Beautiful story. Thanks for sharing!

My problem for most of my marriage was a little different. There has been maybe 5 times in my 9-year marriage where my wife did not cum during sex. I know how to work her body - but I was so beta that I put all my effort into making her happy thinking that she'd return the favor and that return never came. Literally, she'd climax then say, "Okay, now hurry up and get yours done," and there'd be no edging, no experimenting, no trying for multiples. It was just, "I'm done, I don't care about you. Get it over with."

Sadly, like a true "Nice Guy" my solution wasn't to change what I was doing to get what I wanted - it was to try even harder at what I was already doing. So, I experimented with different ways of increasing her pleasure and making her orgasms better and better. It worked ... for her. Squat for me. RP turned that around by introducing me to the concept of "caveman sex" and ignoring her orgasm, which I previously thought was a horrible idea and would never work. Whadda ya know ... it works.

Deconditioning the wife who is disgusted at your touch - 10 Levels of Kino

1 upvotes · 13 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I see what you're saying - but the lack of any suggested "field guide" results in the countless men we see going rambo. They see a general "strategy" and assume they know what that means, but without clear direction they implement it wrong. Then the community beats up on them: "Why did you do it that way? Didn't you know what we mean when we said general things but never explained to you how any of it looks in practice?" This seems counter-productive.

As I often say in other spheres I frequent - I provide templates, not a finished product. Templates are meant to be modified and tweaked, as [/u/cistemd](#) suggested would help with a post like this.

this post is 100% in your wife's frame

I can see where this would come off that way - but that's because many men spent most of their marriages inside their wife's frame with hammers, nails, welding tools, and an assortment of wood and metals, bolstering it like crazy. RP's primary strategy is to step out of her frame, bolster your own frame, and then clash your frames against each other repeatedly until one or the other breaks - and hope it's hers. For most women, this works.

When genuine psychological disorders develop, though, no amount of frame-clashing is going to break that. It's impossible because even if she wanted her frame to break, she doesn't know how to. Result = sure path to divorce. RP is simply not designed or effective at curing mental illness. But curing this specific type of mental illness ("targeted sensory defensiveness," which falls under the umbrella of sensory processing disorders) *can* be

addressed within an RP framework. It simply involves deconstructing your wife's frame systematically rather than trying to beat it again and again against your own frame. So, you put up those boards and welded that metal plating on - now it's time to get the hammer and blowtorch to take them off. Once she has a normal frame like everyone else, commence with the frame-clashing the good old fashioned way.

I'm just amazed from past observation as well that MRP tends to deny the existence of psychological disorders affecting female sexuality. Or if they don't deny it, their solution is "Next! Divorce! Start over on easy mode!" rather than figuring out how to win the game on hard mode.

Deconditioning the wife who is disgusted at your touch - 10 Levels of Kino

1 upvotes · 13 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

The post isn't about fixing her - it's about undoing the mess that I caused. Early in my relationship, my wife loved my touch. Shortly after marriage that changed and she hated my touch. That wasn't a spontaneous change totally within herself - that was learned behavior that I had caused due to my beta tendencies.

This post is about undoing my own mess - but strategically rather than just plowing ahead with actions that would cause a main event and come off as going rambo. We talk about a 1,000 foot rope for a reason. This is one example of how to reel that rope in gradually rather than giving her whiplash.

Deconditioning the wife who is disgusted at your touch - 10 Levels of Kino

1 upvotes · 13 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I agree that it needs work. But I can only share what's worked for me. I realize that formulas are not universal in relationships and sex.

Let's hear more about how your wife reacted then? I can't imagine you had this all planned out and it all went down perfectly ... Basically I'd like to see more lab notes.

True, I had hovered between levels 1-4 at different times throughout my marriage, testing what worked and what didn't and what caused her to start recoiling again. After a couple years of toying around with those 4 levels and finally figuring out what worked and what didn't and that certain things should be done in proper sequence, that's when I (1) went monk mode for 3 months to do a hard reset on the system so past failures wouldn't affect the new incarnation of the cycle, (2) correctly ordered the 4 levels I had been working on, and then (3) strategically theorized levels 5-10.

My wife's reaction during that "toying around" phase was mixed. I ended up confusing her more than anything. Remember, I wasn't thinking of any of it as a plan - I was just trying different ways of engaging in touching her that would be a positive experience. So, I started with a handsy 10 second kiss and she rejected it and I gave up. Then I would try casual touching and skipping back to the handsy 10 second kiss right away and she'd accept the light touching, but still reject the kiss, often saying so verbally and about how she doesn't like passionate kisses. So I'd keep the light touching and mix separate, then do a no-hands 10-second kiss and she had a more positive response, but still recoiled at that kiss. Over repeated testing like this for 2-ish years I finally figured out that I needed to be intentional about what I was doing and not just trying for the sake of doing whatever I wanted - and I was also overweight during much of this time, which obviously didn't help.

Long story short, after monk-mode and some meditation, that's when I started fitting the pieces together, developed the game-plan for after the first 4 levels, and started losing weight. Level 1 really did take 2 weeks. It helped that for Christmas I bought a calendar-book and on the day I was working through some of this the question of the day pointed me to the fact that she liked laying on the couch with me rubbing her head. So, I started with that and saw quick positive reaction, which opened the door to other light and expected degrees of touching.

Level 2 took 2 weeks predominantly because I didn't want to rush things - the mistake I had made before. Level 3 really took me 1 week before I added peripheral touching, but I probably should have been more cautious. Level 4 was also only 1 week for me, but again, for the sake of others it's safer to be cautious. Level 5 is where I hit the first major bits of backlash (also the first "theory" stage that wasn't based on historical experience) and it confused the heck out of her that I would be overtly sexual at inappropriate times. At first she thought I was initiating and would verbalize that and I'd just respond, "I'm about to leave, do you really think I'm trying to have sex with you right now?" and then finish with a 10-second kiss. Then when I'd get home later, she would initiate that night. I accepted happily, but would initiate without a smile. She initiated 2 times in the week that level 5 went on.

Level 6 was weird. We did have company over once during the 2 weeks this happened, but outside of that I would try to engage a little while out on a walk in an isolated place (but where we could still technically have been caught) or in the mini-hallway to the restrooms at our mall while waiting on our kids to go potty. This may have been a 1-week thing, but I was still working up the courage to initiate actual sex and waiting for a convenient, opportune time when the chances of experiencing LMR or a fitness test were minimal (hadn't discovered RP at that time). Level 7 was probably more nerve-racking for me just because it had been so long since I'd actually initiated sex itself, but for her she was already expecting that initiation. Level 8 was really just filler I added into the post because I realized part-way through writing this that if a guy really is bad at sex, that's going to work against him. This level didn't actually take any time, as I already knew my wife well enough to know what works once the process starts - getting it to start was always the problem. Level 9 was where RP helped the most due to learning how to pass tests and understanding LMR. You could say I'm still in level 9 and never fully graduated to level 10 (I think I even alluded to that in my original post), but it felt weird writing only 9 levels and I've seen enough RP stories to know that level 10 does actually exist - and I've seen small indications of level 10 in my marriage as well (the "hands down her pants ... at a dark theater" thing was a real example).

So, those are my lab notes. Feel free to ask if you want more detail on any particular part.

so I just decided to go monk and shoot for daily cuddle time instead. It's like you're talking about she expected the constant push for sex. So you have to reprogram that. Both her expectations and your own processing of rejection.

Exactly!

I also get the red pill view on this, just go find a woman who doesn't have baggage with you ... TRP will just blow through 10 women to find one that's ready

That just seems like too much of a cop-out to me. It screams, "Not AWALT. RP only works on RP-responsive women. Go find an RP responsive woman if you want RP to work." And if that's the case, then for the non-RP-responsive women, we'd be better off encouraging their men to avoid RP-tactics. Maybe they respond to beta behaviors and we should encourage those men to be more beta, right? See how quickly RP praxeology breaks down when the "Next! Divorce!" prescription is doled out so quickly?

If RP really does work and AW really ALT, then why take the easy way out? After all, what's the point of saying MRP is "hard mode" if we're still just giving the easy "Next! Divorce!" answer? That's the easy answer. It makes me think that the folks over at TRP really aren't truly RP at all - or at least position themselves in such a way that they can't ever prove their RP-ness, whereas the MRPs have the real stories to prove RP works. TRP brags, "My girl wouldn't do this, so I found someone else and it's been great." You haven't proved RP works there, you've only proved that it worked on someone else - and there's no guarantee that RP is what caused it to work with the new girl because maybe the new one is responding to something else unique about you, right? MRP says, "My woman used to hate me, now she can't get enough of me" - and that proves RP works and that the man truly is RP and that RP is what turned things around rather than some other unique factor inherent when changing

relationships.

Sometimes I wonder if it would be good if we had more of a wiki type thing where we can develop/edit/workshop and multi-author things.

I would love that. Not sure how that would be feasible, though - or if there'd be enough consensus to make something like that work.

Deconditioning the wife who is disgusted at your touch - 10 Levels of Kino

1 upvotes · 13 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Agreed, and I think I addressed that [here](#).

Deconditioning the wife who is disgusted at your touch - 10 Levels of Kino

1 upvotes · 13 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I agree. Specifically as to the last part, you're right that lifting communicated a lot. But this isn't the first time I've been physically fit in the relationship, and one of those 6 month sexless streaks happened while I was around 10% BF and benching 205 ... When I realized that being in shape wasn't enough to make her want me I gave up on my body and just blamed the problem on her rather than trying to address my other passive beta problems because I didn't know RP back then. I just knew that a tight body alone wasn't enough.

Deconditioning the wife who is disgusted at your touch - 10 Levels of Kino

1 upvotes · 13 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Indeed.

Deconditioning the wife who is disgusted at your touch - 10 Levels of Kino

1 upvotes · 13 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

True, true ... but this sub does say to use your wife as a sparring dummy under the notion that if you can get it to work on her, you're ready for whoever may be next, if you still want to move onto the next at that point.

Deconditioning the wife who is disgusted at your touch - 10 Levels of Kino

1 upvotes · 13 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

at TRP we are very likely to blame the woman at least as much as the man, it takes two to tango

I totally agree. We'd be fools to believe women didn't partially (sometimes even mostly) contribute to the problems. But I think MRP's point, to which I also agree wholeheartedly, is that we can't always fix the woman. So, if a man desires to be with a certain woman - whatever his reason - all he can do is work on himself until that goal becomes attainable, or otherwise give up on the goal. Blaming it on the woman, although often leading to accurate truths, is not necessarily useful. MRP is more about utility than theory, from what I understand. Also, where TRP's focus is exclusively improving one's sex life and nothing else, MRP's focus seems to be more on helping men get what they want out of life with a focus on sexual desires. This is a subtle distinction, but an important one nonetheless. In either regard, I still believe my post is directed at helping men get the sex they want with the woman they want to have that sex with. If someone else wants to come along and tell them to stop wanting sex with her - that he should really want to have sex with someone else, that's legit advice too, as long as each person gets to make up his own mind at the end of the day what he really wants. If he wants his wife, he'd do well to listen to me. If he just wants good sex regardless of who with, he'd probably do better to listen to you and ignore me.

pimp hand approach to relationships (his term, not mine)

Haha, what does that even mean? It has a nice ring to it, I'll admit.

So why the fuck is your wife saying "no" ever?

I think there is some confusion about the timeline of this thread. I started this whole process before discovering RP, but after starting my transformation - and continued the process into RP, which helped me refine some of the later stages and be more intentional about it. At this point, I'm not getting any hard nos, and I'm only getting the soft no about 10-15% of the time. My other post from last week-ish (where I was admittedly hamstering pretty hard) wasn't about her response to my initiation - it was about me wishing she would initiate in stronger ways than she does.

The "saying 'no' ever" thing is probably because she's still out on that 1,000-foot rope and being reigned in. I've been improving for about a year, but only discovered RP in June - so about 4 months ago. /u/BluePillProfessor recommends 1 month for every year of marriage, so I've still got 5 months to go before I can expect that rope to be fully shortened. But in the narrow time-frame that I've been RP-aware, I'm pretty darn impressed at how fast I've seen changes compared to the way other guys talk on here ... so that's a positive. That doesn't mean I won't still need those other 5 months to get things fully in order, though.

Maybe some of this is totally her fault?

Absolutely. And I've droned about that more on RPC than I do here. Why? Because blaming the woman isn't as welcome here (accusations of victim-puking rather than OYS and taking responsibility), but I mod RPC, so I can get away with what I want ;) Her main problem is having been raised in a ridiculously sexually-repressive environment for her entire life. When we've had "the talk" in my pre-RP days she usually refrained: "You have to remember that my parents only ever taught me two things about sex: (1) It's evil before marriage, and (2) It hurts a lot." That was her childhood through early adulthood - and she's quick to note, "Because I was unmarried for 22 years, the 'it's evil' part was the only thing that really applied for most of my life." That's why some of this psychological conditioning and deconditioning is fairly necessary - particularly for other men whose wives were raised in similar bubbles.

maybe she needs a genuine taste of dread but you can't give her that because you have been upfront from day one that divorce is not an option

Heh, a recent situation at our church is helping me out on that. One of the well-known self-righteous church girls who had impressed all the church leadership just came out with some serious, serious garbage. My wife's response was to shift it to me and wonder, "Am I going to find out stuff like this about you sometime soon too?" *Maybe. You never know.* <Wink, wink>

She knows where I stand on things, but that doesn't mean I have to remind her or reaffirm them all the time. So, if her hamster wants to create dread for me, I'm not going to stop it. Of course, this all just happened within the last 2 days, so let's see how this plays out in the coming weeks.

Unless you are lying about your progress (I do not think you have lied about anything) she should be acting better.

Not lying, and I agree - she should be acting better. As you say, she has her own hangups that affect all this. It's become an entertaining challenge. Amused mastery has made the relationship something of a game that's fun for me rather than the way I used to want to beat my head into a wall - especially now that I'm seeing the game actually can be won.

Maybe it is time for you to put divorce back into your thought processes, even if you just do it as a mental experiment

I have contemplated drafting up legal separation papers and have them ready for when some nasty tests come out ... just to see what she'd do.

Maybe you should start fantasising about plowing hotties, flirt with waitresses, catch and release

I do get IOIs. I typically try to stop conversations just shy of getting the number, although that's happened a couple times as well. But I've only ever found this valuable in developing the abundance mentality, which comes pretty naturally for me anyway. So, I've started to lose interest in that sort of stuff.

Once you get those surges of testosterone, and that legitimate and reasonable desire to have a hottie fuck you because she is overcome with lust and appreciation you will change inside. Your wife will smell it and she will respond.

That happened for about the first 2 months of my RP journey - that urge was there. Somehow I got bored with it. I'll have to revisit that concept, no doubt.

Deconditioning the wife who is disgusted at your touch - 10 Levels of Kino

1 upvotes · 13 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

That he does!

Deconditioning the wife who is disgusted at your touch - 10 Levels of Kino

1 upvotes · 13 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Great point there too. Sometimes it's hard to remember all the basics once I've moved on to the next idea - hence the need for constantly refreshing. I know I need to do the cut diet at some point ... it's just a matter of *when* and that's based on the most beneficial time.

Deconditioning the wife who is disgusted at your touch - 10 Levels of Kino

1 upvotes · 13 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Hmm ... Good point. It was always one of those short term goals in lifting to keep me motivated - get ready for being shirtless all weekend instead of being the embarrassed fat tard. My original goal was actually 275 bench before cutting (see the RPC post I linked to above) and I've passed that ... can't remember when I upped it to 300 or why. It might have had to do with a conversation from a user named chadthundercock or something, but I really can't remember.

More to the point, I hadn't really processed why that trip was a motivator for me other than not wanting to be embarrassed. Now that I'm well past that point, I'll have to think about why I still care. Thanks for the tip!

How would you convince your wife to be a stay at home mother?

1 upvotes · 12 October 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

OP deleted the account, so I can't reply to him, but when I saw the title question, my brain instantly re-interpreted it as:

- *How can I convince my wife to tie me down, steal my clothes, spread my cheeks, and let me submit to divorce rape anytime she wants?*

I get that some guys want a wife who doesn't contribute financially to the relationship, but seriously ... if you're

begging to get raped, don't complain when it actually happens. A working wife is a woman who doesn't need support. The more she makes, the less she needs. It's literally that easy.

There is only one reason to get married, can you name it?

There are actually three that I know of:

- Tax incentives (which only works if the marriage lasts),
- Giving health insurance benefits to an unemployed person when they're in a bind, and
- Spiritual/religious reasons

Since the first one is a *HUGE* gamble and the second is really a sham marriage, I'll just go with "spiritual reasons" as the only one. But you have me curious ... what's yours?

I do often tell people:

- Without sex, you're really just roommates; sex defines the marriage
- But it's universally agreed that you can have way better sex outside of marriage, so you better have a darn good reason for getting married beyond fantasies about how great sex-after-marriage is

With this duality in mind, marriage itself makes no sense as a secular institution. I don't know why anyone who isn't a Christian or otherwise religious would buy-in.

102 - Desire and the Curse

1 upvotes · 12 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

How does your church leadership address this?

Right now things aren't bad enough to be considered clear defiance or sin. Again, I've seen a lot of progress, though there's still a long way to go. So, if I described how I have things right now, church leaders would probably say, "You're doing better than most of the rest of us, so what are you complaining about?" But that's because most of the rest of them live in dead bedrooms or sexual frustration but don't have a clue how to get out or what God really intended husbands and wives to be able to experience together.

What if churches instituted a pre-marital program that discussed and outlined male leadership and sexual expectations and have this program be mandatory before all weddings performed? No program completion, no ceremony at the church.

Most churches do this, including the pastor that married us (prior church). He specifically addressed the issue of sexual frequency. My answer was that I'd desire it 1-2 times a day, but would have grace in being realistic about time. Her response was that she thought 3-4 times a week was reasonable. After we were married, it became more like once a week for the first year. Years 2-8 became more like once every month or two with three long stretches of nothing: 7 months, 9 months, and 18 months (during the 18 month streak I had stopped initiating after 12 months). Long story short, 3-4 times a week never happened. In our entire marriage there has been 2 weeks when we hit 3 times and both of those were when we were trying to get pregnant.

So, the premarital counseling did nothing. Reminding her of the premarital counseling was actually more of a setback than a help. For her it's easier to say, "Things have changed" than "I'm at peace with breaking my commitments."

Has any one considered a biblical marriage class for already married couples?

I'm in the process of starting one for men only. There have been seminars done at my church, but they're mostly geared only toward married couples who have special needs children and to address the stresses that puts on the marriage.

During the month of February would be an ideal time

Why's that? Valentines Day? Or because most people do squat during winter? :p

sexual assignments as part of it

Not a bad idea.

This is an area that I think would benefit from female teachers teaching other women.

About a month ago I was talking to my wife about men's conferences at church and how we always end up talking about marriage issues and how to be better husbands and all the issues surrounding that. She was shocked. She said, "I've been a Christian all my life and have gone to women's conferences for as long as I can remember and I've never heard women talk about those things. We never even bring up the concept of marriage or being a godly wife. It's just about dealing with our own lives and issues." I asked, "Have you ever heard a church teaching on how to be a godly wife or how to love your husband?" She said, "Well, it's maybe come up once or twice in Bible studies, but only for one week and then we move on. It's never given much thought or attention. Isn't it weird to talk publicly about your marriage? I don't think women could handle that." I asked, "You mean your sex life?" She said, "That too, but even just your marriage in general."

What I gathered out of that conversation is: (1) Christian women are fairly self-centered, giving little attention to their role in the marriage; (2) Christian women are too embarrassed to seek help from each other when things aren't going well; (3) Christian women assume that every other Christian woman has a great, perfect marriage because nobody talks about marital problems or teaches that they should be doing things they're not.

Even when she has gone to studies specifically directed toward relationship issues, she says they predominantly focus on how to deal internally with the struggles - never on how to externally engage with your spouse in a different way. She's never once (even through Beth Moore or other popular female teacher studies) heard the topic of improving marital sex life come up, and it's extremely rare that even the relational dynamic itself is addressed. She did say that on occasion you'll hear the phrases "respect your husband" or "submit to your husband," but that there is absolutely no explanation or *how to* on those matters and certainly no application or accountability suggested.

Tossing out some ideas

They're good ideas. But good luck finding a woman with the balls to break the mold and lead something like that ... since women don't have balls and all ;) Seriously, though, even some of the stronger, more empowered women in my church would shy away from that - and usually those are the most denying women anyway. So, the ones who would have the strength to lead the conversation are the same ones who have no business telling other women how to be submissive or run their sex lives. It's a perfect mess from the female vantage point.

That's not to say the male perspective is any better. The advice at men's conferences is 90%: "Do more chores and she'll see what a great guy you are and want to screw you" and 10% "Be a leader, but make sure that whatever her input is you're giving that more weight than your own desires. So, lead, but lead in a way that serves her interests." Result? Men get burned out and end up resenting their wives because they give, give, give, and give and end up never getting their own desires met. This is the life of the church man. I've had 4 conversations in the

last week alone with different men where I've found out that this exact pattern is what's going on - and I've seen it countless times before. I call it "fake leadership." You're a figure-head leader, but someone else is really the one calling all the shots; you just have to take responsibility for their decisions both in execution and taking the blame when things go wrong.

102 - Desire and the Curse

1 upvotes · 12 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Not sure what you meant by that. I usually describe myself as a liberal Christian

Sorry, I'm confused ... earlier today in the 111 thread you said, "I'm not a Christian and I have given up on it." My only implication in the statement was just that being on a Christian forum implies a baseline presumption that spiritual aspects of life exist.

What I posted about my husband and marriage is the truth

I never doubted it :)

I'm sorry but I don't believe a wife should deny sex. She forfeited her body the very second she said I Do.

You don't have to apologize to me. I agree with you! But that doesn't change the fact that countless women use sex as a manipulative effort in relationships, or otherwise are selfish enough that they don't care about what their spouse wants. Of course, men are this way too, but it's often expressed very, very differently. Due to the biblical circumstances surrounding the curse and the fall, men in marriages, on the whole, tend to be very passive-aggressive, allowing their frustrations and rebellion to fester until it explodes (whether violently or civilly through divorce with no hope of reconciliation, or cheating, etc.). Women are more direct: they just tell you what they want or don't want and expect you to live up to that. For most Christian men, the notion of doing that back to their wives is inconceivable. Literally, they have not conceived of the possibility that they act this way back to their wives, which is ironically what it takes to lead a household.

Long story short, when a woman becomes sexually denying in a marriage, as wrong as that may be (and this is the majority situation), the solution is, as you say: "that marriage works best under male leadership in accordance to Scripture." But men need someone to tell them how to lead. The church isn't going to tell them (at least not any church I've ever attended, except maybe one). RP figured it out on their own apart from the Bible. I figured it out on my own from the Bible about a year before discovering RP (a little less), but it took RP to help pull things together rather than the countless strands that I'd learned, but not yet connected.

If your wife treats you this way when you gain weight, what happens if you have a medical condition that causes weightgain?

In her mind, she would just stop having sex and feel no remorse. It would be my problem to deal with, not hers. Occasionally, for my sake, she might (and I quote) "take care of [my] needs" as quickly as possible just so she can check the "fulfill wifely duties" box off of her list and feel like she's a great spouse for it (this is how things used to be). But she's the type who could go the rest of her life without ever having sex and be happier than if she had to put any effort into having a sex life, even if she enjoyed the sex. In short, I do believe that she greatly enjoys sex, but to her there are a million other things she'd rather spend her time on, and sleep is one of them. The effort it takes to have sex (including overcoming the psychological history she has on the subject) outweighs the benefits.

What happens when you are 60 and she decides her sexual attraction cuts off at 57?

As one of her friends once said, "Isn't there an age where you can just stop having sex? What is that age? Can we look forward to that?" I'm guessing she'd have a similar attitude. Granted, her long-term upbringing notwithstanding, I've also trained her to believe that our sex-life is a source of stress and frustration, as it was pretty horrible for the first 8+ years of our marriage and involved a lot of hurt and pain from denying each other - her denying me because "I just don't feel like it" and me denying her because "If you really feel like you have to, I could be okay with having sex today" is a real boner-killer. Result? 8 years of psychological conditioning that initiating sex = rejection = emotional pain, therefore sex = emotional pain, despite there being physical pleasure. About a year ago I adopted a policy that I'd never reject her again, no matter how horrible the initiation. Hasn't helped yet ...

Sexual denial is an act of abuse, especially in a Christian marriage.

I agree. She sees it as her prerogative to decide what she does and doesn't want to do at any given time, and with my passive, non-existent leadership, I all but enacted that as law in our household. That started changing about a year ago, and I've noticed significant improvements in that time ... but, as you know from much of our previous conversations, there's still a long way to go.

Is she going to stop having sex and deny what was implied in her vows?

To reference an adage: "Women are the gatekeepers of sex, men are the gatekeepers of commitment." In her mind, the marriage vows were only about commitment. They had nothing to do with sex or promises of how much sex there would be or how good it would be. Even so, post-marriage I've reminded her that before I proposed, when I saw that there were potential physical intimacy issues from her upbringing, we had addressed the issue and she promised point blank: "No, it's just that we're not married yet. I have to be reserved because if I let go, we'll end up sinning. But after marriage, I'll be going wild and jumping all over you. I promise. Can you trust me on this?" Like an idiot, I did. Her response a few years ago when I last brought that up: "I thought marriage would change things - make me more free. I was wrong. Oh well. I'm allowed to be wrong."

102 - Desire and the Curse

1 upvotes · 12 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I agree that RP is not a perfect model. More than anything, it can really only account for biological impulses, but fails to address the spiritual truths behind how the world operates. Although you're not a Christian, that's a truth I will hold as self-evident on this forum.

I do agree that there are many examples of people who tend to break the RP mold. The traditional RP response is, "There are always exceptions and outliers. RP is only meant to describe the majority of people under the bell curve." This "outlier" explanation can account for some situations like what you've described, but not all of them. You are right in that some people just have unique tastes and they can go for whatever suits them. The African American community seems to be very interested in big butts - a trait that most middle-class white men don't care for. Some men like petite-chested women, while others large. Some men like the nerdy, casual look and others like the classy, made-up look. RP doesn't demand everyone like the same type of appearance in the opposite gender (which is why RP denies that 10s exist - a person only becomes a 10 by taste). It only says, "Regardless of what you like, here are some principles about how to attract whoever it is you're trying to attract." The woman who prefers an obese man over a physically fit man is truly the outlier. So, RP can only cater toward the majority.

Studies that support its views are valid but other studies casting a shadow on their views are critiqued to death so they can be discounted.

I'm not sure of an organization in the world that doesn't do this ;)

If you look at the majority of people most are average looking. The Brad Pitts and supermodels are the exceptions and not the rule to how attractive most of humanity is. And it really doesn't matter in the scheme of human mating and pair bonding.

I agree as to the average. But in reality, someone like Brad Pitt is only considered good looking because of his celebrity status. Likewise, Angelina really isn't as gorgeous as she's credited for being - it's just because she's a celebrity, so there's social pressure to assume she's desirable. Movies give us social cues to say, "These really high value people are desired by other high-valued people - don't you wish you were high enough value to get them too?" But if they had never become movie stars and you just saw them casually in the bar, you'd think, "Yeah, 8 or 9," but not see them as standing out from the rest of the world.

But in the grand scheme of human mating and pair bonding, I do believe looks play a significant role. The sheer quantity of examples where looks matter is simply overwhelming, and the fact that people tend to pair off in their own SMV range is very telling about this as well.

111 - "As I Say" v. "As I Do" and the Polygamy/Hypergamy Divide

1 upvotes · 12 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

It's an interesting theory, but it only makes sense in modern society where the state actually takes an interest in protecting the underdogs (the liberal agenda). Most other societies throughout history had no problem just letting people die who couldn't support themselves. Throughout most biblical times, the Israelites were one of the few exceptions. There was a 10% tithe to the Levites (i.e. the priests), but another 10% that was expected to be given as alms to the poor, given that there was no form of social security put in place at a governmental level. Apart from a mandate by God, the world throughout most of history has basically said, "Let 'em die."

111 - "As I Say" v. "As I Do" and the Polygamy/Hypergamy Divide

1 upvotes · 12 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

True, true. And I didn't mean God made a mistake. I was implying it may have been intentional.

111 - "As I Say" v. "As I Do" and the Polygamy/Hypergamy Divide

1 upvotes · 11 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

That's definitely unique. You're certainly an outlier, if this is true - although the question must be asked if this is all true because you're attracted to him specifically or if it's because of your own independent ability to desire and enjoy sex for its own sake?

I know when I weighed 265 my wife specifically told me, "You're too fat. I'm not attracted to you, so don't expect me to want to have sex with you." This is more consistent with the norm.

Since no one has asked (and even in RP threads the question is often left in limbo for volunteered information rather than requested) ... How is your sex life? Is he physically attracted to you? What's the context? Were you always this way or is it just since you married? How long have you been married? Etc. I'd love to hear your full story.

111 - "As I Say" v. "As I Do" and the Polygamy/Hypergamy Divide

1 upvotes · 11 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I don't believe hypergamy is as prevalent as it seems

I do believe it's a real thing, but there are other factors that influence decision-making processes, so it's not always

expressed as actively as the general RP world would have people believe.

I have seen more women "trade down" than up

I get this, but that's usually because a woman sees all the flaws in her husband (lowering her value) while still being enamored by the mental image she has puffed up of the new guy (raising his value), so her perception of the actual situation is skewed ... until a few years into the second marriage when she realizes the "new guy" has lots of flaws as well.

No one really knows what goes on behind the scenes of a marriage. All we have are second-hand accounts, some accurate and others slanted.

Totally agreed here.

Most of my friends from back in the day were never after Chad and are currently long-term married to men most would consider beta. In fact, I believe most people stay within their social class when entering into marriage.

I'm not sure how you're connecting these two statements?

Also, I get the impression that women stay with beta guys because at some point they choose between sexual attraction and life comfort. Within the church, I can say confidently that the overwhelming majority of beta men do not have sexually healthy marriages. I'd limit this to my own observations of the church, but the fact that MRP exists tells me that this extends to the secular realm as well. See 102, the "Man v. Stuff" section for more info here.

Most of the women I know are committed to their marriages and have been through thick and thin with their spouses. Most of the men I know are upright and honest and keep their vows.

Remember that RP is not just a general relationship dynamic, but one specifically focused on sexual strategy and attraction issues. So, I don't deny that these marriages exist, but you've mentioned nothing of the raw sexual passion that these couples are experiencing for one another. In the church realm, I know that passion is conspicuously absent. They eventually give up on sex, exchanging it for some other ideology, claiming a nobler purpose as their driving force in remaining committed. So, while RP acknowledges that these relationships exist, it doesn't care about how long the relationship lasts, but whether the couples are sexually satisfied in these relationships. The answer is usually a resounding no, unless the couple has just given up on sex and chosen to remove its absence as a source of dissatisfaction (i.e. making themselves numb to the issue).

But truthfully, how many good guys and girls have been passed over because they were not worldly enough? Or didn't score a high enough SMV?

That depends on what you mean by "good." I've known guys who are truly wonderful people internally, but are 350lb slobs with mustard stains on their shirts who complain about how girls only care about looks. I've also known obese women who shrill at any man who makes any expectations of her complain, "Where have all the good men gone?" As you noted: "most people stay within their social class when entering into marriage." So, high value men will find high value woman, and the low value will find the low value. Accordingly, if someone "didn't score a high enough SMV," it makes sense that they're going to be passed over by others of higher SMV. Remember, RP is descriptive of how the world works. It makes no claim on how the world *should be*, it only says *how it is*.

So now the person dates and marries his/her 8 or 9 and totally ignores the good person or good Christian

(since this is a RPC thread) and the marriage blows up. So who's fault is it really when you chose flash over substance?

In the Christian realm, RMV is equally as important as SMV - or possibly even more so. This probably deserves a post of its own soon. Because male-branch RP is focused on the sexual aspects, SMV gets talked about a lot more. But look at the female-branches and you'll see more conversations about RMV, as that whole "relational commitment" thing is a higher priority for the RP woman. Simply put, this sub doesn't have enough women to sustain those conversations as a dominant force - but that doesn't mean they shouldn't be happening. That said, although RMV is highly important to how Christians should vet potential spouses, the lower divorce rates among genuine, active Christians demonstrates that they're already doing a fairly decent job at the RMV evaluation anyway - it's the SMV issue that's holding them back and causing the dissatisfaction.

And, maybe when it comes to marriage it should be acknowledged that both sexes are lacking what it takes for the gold standard of lifetime monogamy.

Secular RP would deny that this is a gold standard in the first place. Even from a Christian vantage point, Jesus and Paul would suggest that permanent, voluntary celibacy is actually the gold standard and that marriage is a sub-par aim. That said, for those who do get married, the Bible is clear that lifetime monogamy is not only the gold standard: it's the only standard.

But this is the Internet and no one gets on a forum to talk about how great things are. All you hear are the bad stories. So everyone walks away a little more jaded than they entered.

Completely agreed! Even when the good stories are shared, I fear they are often exaggerated to impress a community of men who get off on hearing about how great things could be. They'll talk about their *one amazing night*, but neglect to mention the other several weeks before and after where nothing like that happened. If I talked about all my great moments, I'm sure I could make my sex-life sound uncannily impressive as well. Or if I only talked about the horrors, I'm sure I could justify my negative feelings to a community that desperately wants to feel validated in its common pain.

111 - "As I Say" v. "As I Do" and the Polygamy/Hypergamy Divide

1 upvotes · 11 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

If a woman successfully 'swings' to a higher-ranking male, it's probable her children will continue to be provided for within the family circle, either by her new or former partner.

Looking at it from a purely female-centric perspective, this makes sense. But look at all the stats on children who don't have an active relationship with their father. It's overwhelming how detrimental this is to children. Most women prefer to avoid remarriage so they can continue collecting alimony, and only remarry after the alimony duration ends. In the meantime, they're still getting financially supported by the new guy as well - but the court's can't take this into consideration because "cohabitation" laws have a standard that is incredibly hard to meet (/u/Whitified and /u/BluepillProfessor - this is one set of laws that I will absolutely affirm is 100% screwed up). So, you have a woman who's supported by two different men simultaneously, oftentimes with her own income as well, whereas the birth father simply cannot provide what her 3-incomes can, which affects the relationship, which has a negative impact on the children.

So, yes, in a technical sense, the base needs of the child are being met, but psychological needs are being crippled by the way support functions in these branch-swinging scenarios. Society hasn't picked up on the psychological implications of this yet, although some recent publications are getting more attention.

Allowing men multiple wives (or allowing them to be serially monogamous) is more risky. It is more likely

to create 'orphans' and 'widows' (either literally or figuratively) who then become a burden upon the community.

One would think, but (as much as I disagree with everything about them) Mormonism paints a different picture of the viability of polygamy. I'm not endorsing polygamy as something society should permit. Again, as I think I noted in my post, my solution is not to relax marriage standards to meet the male's biological imperative either - which is equally as sinful as branch swinging. Rather, it's to restore the heightened commitment between marital partners that existed in the days of old, like 1867 when there was only a 3% divorce rate. By 1900 it had only risen to 7%.

If society's true aim is the benefit of the children, as you suggest, then the solution is to incentivise people to try to work through marital problems rather than incentivise them to abandon marriages and leave children as the product of broken homes.

Looking for resources on modern ways to walk into Christian marriage without the state involved. Are there any foolproof ways?

1 upvotes · 11 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

You may be right. My perspective is limited to my own state, although statistically my state is one of the worst with regard to support allocation numbers (we're one of the few who will actually do a 50/50 split of marital income for alimony purposes).

That said, the swing-back started around 2005, which is about that 10 year mark you were talking about.

- 5,000 BC - 1969 => marriage laws predominantly favored the man
- 1969 - 2005 => marriage laws predominantly favored the woman
- 2005 - present => marriage laws have become more impartial and the primary discrepancies now exist from judicial discretion rather than the actual laws and statutes

Looking for resources on modern ways to walk into Christian marriage without the state involved. Are there any foolproof ways?

1 upvotes · 11 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

You know, or should know, that the State FIERCELY pursues men and puts them in jail for being late on support while the State does NOT pursue women and almost NO woman is EVER put in jail for nonpayment.

That depends on the state. I've certainly had women incarcerated for this. Also, my own father is something like \$120,000 behind on support payments from when my parents divorced and he has never gone to jail for this. In reality, the direction of "women get 90% of awards" is predominantly because men generally earn more than women. If men want to have the advantage in the economic arena, there's a price that comes with that. I'm not saying it's right, but from a secular worldview I can't say it's wrong either.

You know this is true and you know that women are almost never denied licenses under the exact same circumstances.

I will readily acknowledge that it is rarer to see women given such harsh treatment under identical circumstances, though it does happen. That said, in my county it's pretty rare for anyone to get to the point of license suspension, much less jail, in the first place. You have to have at least 3 contempts issued against you before they'll even consider suspending your license, and by that point, if a person is really that defiant, I really can't blame the

system for escalating measures, although, as you note, it's obviously counter-productive. It's like the parable of the unmerciful servant, where the guy is put in jail until he pays back every penny. Knowing he can't earn any money while in prison, it'll never happen, so he's stuck forever. Jesus is literally describing the guy going to hell, and our legal system puts people in the same conundrum. That said, I've used the *fear of jail* as a powerful motivator to get both men and women to pay support, so I guess there's some value to it.

Also, I should note that the questions you quoted were not to say that "unfairness" and "sexism" doesn't exist in these things - I was simply asking him to point out with specificity where the law itself is to blame, as opposed to general allegations. I can't have a conversation on generalities based on a few anecdotes when the specifics don't line up. Anecdotes tend to be outliers, not the norm.

Are you even serious with this question or are you just trying to play Devil's Advocate?

See above. I agree that the bias exists - but it's not a bias from the statutes themselves (or case law ... or if it is from those, that's a nominal part of the problem), it's a bias from beta guy judges who are given too much discretion.

NO Red Pill guy who understands what is happening in this culture thinks that marriage is a good idea. The BEST a man with RP knowledge can say about marriage is...well, it can work. If you hold frame for the rest of your life.

Haha, I daresay even Jesus and Paul agree - as do I. I do like to give Whitified a hard time (it makes for stimulating conversation). But I do also see a biblical compulsion toward marriage, given that most people cannot remain pure outside of marriage. That's why Jesus notes in Matthew 19:11, "Not everyone can accept this, but the one who can should."

Women control everything else and the law, society, all your friends, the church, and all her friends will ALL gang up on you if you try to step out of line.

True, but also check out the recent post by Red-Throwaway12. I have no doubt the church is condemning her hypergamous "stepping out of line" as well. Although the standard certainly tilts strongly one way, it's not exclusively one-sided.

So no, men who are aware of this are not signing up to be married in droves----and guess what!!!!!! More and more men are finding out every day. We have passed the Overton Window already.

And I'm excited about this! I hope men do see the challenges of staying in a marriage. Especially among Christians, this is what's going to get them re-dedicated to their mission in Christ, whereas the beta, feminized church mentality has idolized female-worship marriage as a goal in and of itself, as if that is the chief purpose of the Christian life - to have a great marriage where the wife is happy so your life is happy. Screw that. Turning the focus away from marriage and toward discipleship is key. Incidentally, doing so will solve the marriage problem.

Looking for resources on modern ways to walk into Christian marriage without the state involved. Are there any foolproof ways?

1 upvotes · 11 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Haha, true, true.

304 - Evangelism

1 upvotes · 11 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Too many times people think of making disciples as just being the initial conversion stage with no guidance or follow-up to make sure the new believer is on solid footing to growth.

I call these people spiritual orphans. How do we view people who have a brand new baby, then toss that baby out on the street and say, "There you go, the good people of the world will now raise you." That's disgusting and the baby will probably die or end up with very distorted views of how the world works. When we do this in a spiritual sense, it's disgusting and leads to people's faith dying or otherwise them getting a very distorted view about how the church is meant to operate.

I don't see Christianity remaining the dominant western religion unless the church comes up with a serious mission plan besides getting people to repeat the Sinners Prayer.

That's not pessimism. It's reality. I thought Islam actually already did overtake Christianity as the dominant religion, although that's more due to population growth numbers (Muslims have 3.1 children per woman, Christians have 2.7 and the Christian number is on the decline, Muslims are on the incline, partially due to lower marriage ages than in Christianity).

most churchgoers are in denial about this but time is running out

My pastor actually preaches about this fairly regularly. He tries to use it as a motivational factor for getting people to start spreading their faith, which is a good thing. But when the entire church is absolutely devoid of any actual training on how to get the job done ... the whole thing hits a wall really fast. I've been working toward changing that, but it's very, very tough steering a huge ship as just one man, although I've made more progress than I expected so far, so that's a good thing.

I am also seeing a disturbing trend of dissecting the Bible and various troublesome parts to appease the general masses.

2 Timothy 4:3 - "For the time will come when people will not put up with sound doctrine. Instead, to suit their own desires, they will gather around them a great number of teachers to say what their itching ears want to hear."

Another threat is coming

1 upvotes · 11 October 2017 · /r/askMRP

What's Sivalinga?

Explain to me the problems of Red Pill

1 upvotes · 11 October 2017 · /r/ExRedPill

That would be an over-simplistic view.

I agree.

but let's remember harems and multiple wives were for the wealthy, not the common field hand of the day.

That was my point exactly :)

Explain to me the problems of Red Pill

1 upvotes · 10 October 2017 · /r/ExRedPill

Just say it's no fault since it's in our (male and female) nature to cheat.

My impression is that most flaired people do take this position.

a large portion of people do not cheat. So biological urges can be overcome

Absolutely agreed.

does not take into account that polygamy has been tried throughout the centuries and most of the developed world has abandoned it

True, but RP would say that this abandonment is due to the feminist imperative, not evolutionary development.

a party can't claim higher ground when they are engaging in the same behaviors as the offending party

Unless they believe they're genuinely different from the other party. If monkeys could talk, he could rightly say, "I'm allowed to throw my poop at you, but you're a human. You'd better not do that." And then you'd be hit in the head with dung. Or God might say, "I'm God. I'm allowed to judge everyone. But you all, you'd better not do that."

<https://therationalmale.com/2012/09/10/men-in-love/>

I follow. I don't agree with everything Rollo says, obviously. But I do get that the RP view is that men are capable of love and chivalry in a way that's unique to them. I'll have to take a closer look at this one, not sure if it's one I've read or not.

It seems that as people entered some of the focus and intelligent, in-depth discussions became STFU, side bar and lift.

That's part of the reason I haven't been reading and posting in MRP as much. I get the mantra, but it's old hat and not particularly helpful. Then, if I try to give an in-depth response, it just provokes arguments of, "Who are you to write so much? Get off your high horse. You're not as smart as you think" and all that. No good deed goes unpunished :/

And, no I won't post this on RPC because of Whitfield.

Honestly, that guy frustrates me to no end. I understand his viewpoint, I just think it's extremist and ridiculous and offers no practical solutions. It's certainly not aligned with biblical manliness and gender roles. Oh well. Either way, I understand your reluctance.

Explain to me the problems of Red Pill

1 upvotes · 10 October 2017 · /r/ExRedPill

I agree. As noted in my comment, I'm 100% anti-cheating. That said, from a historical perspective, there really are many cultures that held nothing against it. Granted, those cultures are viewed today as barbaric savages. So, if RP wants to endorse that type of behavior, they can't separate that from modern civility. That is, much of how we define a "civilized" society inherently involves concepts that originated from a feminist imperative and gynocentric tendencies. We cannot uproot all incarnations of gynocentrism without having to uproot everything else that defines a civil culture as well, at which point we'd be starting from scratch. Simply put, that's too much work for a culture to deal with and the number of men who actually would care to do the work doesn't cut it to effectuate any real change.

Explain to me the problems of Red Pill

1 upvotes · 10 October 2017 · /r/ExRedPill

This is a conversation probably more ripe to have in RPC than this forum (read as: make a post about that, as long as you can ignore whatever whitified says, as this would really set him off). That said, my own views notwithstanding, here's my understanding of the RP view ...

FIRST - RP says men and women are different, so they believe it's okay to treat each differently. Specifically, they believe that it's in our biology that men are polygamous and women are hypergamous. They recite phrases like, *women would rather share an alpha guy than have a beta to themselves*. So, in their minds, it's a biological prerogative that men should be okay with cheating and women should be faithful *if they are already in a relationship with the highest value man in their life*. Therefore, the notion that men can have multiple partners, but women should stick to one is acceptable to them. Obviously I disagree with this, as well as disagreeing with the premise of cheating in the first place.

SECOND - Most RP men include as an add-on to the hypergamy/polygamy biology divide a biological imperative for gene diversification, which means that even women will become polygamous over time. They use this to explain why relationship excitement tends to die down after a year or two post-ceremony. One user in particular (88Will88) gave the example: if a woman manages to pin down and marry Dwayne Johnson (The Rock), she's still likely to get flutters and possibly cheat if isolated with Channing Tatum, regardless of whether or not Channing Tatum's SMV is nominally higher or lower than Dwayne's. The RP point in this (and as I have seen said repeatedly): "Don't fault a woman for cheating; she's just being a woman" and "She's not your woman, it's just your turn." These types of statements are RP's way of saying, "Yes, women are cheaters. AWALT. But accept and deal with it. Don't condemn them for it." I do believe that this type of behavior is inherent in both men and women, although I believe it comes from our sin nature, not a biological imperative for genetic diversification (maybe that's there too, I make no opinion on that).

THIRD - They would argue that, historically, when any society legalized polygamy (which was most), it was virtually always the men with multiple wives and never the women with multiple husbands. From a purely observational standpoint (not interpretive), even the Bible follows this pattern. To that end, "plate spinning" for men makes sense from a historical perspective, but not for women. They key distinction here (which is another place where I disagree with the traditional RP prescriptive view) is that in polygamous cultures, the men were still obligated for the care of their first wives and there were usually fairly heavy restrictions on a man's ability to avoid that obligation (i.e. divorce was not as easy as it is today). It's also worth noting that in most polygamous societies throughout history, it was only the elite who were actually polygamous. The common man couldn't afford two wives and two sets of children. Only the rich could. So, if RP were to take the historical view (as many inconsistently claim to), they would have to: (1) accept that male polygamy is mostly directed at adding-on women, not substituting them, (2) that they would still have to be financially obligated to women when there is no fault of theirs in the termination of the relationship, and (3) that men should be discouraged from engaging in any polygamous acts if they cannot financially support all of their previous sexual partners plus the additional prospect. The conclusion behind all of this is that in modern society polygamy is fairly untenable for everyone but celebrities, who are pretty much polygamous anyway.

- The interesting thing to note here is that RP complains about no-fault divorce laws as being a horrendous evil that gave women all the power by making divorce easier. Yet at the same time, these same men want to have the ability to divorce their wives easier with fewer/no consequences. This is the true contradiction.

FOURTH - When you say, "RP is a praxeology not religion," there is a deep, deep, deep divide in the RP community. Some do believe it is only a praxeology (i.e. descriptive understanding of human behavior). Others believe it is a prescriptive way of life. Still others believe it's some blend. For example, if someone fully swallows the red pill and buys into all of the praxeology, but chooses for his own independent reasons that he wants to be a lazy fat guy with no purpose in life ... they'll say that guy isn't really "RP" because he hasn't bought into the prescriptive elements. They view this similarly as the way we Christians view faith in Jesus. "If you really believe

this, it would compel you to live differently. The faith defines it, but the faith is not genuine if there are no actions to prove it." But back to your point: they would more likely argue that RP is amoral (as opposed to immoral). They'd treat it like a hammer. A hammer is not evil, but a bad person can use it to kill people. In that sense, there are no moral loopholes. They make no judgment on whether or not cheating is wrong - they simply show you how to foster attraction. If you direct that attraction toward someone who is married or who isn't your own spouse, they say that's your own business - and they do extend that same courtesy toward women. "AWALT," they say. But they also endorse AMALT, it just doesn't get talked about as often.

FIFTH - When you say, "do as I say but not as I do," you're right that they say this. But they would chalk it up to men and women being different. It's hard to use a non-degrading example because as humans we believe we are the epitome of sentient life. But it's like a man training a dog - he will tell the dog what to do, but not expect the dog to live like a human man. Therefore, "do as I say, not as I do." Or if mankind created artificial intelligence. Androids would be our superior in most ways, yet everyone would agree that androids would be created for a specific purpose and should function within that purpose, not trying to live as humans or become human. Or if there were aliens that landed on earth. We could say, "Do this to be a better alien of your kind," while still living by human standards themselves. These are all examples where "DAISNAID" makes perfect sense. Because RP truly believes men and women are different (and I agree), "DAISNAID" can be applied in many circumstances, although I don't believe to the degree that they attempt to use it.

- To note on this point, from a Christian perspective, God specifically gave Christian men a dual role here, I believe for the purpose of limiting this "DAISNAID" mentality that would inevitably develop. Specifically, whenever a husband tells his wife to live a certain way, the husband must be prepared to live that exact same way with regard to his relationship with Christ as the bride of Christ. If he tells his wife to be submissive, is he submissive toward Christ? If so, the phrase becomes: "Do as I do." If he tells her not to cheat, does he whore himself out to worldly idols? If not, he's better off saying, "Do as I do." If he wants his wife to engage in frequent reproductive acts, is he engaging in spiritual reproduction with Christ through the Spirit? If so, "Do as I do." To this end, husbands must lead their wives by modeling for them what a good bride looks like. We simply do this in a spiritual sense and not in a physical one. In the physical sense, men should be the dominant leaders, but in a spiritual sense, we must fully embrace the role of the submissive with Christ. This is something that the RP community will never understand - and it is also why there can never be any true argument that the dominant/submissive or leader/helper dynamic makes one gender inferior to the other. Indeed, we are spiritually inferior to God, who never plays the submissive (although Jesus modeled even that, but more as a child than as a spouse), but because men and women both have contexts in which we are meant to be submissive in a spiritual sense, at a spiritual level neither one is superior over the other, there is only a role difference. In a physical sense, that is the only arena where one could claim a genuine equality disparity, but even then, as [/u/AstuteBlackMan](#) of this thread noted in his reply to me, both men and women are equally necessary for society to function, including beyond mere reproduction.

Explain to me the problems of Red Pill

1 upvotes · 10 October 2017 · [/r/ExRedPill](#)

It sounds to me like you're in the same camp I'm in - you agree with the *descriptive* elements of RP, but disagree with the *prescriptive*. That is, RP seems to understand correctly how the world operates, and you find value in that - but when it comes to the advice on what people should do with that knowledge, you pave your own way. Sometimes it makes sense, like lifting, dressing better, flirting with your spouse, being a strong leader, etc. Other times it's stuff that can be rejected, like plating, negging, treating women like they're inferior, etc.

Anytime someone comes on this sub asking questions about why they're against RP, it's always the same response: "What does RP give that you can't get anywhere else?" The same question could be asked about any other mentality. There's nothing new under the sun. All we're doing is rearranging old ideas into more useful patterns. To that end, nothing in RP is "new" - but it does pull together useful ideas in a way that cannot be found

anywhere else.

To clarify, if you're having trouble with your wife, you might find a marriage counselor who can explain how to develop an "amused mastery" (a common psychological concept by several different names) so that you don't get so worked up over small problems. But that counselor may not be familiar with developing an abundance mentality (another common psychological concept), although the counselor down the street might know about this one. Counselors are also pretty ignorant about things like personal hygiene, fitness, style, etc., so if you don't happen to bump into a life coach or personal trainer, you're not going to figure out how to do those things. Oh, and none of these people are going to understand the more intellectual backdroppings of socio-political movements, gynocentrism, covert matriarchies, etc., so you'd have to stumble across the right books to figure that stuff out.

In reality, there's even more useful information out there that RP hasn't yet discovered either - and some of what they've discovered is bogus. But that doesn't mean you throw the baby out with the bathwater. Take what's good and leave the rest. If being on RP was the only thing that motivated you to get to the gym in the past 5 years, the fact that someone else in the world might have been able to motivate you doesn't change the fact that in the absence of RP you may never have found that person or realized the importance of finding that person. So, "You can get all the good stuff somewhere else" isn't really helpful when "somewhere else" isn't knocking at your door saying, "Here I am! Now you know where to find me!"

To be clear, I'm in the same boat as you. I reject all the derogatory stuff against women. I reject ideas like "treat women like they're nothing more than sex toys" or "if she's not responding to you, just divorce her" and all that other garbage. I started a sub ([r/RPChristians](#)) specifically to invite the moralizing component into the conversation - to get the good stuff without the negative prescriptive aspects. MRP ([r/marriedredpill](#)) also has a much, much healthier view (although still has some serious problems).

For more information in the "RP" view of gender equality, [This Thread](#) was very, very interesting. It's not the "screw women, they're the scum of the earth" attitude that this sub would have you think RP believes. My guess is that most people on this sub are people who were on RP for a little while, saw a bunch of ignorant surface-level comments without getting into the meat of the material, and then decided to boycott it because they couldn't discern between the non-RP-hater-wannabes and the real deal.

Explain to me the problems of Red Pill

1 upvotes · 10 October 2017 · [/r/ExRedPill](#)

It sounds to me like you're in the same camp I'm in - you agree with the *descriptive* elements of RP, but disagree with the *prescriptive*. That is, RP seems to understand correctly how the world operates, and you find value in that - but when it comes to the advice on what people should do with that knowledge, you pave your own way. Sometimes it makes sense, like lifting, dressing better, flirting with your spouse, being a strong leader, etc. Other times it's stuff that can be rejected, like plating, negging, treating women like they're inferior, etc.

Anytime someone comes on this sub asking questions about why they're against RP, it's always the same response: "What does RP give that you can't get anywhere else?" The same question could be asked about any other mentality. There's nothing new under the sun. All we're doing is rearranging old ideas into more useful patterns. To that end, nothing in RP is "new" - but it does pull together useful ideas in a way that cannot be found anywhere else.

To clarify, if you're having trouble with your wife, you might find a marriage counselor who can explain how to develop an "amused mastery" (a common psychological concept by several different names) so that you don't get so worked up over small problems. But that counselor may not be familiar with developing an abundance mentality (another common psychological concept), although the counselor down the street might know about this one. Counselors are also pretty ignorant about things like personal hygiene, fitness, style, etc., so if you don't happen to bump into a life coach or personal trainer, you're not going to figure out how to do those things. Oh,

and none of these people are going to understand the more intellectual backdroppings of socio-political movements, gynocentrism, covert matriarchies, etc., so you'd have to stumble across the right books to figure that stuff out.

In reality, there's even more useful information out there that RP hasn't yet discovered either - and some of what they've discovered is bogus. But that doesn't mean you throw the baby out with the bathwater. Take what's good and leave the rest. If being on RP was the only thing that motivated you to get to the gym in the past 5 years, the fact that someone else in the world might have been able to motivate you doesn't change the fact that in the absence of RP you may never have found that person or realized the importance of finding that person. So, "You can get all the good stuff somewhere else" isn't really helpful when "somewhere else" isn't knocking at your door saying, "Here I am! Now you know where to find me!"

To be clear, I'm in the same boat as you. I reject all the derogatory stuff against women. I reject ideas like "treat women like they're nothing more than sex toys" or "if she's not responding to you, just divorce her" and all that other garbage. I started a sub ([r/RPChristians](#)) specifically to invite the moralizing component into the conversation - to get the good stuff without the negative prescriptive aspects. MRP ([r/marriedredpill](#)) also has a much, much healthier view (although still has some serious problems).

For more information in the "RP" view of gender equality, [This Thread](#) was very, very interesting. It's not the "screw women, they're the scum of the earth" attitude that this sub would have you think RP believes. My guess is that most people on this sub are people who were on RP for a little while, saw a bunch of ignorant surface-level comments without getting into the meat of the material, and then decided to boycott it because they couldn't discern between the non-RP-hater-wannabes and the real deal.

Explain to me the problems of Red Pill

1 upvotes · 10 October 2017 · [/r/ExRedPill](#)

It sounds to me like you're in the same camp I'm in - you agree with the *descriptive* elements of RP, but disagree with the *prescriptive*. That is, RP seems to understand correctly how the world operates, and you find value in that - but when it comes to the advice on what people should do with that knowledge, you pave your own way. Sometimes it makes sense, like lifting, dressing better, flirting with your spouse, being a strong leader, etc. Other times it's stuff that can be rejected, like plating, negging, treating women like they're inferior, etc.

Anytime someone comes on this sub asking questions about why they're against RP, it's always the same response: "What does RP give that you can't get anywhere else?" The same question could be asked about any other mentality. There's nothing new under the sun. All we're doing is rearranging old ideas into more useful patterns. To that end, nothing in RP is "new" - but it does pull together useful ideas in a way that cannot be found anywhere else.

To clarify, if you're having trouble with your wife, you might find a marriage counselor who can explain how to develop an "amused mastery" (a common psychological concept by several different names) so that you don't get so worked up over small problems. But that counselor may not be familiar with developing an abundance mentality (another common psychological concept), although the counselor down the street might know about this one. Counselors are also pretty ignorant about things like personal hygiene, fitness, style, etc., so if you don't happen to bump into a life coach or personal trainer, you're not going to figure out how to do those things. Oh, and none of these people are going to understand the more intellectual backdroppings of socio-political movements, gynocentrism, covert matriarchies, etc., so you'd have to stumble across the right books to figure that stuff out.

In reality, there's even more useful information out there that RP hasn't yet discovered either - and some of what they've discovered is bogus. But that doesn't mean you throw the baby out with the bathwater. Take what's good and leave the rest. If being on RP was the only thing that motivated you to get to the gym in the past 5 years, the fact that someone else in the world might have been able to motivate you doesn't change the fact that in the

absence of RP you may never have found that person or realized the importance of finding that person. So, "You can get all the good stuff somewhere else" isn't really helpful when "somewhere else" isn't knocking at your door saying, "Here I am! Now you know where to find me!"

To be clear, I'm in the same boat as you. I reject all the derogatory stuff against women. I reject ideas like "treat women like they're nothing more than sex toys" or "if she's not responding to you, just divorce her" and all that other garbage. I started a sub ([r/RPChristians](#)) specifically to invite the moralizing component into the conversation - to get the good stuff without the negative prescriptive aspects. MRP ([r/marriedredpill](#)) also has a much, much healthier view (although still has some serious problems).

For more information in the "RP" view of gender equality, [This Thread](#) was very, very interesting. It's not the "screw women, they're the scum of the earth" attitude that this sub would have you think RP believes. My guess is that most people on this sub are people who were on RP for a little while, saw a bunch of ignorant surface-level comments without getting into the meat of the material, and then decided to boycott it because they couldn't discern between the non-RP-hater-wannabes and the real deal.

Sleeping Naked

1 upvotes · 7 October 2017 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

I do that too. And every now and then I'll overhead my wife too ;)

We now have flair!

1 upvotes · 6 October 2017 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Just changed it to green. See if that's better.

Looking for resources on modern ways to walk into Christian marriage without the state involved. Are there any foolproof ways?

1 upvotes · 5 October 2017 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

She wasn't lying - just reporting what the kids told her. I agree the true overhaul isn't likely to happen anytime soon.

Sleeping Naked

1 upvotes · 5 October 2017 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

haha

Sleeping Naked

1 upvotes · 5 October 2017 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

The sexually repressed religious types certainly do. If her mind has been blown, though, she sometimes will lay around for 15 minutes before washing up.

Sleeping Naked

1 upvotes · 5 October 2017 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

Touche ... totally missed that.

Wife hates that I push intimacy at random times

1 upvotes · 5 October 2017 · [/r/askMRP](#)

Am I still too newbie to do this?

Yes, but (contrary to popular opinion here, I'll give you the benefit of the doubt) I get the impression that although your game needs improvement her saying she's "uncomfortable" is a good sign. It means she's recognizing the changes without you having to tell her, "Hey, did you notice all the things I'm doing differently?"

The fact that she's still denying you, despite these verbal interactions, is a test. You're asking, not telling. You're talking, not doing. She wants to see how bad you want it. Despite what feminism will tell you, wives (specifically, not necessarily women, generally) want you to overcome their LMR. They want to know that they're so freaking desirable that you'll plow through any obstacle because you *have to have them right then and there*. When she says, "You're making me uncomfortable" and you back down, she's thinking (maybe even subconsciously), "Okay, I can still tame him," and then she gets slightly disappointed that you're not so consumed with lust for her that you screw her on the couch right then and there anyway.

I can't tell if I'm losing my frame, since I'm not sure if my responses are good enough.

They're not, and yes - you're losing frame. You're letting her control when you have sex with her. You're letting her be the judge of whether or not your lines are working - and if they're not working, you give up and walk away.

Notice she hasn't given you a hard no yet. If she does, then stop. But, "You're making me uncomfortable" isn't the same as, "Stop. I'm serious, this is not the time." If you walk away to a soft no, that tells her you can be beaten by soft things. Do you want to be the guy who whimpers at pillows or who can stand toe to toe with a brick wall? Don't be an idiot. Don't punch a brick wall. But make her become a brick before teaching her that you're scared of pillows.

Should I keep this rate of sexual tension/suggestion up?

Once you've started, don't backtrack unless you see it start to cripple the relationship itself. Just don't increase or escalate it until you've got the game, frame, and physique to back it up.

She hates it (at least verbally)

Haha, those are all tests. She wants to feel uncomfortable. Comfortable is boring. Women hate boring. Trust me - I was the most comfortable, boring person you could imagine for a long, long time. There's a whole class of personality disorder dedicated solely to women who take this basic impulse to the extreme: histrionic. These girls will literally stab you with a knife just to start some drama and get you to yell at them - because discomfort and negative emotion are better than comfort and/or no emotion. Now, your wife doesn't strike me as histrionic, but AWALT to some extent. My wife scores insanely low on histrionic scales, but when I come home and say, "I had some office drama today" or "I have a bit of gossip for you," her head turns like a dog smelling the postman. Literally, it's funny to watch her physical reaction to those words. And although she doesn't do it intentionally, she's starting drama all the time over stupid things with other people - just because she needs *something* uncomfortable to make her feel like she's living her life. Comfort = going through the motions. Stability = boring. Women say they want this, but they really don't. Don't trust her.

Part of me feels like I need to continue to DGAF, and go after what I want when I want it.

I think you mean DNGAF, but I wouldn't escalate any further until you're ready.

Is this something worth addressing?

1 upvotes · 5 October 2017 · /r/askMRP

This.

The infamous MIL ...

1 upvotes · 5 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

True, true. I'm convinced.

Looking for resources on modern ways to walk into Christian marriage without the state involved. Are there any foolproof ways?

1 upvotes · 5 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Which of the above is of the least importance?

If you're the prize, why settle?

Calling men who doesn't wanna lose money through divorce as "that into money" is disingenuous btw.

It's not disingenuous. I've had countless men tell me that minimizing their monetary losses is their highest priority, even over child-related issues. But I agree I was probably over-generalizing.

How "fool-proof" exactly can it be then? In the US?

It depends on what you're trying to accomplish. You can never pre-nup custody or visitation issues or child support. Everything else is fair game. Spousal support is harder to pre-nup away if the attorney isn't competent with how to do it. He'll just put in some clause, "Neither party shall ever have to pay support to the other" or something like that and it's too broad and will be struck down. But on the whole, everything apart from custody and child support can be addressed.

rendering all pre-nups invalid

Dang, that sucks. I accept that this *could* happen. But again, we can't be living our lives in fear of what might one day occur. Jesus promised the world would spiral down into chaos. Let's accept that and do the best with today.

Don't you think you telling these men to get a legal marriage is dangerous, under these circumstances?

Absolutely. I never tell people, "Just get married. Screw planning for the future. You can worry about that later." I give them information on how to do it correctly to mitigate most of those circumstances. Again, that's literally my job to do that.

more likely to meet legal professionals/etc who disagree with you there. And isn't that what you're looking for? ;)

Nah, I'm not really looking for a debate, but I don't shy away when one finds me. I respond when people ask questions. If a conversation starts, I engage :)

Looking for resources on modern ways to walk into Christian marriage without the state involved. Are there any foolproof ways?

1 upvotes · 5 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Interesting, I usually say TRP doesn't count. That place is usually full of wannabes who give garbage advice that sounds alpha but is really, as MRP would call it, "autistic." The mentality there is also one that lends itself to the belief that RP strategy only works on RP receptive women. If the woman isn't receptive, you just next her - divorce or otherwise. Although MRP has this issue too, it at least understands that nexting is only going to get you in the same mess again if you don't fix yourself first - and if you fix yourself you might save the relationship as a

byproduct. In that sense, TRP is counterproductive toward creating RP men, whereas MRP only works if that's the aim. Playing the game on easy mode isn't going to toughen anyone up.

Looking for resources on modern ways to walk into Christian marriage without the state involved. Are there any foolproof ways?

1 upvotes · 5 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

the only way a man can be safe from divorce rape, is if he marries a woman with similar earnings

No, there are other ways too, like a well-crafted prenup. But this is the easiest and most fool-proof one. And if the guy is that into money in the first place, wouldn't he be happier with a money-producing woman than a non-money-producing one?

and that if any couple insists on the wife being a homemaker then the guy will have no choice but to pay all sorts of \$\$\$ under different labels to his ex-wife in the event of divorce

It really depends on a variety of factors. If they get divorced after only 4 or 5 years, he probably won't owe her any alimony. If it's more like 9 or 10 years, he'll pay alimony for a couple years, but still have his whole life if alimony-free earnings ahead of him. If it's 14-15 years, he might pay 5 years of support. It really doesn't get bad until he hits 23+ years, when indefinite support gets put on the table. Most guys can get past 5 years of support and not be financially crippled, especially compared to how she'll be at the end of those 5 years. So, as long as the relationship is 15 years or less, you're fine - and if she's going to divorce you, it usually happens by then. Most of the longer marriages I see dissolving are the ones that are initiated by the men - not necessarily that the men are technically the first ones to file, but because they'll move out, they'll cheat, they'll stop paying to meet basic living needs for their wives, etc.

Women are, indeed, branch swingers. But if you can manage to get her to stop branch swinging for 15 years, the odds of her swinging go way, way, way down.

But my point of this comment is to highlight the fact that when RP and the MRA talk about spousal support as some crippling thing, they're often leaving the duration aspect of it out. I've had people (IRL) complain to me, "The Judge is making me pay \$3,000/mo in spousal support! Isn't that ridiculous? I only earn \$150,000/yr." I ask for how long. "1 year." *Dude, you got of easy.*

We now have flair!

1 upvotes · 5 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Red = Married Man

Purple = Married Woman

Blue = Single Man

Pink = Single Woman

Other than that color coding, you can write in whatever text you want, but preferably an identification of your faith, age, and number of years married. This gives immediate context for responding to people.

If people start lying or abusing self-created flair, I'll have to remove the ability to self-create and just start assigning flair to people.

Looking for resources on modern ways to walk into Christian marriage without the state involved. Are there any foolproof ways?

1 upvotes · 5 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

What is spiritual marriage?

A biblical oneness bond before God that cannot be broken by any human act, which only terminates upon death of one or the other. Divorce before a human governing court has no impact on God's perception of the spiritual union and does nothing to sever the spiritual union.

Can you link me to resources on reading about that, what states it is valid in, and what the differences are from legal marriage?

It's not a legal concept, which would invoke the laws of the state. It's a spiritual/theological concept that invokes God's laws. As Christians, we're free from the constraints of the law. So, despite the Catholic view that remarriage after divorce is a mortal sin that condemns people to hell, the majority of Protestants who do accept the theological concept of spiritual marriages as distinct from civil marriages agree that if you do get remarried after divorce, it's technically sin - but a sin that can be forgiven. The primary purpose of engaging in such sin is if the sins you would commit by remaining single would outweigh the harm done by remarriage. In such a case, both options are sin, but because the Christian is weak in faith and lacks self-control, he is better off choosing the lesser of the two sins, which is often to remarry. But to do so disqualifies the Christian from serving in positions of leadership because he can no longer meet the "husband of one wife" requirement in 1 Timothy 3:2, given that he is spiritually married to both his ex-wife and his second wife, despite only being governmentally/civily married to the second wife.

If that is a real option I want to look into it more and be more well-grounded in my understanding of it

I think the idea you're looking for is simply to get a pastor to declare you and your girl "married" without ever actually filing anything with the state. If you take advantage of governmental benefits of being married (i.e. file your taxes jointly), then the law will consider your failure to file a marriage certificate as a mistake and still deem you married, or some states may still deem you to be common-law married simply for calling yourselves husband and wife and living together. So, don't think you can ever fully avoid state laws. But by engaging in a spiritual union while ignoring legal, civil marriage is probably your best bet for what you want to accomplish. But good luck finding a woman who is willing to bear the risks associated with that - unless she's the higher-earner, in which case you're the one bearing the risk. What you're essentially telling her when you propose something like this is: "I want to marry you right now, but I also want to be able to divorce you on a whim without any negative consequences if I change my mind about it later" or "I want to have so much power and control over you that if you ever leave me I can leave you destitute with nothing to your name." From a legal perspective, that's what "legally single, spiritually married" translates to for lesser-earning women.

You're better off entering into traditional marriage with a prenup that protects as many of your rights as possible. Just make sure you get a good attorney because 90% of prenups I review for people are garbage and really don't protect any rights at all - attorneys just use a form template and tell their clients it helps when it's only solidifying the rights the state would give each of you anyway.

Sidenote: thank you for explaining things through the eyes of a real attorney - it is providing me more hope for the future and I know that it isn't wise to live in fear of a hypothetical boogeyman that may never come.

In my personal experience, I have only ever had 2 cases where a judge made a really horrendous decision against my client's interests, and both cases were when I was representing the woman and the man won. The only times I have had men who really got screwed by the system were during *ex parte* or temporary order issues, which were cleared up at the final hearing and my client ended up getting his goals met anyway. This has happened probably 7 or 8 times in the 7 years I've been practicing predominantly in divorce/family/custody law. I will admit, for the

6-9 months that those temporary orders are in place, life truly sucks.

I'll also acknowledge that I've heard several horror stories of anti-men cases from other attorneys, where the guys just seem to get screwed - so I'm not saying this doesn't happen. But I'm more inclined to see this as an attorney issue, not a "the system is out to get men" issue. Why? Because if I can have such a great success rate representing men, it's not the law that's screwed up - it's that these men are hiring garbage attorneys who don't know how to represent their cases. Incidentally, most of the attorneys I hear these horror stories from are attorneys who have a reputation for being sleaze balls. I'd love to share names and websites to show you what I mean, but that would probably get me (1) doxxed and (2) sued for libel and defamation. Simply put: *NEVER ever* trust an attorney that claims to be a "men's rights advocate."

Also remember that when you read about horror stories, don't warp your mind into thinking that's the norm. Nobody goes online and says, "I had a pretty normal situation. I think everyone in this online community should know exactly how normal situations play out." They only have that attitude about extreme situations, so you only hear the extreme stories.

Looking for resources on modern ways to walk into Christian marriage without the state involved. Are there any foolproof ways?

1 upvotes · 5 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I haven't read any of his stuff yet, but I believe dalrock's blog is going to be very affirming of your present views. As noted throughout this thread, I suspect dalrock and his contemporaries are exaggerating the seriousness of the problem (not to say the problem doesn't exist at all - it does), but I'll let you decide that for yourself.

If you want a place to live out a male-centric view of marriage, move to a country in the middle-east. If first world comforts are a priority to you more than marriage laws, then weigh your cost-benefit analysis appropriately in deciding where to live.

Looking for resources on modern ways to walk into Christian marriage without the state involved. Are there any foolproof ways?

1 upvotes · 5 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Like any church-going faithful Christian, mostly affected by the Evangelical and the Pietist movements, you do not have the best interests of other parties as your priority

Heh, I assumed God's imperative was the priority of every genuine Christian.

sell marriage and abstinence before marriage at all costs

Nah, I've made it pretty clear that marriage isn't a goal unto itself. I actually usually advise men to remain single if at all humanly possible. But in my understanding of Scripture, there's no middle ground. There's no getting the benefits of being single without the spiritual commitment that comes with it. You're either moving toward marriage or you're committing to avoid intersex physical relationships altogether. Both Jesus and Paul (and myself) recommend the latter as the better option for those who can handle it. But the reality is that in an oversexualized country, very, very, very, very, very, very few men can handle an asexual lifestyle.

for someone who calls himself RP, you sure have a great way of blaming the fruits of feminism on men

RP is about seeing the world for what it is. It's not about hating on women or trying to reinstate the patriarchy - it's about knowing and understanding the truth and living in light of that truth. To deny the role that men have had in giving the women power is to deny the facts. Go ask anyone on TRP or MRP who is to blame for the FI taking over. As everyone refrains: women will always be women, no sense trying to change that; instead, men need to

take responsibility for their own failure to lead. This applies not only in individual relationships, but on a societal level. This is the RP view - not to blame women for taking advantage of men's weaknesses, but to show men how to deal with their failures to take the lead once again.

The laymen just want to know, generally speaking, are the judges biased towards women? Yes or no?

Are cops racist? You can't give a straight "yes" without qualifying your answer and explaining all the circumstances behind it because just saying, "Yes, cops are racist" will inevitably affirm all kinds of false impressions of what that means and how they express their racism or their authority to do so and whether or not there are repercussions or safeguards.

The answer is: yes, on the whole, most cops have a racial bias in how they act, but that this bias does not function the way most people think it does or how the media portrays it. If you just say, "Cops are racist," that statement carries way more baggage than is actually true.

Quoting numbers is an interpretation now?

You didn't just quote them, you use those numbers to create an interpretation of how you think marriage and divorce laws function and then make conclusions about whether or not men should get married.

In fact, I am a FOREIGNER

Haha, yeah, this probably explains a lot of the viewpoint differences.

local law here if u want, and they are blatantly sexist on paper

And to that I would readily cede to your points - you are a greater authority as to your own country's laws than I am, and I know that many countries don't even try to hide the gender bias - some for women and some against. Go live in Jordan or Afghanistan, for example. Men always get custody and women have no property rights beyond the initial dowry paid her prior to the marriage. I had a guy from Jordan actually try to argue in an Ohio court that Ohio had to apply Jordan law because that's where they were married, and therefore, despite his history of drug abuse, domestic violence against both his wife and kids, and despite his wrongful imprisonment of his children (think Harry Potter at the Dursleys, but worse) ... that the court should just bow down to him, give him custody, give him 100% of the property, and only let his wife walk away with the \$5,000 in gold coins he paid to her as a dowry to secure the marriage. If you want laws like that and you don't like your own country's laws, go move to Jordan :) There's a cost to living in a first world country. It's one I'm willing to bear - although I won't stop trying to fight to fix it.

I invite you to share your opinions at Dalrock's or ReturnofKings (ROK). Preferably Dalrock's

I very well might take you up on that :)

As for the spiral of depravity in how our countries are handling things - Jesus only promised things would get worse and worse until the end of days. So, it's hardly unexpected. Perhaps I should take less of a fighting stance and "throw in the towel" as well. Who knows. I do know that things aren't perfect. They're not hell on earth, but they aren't perfect either. Paul tells us that God commissioned the church with the ministry of reconciliation of all things to God. In my sphere of influence, that includes the state of divorce laws in my area. For you it might make more sense to throw in the towel because you're not necessarily someone with any influence to change things ... I don't quite have that luxury. So, I have to be exceptionally knowledgeable and diligent in understanding my local legal culture. If I'm going to make a change, I have to know things *as they are*, not as people are afraid it *might be*. That's all I got :p

Looking for resources on modern ways to walk into Christian marriage without the state involved. Are there any foolproof ways?

1 upvotes · 4 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Fathers apparently abandon their children until women get 82% of custody?

No, you're missing the part about the data not accounting for shared parenting arrangements, which make up, at a bare minimum, half of all custody decrees. [Here's a fun pamphlet](#) that simultaneously shows the fiction behind paternal involvement in children's lives through divorce - and demonstrates that 55% of cases end in shared parenting. 5% end with neither parent getting the kid. 36.5% are when mom gets the kid (10.5% of that are situations where mom was never married, so she has custody by default if dad does not request custody), and the 3.5% where men are granted custody.

When comparing the 36.5% to 3.5% number, it's worth noting that 33% of all children in the US live without their biological fathers ([source](#)). So, yes, I do believe that's a pretty darn significant explanation for the difference. You can't fault the system for failing to give fathers rights who never wanted those rights in the first place. There is certainly fault in the system, but it must be seen in its appropriate context and to the appropriate degree. "82% of the time women get custody" is an inaccurate representation of the actual statistics.

"Male Pride" is apparently so strong that men only get awarded alimony 3% of the time?

I said it's the biggest factor. In the absence of that factor, my personal experience is 100% success in getting alimony for lesser-earning men when there is greater than a 60/40 income differential. Other jurisdictions might be different. I can only speak from personal experience on this one.

We're Christians, so apparently we should ignore the fact that 50 percent of marriages in the United States end in divorce, and about 80 percent of the divorces are initiated by women? Because somehow these don't apply to us?

To the general population of people who self-identify as Christians, the numbers are starkly similar. The reason is because something like 85% of people who self-identify as Christian aren't even genuine Christians (reference our past conversations for that number), and something like 65% of regular church attenders (I'm going from memory here). Only about 2.5% of self-identified Christians are actively involved in a lifestyle of evangelism and discipleship. When you compare the divorce rate of that 2.5% to the divorce rate of the rest of the world, yes, I very emphatically say that the general population divorce rates don't apply to that 2.5%.

You admit that judges are indeed biased towards women... but then apparently the younger, newer generation of legal professionals in the US are slightly better. Therefore suddenly all these numbers won't apply to us in the future anymore? So therefore men should marry anyway, cross their fingers and hope for the best legal professionals?

The reason men should marry has nothing to do with the status of the legal system. You're trying to force a connection in two ideas I kept separate. The reason we should be inclined toward marriage is faith-based, not having anything to do with being hopeful about the future status of the law. And although bias does exist, the wiggle-room that bias has for affecting a final decision is sharply decreasing over time. In the old days, when "no fault divorce" was brand new there was no case law to interpret and refine how things were to be handled, so the individual judges had free reign to do whatever they wanted.

Now that the law is honed in by the appellate and individual state supreme courts (as well as the SCOTUS), individual judges have a lot less discretion than they used to, so their biases play a smaller and smaller role. You'll note that I acknowledged that the biases exist, but I also characterized them as only really impacting cases where

the decision is on the fence. By saying "You admit that judges are indeed biased towards women" you are taking my statement out of the context in which it was given, most likely in an effort to mislead /u/GrowBear.

Really? "Male Pride"? 3%?

Again, you're looking at one thing without giving all of the context behind it. I'll defer to my past comment.

I don't see how its "propaganda", I see numbers presented for what they are, without any interpretation nor conclusions whatsoever. I sure did not include any.

Every single one of your comments here has been an interpretation and conclusion on how you're viewing these numbers - and you're considering the numbers in a vacuum, assuming that no other factors exist than the boogeyman's statistics that pique your interest.

Looking for resources on modern ways to walk into Christian marriage without the state involved. Are there any foolproof ways?

1 upvotes · 4 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

No fault divorce is a thing

Agreed - a horrible thing.

As of 2009, in the US, women are granted custody of the child 82% of the time

That's a pretty ridiculous interpretation of the data. The data only accounted for situations in which sole custody was awarded, not shared parenting. It also doesn't explain the reasons why sole custody was awarded, much of which I would wager is due to the fact that fathers may legally abandon their children, whereas mothers do not have that legal right (they have to jump through adoption hoops to do this). Countless fathers abandon their children, and thus custody defaults to the mother in the absence of a father seeking any rights.

As of 2010, only 3% of all divorce spousal maintenance/alimony recipients the US are men

Again, you have to look at the stats in their appropriate context. First, these states only account for cases when support is actually awarded - it doesn't account for the numerous times the court determines that the husband (or wife) shouldn't have to pay support to the lesser-earning spouse.

Additionally, as noted in the forbes article, only 40% of relationships have women as the primary breadwinner. So, 60% of relationships should naturally result in the man not getting support - and no one can rightly contest that. Of the 40% where women are the primary breadwinner, those stats are based on the woman having 50% or more of the marital income (yes, earning as much as her husband is defined as "primary breadwinner" status). But support doesn't actually kick in until the parties are at a 60/40 income differential (other states use 65/35 or 70/30 or 80/20 - mine is pretty liberal in favor of support recipients) - and I can't find any data on how many families have women who out-earn their husbands to this degree. My guess is that of the 40%, at least half of those cases involve the woman's earnings being within the range that a support award would be inappropriate generally. Of those where support is appropriate and the man has a valid claim, I've found that male pride is usually the primary factor in why it doesn't get awarded. But when I have had situations where the wife earns more than 60% of the marital income and my client is willing to let me pursue support on his behalf - I have a 100% success rate of getting support awarded for the man, regardless of which county I'm in or how hard the wife fights it. Of course, I can't speak for other attorneys or states, but the male pride thing (mentioned in the forbes article) is a significant influencing factor on those statistics.

As of 2016, about 50 percent of marriages in the United States end in divorce, and about 80 percent of the divorces are initiated by women.

That's legit. Hypergamy proven. Doesn't say much about the results of those cases, though. Also, if you scour pewresearch.com you'll note that when couples have a lifestyle that incorporates evangelism and discipleship, the divorce rate drops to something below 5% (can't remember the actual numbers off the top of my head). We're on a Christian forum, so we can't be looking at rote secular numbers - even when accounting for the secular people within the church. We must assume that people here actually take their faith seriously and have an intent to live it out, in which case that 50% divorce rate is nowhere near as scary as it is if you're out in the general world.

In both UK and US, of these divorces, as of 2009 the most common age of the divorces occurred when the women is below 24 years old, followed by age 25-34 years old, followed by age 35-44, and gradually dropping as the woman ages.

Interesting, but not surprising - as a woman's SMV goes down, she's less likely to file for divorce. Is there a similar or different pattern for male-initiated divorces?

The laws don't give you the option of casting blame. "The States of Wisconsin, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, Nebraska, Montana, Missouri, Minnesota, Michigan, Kentucky, Kansas, Iowa, Indiana, Hawaii, Florida, Colorado and California offer no grounds such as adultery, abandonment or cruelty."

True, but the courts don't generally care who's to blame. My state isn't on that list - we do allow adultery, abandonment, and cruelty (even "gross neglect of duty") as grounds for divorce. But the grounds have *absolutely zero implications* on the outcome of the case - they only exist to let the court know that you're allowed to file. They have about the same role in directing the course of the proceedings as the queen of England has in directing what parliament does. You get a, "That's nice, good of you for expressing yourself ... now we're going to do what we wanted to do regardless of anything you had to say."

The entire RP world believes that judges in the West have a reputation for being biased towards women, something you consider not reliable because no one can quote you law or statute.

Now, you have to read my words carefully here - I didn't say judges weren't biased. Judicial bias absolutely exists. But the laws themselves are relatively impartial today. The biased judges are usually older guys who were practicing attorneys during the days of "women get custody all the time every time." Once the laws changed so that shared parenting, 50/50 time became the default, the new, younger judges are on board and the older ones still struggle with applying these laws against their preconceived notions - and they usually fail. If there's a discretionary issue, they'll fin in favor of the woman because their memories told them that's how it was done for too long. Even among younger judges, there is still a beta mentality that is subservient to women. So, they're more likely to follow the shared parenting, 50/50 default, but if there's a legit close call and that default isn't possible, they'll probably still lean toward the woman. Female judges, on the other hand, are an anomaly - you'd expect them to side with women, but because they themselves are "empowered women," they tend to show contempt for other women who don't empower themselves, so they tend to side with the men more often than not. They're less interested in gender wars than they are in proving their own individual superiority. As a side note: 5 of the 6 domestic judges in my county are women - and this usually bodes well for my male clients, so perhaps my personal observations are skewed by the fact that many other jurisdictions have men who run the show and these men are the ones to blame for the gender bias.

Despite all these, you claim that there is no sexism in the divorce procedures of alimony, child support, and custody

My questions were not meant to lead to this conclusion. They were meant to hone in on where, exactly, the sexism and bias is. Most of your points have nothing to do with the outcomes of the case - they only reference how they're initiated. For the ones that do reference the outcomes, the interpretation of the statistics is dubious, at best. I could take a few statistics out of context, hiding relevant explanatory information, and scare people into believing in some boogeyman too. The way you (and the rest of the manosphere) present the facts looks a lot like **these types of memes**. All of those facts are technically accurate, but they do absolutely nothing to portray the reality of the situation.

your agenda will still be pro-marriage regardless, even this version

Sure, but why should I fight against God on that topic? To be clear, I'm pro spiritual marriage. If a couple wants to avoid legal marriage in favor of a spiritual one, I'm not against that. For various reasons, it may be unwise for one person or the other, but that's a result I'm at peace with, as long as the couple goes into the relationship with full knowledge of what they're doing and the potential consequences. But given that 99.999% of marriages in the country are civil marriages, I have to talk in the context of the reality set before us, not some unrealistic hypothetical.

I, on the other hand, think the above is absolutely terrifying and will not touch it with a 100 feet pole.

Understandable, if you're reading propaganda-related interpretations of the facts and not the facts as they are. To that end, I wouldn't encourage anyway toward any situation that is likely to lead to divorce. But that doesn't mean marriage as a spiritual institution created by God for *his purposes* which are higher than *our purposes* should all of a sudden be abandoned.

More to the point, though - what is so "absolutely terrifying" about women being more likely to initiate divorce? Or the fact that young women are more likely than older women to initiate divorce? Or the fact that you're not allowed to play the blame-game? Or the fact that the RP world believes something? I can see cause for fright in your first 3 points and the last one if one doesn't have all of the information and you're just seeing the "dihydrogen monoxide will kill you!" version of the facts.

let the OP [/u/GrowBear](#) see the facts and make up his own mind

Facts in their proper context, sure.

Looking for resources on modern ways to walk into Christian marriage without the state involved. Are there any foolproof ways?

1 upvotes · 4 October 2017 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

So what if the law is pro-underdog, or pro-dogs, or pro-whatever? The fact remains that a 97-3 split still means that in a majority of cases, men are worst off after the divorce.

You can't make that blanket statement based on one individual factor. What if he has to pay \$10,000/yr in spousal support, but because of his wife's help and support he managed to increase his income during the course of the marriage by \$20,000? Even after alimony, he is still better off than he was before.

modern marriage is a joke

I don't deny that. But that doesn't mean it's without a purpose - particularly from a biblical perspective.

Hey if you're happy with with the fact you can get divorced anytime and lose your stuff and pay alimony/support for the rest of your life, something you agree is a possibility, go ahead, no one's stopping

you.

Remember: I've oriented my marriage in a way where I wouldn't have to pay alimony/support. Regardless of which judge I end up getting, I'm 99% confident of this conclusion. It's guys who insist that their wives limit their income-earning potential in order to take care of their husbands - those are the men who must eat the fruit of their decisions.

Why don't you lay the facts on the table for people like OP to decide, instead of asking him "Why is X unfair?" or "Why is Y unfair?" That's called gaslighting by the way

Nah, it's called "Negative Inquiry," as defined in WISNIFG. And I have laid out many facts about how the statutes work and how judges interpret the statutes. These are facts.

whether or not its a good or bad deal to enter is his right to decide for himself

Agreed, except to the extent that God may intervene and communicate an intent in the matter.

Looking for resources on modern ways to walk into Christian marriage without the state involved. Are there any foolproof ways?

1 upvotes · 4 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

It's an interesting concept, but doomed to fail. All it's really doing is forcing people to have a 1 year waiting period before getting divorced instead of 1 month - and the 1 year thing is the most commonly used grounds for divorce under normal circumstances anyway. Although well-intentioned, it doesn't really change things very much.

Looking for resources on modern ways to walk into Christian marriage without the state involved. Are there any foolproof ways?

1 upvotes · 4 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I'm not sure what you're asking for on the history of marriage. That's really a book. Long story short, in Eden and for a while thereafter there was no ceremony or certificate or judge. Divorce didn't even exist. You have consensual sex: you're married. Marriage was always a religious institution that didn't exist apart from a belief in the divine. At some point the state decided to step in and religious institutions ceded power to the state because they were both operating on the same (or substantially similar) terms. The state having the power for so long led the way for the state to start deviating from the spiritual aspects of it. Religion by that point had lost the ability to take the power back, so now it's almost exclusively controlled by the state. So, now we have a distinction between civil unions (i.e. secular marriage) and spiritual unions (i.e. spiritual marriage).

As for approaching a father, just be flat out honest. Your goal isn't to trick him into giving you permission. It's to let him make an informed decision about what's best for his daughter. If he's an RP man, he'll respect your viewpoint and approve. If he's a beta BP man, he's probably going to be too weak and passive to say no to his daughter if she wants to marry you, so he'll say yes anyway. So, the only way you really get a no is if he's alpha and you're a weak beta.

Looking for resources on modern ways to walk into Christian marriage without the state involved. Are there any foolproof ways?

1 upvotes · 4 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Isn't that simply an argument that marriage is not worth it for BOTH men and women?

Maybe, but it goes against the grain of "the laws are pro-female, anti-man."

No fault divorce + state-enforced alimony/child support + sexism in custody allocation + sexism in asset allocation is what creates the perfect storm that ultimately results in divorce rape.

What is unfair about state-enforced alimony/child support?

Where are you finding sexism in custody allocations?

Where is there sexism in asset allocation?

You're making these claims generally, but I don't think the evidence is there to support your hypothetical fears.

AND WHY DO YOU THINK THAT IS THE CASE????

Liberals.

which law specifically states the Queen of England is merely a figurehead, and that it is the Constitution of the UK that gets to decide on all matters, politics and legal affairs, represented by the PM?

Meh, I don't live in the UK. I'm only speaking as to American law.

Now imagine this figurehead has no power but still has to feed all his subjects. Are you still surprised that no one wants be husbands?

I think it's a huge stretch to say "no one wants to be husbands." There are droves upon droves upon droves of guys who want to be husbands. I'd wager it's 99%. As you've noted before, RP is the 1% - and even among RP, a vast number of guys are still wanting to pursue marriage.

Plus, a husband in a proper marriage is not merely a figurehead. If he doesn't like how his wife is acting, he has the power to divorce her at any point. He only has a risk if she manages to fake it for 20+ years ... at which point, more power to her for managing to keep up a facade for so long without losing her identity in it.

So what if new legal professionals are completely red-pill people? The world is still a feminist one. Lawyers/judges are but pawns of greater forces

Nah, because the lawyers are the ones who become legislators who make the laws and judges who interpret the laws. They are the more powerful forces. Of course, the media has an impact too - but only to the degree that they're able to influence the legislators and judges. So, if the legislators and judges are truly RP, they won't be subservient to media influences. Game over for the FI as to divorce laws.

But for the married man: you will still be married 10 years later. You are effectively heading into a deal that can change anytime this feminist world decides its going to change

This I agree with.

Not legally. You do not possess any more authority than your wife.

Of course.

As long as this is the case, men will continue boycotting marriage

I don't see this boycott in practice. I see a select few RP or MGTOW individuals, but they're the extreme rarity in society - and they're usually the men who wouldn't make good (read: godly) husbands in the first place.

the really controversial part of a Patriarchy: wives and children are the property/subjects

I am not aware of any definition of "patriarchy" that requires that wives and children be treated as such. As a historical matter, there are several patriarchal societies that have exercised a patriarchy this way, but it's not a mandate. You're implying more in the word than any sociologist would.

Or do you wish to relegate that to honorary status as well?

Not sure what you're asking here.

This entire thread is basically you defending Marriage 2.0 the single biggest proof that Patriarchy is dead.

I'm not defending Marriage 2.0 as a good thing. I'm saying it's not as ridiculous as people think it is - particularly not as bad as it was 25+ years ago. Or to put it another way: while I believe it's bad, I will fight against someone who treats it like it's hell on earth - particularly when that perception is based on false information. I will always rely on the facts as they are, not tall tales that people share for sympathy.

So your solution to men potentially losing his assets, is for him to STOP CARING about losing his assets? Wow. And you're an attorney?

No, my solution, as noted in other conversations, is discipleship to start a movement from the bottom up. My "stop caring" line of thought is more a Christian perspective on materialism. If your desire to cling to material things is controlling your life, that's not spiritually healthy.

Looking for resources on modern ways to walk into Christian marriage without the state involved. Are there any foolproof ways?

1 upvotes · 3 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I do believe that the families are involved, especially in giving their blessing,

This aspect of marriage has baffled me for quite some time. The "giving their blessing" part is certainly something that was a product of culture and is not a biblical mandate. It was born out of the idea that women were viewed as property. So, a father owned his daughter and if a suitor wanted her, he had to buy her (hence the dowry) and ownership literally changed hands. In a society where women are not property, there is no biblical mandate that this procedure continue, although we maintain the "get the father's blessing" or "daddy walks her down the aisle" stuff as remnants of these past cultural traditions.

That said, when Genesis 2:24 first professes that two people becoming one flesh defines the marriage, it is preceded immediately by: "That is why a man leaves his father and mother and is united to his wife" - implying that there certainly is a familial component to it beyond just rote eloping and having sex.

I do believe the local church should be involved as witnesses in the moment and afterwards to encourage the two of you, support the two of you, and help hold the two of you accountable

These are noble intentions, but not biblically required for the formation of a marriage. That said, remaining part of the fellowship of believers and submitting to one another within that fellowship is a biblical mandate. So, a couple that steals away from the world to be on their own could not be said to be following Christ or living in godliness. Of course, it's not just submissiveness to the body with no return - they submit themselves to your needs as well, allowing for the encouragement and support that you reference. So, although these things are highly beneficial and biblically mandated in a general sense, they aren't a prerequisite to having a biblical marriage before God. I'm not sure if that makes sense.

We now have flair!

1 upvotes · 3 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Agreed - and I thought about that too. But I'm not sure how to pull that off while also having user-editable flair. Specifically, if I assign a cautionary flair, someone would simply be able to remove it at their discretion. Of course, for endorsed people, they wouldn't want to remove that endorsement. Or maybe this is all just based on my ignorance of CSS coding and what's possible and not. I'll have to contemplate this some more either way. Thanks for the suggestion!

Looking for resources on modern ways to walk into Christian marriage without the state involved. Are there any foolproof ways?

1 upvotes · 3 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

men not wanting to be fathers. When that happens, the result is a net loss for society.

Not if you live in China :p

You wouldn't be saying this if we were stil living in patriarchal times

Perhaps, but only because it wouldn't be safe for me to say so - not for lack of desire to express these thoughts. Do you really think that an abusive alcoholic father who regularly sends his kids to the ER should have unsupervised custody rights just because "he's a man and men should get whatever they want"?

Anti-feminism is not the same as "men get everything, women get nothing." From my readings and conversations on MRP, one does not need to be a male extremist to be RP - he only needs to recognize and oppose the feminist imperative - to be his own man independent of societal conditioning. This doesn't mean he has to insist that everyone in his sphere of influence bow down to him for being a man.

Looking for resources on modern ways to walk into Christian marriage without the state involved. Are there any foolproof ways?

1 upvotes · 3 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I get that, but under the system he's describing the state would have no basis for saying she can't touch joint funds. Plus, mothers have default custody rights, so if there's no divorce/juvenile court telling the parties how to allocate parenting time, he gets no parenting time and she can do whatever she wants with the kids. These things wouldn't be illegal under the circumstances proposed.

Looking for resources on modern ways to walk into Christian marriage without the state involved. Are there any foolproof ways?

1 upvotes · 3 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Agreed.

Looking for resources on modern ways to walk into Christian marriage without the state involved. Are there any foolproof ways?

1 upvotes · 2 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I can see why 8.2 would seem troublesome ... but I also believe in the "lesser of two evils" option that many people force themselves into. Basically, there are situations that we, as humans, entangle ourselves in whereby no matter what we do any course of action would be sin. In that scenario, although it is still sin and condemnable as such, a person should pursue the course of action that minimizes the impact of his sin on an eternal scale. This may mean remaining married to a second spouse rather than pursuing reconciliation ... or it could go the other way. It may be situation-specific.

Looking for resources on modern ways to walk into Christian marriage without the state involved. Are there any foolproof ways?

1 upvotes · 2 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

If Protestants trust that the canon as assembled is accurate (that is, there's nothing there that shouldn't be and there's nothing missing that should be there) then why do you not accept the authority of the Church who compiled it?

Most Protestants don't have a good answer to this question. But the only real answer is that I trust the canon I have on the authority of the Spirit, who is at work in me. Now, I mentioned in another comment that this is a somewhat loose concept in Catholicism because, other than the pope, one can never have any real certainty about what is from themselves or from the Holy Spirit. As a Protestant, though, I do believe that the Holy Spirit can give me individual and personal revelation that can be relied upon - particularly if this revelation is consistent with what other people who are bearing good fruit have attested as true (the test Jesus gives in Matthew 7).

To that end, I do feel a strong conviction that the 66 books in my Bible are true and authentic as the inspired Word of God. I believe this not on the authority of the counsel that compiled them, but on the authority of the Spirit within me. If that same Spirit later affirms that the deuterocanonical books are also true, authentic, and inspired, then I will accept those as well - and the same thing would apply if the Holy Spirit wanted to affirm any other writing. Maybe the Holy Spirit someday affirms the book *Crazy Love* by Francis Chan (random pic; I haven't actually read it) by saying, "Yes, I inspired him to write every word of that," then as to me, that becomes Scripture as well. But we cannot impose our own personal affirmations on someone else because until the Holy Spirit speaks to a person, they have no direct affirmation. Instead, when someone lacks the gift of *discernment of spirits*, the best they can do is trust those who bear good fruit (again, the test Jesus gives in Matthew 7) by the disciples they make (the test isn't merely good works, as the immediately following passage proves).

I get that this sounds very mystical and opens wide the door for people to abuse the whole "God said so" concept to start cults and cause all kinds of problems - as has actually happened repeatedly throughout history. But at the same time, the way the Catholic (and Orthodox) church approaches tradition and authority, particularly in the context of validating the authority of Scripture, seems too much like human wisdom to me. It relies on hierarchies and institutional structure rather than a demonstration of the Spirit in power. This seems to run afoul of Paul's profession in 1 Cor. 2, "My speech and my message were not in plausible words of wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power, so that your faith might not rest in the wisdom of men but in the power of God." Relying on the authority of a church council without directly seeing the power of the Spirit at work in them during that counsel ... that just feels like relying on the wisdom of men.

why I mentioned flairs in my post

Good idea. I'll have to figure out how to do this :p

Tag: /u/OsmiumZulu

Looking for resources on modern ways to walk into Christian marriage without the state involved. Are there any foolproof ways?

1 upvotes · 2 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

The auto-mod picked up your use of the f-word. Just a heads up to keep the profanity out in future comments to avoid it being removed.

Looking for resources on modern ways to walk into Christian marriage without the state involved. Are there any foolproof ways?

1 upvotes · 2 October 2017 · /r/RPChristians

So you're quite happy to get the state involved if you divorce but don't want the state "involved" in your marriage?

As far as I'm aware, the state doesn't get involved in marriages in the first place - only divorces. That said, the way a marriage functions is heavily dependent upon the expectations of what would happen if it ceased to function. So, "control of marriage" and "control of divorce" are fairly inextricably linked.

But I think the point you're really making is this: [/u/GrowBear](#) does want state divorce protections, but he wants those laws to be protected on his terms instead of the present terms. This is a good point to make.

Realistically, if you take the state out of it, she could run off with the kids and he couldn't do anything about it. She could drain the bank accounts and hide the money where he'll never find it and he could never do a thing about it. Without court oversight, his income is the only thing she couldn't take from him. So, for everything else he wants state protections, but on his terms and not the state's terms.

This is all about finding the right woman, and not so much about whether or not you affect civil marriage

Spot on.

Scripture and the Tradition of the early Church is such that a valid sacramental marriage cannot be broken by humans at all. Bit odd.

Although not Catholic, I tend to take a similar view, although possibly even more extreme than the Catholic church would go. [John Piper, a Protestant pastor, did a decent job writing up most of the arguments here.](#)

303 - Fellowship

1 upvotes · 29 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

as long as "informal discipleship" involves some level of "covertess" (and by that I mean most, if not all, your beliefs has to be hidden, depending on how receptive the other party is)

In an evangelism relationship (which is pre-discipleship) there is certainly a need to be covert in many situations, particularly when your beliefs are in hostile conflict with the people you're engaging with. See my most recent 304 post on evangelism. With informal discipleship, there's nothing *intentionally hidden*; it's more intentionally withholding information because the disciples isn't ready to receive certain information yet - but if he asks, I would tactfully answer with honesty. I wouldn't try to skirt around the issue or question.

So unless God specifically asked you to be lynched, we shouldn't be looking at post-age-30 Jesus as an example on how to go about our mission.

I disagree there. With that logic, because 95% of the Gospels are about Jesus' post-age-30 ministry, we could never look to Jesus as an example for anything because there would be no way to discern whether he did/said something as a model to us or as a means of getting himself killed.

Instead, I get the impression that Jesus knew he would die, but was constantly trying to postpone the inevitable, until God made it clear to him: "Now is the time." This is clear from the way he withdrew from dangerous situations, the way he talked about his eventual death, the way he talked about his mission on earth, and most notably the way he prayed in Gethsemane. Jesus' primary focus during his ministry was building a kingdom by changing a culture. He was immensely successful at this - and I do think we can take this as a model for how we can do the same: building God's Kingdom and changing our cultures at both a congregational and community

level.

But our God is pleased by results too

I agree completely - a point that virtually all of the modern western church misses.

if the RP movement ever get to a point where having martyrs will inspire the RP community exponentially, SURE i would wanna be a martyr too!

Haha, I don't think I'd ever desire that.

Who even remembers ...

If there was no heaven, then being a martyr would have no earthly value. So, I agree.

All I see is denominational wars

I mean the conversation on Constantine and his influence. I agree that he made it "mainstream" - my point in the reference was that he actually caused more harm than good. He did a phenomenal job making the institution of the Christian church mainstream, but did great harm toward the cause of actually causing people to follow Jesus. If anything, he did more harm to the purpose of the church (many speculate that this was actually his intent all along).

303 - Fellowship

1 upvotes · 29 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I don't see how discipleship is possible without the potential disciple first "selling everything he has".

Understandable, but nobody "sells everything" to go follow a total stranger. Jesus knew his 12 and had been with them before he called them out by name. The process started long before it became official. I treat this as the conversion from informal to formal discipleship.

Actually He did. He just made them look like fools.

That's my point - his method was to work against the leadership, not to work alongside them. He worked alongside individuals from the bottom-up, not against them. The bottom-up method presumes that leadership is "doing it wrong," so the people have to start a movement of their own to get it right. The top-down approach is focused more on fixing the leadership first, then working through them to steer the people.

martyrs achieved nothing by dying

On earth, perhaps not much - other than that their story would be an example, and therefore they are glorified in man's eyes. But in heaven, that is where they reap their reward.

It was ultimately Emperor Constantine that converted the Empire

I would contest that to the moon and back ... but that issue is beside the point :p Check out what /u/1Timothy47 and /u/ruizbujc wrote in [this thread](#) last month for more reading on that subject.

College Kid... Relationships are hard

1 upvotes · 29 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Good connect with the co-dependency reference. I totally forgot to bring that up :p

303 - Fellowship

1 upvotes · 29 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I think you're looking at a false dichotomy. It's not a "there are two kinds of people in the world" kind of thing. It's more that there are an elite few in high positions of power (maybe 1%) who are the true feminists, and an elite few who are truly RP who are kind of scattered randomly - some in high power, others not ... and the other 98% are sheep who are influenced more by this in high power than those who aren't.

Don't you think some level of covertness is required to survive as the 1%?

Absolutely. That's why one must employ tact rather than being "loud and brash." But completely hiding without an end-game just ensures your kind will die out.

My point is simply that they have to stop being drones (take the red pill) before you can share your ideas, or disciple them.

Discipleship *is* how you get them to take the pill.

All I'm saying is that its suicidal to engage someone who is still being indoctrinated.

If that's the case, no one would ever become RP in the first place. RP doesn't spontaneously generate in some people. I'm reminded of MMSLP's instigate, isolate, escalate path ... one which probably applies here. Instigate a conversation with someone, put feelers out, see what the reaction is, and if it's positive, isolate that person to have private conversations without other women or BP guys around, then escalate the conversation to RP topics.

Why can't we just get into power first, and THEN indoctrinate the masses?

That's a legitimate model, but the top-down approach is a lot harder than the bottom-up one. I encounter this in ministry all the time and am in conversation with leaders in a parachurch ministry right now about how to change a culture. Their current model is the top-down approach: *It'll never work if the leadership isn't on board first.*

But I'm showing them through Scripture that Jesus didn't go to the political leaders and religious leaders to persuade them so that everyone would follow. He went to the people - 12 ordinary nobodies, and used them to start a movement from the ground up. If this is what Jesus modeled, we should be following. The top-down approach makes sense from a worldly vantage point, but the Bible constantly says that spiritual wisdom and worldly wisdom are in conflict. So, at some point we have to defy conventional thinking and trust that God will fulfill if we will follow. This gives him glory - to defy logic. If RP truths are a spiritual matter and not a socio-political one (and I believe this is the case), then spiritual wisdom is how growth and change will happen, not worldly wisdom. So, my plan has to be to do it like Jesus did, even if it doesn't make sense to the rest of the world.

303 - Fellowship

1 upvotes · 29 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Like you said, sin makes women want to rule over men. Why would these sleeper agents want to join our side?

Because God created them with that inherent desire. The sin nature simply causes them to fight against their God-

given directives. If this isn't true, the none of RP makes sense in a biblical framework.

Unless of course you "believe in the good of mankind"

Heh, not a chance.

If anything we Christians should always expect mankind to choose bad over good if presented a choice.

It's more that everything we do comes from bad motives. As Paul talks about in Romans 14, nothing is inherently bad or evil or unclean; it's our heart that makes it so. Likewise, Jesus says the same thing in the whole "It's not what goes into a man that makes him unclean; but what comes out of him" thing.

As has been said repeatedly: RP itself is amoral. It's a set of descriptive principles. Some people can choose to use that understanding for good, others for evil - but RP itself is neither good nor evil. It's just the facts as they are. So, for someone to choose between the FI and RP isn't a choice between good and evil - it's the choice between reality and fantasy. Yes, there's an innate desire to believe a fantasy over reality, hence the default position of the FI in the absence of tactful communication of the truth. But the truth itself can still prevail with appropriate tact.

You can't red pill someone if they don't first give up everything they have.

As has been noted before, a lot of RP stuff isn't unique to RP. It's more an amalgam of ideas from countless other areas pulled into one packaging that makes sense. Abundance mentality is a huge psychological fad. Fitness testing has been talked about in social dynamics for ages. The alpha/beta dynamic has been the subject of books since decades before modern feminism. These are not new things - but no one has pulled them together the same way until RP.

Chances are, most BP people have bits and pieces of red pill knowledge already ingrained in them and that they already accept as fact - so they wouldn't have to give up everything. Just most of the core identity-creating concepts.

not sure if sleeper agents in Battlestar could turn 100% machine overnight

In seconds, yes. But this instantaneous transformation is also unrealistic in the real world. Although most of the country are mindless drones, unlike Agent Smith, there's no feminist leader who has such power over them that one word will cause them to go psycho fem-nazi on humanity.

I don't know mate. Feminism achieved their goals within 2 centuries purely by politics alone.

Oh, you can destroy the spiritual with the worldly. But you can't cure the spiritual with the worldly. It's a one-way direction.

303 - Fellowship

1 upvotes · 28 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

tact: adroitness and sensitivity in dealing with others or with difficult issues

Just google "tact" and that's what comes up. That's the definition I use.

"Engaging the World" is like Morpheus standing on a hill and sh outing to the Machines: *"Hey M achien!*
Over here!! Lets talk tactfully, like civilized men!!"

Yeah, he'd be shot down because that's not tactful. That's "loud and brash." Instead, what Morpheus did was grab one or two people at a time ... and then taught them to grab one or two others. This is discipleship. If carried to its natural conclusion (and if the crew had enough equipment and prophecy about "the one" wasn't controlling their mission, etc.), then their victory would be won over by multiplication, not mass preaching.

As I'm sure you can tell, I'm probably more with how you describe the MRA community (I've never looked into it; my only exposure is what's said on TRP/MRP). It sounds to me like TRP has a more defeatist attitude about the matter. Although I love *The Matrix*, *Battlestar Galactica* might be a better analogy. There are several machines covertly hiding among the humans, manipulating the ship's every course and direction for their own advantage. The thing is ... none of the machines on the ship know they're machines (unless they are "awoken" by the other machines for a bold purpose). Their actions are more generally and subtly guided over time. So, they all think they're part of one big all-human community, despite the covert "us v. them" dynamic.

If I know the truth about there being a "machine imperative" controlling the way the ship is being run, I might be able to go to individuals on the ship and tactfully convince them of the machine-infiltration - and in the show when certain sleeper-agents (i.e. machines) became aware of their status as being part of "the enemy," they revolted against their makers and sided with the humans.

Because most people in the US are ignorant of the fact that they're sheep controlled by a feminist agenda, they are not loyal to the feminist institution; they are simply ignorant of the alternatives. As BPP often says, "They've been taught this all their lives; they know nothing else." So, tactful communication does have an awakening power. As you note, the actual "machines" in *The Matrix* will never convert to help humanity, so it'd be idiotic for Morpheus to waste his time trying to persuade them. But he can certainly do something about the people who live and work within the framework created by the machines - and that's what he did.

Let me be clear about this: *The few who lead only have power if the masses will follow*. Expose the masses to a better way and, if they truly believe it is better, they will follow the better way instead. Because God ingrained RP in all of us through creation (which, again, is hindered by the fall), there is some part of us that wants to accept and follow RP praxeology in our own lives.

And look how much they have achieved over the past 50 years?

Because they're taking the "shout it from a public mountaintop" approach. Again, *discipleship* is the answer, not *politics*. You can't cure a spiritual problem with a political solution. The curse (Genesis 3) is a spiritual problem - that women would want to rule over men.

Hide from the machines, play hide and seek in the Matrix (in this World but not of it) and yet never failing to offer the Red Pill to those who are truly willing to go down the rabbit hole.

But he didn't wait for people to be ready - he actively sought these people. And the goal shouldn't be just one or two for their own sake; it should be one or two for the sake of multiplication over time into the thousands and millions. The TRP approach seems more interested in individuals for their own sake. I agree with the practice of focusing on the individual, but think this should plug into a larger plan.

Personally, I ask any Christian who approach me asking me to disciple them to quit their church.

I understand your reasoning, but do believe that this is so contrary to Scripture that one can't legitimately claim to be leading someone into godliness with that instruction. You can be leading someone into manliness more effectively, yes ... but biblical manliness is not the only aspect of godliness or being a Christian or Christ-like. Note that although Jesus often withdrew from the crowd to be alone or with his disciples, he never neglected the needs of the crowd either. We must always be willing to engage with the crowd for their benefit.

That said, when I encounter new believers who are not already plugged into a church, I do not encourage them to

start attending a church immediately - that comes in time.

I thought about making a thread ... but ... I knew you guys would

It might be a conversation worth having anyway :)

inevitably compromised on their positions

I agree with this fatal flaw in how the church approached the situation. That's how the church got blue-pillled in the first place. No to compromises. Yes to being intelligent about how we communicate.

303 - Fellowship

1 upvotes · 28 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Specifically, the limit is when you start to challenge people's worldview, and how people perceive themselves.

In some circumstances, I agree. But I don't think revealing red pill truths to someone is past that limit. Although you may be right that this may be "an attack on a bluepill person's worldview and [how] he sees himself," it's only perceived as an "attack" if it isn't broached tactfully. More to the point, deep down everyone wants to believe in the red pill because God has ingrained us with these truths in our very souls. The red pill is the order of how God created humanity, and although the fall has clouded our judgment on these issues, we still bear a reflection of God and what he created us to be (albeit a shattered one).

This is why I believe I have had very little difficulty persuading men in my church, my brothers, and even my own sister of red pill truths - because they all innately want to believe it is true, even if it offends their conscious intellect. God designed them to accept these things.

The reason sites like Dalrock's and ReturnofKings (ROK) is not tolerated by the World is not because of a lack of "tact", its because they break down the feminist scam, step-by-step, and present to the audience exactly what's going on.

Possibly, but I still believe greater tact in how I expect they are presenting this information would yield a different result in the public's eye and their receptivity toward what is being said. When I say I haven't read Dalrock, I have read 3 or 4 posts ... just not enough to say I'm fluent with anything of his. In those 3 or 4 posts, I get the same impression from him that I do of someone like Rollo Tomassi - they're more out for "loud and brash" communication about the subject to get the easy fruit following their sites.

The "loud and brash" approach does have merit with certain crowds, but it only works for those who are already intellectually inclined toward what you're saying. Even someone who is intellectually "open" to the ideas will reject it for the lack of tact in how it is presented. Virtually everything I've read from Rollo strikes me as this way - he has a clear target audience and he presents only to that audience without shame. Result? People not in his target audience don't like him.

If you, instead, target people who are not so much the "easy fruit" - people who are "open, but not inclined" or even people who intellectually oppose certain ideas, a different approach from the "loud and brash" one must be employed. This different approach involves tact in how information is presented. I'd wager that if TRP employed some of this tact it wouldn't garner the hate it does now. But it is more interested in being internally expressive than externally communicative and persuasive. That's a legitimate choice they have made, and there are consequences to that, which they have appropriately accepted. I'm choosing to take this sub in a different path.

I do have a solution for you, one that is simple and has been successful for at least 6,000 years of human

history. Reinstitute the Patriarchy.

This is not a solution, this is a proposed end goal/destination. The solution is how to get there. If people are dying of thirst, "give them water" isn't the solution - that's the goal. The solution must account for the challenges of getting from point A to point B. If, for example, they lack water simply because they are too lazy to walk to their faucets, then the problem is a psychological one that demands a psychological solution. If it's because the water filtration plant broke, then it's an engineering problem with an engineering solution.

MRP suggests that humanity is dealing with a socio-political problem that requires a socio-political solution. I suggest it's a spiritual problem that demands a spiritual solution, although I accept that, as with many other spiritual issues, a proper socio-political environment can be facilitative of spiritual change.

More to the point, I don't have the power to resintitute the patriarchy, nor would it be sufficient if everyone on RPC banded together to try to do this. So, making such a suggestion is not a solution. The solution is found in the small steps we take along the way that *actually are* within our power to change things. In my view, **discipleship is the solution**. In its physical parallel (physical lineage), it's how God turned one man (Adam/Noah) into all nations, or one man into a mighty nation (Abraham), and in its spiritual reality, it's how God took Jesus as one man and founded the entire global church. Every new religious movement or denomination does the same thing - it begins with one man with a vision for how things *ought to be*, who inspires others through individual mentoring. It's only when we get on big platforms and rely on institutionalization of the vision that we start to lose the battle - because then it becomes more about the institution than the mission itself.

I'm rambling now. My point is that my goal is to help a few men through personal and direct interactions, to inspire them to help other men, and to teach them how to help those men they have inspired to help and inspire others, and so on. The reach of RPC is not intended to be limited to those who subscribe to our sub, but to everyone relationally connected to these individuals. To that end, I have men I'm discipling now to whom I am teaching these very things, and they will soon be doing the same with others (one already is). That's how this will get done - the way Jesus modeled it for us :)

Reinstitute the Patriarchy. Which implies that women are once again to be property of their husbands/fathers. Would you dare endorse this opinion?

Not every patriarchy held this view, nor do we see this demanded when God created men and women, so I disagree with how you're defining patriarchy. More to the point: *This is the exact opposite of the tactful approach*. So no, I would not endorse that opinion, if nothing else because the way it is phrased carries a lot of baggage that I would not endorse. The concept, possibly, but the wording, absolutely not. That is where tact comes in.

How do you "tactfully" tell a Bluepill that the entire World has been scammed for the last 200 years?

That depends on each BPer. Check out the 205 post on "How to Lead," as well as the conversation in that thread between [/u/What_is_real_anymore](#) and [/u/ruizbujc](#) and you'll get an idea about how the "loud and brash" (i.e. lecturer) approach may not be the most tactful, but that information can be communicated effectively through other methods, dependent on each person.

the guy on the plane didn't consider your view because of your tact or your charisma: he was rationally persuaded into your POV

Rationally persuaded *because of the intellectual tactics I employed* (i.e. "tact"). I think you made this misperception clear when you noted that you see "tact" and "charm" as the same thing, and now link it with "charisma." Tact has nothing to do with charm or charisma. It's all about developing a plan and strategy based on what information you have about a person or people group so as to minimize the odds of the message being rejected and working within concepts that you know they'll be more likely to accept and agree with. This is

tactful communication.

try this social experiment again, but this time not with one, but several Jewish individuals

I agree that there is a limit to tact. No amount of tact will persuade me away from Jesus, nor will any amount of tact persuade a Jewish Community to embrace Naziism. But I do not believe any red pill truths (at least that I have seen so far) are so offensive that they cross this line with anyone - that everyone has the capacity to be persuaded through appropriately tactful communication.

303 - Fellowship

1 upvotes · 28 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Maybe one of the issues is that I still haven't read any Dalrock. I can't say I "endorse the beliefs expressed in that blog 100%" because I don't know what they are in the first place :p But I would be shocked if the reason one is tolerable and the other is not doesn't have something to do with tact as one of the factors.

Similarly, I can't say if I'm evangelical or not ... everyone I talk to (including people who call themselves "evangelical") seems to have a different definition of what that term means.

But tact in communication patterns is enough to overcome almost anything. It's how Mormons and Scientology manage to get so many people in the door and how liberals manage to convince people that 90% of their policies make sense (I'll admit: a select few actually do).

I once ran a test on this very concept. I was sitting next to a guy on a plane and decided I was going to convince him that the Nazis were actually the good guys in WW2. I wasn't dumb enough to broach the concept directly. Instead, I talked about policies and used what I know about social agendas to convince him that equality is this great thing and eventually pressed some hard concepts about sacrifice and making the "tough calls" and "if you had to, wouldn't you make this choice?" and tied that into, "What if people 'had to' do things on a national level at one point?" and gradually phased that into explaining Nazi ideals without actually using the term "Nazi." Although I never brought up anything to do with WW2, he connected the dots on his own, saying, "When you think about it real close like this, I guess I can really understand why so many people were willing to die for things that the rest of the world calls crazy or evil, like the Nazis" and "I have a new appreciation for what the Nazis were trying to do" and "I guess you can't just take history's word for it that the allies were the good guys" (actual quotes). No joke ... enough tact can persuade anyone of virtually anything, in the absence of a conviction from the Holy Spirit.

Since so few people ever end these stories once their point is made, I did eventually fess up that I was just running a social experiment on him. He was embarrassed, but laughed it off. He asked if I had hidden cameras somewhere, and I said it was more for my own personal examination of the human nature. He said he could understand and appreciate that, but I think he secretly hated my guts. Nevertheless, the rest of the conversation was friendly.

303 - Fellowship

1 upvotes · 27 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Personally, I don't hide any of my beliefs. In fact, in the last 2 weeks, I've had conversations with 4 other Christian men in my church, all of whom are fairly blue pillled (one's naturally more alpha, but still intellectualizes things within a BP framework).

I simply communicate everything in its natural Scriptural context. I have even showed some of my posts on this sub to one of these men. In personal conversation, I simply avoid the use of RP lingo in favor of the terminology the Bible uses it. So, instead of "captain/first mate" I say "leader/helper." When communicating concepts like "women would rather share a high quality man than have a low quality man to themselves" I simply highlight

people like David, Solomon, Nebuchadnezzar, Jacob, etc. who demonstrate these truths.

When I use Scripture as the foundation of how I speak about these topics rather than RP lingo or the authority of "men swapping notes and seeing what works" I find that people agree with pretty much 100% of what I say. I like to use [the video in this post](#) as a starting point with some guys, as it is a straight-forward, no-nonsense, yet humorous way to broach the subjects while showing how common-sense it is in the Bible. Even my own sister was a fan of that video and said she wished all men took that view of their marriages and relationships. Although she's never heard of the "red pill," she just sees it in the Bible naturally and lives as a red pill woman anyway. I even started talking about fitness tests and she said, "Absolutely, I very frequently ask my husband for things, hoping he'll tell me no."

I'm on the verge of starting an NMMNG group with some of the men in my church. As I talk about these things, it is developing a following and people are hungry to see the truth behind what the Bible says rather than what the church teaches. Because all we're doing is interpreting Scripture, no pastor is against it.

Now, your views, from what I can tell of other conversations, extend beyond biblical principles alone ... not to say they're anti-biblical; just that the Bible doesn't actually address the issue. Wrong or right, you couldn't be as extreme as you are in how you communicate things and get away with it in a church setting. So, you'd just have to learn to be tactful about how you communicate truth rather than doing it brashly, as the internet invites people to do :p

Someone help me understand what just happened?

1 upvotes · 27 September 2017 · /r/askTRP

This is the most likely answer. I concur.

College Kid... Relationships are hard

1 upvotes · 27 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Good response.

110 - Stay Plan is the Go Plan

1 upvotes · 26 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Oh, my wife is taking a break from maternity leave. She's a tax accountant and October 15 is a huge deadline for her - biggest of the year (she works the week after too). So she's working 7 days a week, 70-100 hours/week, depending on how close it gets to the deadline. So, I'm working full time and handling the kids, house, shopping, etc. for the next month until my wife's deadline is over and she's back on maternity leave.

110 - Stay Plan is the Go Plan

1 upvotes · 26 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

i can image you subtly trying to help people reconcile, but most people are unwilling

Nothing subtle about it. I'm pretty overt. Managed to get several couples to reconcile too :) Problem is finding a decent marriage counselor who can help them.

House-wife v. SAHM

1 upvotes · 24 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Well said.

I decided to read a Focus on the Family article on developing a "satisfying" sex life.

1 upvotes · 22 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Good to know. Yeah, I don't think I'll ever give her the reigns back entirely. But I'm debating whether or not, "You pick the positions" is giving her the reigns.

I decided to read a Focus on the Family article on developing a "satisfying" sex life.

1 upvotes · 22 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

The RP position is that men should initiate, lead, and dominate the bedroom. Giving my wife the reigns to take the lead in how we have sex is a beta move. That said, it could still be implemented not as, "I'm handing you the reigns," but as me having researched the issue in advance, taking the lead in deciding to implement something from the research, and then instructing her to spend time considering what of the options I'm giving her (and most everything on there would be a legitimate option) would be a comfortable place to start. So, while it's still coming from an alpha/take-the-lead position, there's that subtle: "I'm letting you choose" attitude that can come off as highly beta.

I decided to read a Focus on the Family article on developing a "satisfying" sex life.

1 upvotes · 22 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Great advice ... and cool website. I can see at some point simply giving my wife that link and letting her have fun picking something new to try. It's about the most non-RP thing in the world, but perhaps giving her freedom to choose how we have sex will help her be more comfortable opening up to try new things. Someone else also mentioned a mojo quiz ... I might try that with her too.

I decided to read a Focus on the Family article on developing a "satisfying" sex life.

1 upvotes · 22 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Sorry for the automod there ... I really need to figure out how to let certain words through.

Thanks for the heads up on this. I do find that if edged appropriately (especially while covering the tip), enough builds up that it's more than sufficient lubrication on its own. It just doesn't naturally spread itself, so you have to get creative.

I decided to read a Focus on the Family article on developing a "satisfying" sex life.

1 upvotes · 22 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

rape fantasy is never about rape but the freedom from sexual responsibility and the enjoyment of "forced" pleasure

I totally understand that. I can't say I've never been turned on by that thought either.

As far as the full cowgirl not lasting

Oh, I was being somewhat facetious there. I can last longer if I choose to ... it's just one of those things where the cowgirl/kissing combo is a huge turn-on for me.

cockring

Hmm ... an area where I'm totally ignorant. What exactly is that? I've heard of male chastity gear before, or "torture cages" or something. Are you talking about getting pierced?

I decided to read a Focus on the Family article on developing a "satisfying" sex life.

1 upvotes · 22 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

keep having sex but set aside training and teaching days

This is what I was missing. Thanks for clarifying that!

Dig in and find the reasons why

Bondage is one of the subtle kinks she reveals every now and then. She likes when I put weight on her because she can't get out. She likes when I hold her hands together above her head so she can't move. For some reason handcuffs didn't go over as well as I thought they would ... so still trying to figure that one out. Probably was just further than she was willing to go at the time. After all the things I'd tried in the past, rope was the one thing that she was first to initiate (and pretty much the only one she's initiated).

full cowgirl with your arms wrapped around her back

One of my favorite positions she's been willing to do. If I can get her riding me while kissing at the same time ... hard to last long at that point.

What's the MRP stance on responsive sexuality?

1 upvotes · 22 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

This is good stuff. I'll try to get to the full article soon. Thanks for sharing this!

I decided to read a Focus on the Family article on developing a "satisfying" sex life.

1 upvotes · 22 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I was under the impression that your wife actually submits to your authority (actual "walks the walk" and not just "talk the talk")

When I lead, she does. When I'm silent, she's mostly selfish. So, if I tell her, "This is what we're doing today," she goes along with it even if it's not what she had planned. If I say, "This is how we're going to handle this issue with the kids," she goes along with it, even if she disagrees. But her heart is still internally rebellious, and there are a select few things (sex being one of them) where she sets her own boundaries and has not been completely submissive. I'm not sure if that clarifies much.

ONE - Great idea. Nothing turns me on more than a passionate, "tongue sucking" kiss. The wife hates anything with tongues, but will play along in rare circumstances. It goes into the "ew, gross" mentality of bodily fluids.

TWO - "guide her hand over her lips and her own breasts" - also a great idea. Although she eventually gets into it with time, starfish is mostly her favorite position ... let me do all the work while she does nothing. She doesn't realize that our whole bodies are sexual. So, when it comes to satisfying me, she pretty much goes straight for my penis and that's about it.

THREE - As above, going for the groin is her default. She's cool with that part.

FOUR - "have her repeat the terms" - this is a good idea to start bringing it all down to earth rather than "that stuff we don't talk about." "Solo" in her mind is sin ... going to be a tough one. I don't think she's ever touched herself other than to wipe after going to the bathroom. Getting her to orgasm isn't very hard. She's climaxed all but maybe 5 or 6 times whenever we've had sex. She does think sperm is "icky" and gross, though, so "learns how to handle semen" is something she'll have to figure out.

FIVE - "take her hand and have her finger herself" - phew, that's going to be difficult. "have her smear her juice

onto her (mouth) lips" - sounds insanely hot, but like an impossible fantasy. This whole step just seems virtually impossible right now - not that I won't try in due time. But I feel like that's going to take months.

SIX - "Don't rush this" - and that's where her selfishness rings in. So far (and I accept this may change) when it's my turn, she just wants to get it over with. We've had exactly one time (about a year ago) in our entire marriage where she was willing to edge me.

SEVEN - Makes sense.

EIGHT - Hmm ... sounds fun. Maybe someday. This actually seems more probable in the distant future than step 5.

Thanks for this breakdown! To make sure I understand: are you suggesting starting from scratch with sex rather than building on whatever progress we've made in the past?

What's the MRP stance on responsive sexuality?

1 upvotes · 21 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

Interesting ... this is great information. I've already read a lot from thedirtynormal.com ... will have to check the other stuff out.

My wife has been highly anti-toys from the start (including vibrators) ... she was taught early on that (1) sex toys are bad and (2) if you have orgasms by a sex toy you'll lose your ability to orgasm to normal stimulus from your husband. Obviously I don't agree with those conclusions, but I can see how at least for the first couple months of marriage #2 would make sense.

What's the MRP stance on responsive sexuality?

1 upvotes · 21 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

I always wondered about the push/pull dynamic. I read about it a lot, but it's never been succinctly explained - only suggested without explanation. Thanks for that!

What's the MRP stance on responsive sexuality?

1 upvotes · 21 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

Good point.

What's the MRP stance on responsive sexuality?

1 upvotes · 21 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

I wish I had a rack. I do have a home bench, but I took it apart a couple years back when the kid stuff started overrunning the house. I also didn't have a bar ... just used it with freeweights, and I only have 25s and 45s at home, so I can't get much of a bench at home anyway. The 45s aren't terrible for an overhead press or curls, though ... but I probably need to invest in some 60s soon. Not sure I can curl a 60 yet (haven't tried), but maybe that would motivate me :p

assistance lifts

I probably need to look into this more. I'm totally anti-machine (too focused, don't hit stabilizers, etc.), but I also haven't deviated much from the main 5 (bench, overhead, squat, deadlift, standing row) other than to do curls and situps.

Can't believe you run before lifting...

That's the best part. I feel like it makes the lifting easier because my body's already loose and back into

processing lactic acids faster, so I don't have to take as long of a rest between sets. I seem to recall that you get the most out of lifting if your rest between sets lets most/all of the lactic acid build-up to die out because then you can lift more (weight and/or reps) in each set, which leads to greater muscle tear. The lactic acid is your body's defense mechanism to prevent you from tearing additional muscle, causing the feeling of fatigue to force you to stop, thereby reducing potential gains as well. I might be crazy, but I feel like the running does help with this. Or maybe I just like running :p

What's the MRP stance on responsive sexuality?

1 upvotes · 21 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

No kidding ... I just commented to someone else I hadn't even thought about that possibility because I always think of the MWC as something to do with guys viewing their wives in that framework, never the wives viewing themselves. I'll look into it.

What's the MRP stance on responsive sexuality?

1 upvotes · 21 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

Correct - that's how she initiates *sometimes*. I tried to qualify that in my other comments. She does do good initiations at times too ... it's just extremely rare. The fact that I've only been self-improving for a year and she was pregnant for 9 months of the last year and is still breast feeding probably has a lot to do with that too ... probably should have mentioned that a lot more here. I haven't seen what she's like with improved-me under normal hormonal conditions yet. That's still another 6-9 months away while she's still breastfeeding/pumping.

Have you told her that the ways she says that is a problem for you?

Yes, that's when I get the response from my previous comment: "I'm a girl, you can't expect me to want to initiate."

Asked her to say something differently?

Yes. I've given her a script, I've told her what she could do to show me she's interested in a low-risk way, and we've talked about these things at length. Then the moment comes and she forgets it all and it's back to ASD or general defensiveness.

does it anyway to be cruel?

It certainly feels cruel, but I don't think she's trying to be cruel.

hoping benching 300 will make her magically have an epiphany about?

No, that's just my mark for when I'll start cutting to get 12% BF or less.

How do you respond? Something accepting and playful like ...

- In the past I had simply rejected her negatively: "If you don't want me, I don't want you. I'm not putting up with this garbage 'I'm okay with it' stuff."
- After I quit that it went to positive rejection: "Hey, it's cool if you're not into it, we'll do it another time." Then she'll get huffy and say, "But you're probably mad at me for not being into it." I'd say, "If I was mad, would I do this?" Then I'd make out with her for about 30 seconds and stop. Rather than any escalation, she'd just say, "Okay, I believe you" and that'd be the end of it (i.e. 30 seconds wasn't enough to get her into it). The most recent this happened was about 2 months ago.

- I've also used the exact line you cited a handful of times since then.
- More recently, I take the MMSLP advice of never turning down an initiation no matter how bad it is. So, I'll AA: "I know you're not interested ... but I think your hole is aching for it." This (or some other AA depending on her exact word choice) has been my default the last few times.

rejection of her and not her initiation method

That very well could be.

But you may also want to really think about why she says those words that way in the first place

Yeah, I think I addressed my thoughts on that in another comment, then someone complained that I need to stop worrying about what's in her head and just do whatever I want and if she doesn't respond, oh well. Not very helpful :p

fall into the same Madonna/whore mentalities

Interesting, I've only ever thought about this in the context of the man viewing his wife in that context - never about her viewing herself that way, although it seems identical to the ASD concepts RP talks about.

Thinking that you'll lose respect for her if she's "slutty" or enjoys the wrong sorts of sex too much or doesn't enjoy the approved sorts of sex

This is very, very probable. Now that you mention it, she was the first one to introduce rope in the bedroom, and she was very nervous about it. I got the impression it wasn't something she wanted; she was doing it just to try to appease me with trying something new ... but maybe I misread that situation (it was just under a year ago, so I don't remember it well enough to re-evaluate). There was also a time when she used whipped cream on herself, not realizing I was sick at the time and felt like puking. Although I was turned on and we did have sex, it clearly wasn't good sex ... she misread it as me being disgusted at her for wanting to do something kinky (this was a few years ago) and that ushered in our 18-month no-sex streak spanning the end of 2014 to February 2016. At the end of those 18 months she finally brought up that the reason she kept rejecting me was because she was so hurt by feeling like I was disgusted with her for bringing whipped cream in the bedroom ... I just about laughed at how ridiculous that interpretation was because she knew (after the fact) that I was sick because I was vomiting most of the next day (magically she didn't get sick - I was cautious on where I kissed her or breathed, which probably only added to her belief that I was grossed out by her).

BJs and cunni are slutty sex, and not for respectable women

She definitely harbors that view, but it also disgusted by the physical "ickiness" of genitalia. The thought of getting any cum in her mouth (even precum) is so disgusting to her that she won't take that risk. If I could guarantee there'd be no precum, she might be more open to it, but she'd probably make me wash myself right in front of her to prove there's no sweat or anything either.

There are literally books upon books for helping women reprogram

I googled "overcome sexual repression" for half an hour last night and was extremely underwhelmed with the lack of meaningful information. Any recommendations on good books? Particularly ones that don't involve actually disowning one's faith :p

The only helpful tip I've found was "learn to masturbate." This is something I've wanted to push her into for a

long, long time, but it's walking a fine line. I've almost told her a few times, "I don't care if you watch porn or think about other guys - just do something to get yourself excited and thinking about sex more often," but that would be against our faith, so I won't cross that line. That said, despite my past efforts (mind you, all while I was still beta - I haven't tried recently), I couldn't even get her to touch herself while we're in the middle of having sex together. The closest she ever got was she grabbed my hand and moved it where she wanted - and that's only ever happened once in our entire marriage. Usually I tell her: "Let me know what you want and what feels good - even if you have to interrupt the moment, just start communicating." Her response has always been, "But you're so amazing on your own, I don't have to do that." And I answer, "But then I'll never learn how to take things to the next level," and she says, "What's wrong with the level we're at? Can't we just stay here?"

type of sex you're having just sucks for her

Her reactions (not just words) tell me otherwise. She has always complimented me about how good I am in bed. Of course, that's mostly because I was the epitome of the "Nice Guy" in trying to meet all of her desires while neglecting my own. I studied and researched everything I could about technique and got really good at it - keep her edging for hours sometimes, to the point where she's writhing around trying to rub against my finger or penis, even to the degree that she'll try to find the edge of a bed sheet to brush against her to finally get off - and then she internally cascades while moaning that she doesn't think anyone in the world could do her better.

My theory at the time was: *If I can make sex as good for her as humanly possible - god-like levels - then she'll want it more.* I've evenly overtly communicated this theory to her and it just does not work. Period.

[/u/BluepillProfessor](#) notes this constantly - that type of supplicating behavior doesn't foster attraction. That's not to say I give up all my great techniques - it just means that making sex great for her isn't going to make her want to make sex great for me. She's too selfish. 99% - after she finally finishes (which again, might be hours of edging without her ever touching me), she just wants me to be in, out, and done in about 30 seconds. By that point, it's not hard for her to make me finish, even if I intentionally try to slow her down or keep her from setting me off.

Or maybe you focus waaaaay too much on her and she's trying to blow steam off the "I need my wife to cum" quest.

I definitely have this issue ... but getting her to cum has never been hard. In our 9 years of marriage, I think we've only ever had sex 5 or so times where I couldn't get her to finish, and there was good reason for 4 of them.

Sorry, that's probably a lot of TMI ... but it's nice to externally process this stuff sometimes rather than internalize it every time.

What's the MRP stance on responsive sexuality?

1 upvotes · 21 September 2017 · [/r/askMRP](#)

Agreed.

What's the MRP stance on responsive sexuality?

1 upvotes · 21 September 2017 · [/r/askMRP](#)

Interesting. I haven't heard it characterized that way, but it makes sense. From what I recall, the spontaneous desire comes from testosterone, which is a predominantly male hormone. Although women have testosterone, it's in lower quantities and can only operate in the woman when working in tandem with estrogen. So, it makes sense to say that the "take initiative" concept comes from "masculine energy" - that energy literally being testosterone, whereas "masculine energy" (testosterone) only increases a woman's sexual desire when there is estrogen to "receive" it (as you say "Feminine energy is receptive"). Studies show that excess testosterone without sufficient estrogen to receive and process it will actually lower a woman's sex drive ... interesting (sorry if this is a weird comment: reporting results as I research it).

What's the MRP stance on responsive sexuality?

1 upvotes · 21 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

Psychological conversation in mind ... as a curious idea, what would be your thought on getting a bottle of placebo pills, telling her it's some KY-type product and seeing what the placebo effect does? I've never been much into the "fix her" mentality in the first place (as you say, it's more about "lead her"), but I've always been an experimenter of people.

What's the MRP stance on responsive sexuality?

1 upvotes · 21 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

Good stuff. Thanks for the input! I've thought about making sex talk a more common, casual thing in the hope that it would drop her defenses a bit, but my efforts have mostly been in the form of AA, flirtatious stuff directed at her rather than conversation with her. That's probably a psychological defense mechanism in me, but I'll work on it.

What's the MRP stance on responsive sexuality?

1 upvotes · 21 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

Then so be it.

I decided to read a Focus on the Family article on developing a "satisfying" sex life.

1 upvotes · 21 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

No worries, I understand your boundaries.

ONE - Agreed

TWO - That talk has happened a dozen times in the last year alone ... probably in triple digits over the course of our 9 year marriage. I don't withdraw affection (maybe that's a mistake), but I do withdraw time, if that makes sense. I have never threatened divorce or legal separation, and I don't expect that will produce the intended result, but I agree she probably doesn't realize how important this issue is to me.

THREE - You're right. I have definitely been seeking that validation. I thought I had given it up years ago in favor of getting my validation from God. But when I started getting in shape and receiving that validation from other people, I saw a psychological disconnect between: "Why does everyone else see all of these changes and improvements and give me validation and show signs of interest - yet my wife seems to be unphased?" That brought back my interest in seeking her validation. It's really silly, but I see that pretty clearly now.

FOUR - I said that each position is biblically defensible. I wouldn't say "bad sex is grounds for divorce." The divorce is still sin, but the reason God/Moses allowed divorce in the first place (even in the absence of justifying grounds) was because it was the preferable course of action over what would have occurred if the parties did not divorce. To put it another way, it's the lesser of two evils. To resort to divorce under that position would be an acknowledgment that I am too spiritually weak to proceed in my marriage in a godly manner without a healthy sex life. I don't believe that is true of me now and I don't expect it to get there, so I don't anticipate divorce (or even legal separation) in my future. To some degree, I included those things on the list (1) because in an extreme scenario they are viable options, and (2) because if I didn't include them, every response from then on would be: "You're so beta because you're too committed to the idea of marriage" and I wouldn't get any serious answers. So, you could say I was posturing for the crowd without technically lying. I hope that makes sense. Also, each step along that path would involve a clear, unambiguous conversation with my wife. I wouldn't just start withdraw without telling her why.

FIVE - See above. But otherwise, what do you mean by, "You did pull back the resentment as the replies came in, but it is there simmering" - I get the second part, but not so much the first.

SIX - Agreed. However, there is a huge disconnect between what she knows and wants from what she actually does. My wife likes to put on the appearance of being the Proverbs 31 woman externally, but harbors an extreme selfishness that comes out in private interactions that aren't public. My mom was just with us for a week at the beginning of the month and said she noticed this and that it really shocked her because my wife otherwise seems so sweet, caring, kind, compassionate, etc. when you're only around her for a short while. I don't think my wife even realizes her own selfishness (just as I'm sure I don't even realize the degree of my own sins until others point them out to me or the Spirit convicts me).

SEVEN - When you say "one day a week for you and your wife to be alone" - do you mean for the purpose of exploring sex or just as a date night? Do you have any recommendations on how to "work on freeing her of her sexual hangups"? I googled "overcome sexual repression" and variants for about 30 minutes, but the results were very underwhelming or things I've already tried that didn't work ... mostly buzzfeed type articles that simply say: "Just have lots of sex and eventually she'll get over it" or "learn to masturbate" or "screw your faith, religion is just trying to manipulate you for control." To be clear, I'm pretty confident that the "learn to masturbate" thing might actually help (she won't even touch herself while we're together having sex) - to the point where I've almost told my wife: "I don't care if you watch porn or think about other guys or whatever ... just doing something to get yourself thinking about sex more often is an improvement." But I don't want to encourage her to sin either ... it's a weird spot.

No worries on the "post hijack" - I'm good with it :)

What's the MRP stance on responsive sexuality?

1 upvotes · 21 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

What's LSE?

What's the MRP stance on responsive sexuality?

1 upvotes · 21 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

I'll check it out. It's it just a knowledge/understanding book or does it offer solutions too?

What's the MRP stance on responsive sexuality?

1 upvotes · 21 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

I'll definitely check it out.

Wife's traditional response has been some hamster variant of: "I'm a girl. Girls aren't interest in sex like men. My vag should give me a free pass, so don't act like I should ever just feel like having sex sometimes."

What's the MRP stance on responsive sexuality?

1 upvotes · 21 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

Thanks for all the info. I'll definitely check it out. As I said, I'm not on DB much since I don't technically have a DB. We have regular sex that's pretty good ... It's mostly the first 5 minutes of trying to get her revved up that I'm sick of dealing with. Going to DB has more been about practicing spotting RP issues and how to answer them so I'm ready if/when the time comes.

Wife does sleep through the night though, I make sure of that. I keep the baby with me until about 3am every night and she doesn't wake up again for another feeding until 730 or so. Wife goes to bed at 9 or 10, so she gets about 9-10 hours of uninterrupted sleep a night. She has her own other issues though.

What's the MRP stance on responsive sexuality?

1 upvotes · 21 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

Good word. Thanks!

What's the MRP stance on responsive sexuality?

1 upvotes · 21 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

Yeah, getting from crap to 2 plates goes pretty fast ... after that it really takes a lot to make small gains. If it helps, I posted my routine over [here](#). My benchmarks on that post are from a month ago, so a bit lower. 2 plates is when I started getting a lot of respect from other guys in the gym and IOIs from other women working out, so that's probably a pretty solid place to be regardless :)

That said, although it had been years since I'd lifted, I'm pretty sure muscle-memory kicks in and helps get back up to "the old days" faster. I notice this with running too. People who are brand new to lifting are training their muscles for the first time, which is much harder. That's also why cracking the 275 barrier is going to be hell ... because I've never done it before, so I won't have muscle-memory working in my favor.

EDIT: Then I immediately read this on TRP:

https://www.reddit.com/r/TheRedPill/comments/71e8df/medical_issue_kept_me_out_of_the_gym_for_nearly_2/dna383l/

What's the MRP stance on responsive sexuality?

1 upvotes · 21 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

Aaaah. That totally went over my head. I thought you meant "do this, do that, create perfect conditions for sex, then I'll think about it."

What's the MRP stance on responsive sexuality?

1 upvotes · 21 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

She does want it. Her brain is telling her she shouldn't and she needs you to help break that down.

This is a good insight. When I tried going down on her, it was before I started most of my self-improvement. I was still pretty beta, so when she said no I listened. She did say as part of the reason for her hard no: "I would never return the favor and it would make me feel guilty letting you do that knowing I'd never do it back." Wrong time to STFU, but alas ... I was an idiot a year ago.

First month ... Next month ... The month after

Hah! This is exactly the way I approached it to get to the "brief lick" phase in the first place ... that's where she cut it off, so I never go to the "go to town" part. But again, I was also pretty unattractive at that point, so things might be different now.

She will test you like crazy afterwards once she's climaxed

Why and what would the tests look like? Usually after sex she's just in a silent glow and doesn't talk at all.

moral or not (which it is by the way biblically speaking)

Completely agreed.

Good approach and mindset, but just realize that you can likely be getting more here

Good point.

She just has some hurdles to jump through and needs the right man to lead her.

I'm trying to be that man :)

What's the MRP stance on responsive sexuality?

1 upvotes · 21 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

The fantasies are there even if they're buried

I totally believe this. I'm contemplating going for a PhD in psychology to complement my law degree (do court forensic work that way), at which point I'd love to concentrate on marriage counseling and sex therapy - primarily for my own benefit, but also to nudge others along in a direction that 99% of other counselors would reject. I'd have a nice niche among men that doesn't exist in very many places.

probably never feel her "get into it."

That's the thing, though. Once she's revved up she's begging for my touch, saying things like, "How do you get me to feel that way? I didn't even know that was possible." Of course, this is also some of my problem, which I noticed when first reading NMMNG: Nice Guys are so giving/others-centered in the sack that it trains their wives to ignore the need to rev up their husbands, so the man ends up being less than satisfied. Even so, my biggest fetish is watching a woman orgasm, so when she climaxes that about does it for me, hence my still enjoying it even if most of the work is by me on her ... but her trying to please/edge me every now and then would be nice too. Sorry, that might be too much TMI, but them's be the facts.

something going on there

Completely agreed - and I'm not yet equipped to handle it myself. I've tried encouraging her to counseling, but I'm also very skeptical about the feminism that runs rampant among most counselors, and I doubt she's be willing to talk to a male counselor about her sexual issues (nor would I want her to - that's just spelling "cheat on me!" with my own blood).

open environment

What are your suggestions for cultivating this? I've tried to be playful/direct in the past. I'd make a game out of it, where we'd ask each other personal questions and I'd wait until the 4th or 5th round of questions to ask about sexual stuff. That has not worked. I've tried pulling out a naughty board game we got for our wedding years ago. Didn't work. I thought about blindfolding her and taking her to an adult store just to show her: "Nothing you have to say is going to scare me off," but I'm guessing that'd be way too much too fast.

I don't have any direct recommendations I could make

Heh, should have read ahead :p

looking for resources about battling repressed sexuality may be beneficial

I actually never thought about this. I was always so focused on improving myself (especially since finding RP - and before that I was too beta to think that the almighty woman needed to improve) that I hadn't really thought to look into psychological resources on sexual repression. Thanks for the tip :)

What's the MRP stance on responsive sexuality?

1 upvotes · 21 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

chore zoned

Hah, I like that. I'm pretty good at rejecting this. I do the chores I want to do. She knows quite well that if she asks me to do a chore, my response is something like, "Hey, that's a great idea - you're right, that does need to get done. Mind handling that for me? Thanks, babe. You're the best!" Then I go off and do something else. She stopped asking me to do chores a while back, but mostly because I just get stuff done now and she knows I'm not going to put up with her nagging.

My wife needs no foreplay She demands I get in her, like right f-ing now

Heh, that'd be nice. For a long time my wife didn't like foreplay either. She demanded I get it over with right away. Haha. Seriously, though - sex is great now once we get started. I just have to tough it out for the first 5 minutes. The point of this post is that I now hate initiating because those first 5 minutes suck about 80% of the time (100% of the time she initiates and about 90% of the time I initiate).

What's the MRP stance on responsive sexuality?

1 upvotes · 21 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

the improvement also has to be for you

I feel you on that! That was the first legit post I made on [r/RPChristians](#) - developing the internal sense of motivation, particularly to stay fit (but it applies to all areas).

I got lazy. Because my goal was more sex

Been there, done that about 5 or 6 times in my 9 year marriage. It's why I definitively know (despite what my wife says verbally) that me being in great physical shape is not going to make her want sex - although I perfectly agree that when I was fat it was definitely a hindrance.

What's the MRP stance on responsive sexuality?

1 upvotes · 21 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

I appreciate that!

What's the MRP stance on responsive sexuality?

1 upvotes · 21 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

That's only a one-rep max ... finally tied my high since high school, though! Just wish I was as thin as I was back then :p Honestly, the way guys talk here, I assumed 300+ was kind of the norm/standard.

What's the MRP stance on responsive sexuality?

1 upvotes · 21 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

I've just never seen even bandaid solutions there ... only divorce. The closest to a suggestion has been: "Say something mean and snarky back to show them how mad you are anger maybe they'll get it."

What's the MRP stance on responsive sexuality?

1 upvotes · 21 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

Does db even offer solutions at all? I get the impression their only solution is divorce.

What's the MRP stance on responsive sexuality?

1 upvotes · 21 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

I've tried ... haven't gotten very far. Her usual response is, "I don't know what I want" and that's pretty darn believable coming from a girl. It's usually followed by, "What's wrong with what we've been doing?" Over time I've gotten her to be open to whipped cream, handcuffs, blindfold, rope ... She hasn't cared for any of that yet, but she does like when I'm physically laying on top of her in missionary ("I like the pressure") and when I lick her thighs, but oral on her is a hard no.

What's the MRP stance on responsive sexuality?

1 upvotes · 21 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

Thanks for being willing to give the hard realities. It's tough to swallow, but I've still got some time before making that judgment :)

What's the MRP stance on responsive sexuality?

1 upvotes · 20 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

9 years of marriage and never once, although I can't say I've pushed the issue. She made it clear early on: "I will never."

That said, I do get turned on by the thought of giving her oral ... but that's a hard no for her too. I discovered that hard no when I tried it for the first time last year. I was shocked because licking her inner thigh makes her go bonkers. She has a clear and openly communicated mental block of viewing genitalia as always dirty, both physically (i.e. slimy, gross) and morally.

She can't even say the word vagina. Instead she says "my butt hole" and hopes I know which hole she's taking about at any given time. This does make for some good flirtatious banter, of course ... but that's beside the point.

Either way, thanks for the insights. If it happens, it happens, but not getting BJs isn't a hard next issue for me.

What's the MRP stance on responsive sexuality?

1 upvotes · 20 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

Being high SMV is indirect, which appears to be spontaneous. So you are wanting your wife to validate your SMV, which obviously isn't high enough. Raise it.

This makes sense. I'm just not sure where to go from here.

I'm 6'0, 15% BF, bench 275 (1-rep max), squat about 340, earn over \$125k/yr, am generally good looking, witty, flirty, pull attention from other people, high social status (usually the default 'group leader' in whatever I do), primary caregiver to my kids, OYS all over the house (at least for the last 3 months). I could probably do with adding some male hobbies (other than lifting, racquetball and writing are my primary right now). I've read through all the levels of dread and don't see many weak spots other than my refusal actually to cheat on my wife. I feel like I'm tweaking strengths more than fixing weaknesses, and those small tweaks just aren't doing much. Someone else suggested getting to 12% BF, which I've been defraying for the purpose of gaining muscle mass ... otherwise, where would you recommend improving to get the most results?

Eh ... now that I think about it, fashion sense is probably one area I know I'm lacking. I wear suits and ties everyday to work, so when I'm home I usually just want to toss on something comfy. But is wearing nicer clothes really going to make that big of a difference?

What's the MRP stance on responsive sexuality?

1 upvotes · 20 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

If you're looking onto responsive desire, you better be reading "Come As You Are" which covers that in depth

Heh, another guy just said not to waste my time - that it's good, but nothing useful for men.

You're trying to overpower turn offs and that's why you're killing yourself with effort.

It's not so much effort in life - I've got a happy balance there. I'm just not interested in initiating anymore. I suppose that's just a fact of life I'll have to accept and deal with, though.

You're here from DB right?

Nah, didn't head over there until after discovering RP and getting sex back on track. I mostly go there to practice identifying problems and figuring out which solutions apply so that when my wife inevitably pulls something on me, it's nothing I haven't seen before.

"Extraordinary Passion" blogspot? You need to get that entire thing in your head.

Haven't heard of it. Will check it out :)

your bedroom sucks because your mentality is f-ed up

The bedroom is fine as long as I'm willing to do all of the initiation and ignore her weak, libido-killing attempts at initiating. We have sex regularly, and 5 minutes into sex it's pretty darn great - mutually (and I have good reason to trust her on that). It's the initiation of sex that's the problem. As I realized through some of these comments, it's most likely that I'm looking for validation from her and if I have to do all the initiating or her initiation is weak, I don't get that.

Have you at least read SGM?

That one is next on my list. I originally understood that it was more about technique in the bed itself, which has never been a problem for us (again, the first 5 minutes being the exception). So, I left it alone and went for all the other stuff on the list. That may actually be the only thing on the sidebar I haven't read yet :p

What's the MRP stance on responsive sexuality?

1 upvotes · 20 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

Originally, it was a purely theoretical question based on an excuse I see made on [r/deadbedrooms](#) a lot. Although my bedroom is far from dead, the things I read there still intrigue me.

Your response presumed I was having trouble getting my wife to have sex with me, as is the normal problem on here. This isn't a problem I have anymore.

What I did realize as a result of this post, though, is that I had a subconscious problem of wanting validation from my wife through her initiation of sex - desiring me enough that she would be more spontaneous and not be so heavily responsive. This is probably why those particular conversions in [r/db](#) sparked my interest.

That said, I think the answer to my original question is clear: the responsive/spontaneous dichotomy is legit and should be embraced to some degree. I just happened to get more than I bargained for when making this post.

What's the MRP stance on responsive sexuality?

1 upvotes · 20 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

Thanks. This is helpful.

What's the MRP stance on responsive sexuality?

1 upvotes · 20 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

I understand this mentality, but that's not what I was asking about and that doesn't address the reason for my question.

What's the MRP stance on responsive sexuality?

1 upvotes · 20 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

I'm not sure where you're picking up the M-H complex or a "super judgy holy attitude about sex." What did I say that led you to see this?

What's the MRP stance on responsive sexuality?

1 upvotes · 20 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

Never heard of the book, but I appreciate your brief review.

I think this is a scientific valid premise that does not conflict with RP teachings.

Good to know.

So, is it okay if a wife says, "Sorry honey, but I guess I'm just a responsively sexual person, so don't ever expect me to initiate"?

What's the MRP stance on responsive sexuality?

1 upvotes · 20 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

Good to know. I've been hovering at about 15% for the last month. One good cut diet and I'm sure I could be there, but I've been following the fitness advice not to cut calories while I continue to gain muscle mass. I was told to keep bulking until my bench was at least 300 ... I'm only at about 275 so far.

What's the MRP stance on responsive sexuality?

1 upvotes · 20 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

Good point. Given that my wife is still breastfeeding, so her body agenda is working against me (i.e. hormones are trying to avoid getting pregnant again), I'd be idiotic to accept it now. But I'll certainly re-evaluate 3 months after breastfeeding ends.

What's the MRP stance on responsive sexuality?

1 upvotes · 20 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

This makes a lot of sense.

I decided to read a Focus on the Family article on developing a "satisfying" sex life.

1 upvotes · 20 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I agree with pretty much everything you've said here. But it sounds like either you've changed what you originally said or your original comment simply could not stand alone without this clarification.

better method for persuading women and children (aka Charm) ... would you not use it 10 times out of 10?

I'm not convinced that "charm" is a great persuasive mechanism for a girl. Attractive, absolutely. I'm sure it's

persuasive for some, but if it was as simple as you make it sound, the world would be a very different place. I'm more with the post on leadership styles as being a better way to get through to women - if what you're trying to do (i.e. logic/lecturer) isn't working, try something new (like life-sharing, delegating, etc.).

How is the lure to argue/convince them (intellectually) not also at est women use to test men?

Not sure what you're getting at here.

Is this what boys want to think about?

When I was that age, yes. Absolutely. But I get your point on the whole. The difference is when the little boy initiates the wall of text. You're assuming the dad is the initiator, inviting the boy to engage.

do you not secretly lose a little respect for him?

Not if he's responding to the boy's initiation.

Would you not find the fish... insecure?

No, I'd assume the fish enjoys it.

What's the MRP stance on responsive sexuality?

1 upvotes · 20 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

wow. boner killer right there

No kidding. Nevertheless, I take the MMSLP advice of accepting it anyway, otherwise I'm affirming her fear of getting rejected and training her not to initiate.

I used to take your approach and say, "Screw it, if you're not interested, I don't want it." The whole *walk away from bad sex* thing, but that is the reason I'm in this hole in the first place. From reading post after post, I'm seeing that rejecting the initiation is bad, rejecting her in the middle of bad sex is helpful. What I've found is that even with her crappy initiations, 5 minutes later she's as horny as I wish she had been 5 minutes ago. I'm just getting somewhat sick of the way sex starts - either I do all the heavy lifting or put up with her garbage initiation style.

drop that expectation

Yeah, I've dropped any expectation of oral years ago. Not sure if you were there for my first ever MRP post, but reading RP for the first few days brought that expectation back. Then I quickly learned that (1) I can't make it happen and (2) if it is going to happen, it's not going to happen if I'm pining over it like a beta. So, I went back into DNGAF mode about it.

every one of those me ... will tell you about the significant amount of work it took ... Look, what are you ok with having?

I think I'm just really trying to figure out if a day will come when having a healthy sex life isn't so much work.

What's the MRP stance on responsive sexuality?

1 upvotes · 20 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

Gotcha. So, in your view, responsive sexuality is a perfectly legitimate thing even in an RP framework, and thus

it's okay if a woman never initiates or shows spontaneous desire for her husband. Or am I taking this conclusion further than you would?

I decided to read a Focus on the Family article on developing a "satisfying" sex life.

1 upvotes · 20 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

blatant attempt to misrepresent my points, or ...

Meh, I took your post the same way. I don't think he was off base.

Would it be wise for a grown man to argue with a 7 year old? What good could come out of that? What good EVER comes out of that?

Well, the child could learn something. Or the grown man could learn something about how 7 year old kids process information. But you're still being pretty ridiculous if you're suggesting a woman's capacity for logic and reason is no better than that of a male 7 year old. My son's 5 ... I guess I'll find out in 2 years.

I will say without question that at least in the legal profession, a woman's capacity for logic and reason is significantly above a 7-year-old's level and probably above 90% of men I've ever met. I'll also note that male attorneys still tend to have the advantage. My point is, there are hundreds of thousands of women attorneys in the US, virtually all of whom are better at logic and reason than most grown men. So, even if this is a minority position, it's one that cannot be discounted.

Although a woman's ultimate capacity for logic and reason might be lower than men's *on the whole*, there are countless women who are practically living at a higher threshold than countless men. Capacity and application are two different things.

I decided to read a Focus on the Family article on developing a "satisfying" sex life.

1 upvotes · 20 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Okay, this comment is borderline inappropriate. I'm not going to remove it, but be careful how you tread.

First thing's first: I don't engage in these conversations to try to convince anyone of anything. So the premise of your post and accusation is totally off-base in the first place. I've long since given up the notion of being able to persuade anyone of anything on the internet. I engage in these discussions because it's helpful for me to flesh out my own thinking and understanding.

For everything else, I agree with ruiz on this one. What you're saying is inconsistent with observable, provable evidence. It's easy to say "women can't logic" or "women think like children" when you're in a crowd of men who get off on hearing rhetoric about male superiority. But if the evidence proves otherwise, I'm going to choose the evidence over the propaganda every time. After all, isn't this the heart of logic and reason? Your insistence on following propaganda that makes you *feel good* about being a man is actually lumping you into the same category as women.

If allegedly RP men are really that easy to sway away from observable fact, I'm going to have to go back and re-test every single RP theory myself to discern what, as [/u/BluepillProfessor](#) says, is "men swapping notes" or "the evidence is in" ... from what is just propaganda that appeals to the RP man's ego, but is otherwise false. I don't want to do that. That's a lot of work. How do you propose I go about testing things like hypergamy and "crabs in a bucket" and all that on a mass scale? It's an impossible task - but if you convince me that RP rhetoric is not to be taken for its word, what other option do I have? Don't do that and bring discredit to the whole community. I was accused of this with some of my early posts and learned to back off of theory and stick to what I know to be true from personal observation and testing. Please do the same.

tried her best to make sense in what she knew is a male space

I have specifically allowed women to participate on this sub and do not consider it an exclusively "male space." RP is not a male-only thing, as BPP also pointed out that there are 3 other RP subs definitively directed toward women. I know it's a bit of an experiment, but Christianity includes both men and women, so I'm testing the waters to see how well people can engage in RP discussion in a mixed-gender setting (acknowledging that an overwhelming majority are going to be men anyway, simply by virtue of the fact that most people are coming from male-only spaces).

To that end, I'm also aware that /u/Willow-girl is openly not RP and opposes many RP viewpoints. Even so, there's still value in engaging in these conversations, if for no other reason than to gain a better appreciation for what we believe and why. And if there happens to be an actual hole in our thinking, why shy away from that conversation? What are you afraid will happen if you converse with "the enemy"?

Your suggestion to "charm her" only makes sense if I'm trying to screw her. If I have other purposes, I engage in other conversational styles that suit my purposes. I think you need to learn the context in which RP principles are meant to be applied.

Rule #1 Never argue/debate a woman. Ever!

I'm pretty sure Rule 0 is "stay on topic" and Rule 1 is "no moralizing" and sometimes "no talking about fight club" is filtered in there somewhere. I'm also pretty sure that if arguing/debating with a woman suits my purposes, the manosphere would agree: do what advances your goals. That's not to say I'll debate every woman I come across - but I will engage when I have a reason for doing so other than "trying to convince someone on the internet" which is pretty well a futile goal.

I know the redpill advice, want to hear yours.

1 upvotes · 16 September 2017 · /r/ExRedPill

Yeah, TRP/MRP rejects MGTOW as failed red-pillers. I figured that was the stuff you already knew :/ But as the other guy said, some of those things aren't exclusive to RP in the first place. RP doesn't corner the market on "improve yourself." I will say first-hand: "lie to get in her pants" and "pump and dump" are not necessarily *red pill* things, they're just things that red pill guys are often idiotic enough to suggest.

beginning of the end?

1 upvotes · 15 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

Look, you're not married and I think your original post said you'd be okay if this was over. So do whatever you want to do. If it's not worth the trouble, let her go.

If she really is worth it, the only real way to salvage these things is to do a grand gesture, beta up for a few months, feed into her blue pill fantasies, then reintroduce your alpha the way you should have done it the first time. In essence: take a mulligan.

Without kids or the prospect of divorce rape, I don't know why you'd go through all that effort. The only explanation is that you have bad oneitis and still buy into the blue pill fantasy yourself. Cut that crap out.

I know the redpill advice, want to hear yours.

1 upvotes · 15 September 2017 · /r/ExRedPill

What do you mean by "MeRPs"?

beginning of the end?

1 upvotes · 15 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

I don't know that you're mentally capable of rewarding her for alpha reasons right now. Any reward you give her for the next couple months will probably come from a motivation of not wanting to lose her.

But that's okay. It's often said here to guys who aren't RP-ready: "Until you *are* ready, keep doing the same beta crap you've been doing. Filter in the alpha gradually." You went Rambo. It's okay. Most guys here do. If you need to be a little supplicating, so be it. You failed, you'll learn, you'll figure it out better next time.

In short, if you want to reward her for her past good behavior because you now suddenly see that you've been an insensitive prick to her, go do it. Ideally this will come from an alpha mindset, but accept the fact that you're not ready to be full-alpha yet and if there's some beta motivation of "I'm afraid I'll lose her if I don't," you plow through it and keep improving until you can be a true alpha, not just a "jerk qualities only" alpha.

A couple weeks back I wrote [this comment](#) to a guy in a far more extreme version of what you're in. Go read the "save the marriage" section. The first point on burning your frame to the ground and starting from scratch is about what you need if she's got the impression that your frame is a jagged mess of broken glass and barbed wire. Go read some [/u/jacktenofhearts](#) - he talks about this periodically: needing to create a titanium frame, but putting cushions and pillows inside so it's comfortable for someone to live in there.

I decided to read a Focus on the Family article on developing a "satisfying" sex life.

1 upvotes · 14 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I always joke that that marriage probably could have been saved if one of us had had the wisdom to hire a housecleaner, lol.

Hah, we do have one. She comes all year round, even when my wife isn't working. In fact, she's at the house right now :p

I have a little cleaning business on the side

My mom did that for a few years after her divorce. If you can build the right clientele and get a few employees under you, there's pretty decent money in it.

Not saying she doesn't love the kids; I'm sure she does; but maybe the nuts-and-bolts, day-in-and-day-out aspects of parenting were not her cup of tea?

Exactly. Nevertheless, the Christian culture pushes women toward motherhood and staying at home, and her mom hammers this as an ideal on her, and my wife succumbs to cultural pressures incredibly easily. The only time she can avoid doing so is when she steps into my frame and I battle off social conventions for her. She likes this.

with family sizes being smaller today, many kids grow up without having a lot of hands-on time with babies and infants until they have one of their own (yikes!)

Yeah, it is scary, but it's more about how far apart the kids are spaced than how many kids there are. Even then, the last kid or two will always go without.

I decided to read a Focus on the Family article on developing a "satisfying" sex life.

1 upvotes · 14 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I do know what you mean.

Nowadays, most men are expected to pull a "second shift" at home alongside their working wives.

Even when my wife isn't working, the general course of the day goes something like this:

- 7am - Kids get up, wife and I keep sleeping while they watch Netflix
- 7:45am to 8am - Wife gets up and feeds them breakfast
- 8am to 9am - I get up, get them dressed and (for those to whom it applies) get them off to school, then come home and get myself ready
- 9am to 6pm - I'm at work, wife watches kids
- 6pm to 8pm - Wife leaves the house (usually to read a book at starbucks, sometimes shopping, or some other hobby); I cook the kids dinner, play with them for a bit, then put them to bed.
- 8pm to 9pm - Wife and I get an hour to ourselves.
- 9pm to 2am - Wife goes to bed; I stay up
- 2am to 8am - I sleep.

So, pretty much whenever I'm home I'm exclusively responsible for the kids, except for the 15 minutes they're eating breakfast (I don't eat breakfast, hence the extra 15 minutes of sleep). On weekends I do sleep in until around 9:30 or 10, so she takes them then, but she also steals away for a couple hours every weekend, and that's also when we do stuff together with the kids as a family.

As I've noted a few times before, I'm not bitter about this arrangement. She gets bitter because she only gets 2 hours to herself everyday (6-8pm) and I get 4 (10pm-2am), failing to realize that I'm sacrificing sleep to do that ("That's your own fault!"), as I get 6 hours a night and she gets around 10 (accounting for the fact that she watches a 45 minute show when she goes to bed every night). Nevertheless, my kids see me as the primary caregiver and have a closer bond with me. She knows this, but accepts it. Instead of blaming it on the fact that I have more intentional/responsibility time with them or the fact that she's usually eager to get away from them, she chalks it up to "Dad's are just always more fun."

Contrary to the impression I get from the rest of the RP community, I really do wish my wife had a better, more intentional relationship with the kids. She's just so focused on "get stuff done around the house" whenever she's home with them that her ability to just enjoy them being kids is shattered ... which is ironic, given that the whole reason she's staying home 6 months out of the year is so she would be able to enjoy quality time with the kids while they're young.

Anyway, despite what other RPer's might say, I don't see any of this as me making some grand sacrifice for the sake of my wife. I see it as me getting the time with my kids that I want with the added bonus that she gets the time away from them that she wants :p It's kind of a weird attitude for someone who begged and pleaded when we got married to let her be a SAHM once we had kids. Then she got what she wished for and immediately wanted to go right back to work (for at least 1/2 the year anyway).

I decided to read a Focus on the Family article on developing a "satisfying" sex life.

1 upvotes · 13 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Meh, she only works 6 months out of the year. Those are 6 busy months, yes, but the rest of the time she has no good excuse.

Question I always had about Christianity (but every pastor/priest is too bluepillled to answer)

1 upvotes · 12 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I think you know what I'm asking and why

I really don't.

I guess that's where our opinions differ.

Indeed. Although I don't deny that gynocentrism and the feminist imperative exist (not only in America, but in most of the world), pondering it for too long doesn't seem to have much value unless you're in politics and have the power to battle against the change from the top. Battling against the change from the bottom depends more on being practical. So, my hope is that this sub is more practical.

As for coming in with assumptions, I don't think the red pill does this. It's more about testing and discovering and sharing reports/results. There are descriptive aspects that will get into the "why" behind the "how," but that certainly seems to be a minority of posts - at least on MRP. To be fair, I don't spend much time on TRP. TRP is flooded with too many wannabes and half-hearted people who just want a quick fix to their sex problems, then get in a mental circle jerk over theory. MRP is better because it stays practical: *Here's what you need to do, here's how to get it done, and let's be real about how long it's going to take.* Some of the "how to" exists there, but it's more for men who want to do rather than those who are only interested in thinking about concepts.

I decided to read a Focus on the Family article on developing a "satisfying" sex life.

1 upvotes · 12 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Well said. I must have missed this as a main post on TRP/MRP ... I've been offline a lot this last week.

Question I always had about Christianity (but every pastor/priest is too bluepilled to answer)

1 upvotes · 12 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

is there a separate set of cultural values, comparable to "honor" in say Norse/East Asian cultures, reserved only for those who display exceptional courage or fortitude in battle and adversity?

How would "Norse/East Asian cultures" decision to employ an "honor" system have any bearing on whether or not circumcision is gynocentric? That makes no sense to me.

though something else must take its place

And there confirms my suspicion: You came here with the conclusion already solidified in your mind that every culture is gynocentric in some way. Whether it's true or not, this destroys anyone's ability to have a fair, truth-seeking conversation with you.

I could just as easily look throughout history and conclude that every single culture throughout all of time has had a male bias. Modern America still has countless social structures in place that are more advantageous to men than women. Does that mean America is male-centric? It's not an "either/or" - it's an "and." No matter where you go, you'll find things that are good for women and you'll find things that are good for men. This is going to be particularly true in any culture that follows a complementarian model, as the Bible does (and so does RP). Even if everyone in the world were RP, women would have certain advantages that men do not. Why? Because RP acknowledges that men and women are different. Those differences cause general inequalities in different areas. Those inequalities mean that women have advantages over men in certain areas. Accept that as a reality of life and move on. Complaining about "gynocentrism" only makes sense if it's so overwhelmingly dominant that any semblance of gender equity is removed from society. Although America may get there someday, it's certainly impossible to find this to be the case in ancient Israel.

VerseBot

1 upvotes · 12 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

According to the **VerseBot FAQ**, it's already active throughout all of reddit unless a mod bans it. I have not banned it, so it should already be active. The FAQ does say you have to tag it in the comment too, or else it won't work with brackets alone.

Test: [/u/versebot](#) [Malachi 2:15]

Question I always had about Christianity (but every pastor/priest is too bluepilled to answer)

1 upvotes · 12 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

a better question would be, what dirty work is "honor" ...

But that's not the question I asked. Circumcision isn't a badge of "honor." It's not a knighthood. It's not a requirement to fight in a war. It's not something that gives extra respect in the community. After all, literally every single male has it. It doesn't mean anything special on a societal level - it only has an implication between the individual and God. The chivalrous guys among the Israelites would be circumcised right alongside the criminals.

You're also not accounting for the fact that some people are simply better suited for some roles than others. If the men sent the women off to war and to protect the country, in those days (specifically: before guns), that would put the nation at extreme risk. Men are more suited to that job, so men did the job. "Honor" wasn't a system used to get men to do the job; it was a system used to reward men for the fact that they're fulfilling a role that no one else could accomplish as effectively. Men were not "honored" until after the job was done, unlike modern patriotism, where just being a "man in uniform" comes with an expectation of honor and respect from society, even if you just sit in base and play video games all day, never actually participating in war.

Women weren't sent to fight wars

You could say that both could go off to war (i.e. increase army size, even if your added size comes from a class-B soldier). But the fact is that someone has to stay behind and get stuff done while the battles are being fought. So, are you going to keep your best soldiers behind for that purpose or the weak/non-soldierly people? This isn't gynocentrism, it's just common sense.

By "violence against men", I meant thousands and thousands of sons coming home in body bags. The fact you don't see that and can somehow relate it to "violence against women" is pretty alarming.

Circumcision has nothing to do with sending men off to war, and it's not the cause of men coming home in body bags. I still don't see even remotely how you're connecting these two ideas. If another country decides to attack, that's a force of violence from outside a nation. Other than circumcision (which I'd hardly call violence in any modern concept of that word), violence against men was strictly prohibited: "an eye for an eye" and all. But the culture at the time specifically *authorized* violence against women. Men were allowed to beat their wives for not living up to certain standards. There was no law against this. So, when a society condones violence against women, but forbids violence against men, and the only actual violence against men comes from those outside the country - I'm not sure how you're still arguing this point. It just seems like you need to read more history books on ancient Israel culture.

I decided to read a Focus on the Family article on developing a "satisfying" sex life.

1 upvotes · 12 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Yeah, my wife is about as far from "high libido" as I could imagine is possible. I've long since given up on us

being "in the mood" at the same time - literally *ever*. Oh well. I'm over it.

I decided to read a Focus on the Family article on developing a "satisfying" sex life.

1 upvotes · 12 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

True. I would just enjoy every now and then when I come home from the gym or a late night at work that she's dressed up, candles, lit, or something like that. And that does happen sporadically ... maybe twice since the baby was born (i.e. in the last 2 months since her recovery period ended). But before the baby was born, that had happened maybe once in the last 6 years.

Her usual way of initiating was: "I'm kind of tired, but if you really need to I could deal with it today. Up to you." That's a total mood killer. I get that it's coming from an insecurity from the fact that I had rejected her shallow advances like this in the past, so she makes them even more shallow to avoid getting hurt from further rejection. But she should also know I've never once rejected a hard advance. Anyway ... there simply hasn't been enough time since baby-birth to re-establish a new norm and make any comments about her current state. I just know it's better now than it has been in the past.

I decided to read a Focus on the Family article on developing a "satisfying" sex life.

1 upvotes · 12 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Agreed on all counts :)

Responsive-only is an annoying copout. But pretending to be spontaneous when you're not really wanting it (i.e. initiating only because you know he wants you to) is about as shallow as a man faking his way through an intimate conversation just to get sex afterward. As she can usually see through his faking, he can usually see through hers (though if she's good enough he won't care).

I decided to read a Focus on the Family article on developing a "satisfying" sex life.

1 upvotes · 11 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

My understanding comes from the spontaneous/reactive desire spectrum. Some people spontaneously want sex for no reason at all. Other people only start to get aroused half way through intercourse. Others are in between.

Statistically, guys tend closer to the first. Instead of total spontaneity, maybe it's something small like seeing his wife's cleavage unexpectedly. He's responding to very small stimuli, so it really comes off as more spontaneous. Most women would not get aroused by her husband's waist line dropping a couple inches for a brief moment. Instead, when he starts kino on her, at some point her engines are going to get revved up - she's responding to clear sexual intent.

I used to believe that if my wife wasn't into sex before we started, then it was just duty sex, thus no fun. Even if she became physically aroused during sex, I had created a psychological barrier telling me it wasn't real and shouldn't mean anything to me. I assumed she had to be more spontaneously sexual like I was. So, if she rarely ever initiated, that meant to me that she had no desire or attraction for me, which caused me to resent her. It also conditioned me to avoid initiating because in my mind good sex could only happen when she initiated - because I knew she'd be into it. The result? I never initiated and then resented her when she never initiated either.

This resentment actually turned off my spontaneous desire. I had conditioned myself to have a negative psychological reaction to sex. If she bent over and her shirt opened up, rather than enjoying my wife's cleavage, I would then think, "I don't want to see that shrew's boobs. It's like she's trying to taunt me by flaunting sexuality just to deny me when I try. I'll show her!" and then I'd up and leave in a butthurt huff. This really put my wife in an impossible predicament because failing to initiate increased my resentment; subtle initiation (like showing off her body) would cause my resentment to fester; and the only thing that would pull me out (overt jumping all over me, wild and crazy sexual advances) were something I had conditioned her not to do ... why would she? I was acting all butthurt at small advances, so how much worse would I be at a grand gesture! I once went over 9

months without initiating just to see how long it would take before she wanted it enough to initiate. It never happened. That was during a total 18 month span where we didn't have any sex at all.

In reality, I now understand that as the man it's my job to initiate. When I initiate, that's when her responsive desire has an ability to kick into gear. I can now value this as genuine responsive desire rather than viewing it as illegitimate for its failure to be spontaneous. Incidentally, the more I initiate and trigger her responsive desire, the more sensitive her responsive desire becomes - thus she is shifting to become more spontaneous (although still far from the fulcrum).

So, if she says things like, "I have a headache" or "I'm tired" or "I've got an early appointment tomorrow," instead of just assuming those mean, "Don't bother initiating today," I take them at face value: she has a headache, is tired, or has an appointment. I initiate anyway, even if she doesn't show any signs of being horny at all. Result? She gets horny, and over time it's easier to get her horny.

302 - Bible Study

1 upvotes · 11 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Great idea!

50/50 v. OYS/Value

1 upvotes · 8 September 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I don't know that there are any clear RP lawyers. I do know to stay away from any attorney who claims to be a "men's rights advocate" or who advertises that they specialize in representing men in custody cases. This is idiotic because we all play with the same statutes. People who represent women know the same tricks as the ones who represent men. They have no distinct advantage and they're not fighting any harder than any other attorney. What they do have different is that they're more into using marketing gimmicks to get your money, which means they're usually more interested in the money than anything else. These firms often charge way more than their competitors. Why? Because they're intentionally marketing to the demographic that they know has more money to spend. Screw those firms.

A good attorney should be able to communicate two clear things in the initial consult:

- I will be utterly and honestly real with you about case expectations and what the likely outcome will be.
- No matter how improbable the result may be, I will fight hard through trial and appeal to pursue your goals.

Some attorneys lack the second and are just pushovers. They want a quick buck, to settle the case, and then churn the mill over to the next sad sap who hires them.

Reverse attorneys will promise you custody, support, extra parenting time, that they'll make her pay your legal fees, and that they'll even convince the judge to make her buy the moon and hand it over to you in the final entry. Then, when they obviously can't deliver, instead of owning up to the fact that they're lying scumbags only after your money, they actually blame you for why you didn't get everything they promised. "Hey, you didn't tell me about ____ at the first meeting. If I had known about that I never would have said those things. It's your fault for doing that or not telling me about it up front."

If an attorney is both honest about the realistic outcome, but vigorous in his pursuit of your goals, that's an attorney I would trust. When an attorney has both, you almost always get a solid stream of cost-benefit analysis every step of the process.

50/50 v. OYS/Value

1 upvotes · 8 September 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Oooh.

50/50 v. OYS/Value

1 upvotes · 8 September 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Yes, even with those.

50/50 v. OYS/Value

1 upvotes · 8 September 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I'll look forward to reading it :) Thanks for sharing your thoughts.

50/50 v. OYS/Value

1 upvotes · 8 September 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Haha ... Yeah, I tried to keep it out of my main post, but I'm gonna be real in the comments.

50/50 v. OYS/Value

1 upvotes · 7 September 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Yeah, I didn't have time to proof read initially like I normally do. Hope I got them all.

109 - Pursuit, Seduce, Initiate

1 upvotes · 7 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Haha.

Calling out your partner's bullshit?

1 upvotes · 7 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

Direct confrontation is only to be handled by those with an iron frame. If you don't have that, don't do it because you're probably going to come off as butthurt. You're better off with STFU/AA/AM/WISNIFG stuff, etc.

If you do want to call her out on it, be prepared for her to DEER, which is going to make her defensive, raising her ASD and LMR and ultimately make it harder for you in the future if you don't have the frame to plow through in the present. You're probably also likely to come off as a jerk rather than an arrogant tease with an unwavering drive to get what he wants. The former is bad, the latter is good (although sometimes you have to be the former for a while to get to the latter).

Mitch's Red Pill

1 upvotes · 7 September 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

In Christianity, "free will" is more elusive than a non-Christian understanding. About 1/3 of Christians don't believe free will exists with regard to major concepts and about 10% don't believe it exists at all (my wife used to be one of them).

What all Christians agree on is that without Jesus, we are only free to do evil (defined by anything that displeases God, not our own internally subjective views of morality). In order to acquire the freedom to do good, Jesus has to change a person's heart.

- Hebrews 11:6 - "And without faith it is impossible to please God."
- Romans 14:23 - "Everything that does not come from faith is sin."
- Isaiah 64:6 - "All our righteous acts are like filthy rags."

you can literally stop at any time

Totally agreed, but in Christianity sin begins in the heart. So, even if you never technically penetrate, "whoever looks lustfully at a woman has already committed adultery with her in his heart" (Matthew 5:28).

As to that last bit, you're right - I'd still retain the ability to stop. But I also have to weigh that ability with my own maturity. I can tell my 3 year old daughter to stop yelling and screaming all day, and even if she genuinely wants to stop crying, she keeps on doing it anyway because she can't control herself. Spiritually, a person's age or mental acuity doesn't change the fact that one may be weak in the exercise and application of their faith. I don't believe I'm in this camp, but the Bible also tells me to flee from temptation, not to run toward it. And I know where my triggers are. A heroine addict technically has the ability to choose free heroine sitting in front of him, but is he really mature enough to do so? He's still responsible for his choice, but we'd be fools to think that choice can be made in a vacuum. So, there's some balance that has to be made.

To be clear, I'm not trying to convince you to adopt my faith or trying to suggest anyone else here is evil. The Bible is pretty darn clear that we're not to judge non-Christians. You all can do what you want because you haven't subscribed to what it means to be a disciple of Jesus. But because I have, I have to reconcile what I do with what I believe.

Mitch's Red Pill

1 upvotes · 7 September 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

The only thing I've down voted in this thread is the other comment where you falsely accused me of down voting you. And now this one, of course. Getting huffy about down votes is a pretty beta attitude. Why do you care so much? Maybe someone else did it. Maybe it's just normal vote fuzzing created by reddit's algorithms.

As for responding, I have no need to explain myself to him. And it's pretty clear nothing I say would change his mind anyway. So why would I engage in a pointless endeavor? It's not worth my time trying to DEER to everyone who accuses me of something, which it appears you're asking me to do. The only reason I'm engaging with this comment is because I'm hopeful you'll stop making idiotic assumptions and maybe you'll stop caring about what internet strangers think of you and your friends. I get my fair share of down votes but you don't see me huffing about it.

As to his reply to you - he didn't give any actual advice. He suggested a way I could change my behaviors to suit his frame. Screw that.

Just realized my best friend is dating a sociopath. Is there any way I can possibly open his eyes or is he a lost cause?

1 upvotes · 5 September 2017 · /r/askTRP

She may not have a personality disorder at all. She may suffer from alexithymia (not officially a part of the DSM-V). From a quick wiki read:

The core characteristics of alexithymia are marked dysfunction in emotional awareness, social attachment, and interpersonal relating. Furthermore, people with alexithymia have difficulty distinguishing and appreciating the emotions of others, which is thought to lead to unempathetic and ineffective emotional responding.

And ...

Alexithymia is defined by:

difficulty identifying feelings and distinguishing between feelings and the bodily sensations of emotional arousal

difficulty describing feelings to other people

constricted imaginal processes, as evidenced by a scarcity of fantasies

a stimulus-bound, externally oriented cognitive style.

And ...

contributes to poorer mental health, poorer relational well-being, and lowered relationship quality.

Individuals high on the alexithymia spectrum also report less distress at seeing others in pain and behave less altruistically toward others.

True sociopathy is a tough scale to hit. Even normal people (especially introverts) might show indications of sociopathy while not being remotely sociopathic, simply because of the way their external behaviors are a poor indication of their internal thought processes. Alexithymia, however, seems much closer to what you're describing.

Just realized my best friend is dating a sociopath. Is there any way I can possibly open his eyes or is he a lost cause?

1 upvotes · 5 September 2017 · /r/askTRP

To /u/dr_warlock's credit, your original post gives absolutely zero indications of sociopathy in her - only problems with him. My guess is that he has Dependent Personality Disorder with Avoidant (APD) features. With the information you've given, the best I could conclude is that she has certain narcissistic tendencies (primarily considering her own interests as being more important than his sacrifices), but nowhere near enough to have any confidence in that.

I wrote more about PDs in [this post over on MRP/RPC](#).

Can RPChristians use real dread?

1 upvotes · 5 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

If anything, pride is a contributing factor in keeping me from falling. But more to the point: humility is thinking accurately of yourself, not thinking less of yourself. I believe I have made a perfectly accurate statement about my capacity to withstand that particular sin. There are other contexts where I wouldn't have said the same.

Can RPChristians use real dread?

1 upvotes · 5 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Yeah, "serious" probably wasn't the right word there. I really meant "any," but was trying to buffer it against the possibility that a spiritually immature person reads that and considers it a license to do stuff that he'll get in trouble with.

I don't recommend flirting with other women, but striking up a conversation is perfectly fine. I don't do it to seek IOIs, but it's nice to know when they're given. My wife says the same thing - she enjoys it when other guys notice her. I'm glad she enjoys that. I'm not the type of guy who wants to put her in a box so that no one else ever sees her (though she tends to do this to herself anyway).

The quest for sexual purity has done more to stifle God's design for sexual maturity between spouses than it has helped. People tend to go overboard with, as Jesus calls it, "rules taught by men" by adding to Scripture and

expecting everyone else to follow the new rule because it logically makes sense.

Nowhere in the Bible does it say, "Thou shalt not look at or talk to someone other than your spouse," nor does it say, "Thou shalt not enjoy it when someone other than your spouse desires you." These things *can* lead a person into temptation, which *can* lead a person into sin. So, the spiritually immature must beware - they might, as you say, "take a bite." But for those who aren't sex-starved maniacs, simply saying hi to a girl at the gym or asking a cute secretary how her weekend was shouldn't be a problem.

For high value men, they don't need to flirt to get IOIs. Just introducing yourself to someone is enough. Culture is going to have a really hard time convincing me that it's sinful to introduce myself to someone simply because it might lead to sin. If we were instructed to avoid everything that could possibly lead to sin, we'd have to leave the planet, as Paul suggests in 1 Cor. 5. And if it's not sinful, why are we treating it like it's sin? This all comes from the feminist imperative that's been trying to betaize men in the church for at least a couple centuries.

Mitch's Red Pill

1 upvotes · 5 September 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

This makes too much sense. Thanks for the explanation.

I decided to read a Focus on the Family article on developing a "satisfying" sex life.

1 upvotes · 5 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

You're right, I was thinking of MRP, where it's pretty much exclusively for men. RPW has some good stuff, although I get the impression that they tend to reject even some of the descriptive aspects of RP that are less friendly toward women. Otherwise, good write-up :)

I decided to read a Focus on the Family article on developing a "satisfying" sex life.

1 upvotes · 5 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

True dat.

Filed today.

1 upvotes · 3 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

True. But I once had to explain to a guy: "It's going to cost you \$30,000 to go through with this trial. On my best day in court, if a miracle happens, I can get you \$3,000 extra beyond what they've already offered. You choose. \$3k or \$30k hit." Those are the extremes where they settle.

Information too late ...

1 upvotes · 3 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

True statement.

Filed today.

1 upvotes · 3 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

As soon as I realize it. I just had that conversation with a client on Friday. About 75% say, "Fine by me, I'd rather give you the money than her." When the amount the amount is grossly disproportionate, that's when they start saying they'll be more willing to settle.

Filed today.

1 upvotes · 2 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

Two situations: (1) if what he wants is impossible, or (2) when the cost outweighs the benefit. Of course, the cost-

benefit analysis is his to discern, not mine to dictate.

Information too late ...

1 upvotes · 2 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

Good point. Some other people helped me realize that - "what she does" not "what she says" and all.

Information too late ...

1 upvotes · 1 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

Haha, I can affirm this.

Information too late ...

1 upvotes · 1 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

Yeah, I handle the MIL quite well most of the time - usually just calling her out on her crap to her face. She's so conflict-avoidant that it shuts her up right away.

I'm just not in the mood to deal with the backlash that my wife will experience if I do that to her mom on this issue right now. I've tried to pace out my RP changes healthily over the last several months/year, but I can tell my wife is still trying to figure out what's going on, as I'm not as predictable as she once found beta me to be. She feels the effect of the changing relational dynamic between the two of us. She likes it, but that doesn't magically make the stress of "change" go away. So, when outside sources stand to threaten her well-being, I tend to be a little more protective of her with that kind of stuff for now.

Telling her what i'm doing

1 upvotes · 1 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

I went through about 3 days in my journey where I was emotionally cold, very direct and decisive, and highly efficient. I became robotic and my wife immediately picked up on the relational distance this created. This was a gross misunderstanding of stoicism and frame.

If your wife wanted to screw a machine, there are plenty she could buy instead of having married you.

Amused mastery is most often brought up in contexts that make it look like little more than a responsive tactic to specific situations, or a mentality to keep you from getting butthurt when she's throwing a fit. But it should really just be on all the time. Enjoy life. Have fun with the little things. Before giving your wife an instruction, ask yourself, "How can I word this to make her roll her eyes with a hidden smile?"

Hey, I know you've gotta pick up your sister, but I need to drop a massive deuce before she gets home ... don't want the house stunk up when she gets there, right? <wink emoji> So, let's head out at ____ to drop me off first.

or

I know Princess Wannabe will be getting in at ____, but I've got to get some stuff done, so let's leave today at [a ridiculously early time]. Her: [responding to the setup] "Why so early?" Well doing ____ will probably take 15 minutes, doing ____ another 10, and ____ another 20, and screwing your brains out before she gets here will take a couple hours.

Bonus: If she ignores you or responds with sarcasm (even though she secretly likes it), you say, *I suppose if we can't leave that early, there's about 45 minutes of stuff I can cut out.*

Information too late ...

1 upvotes · 1 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

True, there are other ways, and I utilized that for different conversations. But my wife can be a chatter-mouth and would blab to her mother if her mother happened to be around, even if the conversation itself was private.

I did tell my wife this morning and she's fine with it (at least consciously - her body agenda might tell a different story).

Information too late ...

1 upvotes · 1 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

Well, even MRP itself is all about long-term strategy over short-term wins.

Information too late ...

1 upvotes · 1 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

(lol, dread)

Haha. What's even funnier is the context of this statement with the "lizard brain rationalization" stuff - as if counting the condoms would prevent you from cheating anyway.

But yeah, just as abstaining for 3 weeks is off the table for you, using condoms is for me, otherwise none of this would have come up in the first place :p Good on you for being willing, though.

Information too late ...

1 upvotes · 1 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

Fully agreed. The relevance of her final question that night totally flew over my head until I read [/u/GargantuaBlarg29](#) and [/u/anythinginc](#)'s comments.

After we got dressed and she's back in bed, I kiss her goodnight. While I'm walking away she asks, "Would you still love me if I did end up getting pregnant after tonight?" This should have been a dead give-away for me, and now I feel like an idiot.

I responed, "Of course. If you get pregnant, that's on me, not you. Don't worry about it." And then I left. I also told her about the vasc appointment today. She's fine with it (at least verbally - her body agenda is clearly telling her something different without her realizing, which is what I took as a crucial point of what garg and anythinginc said).

Information too late ...

1 upvotes · 1 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

Perhaps, but I'm not convinced yet. My MIL is the epitome of the female hamster with a "warp drive" setting. We're talking legit mental health problems. I've fought battles against her, and a DNGAF/amused mastery mentality truly wins the day every time (she hates that she can't get to me), but I've also learned to pick my fights because even if I win, my MIL takes it out on my wife. Screw her for doing that, but my wife doesn't know how to seek protection within my frame during those times and often ventures out just long enough to get hurt and come crawling back in.

I suppose this is a good thing because it often rebolsters my wife's attraction to me - she totally loves that I'm strong for her when her mother is mentally raping her. But I'm not always in the "pick up the pieces" mood.

Information too late ...

1 upvotes · 1 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

This is exactly what I needed to hear. I totally forgot trickle truth was a thing - and it's the only thing that fully explains the situation. And I'm now confident you're right about her second guessing having another kid. Specifically, I also forgot the "what she does" v. "what she says" split. I was giving too much weight to what she says because I'm confident she believes what she says. But as is often the case with her, she doesn't actually know what she wants, and what she says she wants is often wrong.

These are my action steps. Thanks!

Information too late ...

1 upvotes · 1 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

The only time she made an excuse not to within the past several weeks was when I told her no to buying a house we obviously could not afford. She was clearly very upset and when I offered a hug she said she didn't want me touching her. So, I STFU and left for the gym. When I got home she ended up initiating with me that night anyway.

I hadn't thought about the birth control reminders as LMR before, but she knows it hasn't stopped us from having sex the other times she brought it up. I just take it as her shifting blame to me in the event we did get pregnant again - setting herself up for an "I warned you" mentality.

Your wife is a whore and you should divorce her

1 upvotes · 1 September 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I get that, but remember that they all talked constantly about what Jesus said while he was alive. He may not have been quoting the written text, but I do believe he was quoting something he knew Jesus said all the same.

Information too late ...

1 upvotes · 1 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

True. Good point.

Information too late ...

1 upvotes · 1 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

Hah - fair point!

Information too late ...

1 upvotes · 1 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

Touche. So ... just let it go and keep doing my thing. That was my intended plan - just didn't want to do that because it's the easy thing, I prefer an actual reason.

Information too late ...

1 upvotes · 1 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

Could be, but as I just commented you someone else, she hasn't seemed like she has been trying to get out of sex lately, and she initiates with me frequently. If she really wanted out of sex wouldn't she have told me about missing a pill and ovulation before we started and not after?

So, I'm not sure how to reconcile that with the "she's not attracted" responses. Instead, I took her initial comments as her reminding me so she could absolve herself of guilt if she did get pregnant, blaming it on me with a "don't say I didn't warn you" attitude.

Information too late ...

1 upvotes · 1 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

Thanks for the info. I haven't gotten the impression she's trying to avoid sex recently - and she initiates frequently too. But this is a good word to remember and apply all the same.

Information too late ...

1 upvotes · 1 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

True. That's why I'm not worried about her being pregnant. It's more the careless flow of information that I was asking about.

302 Challenge - Philippians 1:1-2

1 upvotes · 1 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I remember it all too well ...

302 - Bible Study

1 upvotes · 1 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

My spiritual growth is not at risk and my pastor is making huge strides. I'll take a guy who is faithful, available, and teachable over a close-minded guy who's "further along" every time. I probably should have mentioned some of his more positive qualities earlier as well :p

302 - Bible Study

1 upvotes · 1 September 2017 · /r/RPChristians

This is a sad reality. When discipling my pastor I tried to teach him these things as an important thing that every Christian should know how to do. His response: "No, Christians don't need to know how to study the bible, as long as they're reading it. That's what Sunday mornings are for." Note that my pastor never does biblical exegesis on Sunday mornings - it's always a topic with a pop psychology solution and a couple verses kind of related.

Dread-game may be the most important aspect of a Redpill LTR or marriage.

1 upvotes · 30 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Christ is perfect, and so my impression was that men were held to a higher standard than women

Nah, Jesus imputed the same standard of perfection on his church too: "Be perfect, therefore, as your heavenly Father is perfect" (Matthew 5:48).

You standing up for your religion because I'm saying things you know aren't true?

Touche. That got a bit meta.

Dread-game may be the most important aspect of a Redpill LTR or marriage.

1 upvotes · 30 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

You ever read the verse immediately before that?

Ephesians 5:24 - "Now as the church submits to Christ, so also wives should submit in everything to their husbands."

I agree that most pastors emphasize 25 and downplay 24. But if your reason for abandoning Jesus was because you didn't agree with what his so-called-followers were saying about him, then my guess is that you were never a

"Christian" to begin with - you only self-identified as one. That's pretty darn common, and explains the first 17 years of my life, where I self-identified but later realized I was never really "saved" to begin with.

How would you respond your wife's co-workers started bad-mouthing her in front of you, saying things that you know aren't true? Would you abandon your wife or would you stand up for her and give them some hard truth to chew on?

I'm dating two MGTOW.

1 upvotes · 30 August 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

Do you have any examples?? Just curious.

Read the book *Blink* by Malcolm Gladwell. The entire book is about this concept and is filled with example after example - including studies performed in controlled environments to prove this concept :)

Clearly he saw me being strict with myself.

There you go! Great example :)

What RPW "idea" DON'T you subscribe too?

1 upvotes · 30 August 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

That's the right response.

Mitch's Red Pill

1 upvotes · 30 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

And yet that's still one of the sidebar books. So, if that book is to be viewed negatively, why are we all reading it?

I'm dating two MGTOW.

1 upvotes · 30 August 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

Well, that's deciding what to do going forward. I think what the other guy was saying was simply that you should own up to the fact that you decided to enter into two separate relationships with men who have a similar history - that it was your choice to do this, your choice to interact in a way that makes the relationship work, and accept that. You could have turned either of them down and been in a different situation, but your choices are what caused you to get along with both of them and what led you here. Not that being "here" or getting along with two guys is a bad thing. Having options is really good :) But, personally, before hopping in deeper with either of these guys, if I were you I'd be vetting them far more carefully than they're vetting you. Both of these guys seem like short-term fun, long-term trouble.

Mitch's Red Pill

1 upvotes · 30 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

So the 2011 edition I read is a heavily modified re-write? I can't see any evidence that there was an edition before this.

Or has the manosphere changed to reject even the original MMSLP, but the sidebar just hasn't been updated yet? That would be good information to know.

Beyond this discrepancy, I agree that Athol went off the deep end with what I've heard of his blog/discussion board. I just wasn't aware of him ever being a "pure alpha, no beta" guy. Although the comment by W&S also clarified that what I was calling "beta" may really have been a different aspect of alpha, depending on the motive

(want v. need, etc.).

Mitch's Red Pill

1 upvotes · 30 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Well, I am a lawyer and I was 6 engineering/science credit hours shy of qualifying to take the patent bar, which is a predominantly engineering field. So, there's that.

I do absorb and reflect, but I do this at a much faster rate than the average person. I've also been studying these concepts intentionally for the last year and a half and applying them for the last 8 months - I just knew them by different terms before discovering RP about 2-3 months ago.

As for verbosity, I've done a lot of meditating on that over the years. It stems from non-diagnosed mild Obsessive or Compulsive Disorder (not to be confused with OCD itself). I feel a compulsion to explain everything I say with every caveat and nuance lest someone accuse me of saying something other than what I meant. The guy who trained me in law was the same way and often says it's impossible to be a good attorney if that compulsion isn't in your blood. Unfortunately, it carries over to other areas of life too frequently.

Mitch's Red Pill

1 upvotes · 30 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

This is a fair assessment and I better understand your beef with me now. I could say something about each point, but it'd probably be pointless. All of them were certainly true of me at one point, and at least one of them probably still is.

What I notice, though, is that these predominantly focus not on embracing the descriptive aspects of RP; rather they address the prescriptive. I do believe I see the matrix for what it is. But because my goals in life are not the same as most other men (great sex is not my highest priority), how I use that truth is different.

I just find all dogma ... or any other limiting doctrine to be incompatible with free thought and an open mind

Interestingly, Christian theology says the opposite - that everyone is a slave to their baser traits (their "body agenda" as many here call it; add the "sinful nature") without Jesus; and when they have faith then they are finally free to think for themselves. Whereas evil was the only option before Christ, those who have Christ now have a whole new world of good opened to them. In this way, rejecting Christ is submitting to slavery and a closed mind. But ... from a non-Christian's perspective I can see how one would reject this thought.

LTR had nudes in her laptop from her phone dated June/July. Pussy and ass pics. She has never sent me nudes in our 9 month relationship.

1 upvotes · 30 August 2017 · /r/askTRP

Plan B works either way.

Dread-game may be the most important aspect of a Redpill LTR or marriage.

1 upvotes · 29 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Agreed on all counts.

Dread-game may be the most important aspect of a Redpill LTR or marriage.

1 upvotes · 29 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I had the same thought. Applying dread without OYS just makes her think, "If only those girls knew about him

what I know ..." and then she looks on with contempt.

Communication questions

1 upvotes · 29 August 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

The key is to minimize the negative and increase the positive.

I was with you up to this point. Sometimes you want to give negatives to types of communication you don't like and positives to reinforce the communication you do like. Not all communication is good communication.

Mitch's Red Pill

1 upvotes · 29 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

This makes sense and is a fair point. It reminds me of [this set of graphs I made](#) a while back.

With churches, for example, they want to be in the upper-right corner. 99% are in the upper-left peak because they're culture-appeasing. They think they can just draw a straight line over by sprinkling in challenging messages without reducing their culture-appeasing attitude. In practice it doesn't actually work like that. Challenge and culture-appeasement are fundamentally at odds, so the warm fuzzies must inherently go away for a new foundation to be laid. Cultural-appeasement is inherently self-limiting in how productive a church can be; but making purpose one's foundation removes that cap.

If I were to make a similar graph for what you're talking about, it would probably show that for a guy to get the full measure of benefits of the red pill, he's going to have to dip into "jerk" territory for a while to create a new foundation for the relationship - one that's not self-limiting. BP ideologies and appeasing the feminist imperative are inherently self-limiting. A person can be minutely happy in that framework up to a point, but he hits a glass ceiling far sooner than he'd expect and just accepts it as his lot in life. Understanding and applying RP concepts removes that limiter, often initially causing men to dip into the rage stage and/or jerk mode, often decreasing his happiness in the short term while he undergoes the hard work of swapping out the foundation so he can rise higher than his previous BP ideologies would allow. In this sense, what I call "the infinite application graph" has just proved its ongoing application in yet another context.

Mitch's Red Pill

1 upvotes · 29 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Here's a fundamental philosophical difference we may have: you probably assume that you're naturally good but you've learned to have "the strength or ability to do evil" so you're not helpless. I'm the inverse. I see myself as coming from a Genesis 6:5 place: "every inclination of the thoughts of man's heart was only evil all of the time." That's me.

It was also said of Brother Lawrence centuries ago: "When he had failed in his duty [i.e. did something bad], he only confessed his fault saying to God, 'I shall never do otherwise, if you leave me to myself. It is you who must hinder my falling and mend what is amiss.' Then, after this, he gave himself no further uneasiness about it."

This is the misperception many people have about Christians - that we're some obsessive rule-followers. In reality, Paul says two times (1 Cor. 6:12 and 10:23), "Everything is permissible, but not everything is beneficial." I don't care what's "right or wrong" for the sake of doing the "right thing" or avoiding the "wrong thing." I do what's beneficial because at the end of the day that's all that matters. I simply have a longer-term perspective on what's beneficial than most.

Mitch's Red Pill

1 upvotes · 29 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I get that this is what was said. I'm asking for an explanation of where those blue traits are so I know where to start re-evaluating. Telling a guy he's still blue pill doesn't help if there's no identification of which qualities are blue.

Mitch's Red Pill

1 upvotes · 29 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Labels aside, we're clearly saying the same thing. Thanks for the clarification on misused labels. That said, I do think MMSLP goes beyond this in his chapter on beta traits, like where he talk about having a high paying job as being a beta trait.

How long should I wait to be "official"?

1 upvotes · 29 August 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

It isn't necessarily fair that I can have my emotional needs met while his physical needs are only met on a limited basis.

I wouldn't even characterize it that way. Again, I'm a proponent of waiting until marriage anyway. It's more about his ability to vet you for your physical interest in him and whether or not that interest can hold up over time, whereas the short bursts give a natural relational excitement that overflows into physical affection. When you're in the same city for a long period of time together, seeing each other often, that's when the "honeymoon" emotions tend to die down a lot and you can really figure out what you're doing together.

I talk a lot more about that in [this post](#). On the graph, you both are going to want to figure out what that life on the downhill slope will be like. From a distance, you're so stuck in the ideology of what it might be like to be together that you simply can't get the practical knowledge. So, emotions run high and you can do a lot of fact-finding, but you get no sense of reality for what life will be like when the emotions simmer down, or even invert to the hard negatives that most all people experience at some point during the marriage - and that "some point" isn't just a fight or two ... it's usually months to years of thinking, "Why did I marry this person?!" before you finally figure out how to progress from the "divorce or turning point" circle. You need to find out if he's the kind of guy who will stick with you through that, even when he no longer has any emotional interest in you, and he needs to know if you have that character as a woman. That's how you'll make a marriage last long-term - by being prepared for these things in advance and vetting someone to see if they can stay committed during those hard times and have the wherewithal to know how to trudge forward rather than quitting or backtracking.

How do I get better at AA

1 upvotes · 28 August 2017 · /r/askMRP

I'm just going off of stuff I've read in other posts and sidebar material. I can't count the number of times I've read flaired people say, "You have to mean it when you say it" and "Don't laugh it off."

What you're describing sounds more like the C/F (cocky/funny) tactic that appears in a lot of Rollo's stuff, which gets talked about here a lot less.

Or maybe it's both. I've just never run across a description of AA that described it as a joke for a joke's sake.

LTR had nudes in her laptop from her phone dated June/July. Pussy and ass pics. She has never sent me nudes in our 9 month relationship.

1 upvotes · 28 August 2017 · /r/askTRP

What's 4d chess and why is that "wtf"?

109 - Pursuit, Seduce, Initiate

1 upvotes · 28 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Exactly!

109 - Pursuit, Seduce, Initiate

1 upvotes · 28 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

That's a fair point and a view I won't definitively say is wrong, as you could be very right. I'm fine with those who wish to take that conclusion.

That said, I've heard all the theories about it being a cultural gesture and having nothing to do with seduction, but I can't say that I agree. The context of the book seems too strong otherwise and there were other culturally appropriate ways she could have sought him out as a kinsman redeemer. Yes, he noticed her character, but isn't that what passages like Proverbs 31 and 1 Peter 3:3-4 say is one of the more important attractive qualities? As opposed to Proverbs 11:22, for example, where it points out that men should not be attracted to beauty without character. Rather than flaunting her body like a prostitute, Ruth took the high road and began with the more godly way of making herself appealing to Boaz.

I do agree that the threshing floor scene was not a sexual encounter; but it's certainly one that would have made him think of a sexual encounter. It reminds me of David in 1 Kings 1, where he was extremely old and couldn't keep warm by blankets alone (presumably older than Boaz, then) so the solution was to find a hot young girl to lay in bed with him to get his blood to boil. Even though David didn't sleep with her, the sexual attraction kept him warm. I see Ruth as doing something similar here and I have no doubt that even in the absence of them having sex that night, Boaz almost certainly thought of it, and I'm confident she wanted him to.

109 - Pursuit, Seduce, Initiate

1 upvotes · 28 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

That whole book is about gaming Tizrah, seducing her, foreplay, and having sex with her.

And her doing it right back. Again, not to say that we develop a covert contract over this, but we do have women readers here sometimes too ;)

How do I get better at AA

1 upvotes · 28 August 2017 · /r/askMRP

Read and replied to your response to the other guy, so check my comment there, since you just copied and pasted and I'm not going to keep two threads going.

How do I get better at AA

1 upvotes · 28 August 2017 · /r/askMRP

she asked who "Alice" was ... A girl I met at a bar a while ago.

Decent starter, but you need to recognize what she's really looking for her. She suspects you of hooking up with her. So, agree with her suspicion and amplify: "A girl I met at a bar a while ago. I was trying to scope out options for a threesome."

My wife just did this to me on Thursday. We're both Christians, so the idea of a threesome or even a joke about it is somewhat laughable on its own. But she said she had a few things she wanted to talk about. I listened through the first couple and really didn't want to talk anymore, so for the third she's getting all caught up in herself: "I'm not sure how to ask this. I ... uh ... I wanted to know if you'd be interested in ... uh ..."

Me: "Absolutely I'd be interested in a threesome." At first she laughed hysterically (which knowing her usual response to sex stuff was quite shocking; she even joked back about how it better be MMF instead of MFF). Then I started going very briefly into details about finding someone and how to convince them - and I held a straight face. Her laugh went away and she got into a confusion over whether or not I was actually being serious. At that point her mind was sufficiently removed from whatever it was she wanted to ask me and I just said, "Anyway, I've got to get some stuff done. I'll see you in the morning," then I went to the basement and got to work. She's left lingering with the thought that I might have been serious.

Faith issues aside, I amplified and I owned it. Will I ever actually have a threesome? No. But she doesn't need to know that. She just needs to believe my amplifications when I deliver them. The easiest way to pull this off is if I actually mean it when I deliver it, but once you get good you don't need that component anymore.

She was all mad after that. I ignored it completely and kept talking normal when I wanted to say something.

Be careful in your self-assessment here. At one point I thought that me talking normal while she was acting all emotional was the same thing as stoicism and amused mastery. It's not. Often-times she interprets it as you being cold and heartless and "emotionally shutting down" in response to her antics. If she views you that way, that's worse than if you yelled and screamed back - because at least then she knows that you feel something, *anything*, in the situation.

Instead of simply being calm and talking normally, act the same way you would as if your kid were throwing a temper tantrum. My wife and I often laugh when our kids throw outrageous temper tantrums. It's cute. So, sometimes I laugh at her when she does the same. Other times I scold my kids, so sometimes I scold my wife. Sometimes my kids really just need a hug-and-cuddle session to calm them down, so I hug-and-cuddle. Figure out what's appropriate in the moment and go with it. But just talking normal and engaging in the conversation (1) might make her think you're just shutting down, and (2) legitimizes what she's saying, which is going to lead to you DEERING more and more.

Starting to recognize and pass Fitness Tests. Am I doing this right?

1 upvotes · 28 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

That's hard core. There are some lines I haven't crossed, and thankfully haven't needed to. Usually if I'm thrashing a person, making them look like an idiot, it's because they deserve it. I've had a couple cases settle out this way. We'll get to trial, they go first, I cross-examine them so hard that by lunch break they're offering me a better deal than the last one I offered them. But, again, it's usually when the other side is the one trying to screw with us first.

I've been at it for 7 years now, so I've got a lot more time for this other stuff to get to me. But I do think my current firm placement (dealing with people who come to us because their spouse has psychological issues) buffers me from some of that, as I'm mostly representing the sane person and the other side is legit crazy. When going against abusive narcissists or borderlines who endanger their children just to get an emotional reaction out of the husband ... I don't feel bad destroying those people.

At my previous firm, I did have a couple cases I turned down due to moral issues, but that was a Christian owned and operated firm, so I had more flexibility there. To avoid discrimination claims, I told the potential clients in advance, "If you hire me, here's how I will approach your case, and I will not budge on these issues ..." A couple stuck around and we did just fine even without pushing the buttons they wanted me to, and a couple went somewhere else. Interestingly, for the couples who stuck around, I ended up getting more referrals from them down the road than most other clients - they appreciated the moral integrity while simultaneously getting the results I cited up-front.

Starting to recognize and pass Fitness Tests. Am I doing this right?

1 upvotes · 27 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

That thought never crossed my mind, but props to you for the positive attitude :p That said, I hold no guilt over what I do, so I proceed with a clear conscience.

The alternatives

1 upvotes · 27 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

True that many people apply it that way, but to quote rational male, year one, plate theory 2: "Spinning Plates doesn't necessarily mean you're f-ing all of your plates. It's more of a spreading out of your efforts across a wider pool of subjects."

6 Questions for Christian Merps

1 upvotes · 26 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I totally get what you're saying, but I think all of this is predicated on a misunderstanding of what I said. When I said "grace through faith will always be a non-negotiable" I didn't mean that this had to be the exclusive aspect of a soteriological model.

From what I understand, Catholics and Orthodox alike also affirm that salvation cannot happen without (1) grace and (2) faith - that these are integral to salvation. So, I count them as Christian, despite the fact that they add other things into their soteriological mode.

However, if someone argued, "You can be saved without God's grace" or "You don't need faith to get to heaven," that's where I'd have true beef and would probably reject such a person as "Christian" for the purposes of this sub.

I think this distinction should clear up pretty much the rest of your comment.

6 Questions for Christian Merps

1 upvotes · 26 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

can you clarify what you mean? Especially the 1600s paragraph ... screams blue pill

The context of this section was explaining the gender balance within the church at differing time periods, pointing toward why the church started watering down its men.

The point of the 1600s was to say that women were treated pretty cruelly, for the most part. Puritanism really was more male-dominant than the church is female-dominant today, which paved the way for the Salem witch trials at the end of the 1600s. When religious freedom arose post-revolution in the 1800s (i.e. as the government started figuring out how to run itself), that's when women realized they could hop on the new "freedom" bandwagon and start getting power for themselves, much of it being a retaliation of the female-oppressive systems that were in place before then.

By that point the church was struggling to regain power that it had lost when all the men were off exploring the country and fighting the civil war, leaving the women and children to run the show and pray for their husbands' lives and safe return. So, the church was bringing these women in who had nowhere else to turn. Given the increased (and almost exclusive) presence of women in the church during the civil war, the church saw women as its main gateway to power, and has been riding that bandwagon ever since. That's the same time when you see methodists and other denominations really start allowing female preachers.

So, I wasn't trying to be "blue pill" in regard to how the world functions today; rather, I was giving a historical context for how the past oppression of women paved the way for their eventual dominance over the church.

Non-first world countries are routinely pressured into implementing first world laws and standards, even if

their people didn't ask for them.

For many, that may be the case. But from what I hear from missionaries who I know personally who have spent over a year in places like China, Thailand, Djibouti, Egypt, Nigeria, Iraq, Iran, Turkey, Morocco, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Korea, and a few other places I can't think of off the top of my head - these people all say that they're still heavily male-dominant cultures who stick to more traditional male-headship roles. Basically, the strong run the place. The missionaries I know don't bring female-worship with them; rather, they accept that trying to change that aspect of the culture is a low/non-existent priority in comparison to other aspects of advancing the Gospel and that working too much against the grain of culture, especially when there's no inherent biblical conflict to a particular cultural norm, actually hurts the mission rather than helping it.

is it any surprise that people in power will try and force their moral values on people without power, against the latter's will, and/or try to influence the less powerful people into thinking like them?

This makes sense from a worldly perspective, but it is not the mindset I have seen from the missionaries I've known.

I hope that gives some clarity :)

Starting to recognize and pass Fitness Tests. Am I doing this right?

1 upvotes · 26 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Good point. My job kind of sets up a fence to keep that mentality away. Doing divorce work, I'm trained to handle the worst of the worst of the worst situations people go through and I'm the one who has to help them through it. Abuse? Addiction? Mental health? Child molestation? I don't get much of an option to say "screw that case, you're on your own" (unless I went self-employed, but my boss is over 80 years old, so I'm just kind of waiting for him to move on and I can take over the firm).

Starting to recognize and pass Fitness Tests. Am I doing this right?

1 upvotes · 26 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Sums it up nicely.

Weekend Challenge

1 upvotes · 25 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

[/u/OsmiumZulu](#) gave a good description. I wrote more about this in my post on [abundance mentality](#) - check about half way down for the word "Scarcity" in bold.

Your wife is a whore and you should divorce her

1 upvotes · 25 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Yes

Business Partner Getting Married; How Do I Protect Our Assets?

1 upvotes · 25 August 2017 · /r/askMRP

There are lots of things that can be done. The key thing is the prenup, which is sad because only the partner getting married can really enforce this unless the partners agreed in advance in the OA that a prenup would be required if either party were to marry.

The first and most important thing is to keep all of your documents - never delete anything. If you can't prove what the business was worth when you got married, the whole thing might end up being marital.

Don't ever let your partner's spouse work for the company unless you're willing to just hand her 50% of your partner's share.

Set up the OA to have different grades of stock - ownership interest and managing interest. Of course you'll need the buy-sell provision, but also make sure that even if a third party obtains an interest, that it's only a Class B (ownership-only) type.

Have a business valuation done every time stock ownership changes hands so that there's a clear record of value transfer. Also do this at the time of the marriage so that your partner's spouse can't later claim in the pre-nup, "I didn't know what I was giving up."

The pre-nup needs to include a provision that active appreciation is not divisible with respect to the company (*and here's the key*) unless it exceeds \$X or Y% growth in Z years. If you just say "never ever" no court will honor that. Give some clearer boundaries and the court says, "Okay, now it's clear you actually thought about this" and they're more likely to honor it.

All of that in mind, when it comes to the actual divorce, if you can plan a few years in advance (assuming you're the one to initiate), I wrote up one potential strategy [here](#) for decreasing the value of the business and your income for divorce purposes while actually growing the business for all other purposes at the same time.

Lots more to say, but that's the gist of the important stuff that doesn't always get talked about. I didn't want to repeat too much of what was already said here. Sepean covered a good chunk of things.

Tag: [/u/GCOW30](#)

What's the big deal about this RP stuff?

1 upvotes · 24 August 2017 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

That's a good point - and one I tend to agree with. But I just got reamed for making this exact point on MRP, where one of the flaired people hammered that RP is about nothing more than sexual strategy and trying to make it something more is wrong, or something like that.

I usually describe it that RP is a descriptive praxeology of how the world works, but TRP/MRP delve into prescriptive principles about how to use that descriptive understanding for the benefit of oneself (TRP and MRP) or one's marriage (MRP to some degree). To that end, the "sexual strategy" is not "RP" in a pure sense - it's only TRP/MRP/RPWo/RPWi/etc., and to some extent RPC. RPC (or at least my vision for it) prefers to embrace the praxeology in its descriptive form as having value in and of itself, while still working within a pragmatic application toward prescribed goals.

What I mean by that is something unique that TRP/MRP could never understand. They have concluded that a man sets his own goals and determines his own measure for success (unless you're 88Will88, in which case he decides the measure of success for everyone else). In RPC we, by virtue of our faith, accept that God, the author of RP descriptive praxeology, intended the order of those things for a particular purpose that we play a part in, and that our fulfillment of that purpose is the measure of our success. That isn't to say we can't have lesser goals. My marital sex life satisfaction might not be the overarching purpose for why God created the world the way he did or what he wants me to pursue in life, but as a sub-goal it is a worthy cause and one appropriate for conversation here. But if that is my only measure of success apart from God's intentions for his people, then I have lost sight of pseudo-objective reality in what Scripture dictates.

Your wife is a whore and you should divorce her

1 upvotes · 24 August 2017 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

I've read the art of war. Will have to check out this one.

Your wife is a whore and you should divorce her

1 upvotes · 24 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Haha, touche.

Your wife is a whore and you should divorce her

1 upvotes · 24 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

if that were true, they'd treat the whore wife as a "cost of doing business" and be done with it.

Nah, that's not how people think. If you have a guy who loves his job, makes good money, has flexible hours, etc. - but there's that one person in the office who just gets on his nerves ... he may well prefer to keep the benefits of the job and deal with that guy rather than changing jobs. But he'd be a fool to stay and not try to work on improving that one negative aspect. You don't say, "Oh well, it's the cost of doing business. I'll just let him keep being an idiot and annoy me all the time." No, you set boundaries with the guy, try to make friends, try to get your boss in on the situation, etc. - all to fix the problem.

So, if a guy likes his marriage but the sex life isn't quite satisfying, he may do well to stay, but that doesn't mean he's "desperate" just because he goes to an internet forum to ask for help, nor does it mean that sex has all of a sudden become the most important thing to him. It simply means he'd like to work on his weak areas to take a good thing and make it better. This isn't true of all guys, but I'm confident it's true of some.

I had an epiphany this week

1 upvotes · 22 August 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

Acting like a doormat is not a show of love. Or if it is, it's a show of just how cheap your love is.

How not to show butthurt when turned down

1 upvotes · 22 August 2017 · /r/askMRP

Good point.

Starting to recognize and pass Fitness Tests. Am I doing this right?

1 upvotes · 21 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Agreed.

Based discussion on sex with my middle-school daughter

1 upvotes · 21 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

As with most things in life, *discipleship* is the answer. Disciple your daughter, or if your wife is mature enough and fluent with discipleship as a process, have her do it. Either way is fine (I usually oppose cross-gender discipleship, but parent-child is fine).

[/u/ruizbujc](#) disciplined me and wrote a book on the process. I'm sure he'd give it to you for free. If you can set her sights on God's Kingdom first, all the rest will follow. Matthew 6:33 all the way!

Starting to recognize and pass Fitness Tests. Am I doing this right?

1 upvotes · 21 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Yeah, I probably wasn't clear on that. I meant that as a metaphor for the situation at hand. If you can get to a point where you can still be content in your relationship with your wife even if your marriage totally blew up in your face (not arrogant playful jerkiness, but calm peace), that's when you're most likely to be able to save your marriage and improve upon what it ever was before.

Do you believe that women hate each other?

1 upvotes · 18 August 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

Thanks :)

What we can learn from the feast-day of the Dormition of the Theotokos.

1 upvotes · 18 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Interesting. I'm all for confession - but I tend to promote it as being slightly more public (discuss things openly in small groups and not just to a priest).

Episcopalian? Eek. There are two denominations in mainline Protestantism (maybe three) that I technically can't reject as "non-Christian," but I really want to ... and that's one of them :/ Sorry. That said, his attraction to RC gives me more confidence, even with my concerns about RC ;)

How marriage changes things

1 upvotes · 18 August 2017 · /r/RedPillWives

started plotting different points from our relationship on there

I've done the same thing! Very helpful to me.

"discipleship", do you not find that it's a fairly vague goal to have?

The way the western church defines discipleship, yes - it's incredibly vague. In a blog post from the guy who discipled me: **"It means everything and nothing at the same time."** (he would actually advocate I use the phrase "disciplemaking" instead of "discipleship," but old habits die hard). But Jesus teaches disciplemaking with a clear process - another path to follow. If you look back at that relationship graph, switch to the upper-right corner and you'll see a similar pattern for a discipleship culture.

Do you have more specific tasks within discipleship, or is it simply a way of conducting your life?

This is actually one of three full-length books I've written (the other two are fiction). It can probably be really overwhelming without the book to walk you through it, but **this is a one-page illustration of the entire book**. You'll note that the 4 distinct phases match the 4 circles in the upper-right graph (**link again for reference**).

Discipleship in a Christian sense is designed by God to be the spiritual truth that the family structure was meant to point toward. That's why there are a lot of parallels between the two graphs. If I were to re-make the upper-right "discipleship culture" graph, I'd replace "relationship" with "spiritual joy," but because that's derived from the relationship itself I figure it's close enough :D

Do you often discuss openly with your life how you're both engaging in discipleship together?

It goes in phases. Sometimes we're just so in sync that we don't need to talk about it - we're fluent just by virtue of doing things together and being around one another. Other times, especially when it becomes a challenge to keep up, we'll have an intentional heart-to-heart.

Here's the fun part (and women on this sub should appreciate this), a good friend of mine once commented: *A good marriage IS discipleship*. That is, *husbands must disciple their wives*. This is the essence of godly leadership in a home. Of course, this comes with what I originally said about discipleship - it's not about rote teaching; it's about *purposeful, loving, intentional relationships*.

As with men I disciple, I set the agenda. I have a purpose for the relationship and what I want to see happen as a result. Love is the medium through which I accomplish that purpose. Every interaction is born of love - not just a

gooey emotional love (which leads to beta-dom, which is not love), but one of clean and decisive action designed for the best interests of the relationship and my wife. I execute on decisions toward the purpose with intention. There's no being lackadaisical about it - every action is designed to take us one step closer to that purpose, even deciding when to rest or just goof off.

In fact, if you go back to my one-page book summary, you'll note in the "equipping" phase (which is the meat of discipleship), I list three things that must be kept in perfect balance:

- fun and games
- personal issues addressed
- life and ministry skills training

The same three apply to marriage. If you can't just relax and have fun, the "loving" aspect of the relationship will die. If you don't address personal issues ("my mom just died," "I'm lonely," "the kids are stressing me out!") you will never be able to take any steps toward your purpose. If you're not helping your spouse develop the life/ministry skills necessary to fulfill the purpose/mission, then you lack intentionality in the relationship.

The way God designed these processes (marriage and discipleship) to parallel one another so perfectly astounds me everyday. But it makes sense. After all, Jesus calls himself the "bridegroom" and the church is known as "the bride of Christ" (kind of weird that I have to be both a husband and a bride, but it works and I understand my wife better because of it!); and God even calls himself his people's "husband." Anyway ... sorry if I'm boring you, but this is really my life passion. So, get me started talking about discipleship and I won't stop! Haha.

What we can learn from the feast-day of the Dormition of the Theotokos.

1 upvotes · 18 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I've been pretty much everywhere too ... except Catholic :p Not that I have anything against Catholic people; I just have too many fundamental disagreements with their theology that every time I try to give it a chance, I just can't get over too many hurdles. It doesn't help that 35% of my church is ex-Catholic.

What we can learn from the feast-day of the Dormition of the Theotokos.

1 upvotes · 17 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

but I also think RP and Christian Masculinity can be a bit forced too

I can certainly see that.

selfless giving without expecting anything in return

Here's the thing, though - Jesus does expect something in return, just as RP does. RP says, "If she doesn't respond, next her." Jesus says, "If people don't respond to the grace I offer ... next." I'm not going to make a theological declaration that the Holy Spirit ever stops working on someone, but we certainly have the ability to callous our hearts. God won't force it; he just goes on about his business, building his kingdom through those who actually will accept his grace.

fulfillment of God's promise. She is called the New Eve and has chosen the abundance of God's love.

Help me understand this better. I've heard people say this before, but I've never understood the Scriptural backing for it. I won't argue with whatever answer you give, I just want to know.

When you're a beta male who cannot give her the comfort, structure, and masculinity she needs, you are, in

effect, pushing her to Hell.

This flows well with the parallels I've seen between husband-wife and Christ-church. Well said.

When you have become the Alpha, she now has a choice whether to accept Heaven, or Hell.

Well, I'd say "the perfect Alpha/Beta blend." Again, even MRP acknowledges that we have to have some beta traits. Pure alpha might be sexual heaven, but it would be a total nightmare for the wife everywhere else if beta comforts were entirely absent.

What we can learn from the feast-day of the Dormition of the Theotokos.

1 upvotes · 17 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I have trouble seeing the connection here, or maybe it just seems forced. Either way, I'm always intrigued at the practices of other sects. I considered switching to orthodoxy at one point a couple years ago. I really do value the sense of tradition you all have. It is something that many protestants often inappropriately ignore. Thanks for sharing!

Supportive Relationships Linked To Willingness To Pursue Opportunities

1 upvotes · 17 August 2017 · /r/RedPillWives

Cool framework for the study they did, but isn't the result something common sense would have shown anyway? It boils down to this: "If someone's encouraging you, you're more likely to do something risky/rewarding than if you're not getting encouragement or being discouraged."

Ok ASKMRP, riddle me THIS!!!

1 upvotes · 17 August 2017 · /r/askMRP

This makes a lot of sense.

That led to her being disgusted at my touch because she knew what it meant.

Yeah, I was there. Conditioning her to accept physical touch without thinking I had an expectation of sex was a very difficult task, but also a very crucial one. If she thought it meant sex, she'd cringe because she didn't want sex most of the time. But, once she knew it was just about touch and not sex, her LMR shield dropped (or more accurately: never came up) in response to my touch. Result? The touch would actually make her horny sometimes (not every time). So, where previously she'd reject the touch because she didn't want sex, accepting the touch turned her attitude around so that she actually did want sex in a large minority of incidences (maybe 40%).

How marriage changes things

1 upvotes · 17 August 2017 · /r/RedPillWives

What exactly is discipleship for a Christian?

The short definition: *Developing purposeful, loving, intentional relationships with others to model Christ-likeness in your own life, then help them do the same.*

Or maybe to reword it better, it's teaching others how to follow Jesus and be more like him, but accomplishing this through living life alongside one another so that your life rubs off on them (intentionally, not passively) and not just rote classroom-type teachings.

If your wife had not have come on board with it, would you have pursued a different purpose with her?

I would not have given up the mission of discipleship in my own life, but for the sake of my marriage I would have pursued something she could have gotten on board with - it just couldn't have been my highest priority. That said, I have the capacity to be 100% all-in on multiple things. She's more of a one-at-a-time person, so I could make that work legitimately, but if she had already committed to another purpose, that would have been really hard to pull her away from. But for her, she has trouble figuring out what she actually wants out of life, usually just going through the motions. That's where it's my job as her husband to lead her in finding a purpose, which is what I did :D

Just for fun: What's the dumbest thing you've ever said to your spouse?

1 upvotes · 17 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Nice.

Just for fun: What's the dumbest thing you've ever said to your spouse?

1 upvotes · 16 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Hahaha - I would have loved to see that reaction! Glad you didn't say it, though :p

205 - How to Lead

1 upvotes · 16 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I'm definitely an investigator/delegator. I'm probably weakest at coaching or life-sharing, though. I tend to inherently reject coaching because I naturally analyze things and formulate conclusions very quickly, so the open-ended nature of coaching, where I don't have a preset destination I'm leading someone toward ... that's hard for me.

Just for fun: What's the dumbest thing you've ever said to your spouse?

1 upvotes · 16 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Oh my! That's hilarious.

The Dangers of so-called "Biblical Counseling"

1 upvotes · 16 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Well said. To be clear, though, the 99% was a reference to so-called "biblical" counselors who don't approach counseling from a Gospel-centered standpoint. Even so, the % of Wk, BP *marriage* counselors is probably also pretty high.

As noted, there's only 1 out of 30 that I've known who I would trust as a marriage counselor - and she is very highly respected among the male clients I refer to her. Of course, I may be a little biased because she (after I started utilizing her for referral purposes in exclusivity) has adopted [everything I wrote here](#) and utilizes it as the foundation for all of her marriage counseling. So, it's hard to go against someone who is using a model that I employ myself (originally created by ruizbuja).

Just for fun: What's the dumbest thing you've ever said to your spouse?

1 upvotes · 16 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Haha ... both good ones.

Why I'm not afraid of divorce rape - and how to get yourself there too.

1 upvotes · 16 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

This is a very intriguing idea I hadn't considered. Excellent point!

Why I'm not afraid of divorce rape - and how to get yourself there too.

1 upvotes · 16 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Yeah, our Sienna has the doors, but not the tailgate. But my wife is also relatively tall. The doors really help when you have 4 kids.

WISNIFG TL;DR Edition!

1 upvotes · 16 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Was about to say the same thing. I concur.

Why I'm not afraid of divorce rape - and how to get yourself there too.

1 upvotes · 16 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Actually, I just had a case a few months back where we included interest income from a guy's IRA. But you're right, that's pretty rare. It's rare because it's passive income when usually only active income is included in support calculations. Your K1 income is active. Sorry :/

Why I'm not afraid of divorce rape - and how to get yourself there too.

1 upvotes · 15 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Exactly.

Why I'm not afraid of divorce rape - and how to get yourself there too.

1 upvotes · 15 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Ah, I've gotten my impala and malibu both past 200k (i think they were around 220k each when I traded them in). But you're right, Toyotas will always last much longer. But there's also a decent price hike to get there. ~50% price increase for ~50% longevity increase.

Why I'm not afraid of divorce rape - and how to get yourself there too.

1 upvotes · 15 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Nah, every car I've owned (and my wife too, before the Sienna) has been a Chevy. So, I may be biased there.

Job 31 - Prime example of an RP conversation

1 upvotes · 15 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Well said!

Why I'm not afraid of divorce rape - and how to get yourself there too.

1 upvotes · 15 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

That's what my wife drives ;) I opted for a Chevy Traverse and I love it!

Why I'm not afraid of divorce rape - and how to get yourself there too.

1 upvotes · 15 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I don't think there was a potential new guy. If there had been, she likely would have filed to get out. But remember: the guy initiated this process both times, so it's not like she saw it coming. As a result, she hadn't been intending to leave in the first place.

Why your wife should work at a real job

1 upvotes · 15 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Nah, if she's going to make a negative assertion, she's the one who needs more than her word to back it up. The bias exists, but it doesn't typically swing that far. If it's he-said/she-said, the court will assume 50/50 without some evidence beyond testimony alone to pull things out of that gravitational center.

Why I'm not afraid of divorce rape - and how to get yourself there too.

1 upvotes · 15 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

our income is 60/40

My particular county does a 50/50 to 55/45 split of income, so you might still end up paying some support if you were here. That said, it wouldn't be much. More to the point, my county is probably the most disadvantageous in the country for support purposes toward men. The neighboring counties all use a 60/40 split like you have, so guaranteed no support there. I've even seen some use a 70/30. I've heard of other states using a 20% cap as well (I think it may have been Texas).

But yes, "earning potential" is huge.

Why your wife should work at a real job

1 upvotes · 15 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

what are some key strategies to setting yourself up the best to at least share 50/50 custody of the children?

Yep, the other post will address this in more detail. I also made a post about "the merits of shared parenting" a couple weeks back, addressing many crummy arguments and why they don't hold weight if you know how to argue against them (i.e. simply by challenging the false assumptions inherent in them), so check my post history for that one too.

are there some other key points that may not be so obvious that can help ensure equal parenting and custody rights in the event of divorce?

Yeah, shared parenting assumes you can communicate freely and openly with your spouse in a civil manner. So, it's not just about how involved you are with the kids - it's about showing you can be civil with their mom too. No cussing her out, no manipulation games, etc. Also, make sure you're internally whole as well - no drug abuse, no bringing other women home every other night, etc.

Welcome to Red Pill Christians

1 upvotes · 15 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Great to have you along :)

Personally, I'd wager I agree with most of what you'd have to say on the subjects of marriage and desire. Although I've usually gone against the Catholic view of contraception, I believe it's a noble view that shouldn't be dismissed readily. Just make sure when discussing disputable matters that it's not in a condemning, condescending way and we should be good ;)

The idea of a discord channel (I've never used IRC) is a good one, but I'm not sure how much participation there would be. Maybe when we get over 1,000 subscriptions here first? I don't know. I'll chat with my buddy who's an expert on discord stuff to see what all would be involved in running something like that :)

WISNIFG, NMMNG, 48 laws, and rational male conflicting topics

1 upvotes · 15 August 2017 · /r/askMRP

You'll never find perfect overlap. That said, many people over-identify things as manipulative or otherwise try to over-moralize manipulation.

- **Over-Identify:** *Calling things "manipulation" that aren't.* People who use "manipulate" in an accusatory manner do so in one of two contexts: (1) when deceit is involved to coerce behavior, or (2) when it's honest, but one side is advantaged and the manipulated party is harmed. If the other person suffers no harm and you're not being deceitful about it, there's no problem and it's not the type of manipulation that warrants shaming. In this sense, rewarding good behavior and punishing bad behavior is not manipulative. Nobody accuses parents of "manipulating" their children when we do this. We call it teaching. Your spouse needs to know healthy boundaries for how to interact with you and when you do these things you're not manipulating her, you're teaching her.
- **Over-Moralize:** *Condemning some types of manipulation that are perfectly appropriate.* The dictionary definition defines manipulation with the words: "cleverly, unfairly, or unscrupulously." The latter two were addressed above, but someone could say "cleverly" could still apply to all kinds of other things. In this sense, it would be idiotic to condemn parents for employing "clever" tactics to teach their children to function well in society. Technically they are controlling and influencing behavior in a clever way (dictionary definition of manipulation), but everyone would agree that they are probably doing right by their children, so it's idiotic to condemn all manipulation as immoral.

Don't get caught in either of those traps.

Need some advice to see what I did wrong today

1 upvotes · 15 August 2017 · /r/askTRP

WISNIFG. I'm not sure what else there is to say. Read it.

Career beta...just took TRP.

1 upvotes · 15 August 2017 · /r/askMRP

Wife says "okay" in a tone of voice that let's me know she's disappointed and thinks I'm being unreasonable.

How often do you think your wife does things that are unreasonable, or treats you in an unreasonable manner? Like only giving starfish sex or limiting it to once every couple months? Why do you care if she thinks you're being unreasonable?

Am I being a dick?

Not to be too childish, but: "She started it!" Don't be that way just to get revenge, but sometimes you have to go into "jerk territory" for a while to figure that side of things out so you can establish a better balance after you've mastered both sides.

Why don't I just take the few seconds to make the order then she's happy and I'm a nice guy?

Because it shows that you can't enforce your boundaries, so she'll walk all over you in more important areas too. Start small and work your way up, not the other way around. This is a perfect small thing to start with.

Is this a test or a reasonable request?

If she's equally capable, it's a test.

I'm thinking I should have been more playful. Maybe texted her back something like "I'd be much more interested in ordering you a satin teddy." That kind of text isn't something I've ever sent before and would be totally out of character for me. What do you guys think...suggestions?

Playful is good, but if you do too much too fast she'll get a jarring sensation with your character. Going Rambo can result even from positive aspects of your change and not just saying "no" all the time. It's the whole 1,000 foot rope thing - move too fast and the rope will snap and she'll be left stranded. Reel her in gently. Save being playful for when she's adapted to the smaller changes you're making first, adding it in when you feel like the "out of character" feel of it would be more in-character because you're more fit and confident at the time you try to pull it off. Try to be sexy/funny before you have reason to express that kind of confidence and she might actually lose respect for you because it shows you don't know your actual value on the SMP, especially within the marriage.

Welcome to Red Pill Christians

1 upvotes · 14 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Glad to have you :)

Thank you from a SF Bay Area Christian

1 upvotes · 14 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Yeah, I should have clarified "sinful lust." Desire itself is okay to foster and cultivate with someone you're dating.

CMV: Can anyone break my fall? I feel like on my current trajectory I'm gonna end up redpill.

1 upvotes · 12 August 2017 · /r/ExRedPill

I agree. To quote myself:

both genders experience each of these

What you're describing is really an "ideal world" scenario that doesn't exist yet (huge emphasis on that "yet").

The reality is that, at least as of human biology today, the evidence is that there really are genuine differences. Sexual desire is triggered by chemicals like adrenaline and testosterone, which are undeniably found in higher quantities in men than in women. Is this purely biological/evolutionary or a product of culture conditioning men toward activities that increase these levels? Doesn't matter. The facts are the facts. Also, women have more serotonin receptors than men, meaning they can process more of it - and higher serotonin levels has been repeatedly linked with a decreased desire for sex. Also, men have higher dopamine levels, and dopamine is released in response to the anticipation of a pleasurable experience (in this case: sex). All of these chemicals are found in both genders, as you say, but their levels are very different.

Then there are the more emotionally connective chemicals: vasopressin and oxytocin. The levels in both genders are fairly close, but vasopressin synergizes with testosterone, making its effects far stronger in men, whereas oxytocin synergizes with estrogen, making its effects far stronger in women. Vasopressin has some pair-bonding effects that develop emotional connectivity, but it also distinctly creates a feeling of separation and dampening of emotional responses toward more rational behaviors. Oxytocin, on the other hand, actually inhibits cognitive function and encourages emotional extremes, with primary effects of promoting pair-bonding, connectivity to offspring, the "emotional connectivity" women feel in relationships, etc.

These biochemical differences are not things we "teach men ... and women" - they are the current state of our physical makeup. Yes, both genders have all of these chemicals - but the levels are not the same for each. As a result, each gender has naturally different biological inclinations. Are there exceptions? Absolutely. When RP guys say things like "AWALT" they're idiots if they take it to be a blanket statement. In fact, a recent post on

[r/askmrp](#) revealed (from one of the mods of [r/marriedredpill](#)) that this really means "All women can be like that, don't be surprised." A distinct trait about humans from virtually all other animals is that we have the ability to deny our biological makeup to function as we choose. But, on the whole, our biological makeup is going to influence things more often than not.

So, I get really frustrated when someone says, "Well, I have some friends where the girl has a super high libido and the guy just wants to cuddle all the time." Great. But a few examples of outliers doesn't change the nature of the bell curve itself. In fact, any population distribution model assumes that *there will be outliers*. Everything I said above is based on general trends and population distributions - not as a fanatical "EVERYONE IS LIKE THIS!!!!!!!!!" viewpoint.

Thank you, and advice please

1 upvotes · 12 August 2017 · [/r/ExRedPill](#)

Do you have any advice on how to do this/whether to do this?

On TRP it's not worth it at all. You'd be wasting your time. On [r/marriedredpill](#) you'll have a voice if your ideas stand on their own merit, but if you think you'll get any credit just because you're a girl, think again.

[r/redpillwomen](#) will probably allow your thoughts and suggestions, and numerous guys from other RP subs tend to participate there, though they're usually the type who might actually agree with you.

[r/RPChristians](#) goes another level into directly encouraging conversations about the morality of red pill thinking and what's appropriate and not - and it actively rejects things that don't stand muster against the Bible, while accepting all else. So, that might be a good place to have that discussion too. A buddy of mine recently made [this post](#), titled: [What's the big deal about this RP stuff?](#), and it got some good conversation going.

How to get my wife into RPW?

1 upvotes · 11 August 2017 · [/r/RedPillWomen](#)

it may be impossible for me to influence this.

As previously noted, finding someone else she trusts to recommend the book to her is the way to go. I've used this tactic on my wife on the past (pre-RP days) and it's worked quite well. That said, this is easier for those of us in Christian circles because there's usually a small group leader, pastor, discipler, etc. you can work through. Outside of a church context, it's a lot harder to find someone like that.

to the claim I'm "trying to fix her" - I'm not

Ah, but you are. You're just trying to give a different perspective on the same behavior. Whether I look at a moose from the front or the back, it's still a moose.

The fact that you want to change something about her means you're trying to "fix" something about her. She's happy ... but not happy enough. You want to "fix" that so that she's living within the bounds of what you expect - even if you're satisfied with her current happiness level.

But fine, let's get technical with language. In this sense, on the scale from "falling apart" < neutral < "best ever" ... *fixing* is technically the "falling apart < neutral" phase and *improving* is the "neutral < best ever" phase. You're trying to *improve* her.

Regardless, it's all on the same spectrum. The fact that she's already somewhere between "neutral" and "best ever" doesn't change the fact that you're still trying to slide her up the same scale.

Use red pill to get out of a dead bedroom

1 upvotes · 11 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

This is some good insight. I'll digest this and maybe plan to start up something similar in a while.

How did you go about finding people for the initial group outside the church? Or do you mean you took people from your church but just didn't meet in the church building itself?

What's the big deal about this RP stuff?

1 upvotes · 11 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

The explanation given is the best I've got :/ I've read a ton of Rollo, but haven't started any of Dalrock yet.

Sticking to MRP sidebar material first and although he's linked somewhere, I don't think he's on the mandatory list.

What's the big deal about this RP stuff?

1 upvotes · 11 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Haha, fair enough.

106 - What doesn't work

1 upvotes · 11 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Haha

What's the big deal about this RP stuff?

1 upvotes · 11 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I'm confused. Fixed what? Noticed what?

Either way, cuss word or not, I approved the comment :p I'll probably approve most of them, but when cuss words are used I'll probably still have it filtered so I can see the context and manually approve them, as there have been some blatant trolls who have cussed around just for the sake of it, and an auto-mod with manual approval is easier than me scouring every post every day. I should update the rules to reflect this.

What's the big deal about this RP stuff?

1 upvotes · 11 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Very true.

What's the big deal about this RP stuff?

1 upvotes · 11 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Interesting. I keep meaning to get around to reading some Dalrock, but I've been focusing so heavily on other sidebar material that I haven't gotten around to any of his stuff yet. Is it worth skipping ahead or should I stick to primary sidebar stuff first?

It's too bad he and Rollo didn't get that book together. It certainly would have ruffled some feathers. But, again, I'm still curious how a mainline Christian community would accept it. I think the political climate has changed enough after the election that the church might just be willing to take a drastically different look at all this - but if we wait another 5 years, that small window might be gone.

Use red pill to get out of a dead bedroom

1 upvotes · 11 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I also enjoy running cultural marxists and other kinds of communists out of my church. It's like a sport to me.

Haha, that's a very interesting goal. How do you spot them, and what do you do to run them out?

Also, I saw in one of your old posts that you were running NMMNG groups or something. What did you do to start these up? Were they online or in person? Mostly people in the church or in your community? Did your pastor sanction this, or was it on the side? What types of things did you talk through? I've thought about doing something similar, as there is a huge need for this in my church and I have enough of a voice with my pastor that if I said I wanted to do it, he'd endorse it and help me get the ball rolling.

What's the big deal about this RP stuff?

1 upvotes · 11 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I'm sorry to hear all this. Unfortunately, I see very domineering men cause women to file for divorce frequently. What I can say is that while TRP might prompt men to be this way, MRP does not. As I noted in [103](#), TRP focuses solely on physical intimacy, which comes almost entirely from domineering, alpha traits. MRP acknowledges the additional need for emotional intimacy, where certain beta traits are required in order to keep a lasting relationship.

As cholomite says: *Tingles without fuzzies won't last; fuzzies without tingles are worthless*. It sounds like your dad was terrible with fostering warm fuzzy feelings, so his first marriage to your mom didn't last. My parents were the opposite, having divorced because my dad was too beta (and admittedly so). But with my job, I now see both ends of the spectrum quite regularly.

Anyway, jacktenofhearts once wrote a post chewing a guy out for building an impenetrable iron frame. The fact that it was impenetrable meant he couldn't let anyone in. And even if they did get in, it was decorated with broken glass and pointy nails. Nobody wants to live in someone's frame if that's what it feels like - so they just leave.

I don't know what [/u/BluepillProfessor](#) would have to say about it - but my current theory is that the man creates the frame, the wife gets to live in it and decorate it however she likes. That is, his boundaries are not to be broken, but he needs to know the unique ways that she needs to feel loved in order to be comfortable within his frame. If he tries to choose exclusively how he will express love without concern for how she needs to receive it (of course, based on how she reacts, not necessarily what she says), he's creating a frame for the partner he wants to have, not necessarily the one he actually has. This is where there might be room for compromise. For example, someone on MRP just made a post about how his wife likes Robert Downey Jr., so he sent her a gif of him saying something - he's working within his frame, but also making use of what he knows she likes, decorating the area inside his frame with what he know works for her uniquely. I think this is healthy.

How do you not care?

1 upvotes · 10 August 2017 · /r/askTRP

To "feel abundant" you have to *be abundant* (at least at first). You have a scarcity mentality. You're not getting enough sex, you don't have enough time, you probably don't have enough money ... as long as you're focusing on what you don't have enough of, you'll never feel abundant.

Boss offers you overtime? "Nah, I'm good. Don't need the extra hours." Maybe you think you do, but learn to budget without it. As soon as you don't need your boss's freebies anymore and you're cool with your budget, go ahead and take those extra hours - not because you don't have enough money, but because you can utilize that extra money in some other way to cultivate abundance in a different area of life.

Like time. Use some of that extra cash to have groceries delivered to your door after you click a few buttons

online. Pay someone to clean your house for you. Give the neighbor kid \$20 to mow your lawn every couple weeks. Then you'll have not a scarcity of time, but an abundance of it.

An abundance of time lets you read sidebar, lift, develop confidence - go into monk mode. Then, when you come out, you'll finally be able to ask out that girl you've been pining over for the last 3 years - and she'll probably actually talk to you because you've had the time to talk to other girls too, now that you've got an abundance of muscle, abundance of time, abundance of money, abundance of game, etc.

You don't actually have to be rich to start this process. You just have to learn to accept what you're at and realize how blessed you actually are. I hate to pull this card ... but go to some African third world country and go see what actual scarcity is like. You have abundance right now. But culture tells you you don't have enough and you need more. Screw culture. Learn to be content with what you've got and even less - then rework your budget to live on even less - and your mentality will be one of abundance with what you've got, while freeing up cash that will actually lead to the things you want, not the things that placate you (like chipotle or video games or netflix).

What's the big deal about this RP stuff?

1 upvotes · 10 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I would love to write a book on all this someday :p I seriously doubt there exists anything along these lines on Christian bookshelves right now. The question is - would an agent or publisher be willing to accept something so heavily against the grain of mainline Christian culture?

Need help pulling my life together after rape charge

1 upvotes · 10 August 2017 · /r/askTRP

Correct.

203 - Lifting and Diet

1 upvotes · 10 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I think that's a great idea for a post ;) Now go start writing!

Is Red Pill truly congruent with Holiness?

1 upvotes · 10 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Well said :) I think this is about how I sum it up now.

203 - Lifting and Diet

1 upvotes · 10 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

You may well be right ;)

203 - Lifting and Diet

1 upvotes · 9 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Thanks :) This is great information.

203 - Lifting and Diet

1 upvotes · 9 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Good points :) I'll check in on those articles! Thanks for sharing.

203 - Lifting and Diet

1 upvotes · 9 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Thanks for sharing - do you recall what that paper was or where a copy could be found?

As far as a quick workout goes, I've had a few times where I've only had half an hour as well. In these instances, if I happen to be at the gym (usually because I got there late but my kids want to swim), I'll do a 3x5x5 focusing on bench, squat, shoulder press, and sit-ups. It goes something like this:

- Bench: 5 reps = ~30 seconds
- Situps: 10 second transition, 30 seconds to complete (20-25 reps)
- 20 second rest after the sit-ups (also gives time to change weights if necessary)
 - Total Time: 1:30/set ... 5 sets = 7.5 minutes. Rest for 2.5 minutes to the 10 minute mark (this also gives time to set up the next exercise with appropriate weights).
- Squat: 5 reps = ~30 seconds
- Calf raises: 10 second rest first, then 30 seconds (40-50 reps)
- 20 second rest after the calf raises (also gives time to change weights if necessary)
 - Total Time: 1:30/set ... 5 sets = 7.5 minutes. Rest for 2.5 minutes to the 20 minute mark (this also gives time to set up the next exercise with appropriate weights).
- Shoulder press: 5 reps = ~30 seconds
- Rest/stretch for about 30 seconds (also gives time to change weights if necessary)
 - Total Time: 1:00/set ... 5 sets = 5 minutes, taking you to the 25 minute mark - you've still got 5 minutes to grab your bag and head out, or that gives you more buffer for resting, if you need it somewhere :)

This is, of course, a HIIT routine. HIIT is pretty much the best way to deal with time conscious lifting/cardio. Ideally, with more time you can get better muscle tear (which is what causes strength-gain and the bulky look) if you allow for longer rests, as that allows the lactic acids to subside, giving you the ability to maintain higher weights for each set. But, when I do this type of routine, I'm usually working at about 85-90% of the weight I'd do on any other day because I know with the much shorter rest periods my muscle fatigue will necessitate a faster drop (although my first set is always a max set, even with this - I just lower it quicker).

203 - Lifting and Diet

1 upvotes · 9 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Good thoughts! Just as a quick thought - I seem to recall you're a woman. Do you think there should be any differences in how women v. men should focus their exercise/lifting/diet?

For example, many men want to bulk up to get huge muscles. This means power weights with a higher caloric intake than a normal cut diet would allow for. However, most body-building women are relatively unattractive to the majority of men, as many guys prefer a woman with a toned body rather than a bulky one. What's your take on this distinction? Which do you pursue?

Obviously, as a man I can only talk about what I know works for me as a man. As it seems you know well what you're talking about, would you be interested in writing a post on what lifting, cardio, and diet should look like to hit more feminine goals for what a body should look like?

Can you divorce a woman if she lied about her number of sexual partners? (within biblical rules)

1 upvotes · 9 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Catholics absolutely do not believe that Mary was sinless

Interesting. I've heard this from at least a dozen Catholics over the years. So, I googled the question and one of the top results was www.catholic.com affirming this notion that Mary was born and lived her entire life without sin.

I fully believe that many Catholic churches don't preach this, but one also can't say Catholics "absolutely do not believe" this when catholic.com itself is professing this view :/

I never fail to be surprised at what Protestants believe about Catholics.

I fully agree with you there. Many people are really deceived about what Catholics actually believe. But I, personally, try not to make a claim about Catholics that I haven't researched or heard professed from a priest directly.

How come RP is never about trying to make a relationship work?

1 upvotes · 8 August 2017 · /r/askMRP

things have been good. We don't argue. I get sex. Blowjobs all the time Etc.

So ... what's the problem? If what you're doing is working, keep doing it. It's often said here, "If you always do what you've always done, you'll always get what you've always got." If you're one of the rare people where this can be applied positively, then apply it.

But I'd like to better myself as a man.

To what end? And whose definition of "man"? If you want acceptance in this community because you're a true "RP Man," go for it - if that's a higher priority to you than getting what you want in your relationship. But if you're trying to be the type of man who gets everything he wants from his girl ... then go be that. If you find what you're doing isn't working, then come back here and get some things straightened out. But if there's no actual problem, I wouldn't mess with what works (unless you can see an inevitable breakdown in the future due to unsustainability, or any number of other issues).

Being Christlike vs. Being Used

1 upvotes · 7 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

1. Totally understood.
2. I'm not going to deny your experience for what it was. But the literature I remember reading a few years back was also fairly persuasive. To be clear, Christianity has similar commands and expectations, and when I mention "body shaming," it's subconscious and psychological, never overt. Nobody will ever say, "You should be ashamed of your body!" It's the fact that it must remain concealed that makes people develop subconscious thought-processes about it being "bad" to reveal their bodies, which can be difficult to overcome later.

In fact, it bothers me that I have no good explanation as to how Christian women dress so worldly that they can't be told apart.

And right you are to be bothered by this!

but I can't distinguish the average Christian woman from the masses

Well, you have to remember that the "average" self-identified Christian is not actually Christian.

[/u/ruizbujc](#) did a research study on this once, doing in-person interviews with a few hundred people to try to figure out what % of the church would meet a basic standard of "saved." You'll have to ask him about his criteria, but it was fairly low-level basic stuff that most people would agree with.

His conclusion? 18.65% of church-goers/3.8% of self-identifiers would meet the criteria of "saved."

Okay, I was curious, so I looked up his comment. Here's his criteria:

- Can "articulate what they believe and why"
- "Their beliefs affect their daily life."
- "Can give specific examples of how Jesus had impacted the way they live" (as opposed to general examples).

Even if we ignore the "saved" language (if you disagree with his standard, which is fine), the bottom line is still that 81.35% of church-goers can't articulate a way that Jesus changed their life. This means that 81.35% of church-goers can't acknowledge their attire as something that has been affected by Jesus. This number rises to 96.2% when dealing with all self-identifiers (i.e. including those who call themselves Christians, but don't actually attend church regularly).

Bottom line: your point is well-taken and statistically verified :p

Why don't we look more like out nuns who dress like Mary?

Is that why nuns dress that way? I've never really thought about it :p How would they know what clothes Mary wore?

201 - Healthy Sexual Desire v. Lust/Coveting

1 upvotes · 7 August 2017 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

This is a common misperception - that Jesus is "adding" to the law. Jesus is referencing the law that the Pharisees love to quote, then saying, "But you forgot about this other law over here."

To put it more formulaic:

- "You have heard that it was said" = the law the Pharisees love to quote
- "But I tell you" = he's referencing other parts of the OT that the Pharisees were ignoring, not just making up some new standard.

In the case of "murder/anger" he's quoting a psalm that has highly paralleled language. In the case of "adultery/lust" he's quoting another of the 10 commandments that the Pharisees had ignored in favor of using the easy "adultery" standard instead of "coveting."

If it was any or every woman (as some believe), that would contradict "marry, and fill the earth".

I'm not sure how that follows. Clearly someone can lust after his own wife. But for someone not his wife, the lust itself would be wrong, but more general desire, appreciation of beauty, etc. are perfectly appropriate. That desire and appreciation can still lead people toward marriage and, thereafter, procreation. But, to be clear, the command isn't to "marry and fill the earth" it's "multiply and fill the earth." There is no command that we must marry.

Quote the opposite - Paul says in 1 Cor. 7 that it's better not to marry, and Jesus says in Matthew 19:11-12 that if

someone is capable of remaining unmarried, he should.

I had an epiphany this week

1 upvotes · 7 August 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

My recommendation on showing gratitude is simple: *Don't talk. Do.*

[/u/ginlady](#) mentioned a few good thoughts - strong eye contact and a little smile. Sometimes just a twinkle in your eye, expressing a deep longing for him is affirmation that he's doing things that make you desire him. Sometimes something a little more overt, like a hug or a kiss can work. Rub his back, massage his shoulders.

Although I'm not the biggest fan of the book, *The 5 Love Languages* addresses some ideas:

- Words of Affirmation - this is actually verbalizing your thanks.
- Physical Touch - I've already mentioned some of that. This is a big one for most guys.
- Acts of Service - Return the favor, simple enough.
- Quality Time - When he helps you, stop what you're doing, put your phone down, and just put your attention on him.
- Gift Giving - Depending on how big of a help he was, buy/make him something meaningful and note: "I just wanted to express my gratitude" or some sappier way to say that.

Just a few ideas :) But bear in mind that the world is so flooded with "talk without action" that *words of affirmation* tend to mean very little nowadays. If you are going to go with words, you've really got to ham it up or do something to show your seriousness, like [/u/ginlady](#) suggested.

Being Christlike vs. Being Used

1 upvotes · 7 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I just so happen to feel that modesty requires not showing cleavage and curves.

As to the conversation with you and [/u/OsmiumZulu](#), this is what Romans 14 would call a disputable matter. Each one has their own convictions. Sometimes the Spirit legitimately leads people into believing two different things based on what He knows each can handle. Other times, it's a timing thing about when God reveals a new truth (such as a person not yet mature enough to understand something). Still other times there is just legitimately no one right answer, and it's okay to embrace that.

To that end, the message of Romans 14 is to bear with one another in our disagreements on disputable matters, not arguing over them.

All I ask is that you show me the same courtesy by accepting that what I expressed was an opinion and my ideas.

That's a fair request. If I had to guess, OZ is used to travelling in more intellectual Christian circles, where appropriate Scriptural support and terminology must accompany statements of belief, especially when those statements are made as a recommendation to others. To this end, including terminology like, "This is what the Spirit has convicted me; he may not have convicted you likewise," often abates these types of conversations into the Romans 14 framework :) I hope that helps. Otherwise, if you're having a good discussion, don't let me stand in the way :p

Being Christlike vs. Being Used

1 upvotes · 7 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

The concept behind what you're describing is a noble one. In an ideal world, everyone would be able to do this without two (off the top of my head) pitfalls coming up:

1. Falling into the same trap that Jesus ragged on the pharisees for doing: creating too many rules that went beyond the direct requirements of the law (Matthew 15/Mark 7).
 2. The psychological implications of body-shaming women. Although it could be argued that you're really exalting the value of her body by concealing it and making it something that only a prized husband gets to see ... from what I recall reading in several Muslim sources back in the day, the reverse is actually true: women get so used to hiding their bodies in public and that it's "bad" for a man to see her skin that when she gets married she has great difficulty overcoming that psychological perception that has been ingrained in her for so long that she still can't be fully open with her husband, leading to many sexual problems.
- This is virtually identical to the way the western church over-emphasizes the "sex before marriage is sin" aspect, without actually teaching on the fun of it in marriage. Because most people hear this message repeatedly during their teenage years, and even long before, they spend a very, very long time in that phase. Because they're not married for, say, a decade of hearing that, and our brains filter out inapplicable information, that's 10 years straight of hearing "sex is sin" (because "before marriage" doesn't mean anything when you know you're not married - they just think, "For me right now, sex is sin" and "right now" gets really hard to change).

Anyway, good thoughts and discussion :) Thanks for sharing your views on this! I wish more people processed information on this topic like you do. I would definitely prefer Christian women to err on the side of modesty than sluttiness. Unfortunately, outside of church itself, we're too far into slut territory and there needs to be a swing in the pendulum back a little ways.

Tag: [/u/RedPillWonder](#) (since I'm really piggy-backing on your conversation)

Also, as RPWonder noted, I'm happy to see some of your suggestions get put up on the front page for discussion :D You're always welcome to make a post. At the same time, some of those things will naturally be addressed as we continue in the series I've been doing and hearing from others, although it may take time. Due to time constraints and the mass amount of reading I do (presently on RP stuff), my free time is mostly limited to about 2 primary posts per week, which I think isn't too bad of a pace.

201 - Healthy Sexual Desire v. Lust/Coveting

1 upvotes · 7 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Well said. I like the steak example :)

The Sandbox and the Swingset, Introducing MRPW

1 upvotes · 6 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

What you're describing is attitude. I'm describing behavior. Although I agree my wife may not have had the best attitude in all of this, she did maintain a positive attitude for most of it. It is perfectly possible to engage in negative behavior with positive attitude. When my wife's attitude is positive, despite doing things I disagree with I will still interpret her intentions as noble and will not see her as a shrew. As a result, rather than blaming her negative actions on her ("She's just a shrew" mentality), I see it as a mistake or oversight that requires me to step in and solve the problem, which I'm happy and expectant to do for the good of the family (bearing in mind that most of this happened before I discovered RP).

As someone else commented, there could be a correlation with Christian couples benefiting from this, but not for

the reasons noted. The "I'm stuck" mentality really isn't as present as most would think. In reality, although the church message is over-feminized as a whole, leading to an encouragement of too much beta in men, there is still the underriding baseline theology that Christian women are raised to do things with positive loving attitudes and men are told to be leaders. So, a Christian man is more prone to see these things as opportunities to lead as long as the wife does them with positive attitude. They may actually increase his attraction to her because the fail behavior mixed with positive attitude gives the occasionally attractive "ditz effect" where she's cute and needy, making him feel like he has something to contribute.

Being Christlike vs. Being Used

1 upvotes · 5 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

This is exactly what I was going to suggest.

Can you divorce a woman if she lied about her number of sexual partners? (within biblical rules)

1 upvotes · 5 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Oh, and I just checked again, but I still have no idea how to change the timer on that spam filter.

Can you divorce a woman if she lied about her number of sexual partners? (within biblical rules)

1 upvotes · 5 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

We're not ancient Hebrews, nor do we follow Jewish laws or the culture of those times.

That is, in fact, my thought on the matter. That said, there is some value in knowing the history of what we believe. As an attorney, I can't tell you how often it comes up in law that we cite outdated and overruled laws because the historical context matters.

The Taming of the Shrew: A Red Pill Analysis (X-Post from TRP)

1 upvotes · 5 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Good point.

Can you divorce a woman if she lied about her number of sexual partners? (within biblical rules)

1 upvotes · 4 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Would I practice it that way? No. Did the ancient Hebrews? Yes. If we're talking about Jewish law, we shouldn't be imputing our own views and biases on the matter - it's strictly a question of what the law meant in that culture at that time. So, "Would you ...?" is irrelevant to the academic component of the conversation that /u/RedPillWonder is trying to create.

Can you divorce a woman if she lied about her number of sexual partners? (within biblical rules)

1 upvotes · 4 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

This has been my suspicion too. That is not the case with /u/RedPillWonder, as has been made clear now :)

Can you divorce a woman if she lied about her number of sexual partners? (within biblical rules)

1 upvotes · 4 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Gotcha.

The Taming of the Shrew: A Red Pill Analysis (X-Post from TRP)

1 upvotes · 4 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

It's a great read - definitely put it up there if you're done with the rest of the sidebar.

Can you divorce a woman if she lied about her number of sexual partners? (within biblical rules)

1 upvotes · 4 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Why doesn't she have a valid reason to divorce him? Or does this thing only flow one way?

Ancient Hebrew culture legitimately didn't work both ways. So, without question about the appropriateness of how the laws worked back then (which is a much longer discussion), this questions is purely a technical matter about how the laws actually functioned in that time. Because it was a one-way law, we must discuss it in that context - unless someone disagrees about this interpretation of it being one-way.

Can you divorce a woman if she lied about her number of sexual partners? (within biblical rules)

1 upvotes · 4 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

From a purely sociological viewpoint, this is a brilliant explanation. In that light, I agree with everything you have said. But what did you mean when you said, "It is not the sex act that precludes and a no-man's, but the knowledge you gain from having sex"? I get the fingers and toes bit, but what if the misrepresentation is not something that sex would cause you to discover?

The Taming of the Shrew: A Red Pill Analysis (X-Post from TRP)

1 upvotes · 4 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Well, I'm glad they did. I was an English lit major in college, and took about every Shakespeare class that my University had to offer. I loved every second of this post. Maybe when I have some time I'll write a more full response.

The Taming of the Shrew: A Red Pill Analysis (X-Post from TRP)

1 upvotes · 3 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I was literally contemplating this exact post almost a month ago. However, I thought I read in the rules somewhere that we're not supposed to analyze fiction, and we're supposed to stick to real life examples. Maybe that was just a TRP rule?

Custody theories that could ruin you ... and the merits of shared parental rights

1 upvotes · 3 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

credit based on how many overnights the non-custodial parent has a year.

That's a stupid system. You don't pay for overnights. You pay for what happens before they go to bed.

So when you can argue the true 50/50 arrangement is happening, is that usually a deduction in the support or does the support go away?

If the income levels are relatively close, support goes away. If there's a disparity, it's a deviation of up to half the support amount, depending on the degree of the disparity.

Please don't read this as me getting out of my responsibilities.

No need to DEER. I get it.

Can you divorce a woman if she lied about her number of sexual partners? (within biblical rules)

1 upvotes · 3 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Good thoughts here! Question, though:

However, I think this could be grounds for an annulment.

At least in the US, most states cut off annulment once the couple has sex or have remained together for a certain number of years (in my state: 3). So, if the couple sleeps together on their wedding night, annulment is no longer an option. Likewise (and I actually had a case like this), if they've been "married" for 5 years but never had sex, you still can't get an annulment - must be divorce.

That said, I don't recall seeing any biblical "annulment" principles that would say whether or not this same principle would apply. What are your thoughts on the requirements of an annulment?

Can you divorce a woman if she lied about her number of sexual partners? (within biblical rules)

1 upvotes · 3 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Sorry for the automoderator. This post is approved.

That said, this is very insightful. Thanks for sharing all this! I'm not too keen on relying on Jewish resources outside the Bible or even non-biblical writings of early church fathers (other than for word-studies), but there's definitely good context there to help us understand how these things have been addressed by the church over the years, rather than automatically assuming that every generation before us handled them the same way.

He said specifically that if a man were addicted to pornography he has no right to issue a bill of divorce to his woman texting another man. I claim otherwise, on grounds that this is not a realistic foil upon which to argue. If she were committing adultery the man has every right to divorce.

Assuming you're referencing ruizbujc, I think he was saying simply that the husband had no proof that his wife actually was cheating on him. From what I know of the story he's referencing, the texts were not of a sexual nature at all - they were casual conversation. So, the man was jealous, but had no actual basis in fact for the belief that his wife was cheating on him, whereas he did know for a fact that he was committing sexual sin against his wife vis a vis the pornography. That's why it was an imbalance.

Some have commented upon the broad nature of the word "porneia" and "fornication". Etymologically these referred to specific instances. The words weren't broad. At least "fornication" isn't. It comes from a Latin word for a specific type of roof under which brothels and sluts invited men.

Interesting, I didn't know the Latin origin there. That said, *porneia* is the Greek word in the original text, which I do believe predates the Latin and has a significantly different meaning than the English translation "fornication." There is a lot of debate over what, exactly, *porneia* actually means, and the main problem is that in extrabiblical texts the word is used in so many contexts, that it's impossible to discern if Jesus meant one specific context or to

incorporate all ways the word was ever used. So, we get people arguing both ways :p

And porneia is not clear about excluding premarital sex. In fact it appears the Bible permits premarital intercourse as long as it leads to marriage.

I have long held the view that biblical marriage requires two things: (1) sex and (2) mutual consent. We see that in early days, marriage ceremonies didn't even exist. Adam and Eve were "married" because they were one flesh - they had sex - and both intended to have a relational connection when they had sex.

So, if a man today rapes a woman, the sex part is there, but there's no mutual intent to create a relational connection. This is not "marriage" - it is criminal. Interestingly, though, in OT law if a man raped a woman, he was obligated to offer to marry her. So, even then the "sex even without commitment" implies that the commitment must be offered, which would culminate in marriage if accepted.

In reverse, if two people intend a relational connection, but never solidify it with sex, they are not one flesh and it is not marriage no matter how long they hold themselves out as being in a relationship.

When it comes to "casual sex," most of these encounters actually do involve some kind of a relational connection. Even if it is a one-night-stand, at least in that moment there's mutual consent and you're both saying, "I want this connection with you right now." The fact that you both decide later that you no longer care for the connection or that this decision is agreed on before having sex doesn't change anything - at the time of becoming one flesh there was a mutual intent to engage in that relational connection. So, I interpret this as a marriage being created in God's eyes. So, when someone after a ONS then goes and marries someone else through a ceremony, it is really viewed as his second wife by God, although the act of engaging in a vow makes it binding, so he cannot then leave his legal spouse in order to return to his first wife/spiritual spouse later - and when he has his wedding night sex, the deal is sealed and the new wife becomes a spiritual spouse as well.

That last paragraph is something I'm more lenient on because Scripture isn't totally clear on the point, but it seems to make sense to me. "One flesh" = marriage, as long as it was mutual.

Looking at Deuteronomy 22 and Exodus 22 rape is even permitted if the man is honorable and marries her.

Well, Deuteronomy 22:25-27 says that if she's betrothed (implying she wouldn't have consented), then the man is to be put to death. In 28-29, it's not clear that he's talking about rape. She may well have decided to go along with it, just as in the situation in 23-24, where he sleeps with her, but she didn't cry for help, so she's put to death too (again, because she's betrothed, thus the implication is that she consented to cheating on her would-be husband). When it says "he has violated her," this doesn't mean "he raped her" - it means he took her virginity without them being married, which was considered "violation" in that culture.

The Exodus 22 passage actually clarifies that the father has the right to turn down the offer of marriage, while still accepting the marriage price. If the woman was truly raped, the father would simply have to turn down the offer, accept his money, and his daughter wouldn't have to be traumatized by being forced into marriage with a rapist. Her obligation isn't to the rapist - it is to her father.

Interestingly, though, in the story of Amnon and Tamar, Amnon raped Tamar and there was no forced marriage. Even so, Tamar wanted to marry Amnon. Why? Because she wasn't a virgin anymore, so she knew that finding another husband would be nearly impossible, and lying about it would get her killed. So, by her own choice she preferred to marry her rapist over being alone for the rest of her life. Since he wouldn't marry her, she ended up alone for life anyway. It's a sad story, but that's how culture was back then.

she could refuse but this is rare: she would then on have no virginity to offer and live under shame

We don't actually have any recorded stories where a father forced his daughter to marry a rapist. The only

recorded story was where Tamar wanted to, but even then they didn't end up married. So, I don't think we can speculate on the rarity of refusal when we don't even have one example of consent. But I do agree that the choice naturally implies a particular conclusion - better to marry your rapist than be alone and under shame.

If we say porneia is a catch-all condemnation of sex outside of or antecedent to marriage, we condemn our father Abraham.

True enough, but I think most people do condemn his act of sleeping with Hagar as sinful. The message of Christ is that the person may be saved, although he may commit condemnable acts. It would be far more controversial if someone were to try to argue that Abraham was without sin and that's what saved him - which would clearly be wrong conclusion. So, accepting that he sinned is of no consequence, as we accept this of all people (unless you're Catholic, in which case you probably believe Mary was also sinless ... which is just weird to me).

I have no intention of white knightting or trying to look like the law can't condemn me. I'm screwed either way if I turn to the law.

This is well said. But it only makes sense in the context of:

I must consult God and do what is right. He knows context and what to do in every situation.

... instead of

Personally, if i were married to a contentious shrew who treated me like a menstrual rag, I would divorce.

The reconciliation I'm seeing here is the same one Jesus explains for why Moses gave a certificate of divorce. "If you're married to a contentious shrew, you're probably going to end up sinning in your relationship with her in one way or another. Could you avoid it? Probably. But as a practical matter, it's not likely. This is what Jesus meant when he said, "Because of the hardness of your hearts" - you should be able to avoid sin, but you can't, so here's another option to mitigate the sin. In that situation, the option is divorce. That divorce is not justified. That is, it's still sin. But it's viewed as the lesser of the sin options if you know you are practically incapable of the righteous decision due to a hardened heart, weak/newness of faith, etc. So, I will never tell someone, "Yes, you are right to divorce under these circumstances," I have no qualms in telling them, "It's wrong to divorce under those circumstances, but it might still be the practical best conclusion for you."

As for me, I often feel stuck just beyond the bounds of this dilemma. I feel empowered enough by Christ to be able to choose righteousness by His Spirit's enabling power, even when it is a difficult choice that many others could make. As a result, if I were to try to take this course of action and divorce my wife without biblical grounds, I would be doing it with knowledge that my heart was not so hard as to be incapable of righteousness in the situation, and thus I don't know that I could choose that option. That's all stuff I haven't really spent much time dwelling on, though, so I won't ponder much further.

Can you divorce a woman if she lied about her number of sexual partners? (within biblical rules)

1 upvotes · 3 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I'm going to have to summon [/u/ruizbujc](#) on this one. I know he has thoughts on this and I fully endorse them.

Single Father v. Single Mother Stats

1 upvotes · 3 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Indeed.

Single Father v. Single Mother Stats

1 upvotes · 2 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

If you want to go into statistical methodology theory, technically the sample size only needs to be 30 to create a normalized distribution representative of an entire population that most statisticians will give great weight and accuracy to.

Single Father v. Single Mother Stats

1 upvotes · 2 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Good question. The answer is: *I don't know*. I'm not aware of any meta studies that have been done on that.

Divorce Incorporated

1 upvotes · 2 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

You're right, it would be more accurate to say *most states abolished*. I can't speak to the laws of other states as an attorney, but as someone who's looked into it, my recollection is that the states that have retained common-law-marriage have greatly dimmed its meaning. For example, I think in CO you have to have some kind of agreement to be considered married, even if it doesn't meet the technical requirements of marriage licensing. Similarly, in New Hampshire, both parties have to represent themselves as "husband and wife" and there must be evidence of this or it doesn't count. In Iowa, common law marriage exists only for support for dependents, but won't protect other rights. Many other states, like Kansas, Montana, South Carolina, and some others will treat common law marriage as a presumption, where if you can present any evidence that it was not a mutual intent to function as a marital unit, then the burden goes on the other side to prove that you actually did have that intention.

So, the whole "shack up for a few years and you're automatically deemed married" thing is abolished in every state. But some states have retained a remnant of the old laws, but it's much easier to get out of it, as the requirements to prove it have gone way up. In my state it's abolished entirely, except to people where it's grandfathered in because they were deemed common-law-married before that law was abolished.

Mini-FR - The vasectomy conversation

1 upvotes · 1 August 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Haha, that would produce an interesting reaction indeed. I'm fully with the "own it" mentality now.

106 - What doesn't work

1 upvotes · 31 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

it's still worth making sure there aren't any biological impediments

Exactly, this is why I try to minimize any time periods my wife is on the pill. It's also why I won't use condoms anymore ... my desire for condom sex is lower than my desire just to get some sleep. If there's an extenuating circumstance beyond raw desire issues, it's got to be addressed.

106 - What doesn't work

1 upvotes · 31 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I think there are plenty of situations where this happens

Very true. That said, I think these situations are rarer than married couples in a dead bedroom would like to think. It's easier just to assume "he/she is just LL" rather than the pain of realizing, "he/she is only LL for me."

Athol Kay cites SSRIs as impairing libido. My husband just got diagnosed with severe sleep apnea, which definitely dampens his libido. In those types of cases, you've got to get the medical situation dealt with.

Absolutely, you should. But remember that it's a scale, not an on/off switch. Most libido-impairing substances aren't all-or-nothing, they simply change the threshold at which your libido kicks in.

So, someone on an SSRI or with sleep apnea might have a lower libido than someone else, but if approached by their celebrity of choice, who's doing all the right things to seduce them ... they'll probably be inflamed with desire anyway. They won't, however, feel that desire for their spouse wearing day-to-day clothes, talking in the typical manner, and going about their ordinary business.

So, between "typical spouse" and "seductive all-star celebrity," somewhere in that spectrum is a line where, once crossed, their libido will be activated. For most people, just "someone else" other than their spouse at all is all it takes. This tells me they're not really "LL," they're just not interested in someone who isn't willing to put forth common effort that applies in the dating realm.

If your husband does have legit LL issues from his sleep apnea, maybe he legitimately wouldn't naturally notice the scantily clad girl at the bar ... but maybe if she was actively trying to seduce him his response might be different ... if it didn't work, maybe if she knew exactly his buttons and which ones to push, she'd be even more likely to turn him on. Right? So, where's that line for your spouse? The sleep apnea may have changed where its located on the spectrum, but it hasn't thrown out the line altogether.

The RP Can Only Do So Much Married To An Alcoholic

1 upvotes · 31 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

if we just don't talk about it, then they won't want to do it

A more proper assessment would be: *If we talk about what the Bible has to say on hard issues, culture will reject us. That's counter-productive to filling seats <ahem> ... I mean, sharing the Gospel with new people. So, let's just not say anything that people might not want to hear.*

The notion of romantic "love" often means doing whatever it takes to be peaceful and that usually means no conflict. I have never read this in scripture

That's because it's not there. The very idea of marrying for "love" didn't even exist on a widespread level until the late 1800s. Really, in the mid-1700s philosophers of the "enlightenment" era started proposing the idea, but parents still controlled marriage because they controlled the wealth. In the 1800s, that's when the industrial era started to boom and young men could afford to marry who they wanted, rather than who their parents told them to. As a result, they started rushing into relationships, and it didn't take long before they realized how fleeting "love" could be, and started wanting out of those relationships. The divorce rate has been on the rise ever since then, especially as the laws made it easier and easier.

So, when you talk about "love" in the context of marriage, it's important to remember that most people for virtually all of human history did not believe that "love" was even a part of marriage; rather, if someone happened to develop a love for their spouse, that was a fortunate man.

Since she has no job and stays locked in the room much of the afternoon, no one outside our home has to interact with her.

Document this. Set up a camera watching her door (inconspicuously, of course) to show that she can go 4+ hours without leaving her room. This shows that she's inattentive to the kids. Get 4-5 videos like this and you can easily explain that this is a recurring thing and the court will buy into it (as opposed to one video, which could be a one-

time phenomenon). Although the court won't watch the video as evidence, a GAL might be more interested.

I cannot prove what her blood alcohol level was at the time

Go to a police or fire department and ask them how much it would cost to get a mechanism that will prevent you from starting your car if you can't blow clean. It's not fool-proof (she can have someone else blow for her), but it's certainly inconvenient and will make her think twice before driving with the kids while intoxicated. Right now, she thinks it's okay because she doesn't realize when she's drunk. If the machine tells her she's drunk and she has the kids, she's not going to fake it to put the kids in harm's way - she'll have to face the reality of her situation at that point. In getting a divorce, this won't necessarily help much, but it can be a huge step in rebuilding trust and saving your marriage.

I almost feel like my absolute evidence (courtwise) would need to come from a DUI, but how can I take that chance and expose my kids or anyone else?

I always advise to do what's best for your kids. Don't let her drive drunk with them. Period. That said, even a DUI isn't going to convince the court if she is good enough at explaining herself away. Again, this is where video footage really helps. Sometimes audio can even work. I had a case where the husband would tape an audio recorder under his wife's seat when he knew she'd be driving somewhere, hoping to pick up slurred speech and drunken ramblings while she's driving.

The money issues scares me as I don't have much.

You're about to have even less. In my view, \$3,000 seems expensive, but in the grand scheme of things, it's a small price to set yourself up for the long-term. If you can get custody and she's ordered to pay you even a pittance of \$250/mo in child support (a typical order in my state when the obligor isn't working), that's \$3,000/yr. Add to that the fact that if she got custody or you did shared parenting, you'd probably end up owing her closer to \$500/mo (assuming you make around \$35,000/yr), which is \$6,000/yr ... your net per year goes from owing \$6k to receiving \$3k. That's a \$9,000 annual difference. If the psych eval costs you \$5,000, you'll make that up in 6 months of child support figures alone (assuming the eval does end up getting you custody, which is the strongest evidence in any case like this - even better than a DUI).

When clients have trouble coming up with these funds, they usually borrow from family, sell off assets (preferably before the divorce is filed), or pay on credit cards.

I'm told this is due to ADHD and needed to be away from everybody

As I'm sure you're aware, this is obviously a joke. No ADHD person has to withdraw from society to control their "problem."

I now know she is upstairs getting hammered and quite often zonks out and never comes back down.

Better than a camera watching the door is a secret camera in the room. Get a nanny cam.

how bad would it need to get for the court to care?

To the point where the court believes she will neglect the kids' needs or put them in harm's way. Spending 6 hours in her room crying and sleeping is fine as long as she gets out to make them dinner when the time comes, or she can attend to a scraped leg when they knock on the door. If they're young kids (4 and under), the standard goes up because they require more supervision, so she is expected to supervise them and periods longer than an hour of isolation will probably reflect poorly.

If we split, I'm definitely sure she would go back to our home state as that's where her financial support (in-laws) would be found.

Courts hate relocating the children. If she moves, she loses the kids. She'll know this and will stay so as to avoid losing the custody battle. She'll probably try to convince you to let her take the kids, just don't give in. She'll back down and stay before she gives up custody.

The RP Can Only Do So Much Married To An Alcoholic

1 upvotes · 31 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

You almost nailed it. The exception is the finding someone new part. Right now in my current state, I'm feeling like I understand those MGTOW guys now.

I haven't looked into MGTOW at all, so I can't speak there, but the option of remaining single really might not be all that bad. This will probably totally destroy any respect in an RP community, but I tend to lean toward the theological viewpoint that remarriage after divorce for any reason while your ex is still alive is sin. As a result, even if I accept divorce as an option, remarriage is something I don't - at least not right now.

That said, the Scripture on point is ambiguous enough that, even though I think the stronger interpretation is what I mentioned, it's a perfectly valid and legitimate belief to go the other way on point also. So, I'll never criticize or condemn anyone who does think it's okay to get remarried after divorce and it's a subject where I'll openly admit that my current *leaning* (I won't even call it my "view" or "position") may very well be wrong.

Yes, i was waiting for Part 2!

Maybe I'll write it up for this sub at some point.

I have no idea how to even reach out to a divorce judge.

Literally: google the courthouse, walk in randomly, ask to talk to the judge's court officer, then pop the question. If the court officer has your answer, there you go. If she doesn't, she'll ask the judge for you.

I cried infront of a potential plate. She fucked me everyday for the next week.

1 upvotes · 31 July 2017 · /r/askTRP

Glad I could help a little.

edit: why are they talking about video games on RPChristians?

Because there's a sub made up of SJWs who like to troll anyone who holds to conservative values - especially Christians. So, when they discovered "RPChristians" they decided to brigade the sub and play off "RP" as "Role Playing" instead of "Red Pill" to make a joke of us. I've promptly removed all that garbage and banned the trolls.

Mini-FR - The vasectomy conversation

1 upvotes · 31 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

More likely she's consciously or subconsciously lost and confused.

As things are now, you're probably quite right. I think I was talking about a future-point, once I'm further along in my journey. I still have some weight to lose and tactics I've been withholding and have yet to employ (trying not to go Rambo).

That said, I was just watching the first Captain American movie with my wife and son today and when he first gets the super-soldier serum and erupts from the chamber, my son blurts out: "Daddy, he looks just like you with your shirt off!" It made me smile! In no way am I close to movie-touched-up Chris Evans body, but the fact that he said that and my wife smiled with a blush made me happy :)

Your wife's dialog reveals that she's very much into using children as the means to securing commitment from you - your connection to her - not sex.

That very well could be. I doubt she's doing it consciously, but you're probably right that some element of that is there. She once even pointed out that the only reason she believes her parents stayed together as long as they did was because of the kids - i.e. kids = forced commitment. As you say, I'm changing the rules (and for the record, her parents are still together, despite that both of their kids have been moved out for a decade-ish).

You can bet that she will maintain her "LL" until it becomes very clear to her that she must unleash her inner slut to attract and hold the Man that she by her own observation and deduction (not by discussion with you) has determined is The Prize that she wants no other woman to have. Be that Man.

I'm counting on this. I've already seen shifts in the balance and am confident in the direction I'm moving.

201 - Healthy Sexual Desire v. Lust/Coveting

1 upvotes · 31 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Haha, fair enough. I suppose that was my way of appreciating the beauty in what was written without weighing it down with disagreement. As I'm sure you're aware, I'm not Catholic. So, although I have a healthy respect for early church fathers, I believe the same Spirit that was at work in them is also at work in us today. So, beyond the apostles themselves (and maybe the immediate next generation after them, like Timothy, for example), I don't make the assumption that they have some special knowledge that the Holy Spirit can't communicate directly to us all the same. As a result, I give them great respect, but will not just assume they're correct.

What I notice from this passage, as is true of most of what I've read from the early church fathers, is that he's not really interpreting a passage. Instead, he's dictating a stream of conscious exercise where he begins with a passage and then starts talking about everything that it reminds him of. As a result, most of what he says is way off point of actually understanding the passage itself and goes into human ideas about what he, personally, thinks on the subject matter. To that end, he may be very wise and many would do well to listen to him, but I'd be cautious about giving his words weight as an authority over how Scripture must be interpreted.

From what I can tell, the core of his argument is here:

"What then," one may say, "if I should look, and desire indeed, but do no evil?" Even so you are set among the adulterers. For the Lawgiver has pronounced it, and you must not ask any more questions. For thus looking once, twice, or thrice, you will perhaps have power to refrain; but if you are continually doing this, and kindling the furnace, you will assuredly be taken; for your station is not beyond that nature which is common to men.

I understand the wisdom in what he's saying. Don't let desire take control of you. But the assumption that desire inevitably leads to sin is a conclusion I cannot share. To be fair, James 1:14-15 says, "Each one is tempted when by his own evil desires he is dragged away and enticed. Then, after desire has conceived, it gives birth to sin; and sin, when it is full-grown gives birth to death." But what I notice here is that the desire itself is not sin - it only leads to sin. I think that's what he's trying to say, but he makes the assumption that all desire will lead there. Are we to say that we should abandon our desire for food because it will inevitably make everyone become a glutton?

Instead, I see Paul preaching: "I discipline my body and make it my slave" (1 Cor. 9:27). That is, he

acknowledged that desire can lead to sin (see Romans 7), but also saw that this could be controlled and utilized. Nowhere do we see an apostle preaching: "Stop desiring things; you must become emotionally numb." Instead, we constantly see throughout Scripture the value of appreciating the wonderful things God has given us and that it is good to desire what God has made available. In Eden, Adam saw that all the plants were good for eating and he desired them. God told David, "I gave you all of Saul's wives and concubines, and if you desired more, I would have given you more." In the Psalms, we are instructed: "Delight yourselves in the Lord and I will give you the desires of your heart." In the NT we are constantly reminded to desire things like righteousness, mercy, and to save the lost - all things which have earthly parallels that help us cultivate and understand these spiritual drives we're meant to have - even to the degree that Paul instructs us: "Run as one trying to win the prize," which presumes we must desire the prize.

Now, per 1 John 2:15-17, we're not to make those earthly desires an end of themselves, nor are we to humor them to the extent of sin itself. But I do believe desire can be controlled. I can have a healthy sexual desire for my wife, while not letting that desire consume me into looking beyond my wife (i.e. pornography, adultery, etc.). Likewise, I can desire a cup of ice cream, yet not be consumed by it to the point of gluttony.

All of that said, if this means what I think it means:

Since, although you have not touched her with the hand, yet have you caressed her with your eyes; for which cause this also is accounted adultery

Then I agree with him - that it becomes adultery when you start to play out your fantasy in your mind. So, while I may be able to let a woman walk in front of me, and I may even notice and appreciate her beauty, it is not sin until I start fantasizing. Once it gets there, that's when the "coveting" takes hold - the fact that I really wish I could act on it, but am only unable to do so because of humanistic motives, as my post describes.

201 - Healthy Sexual Desire v. Lust/Coveting

1 upvotes · 31 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Some have taken this to mean that a man should avert his eyes from every woman not his wife, under pain of hellfire.

Yeah, when the Pharisees tried to call out Jesus for not following their "stricter than the law" man-made commandments, Jesus called them out on it and rebuked them pretty harshly. In Matthew 15:9 he says plainly, "These people honor me with their lips, but their hearts are far from me. They worship me in vain; their teachings are merely human rules." That "hearts are far from me" line reminds me of Matthew 7 where Jesus casts these people away. I'd rather not wind up in that spot :p

Great thoughts :)

201 - Healthy Sexual Desire v. Lust/Coveting

1 upvotes · 29 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Very interesting. Thanks for sharing.

201 - Healthy Sexual Desire v. Lust/Coveting

1 upvotes · 27 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

My pleasure :)

Own Your Slice: 7/26

1 upvotes · 27 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Any advice ...

Find someone to disciple you. I cannot possibly overestimate the importance of personal one-on-one discipleship to your faith. Imagine if Athol or Rollo lived near you and agreed that they'd meet with you every week for an hour for free! not only to teach you everything they know about being RP, but also to help you implement it, invite you into their homes so you can watch them how they implement it, etc. Wouldn't that be amazing?

99% likely you have someone in your immediate sphere of connections who is the spiritual equivalent of Athol or Rollo. Go find that person. The great news is that these guys are so passionate about helping others grow for Christ and lead faith-based relationships that they don't only consider it their duty in Christ to do this for free - it is where they find their greatest joy! (3 John 1:4 and all).

The hard part is finding someone who's going to be intentional and proactive with you about discipleship and not reactive, letting you run the show on how you want to be discipled (compare that to your wife trying to run the show on how she wants you to lead her). But I've found that most men can actually overcome this trait if they are godly enough and you're forward enough.

Own Your Slice: 7/26

1 upvotes · 27 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

FITNESS/DIET*Grade: A*

I'm around 17% BF, but have come down from 27% in the last 5 months (lost over 40lbs so far). I'm lifting 5 days/wk and cardio 6/wk (only for 20 minutes on days I also lift). I take one Sabbath per week. I've jacked up my protein intake and simplified my meals. I probably still eat out a little too much, but have cut virtually all of my snacks down to Whole30 approved (i.e. fruits/veggies, unflavored meats/jerky ... that's about it). Portion control has been insanely better than in the past too.

SPIRITUAL*Grade: A-*

I usually gauge my spiritual health by the 7 basics. This deserves a post of its own, but the basic concept is that there's always 2-3 that should be really strong; 2-3 that should be fairly weak, and 2-3 that are just in flux at any given time - and which falls where should be rotating as God leads (for most men I've discipled, that ends up being around every 6-12 months):

- Gospel Engagement: 5/10 - I tend to make big breakthroughs, then taper off in how I understand the application of the Gospel to daily living. My last "breakthrough" was about 3 weeks ago and I haven't revisited this aspect of my faith recently, still coasting off the revelation from the last time.
- Quiet Time: 10/10 - I'm loving my daily time with God. It usually involves Scripture and prayer, but mostly just enjoying God's company.
- Bible Study: 10/10 - I'm one of the volunteer writers for gotquestions.org, so I'm constantly getting interesting questions that stem further study. I'm also constantly being asked to produce new content for my church, which really engages me in the Word. I've scaled my involvement in other Christian subs here back quite a bit since discovering RP and creating this account, but still participate in that angle of Scriptural study and discussion periodically as well.
- Scripture Memory: 1/10 - 2 months ago this would have been 10/10. Last month was mostly a review month.

Now I'm in an off month, although I still keep fluent with my mastery of Scripture in my heart by frequently testing myself with passages that would apply to daily life situations (even if I never announce verbally in the conversation what I'm doing).

- Prayer: 7/10 - Praying with each of my kids individually (as well as collectively) has really prompted me to engage with God in different ways and has revitalized my own personal prayer life. That said, frequency of my personal prayer life could use improvement, although quality has gone up as I've learned to spend more time just listening, as my kids have taught me this through their incessant: "I just want to hear Jesus talk!"
- Evangelism: 2/10 - I've still got some non-Christians I'm engaging with periodically, but a lot of these relationships have slowed down due to the business of summer. I tend to have a much easier time connecting with neighbors and co-workers outside of work during fall/winter. That said, I'm starting to build relationships at the gym, now that I'm there frequently. So, maybe this is a new avenue, nixing the "where you work, where you live" for "where you play" (the WLP trifecta).
- Fellowship: 4/10 - I cancelled my small group back in February because everyone was ready to start leading their own small groups (3 of the 4 couples actively are now). Instead, I'm helping run a new "planning committee" for a 2-day seminar on internal healing, but this "committee" has turned out to be more of a fellowship group than anything (I'm usually the one who has to keep us on task). I'm still meeting with other believers periodically, but nowhere near as often as when I was leading a small group. Also, I used to disciple my pastor, but haven't seen him for a few months since he went on a sabbatical, so that's still kind of weak.

CAREER/FINANCES

Grade: C-

I'm getting apathetic. I go in cycles. I recently finished a major trial that my boss threw on me at the last minute without giving me any real prep time. Once that finished, I needed to take a break, but had a bunch of other stuff slam me that I had been putting off (having a new baby just before all this didn't help either). So, now I'm in "I don't want to do anything" mode. I control my own hours, so instead of a 9am start time, I'm hopping in at 10:30 or 11, rationalizing that I just got over a huge hump and caught up on most of my stuff, so I don't have as much to keep me busy now. Sure, there are a few things that could get done, but they're not time-pressing, so I'm starting to feel lazy. I have another trial next month that'll kick me out of this lull in about a week, but I should probably start now. Nevertheless, the paychecks are still great ... just got a client to pay on her back bill, which was pretty large, so that's going to be a sizeable paycheck in a couple weeks.

FRAME

Grade: B

My wife is testing me much less often, which is a positive. I feel like I'm passing the tests. My biggest need for growth here is in learning to delegate and making my wants/needs clearer. I'm effectively standing my ground (playfully) against her efforts to take charge, but I'm still reluctant to tell her to do things that matter to me. I've rationalized this as OYS - if I want it done, it's my responsibility; it's not her responsibility to make me happy or **cut up a melon that I'm going to eat and she won't**. I need to get over that mentality without being demanding. My go-to techniques are A&A and fogging/broken record, both which work perfectly for my wife.

SEX

Grade: B-

Coming up from an F as recently as 3 months ago, this B- is actually something I'm pretty proud of. For the first time in years, she's responsive to physical touch and actually engaging back. She still has very strong boundary issues, and there are physical limitations right now due to her post-op recovery from giving birth, but as of lately

the bad streak is over. We're also talking more openly about sex, which helps a lot. She still comments that she's worried my expectations will be too high come Monday, when PIV is back on the table, and brings up excuses about going back on the pill and breast feeding messing with her hormones, mostly trying to buffer the increased energy we're both experiencing with her expectations that returning to our prior DB ways feels inevitable to her (we've had small good patches before that didn't last) ... but I accept there is a real truth to a lot of it as well, especially the birth control part - that usually just kills her libido. I didn't even know she was planning on going back on birth control until she mentioned it in passing today ... will have to talk to her about this soon. The vasectomy consult today also raised some interesting conversation (including the passive comment about birth control).

TIME MANAGEMENT/DISTRACTIONS

Grade: A-

But for the stuff I put in my work section, I'd give myself an A+. I've never been so productive outside of work than I have been in the last few months. My home is improving and I've been reading and re-reading so much it's been insane. Rather than tiring out, like I expected, all the lifting has actually motivated me. I used to be a TV junkie, but noticed that after a few weeks of abandoning almost all TV, I don't even care anymore (to my chagrin, I still watch Big Brother with my wife - it's her "thing").

What's the best way to play this out?

1 upvotes · 26 July 2017 · /r/askMRP

Started planning a few days ago, just didn't post on it until this morning.

Princeton's new 'men's engagement manager' to combat aggressive masculinity on campus

1 upvotes · 26 July 2017 · /r/RedPillWives

Haha, no kidding. Well said.

What's the best way to play this out?

1 upvotes · 26 July 2017 · /r/askMRP

I track with what you're saying. My point wasn't to make it a game as much as to incentivise her to step up her attire. Under normal circumstances, she's fairly conservative, almost prude-ish with how she dresses when we go on dates. So, I was thinking of dangling a carrot to see what impact that might have. This is a tactic that I've seen elsewhere on RP threads, I just haven't seen it implemented in this context. In short, it boils down to: "Reward good behavior, not bad behavior." The only add-on is that I'm telling her in advance that there will be a reward for that good behavior. If she still decides to ignore the advice and wears jean/t-shirt, then I let her know she's missing out on other opportunities we had planned, but that she'll get that chance later - with the understanding that this is a way to set a clear boundary and stick to it so she sees that I'm not going to buckle and give her the good date anyway, despite her bad behavior. I'm probably just over-thinking that, though.

What's the best way to play this out?

1 upvotes · 26 July 2017 · /r/askMRP

It's possible to be great at one area but still have questions about another. When I teach seminars about divorce law, nobody heckles me, "You have no business teaching law when I just saw you ask another attorney about the requirements to file an ERISA claim!" ERISA isn't my specialty. I can be good at one thing and ignorant about another. There's nothing wrong with that.

What's the best way to play this out?

1 upvotes · 26 July 2017 · /r/askMRP

Yeah, I wouldn't intend it as validation seeking, but I see how it would come off that way. You're right and I opted not to take that direction.

What's the best way to play this out?

1 upvotes · 26 July 2017 · /r/askMRP

Not sure ... my state is just that way sometimes.

What's the best way to play this out?

1 upvotes · 26 July 2017 · /r/askMRP

Good call. Thanks for the insights.

What's the best way to play this out?

1 upvotes · 26 July 2017 · /r/askMRP

All of the three options are fairly equal to me. My preference changes by the hour and I'm guessing I'll just wing it once we get in the car and start driving as to which plan I'll go with.

I'm not fluent with what she can/can't wear in her wardrobe because being post-pregnancy changed a lot. But I can probably keep it categorical: "skirt and a tank top," for example. I just have to be prepared that she legit might not have a combo like that that fits.

What's the best way to play this out?

1 upvotes · 26 July 2017 · /r/askMRP

Great link. Thanks for the reference and tips! I think I have all of that down pat.

Wanted: Op-Sec Tips for MRPers out there getting numbers

1 upvotes · 25 July 2017 · /r/askMRP

I understand where you're coming from, although I think you're reading subtext where there is none because most people like to feel affirmed in their misperception that all Christians are judgmental pricks. I made no comment about anyone's personal character (unlike your proposed parallel), and RP condemns certain choices all the time due to their natural result. I fail to see how this is any different. Nevertheless, if other people or mods read this differently, I'm fine with accepting that I have blind spots every now and then.

Wanted: Op-Sec Tips for MRPers out there getting numbers

1 upvotes · 25 July 2017 · /r/askMRP

It wasn't my intention to moralize, which is why I stated directly: "That's his business to decide." My point was simply that if you take someone else's advice, it's wise to see where that advice got them before acting on it.

If I'm asking how to build a deck on my house and I get advice from a guy who has built 10 decks and all of them fell apart after 3 months of people walking on them, I'd want to know that before taking his advice.

If [/u/BarracudaRP](#) is okay with the result, then he's fine taking the advice. I'm not saying that result is bad or wrong; jut that it's a fact of where a lifestyle will lead you. I don't see how this is moralizing.

Use red pill to get out of a dead bedroom

1 upvotes · 25 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I've never hard of him. I'd love to hear his story, though :) [/u/RedDreadWolverine](#) - what's your story? Let me learn!

Need advice from others

1 upvotes · 25 July 2017 · /r/askTRP

I did the Whole30 diet. That's a great place to start for recipes and tips on what to look for. It'll be a lot more serious than just no wheat or grains, but that's certainly part of it. The point of the Whole30 diet is to cut virtually anything that's likely to cause a health problem, then after the Whole30 (which is 30 days) to start adding things back slowly so that you can get a feel for what your body responds negatively to. Check out [r/whole30](#).

Wanted: Op-Sec Tips for MRPer's out there getting numbers

1 upvotes · 25 July 2017 · /r/askMRP

The tips are good, but bear in mind from this other guy's thread, he's actually cheating and has a somewhat self-destructive attitude about his marriage. That's his business to decide, but make sure you know the likely result of mimicking someone else's lifestyle before making it your business too.

Half assed mrp?

1 upvotes · 25 July 2017 · /r/askMRP

Indeed.

SO is bitchy and disrespectful too often, should I leave?

1 upvotes · 24 July 2017 · /r/askMRP

I'm confused. What episode of what?

Mini-FR - The vasectomy conversation

1 upvotes · 24 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Thanks for the follow-up. I'll try to check out that sermon soon.

Losing My Inner Fire

1 upvotes · 24 July 2017 · /r/askTRP

I'm guessing you're not religious, but there's still wisdom to be found in spiritual texts. Try this one on for size:

I became great and surpassed all who were before me in Jerusalem.

Also my wisdom remained with me.

And whatever my eyes desired I did not keep from them.

I kept my heart from no pleasure, for my heart found pleasure in all my toil, and this was the reward for my toil.

Then I considered all that my hands had done and the toil I had expended in doing it, and behold

All was vanity and a striving after wind, and there was nothing to be gained under the sun.

Like [/u/bertansd](#) said, "you're ready to move on to spirituality." That quote comes from Ecclesiastes 2. The very next chapter says, "He has made everything beautiful in its time. Also, he has put eternity into man's heart, yet he cannot fathom what God has done from beginning to end."

To reword that, you're designed for more than just reaching "the top of the mountain." Hebrews chapters 8 and 9 talk about how the things you've been pursuing (i.e. physical stuff) is just a "copy" or "shadow" of the real

"heavenly things." We're meant for the real thing, not the silhouette that you've been settling for. Re-post this in [r/RPChristians](#), if you'd like to travel more down this particular rabbit hole.

Good Enough?

1 upvotes · 24 July 2017 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

I think you meant to respond to [/u/innominating](#), as you quoted his text. But, as I'm sure you're aware, I agree with this whole-heartedly!

Good Enough?

1 upvotes · 24 July 2017 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

Hmm ... I'll have to think about that. I get what you're saying in this comment and what the dread threads say. But if practicing dread gets a guy to the point where he finds sex worthless and a pointless end in life, it seems to me it's stealing something away from him, not enhancing his life ... hence a "backfire." Most of this guy's comments beyond just the original post show that he was getting the sex he wanted, but he still wasn't satisfied, even outside the marriage.

Of course, as I'm sure you're well aware, my position on that is going to be that it's a spiritual emptiness, not a physical/emotional one ... but this wasn't the time or place to get into that conversation.

Mini-FR - The vasectomy conversation

1 upvotes · 24 July 2017 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I really appreciate this feedback.

The biggest concern I have for you is making a big move (financial, sexual, familial, whatever) in the first six months without going through the crucible of reading, lifting, and reflecting.

What would this look like and when would appropriate progress markers look like for moving forward? I do feel like I've been gradually implementing RP for the last 6 months already. I started February 1 with 90% cardio, plus started taking responsibility for my house (fix deck, remodel bathroom, stain baseboards, etc.). Beginning in April, I added some assertiveness tactics and passing tests. In May, I added dieting to the list (I had lost 20 lbs before; another 15 during May). In June I switched from 90% cardio to 80% lifting and added gaming my wife. July 1 or so I discovered RP, which gave context to what I had started and helped me focus my efforts with a more laser precision. We had a new baby on June 19, but starting in July, after my wife had a couple weeks of recovery, she started responding sexually (just no PIV). Financially, we're better than we've ever been. Family life is solid, and I'm even getting my unruly 3yo under control. Sex is back on the table, although I'm hoping to start gradually pushing boundaries in mid-August. Because of how she has responded to my being more dominant in other areas around the home, and because of hints that she used to give that beta-me was too dumb to pick up on (which I now see quite clearly with RP lenses), I'm confident she's going to like rough sex once she gets over the moral dilemma ... but I'm planning on holding off until mid-August because I don't want it to be like, "The doctor gave you the 6-week all clear to have sex again, so let's hop in and hammer hard!" That'll probably scare her away if we don't ease into it.

With all of that in mind ... where are my weak spots? From my perspective, everything is going great and I'm seeing the responses I wanted. But outsiders usually have a more accurate perception of these things.

I was working through your logic. Birth control = LL. No BC = HL? I didn't read that anywhere in your writeup.

I'd never put her in an "HL" category. It's more like "Birth Control = no libido at all; no BC = 'not attracted to fat, beta ruizbujc, but still willing and will get horny on rare occasions.'" The idea of my wife ever being HL was

something I didn't consider possible until coming across RP, which doubled my motivation and focused my plan - not to say that I'm depending on it or making a covert contract of it. I long ago learned to accept as fact that my wife will never be HL. Although RP has given me hope of this happening, my expectation is unphased, as I often say in most areas of life: *Hope for the best, expect and prepare for the worst.*

If you go get a vasectomy, and she goes to no BC, are you sure her sex drive will increase?

She stopped taking BC about 4 years ago. She went on briefly between our 2nd and 3rd kids, but again, the libido dive was so sharp that we switched to natural family planning. That's when we became pregnant with our 3rd kid. We are extremely fertile to the degree that our 2nd, 3rd and 4th kids all happened with only having sex one time without contraception, two of those happening when I know for sure she wasn't ovulating (they were the day after her period ended). So, I don't trust NFP for my life :/ But to answer the question, yes, her sex-drive re-normalized to the degree of our relationship at the time (i.e. still low, but at least present). I talk a bit more about that in this post [here](#), specifically telling a story of when she confessed, extremely guilty, that she had looked up the 50 Shades of Grey trailer on youtube (for her, that's the same thing as me confessing to watching porn years ago). She was ashamed that she actually wanted sex - and even more troubled that she preferred to go there (although she stopped herself half way through the trailer) rather than coming to me. So, that's where I get hope that she might be HL, just not for who I was back then.

Have you tried sex where you are responsible for the BC? I think you wrote she made a comment about you not liking to wrap it up.

I despise condoms. People write about: "Turn down vanilla sex. Bad sex is worse than no sex." That's how condom sex is for me. I gave it a shot for an entire year once (before we had kids, as an effort to keep her off the BC pills), including trying many brands and sizes, and it never worked. I think that's a lot of what started a bad precedent in our sex-life early on in the marriage. I'd rather have no sex than condom sex.

The fathers teach that it is God's design to come together periodically as a man and woman, and then to abstain periodically as well - so that we don't give in to our lusts and passions - and we struggle against the flesh.

I can see the logic in this, but Paul says quite plainly in 1 Cor. 7:5 that sex should be a pretty much all-the-time thing and that any pauses are only to be short in nature and for the purpose of prayer. Deriving other purposes from it should be fine too, but I'm more inclined to take Paul's instruction as the guidepost than early church fathers, who I don't know whether or not their recommendation is inspired.

So what are you trying to achieve? Are you choosing to permanently alter God's design and the body He has given you to enflame your lusts? And to what extent?

I'm trying to avoid having more kids. Although I get the naturalism approach (i.e. no body modifications), I don't see this as a Scriptural mandate; rather, it's an implied philosophy that people have developed which is consistent with Scripture and not compelled by it. The consistent v. compelled distinction is a significant one. To that end, I would never tell a Catholic that their view is wrong - they may very well be right; but I'm also not going to tell anyone there is no other alternative philosophy on the matter that is also Scripturally permissible.

To revisit one thing ...

crucible of reading

Isolating out that one part, I've been through NMMNG, WISNIFG, MMSLP, Rational Male Year One, and virtually all of the top all-time threads on all four subs (TRP/MRP, ask TRP/askMRP). I've got a few more top

threads to read, then I'm planning on switching to SGM, given that PIV will be back on the table again next Monday. I've also re-read relevant portions from the books, as necessary. Any thoughts on where I should focus next, given what you know about my situation?

Mini-FR - The vasectomy conversation

1 upvotes · 24 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

threat that the female cannot claim exclusivity to our commitment

If anything, I see the reverse. The vasectomy increases dread (at least for my wife, per her comments) because she knows that I'll be free to have sex with others without risk of impregnating them, making me have less fear of cheating and less likely I'll get caught (especially given that she knows my profession and that I could hide it if I wanted to).

If you make this change and she still hasn't responded (despite not being on BC) What then? Remember, she'll have a high libido for the *right* alpha. You can be that man.

I'm not sure what you're asking. If she goes on birth control, pretty much any form (we've tested many), it kills her libido, making me have to jump through extraordinary hoops to get back to her libido. It's always been true of her because despite being fairly tall for a woman (5'10"), she's fairly small/thin so medication always has a huge impact on her, and if it says there's a side-effect, it almost always hits her hard. Even with RP theory, many people on MRP have said plainly, "If she's just a naturally LL person, there may be no hope. You either accept it or next her." Putting her on indefinite birth control would be the same as making her LL indefinitely as well - to a degree that even hardcore RP vets, I believe, would agree is impossible to overcome, even if I were Brad Pitt or the real Brad Pitt showed up in her life.

As for the "what then" line ... I'm already seeing the improvements I had hoped to find from RP. So, from what you've told me, the primary risk to me having a vasectomy is that I'll care less about those improvements. I'm not sure where the danger is :/

what is the Godly thing to do? The Roman Catholic views against contraception ...

I agree that they have a Scriptural basis for their position, but I believe it is extremely weak compared to alternate views on the matter and I do not personally hold to the "no contraception" view, which treats sex as an end in and of itself. This is something I've done an immense amount of studying and meditating on, but the conclusion goes into discipleship theory, which would probably get too far off topic to address here.

Either way, I greatly appreciate your concerns! You've given me some good things to think about. Although I may not agree, it's good to know that you care enough to be as blunt as you are. Thank you :)

[Update] How do I catch her cheating. Looking back what a wast of fucking time !

1 upvotes · 23 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

This is a great response. Thanks!

Prenuptials

1 upvotes · 23 July 2017 · /r/askMRP

We usually push it to trial. The court won't budge on these types of issues, and if they do it's clearly reversible error, so you just appeal and get them overturned.

Most often, the quick answer is to give a time-frame. For example, if the youngest kid is 15, you let so and so stay in the house until the kid graduates, then sell it and split the proceeds. Alternatively, you get a close

approximation of offsets of dissimilar assets and hope to convince the other side to go along with it, and they do the same back (i.e. accounting for agents' fees, brokerage fees, transfer tax, closing costs, taxation on retirement accounts, etc.). In some cases (including one I'm doing right now), the husband is offering to give my client the house in exchange for a reduction in spousal support for the next 10 years. In that type of a situation, I advise my client to consider the present v. future value of dollars and make sure she's not doing something stupid, especially in light of the fact that we don't know what inflation will look like down the road.

Mini-FR - The vasectomy conversation

1 upvotes · 23 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I've read MMSLP and a lot of the rational male articles. I've also done a ton of research on the subject, including all the horror stories. I have no doubt that there are psychosomatic effects that many men experience as a result of the procedure, but the actual cases of a physical problem are rare enough that it's worth the risk to me. It's much better than the alternative of putting the burden on my wife for contraception, effectively giving her a blanket excuse to explain away a LL without even trying.

Mini-FR - The vasectomy conversation

1 upvotes · 23 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

the first paragraph has been reduced ... has been added

I think I did all that within the first 5 minutes of putting the post up. My normal pattern is to draft something (comments and posts alike), click "submit," then re-read it and re-format it once I see the final product, and make edits as necessary. I don't count that as changing it after-the-fact, as it's still part of my original submission process in the first place. Sorry if that caused you confusion if you happened to be there right when it was first put up.

I have other replies on this sub that I have deleted (days ago) but your responses to me are still there

I didn't know you deleted them. I don't normally go back to old posts to see if people have deleted something. Either way, it's not a big deal. I just don't get what you're trying to imply in all this.

Mini-FR - The vasectomy conversation

1 upvotes · 22 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I haven't made any edits to the post and I removed my comments because the other user deleted hers and my comments made no sense without that context.

My wife and I had already discussed the ins and outs of the matter before, she was just not in a place of mind to recall those conversations and I was not in a position to have them all over again right then and there. I think you're fishing to find fault.

Married to a Beta Husband - How Can I Ask For More Leadership and RP Attitude?

1 upvotes · 22 July 2017 · /r/askMRP

Haha, good point

How does biblical submission benefit wives?

1 upvotes · 21 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Do you give your wife a list of things to do?

Only when I need something done I know she wouldn't ordinarily do already.

so serious that they can be settled only by one person asserting Biblical authority over the other?

If a guy has to wave the Bible around he's already lost. That is a plea for obedience and will not foster submission.

We're generally in agreement on most things

Early-marriage, this is true of almost all couples, but people change over time and they learn on a subconscious level to improve their own life experience at the expense of their partner. If you haven't gotten there yet, that's awesome! I hope you never do. But this does happen in most marriages.

Consider the Prisoner's Dilemma. In a marriage context it works something like this: everyone gets a "nice" card and a "mean/lazy" card. Scores are kept individually and as a team. Both spouses play the nice card a lot at first. Over time, the wife (for example) realizes that she could get a day off by being mean/lazy, knowing that her husband will play the nice card anyway. Instead of retaliating, the husband continues playing "nice" cards because he knows that's the best way to get the highest overall team-score, even if he's losing individually on it. As he continues to do this, his wife is reaffirmed that he will always play the nice card no matter which card she plays. So, she eventually just plays whichever card she happens to feel like that day, knowing that it won't impact which card he plays. When she drops nice cards back to him, he assumes it's because he played a nice card and she's returning the favor. When she drops a mean/lazy card, he assumes it's because his nice card wasn't nice enough, so he keeps playing more nice cards, trying to up his strategy rather than change it. Because her "niceness" is spaced out the drought gives him a stronger rush when the nice card is actually played, keeping him motivated to stay in the "nice guy" strategy. Eventually, when he realizes that his strategy isn't working, he becomes consciously aware of the resentment that has been festering for some time.

Now, nobody is capable of playing nice cars 100% of the time. So, a perfect 10 is impossible. But suppose a husband and wife figure out how to play the nice card more often than not and in relatively equal proportions. Couple 1 might then have individual scores of 6/10 and a team score of 6/10. But the wife in couple 2 has figured out how to strategize this game, so her score might be a 9, whereas her husband's score is a 4. Their joint score is, then, a 6.5. So, their marriage for all practical purposes seems to function in society better than couple 1's marriage because they get more stuff done and are progressing by societal standards better, but within the marriage walls the husband is actually plotting divorce. Strategization is inevitable in every marriage; some people are just smarter about it.

Marriages with lower responsibilities and higher excitement levels (i.e. no kids, haven't hit the 7-year itch yet, etc.) are much more prone to be nice-nice because they haven't had enough time to subconsciously internalize their partner's strategy and have enough energy that the mean/lazy card isn't mandatory as often. As stress increases, the mean/lazy card becomes insanely more tempting to play, especially if you know your partner is likely to respond with another nice card. Who can blame someone for taking advantage of that every now and then? Then, you are appreciative for having gotten a free day, so you play a nice card the next day as a "thank you" for the previous day ... but it's not really a "thank you" because now your spouse is at 2 consecutive nice cards compared to your one. So, the husband doesn't perceive the appreciation that the wife is trying to give because all he sees is the imbalance. She feels guilty and plays a couple more nice cards, but then the guilt burns her out, so she plays a mean/lazy card and the cycle repeats and constricts.

I mean, most people are decent human beings, for the most part, right?

I disagree. People are inherently selfish at their core. A distinct quality of humans is that we have the ability to overcome these impulses with conscious effort, but the drive to pursue our own satisfaction as a primary priority

is never gone. This is why the divorce rate is so insanely high.

Women generally don't marry men because they hate them and want to make their lives miserable.

Of course not. But as the card game shows, selfishness becomes a strong motivator when there's no immediately perceivable negative consequence for it. After a few times of thinking, "I was a jerk to him and he kept being nice anyway," her short-term appreciation may go up, but her long-term comfort level with playing that mean/lazy card will go up as well. When it reaches a certain point she becomes altogether desensitized to the things that were previously holding her back from playing it and just ends up playing cards based on however she feels that day (i.e. for her own individual score) rather than what's in the best interests of the marriage as a whole (i.e. the team score).

To be clear, I use the common example, but it is also possible (just less common) for this game to play out in the reverse or with other strategies.

you want to find a partner capable of giving as good as they get. It shouldn't be all one-sided.

Agreed. What you're saying is: "Find someone who agrees with the nice-nice strategy before you get married and make sure that their resolve is strong enough that they're not going to back down from that strategy when they realize there's a loop hole." The 7-year itch occurs because it takes about that long to notice loop-holes in the others' strategy and exploit them until enough resentment fosters that divorce becomes an imperative.

When someone treats you well, the natural inclination for a normal person is to reciprocate, I think.

You're absolutely right. But this inclination is also in competition with the selfishness inclination we all share. What happens when one spouse realizes they get the good treatment even when they don't reciprocate? That's when one tends to take advantage of the other. Some base internal sense of morality kicks in making you place the "nice" card periodically to reward all his nice cards, but the innate selfishness we all have buffers this and it's a constant internal struggle that finds different balances with different couples.

Ultimately, biblical submissiveness is an internal abandonment of selfishness. If mutual submission plays out as it's meant to, both partners will always play the nice card whenever they are physical/mentally/emotionally capable of doing so. The concept of husband-headship is simply to say that the husband is the one who sets the strategy and must work for the team score regardless of his wife's strategy, and that his strategy should be uniquely designed to mold his wife's strategy for the common good rather than her own gain. The **tit for tat strategy** is a prime example of this. The husband is not to play for his own personal score and the "tit for tat" strategy only works if he abandons the concept of wanting his score to beat hers - at best he can tie her and no more. That is part of the sacrifice he must make as a man for the good of the family.

Can the wife apply the same strategy to mold her husband to appropriate behavior? Possibly, but in most marriages it simply does not work that way, and most often the husbands are trained to be "nice guys," so the wife's only strategy is really just to be nicer to her husband. If she was truly intelligent, she might try to find a way to convince him to punish her with mean/lazy cards every now and then to disincentivize her from taking advantage of his "nice guy" strategy. But most wives won't do this - they will trust their own will-power to be nice as often as possible because then they maintain control over the marriage, strategy, circumstances, and can get the personal score they want. She rationalizes: "But he's so nice, I'll just want to be nice to him all the time too! And if I do have a bad day, it's okay to be lazy every now and then, and I'll need him to pamper me during those times too, and I can make it up to him the next day with more nice cards." ... and we already saw where that mentality ends up. If she teaches her husband to disincentivize her bad behavior, the overall team score will actually improve and there will be a significantly reduced imbalance in the individual marital satisfaction levels, reducing resentment-growth.

But if a husband believes that his wife has a God-given mandate to be submissive, maybe he assumes he doesn't have to do any of the nice things that would naturally bring out a loving response in return?

That would be a husband who abuses the Bible rather than applying it. The Bible does not teach this attitude even remotely. It actually puts a much higher burden on the man than on the woman.

"She should just do it," he might say ... "Well, if he were a little more considerate toward me, I might be nicer to him!"

I have yet to see a biblical leader-submissive marriage function this way. This usually only happens when men are passive and refuse to lead.

each is waiting for the other person to make the first move

Yes - when you hit the devastating pattern of mean/lazy-mean/lazy strategy, each waiting for the other to play a nice card. You're right, this is a sad, sad shame. It usually comes because one person sees a hole in the other's strategy and takes advantage of it, putting in a mean card where it wasn't rightly played. Things slowly spiral down from there.

How does biblical submission benefit wives?

1 upvotes · 21 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I'm still not sure from it how this obedience thing plays out in practice

That might be the first disconnect - submission and obedience are two different things. Submissiveness is an attitude/character of the heart. Obedience is an action. A wife can be 100% obedient and yet entirely unsubmitive. I've seen this many times. That said, a submissive wife will be obedient most of the time, but not necessarily 100%. In MMSLP, Athol Kay talks about how there are some times he makes a decision and his wife does something different because she has information he doesn't know about and there's no time to talk about it, so he just runs with it. That's not her being "unsubmitive" because she didn't obey - that's her trying to do what's best for her family in a snap-judgment that if he had all the facts he would have agreed and made the same choice. Where this deviates from submission is when the wife just always assumes this and therefore chooses not to give the facts because (1) she assumes she knows what her husband would want, and (2) usually subconsciously, she doesn't want to risk hearing that he might want something different.

That has not been my experience!

Your description of your experience is good, if it's actually working the way you think it does. If this works for you with a healthy emotional bond and a frequent, intense sex-life, more power to you. But at the same time, don't be too caught off guard if in a few years you're in marriage counseling and he's complaining that his needs never get met and he feels like you walk all over him. I'm not saying this will happen to you, but 9 times out of 10 it will, you might be that 1 where it's not like that and there genuinely is no resentment. Yay! for you and him if that's the case!

He always takes out the dogs, so if they're barking to be let out, I can go on reading or whatever

Two things here: this system obviously works for you because the list of stuff that needs to get done is small enough that you actually have time to read. Also, it doesn't sound like you have kids, so when something's cleaned up it probably stays clean for longer than 10 minutes.

When my wife and I were newlyweds everything was about as easy as you describe. Even with one kid, it was

tolerable and efficient. When we had our second kid, that's when things started shifting ... and then the third and now fourth kid have expounded on this.

having some kind of a system in place is probably better than ... when they don't read your mind, lol.

Sadly, most marriages don't work this way by default - mine included. You heard my melon story as one of many, many examples of when I struggled with telling my wife what she could do to help me.

On my wife's end, it was literally everything. "I shouldn't have to tell you to do the dishes! You should just know that I want them done and then do it because you love me!" Then I'd respond, "I've got a million other things to get done. I do ___ and ___ and ___ and ___ [and keep listing]. I don't have time for the dishes today." Her response: "Then you should prioritize and start thinking about what would make me happy every now and then." About 75% of the time this conversation would happen while she's watching TV and I'm getting the kids ready for bed. I have yet to meet a man who hasn't identified with this conversation. Of course, I haven't met your husband either.

Well, whose fault is that?!

The man's, of course. That's why RP law says to fix the man to fix the home. If a man's not happy, it's his responsibility to take steps to move toward his happiness. I think I was more getting at the point that when a husband is not leading and/or his wife is not submissive, that's the mentality that husbands develop, which is detrimental to the relationship as a whole, even if it's beneficial to the wife in the short-term.

You don't need the blanket authority of "Biblical submission" to do this

I agree - you don't need biblical principles to do that. But at that point I was only explaining what the dynamic actually looks like and some of the factors that cause the poor dynamic. A straight 50/50 dynamic looks differently and has its own issues, but these are extremely rare.

I'm happy to be of service because he is so good to me ... This isn't because I feel some sort of obligation to "obey" him ... he's my man; I want him to be happy.

That's biblical submission.

It's probably important to remember that when Ephesians 5:22 says, "Wives, submit to your own husbands, as to the Lord," if we add the immediate context, backing up to 5:21 it says, "submitting *to one another* out of reverence for Christ. Wives, submit to your own husbands, as to the Lord." So, there is an element where there should be mutual submission. Your husband should help and serve you because he loves you, just as you help and serve him because you love him - neither of you doing this out of "duty" or rote obedience.

If you did things just to "obey" your husband and he did things for you *because he has to* rather than because he *wants to*, that's the same thing as going into the bedroom and giving starfish duty sex. It's just not fun or enjoyable and it breeds resentment. Submissiveness comes from the heart. If you already have that attitude toward your husband, that's great. Most wives don't. I don't say that to be mean or mysoginistic, it's just a fact proven not only by biblical text, but repeated observation, study and research from secular scientists, sociologists, psychologists, etc. It doesn't take the Bible to point out that most women like being the dominant ones to run the home and most husbands are passive and get walked all over. If you've already gotten past that, then good on you :)

How does biblical submission benefit wives?

1 upvotes · 21 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

2/2

how this 'submission' thing plays out in real life

I can't count the number of guys who I've told that melon story to and I'm getting all kinds of "Amen, brother!" It's in the high 90% range. Most of them will affirm, "My wife thinks everything's just fine and I'm stupidly reaffirming to her how great things are." Or even worse, "My wife thinks things are falling apart and I can't bear to tell her it's worse than she knows because I'm not happy either! At least right now she thinks I'm happy, so that's some small consolation for her. God only knows what would happen if she found out how I really feel!"

As a result, especially in most marriages, "this 'submission' thing" plays out with the guy submitting to his wife.

When the husband actually does step up and start leading the relationship all of those, "What do you want for dinner?" "I don't know, you decide!" conversations go out the door. The husband isn't bossing around his wife like a slave driver, but he's telling her what will *actually help him* as opposed to *what she perceives will help him*. The balance of responsibilities then shifts drastically. Wives are extremely good at communicating what's important to them and what they want done. Husbands already know most of these things because he has observed her prioritization in what she's been doing when she's running the show. Wives, on the other hand, are almost unanimously ignorant of what their husbands want, other than the common trope: "men only want sex!" That's a lie, but sex is high enough of a priority for most men that if they're getting it, that'll placate them from bothering their wives with the other stuff they really care about.

I should also clarify that when most husbands do speak up about things that they want their wives doing, it's not what they *want* their wives to do, it's either (1) stuff they think their wife will want them to want, so they're trying to impress their wives by identifying it as a want, even if they don't really care about it, or (2) stuff that *needs* to get done, regardless of whether or not they have an affirmative desire for it to get done. For example, I don't care if the weeds get pulled or not, but I know it needs to get done at some point or the neighbors will call the city prosecutor on us. Cutting that melon doesn't need to get done, but I want it to get done.

So, the effect of a leader-submissive relationship ends up looking on the surface as almost identical to every other relationship, but the difference is that the actual allocation of responsibilities is different from when the wife just does her own thing or runs the show, and the new allocation accounts for the husband's desires and wishes. If the husband doesn't experience the internal sense of authority in the household or the wife refuses to submit to that sense of authority, the husband will always clam up and become internally, secretly resentful. The alternative is that the husband does lead and the wife is not submissive, so you're just butting heads all the time and can't stop fighting over stupid stuff, in which case the husband still becomes resentful. Resentful husbands resort to things like pornography, getting a mistress, alcohol, drugs, video games, TV/movie addiction, and all kinds of other things to numb the resentment: "I can deal with it as long as I have my release."

How does biblical submission benefit wives?

1 upvotes · 21 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

1/2

The bottom line is that God told us to do it that way, so we have an obligation to do it that way. But that doesn't do much to answer the "why" question.

don't you just sort of hash things out as you go along?

Of course, everyone does. The problem is that these "hash things out" sessions are never an exactly equal dynamic with regard to internal stability. As a result, regardless of the outcome, the partner who perceives him/herself as being the needier/less assertive of the two will always walk away from those conversations feeling like he/she got the raw end of the deal. If they are, in fact, equal, it's still possible that they both feel like they're lesser, so they're both going to feel like they caved too much and that they're getting screwed. Even if they don't feel like this initially, over time the minor imbalances cause resentment to build.

They key thing to remember here is that a person's perception of a 'good marriage' is not defined by how well the ship runs, but by how happy the crew is running the ship. So, even though everything gets done when you "has things out as you go along," 9 times out of 10 one side or the other will feel resentment about how things are getting done, and out of those 9, much of the time it's both.

Now, I keep saying "perception" because that's usually all that matters to us. We, as humans, rarely care about objective reality. For example, God's primary purpose for marriages is to make disciples. A marriage that's accomplishing this goal is objectively a "good marriage" because it is fulfilling its primary purpose, even if the couple isn't happy along the way (although I've never seen a disciple-making marriage that's truly unhappy - the exceptions come when people don't understand discipleship and assume they're fulfilling that purpose when they're not). But even though this objective goal may be accomplished, the couple may still feel like it's a failing marriage because they are harboring resentment at how the primary goal is accomplished, thereby failing the secondary goal of marriage: mutual joy in one another. Most people perceive this secondary goal as primary and the primary goal as non-existent (i.e. they individualize it rather than considering it a joint endeavor), which changes the experienced dynamic.

Do you guys really tell your wives in the morning, "Today I expect you to wash my car and while you're at it, make me a sammich!"

No, that's called being a jerk.

I know what I need to do in day-to-day life ... I don't really need a husband to instruct me

You might be surprised by how many marriages there are where the wife feels this way, but the husband is completely resentful against him/her. When wives feel this way, it's usually because they're the dominant ones and they're blind to the fact that their husbands are unhappy with the arrangement. These wives are also often blind to their husbands actual wants, needs, and desire because he rarely ever communicates them or they assume it always revolves around sex and nothing else. The husband will also often deny his unhappiness because the church tells him it's a good thing to bend over to his wife's every whim, so he has a spiritual misperception that he should be happy in circumstances where he's not. In order to reconcile this, he simply puts on his happy face and tries his hardest to convince himself and everyone else he's happy. It might even work for a short while, but he's really just repressing the unhappiness rather than dealing with it, so a few months down the road he explodes at his wife when she does something small to set him off.

Here's a simple case study: I love eating golden honeydew melon. I could eat a whole one every day. But I hate cutting them. My wife doesn't mind cutting them and she's home all day and has the time to do it. I know that she's okay with it. But for some reason I have this internal inclination that it's not okay to tell my wife to do something that's helpful to me (anti-submissive feminist agenda, nice guy syndrome, pedestalizing my wife's happiness, etc. all play in). I make a subconscious assumption that my wife will be happier if she doesn't have to worry about doing things I want her to do on top of the stuff she wants herself to do. This is expounded by the fact that she puts a ton of stuff on herself that doesn't matter to me. So, she fills up her time with stuff that I perceive as useless, but because I know it matters *to her* I accept the fact that her responsibility list is really high, so I am dissuaded from asking her to cut that stupid melon for me. I do it myself or let it sit for so long that it goes bad. One way or another, the end result is that my wife sees no problems because she never knew that I really wanted her to cut that melon, and I'm stuck doing something I hate doing or just not getting my melon at all. Although this might not register at a conscious level immediately, over time with several of these types of situations (and there are dozens for every couple every day) I develop a subconscious pattern of feeling like she only cares about her needs and not mine, whereas I'm also contributing to helping her needs, so I feel like it's a one-sided relationship ... yet if I show her I have needs, I'm afraid that adding the stress to her will break the relationship even more than suffering a one-sided feeling. Because I believe these are the only two options (one-sided v. breaking the marriage by having needs) one-sidedness is better for us in the long-run. Because I've

chosen the "better" option, I must express myself as being happy and content because if I can't be happy and content in the best option, then I must admit that I can never be happy and content in my marriage and we're doomed to fail - and I will avoid that conclusion at any cost. The possibility of alternative options doesn't register because I've been conditioned to see things in a bi-modal way: it's going to be one-sided against her or against me, and because I know my limits and don't know/trust hers, I have to be happy with it being one-sided against me for fear of what the reverse might cause.

I know this is stupid, but that's legit how most men process life, especially within churches. Nowadays, I just say, "Hey Babe, can you cut that melon for me while I'm out at the gym? I'd love to have it as a snack when I get back." At first she would resist because it's more work for her, but she'd do it resentfully. After a couple weeks, that resentment turned to affection. Why? Because I was actually inviting her into my heart to help me in areas that actually matter to me. I don't give a crap if she dusts the house, vacuums the living room, redecorates the bathroom, or cooks me dinner. I don't value those things from her in and of themselves, although I express appreciation anyway because it does take work off of my plate. But cutting that stupid melon ... even though it's a much easier, stupider, simpler task, it matters to me and she gets to partake in that and know that my appreciation is genuine and not obligatory.

[Update] How do I catch her cheating. Looking back what a waste of fucking time !

1 upvotes · 21 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Oops ... now I remember the context of this conversation :p haha.

No, the reconciliations usually [nix that: have always] happen[ed] before psych evals are ever performed, although sometimes the people come in with a suspicion and it just never gets confirmed.

[Update] How do I catch her cheating. Looking back what a waste of fucking time !

1 upvotes · 21 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I'm sure there's something there, but I feel like I'd be working more off of assumptive interpretation rather than observational deduction :/ I try to avoid mixing assumption and statistics as much as possible (although it's kind of inherent in every probabilistic conclusion). Thanks for the recommendation, though.

[Update] How do I catch her cheating. Looking back what a waste of fucking time !

1 upvotes · 21 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Good question. Usually our client is unaware of his or her own issues and suspects the other side of having a mental health problem (we deal with all mental health cases, PDs are just the most common). People also come to us when the other side has filed a motion for a psych eval against them and they want someone experienced in helping them through that aspect of their case. They also come to us after psych evals are already done because of our knowledge and ability to discredit crappy evaluations. Some people come to us because they were referred by their mental health specialist (psychiatrist, therapist, marriage counselor, etc.) because we have a broad network of those. Others just find us online and don't even know we address psych issues, but it ends up conning up in their case anyway (or not sometimes). So, I can't peg it to just one thing or make broad, sweeping generalizations about why our clients come to see I'd and I've never tried to correlate the intake source with the issues that come up in the case.

[Update] How do I catch her cheating. Looking back what a waste of fucking time !

1 upvotes · 21 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Well, we haven't had a case for homosexual divorce yet, so every case we deal with has had one guy and one girl. Sometimes we have the girl, sometimes not. Sometimes our client has the PD, sometimes it's the other side, sometimes it's both.

My stats come from our cases, not just our clients (i.e. I include what I know of the other side too). One of our past psycho clients was actually just stalking us today ... She was being really creepy, hanging around outside our door talking to other clients even though she's not our client anymore.

[Update] How do I catch her cheating. Looking back what a wast of fucking time !

1 upvotes · 21 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

About 50/50 ... Maybe 55/45 with a tad few more women.

103 - Desire Cultivates Intimacy

1 upvotes · 20 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Weird. I've never had that problem. Maybe reddit does that to prevent spam?

103 - Desire Cultivates Intimacy

1 upvotes · 20 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I was agreeing that people tend to overthink and complicate things. I have no idea what you mean by "7-10 minutes between posts blocker."

[Update] How do I catch her cheating. Looking back what a wast of fucking time !

1 upvotes · 20 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Thank you for this. I understand much better now.

even if you think you want it to work out, file for divorce. This triggers her respect and genuine loss aversion.

I will note, of the couples I have helped toward reconciling (9 to date), 7 of them had filed first. Of those 7, only 1 was the woman filing first. Interestingly, of divorces that actually go through, it's closer to 75% where the woman files first (although our firm's strategy may play slightly into that).

How does biblical submission benefit wives?

1 upvotes · 20 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Because god is Red Pill. He knows that women ...

This is a good point and one worth remembering. God knows exactly how he created men and women and the inherent tendencies he placed in each. So, when women want to argue against why God didn't put them in charge, the only alternative to arguing against his given plan is to argue against how he created men and women in the first place, in which case their argument is, essentially: *Why couldn't God have give women all those male instincts and men all the women instincts instead? Why didn't he create women to be men and men to be women?* Of course, if he did then we'd be dealing with the exact same issue in reverse.

He did not leave them without a voice and with no power. He gave them power that BALANCED and blended with the power of men to create a good society.

This is where the feminist agenda misses the point. To them, there is no balance. It's all or nothing. If they preached anything else, they would lose so many people to the middle that the hard-corers no longer have a platform to stand on.

given women more and more power and taken it from men since the 1950's.

This hit a major head with the first "no fault" divorce laws in CA in 1969. That's when everything really changed. That said, you're right that it started in the 50s, post-war, because PTSD ruined the vets' ability to lead their home, yet they were the poster-boys of "masculine men" that everyone was to aspire to be like. At the same time, while they were off to war, the women got comfortable having all the power at home and weren't willing to give it up. "You haven't been here for the last 5 years. You can't just come back [from risking your life for our family and country and the greater good?!?] and start telling me what to do after all this time."

Really, men were crippled post-war for having a mission outside the home. Is it any wonder, then, that it's this wave of men who started idolizing their wives, whom they had longed for as their only hope and motivation to keep fighting while overseas? It reminds me of the song, "A girl worth fighting for," from *Mulan*, which my kids love watching. It's a beautiful song full of RP concepts, but shows how even though the men have that attitude, the overall theme still ends up being feminine empowerment.

marriage is not even a viable institution any longer

From a purely secular standpoint, I'm absolutely shocked when couples get married but still file taxes separately. You're giving up pretty much the only social advantage non-Christian marriage has to offer. Christian marriage, on the other hand, does have many additional benefits to our spiritual lives that I don't expect the non-Christian to appreciate or partake in.

Sure it CAN work for a select few

I'm sure you'd agree: the fact that it *CAN* work doesn't make it a good idea. A select few individuals might be able to shoot an apple off of a person's head while blindfolded ... but this is still a pretty dumb thing to do if both parties aren't being grossly compensated for the risk of dying or being charged with reckless homicide. That compensation simply doesn't exist in our society as to non-Christian marriage.

it is the children who will lead us

I give the institution of "marriage" no more than 10 generations down the line before it's either entirely overhauled or abolished altogether. I won't live to see the day, but the wheels are in motion and have been for the past 60-70 years. When that gets to an even 200, that's when I'm calling it. The only reason I say so long and not sooner is because the "everyone else is doing it" mentality is really hard to break, even when logic doesn't support it.

6 Questions for Christian Merps

1 upvotes · 20 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

What part of the Creed to Mormons reject

That's a very long question to answer, but suffice it to say that most Mormons point to the Nicene Creed as the shining example of why "God" had to send the BOM to fix all the misperceptions in the church. Denial of the trinity is the biggest rejection of the creed. [This old thread](#) might provide some answers (I only skimmed it). [CARM](#) also has a very good overview of some of the more interesting and distinctive Mormon beliefs.

I think we need to be very careful in issuing decrees on who and who is not a Christian.

I completely agree with this. But at the same time, it's not wise just to let anyone who self-identifies as a Christian to be "in." 1 Corinthians 5 sets clear boundaries for who should not be able to associate with the name of Christ. Without some kind of standard you get people like [this](#) and articles like [this](#), which are consistent with things I've

heard of in American branches of the Episcopal and Anglican churches, to name a couple.

Many in my denomination argue that Roman Catholicism ... Apostolic Succession ... Papal Infallibility ... Transubstantiation ... rank heresy

Totally agreed, and a lot of those arguments are idiotic, even when they do strike on important issues. The soteriological distinctions are what concern me most. For example, if one teaches that you can't be saved without accepting Joseph Smith as a true prophet, that's a salvation issue and is drawing a clear line.

Salvation by grace through faith will always be a non-negotiable for identification as "Christian" for any sub that I run. If someone wants to append to that some understanding of how works fit into a soteriological model, I may have some room for leniency as long as they're not trying to remove "grace through faith" from the soteriological model they propose.

[Update] How do I catch her cheating. Looking back what a wast of fucking time !

1 upvotes · 20 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Good point.

[Update] How do I catch her cheating. Looking back what a wast of fucking time !

1 upvotes · 20 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

That is patently not how it works

I know that's not how it works, but I've heard at least 3 women say this with my own ears.

That said, I totally get what you're saying about it not being the "sex we want." This makes a lot of sense.

Are you really trying to have the "no secular morality or standards" argument? Is Jesus really the only thing preventing you from hotwifing and an open marriage? Ridiculous.

Not at all. I just wanted to understand others' perspectives better, as I deal with non-Christian men with marital difficulties every day as part of my profession.

[Update] How do I catch her cheating. Looking back what a wast of fucking time !

1 upvotes · 20 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Great article. Thanks for the reference.

Was this the an RP move? Need advice/input.

1 upvotes · 20 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Thanks!

The Importance of Qualified Pastors

1 upvotes · 20 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

If a man's chief mission is his wife's happiness/glory/benefit, her helping him becomes helping herself

Brilliant.

103 - Desire Cultivates Intimacy

1 upvotes · 20 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I agree with your premise here. Thanks for clarifying.

[META] Field Reports, OYS, etc?

1 upvotes · 20 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Excellent points :)

What if we set up a challenge for every 100 marker of subs we get? That'll give some time to come up with content for the first one.

BPP on Divorce in a Christian Marriage

1 upvotes · 19 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I follow now, thanks!

Reacting v. Responding v. STFU

1 upvotes · 19 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Dang, yeah, that's a rough situation. I've been there before and there are a few strategies:

IGNORE - This was already recommended and it's a lot harder than the title would imply. It also takes a lot of time. The key is to remember that the goal of the "ignore" strategy isn't to get her to stop (she won't with this strategy); it's to get yourself to stop caring.

COALS OF KINDNESS - The Bible has this phrase: "If your enemy is hungry, feed him; if he is thirsty, give him something to drink. In doing this, you will heap burning coals on his head. Do not be overcome by evil, but overcome evil with good." (Romans 12:20-21). When she realizes that not only can't she get to you, but that you're trudging forward in happy land her frame will buckle to yours instead of the other way around.

Really, that's all this tactic is: fogging mixed with frame refortification. The fogging is the *be good to her* part. If she says something dumb, don't DEER as to why your way is better or how you really do know more than her. Just agree with her in some way, even if she's wrong.

HER: If you touch that machine with a latex glove you're going to cause a meltdown in the hospital and maybe blow up the whole planet, you friggin idiot ... shows you how much you know after only 1 year compared to my 26!

YOU: I understand where you're coming from and I see how you would think that [fogging]. I respect your experience in this situation [self-disclosure, even if exaggerated]. I'm sure under some circumstances that might actually happen [fogging some more]. But I'm going to do it anyway [then broken record this].

As you continue to respond with kindness and a refusal to entertain her lunacy with arguments, she will come to value the fact that you at least respect and understand her, even if it doesn't result in her controlling you. Then, as you broken-record your way into assertively pursuing your way of doing things, she will realize it's a futile effort to keep pushing on you when (from her perspective a few months down the road) you fully grasp her point of view and understand her, but have your own system of doing things anyway.

MENTAL PATIENT - If that doesn't work, she probably has a mental disorder. In fact, I'm confident from what you've described that this is probably the case. Go check my post on identifying mental disorders, see what you think fits her best and report back so I can give clearer feedback. That said, my best guess is she has a predominant Narcissistic Personality Disorder with Antisocial and Borderline features. She might even have a touch of Schizotypal elements in there. It's not common for this type of blending. In fact, the diagnosis for one of the parties in the last case I just had a trial on (last week) was: "Other Specified Personality Disorder (with Borderline, Antisocial, Histrionic, Schizoid, Dependent and Obsessive-Compulsive Features); Disruptive Mood

Dysregulation Disorder; Major Depressive Disorder, Recurrent Episode, Severe; Unspecified Disruptive, Impulse-Control, and Conduct Disorder." Geeze ... and this stuff is more common than you'd think, especially when people act the way you've described. But usually I only see one primary with 1-2 secondary "features," if that.

Either way, I don't want to speak more as to how to interact with someone with a PD until I actually have a good feel for what the PD is, and which features are present. "All of them! She's the most psycho person you've ever met!" is not helpful, if that's where you would go :p

DEFER TO AUTHORITY - I've also found it effective in many situations to be assertive about deferring to the authority structure as a workable compromise. I don't know if she's on par with you or beneath you in level, or perhaps even above, but my guess is that there's a higher authority than both of you. As long as she's not your immediate supervisor, just implement fogging and broken record in the direction of deferring responsibility for your actions to your actual supervisor.

HER: You idiot, don't you know you're going to kill everyone in here if you blink 7 times like that? Geeze, my 26 years of experience sure knows more than your stupid 1.

YOU: I can see how you'd think that [fogging]. I certainly don't want to kill people [self-disclosure]. But I'm going to do things the way I was trained to do them [and broken record this]. If you think this will be a problem, I'm happy to give you the contact information for my supervisor so he can address the issue and any additional training I may need [workable compromise].

The key is to remain fairly robotic in tone through all of these conversations. Any hint of emotion is a string she's going to start tugging at until you unravel. I often like to imagine myself as one of those pre-recorded phone answering services that has default responses for everything. Built up your repertoire of default responses and practice being monotone. This truly works.

Reacting v. Responding v. STFU

1 upvotes · 19 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

What's your occupation? Frame came naturally to me by virtue of being an attorney. All I had to do was convert what I was doing in my profession to my home life, which was insanely fast. Maybe you could try developing frame in your workplace there, as people will expect you to be more rigid, and then it's just a conversion game and not trying to reinvent the wheel with your SO.

BPP on Divorce in a Christian Marriage

1 upvotes · 19 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I'm confused ... is M102 getting a second wife after divorce or is it more like the husband/wife 2.0 concept? I can't tell from the context here.

Was this the an RP move? Need advice/input.

1 upvotes · 19 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

That totally makes sense. Good explanation.

BPP on Divorce in a Christian Marriage

1 upvotes · 19 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I understand now :)

BPP on Divorce in a Christian Marriage

1 upvotes · 19 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Well, wives should get their butt in gear and be more loveable, and make it easier for him to make you happy, etc.

Two things to note on this. First, I have often refrained IRL that this notion of "my husband must be my prince who pursues me - it's not my job to spark things up" is not found in the Bible. What we constantly see is women seducing the man until his boner can't take it anymore and he'll fight through any obstacle to have his way with her. Look at Boaz, who was so turned on by Ruth literally sleeping in his bedroom before they were married that he was willing to pay a hefty price as the kinsman redeemer just to have her. This isn't a story about the noble savior-man rescuing the damsel in distress. 90% of the story is about the girl's need, effort, and success at being seductive to ignite the man. Most of the book of Song of Solomon is the same way.

Second, you're assuming that women know what will make them happy. This is a very, very long-shot, in my experience. I can't count the number of times where I have talked to my wife when she's not "in the zone," asking her what would help or make her happy and she admits: "I have no idea." I make all kinds of suggestions and they're all rejected. Eventually I would give up, take charge of the situation, and just start *doing* rather than *talking*. Guess what? She'd be happy within minutes. That's not to say I had performed psychological voodoo to figure out what she needed in that moment. She just needed to go from *thinking* and *talking* to *doing*, but she didn't know how to do that and it took me being a leader in *LITERALLY ANYTHING* to send her emotions running in the right direction.

House-wife v. SAHM

1 upvotes · 19 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Haha. Nice.

Was this the an RP move? Need advice/input.

1 upvotes · 19 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I'm pretty sure most hard-core RPer would recommend ghosting. As a Christian, I don't think this is the best approach.

The bigger issue isn't necessarily in what you said, but the probable reason why you said it and how that reason was likely expressed, given the context of the rest of the conversation. The words communicate a clear boundary, which is good; but the context proves that she got to you, which is bad.

If the whole of the conversation were RP, you simply would have started like this, "Hey, I'd love to have a relationship with you. I get that you're seeing someone else, but I'm not going to wait my turn and I'm not okay with being 'just friends.' So, can I pick you up for dinner tomorrow?" When she rejects you, you respond, "No biggie. I'm not here to force you. But like I said, I don't think this friends thing is going to work. I hope you understand." If she tries to stalk you after that, just put this conversation on loop until she goes away. If it gets stalker-ish, you may actually have won her over. If stalker-ish without winning her over, then ghosting is appropriate, as you'd have done everything you could at that point to separate in peace with grace.

How does biblical submission benefit wives?

1 upvotes · 19 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

and I thought some women had asked those questions of you irl as well

Yes, they have. They usually come from closet feminists in the church, though. They're just bitter at what God said, so they prefer to imagine a "better way" than the way God did it. My usual response is that it's pointless

imagining what God could have done when we only have to concern ourselves with what he actually did.

No. We disagree on this one. If He indeed mirrors who He is

That's the thing, though. Who put the restriction on God to say: "You're only allowed to create a universe that mirrors you!"? Sure, that's what he actually did, but who is preventing him from doing it a different way?

I think you and I are "challenged" to write short responses lol

It's always been a problem. That's the lawyer in me - always wanting to over-explain.

BPP on Divorce in a Christian Marriage

1 upvotes · 19 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I thought the idea was to "save the marriage" and that is why I wrote my book. They have clearly and unanimously agreed that the purpose of MRP is to save the man and saving the marriage is merely a byproduct.

It took me a while to realize this.

It is clear the man must save himself first or the marriage stays in the crapper.

I agree with this as well. That said, I don't think the concepts are mutually exclusive. One can have an intention to save his marriage while still himself being saved. The idea that one must abandon commitment to his wife in order to restore that commitment is something I haven't seen yet. But I'll chalk that up to inexperience on good faith for now.

BPP on Divorce in a Christian Marriage

1 upvotes · 19 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

some men might say, it's been 3 days! I want a divorce." And honestly, my heart might be with em, but God commands husbands to love their wives and to forgive

There's also 2 Timothy 2, "If we are faithless, he remains faithful." Preceding this is: "If we disown him, he will disown us." In other words, the way God interacts with us is that He lets us walk away by our own intentional, conscious choice; but our faithlessness to the covenant will not prevent him from holding up his end. If this is to be modeled in marriages (due to the parallel established by Ephesians 5 and many other like-passages), the implication is that simple laziness is not enough to warrant a divorce. It has to be a willful, conscious rejection.

Now, if a wife gets to that point where she's constantly making that choice, a passage like Hebrews 10:26-27 would apply: "For if we go on sinning deliberately after receiving the knowledge of the truth, there no longer remains a sacrifice for sins, but a fearful expectation of judgment and a fury of fire that will consume the adversaries."

Let me translate to this context: "For if she goes on withholding sex from her husband deliberately after having been confronted about her sin, there no longer remains anything for the husband to do, only a fearful expectation of sacking the judge on her with the most hard-hitting attorney money can buy."

Tag: [/u/BluePillProfessor](#) - you might want to add that Hebrews reference to your repertoire ;)

Lastly ... how do you distinguish between a wife who "withholds sex" and a husband who thinks she does because

he's really bad at initiating and misinterprets cues like, "I'm tired" or "I have a headache" as "Don't even try to have sex with me tonight" when she really just means she's tired or has a headache? What about when a woman likes to play hard-to-get or give fitness tests because that's how she turns herself on and the guy's just not passing it? Is that withholding because the guy's too dumb to know how to rev up her engines? The questions abound from here.

BPP on Divorce in a Christian Marriage

1 upvotes · 19 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

You may also be interested in this from a guy I know on Facebook:

—

Interesting little thing I was reminded of when discussing Matthew 5:27-28 with someone last night.

Jesus says, "You have heard that it was said, 'Do not commit adultery.' But I tell you, everyone who looks at a woman lustfully has committed adultery with her in his heart." Most Christians think that Jesus is re-defining the nature of the law here (I once thought this too) away from physical expression to a condition of the heart. In reality, he's pointing out the fact that their culture was changing the law with their word choice when, in fact, the law was always about a heart orientation.

For context, in the verses right before this he says, "Not an iota, not a dot, will pass from the law until all is accomplished. Therefore, whoever relaxes one of the least of these commandments and teaches others to do the same will be called least in the kingdom of heaven."

He then immediately goes into referencing the command, "Do not murder." He properly quotes the commandment, but then adds, "But I tell you if you are angry at your brother ... you are subject to judgment and hell fire" (slight paraphrase). Despite popular belief, he doesn't say, "If you're angry, that's the same as murder." I believe he's referencing various passages, the most notable of which is Psalm 37:8-9. The Septuagint is a Greek translation of the OT (which was originally in Hebrew). The word Jesus uses for "angry" is a different conjugation of the same word used in Psalm 37:8-9, which essentially says, "If you're angry, that leads to evil, which will lead to your destruction." Sound familiar? Jesus just said the same thing: "Anger leads to judgment and hell fire" [we're talking about unrighteous anger, of course].

In short, what Jesus did there is showed that they were doing what they accused him of doing: skirting around the law. They focus on the commandment, "Do not murder," while ignoring the psalm, "Refrain from anger," the consequence of which leads to destruction. They were removing pen strokes from the law, whereas Jesus had kept the whole of the law the entire time.

Then Jesus gets into the adultery section and says, essentially, "And even when you quote the 10 commandments, you're still doing this!" To re-quote it with the Septuagint's Greek words added where they go:

"You have heard that it was said, 'You shall not commit adultery' [moicheuseis]. But I say to you that everyone who looks at a woman with lustful intent [epithumesai] has already committed adultery [emoicheusen] with her in his heart" (Matthew 5:27-28).

Why do I include those words? Because in the Septuagint Exodus 20:14 references *moicheia* for "do not commit adultery," but they were failing to teach Exodus 20:17, referencing *epithymeseis*, which Jesus had to add back in.

Why does that matter? Because Jesus isn't re-defining the law here. He's telling them that their common vernacular was trying to change the meaning of the law when God intended the law to be fulfilled from our hearts and not merely our actions from the time he first gave the 10 commandments.

So, who was actually the one abolishing the law and removing not only "iotas and dots" but whole words? The teachers of the law were the ones doing that! And Jesus just proved that his teachings are actually more aligned with the OT Scriptures than what was being taught to the Jewish people at that time, despite that people accused

him of abandoning the law.

To be clear, at first they were looking only at the 10 commandments (don't murder) while ignoring the "lesser" commands from other places in Scripture (the Psalm passage). Then he shows them that even their understanding of the 10 commandments themselves - the most fundamental part of Jewish culture at the time - was wrong or cherry-picking.

This might seem like unnecessary technicalities, but to me it is beautiful to see what Jesus was doing and how it fits together. A plain reading in the English translations not only leads to incomplete (although not harmful) interpretations, but it misses the entire beauty behind the flow of what Jesus is doing in this passage.

I am constantly impressed by the way Jesus taught, lived, and passed on truth to us.

BPP on Divorce in a Christian Marriage

1 upvotes · 19 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

most Christian denominations today interpret the Mathew Divorce exception as only for adultery when that is not even the word that was used!

Indeed, this frustrates me to no end.

Each Greek interpreter uses the word "Porneo" to interpret what Jesus had said in Aramaic

This is another issue I often harp on. People try to use cross-references to other NT uses of *porneia* to try to define the word, all the while forgetting that their use of the word in the epistles is based on Jesus' use of the Aramaic, not the other way around.

all the earliest translators of Mathew specifically ruled out that "adultery" was the "only" valid grounds for divorce.

Agreed. This is a misconception based on people who don't look past the English translations.

"porneo" which includes any sin and certainly any sexual sin

Here's where we may start to differ. I don't recall my studies of *porneia* referencing just any sexual sin, although it is certainly more broad than *moicheia*. If we go with the broad definition, then Jesus is essentially saying that any guy who ever lusts after a woman, then masturbates has committed *porneia* and his wife is allowed to divorce him. This would mean that, essentially, 99% of women can divorce their husbands with no sin. Looking at the context of the passage, I don't get the impression that Jesus was trying to open up the grounds for divorce; rather, he was trying to: (1) point out that the Jews were picking and choosing which laws to follow and how they wanted to follow them; and (2) show that these issues all begin in the heart in the first place, not necessarily our physical actions.

I am confident from my research that the divorce exception includes a sexually withdrawing spouse and not merely a person who commits adultery

I'll have to contemplate this one.

I don't know how I can reconcile that with the greater context that Jesus seems to be broadening the scope in which certain sins are actually sinful (i.e. murder is broadened to anger; adultery is broadened to lust; oaths are broadened to any verbal affirmation), and not relaxing them (see Matthew 5:26 - the verse immediately preceding all of this, for context). If the pattern is followed, Jesus is increasing the contexts in which divorce is sinful, not increasing the number of circumstances in which divorce is acceptable.

To put it another way: it wouldn't make sense in his list of sins to say, "You're actually doing this sin when you don't think you are; same with that one; same with that one; oh, but not divorce - you're actually better off on that one than you thought; but oaths, yeah, that one too."

Alternative Route to a Similar Conclusion

As you noted, withholding sex is certainly a sin. Matthew 18 says that if your brother (presumably applying to any believer, per Matthew 12:49) sins against you, you're to confront him about it. In this case, I take that to apply to the wife as well.

If she won't repent, you bring witnesses to talk about the issue together (ex. Christian marriage counseling). If she still won't repent, then you get the church leader involved. If she still won't repent, you're to treat her as a pagan or tax collector (read: non-Christian), remembering that Jesus spent most of his time loving on pagans and tax collectors, who would then follow him - **including Matthew himself!** (the guy who wrote those words).

Now, in 1 Corinthians 7 Paul says quite plainly, "If you're married to an unbeliever and they want out, let them go." So, if your withholding spouse wants to divorce you, you're free to say, "Adios and farewell" - **AFTER** having first done everything you can to reconcile per the Matthew 18 process. To that end, if they won't work with you, let them file for divorce.

Going one step further, if you want to be the one to initiate the divorce (perhaps they like the beta comforts you're giving them), if they are stuck in unrepentant sin and yet still call themselves Christians, 1 Corinthians 5 (specifically v. 11) says we shouldn't even eat with these people and we should expel them from the church. Granted, the context could easily be read that he's talking about situations where their sin will degrade the name of Christ to outsiders (reading a more broad context would be very hard to reconcile with other contexts), so a private sin issue between spouses that isn't being publicized to outsiders might not work here, but it's certainly another option to think about if she's pretty open with her friends about her withholding nature.

The one situation this doesn't cover is if your spouse openly acknowledges she's an unbeliever and yet refuses to divorce you. This can suck for guys who got married believing she was a believer, but later discovered she was not or that she fell from the faith (depending on your stance on eternal security).

Was this the an RP move? Need advice/input.

1 upvotes · 19 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

The hamster is a metaphor for how people's brains try to rationalize stupid things. The hamster hops on the wheel and cogs start spinning and spinning and spinning in the brain until some form of idiocy poops out. Here's the iconic example:

- Girl cheats on her boyfriend.
- Girl feels guilty and needs to feel right about what she did.
- Girl thinks to herself: *My boyfriend has been pretty mean to me lately. He kind of deserved it.*
- *I haven't been getting enough sex from him. How else does he expect me to get my needs met?*
- *After seeing how that other guy ghosted after sleeping with me, I now see that other men are jerks. That makes me love my boyfriend even more - he's always there for me.*
- *Therefore it was actually a good thing that I cheated on him and he should be happy about it.*
- *But I shouldn't tell him because then he'd get mad because he wouldn't understand why it's such a blessing in disguise.*

That's the female hamster in all its glory. In your story, she rationalized using you as being acceptable behavior. She also rationalized dating a non-Christian based on emotion, bad theology, and stupid logic. That was her hamster. Your hamster was the way you justified pining over her for so long without taking action much sooner.

We all have hamsters. Women's hamsters just spin the wheels a lot faster, so their cogs can rationalize a lot more stupid stuff than men can. My wife has actually gotten so fluent with this that she'll finally end arguments, "I know it doesn't make any sense at all. I can't explain to you why I want things done this way. I just know that it's what I want. Can you support me in that?" And then I have to decide whether or not the issue fits within my frame and follows the "pick your battles" principle.

Was this the an RP move? Need advice/input.

1 upvotes · 19 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

me saying that I did not want a friendship with her needed to be said I think, because she responded by asking if we could still be friends.

I fully understand. If you felt you needed to say, that's your judgment call to make. But as to the title question you asked: "Was this an RP move?" the answer is probably no. That said, you're not trying to pick her up anymore, so who cares if you didn't do things the technical RP way? Now, if the next girl you have your eyes set on was in the conversation, that'd be a different story.

Was this the an RP move? Need advice/input.

1 upvotes · 19 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

One thing I do disagree on though, is the "If you can't find the perfect, godly woman, raise one up." I don't think its an RP idea to take up girls with high n-counts, waste time on lost causes, etc.

Sorry, I thought I had mentioned that in my original comment: *"find someone who's already on the path to Christ who you find attractive, enter into a relationship, and begin discipling her. If you have to, go below your bar and raise her up. Is she not very attractive, but has other great qualities? Join in and show her how to become attractive to you. Take her to the gym with you; go clothes shopping with her; help her pick out makeup and perfume. If she's already attractive, but spiritually immature, start a relationship and lead her into godliness."*

To be clear, I **DO NOT** recommend dating a non-believer in the hope of saving them (very, very bad idea), nor do I recommend picking up someone with a high n-count in the hope that you can tame them, nor do I recommend picking someone who you know you could never be physically attracted to, even if they got their body in slammin' shape and developed great fashion sense. You simply cannot take a 2 and make her a 9. This is basic MMSLP. That said, if you've been looking for an 8, find a 5 or 6 and help her become an 8. That's manageable.

The other reason that traditional RP logic doesn't work here is that the qualities that define a good RP LTR are vastly abundant. Spiritual maturity in a woman is nowhere near as abundant (to be fair, it's pretty rare among guys too). You can't just go to the bar and find someone ... in fact, you're almost certain not to find a spiritually mature woman if that's the place you're going to look. But the bar holds dozens of LTR-material women from an RP standpoint. Combine the spiritually mature factor with all the factors that make up a good RP LTR girl and the odds just look uncannily dismal.

Seriously, [this post](#) goes into the stats and concludes that just looking at people who self-identify as Christian (ignoring everyone else in the world), only .155% (yes, that's a point 155, not 1.55) are spiritually mature, marriageable material, "which means 1 in 645 people would be marriageable ... which would mean you'd simultaneously have to attend 9 churches consistent with the median [church size] to find your souse." That's

ridiculous.

Now, add in the fact that **only 70.6% self-identify as Christian** and that .155% of self-identifiers becomes .109%. That's about 1 out of every 900 people walking down the street would be the truly great, spiritually mature Christian woman that every Christian guy dreams of.

His conclusion? Same as mine: "But the better solution is to do as I have said in other posts: raise up someone to the caliber of person you would want to marry (but in a safe context to do so that doesn't 'lead people on')." [This is the same guy where I learned that concept in the first place.]

No matter how RP you are, RP can help you get the girl when you find her, but finding her is going to be a nightmare without actual divine intervention.

How does biblical submission benefit wives?

1 upvotes · 19 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

And they tend to question it (not constructively, but critically) when, among other things, their relationship with God isn't close, or when there's mental or emotional trauma or damage, etc.

There's your best point. The question I was asking wasn't a present-context "why," it was a "God could have designed women to be the leaders, or for shared leadership instead" kind of "why." But you're spot on: people only question this when they're not already walking maturely in Christ. Those who are one with Christ in Spirit, actively evangelising and discipling, and engaging in fellowship - those people instinctively know the answers even if they don't consciously think about it, so they're not the ones asking the question. The real answer is, "Just go after Jesus and it'll all be clear." Or to put it another way: "Seek first His Kingdom and His righteousness and all this will be added to you as well."

God is not saying there aren't good women to be found anywhere. But God, through the inspiration of the Holy Spirit speaking through Solomon (the presumed author of Ecclesiastes) is saying it's far easier to find a good man than to find a good woman

I'd contend Solomon is more likely referring to the fact that good men and women are rare, but at least among the men there was one. There's no "far easier to find a good man" context for that. But I do see what you're saying. I'm more inclined toward the position that the "one" he's referring to is either himself or his father. Some people say he's speaking prophetically about Jesus, but I don't see that connection.

The three persons of the Godhead are equal. They just have different roles.

I often use this explanation as well. I've had success referencing it like a bicycle. Wheels are not a bicycle. A frame is not a bicycle. Handle bars are not a bicycle. Put these all together and you have a bicycle. But the wheels don't decide where you go - the handle bars do. The handle bars don't hold the rider, the frame does. The frame doesn't propel the bike, the wheels do. Nobody values a pair of handle bars alone. They want a bike in all three components. The person riding the bike equally values all aspects of the bike insofar as it gets him where he's going. So does God value all aspects of the family unit insofar as we're moving forward, doing what He designed us to do.

How does biblical submission benefit wives?

1 upvotes · 18 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

How would you respond to the woman who argues: "Sure, someone needs to take the lead ... a kingdom divided and all that. But why does the wife have to be the submissive one? What if what God established in Eden was just a starting point until we evolved enough as a species for women to take over in some relationships? Or why didn't

God create a system where the better leader should take charge?"

I've heard these questions before and have some ideas, but I'd love to hear others' feedback.

How does biblical submission benefit wives?

1 upvotes · 18 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Good word.

Advice to Young Women Today for a Better, Happier Life and Relationships

1 upvotes · 18 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Good call. Just make sure those efforts aren't always directed at her. If you're not taking care of yourself, you will burn out after 7-10 years, which is when most people get divorced. Otherwise, great story :)

103 - Desire Cultivates Intimacy

1 upvotes · 18 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Hey there. I appreciate your efforts to add a sense of humor to this sub. That said, when that humor comes off as trolling or is denigrating to our faith, it does violate the rules. I have removed 3 of your comments for this purpose. I'm happy to let you continue participating, but please be productive in your discourse, mixing humor in as appropriate, and not purely poking fun at the subject matter. Thanks!

House-wife v. SAHM

1 upvotes · 18 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I agree. Personally, I'm not big on apologetics and I have found, as you noted, that it's worthless as an evangelistic tool and only really has value in affirming principles of the faith to younger believers who might otherwise be led away. I was in the apologetics scene for a long time throughout high school and college, then when my faith became real it slowly faded away until I saw it in its appropriate context.

Bottom line, as you say: it eventually all boils down to faith, and trying to pretend otherwise is a violation of 1 Cor. 2.

What's the stance on using RP stuff in other arenas?

1 upvotes · 18 July 2017 · /r/askMRP

Nice.

House-wife v. SAHM

1 upvotes · 18 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Don't resent it, use it for your benefit.

In its various forms, I call this intellectual, relational, or emotional Aikido.

The point of Aikido is to use an opponent's force against it, rather than attacking with your own force. I do this in law all the time. The other side makes an argument that sounds flashy. Rather than arguing against it, I find a way that my client could abuse their rationale for his own gain. This simultaneously shows how idiotic the argument was in the first place while also making my client look like a saint because he's passing up on the chance to take advantage of what the other side is proposing. Judges eat that up. Then, when the judge rejects that idea, I propose what my client really wants and the other side, not being trained in intellectual Aikido, can only try to poke holes ... and we all know how people respond to DEERing.

You're proposing the same thing on a societal level: *Let them make their arguments; and then we'll adopt their arguments to prove our point anyway.*

Presuppositional apologetics also brushes on this concept. It makes an offensive weapon of atheist worldviews by taking those worldviews and showing how they either support the Bible or were stolen from the Bible in the first place.

I've spent a lot of time mastering pretty much every form of Aikido ... except physical :p

What's the stance on using RP stuff in other arenas?

1 upvotes · 18 July 2017 · /r/askMRP

Good thoughts. My dad and brothers are two I've been subtly influencing. I've only actually used the phrase "red pill" with my dad, who is having significant problems with his LTR (they've broken up, but still hang out sometimes; she's seeing other guys, he wants to see other girls, but is too butt-hurt and won't admit it). My brother just started a new LTR 6 months ago, but is extremely BP (even more than I ever was; his last LTR was completely non-physical with him, which is partly why they broke up). My other brother has just given up on girls entirely, after having his heart broken.

If I hear "happy wife happy life" ...

What's your typical response? This phrase gets used a lot in my church. My wife even used to say it. My response nowadays is, "That's right - a happy wife does give a happy life [fogging], but a happy wife comes from a happy husband."

My wife about choked when I first said that, but I've never heard her say the phrase again. At various times over the past several years, she's consciously acknowledged: "If you're not in a good mood during this, it's going to suck and I won't be able to enjoy it either." I think when I first corrected the HWHL mantra, she connected it with those types of thoughts and realized I was right.

But as I continue to hear the phrase at least once a week, is there a better response?

What's the stance on using RP stuff in other arenas?

1 upvotes · 18 July 2017 · /r/askMRP

All good points. My only fear is that if the feminist, vag-worship agenda keeps getting pushed unopposed, that could likely create a world that's sucky to live in no matter how much sex you're getting. The opposition right now is weak, and the feminists laugh at it.

House-wife v. SAHM

1 upvotes · 17 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Just keep in mind, it may at times be beneficial to use different language to "win" over people. Pick your battles. Win the war.

Great conclusion. Thanks for this insightful write-up!

Rejecting appreciation ... weird concept, but it works for me.

1 upvotes · 17 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I agree. These would have been much better responses. Thanks for the tip.

Is Red Pill truly congruent with Holiness?

1 upvotes · 17 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Until I started making some changes, I would have put myself in that category (with one lull - and I know exactly why that lull happened). It goes back to my road v. destination example (if I used that; can't remember).

The physical expression is a "shadow" or "copy" (per Hebrews 8-9) of the "heavenly thing." I consider these to be roads. They are the path we often have to take to get to the destination, which is understanding the spiritual truth that God meant for us all along (see also 1 John 4:20). Once you are at the destination, you no longer require the road. You'll go out for a drive occasionally because you like revving your engine, blasting some tunes, and feeling the wind in your face. But you don't need the road. You're already at where you were supposed to be all along.

With this mentality, once a guy has developed a healthy understanding and lifestyle of evangelism *and* discipleship, physical child-conceiving and child-rearing are no longer necessities. They don't have the same value, although they are still greatly desired. As a result, I learned to be fully content and satisfied in my relationship with God through my DB times, even though I continued to desire sex. Likewise, I do not judge my worth as a man by how well I have raised my kids, but by Christ in me and the fruit he produces from me - *yet this does not diminish my desire to raise my kids*. Although my marriage was sexless and parenting together resulted in a lot of conflicts, I was already being filled by God through my evangelism and discipleship in these exact "truer" spiritual areas. I had exchanged the "shadow" of physical reproduction and co-child-raising for the truer "heavenly thing" of spiritual reproduction and discipleship.

Now, you don't actually get a new baby every time you have sex. Likewise, you don't get a new convert every time you share your faith. But the intimacy, passion, and overall ecstasy you get from working in unison with the Holy Spirit ("as one," even, per John 17) is far more satisfying than sex, even when the person ultimately rejects the Gospel (which Romans 3 addresses is still God-glorifying), just as sex is still satisfying, intense, blissful, etc. even when it doesn't result in conception. [This parallel leads me to some confusion on the appropriateness of contraception, as an intentional effort to reap the joy of sharing the Gospel while stifling the chance of actually reaping a convert ... that just seems wrong and I haven't processed that for long enough yet. Until I have, that's +1 for Catholics.]

It's also worth noting that some people wander through difficult terrain all on their own, arriving at the destination without ever having taken the intended road. That's fine. There's nothing wrong with this. The road just makes things easier. The road is also not a guarantee. At some point someone needs to tell a person where the road is supposed to take them, or else they might keep driving circles around the destination forever. I have found that Christians with healthy sex lives are more receptive toward learning and implementing an active lifestyle of evangelism than those without. Similarly, effective parents are much better disciple-makers than those who have never raised children. However, I've also found that if someone doesn't connect the dots for them, they will just keep living in blissful ignorance of what God wanted their healthy reproductive appetite to show them.

For example, a great parent might think discipleship is all about teaching, teaching, teaching, and not realize that methods that worked with his children (ex. modeling, heart-to-hearts, life-on-life observation, coaching, etc.) are virtually always necessary to apply in discipleship relationships too; so, his discipleship will suffer if he hasn't connected the concepts. Likewise, a person's evangelism will suffer if he doesn't account for all of the things that go into sex - not just the act itself, but everything that leads up to it, from dating to marriage to foreplay to intercourse, etc. When you don't account for these things you get preachers on the street corners with a megaphone saying, "Repent or burn in hell!"

Tag: [/u/RedPillWonder](#) - these are some of my more obscure thoughts and it might interest you as well.

Advice to Young Women Today for a Better, Happier Life and Relationships

1 upvotes · 17 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

It's worth noting, as you mentioned in your original post: the amount of debt brought into a marriage from student loans *is* an important factor. It would difficult on a marriage if a woman got her degree in archaeology or

philosophy, for example. There are no "on the side" jobs she can do with these degrees, so the husband either has to absorb her student loans out of his income, which could otherwise go to the family, or the option of her staying home is off the table until she pursues her originally-intended career path long enough to pay down that debt, which can even be rough given the lack of jobs for people with these types of majors. Sure, she can do work outside of her degree, but she could have done that without the debt anyway. Also, if something happens to the husband, the likelihood of hopping right into a well-paying archaeology job without experience is nil. I don't say this to discourage women from pursuing some of these more "obscure" degrees, if they're truly passionate about them - you just have to be mindful of the potential long-term implications the debt to get that degree might have on your family and be up-front with your man about the realities of this before you get married.

On a separate note, my wife read the book *Parenting by the Book*, by John Rosemond. She said that he spends some time explaining how many marital problems and parenting issues arose a few decades ago (70s-80s) when language and emphasis shifted from women being "home-makers" or "housewives" to "stay at home mothers."

He says the implication is that the wife's primary responsibility to the kids and her responsibilities around the home (if any) are secondary. As a result, the role of the father in children's lives has been minimized and become subsidiary to a "mother knows best" mentality.

What are your thoughts on this? Actually ... I might make a separate thread about this altogether, so feel free to respond there instead!

Advice to Young Women Today for a Better, Happier Life and Relationships

1 upvotes · 17 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Young women can and should pursue a money making skill, obtain a degree, and prepare and work towards realizing financial blessings and independence for herself (and her future family)

My father-in-law instilled in my wife: *When you become someone's wife one day, you need to be able to help him where he needs your help. If that means financial help, you need to prepare yourself for that possibility. If you just want to be a home-maker, kid-raiser, that's great; but your husband might have different plans and you need to be prepared to follow his lead rather than insisting that he make your dreams a reality, in which case you're really the one trying to control him.*

So, when you say:

Even if a woman chooses to stay home and be a full time wife ...

I agree with my father-in-law that this should really be a marital decision, and that the wife must be willing to submit to her husband's lead on this, if they are not on the same page. If he's a good husband, he won't just be thinking, "Money! Money! Money! Make me more money!" He'll have properly evaluated the circumstances (including biblical role expectations), giving great weight to his wife's expressed desires (assuming he allows her an opportunity to express them fully, rationale and all), and she should be able to proceed comfortably knowing that his bottom-line is best for her rather than if she were to resort to dirtier tactics to get her way (i.e. manipulation, trying to buckle his frame, acting out, withholding sex, etc.).

Advice to Young Women Today for a Better, Happier Life and Relationships

1 upvotes · 16 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Very interesting. That story is simultaneously frustrating to hear, yet very intriguing to think about as to all the things going on behind the scenes. Thanks for sharing!

Welcome to Red Pill Christians

1 upvotes · 15 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

This is good advice. I did a little research on the Madonna-Whore Complex a week ago, but know I need to understand it much better. I'm confident that this affected my relationship - and probably still does.

103 - Desire Cultivates Intimacy

1 upvotes · 14 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Thanks!

Girlfriend wants to start smoking cigs

1 upvotes · 14 July 2017 · /r/askTRP

You don't want to react, but you do want to respond. "Have fun" is non reactive. That's good. But you also didn't respond, so you are not leading her in a situation that she has brought to your attention. She mentioned this to you because she wants you to lead her. Your response should be a reaffirmation of your boundaries. /u/CapNBalls gave you a good example of this. Use it.

Part 1 - Signs your wife might have a personality disorder

1 upvotes · 14 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Good write up. Thanks for sharing! The key here is that because the hamster runs a different direction and sometimes uses different wheels, although MRP tactics will work, you might have to apply them in different ways from what people might suggest.

Part 1 - Signs your wife might have a personality disorder

1 upvotes · 14 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Anxiety is not a personality disorder. I can't remember off hand for sure, but I thought that fit into the axis 2 mood disorders.

Not Empathizing Enough

1 upvotes · 13 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

There's some intent to support contribution and growth of the sub, so I'm commenting on more things than I otherwise would. That said, I don't see the incontinence. One situation is a woman who is unhappy and speculating about what might make her happy; there other is a woman who has actually experienced that happiness. Also, marriage counseling is a unique endeavor that prompts people to speak off the cuff without really being able to process things fully before speaking.

Not Empathizing Enough

1 upvotes · 13 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

And this is where most marriage counselors I work with just don't get it. They assume a cry for help is a cry for help, or a shout of pain is a shout of pain. It's probably because most marriage counselors are female, but they assume that wives know what they want and are effectively communicating it and that over-simplistic husbands are just too dumb to understand how emotional needs work. The fact that there is a subconscious (and kill me if it ever becomes conscious!) hidden agenda never crosses their minds.

Even politically conservative psychologists have bought into this feminist model of marriage counseling - "You're just not communicating well enough; let me help you understand each other better." It worms its way in like a snake. No, she is communicating exactly what she intends. The problem is that when she's upset the hamster takes over and she doesn't know what she really wants, so whatever comes out of her mouth can't be trusted. I've

seen this happen on loop more times than I can count. As a result, there's only 1 marriage counselor in my entire large-sized city who I will ever refer clients to.

Tag: [/u/Olongapo](#)

Woman's desire is to their HUSBAND according to God

1 upvotes · 13 July 2017 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Yeah, I don't even say "the prayer" with people anymore. I don't want to give them a false assurance of salvation. In my view, faith is what saves, but faith doesn't mean anything if not in the context of faithfulness. Likewise, I can say I "trust" someone, but that means nothing if not in the context of "entrusting" something to them. The bond isn't formed until there is some type of interplay.

Another way to look at it (and probably the simplest way I can explain it):

- Works can never produce faith; works can be faked
- Faith always produces works; faith cannot be faked (but also cannot be observed/objectively proven)
- Faith saves, works do not
- Evidence of works doesn't prove anything
- Absence of works proves absence of faith

As a result, based on the general concept of "good works," we can discern either (1) someone is most likely not saved, or (2) we can't tell if they're saved or not, but we cannot discern (3) that person is almost certainly saved.

In the same passage you quoted, the immediate previous section actually gives the test that Jesus recommends using to get to that (3) conclusion of a person: "By their fruit you will recognize them." Every time Jesus talks about plants and fruit he's referencing the joint evangelism/discipleship processes - planting a seed and helping it grow. The parable of the sower is probably the prime example. Even beyond that understanding, the rest of Matthew 7 and the surrounding passages make it clear that the "fruit" is not "good works," but those who are walking the narrow road because of us. So, I always ask people: *who is following Jesus today because of your life?* If you have no one, you may be saved but you will never have confidence in your salvation. If you can identify people, then you have every reason to be confident in your salvation. Not only did Jesus make this the standard in Matthew 7, but he also made imparted it to us as our mission and goal of what we're to do after his ascent: "Go therefore and make disciples of all nations" (Matthew 28:19). If that is our mission in life, I would be very curious how many people could reject or ignore that mission and claim that their faith is genuine when, again, faith always produces works.

Part 1 - Signs your wife might have a personality disorder

1 upvotes · 13 July 2017 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

Well said.

Part 1 - Signs your wife might have a personality disorder

1 upvotes · 13 July 2017 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

That's quite a story. Thanks for sharing!

Part 1 - Signs your wife might have a personality disorder

1 upvotes · 12 July 2017 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

I follow.

Woman's desire is to their HUSBAND according to God

1 upvotes · 12 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I'm not sure why you think that needs to be proven here.

Woman's desire is to their HUSBAND according to God

1 upvotes · 12 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I'm not sure what you're trying to prove. I've already agreed salvation is not by works.

Part 1 - Signs your wife might have a personality disorder

1 upvotes · 12 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

War is a common example. The first thing that a battalion needs to do is establish a boundary and its goal from there is to keep inching that boundary forward to take more ground from the enemy. Although the boundary itself is designed to be as defensive as possible, which helps protect the battalion from breaking, it is also usually an offensive strategy to cover more ground of enemy territory and also is comprised of soldiers and offensive men on the front lines.

6 Questions for Christian Merps

1 upvotes · 12 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Glad I could help clarify some things.

I agree that most churches do preach that sex after marriage is a good thing. Unfortunately, the teachings against premarital sex or sinful expressions of sex grossly outweigh the number of sermons you will ever hear on how good and beautiful it is to have a healthy sex life in marriage.

In addition, even though churches may preach that sex after marriage is good and healthy, people who have lived in the "sex is bad for me right now because I'm not married yet" phase often have lived there so long that they are mentally incapable of making the transition to appreciating healthy sex in the context of marriage. Intellectually they know that it is okay and there is nothing wrong with it but emotionally and subconsciously they are still stuck living in light of the message they had been told all of their unmarried lives: you shouldn't be having sex right now.

Interestingly, people who get saved after they have already been married tend to have much healthier sex lives because they did not live in the negative stigma the church otherwise presents about premarital sex. Although it is true that premarital sex is certainly sinful, the imbalance of attention given to this as opposed to the beauty of marital sex continues to be a frustration within many Christian marriages.

Part 1 - Signs your wife might have a personality disorder

1 upvotes · 12 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I don't see that concept as holding true in other contexts ... but I'll take your word for it as to its limited application in MRP.

Woman's desire is to their HUSBAND according to God

1 upvotes · 12 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I haven't seen enough of his stuff to endorse him, but those two videos are great. The first one is a far more humorous presentation of my 102 post. For his second one, I usually summarize it like this:

- Admit you're a sinner in need of a savior; you can't do it alone
- Believe Jesus' death and resurrection are the only way you can be saved from sin

- Commit in your heart to orient your thinking and actions around this belief (satisfying the James 2 requirement without compromising into a works-based salvation model)

Part 1 - Signs your wife might have a personality disorder

1 upvotes · 12 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Game has nothing to do with setting and enforcing boundaries

That was my point: there's more to RP than just boundaries and defense.

Surrendering delusions of control over things beyond your power is a central part to Stoicism.

I haven't studied stoicism much yet, so I'll take your word for it. That said, from conversations with countless others here, I get the impression that there's nothing anti-RP about setting yourself up for success; you just can't let the outcome of your efforts make you all butthurt if/when those efforts don't give the results you want - you keep improving anyway.

How did you end up discovering Red Pill truths?

1 upvotes · 12 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

That sounds like an awesome endeavor. Just be cautious that you're not putting him in a position of temptation either.

6 Questions for Christian Merps

1 upvotes · 12 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I know I responded to BPP and said I would cease comments on here

No need to delete comments or withhold future comments. Unlike TRP/MRP, I hope this sub to be far more open to hearing from both genders. If I think something is out of line or counter-productive, I'll probably remove it and clarify the rules so that other people know the standard up-front. The primary standard I have right now that might not already be on the sidebar is not to denigrate Christianity or RP praxeology. Challenging these concepts and discussing their validity is perfectly fine, but if some girl or WK wants to roll in and say, "You're all just stereotyping and being sexist!" I'll probably remove that, as that's not very productive to conversation.

Another thing worth noting: Christianity is designed to be challenged. Acts 17 commends the Bereans because they didn't just accept Paul's word for it - they tested what he said themselves before buying into it. What I gather from some of my posts on MRP is that many people are less interested in mass testing, observation, and data collection and more interested in hearing one-off stories about what worked for the author. That's another fine approach too, but I will be inviting all forms of challenge to our model *as long as they are productive and rooted in observable fact and not intended to denigrate or lead people astray*. (Tag: [/u/BluePillProfessor](#) as this may clarify something I said earlier; this may prove to be a bad idea, but it's the model I have in my head right now).

may have mistakenly assumed this sub would also discuss Christian sexuality

I absolutely intend it to :) We haven't necessarily gotten that far, and my guess is that most Christians are too subliminally stifled to feel comfortable talking about sexuality until there are a string of posts on it, allowing for crowd mentality to override Christian cultural stigmas about sex.

I asked if Christian sexuality is discussed that men with physical disabilities that result in ED be included.

I'm absolutely open to discussing posts on these types of topics.

a man might read all of the sexual success stories and think to himself "what about me"

My expectation is actually the reverse: I believe we are less likely to see success stories and more likely to see people who are hurt and wounded and embarrassed to talk about their sexual failures because of the social stigma of anti-sexuality implied in most churches.

I concluded with saying that a true Christian woman would not see this as a problem, and would find new ways of pleasing her husband and continuing their sex life.

That depends on the specifics of a problem. "Accept it and move on" is an acceptable conclusion when it is fairly definitive that nothing will solve the problem. But even when that mentality seems appropriate, one has to be willing to revert out of it to try new ideas that might come up after-the-fact.

I mention this because I was in an "accept it and move on" phase of my relationship with my wife for a long time. I had tried everything I knew how to do to help her become interested in sex and nothing worked. When we did have sex, although she would enjoy it, it was clearly obligatory, which affected the quality. As you say, I had moved on to finding other ways of connecting and relating with my wife because I assumed the problem was unfixable. It was about 6 months ago that I started my internal transformation and about 2-ish weeks ago that I discovered RP and have since realized that my efforts were not as exhaustive as I thought and that RP systems can work where everything else failed.

I believe women should take a similar attitude as well. Sometimes it is appropriate to give up on option 1 and move to option 2. Other times we should keep fighting or be willing to re-open doors to option 1 if the opportunity presents itself.

Part 1 - Signs your wife might have a personality disorder

1 upvotes · 12 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

For the OI/CI post I see where you're coming from and how it could be interpreted that way. That said, from what I've been reading, TRP/MRP is not a purely a defensive/boundaries game. I think /u/anythinginc addressed this issue better than I could, so I'll defer to his comment [here](#). Long story short, a ton of stuff that gets talked about as "game" falls in line with exactly what I have been addressing. As I have done so far, I will continue to limit my posts to things that I have either personally experienced or personally observed en masse.

Part 1 - Signs your wife might have a personality disorder

1 upvotes · 12 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I'm not sure what you're asking.

Part 1 - Signs your wife might have a personality disorder

1 upvotes · 12 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Vetting would be more appropriate for TRP. In MRP I'm going on the assumption that it's predominantly people who are already in LTRs and want to read about that context, not the stuff single guys would want to read. So, it made more sense to address this from a "Whoops I'm stuck with Sybil" vantage point. I usually try to consider the target audience before I write anything. I may not be right about what they want to hear all the time, but the reaction so far has been overwhelmingly positive with a few hard core complainers.

As for "not actionable," part 1 wasn't meant to be. It is the necessarily context paving the way for the actionable part. Without knowing the context, the application will almost always be off.

101 - Fitness develops attraction

1 upvotes · 12 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Indeed ... just as women have to go out of their way to let their husbands lead when culture tells them they're superior to men and should be pedestalyzed.

Part 1 - Signs your wife might have a personality disorder

1 upvotes · 12 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

It's not us who diagnoses them. You also have to remember that there is selection bias because people come to us when they suspect a mental health issue in their SO, and more often than not their hunch is based in fact.

But more to the point: it's all about scale. A woman might have a personality disorder but be so high functioning that it only shows up when tested for it. In that situation, the features are present but controlled. This is no different than saying AWALT or that all women have hamsters. It's painfully common to over-diagnose too ... so MRP also drinks the company kool-aid. My kool-aid just has independent, objective, scientific testing to back it up.

Part 1 - Signs your wife might have a personality disorder

1 upvotes · 12 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Nice. I like it.

Part 1 - Signs your wife might have a personality disorder

1 upvotes · 12 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

As I noted a few other times on this sub, my firm specializes in cases involving psychological issues. The head partner was I the board of psychology and we are required to go through training and continuing education courses on personality disorders in specific because they are the most common issues impacting divorce and custody decisions.

So, although most divorce lawyers may be fairly ignorant, 80% of my cases do involve these issues and I need to understand them inside and out in order to be able to cross examine psychologists and present testimony from competing psychologists, etc. It's like a med malpractice attorneys. They're not licensed doctors, but they do know every bit about medicine relevant to their cases as most doctors and sometimes more. Now imagine that med malpractice attorney has her practice almost exclusively about one type of injury ... That's where I am with personality disorders.

One thing I've noticed is younger chicks don't seem to care about my career, only older women are impressed. Any thoughts?

1 upvotes · 12 July 2017 · /r/askTRP

I'm in the US. Some states actually do a great job limiting support figures ... mine is not one of them, but even then it's county specific. For example my county will give the lesser earner 45% of the after tax cash available to the parties from the joint income pot, unless it's a long term marriage (25-30+), in which case it can be 50% (max anywhere). The next county over only gives 40%. Others give 30%. Those are, of course, rough figures, as there is a lot of judicial discretion ... but judges follow them about 90% of the time.

6 Questions for Christian Merps

1 upvotes · 12 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I think I had already read that once (or maybe it was another post you made ... I think titled something akin to **Athol Kay is official lost to us**), but went through it again anyway. I was already familiar with his transition. From what I gather, the forum failed because there weren't enough clear boundaries placed on what people could

and couldn't say and there wasn't enough emphasis on who is to be trusted. That's why I like MRP's flair system of "MRP endorsed" and "Red Beret." Although I often disagree with some of these people, I find that their comments actually are consistent with RP praxeology and my dissent is with RP concepts that are in conflict with Christianity (i.e. plating, pre-marital sex) and not the person ... although some of them can be just plain jerks too - not in a motivating way, but in a self-puffing way. But I kind of expect that from RP forums, and I deal with that in my law practice with pretty much every other attorney anyway, so it doesn't really get to me.

All of that said, if you have any suggestions specific to this sub, I'm all ears!

6 Questions for Christian Merps

1 upvotes · 12 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Sadly, I missed the comment and even reddit doesn't show it. Unfortunately, that means I can't start processing where to draw the lines. Do you remember what she said?

My original intention was to allow women to post freely, able to express their spiritual, relational, and sexual issues just as well as anyone else here. That said, I expect to put restrictions on both genders from denigrating the user-base here or our shared system of beliefs, including those shared beliefs that extend beyond the Bible alone (i.e. retained RP principles).

To that end, if someone wants to knock on plating, that's fine ... RP will not condone plating. But if someone wants to knock on physical fitness as being "shallow," they must do so in a respectful and productive way, not a denigrating way.

I moderate another fairly prominent sub on my main account, so drawing these types of lines isn't overly new ... this is just a new context. I will probably maintain a similar standard as I enforce there.

The biological step-mother.

1 upvotes · 12 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Hah, I do now. I started my RP journey 6 months before finding RP (discovered the principles from other sources). By the time I actually found RP, it was like turning the power on to an electrical relay that I had just spent the last 6 months building. I saw no progress for those 6 months, then BAM! All at once, there it is. Here I am about two weeks later and happy as can be. So, I'll keep trying to give back to the RP community, as it has helped me, even in the relatively short time I've been here. In the meantime, I'll keep dealing with all the haters who think I shouldn't post anything because I'm so "noob."

How to bring out the Alpha in a Beta man?

1 upvotes · 12 July 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

Glad I can help. I wouldn't recommend trying all of these at once, and you'll very likely find that some of them just won't resonate with your SO ... but at least it's some things to think about.

One thing I've noticed is younger chicks don't seem to care about my career, only older women are impressed. Any thoughts?

1 upvotes · 12 July 2017 · /r/askTRP

It depends on the circumstances, but in total, it's about 2/3 women cheating, 1/3 men cheating. If I had to guess, it's because the majority of men are pretty BP and are so paranoid about losing the girl that they worship and the girls are just totally unattracted (until they reconnect with Chad on Facebook), so these men won't cheat. On the flip, when I do see RP-type guys (high confidence, great physique, charmers, hold frame, etc.) they're typically cheating on their spouses left and right - far more than the women cheat. To put it another way, fewer guys cheat, but when they cheat they cheat far more.

If it helps, that 2/3 - 1/3 statistic was actually found directly from an analysis I did of 78 of my cases, investigating the causes of divorce. Interestingly, cheating was only the 3rd most common cause for divorce on the list. #1 (by about double the cases that involved cheating) was having a controlling/manipulative spouse. #2 - irreconcilable disagreements (usually about money or how to raise the children).

One thing I've noticed is younger chicks don't seem to care about my career, only older women are impressed. Any thoughts?

1 upvotes · 11 July 2017 · /r/askTRP

My observation is the reverse: narcissists have a harder time beginning relationships with younger women, and even when they get them started they certainly don't last as long as compared with the frequency and duration of post-40 women. Again, though, my profession may be showing me a slanted sample of the population.

One thing I've noticed is younger chicks don't seem to care about my career, only older women are impressed. Any thoughts?

1 upvotes · 11 July 2017 · /r/askTRP

I can only go by what I see in my law practice, which is focused on divorce and custody law. So, I usually see it through the lens of marriage issues, but still hear a lot about all the ex's hookups.

Welcome to Red Pill Christians

1 upvotes · 11 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

BJs are totally off the table in her mind. It's one of those "dirty" aspects of sex to her and she doesn't consider it hygienic. Also, it's not a lube issue ... usually no problems naturally there, and she would affirm that. I think it's likely psychosomatic (is vaginismus the right term?) She has never asked a doctor since yr 1 of marriage and is too embarrassed. All they told her was to practice putting things in to open her up, which will also help her get used to it. This is another thing she won't do. Her mom would never let her use a tampon growing up and she's still never used one to this day. In her mind tampons or following the doctor's recommendation are parallel to masturbation.

Again ... When we're active she doesn't feel the pain at all (or at least very minimally and rarely), so when we're in a healthy place it's not a problem. But the "bad and hurts" phrase still shows that she psychologically can't get over seeing sex as a negative thing, even though she consciously knows better.

Welcome to Red Pill Christians

1 upvotes · 11 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

I have asked what it means several times. She says she doesn't know what her mom meant - that's just what she was told. Knowing her mom, I wouldn't be surprised if it was a harmful manipulative tactic to keep her chaste until marriage.

My wife did have extreme pain on our honeymoon ... took 3 days to make PIV possible, so I'm sure there's some psychological aftereffects from that. Also, if we go a long period without sex, the first time again will have some pain for her as well, but nowhere near like the honeymoon. When we have sex consistently, though, there are no problems.

Marital Confidence Intervals and Probabilistic Stage Setting

1 upvotes · 11 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Good thoughts. As a note of clarification:

when she says "I want a divorce" ... you can't say "there is the door."

Immediately, no. But I'd hope no husband would do so immediately.

Matthew 18 says we try to talk to them, bring a friend or pastor if you have to. If she won't try to reconcile, treat her as a non Christian. 1 Cor. 7 says if an unbelieving spouse wants to go, let them go.

In short, we have to try to reconcile first, and if that doesn't work, then show them the door. The only additional requirement we have in that situation is to bring a friend or pastor to help, which non Christians might skip.

Welcome to Red Pill Christians

1 upvotes · 11 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

That's just what her mom told her. I don't know why.

Marital Confidence Intervals and Probabilistic Stage Setting

1 upvotes · 11 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I'm more open-minded about catholicism than most protestants.

I totally get that OI creates a bit of a catch-22 in that if you want to save the marriage, you have to be willing to give it up. That said, when I posted about OI here, several people reamed me for talking about OI in a long-term capacity when they said it only applies in the short-term, individual efforts. So, by that logic OI wouldn't apply to the long-term mentality of letting go of your marriage, right?

Who do you want in your church? ...

All of that makes sense, but there's also the option: "Someone who wants it so bad that they're willing to fight for it because they know it's right, even when it's not easy and they feel like things aren't working."

A man usually haha to show a lot of effort, maturity, and ownership ... before the community condones divorce versus "MRP harder."

This has not been my experience from reading around this sub for the past couple weeks. I do believe you that at its core the mods want to foster the exact attitude you're describing, but most comments I'm seeing do not seem to back this up.

by labeling divorce as "not true OI" and "beta" is counterproductive I feel

I see your point. I think my point was more one of semantics to show that the real culprit those comments are addressing is oneitis, not OI, and that OI in a raw sense should mean something different. I wasn't necessarily suggesting people have to follow "true OI" or cling to oneitis.

But, after many conversations in this thread, I see where I was wrong and miscommunicative on a few things, and I'm happy to own up to that and will fine-tune my word selection in future posts :)

Help

1 upvotes · 10 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Indeed, it is very hard, and I loathe the thought of sex in those times too ... but I'm glad someone else can vouch that this does actually work.

Marital Confidence Intervals and Probabilistic Stage Setting

1 upvotes · 10 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I totally get where you're coming from and agree with a lot of what you have said. I do believe that a Christian

worldview holds certain things to be of greater value than individual happiness, as our calling to be like Christ compels us to be willing to self sacrifice for the greater good. From a non Christian perspective I don't expect this to make much sense, but when you talk about "the person has to be more important than the vow," I agree to the extent of the identity God gives us, but Christians find their identity in Christ and not ourselves, so that is what becomes uncompromisable, not or own unique make ups of wants and desires.

That said, there are certainly appropriate reasons for divorce, which I readily embrace. Even beyond those reasons, if a person has a choice between two evils because the "right choice" is not something they are realistically capable of executing, and divorce is the lesser of those two evils, then I can support it (this is exactly what God did in allowing Moses to grant divorces). However, I do think that all rational effort to save the marriage should first be applied, including to a degree greater than MRP would otherwise encourage.

I hope that helps clarify.

Red Pill Advice for a 17 year-old?

1 upvotes · 10 July 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

That could be. Longer-term escalating friendships can also help this vetting process, though, without putting either of you at risk. My wife and I were romantically interested within the first month we met each other, but didn't actually start dating until almost 3 years later ... then it was another 3 years before we were married. That pre-dating friendship period gave us freedom to get to know each other deeply first, without risk, while also getting to know other people to figure out what we wanted in an SO and not, whereas jumping into a committed relationship right off the bat would have prevented us from figuring things out. We would have started wondering what life would be like with other people because we never vetted anyone else.

Looking for some advice. Situation is complicated.

1 upvotes · 10 July 2017 · /r/askMRP

A good friend of mine used to say:

Women go into relationships hoping to change their men; men go in hoping she'll never change; in the end, neither of them gets what they want.

She's trying to change you. As you say, "The man I was is slowly being chipped away." She doesn't like that it's taking too long to chip off more layers. Your problem is that you're letting her chip away layers at all. That's your frame buckling to hers. Even if you think it's internal and you're hiding it, she can smell it on you.

Is your marriage over? It doesn't have to be. That's really up to you. But letting her chip more away is not the way to fix it. I've divorced people (I'm an attorney) who have been married for less than 3 months and just want out. I've also others in the exact same situation who came to me for help with their divorce, I gave them a few pointers on fixing their relationship, and now 7 years later they're still together. I've had this happen a few times.

Your marriage will be what you make of it. That said, cutting and running seems to be the coward's way out that won't solve your long term problem. The problem you're having with her is something that will follow you into your next relationship if you don't learn how to deal with it now. To quote /u/ReddJive ...

Sure TRP says divorce start over ... MRP takes it to the level of fix yourself before you just up and divorce ... if you don't work on you these same issues will be there with the next woman. Your wife is simply your sparring partner. Your practice girl if you will.

Although I may still oppose the overly-relaxed attitude about divorce here, this is pretty good advice. Who knows ... maybe you'll end up saving your marriage in the process. If not and she can't handle the better you, let her be the one to walk away.

Welcome to Red Pill Christians

1 upvotes · 10 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

That'd be cool. I haven't gotten to his stuff yet, but that's next on my list. I have read a few of his blog posts though.

Help

1 upvotes · 10 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

To you, is discipleship predominantly about teaching?

6 Questions for Christian Merps

1 upvotes · 10 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

That is absolutely beautiful. I'll be pondering that for a while now. Thanks for sharing!

102 - Desire and the Curse

1 upvotes · 10 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Yes it is. Maybe one day I'll do a post on high-conflict personalities. That's more 400-level stuff, though.

Help

1 upvotes · 10 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Yeah losing control is certainly bad and makes her think you are weak and can be controlled. Glad you don't have that problem either. But you do need to say things like, "I feel like ___ when you ___" or "I'm feeling ___ today, how about you?"

Help

1 upvotes · 10 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

One of her big objections is that I don't admit to doing something wrong when she blows up at nothing.

That's your main problem, then. I was taught early on and have never found any data, verse, scientific study, or even remote suggestion to counter this: **In any conflict, you are at least partially to blame.** Even if you don't think you've done anything wrong, you've at least done something to cause the other person to perceive you have done something wrong. You can always acknowledge that you gave that perception and say, "I'm sorry I made you feel that way."

I did that for 20 years and promised myself I wouldn't do it any more

I'm leading a 2-day spiritual freedom conference in September. One of the topics I'm in charge of is "inner vows." An inner vow is when we make a promise to ourselves that is not biblically mandated. It turns into "rules taught by men" that Jesus condemned the pharisees for following. 99% of the time they're unhealthy and based on a need to protect ourselves from internal emotional wounds rather than setting healthy scriptural boundaries.

interesting data point

That is very interesting! Keep me posted on how well this continues to work after the next few times.

What exactly do you mean by disciplining my wife? Physically? Consequences?

I think you misread that. I said "discipling" not "disciplining."

she wants the family to go away for a few days...I say "No, I can't imagine being stuck in a hotel room with you the way you are acting right now."

I would seriously tone it down on stuff like this. This is probably another huge part of her problem. How you communicate a decision matters deeply, and you're shifting the blame on her for the decisions you're making. If you're making a decision, own it. Let it be your decision. You don't have to explain to her what your reasoning is.

If you do want to explain your reasoning, don't make it an argument and don't say it in a way that belittles her or blames her. Take responsibility. If she wants to go on a vacation, just say no. If she persists, tell her you don't think it's a good idea. If she asks why, explain that you're not in an emotional state to enjoy a vacation and that you will let her know when you are. This might open up the door for her to (1) want to improve your emotional state, (2) want to understand how she has contributed to negatively affecting your emotional state, and (3) feel more connected to you as you are actually expressing feelings in a calm, safe manner rather than acting snide or belittling her or exploding at her.

Remember, as a BPD those feelings are what she craves from you. She needs to know you have them too. She just doesn't want them directed against her (but even against her is better than none at all).

Don't aim for perfect game, the bar for sex is not that high!

1 upvotes · 9 July 2017 · /r/seduction

I disagree. Go to [r/asktrp](#) and post the question, see what you get.

Any statistics on what is considered a high n-count (for a female) before marriage? Or opinions?

1 upvotes · 9 July 2017 · /r/askTRP

Dang ... that's just screaming, "The best way to fix the country is to motivate people to be deadbeats!" It creates polarization. The lower-middle class has every motivation to get poorer because it's easier and won't really lower their life circumstances all that much. The upper-middle class can't take advantage of those benefits, so they're motivated to keep getting richer. As a result, poverty increases and the only way the state can keep up with the benefits is to tax the rich harder. Eventually the rich will leave and the state will break. That's why so many of our wealthy businesses have created home-bases overseas now :/

On the plus side, I suppose it's easier for those who are naturally bent toward alpha, leadership, success, etc. to establish their position and it's easier for women to spot the guys who are actually worth their salt. The problem is that there's a heck of a lot fewer of them.

The biological step-mother.

1 upvotes · 9 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Thanks for the feedback. I'm sorry to hear about your situation. If you want more input on how to deal with someone with a borderline personality disorder, I just made a decent write-up in [this post](#) over on [r/RPChristians](#).

I also talk about BPD a bit in the end of [this comment](#) on this thread.

I hope that helps :)

Welcome to Red Pill Christians

1 upvotes · 9 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Yes, it certainly is a shame :/ Even as recently as a year or two ago (married 9 years), my wife would remind me periodically when arguing about sex, "My parents and church only ever taught me two things about sex while I was growing up: (1) it's bad before marriage, and (2) it hurts a lot. That's all I knew about sex for over 15 years.

It's going to take a long time for me to get past that." We have gotten past much of it, but I still notice reservation in her on a handful of things.

Any statistics on what is considered a high n-count (for a female) before marriage? Or opinions?

1 upvotes · 9 July 2017 · /r/askTRP

That totally sucks.

Any statistics on what is considered a high n-count (for a female) before marriage? Or opinions?

1 upvotes · 9 July 2017 · /r/askTRP

My state abolished estate taxes a few years ago, so you only have to worry about the federal level, which only applies if you have \$5m per person or more. I've had a handful of clients where that has mattered, but the overwhelming majority of people in my state never have to worry about an inheritance tax. Even if you do, there are ways to plan around it with trusts, LLCs and Family Limited Partnerships.

No More Mr. Nice Guy Contradictions

1 upvotes · 9 July 2017 · /r/askTRP

FEELINGS - Beta guys hide feelings because they don't want to burden other people with them, lest they turn them away. Alpha guys are able to communicate feelings effectively because that's how you get what you want. Where this gets flipped in your mind is in being controlled by feelings. The reason beta guys hide their feelings is because it puts them at risk of not getting the love and validation they need, which controls them. Alpha guys can communicate what they're feeling without letting it affect their attitude, demeanor, etc. in the moment. They can say nonchalantly, "I'm angry with you. We need to talk." A beta guy will likely blow up when he can't bottle it up anymore.

PASSIVE AGGRESSIVE - There's a difference between setting boundaries and being passive aggressive. Burning dinner, spilling something on the floor, or making ambiguously innocuous/snide comments are all passive aggressive. Establishing a clear framework of expectations and how you engage with people who are inside from outside of that frame is setting a boundary.

Marital Confidence Intervals and Probabilistic Stage Setting

1 upvotes · 9 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I agree with what you've said in concept, but I still don't understand the problem of engineers embracing Hare Krsna or doctors starting a club to talk about philosophy. Are they not allowed to do that with a mindset: "How can these things help us become better engineers and doctors?" or "How can we become better philosophers without compromising our commitment to medicine?"

Help

1 upvotes · 9 July 2017 · /r/RPChristians

My wife was formerly a teacher.

Another good passage for her: 1 Cor. 9:27 - "I discipline my body and keep it under control, lest after preaching to others I myself should be disqualified."

I'm sure this applies to you as well, but when she's out of control she undermines any legitimate contributions she has to offer God's people. When a leader lacks self-control, it's unclear if the leader is even capable of distinguishing between the Holy Spirit's guidance (where teaching should come from) or their own human

intellectual capacity to understand and relay information. God constantly says that human wisdom will fail, so the church should never trust in the latter of the two, even if it does lead to correct conclusions most of the time.

Any statistics on what is considered a high n-count (for a female) before marriage? Or opinions?

1 upvotes · 9 July 2017 · /r/askTRP

rumblings of legislating this advantage away

True, but those rumblings have been around for so long that it's hard to take them seriously anymore.

I thought TRP/the manosphere's consensus was that there is no social advantage afforded by marriage outside conservative/religious circles?

That very well could be. I haven't read that yet, but I don't doubt it. That said, a quick glance at the TV will show that the media/entertainment world at least still puts pressure toward marriage as an admirable goal, and I'd be shocked if there wasn't something subliminal floating around in people's brains from all this. Just look at all the posts that come up about people who *want* LTRs despite the strong opposition TRP gives to this concept. It's coming from somewhere.

a legal wife *can* contest her husband's will

In my state it's called a "spousal election to take against the will." So, put everything in a trust and don't give your wife anything. End of story. I can't say all states will allow this, but I know for a fact mine does. You can also draft a pre-nup that waives her right to elect against the will or otherwise disclaims any inheritance she might receive from her husband.

abolished it altogether ... government has no real interest in it

I could not agree more. Well said.

Any statistics on what is considered a high n-count (for a female) before marriage? Or opinions?

1 upvotes · 8 July 2017 · /r/askTRP

it only does something useful when you break up or die

Taxes. Higher brackets = more disposable income than two singles filing separately. From any non-religious vantage point, that and social perception are the only real reasons to get married.

Divorce and inheritance can be dealt with by appropriately executed pre-planning documentation, so really don't have to factor into the equation at all (I'm a divorce/estate planning attorney, so I draft these documents all the time).

I should also note, before divorce laws started changing (beginning in 1969), there was a much greater security in the stability the relationship provided, which *was* a benefit. But because divorce rates are so high right now, rational expectation negates that security.

Dealing with the stressed wife.

1 upvotes · 8 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

This is a good way to distinguish, although I think I'd use terms more like: manageable stress and unmanageable

stress. For example, if her boss gave her a project that's going to take 80 hours to finish and wants it done in 1 week, you can't help her with it (i.e. it's unmanageable), but it's absolutely rational for her to be stressed about something like that.

Either way, this is a great line to draw when distinguishing how to respond to different types of stress. Thanks.

A reminder of why Redpillers should marry (and that redpill model with wifey works, and that beta bucks model does not).

1 upvotes · 8 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

This is wonderful. Thanks for sharing!

Edit: I noticed after the fact, it's disappointing that the data is so old.

Marital Confidence Intervals and Probabilistic Stage Setting

1 upvotes · 8 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I think I understand this place better now. Thank you.

Question about stoicism and initiating .

1 upvotes · 8 July 2017 · /r/askMRP

Good word.

Marital Confidence Intervals and Probabilistic Stage Setting

1 upvotes · 8 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

More to [/u/bogeyd6](#), historical samples v. current samples is a trite distinction if the history is recent or there has been nothing causing a total shift in the population from the time the historical samples were taken to the present. For example, if I were trying to develop confidence about how my wife will respond to me under a certain set of circumstances and I'm looking only at data from when we were dating 10 years ago, you're right, the historical data would be garbage. Our life contexts have changed and the data is so far removed from present reality that it's worthless. I should be looking at how she interacted yesterday or today. The fact of the matter is that all data is "historical" data - it's just a matter of how historical it is (i.e. extremely recent history all the way to extremely ancient history).

The reason the single historical data point doesn't work is because you don't have a big enough sample size. Any given sample has to be converted to a normal distribution first so that the standard deviation can be reliable. For the most part, "30" is a magic number that denotes an acceptable sample size that will give a reliable standard deviation, as long as there is consistency and true randomness in selecting the sample. For example, looking at 30 historical battles might not lend itself to high degrees of confidence in predicting outcomes of future battles if they were all fought on different fields, in different wars, different numbers on each side, etc. But if a battalion in one war had fought on a particular battlefield 30+ times, replenishing their troops to the same numbers at the end of each day, then we could develop a confidence interval for probabilistic outcome if that battle were repeated under the same conditions again in the future (costumes, weather, weaponry and all).

If it helps clarify that subject, *it doesn't matter how historical/ancient the data is. The CI simply says, "Under those same conditions, we can be x% confident that future cycles will, on the whole, produce an average within a particular range." If someone dug up a process from 1,000 years ago a CI could be developed all the same ... it would just be fairly useless if nobody uses that process anymore.

Although I don't use CIs regularly in my current profession, because of my background in statistical methodology I still talk about these things with my father-in-law, who uses them daily (he's an engineer). The examples I have used are consistent with how he expresses CIs are used in practice (as opposed to classroom theory), I just

tweaked the subjects to things that might be slightly more aligned with RPer, hence protein count and women.

As for outcome value (to [/u/GargantuaBlarg29](#) now), it's important to understand that confidence intervals are foundational to six sigma management, which is all about minimizing the number of outliers/defective products in ongoing production by creating consistency in processing one product after another, removing as many variables as possible. The CI is the primary tool used to measure the effectiveness of a given six sigma process because six sigma is more interested in developing confidence over the entirety of a population rather than discovering a conforming individual sample size. As a result, the parameter outcome is essential. We're just not looking at probability of how an individual unit will come out; we're looking at probability of where the average of all future units will end up.

As a result, to translate it **back to marriage** - a CI isn't about calculating the probability that my wife will respond X way under a certain set of stimuli I introduce into the relationship. It's about (much like six sigma management) reducing variables to set a stage where her average reaction falls within an acceptable range of desired outcomes. Although individual point probability is much simpler to calculate, in a marriage setting we are far more concerned with long-term behavioral results and not one-off victories.

Thanks

1 upvotes · 8 July 2017 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I don't think we will be. But part of that depends on how active the community is. So, get in there and ask some questions :)

Marital Confidence Intervals and Probabilistic Stage Setting

1 upvotes · 8 July 2017 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

Exactly. That's why I noted in the post itself that if a RP guy converts RP thinking from his conscious mind to a subconscious lifestyle, he becomes beta, even though he maintains the appearance of being alpha. He's no longer intentional and in control - he's just on auto-pilot with a handful of tools he learned. Eventually your wife will adapt and get bored of those tools, at which point a new balance needs to be implemented to keep her on her toes. This adds PUA stuff like being a "man of mystery" because she never knows what you're going to do next ... or as MRP more commonly calls it: gaming your wife.

Welcome

1 upvotes · 8 July 2017 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

That's my hope too :)

Marital Confidence Intervals and Probabilistic Stage Setting

1 upvotes · 8 July 2017 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

You misunderstand. I wasn't endorsing this third option as a viable option. I was simply saying that true OI is worthless and the other two options aren't really OI in the first place, but that's okay.

Marital Confidence Intervals and Probabilistic Stage Setting

1 upvotes · 8 July 2017 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

Thanks!

Marital Confidence Intervals and Probabilistic Stage Setting

1 upvotes · 7 July 2017 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

Yeah, in trial M/T, so I figured I'd crank this one out before working all weekend. That's a good way to put it, though.

Dealing with the stressed wife.

1 upvotes · 7 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Who's the purple piller?

The biological step-mother.

1 upvotes · 7 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Already working on a post about this ... should be up soon.

The biological step-mother.

1 upvotes · 7 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

There are a few parts of my household that I'm still not involved in or aware of the details.

This is actually okay, over time. The captain has to be super hands-on when he hires his first-mate. Once he trusts his first-mate, the captain should be able to rest easy that there are some things he doesn't have to concern himself with anymore.

They key is that the captain trains the first mate to do the job the way he wants it, and only then does he stop overseeing that job. If he hired a first mate and just said, "That's your job, do it however you want," that wouldn't be a very good captain and it would create problems with other aspects of how the ship is run.

Otherwise, thanks for the feedback :)

Dealing with the stressed wife.

1 upvotes · 7 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Good point.

Dealing with the stressed wife.

1 upvotes · 7 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Giving her tasks to complete that would please her husband gave her that sense of accomplishment

This is spot on. When I was fully BP my wife would get super angry because I didn't tell her what I expected of her. As a result, she never perceived that I appreciated or cared for anything she did. In reality, she was doing things I didn't care about, so she was right - I didn't appreciate it, but like a good BP guy I told her I did anyway. She saw through it and it never worked.

When I started the exercise I referenced above, my wife said at first that it was really weird for her. Then I explained, "But when I ask you to do something rather than you just doing it, doesn't it make you feel better knowing that what you're doing are things that actually matter to me?" That turned her right around because now she felt like a nurturer once again. The very fact of my asking her to do it changed her attitude toward me. She felt appreciated even when I didn't communicate appreciation. Why? Because the fact of asking lets her know that what she's doing matters.

She performs heads above any other moms she knows, yet she is still not content.

There are two key reasons for this: (1) She only sees the best things from the other moms, whereas you have a realistic perspective in seeing that her life actually is better; as a result, the comparison game tells her she's always on the losing end. (2) Even when she sees her situation as better than theirs, she believes she experiences higher stress than them, mitigating the goodness of her own situation. Rather than taking the logical conclusion

(decrease stress at the cost of nominal decline in standard of living so you're more like all the other moms), she resorts to the irrational one: "Increase my lifestyle even more to justify my feeling so stressed," which increases stress even more into a terrible cycle.

The key thing to remember is that the "lists" are all born from comparison to other moms. Take her out in the middle of the wilderness, removed from society for 10 years and I promise that list will crumble and vanish. Unfortunately, this is not a realistic exercise for getting her to drop the list, hence the short-term exercise I proposed in my post.

Dealing with the stressed wife.

1 upvotes · 7 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

announcing it to her

Remember, the announcement is only a short-term 3 day thing, and you don't have to tell her why you're doing it. The suggestion isn't meant to be a long-term endeavor, nor is it sustainable as one. When a first mate is hired by the captain, the captain has to be very hands-on for a while. When the first mate gets the hang of the job, the captain can back off.

The announcement only becomes truly problematic if you communicate a responsive expectation: "I'm doing this because I want our marriage to get better." Even something as generic as that will create presumptions in her mind that you're dissatisfied with something, she correctly pieces it together that she's not making you happy, so she internalizes it as a contract that makes her response one of duty and not authentic. Simply telling her, "Let's try this" does not invoke duty and obligation toward how she should react to what you're suggesting.

setting yourself up for failure.. or an opportunity for her to tell you didn't complete something on the list

How's that any different from any other fitness test, though? Women do this all the time anyway. If anything, you should welcome and invite the opportunity for her to tell you this so you can pass the test and show her that you really are in control and she can rest in the security that your control has to offer.

Let me be more clear: if you forget something on the list, she knows you're responsible for it, not her. She doesn't like that her life condition has decreased because of that forgetfulness, but she does like that it's not her responsibility. When she asks about you forgetting about it, it's a fitness test implying, "I don't believe his frame is big enough to handle everything my frame can handle; let me show him how big my frame is." When you take responsibility you are saying, "If I'm not happy, you're not happy; you don't even know how to make yourself happy, so neither of us can trust the way you want to do things. As a result, we're going to live the life I want to live, not the one you want to live. That might mean you don't get your way all the time, including in that one area where I forgot the thing that should have been on the list. But that's okay because it's my job to figure it out, not yours. If I need help with it, I'll let you know and tell you how to help." As this short-term exercise expires, you re-open the door to letting her help through communication about the list, while not necessarily controlling what goes on the list.

Dealing with the stressed wife.

1 upvotes · 7 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Take note, I said "for 3 days." I do not recommend this strategy as a long-term endeavor. This is more of a primer to reset the gears in the right direction, after which you can coast without micro-managing because the ship has been steered back on course and the wind and waves will take it from there.

The biological step-mother.

1 upvotes · 7 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

But I do delegate and observe

Yes. I addressed this in my "corollary" post titled, "Dealing with the stressed wife." I completely agree: *Do not establish a lifestyle where she does nothing and you do everything.* That will work out poorly for you.

For example, I once had a case where my client was in a deposition being asked about household responsibilities (they had no kids). He kept getting angry and I kept stopping him and trying to move the question along, but he eventually turned to me and said, "No, I want to make this clear on the record." Against my better judgment, I let him speak. He said, "I have done everything around here. I have produced all of the income, done all the house work, taken care of the yard, etc., etc. She sat on her butt for the last 30 years doing nothing but spending my money." The other lawyer smiled and said, "I'm glad you now understand the lifestyle expectation you have given my client, and the courts will be very interested to hear this." We still won that case on different grounds, but I now forewarn my clients the same thing: don't just do everything for her. Delegate. Make her do things, but you take the lead in how you do it.

Also, bear in mind that I did say in my post:

The father/husband must take the following attitude, regardless of whether or not it makes legal sense to do so

and

As a matter of fact, these assertions would not stand up in court if you were to get divorced

The point is that this mentality is what is required to restore the marriage and maximize your odds; not to ninjabodge state statutes.

How does her dependence on you affect other things like child support, alimony, etc.?

Most of my clients say that custody and parenting time are the most important aspects of the case and that everything else is peripheral. So, I do emphasize the custody component.

That said, deferring to my other post, I do agree that delegating is essential. When a step-mother moves in she doesn't just lounge in luxury; she integrates. The difference between this and the biological mother mentality is that biological mothers assume co-equality and co-ownership of everything, whereas step-mothers presume it's all his and she's joining in on his system.

Incidentally, if a biological mother does develop this attitude toward her husband, if they are ignorant of the law (as 95% of women are), they may naturally assume that their rights in divorce aren't as strong as they actually are. If she's attracted enough to her husband because he has his act together, she may never get around to researching divorce in the first place, so she never wises up.

Girls reading reddit, what is your impression on our experiences and what we go through

1 upvotes · 6 July 2017 · /r/seduction

This sounds a lot like the tingles and the fuzzies. If I recall from MRP, Cholomite's Law says: *Tingles without fuzzies don't last; fuzzies without tingles are worthless/no fun.*

Having your crap together and presenting an "I'm strong enough to protect you" (not just physically, but mentally and emotionally as well) mentality develops tingles (sexual attraction).

Being emotionally vulnerable and giving women an opportunity to nurture you or others that you care about (i.e.

your children) gives her the fuzzies (feel-good emotions).

What's your take on that?

Wife goes on a sex journey to 'find herself'. Is shocked when husband leaves her

1 upvotes · 6 July 2017 · /r/TheRedPill

Yeah, it's essentially how a woman rationalizes her behavior so that she can act on her feelings without guilt, shame, etc. I will disagree with /u/Popeman79 slightly in that sometimes the justifications are real and make sense, but they are either taken out of context or given more weight than should otherwise be allocated to them.

For example: "I'm super attracted to Bob and he's been hitting on me. Cheating on my husband is bad, so I shouldn't. But my husband has been cold and distant lately and he gets to do all the stuff he likes doing while I'm stuck at home with the kids, so I deserve something nice. Plus, maybe if I sleep with Bob it will make me feel sexy again, so I will be more into my husband and he'll benefit from it to - it's a win, win."

As you can see, some of these justifications might be true. Her husband might actually be distant. But that's not a good excuse. Feeling sexy again actually will likely make her want to sleep with her husband again (MMSLP talks about this), but that's a horrible reason to cheat on your husband.

Wife goes on a sex journey to 'find herself'. Is shocked when husband leaves her

1 upvotes · 6 July 2017 · /r/TheRedPill

I feel like 90% of TRP is about how men can utilize a combination of biology and the hamster to get what they want. Take the hamster out of our equations and a lot of TRP philosophy goes out the window. So, yes, we do have to deal with their hamster if we're going to maintain control of the situation.

FR – Qualities of a Good Husband

1 upvotes · 5 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

My guess is that advanced material (1) is situation specific, and (2) assumes you're not an idiot when discerning if/when/how to apply it. But I'm still relatively new too.

AMALT?

1 upvotes · 2 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I've heard it refrained here quite a bit: "Men are polygamous, women are hypergamous." So, that's the parallel there.

The change in how people treat you once you get fit/bulky is real, and one of the best things that happened to me. Thanks TRP

1 upvotes · 2 July 2017 · /r/askTRP

BENCH - W/ spotter: 235 4x, 225 8x, then 6x; w/o spotter: 225 12x, 205 12x, then 8-10x

SQUAT - Only tried once @ 315lbs, wasn't bad; I usually use the leg press machine and max it (500lbs) for about 20 reps

DEAD LIFT - Haven't tried, only been working out for a week

PROGRAM - None, just re-hashing what worked well when I was in HS/College when I was ripped. Usually run 1-1.5mi, bench, declined sit-ups, fly, leg press, curls, hamstring machine, shoulder press, quad machine, reverse shoulder press (lats), calves, lawnmower/triceps, back arch machine, bench, declined sit-ups, swim 4-6 laps and cool down in the pool. All items (except run/swim) are 3 sets.

Do you have a recommendation on a program? Obviously my full-body workout (every day for the past 7 days) is

not sustainable long-term ... or should I keep trying it? I find that even with struggling on my last 2-3 reps each set (almost can't finish), I still come home fine and am not sore the next day. I attribute this to the pool, but may be wrong.

quitting videogames, porn and netflix have made me realize how sad and pathetic my life was.

1 upvotes · 2 July 2017 · /r/askTRP

Let me know if you ever figure this out. My brother is in this boat, except without the drugs and he used to have the real thing. He goes in phases staying in decent shape and women naturally love him. He's a total DNGAF type guy.

But he had one really bad relationship that was off and on (about 200 breaks-ups/get-back-togethers) for about 8 years. When it finally ended, it broke him and he's given up on everything except movies, video games, and (I presume) porn.

I try to talk to him about it, but as you say: he's 100% perfectly happy and content with where he's at. He knows that if he puts in literally 1/4 of the effort as most guys on this sub, he could be a stellar success with girls, athletics, enhancing his education, etc. because he's already proved it numerous times. But I can't get him to see the light again.

It's not bringing me down, as he lives over 100 miles away ... but he's still my bro and I love him.

The change in how people treat you once you get fit/bulky is real, and one of the best things that happened to me. Thanks TRP

1 upvotes · 2 July 2017 · /r/askTRP

I've been following this path, but probably shouldn't be. I'm 6'0" weighing 220lbs. My bench is currently at 250 max, 225 for reps. Is it time to cut or do I keep where I'm at until I'm benching 300 again? (haven't since college)

Still learning, help me understand this.

1 upvotes · 1 July 2017 · /r/askMRP

Overt ... 10 years ago, before we married, we discussed it and both agreed to it.

The after/eternally persistent test ... ?

1 upvotes · 1 July 2017 · /r/askMRP

Gotcha ... this is slightly different from what I would have though. Thanks for this. I don't think I'm at risk of going Rambo :)

The after/eternally persistent test ... ?

1 upvotes · 30 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

Very insightful. Thanks! This gives vey good perspective.

What's Rambo? I see that a lot and know the movie by cultural references ... but what does it mean in a RP conversation?

The after/eternally persistent test ... ?

1 upvotes · 30 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

Good points. No insult taken. I do agree that at her core, there is some innate desire to flirt in her. I just think it's been sooooo deeply repressed through extreme religious conditioning throughout her entire upbringing that it's highly unlikely she'll ever act on it, even if I did give her that freedom.

That said, would it be worth explicitly giving her that freedom? For example, telling her plainly, "Hey, why don't you go up there, ask like you're asking the clerk something and smile at the guy sitting at the counter?"

My thought is this. She thinks I find her attractive because I have to by virtue of being married, Bible, etc. In reality, although she's very physically attractive (solid 8.5, probably a 9 due to my tastes), her attitude is totally unattractive and I don't even want sex half the time because it's bad sex. She doesn't feel sexy because my attraction to her is "obligatory." As a result, she never presents a sexy attitude.

I'm thinking that maybe if she can see other guys also find her attractive, she will feel sex, then start acting sexy, then I'll be attracted to her and she's going to want it more because she'll believe once again that my attraction is genuine and not obligatory (and by that point it will be).

Thoughts on this? Also tag: [/u/straius](#)

The after/eternally persistent test ... ?

1 upvotes · 30 June 2017 · [/r/askMRP](#)

Yes, and she will be for an entire year. I assume that makes a difference?

The after/eternally persistent test ... ?

1 upvotes · 30 June 2017 · [/r/askMRP](#)

intimacy building to do to create the necessary safe environment

Yeah, I definitely botched this a couple years ago, and it takes her forever to move on from things. There was one isolated time when she brought whipped cream and strawberries into the bedroom. Beforehand, we hadn't had sex in over a month and I was getting home from a night out with the guys long after she normally goes to sleep. As a result, I had no reason to expect sex and had gorged myself on food before coming home. The thought of more food (even whipped cream and strawberries) made me want to barf. I tried to act excited, but she could see right through it, noticing that I was disgusted. I was too beta to control the situation.

Long story short, we didn't have sex for another 3 months after that. Even after sex resumed and I confronted her about it being vanilla (which I have done periodically) she explained how embarrassed and mortified she was at how disgusted I was the one time she tried to do things differently, thinking it was her that I was disgusted with, not the pukiness from being so stuffed.

Fast-track a couple years later and despite a few efforts by me to try to do some different things (handcuffs, blindfold, etc.), she has been incredibly resistant to anything beyond missionary or cowgirl. For example, she refuses doggy style because: "I'm not an animal." She refuses oral because, "I would never do oral on you and I don't want to feel guilty for you doing something on me that I won't return." Even if I say I want to do it, she's hesitant and the guilt would still come.

Either way, I'll look into that blog. Thanks for the reference :) Not that it's going to stop me from bettering myself, I am extremely doubtful about the prospect of her ever turning from the "good girl" to the "hot slut." At least this doubt affirms to me that I'm doing this for my own purposes and not to get something out of it ... but it would be nice to have something to look forward to also :/

Thinking to end it with LTR for lack of feminine qualities

1 upvotes · 30 June 2017 · [/r/askMRP](#)

Hey, do you have any updates on this? I know this is an old post, but I'm in a similar situation. I don't often find my wife attractive. She is, as you say, a "good girl," and makes no effort at all to seduce me. She is very physically attractive, but like you say ... when you've seen the same body over and over it's more about the

attitude and attire. Even when we do have sex, it's usually me pleasing her and then finishing myself off in 30 seconds when she's done, or it's the same boring positions and routine (NMMNG had a lot to say about this that I'll be implementing down the road; post-c-section we've got a 6-week sex moratorium and are only 1 week in).

Before discovering TRP/MRP, about 4 months ago I started lifting and dieting and am in much better shape. For biblical reasons (I'm a Christian) I already started developing things like OYS and OI during that time-frame. I'm passing tests, but still failing some too. From what you describe, I am now where you were at when you wrote this post. So, I'm curious ... since you're two months ahead of me, where are you at now? Are you seeing progress in her, or did you leave her? Have you seen any signs of the "good girl" gone "slut" transition starting to happen?

The after/eternally persistent test ... ?

1 upvotes · 30 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

That was an incredible post. Thanks!

The after/eternally persistent test ... ?

1 upvotes · 30 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

I've seen this a million times, but have no clue: what is AM?

Because of the "I am" form of the word, this is pretty much impossible to google and the red pill glossaries don't include things like AA/AM.

The after/eternally persistent test ... ?

1 upvotes · 30 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

Wonderful explanation. Thank you for taking the time to write this up.

Common shit test I've been getting.

1 upvotes · 30 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

Let me know if you get an answer to this question. I can foresee my wife doing this. You pass the test, she says, "That's cute ... but no, really ... answer my question."

NMMNG and Divorce

1 upvotes · 29 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

Are those books also in the sidebar or am I going to have to save this post to remember them?

NMMNG and Divorce

1 upvotes · 29 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

That's where my completionist nature kicks in :p I'm also an intellectual in nature, so from what I hear the writing is probably something that will resonate better with me than most.

NMMNG and Divorce

1 upvotes · 29 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

First was NMMNG. I think second is WISNIFG, which I'm starting tonight.

5 Love Languages v./and (?) NMMNG

1 upvotes · 29 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

That makes prefect sense. Reading this and other comments, I have come to this conclusion:

5LL cultivates fuzzies, RP cultivates tingles.

Cholomite's rule takes it from there. My marriage has more than enough fuzzies already.

How do I get a life?

1 upvotes · 29 June 2017 · /r/askTRP

It means that I'm approximately average weight (maybe slightly above) for my height/age, but also have slightly above average strength/muscle mass/stamina (i.e. I can still run long distances, I bench 250, etc.). I do not have a 6-pack or bulging biceps. People would look at me and say, "He's a big guy," but not "He's a fat guy" or "He's a jacked/ripped guy."

With this in mind, asking around on TRP about fitness goals and hearing advice, I'm told that from average it still takes 2 or so years to get in that ripped/jacked state that you need, unless you're hyper-ambitious about your regimen (which I am ... hoping to cut that time down a lot). I've had at least 2 people tell me that directly and I've seen it a couple times said to other people in similar conditions here.

If your body is not in top-notch shape, RP theory can work, but you're in hard-mode. Too skinny or too fat and you've got more barriers to work through when it comes to attracting women and your testosterone levels are too low to maintain the motivation and self-confidence needed to implement the more psychological aspects of self-improvement necessary to make red pill theory work in your life.

As a result, most threads suggest starting with improving your physical shape as the first and most important step, and also because it's the one that takes the longest to see real, raw results. Also, just as a matter of fact ... if a guy doesn't have the self-confidence and internal motivation to get himself in shape, he already lacks the qualities to make himself desirable to women or follow through with a self-improvement MAP because that lack of self-confidence and internal motivation spreads to all other areas of his life. So, the physical fitness regimen is, essentially, a hazing test to weed out people who just want an easy way to psychologically game women from the people who have what it takes to follow through.

That said, I'm still very, VERY new to TRP/MRP, so you might want to ask someone like /u/BluepillProfessor or one of the other veterans who knows their stuff better.

How do I differentiate friendliness with sexual interest with foreign girls?

1 upvotes · 29 June 2017 · /r/askTRP

Are those the kinds of friends who will help him grow or hold him back, though?

5 Love Langues v./and (?) NMMNG

1 upvotes · 28 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

This is insightful. That was my first red pill mind blow a couple days ago: women don't care about men, only about how men make them feel. I think the properly calibrated and mature Christian woman can overcome this at a conscious level, but there will always be a subconscious internal struggle with this core principle.

5 Love Langues v./and (?) NMMNG

1 upvotes · 28 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

This is very interesting and I feel like I only understand half of it :p I might have more questions for you after I take time to ponder.

5 Love Langues v./and (?) NMMNG

1 upvotes · 28 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

Yeah, that's exactly what I'm thinking.

***5 Love Langues* v./and (?) NMMNG**

1 upvotes · 28 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

Thanks! This is actually a helpful comment :)

Do you introduce your wives to TRP/MRP or RPW, and if so: when?

1 upvotes · 28 June 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Sage advice. Thanks!

Still learning, help me understand this.

1 upvotes · 28 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

Vey insightful. Thanks for this. Does one of the books cover fogging specifically? I saw DEERING in NMMNG, but not fogging.

Still learning, help me understand this.

1 upvotes · 28 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

Gotcha. I don't think either of us consciously took it as bragging, but I see how there could be subconscious elements of unattractiveness at work all the same.

Still learning, help me understand this.

1 upvotes · 28 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

This makes a lot of sense. I have a lot to learn! Read NMMNG going in thinking I wasn't a nice guy to begin with ... boy was I wrong. I'll keep going through sidebar.

RP and religion ...?

1 upvotes · 28 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

frame is weak as hell and that you are pretty much obsessed with your wife's approval

I would have argued this point with you a couple days ago ... but after finishing NMMNG, I must agree. My frame is only strong outside my marriage (to be successful as an attorney it has to be). As soon as I get home, I'm into caregiver mode and try to be low maintenance and all that.

Still learning, help me understand this.

1 upvotes · 28 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

Thanks for the input :)

crap-test

Sorry, the verbiage is my own internal word-preference. It has nothing to do with her or you or anything. Getting into it would get all religious and psychological ... suffice it to say I have no problem with other people saying certain words, but I respectfully decline myself.

Why did you tell her?

I should have explained: I didn't tell her to try to create dread; it's because we have an explicit, verbalized agreement to tell each other when these types of things happen in order to foster loyalty and trust.

Probably fogging in some way

So, any time she disagrees with me, rather than standing my ground I should just agree with her and submit to what she tells me to do? My understanding of fogging is that this is a tactic not intended for all arguments, but only those in which accepting her statements, frustrations, etc. would already fit within my degree of acceptance anyway. Otherwise, what's the difference between fogging and just being a pushover?

Still learning, help me understand this.

1 upvotes · 28 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

Thanks for the heads up. 2 days in and already finished NMMNG. I'll start with MMSLP soon, as that's the other one I see recommended to me a lot.

RP and religion ...?

1 upvotes · 27 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

Good thoughts. Thanks!

RP and religion ...?

1 upvotes · 27 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

Interesting. Do you think the cultural norm reversal of being a SAHD has impacted the sexual interest reversal? I'd love to be a SAHD, and my wife's income could support it, but she also wants to be SAH and her job lends itself to that better (I have more day to day flexibility, she has season to season flexibility), so I'm likely always going to be full time.

RP and religion ...?

1 upvotes · 27 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

Looking more closely, is the "post on dread" the 60 day challenge? That's the only one I'm really seeing. The other thing on the sidebar that mentions dread is a blog that just recommends a ton of books that are already in the recommended reading. Is there something else I'm to be looking for?

As for the challenge, I think I've got some of it covered already:

FITNESS - I already mentioned I'm still working on this one

DIET - I just finished the Whole 30 a couple weeks ago and am maintaining core principles. Diet is well under control.

Hygiene - I started addressing this a few months back. I used to have my wife cut my hair, but started going to a genuine barber; upgraded from generic brand to Old Spice shampoo and deodorant (I actually picked these out with my wife as the ones she liked); I've started shaving more regularly (I grow slowly, so it's easy to forget and let it go too far); I started using cologne.

STYLE - After fitness, this is probably where I need the most work. I'm in the "comfy clothes" phase still, except when I'm at work, when it's all suits every day. I did, however, start intentionally keeping the suit on until my wife was home and could see me in it (not in an obvious way, of course), rather than changing immediately when I got back. I suppose instead of gym shorts for the rest of the evening I should be putting on actual clothes :p

GAME - This is one I'll have to process some. I haven't intentionally made any efforts outside our marriage, but there have been a handful of times where I'll catch myself unintentionally chatting someone up just to feel good about the fact that I can still make someone smile. I used to be real good at game, but gave it up long ago, so I'm not sure how this fits in a marriage context. "Game your wife" seems like something you'd suggest to happen much later.

FINANCES - Immaculate. No debt (except our mortgage), great retirement, good buffer in the bank, and still freedom to live the lifestyle we want.

CAREER - Couldn't be better. I'm the senior attorney at my law firm and the boss is 82 or so; the expectation is that I'll take over the firm within the next few years (possibly co-own with another attorney, depending on the logistics).

SOCIAL AND HOBBIES - I already have a strong network of guy friends. I've typically tried to include my wife in that network vis a vis their wives or just directly, but she's very introverted, so she often complains about how I have all kinds of friends and she has no real relationships. Pushing too hard on this area beyond where I'm already it would probably come off as rubbing it in her face. To help, I've shifted to some more alone-hobbies, like novel-writing, going to the gym, racquetball, swimming with the kids, running/biking, going on walks with the kids, etc. Having 4 kids (including a newborn) pretty much means I have to pick hobbies that can be done when they're in bed or I take them with me; I have always refused to use my wife as a babysitter - I just always assume I'm responsible for the kids.

Any thoughts, comments, or suggestions? Areas where you think I'm deluding myself?

RP and religion ...?

1 upvotes · 27 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

Thanks :) This adequately addressed everything I was processing.

RP and religion ...?

1 upvotes · 27 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

Do you lift? Are you fat?

For the first 3 years of our marriage, yes I lifted and no I was not fat. Here's a quick snapshot. There have been ups and downs, but the overall trend looks something like this.

- At the time we married I was 6'0", 180lbs, doing triathalons and benching close to 300lbs.
- When we started having kids (3 years into marriage) I gradually declined until about a year ago when I hit my worst: 275lbs, struggling to run 5Ks and not lifting at all.
- Today, I'm back in marathon shape (not quite triathalon), weighing 220 and benching 250. I don't have a 6-pack or bulging veins and haven't had that since high school. I'm still working on rebuilding.

Why does everyone need to be reminded at all times about your love for God?

Sorry, that was kind of the context for this thread, and it also frames the context of my entire life, so I didn't think it would be off-putting. I'm happy to tone it down :) If you were referencing my conversation with my wife specifically, to that end you have to remember that I'm giving snapshots of conversations that might happen once every couple years, so it's not like I'm always feeding her this line. Part of my beta-ness was the fact that I really was not leading in a spiritual way (I gave up because she wasn't responding to my efforts to lead and specifically told me to stop trying to lead her at one point). Since then, spiritual conversation only comes up between us when we're in groups with other people who want to talk about it as well (b/c she won't shut them down if that's what they want to talk about), which also contributes to a huge disconnect: that despite having a common faith, we aren't "one" in how we live it out or communicate it. I clearly see that the responsibility for this is on my shoulders, not hers.

If you wife decidede to slut it up with you, you would probably judge her.

Not in the slightest. Biblically, I don't see many boundaries between what husbands and wives are allowed to do together. The only real boundary I have is causing harm (spanking is fine, doing actual damage to her body is not). I've tried introducing kinky-ish things in small ways here and there to gradually show her that I'm okay with it, but ropes to the bedpost is about the farthest she's ever been willing to go, and that probably only happened once or twice. Beta me respected her boundaries with a smile, while internally resenting her for it until I just said "screw it" and stopped caring anymore.

Oneitis is the idea that your wife is the only one for you

Yeah, I get what you're saying now. I don't believe in the concept of "soul mates," and fully accept the fact that there are countless other women out in the world with whom I could have a happier marriage. That said, having a happy marriage isn't my primary goal in life, and preserving the marriage I have is a significant factor in maintaining and pursuing the other things that really matter to me. So, for the sake of achieving higher priorities, making the most of my current marriage is what makes the most sense, even independent of any spiritual beliefs about divorce. But the spiritual beliefs certainly give her a reassurance that my independent priorities would not, as those priorities could change whereas she knows I won't give up on my faith, letting her abuse my oneitis for her own purposes. Interestingly enough, though, even though it doesn't come up often she has occasionally brought up the fact that one of her biggest fears is that I'll divorce her because my dad divorced my mom (my life very closely paralleled my dad's until about 5 years ago, when we finally diverged, the most significant parallel being that my dad was a pastor, yet that didn't stop him from divorce after he'd been out of the ministry for a couple decades).

RP and religion ...?

1 upvotes · 27 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

Disagreements aside, tell me more about this:

I do not particularly enjoy it because I am not attracted to her. Incidentally, that is how I found red pill theory.

My wife is very physically attractive, but I'm otherwise in a similar boat. Even when we do have sex, I really don't care for it. For a while I attributed it to boring repetition of the same 2 positions and the fact that her hands never move the entire time (doesn't grab her boobs, play with herself to help things along, won't touch me or move me to where she wants me to touch her ... literally, her hands are at her sides or under her head the entire time).

At some point I realized that despite her looks, even if I ignore her lack of skill in the bedroom, I'm not attracted to her personality anymore. For the first few years she was one person, then kids came and she became totally different. I've talked to her about this a handful of times, but the conversation doesn't go anywhere and my friend's old mantra usually pops in my head: *"Women marry men hoping to change them; men marry women hoping they always stay the same ... in the end, both are always disappointed."*

Doing divorce law, this is a reality I've seen proven over and over and over again. It puts men at a huge disadvantage because if you marry a woman for her personality and/or character, you have no guarantee that she'll still be like that in 5-10 years (when most people get divorced). If you marry her for her looks and sex appeal, you have a guarantee that this will fade with time.

I suppose that's where red pill theory comes in: just pick someone and "be awesome" regardless of whether or not you really like her 10 years down the line; find something else to center your life around. But even that seems to go against the grain of the notion that (as I have seen said here several times) MRP is, at its core, a strategy for sex.

Anyway, I'd love to hear more of your story and how red pill theory fits in :)

RP and religion ...?

1 upvotes · 27 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

She is at many times like a child, treat her as such

This mentality helps. I think it gives a lot of perspective on how to deal with tests and general garbage that comes my way - and it's true: I can deal with my kids screaming at me without ruining my day, so I should be able to do it with her too. Thanks :)

That said, I'm pretty sure the covert contracts and OI stuff are things I've already got down pat. I have a lot of work to do in other areas, but the more I read about those things, the more I'm feeling confident in where I stand on them. Maintaining frame has always been a natural part of my character.

The "no begging or guilt tripping" thing confuses me a little. I have also refused to resort to those things. Beta me had that idea that the "perfect guy" was the one who would respect her boundaries and be happy about it. Everything I'm hearing here is to push those boundaries. So, I think I've already been doing the "no begging or guilt tripping" thing, but probably from the wrong place.

RP and religion ...?

1 upvotes · 27 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

This is good. Thanks!

RP and religion ...?

1 upvotes · 27 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

Well said. Thanks!

RP and religion ...?

1 upvotes · 27 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

2/2

Being satisfied with our earthly life is not exactly a recipe for spiritual progress.

Agreed. That said, as noted above, I do believe God gave us earthly things to find satisfaction in as a model for how we should find satisfaction in Him as well. 1 John 4:20 puts it incredibly well: "Whoever does not love their brother, whom they have seen, cannot love God, whom they have not seen." In essence, the physical/tangible things are the road map to how we can understand the spiritual things. Once we're at the destination, the road is no longer binding on us - its purpose has been served. But very few people can find what God has in store for them if they don't have some tangible example to look at first. After all, isn't that why Jesus spoke in down-to-earth parables rather than theological babble?

And this once again commingles nicely with MRP mentality: let's learn to master what God has given us first (Genesis 1:28 again, "fill the earth and subdue it, and have dominion ... over every living thing") so that we can understand the spiritual concepts those things were meant to parallel in our relationship with God. Genesis 1:28 is probably the most Red-Pill verse in the whole Bible for that reason alone, and that verse sets the context for every single thing the rest of the Bible is about thereafter: multiplication, discipleship.

So, when I say my passion isn't anything to do with my own life, it's simply this: to make disciples - helping others to find Christ and walk with him, experiencing what I have. This is the satisfaction I found in God that

allowed me to give up porn and stop worrying about why my wife wouldn't sleep with me. Sex with my wife was merely the road, whereas spiritual reproduction with God was the destination. Once I'm at the destination and living in the place he prepared for me there, I no longer depend on the road or need it. That doesn't mean everyone should give up on sex; rather, it means that no one should have to rely on sex for their satisfaction once they have developed a lifestyle of disciple-making. In my mind, this is where I have become most OI in my marriage. Interestingly enough, in relationship with God he pretty much commands us to be OI there too (1 Corinthians 3:6-7 essentially says, "Don't worry about the outcome; that's my responsibility. You just be who I created you to be (Christ-like) and live that out (i.e. making disciples like Jesus did) and I'll take care of the rest." As you already cited, "Seek first His Kingdom and His righteousness and all these things will be added to you as well" (Matthew 6:33) - pretty OI to me :)

But it pales in comparison to what the Lord gives us through Christ by faith

Indeed ... just as a shadow pales in comparison to the intricacy and innate beauty of the thing casting it (Colossians and Hebrews again). This also reminds me of Psalm 37:4, "Delight yourself in the Lord and He will give you the desires of your heart." At first glance, this sounds great - "Yay! All those things I've been desiring will be mine!" But the passage could be re-written easily to say this, "Make me your greatest desire and I'll give myself to you!" Now that's a beautiful thing.

Tag: [/u/cloud_of_unknowing](#) [/u/justpickanyusername](#)

RP and religion ...?

1 upvotes · 27 June 2017 · [/r/askMRP](#)

1/2

This is easily the best comment I've seen here so far. Thank you for this :) Love all the references and biblical grounding too! I'll try to give this the reply it deserves. Sorry if it's long :/

"Christianity" has been thoroughly feminized

I've been preaching this for years. In short, no matter what era or culture, women are more prone toward Christianity. The fact that we are the "bride of Christ" assures this - that's something they already are or want to be, so it comes naturally to them. Functioning in a relationship with God that way isn't natural for a man. As a result, the western church started playing to its strengths. It's very interesting that we don't see this same attitude in most of church history until suffrage movements started creeping up. I did a long study on that at one point and it was very eye-opening how church positions on gender roles and women's rights developed and at what was going on in history with each phase.

To some degree, this epitomizes MRP theory: wives want to submit, and if they don't respect their husbands, they just might go looking to someone else. When the church (the bride of Christ) lost respect for God, it looked to culture to screw it instead (not to be bizarrely graphic, but the entendre and implication both work).

Our sexual gratification, believe it or not, is not a high priority to the Lord. He is much more concerned with our faith and walk with him ... For the natural man, the flesh, sex is the peak of human experience.

Here's the biggest "MIND BLOWN" thing I've found in the last few years, which might tie a few things together for you, biblically, that jives quite well with this whole red pill thing. Discipleship is my greatest passion. God gave us the mission to "make disciples of all nations." He didn't "invite people from all nations to church" or "get people from all nations to say 'the prayer.'" He said, "Make disciples." This meant something very specific to him, and most of his last-supper speech (John 13-17) is devoted to this concept: "What I have done for them, now send them to do that for others." This has been my life-blood since the day I was saved.

Stepping aside for a moment, it's important to note that virtually everything God does in a physical/tangible way on earth is meant to parallel a deeper spiritual truth that only makes sense when someone understands the Gospel. There's a long-winded proof/explanation of this concept, which I'm happy to share, but for now I'll just assume you don't disagree. Marriage is no exception. In fact, this is one of the ones explicitly stated. We have the entire book of Hosea that exists to prove that physical marriage is meant to parallel our spiritual relationship with God, not to mention Ephesians 5, ever reference to us as "the bride of Christ" or Jesus as the "bridegroom" or God calling himself our "husband" (ex. Isaiah 54:5 - "For your Maker is your husband - the Lord Almighty is his name"). Looking into this, we also see that it extends to the familial structure as well. The apostles are constantly calling their disciples their "children." Paul even directly says a few times that he is their father.

At one point I was looking into the whole point of marriage. "It's not good for man to be alone" was not satisfying. God created man, including all of his needs. He could have said "it is good" as to his loneliness, just as he did with everything else. Why did he imbue this need for a spouse in him? The answer is right after he creates woman (Genesis 1:27 - "male and female he created them"), "Be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth" (1:28). That was God's purpose. But then you get to Genesis 6 and you see that they were fulfilling this command. They were filling the earth and multiplying, but God wipes everyone away and says, "That's not what I meant."

So, what did he mean? We get the answer in Malachi 2:15 - "And why did the Lord God make them one, with a portion of His Spirit in their union?" In essence, "Why did God want man and woman together?" It continues: "To produce godly offspring." Pre-Noah, the offspring were not godly, they were just warm bodies. God wanted *godly* offspring.

Now, because of the Gospel, we know that the physical things were only shadows of the truer heavenly things (Colossians 2:17 - "These are a shadow of the things that were to come"; see also Hebrews chapters 8-10 calling earthly things "a copy and shadow"). So, if the whole point of marriage is to produce godly offspring, that explains why God made sex so wonderful. As you say, "For the natural man, the flesh, sex is the peak of human experience." God wanted it to be that way. Why? Because just as physical oneness produces physical children, spiritual oneness produces spiritual children. Jesus even literally called it being "born again" (John 3). Producing those children is the whole reason God created marriage in the first place, and because of the Gospel we now understand that God didn't care for physical children alone: he wanted spiritual descendants (see Romans 9:8).

Spiritual descendants come from spiritual oneness - what Jesus talked about in John 17:21 when he said, "That all of them may be one, Father, just as you are in me and I am in you. May they also be in us." That's the reference to the spiritual oneness, but read the next line to see the product of this: "So that the world may believe that you have sent me." New believers. Spiritual babies who have been "born again."

To be clear, physical sex is the epitome of physical existence because God wanted spiritual oneness through evangelism to be the epitome of spiritual existence. And after someone has been "born again," they must be raised. Just as sex is the epitome of ecstasy in a marriage, those with kids typically agree that raising their children is the epitome of joy in a marriage (which is distinct from ecstasy). Not surprisingly, then, we see 3 John 4 saying, "I have no greater joy than to hear that my children are walking in the truth." In essence, his greatest joy was found in the way he raised his kids, just as I expect his greatest ecstasy from his relationship with God was found in the evangelism process that gave birth to those spiritual children.

So, although "our sexual gratification ... is not a high priority to the Lord," he had a very specific and clear reason for making it a high priority to us: to pave the way for an intense desire for evangelism and discipleship.

But look at what's happened to the western church! In many places overseas people are being converted left and right. But in the westernized church, where we have feminized Christianity to the nth degree, we're acting like all these low-libido women who would rather avoid sex. Sexless marriages and the stifling of sexual drive within the church has not led people away from sexual sin: it has only led them to repress or hide it (making true repentance insanely difficult), which also has the counter-impact of making them not want spiritual oneness with God through evangelism either, and thus Christianity is on the decline in America (among other factors, of course).

Sorry if that was long, but it's truly fascinating to me to see the bold connection in Scripture between things like marriage, sex, evangelism, discipleship, raising children, etc. Tons more to say on that, but I've already gone on too much :p

RP and religion ...?

1 upvotes · 27 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

This comment was very helpful. Thank you!

it is not her fault, it is your fault the relationship is like this

Totally agreed, and I have maintained this position for a long time. That said, beta me had given up on the relationship in the first time, just looking to enjoy the little things rather than actually making something of our marriage. So, in a way, I knew I was to blame, but I didn't care because I had become content with the low relational bar and the non-existent sex bar.

ease into everything slowly

This is going to be hard. I tend to be an all-or-nothing guy. For the last several years, it's been pretty much "nothing" in the marriage and sex departments. Now I've got some revitalized interest in taking charge and developing an attractive frame. My temptation will be to change everything overnight, implementing every new tactic the very next day after reading about it. Even as a cross country/marathon runner, I never quite learned to pace myself ... I sprint until I start to run dry, take a short breather, then sprint again.

you have never **led her** in the bedroom properly

This is true. I've always put her sexual satisfaction above my own, catering to her desires and not mine. She has said repeatedly that she appreciates that about me - that I won't finish until she does first, which she consciously thinks of as that one-in-a-million-kind-a-guy thing. But subconsciously, I feel like it was the ultimate beta bomb in her psyche, affecting how she views me.

Get ripped ... not I look better than I ever have. Or, I look pretty good for my age. Meaning I am just as ripped as any 20 something college athlete ripped.

This is probably the most helpful line I've seen on this thread. To some degree, I had "marriage weight" in my head as the goal. When we were married, I was 6'0", 180lbs, running triathalons, and benching close to 300lbs. Today, I'm the same height, but 220lbs (after losing the 35lbs I mentioned in my original post), still able to run a marathon (with much lower times), and benching about 250. But even at marriage weight and strength, I wasn't ripped the way you describe. I had abs that showed, but not quite a 6-pack, and I typically hid my physique under baggy clothes (hence what I believe to be the reason for much of the "men's fashion" advice around here).

Start passing s*** and comfort tests and your attractiveness will increase

So, I mostly read about these tests on TRP, but haven't gotten to much content about them here other than people saying, "I'm passing these" or "I'm failing these." What do these look like in a marriage context? Is it simply how you handle conflict/disagreements? Or is there more to it than that? How do you know when it's active v. passive? What's the difference between s*** and comfort in a marriage context? After 9 years of marriage, are these really "tests" or just patterns that have developed because she's already figured out beta-me's boundaries?

You have probably never pushed past any of her boundaries. You have always stopped at any resistance like a good beta nice guy.

This sums it up fairly closely. When she verbalized a boundary, instead of insisting, I would get angry. It's a pretty childish way of letting her know I didn't like her boundary ... but hey, I've been pretty naive about what a healthy sex life looks like for a good chunk of my life :p

Don't push any boundaries until you have reached this point or it will backfire

Sage advice there. That said, how clear is the line between, "That's easy - I'm already used to not pushing boundaries because I've been a pansy beta in the bedroom for so long" and "I'm an alpha now, but I'm tactfully withholding"?

Dread level 5

How does this whole dread level thing work? I saw it briefly on the sidebar, but haven't gotten there yet. Is that a place to start, or should I stick to the books before getting there?

about 5 months until you start this

That's about the time-frame I had in my head anyway.

RP and religion ...?

1 upvotes · 27 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

none of this has anything to do with what actually matters here, which is improving yourself

Indeed. That single purpose is what got me started down this path months before even discovering this sub :) I'm still curious, though, if MRP thinks I should maintain my intentionally stifled libido leading to my "screw sex, I don't need it" attitude, or if giving up hope is really, in effect, giving her more power and authority over me, submitting to her frame of sexlessness rather than the frame I originally tried to maintain of desiring a healthy sex life.

RP and religion ...?

1 upvotes · 27 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

I doubt that she has ever found you attractive ... gives her tingles

When we were dating, I did this. At some point she started feeling dirty for being aroused before marriage, which led to her withdrawing from situations where we could get physically close. I started to back off from the relationship as a result. She recoiled and promised that when we were married she would feel open and free, jumping all over me. Things got better for a while, but when we married she never followed through. Not sure if that changes anything, except to say that I do believe she found me attractive when I was an alpha before. I just let a few bumps and bruises along the way lead me down the beta path for so long that her former attraction fell into oblivion.

In other words your house/ yard is a pigsty and you do not do the manly things that a wife expects done.

I can see how you got that impression, leading me to make an edit on my post. My point wasn't that I'm not doing these things. It's that I don't care to and it's become something I dread rather than something I enjoy because I don't see how it connects to my passions and purpose. Of course, again, that's my problem, not hers.

focus on lifting and diet

Still working on this. I'm in pretty good shape now, but someone else here helpfully noted, "wedding weight isn't enough. You need to be like a ripped high school jock." I'm not there yet. I'm 6'0", 220lbs, can run a marathon and bench 250 ... but my physique is not "ripped" and I do still have a little padding on me.

there is no fixing your sex life ... You have never had a good sex life with her

Accepting the second part as true, if I'm correct about her being attracted to me at one point, does that change the hope for the future? Or is your line about her being "very low libido naturally" (if that's true) something that would override most everything else?

I do agree that the need to "erase all that history from her brain" is going to be the hardest part. But isn't the whole point of MRP to do exactly that? To give hope to guys who have struggled with this issue in their marriages?

any happy sexual future probably does not include your wife

That is a reality I accepted a few years ago and decided to move on with my life, content without a healthy sex-life. Discovering TRP/MRP last night started to make me reconsider my position on this. Am I correct in understanding that you're essentially saying, "Forget about us. If you won't divorce, you're a lost cause and we can't help you"?

Tag: [/u/ParadoxThatDrivesUs](#)

RP and religion ...?

1 upvotes · 27 June 2017 · [/r/askMRP](#)

You were never Alpha

I respectfully disagree. But I'll take your post in this context nonetheless.

Organized religion is a tool for control.

I actually agree with you. That doesn't diminish the truth it has to offer or the value it brings. Faith and grace, on the other hand, are the exact opposite. They remove control by granting freedoms that didn't exist in the era of the law (or as Christians call it: the old covenant). Unfortunately, most modern western church leaders would prefer to be behavioral psychologists than actual pastors (the way the Bible defines the role), so they're more interested in conforming behavior patterns than developing hearts and relationships. To put it more clearly: God doesn't want people to act nice and avoid bad things; he wants nice people who have no desire to do bad things. One is actions based, another is character based. Most churches confuse actions and character. They'll use the word "character," but (to quote Inigo Montoya, *Princess Bride*): "I do not think it means what you think it means."

use it to your advantage ... persuade (trap) her into having sex with you

Yeah, I'm not interested in that.

"follows the bible ... good christian ... heaven"

Agreed, but on different grounds. This is back to that behavior conformity garbage that many pastors focus on. Behavior matters, but (to quote my discipler): "We are human beings, not human doings. Stop trying to define yourself by what you do; figure out who you are, then live it out." In other words, obeying all the rules cannot possibly make someone a "better Christian." But being a Christian does provoke an internal desire to live a

certain way. Getting this process mixed up is one of the most serious problems in the church.

Rules are for Betas, exceptions are for Alphas

And that's probably a better way of summing up what I've been saying :p (using RP terminology, of course).

NO COVERT CONTRACTS

If you can, can you explain this covert contracts idea a bit more? Basic logic and context leads me to conclude that they're subconscious codes that we live by, assuming that we can expect a certain *quid pro quo* when we meet the code or sets of expectations others might have on us or that we put on ourselves. But how, exactly, does that fit into RP mentality? Is it simply that it's inconsistent with being OI and OI is necessary in order to reach a state of being that will attract her? Or is there more to it than that?

Questions aside, I obviously agree with the concept and have been implementing at least my understanding of this concept for a long time as something I believe the Bible teaches as well. But, maybe you saw something in my post that implied I'm a little blinded to my own covert contracts? If you could angle that mirror for me to catch the blind spot, that would be very helpful :)

It's also worth noting, if it makes a difference, that she is fully aware that my position will be "accept the no," which is exactly what I've done. I don't let it get to me anymore ... I just brought it up as an example, not something I'm worried about changing.

All that said, thanks for the input :) This has been helpful.

RP and religion ...?

1 upvotes · 27 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

you don't need reasons for divorce anymore

Sorry, I meant biblical grounds. Legal grounds are a joke. As to my wife's hamster, she is a legalist through and through with every fiber of her being. This means that she will sacrifice every ounce of her own happiness for the sake of "not sinning." Interestingly enough, this attitude itself is pretty darn sinful and not what Jesus called us to. Jesus came to free us from the law, not to make us slaves to it again. But my point is: even though I accept the possibility that she may leave me one day, I see it as about as likely as me winning the lotto ... particularly in light of the fact that I don't buy lotto tickets. Is it possible? Yes. But even less likely than it is for the average lotto player, which is already absurdly unlikely as it is.

You coming to peace with the possibility that you might not be married for life, and that you can have a pretty good life without your wife.

Yes, I get that and am already on board ... have been for a number of years. There have been a handful of times when she has asked me, "How would you feel if I died?" My response is typically, "I would be sad, but not devastated. I find my satisfaction in God, not you. You're here because I like you and want you around." This is truth for me in my inner-most being.

That said, explain to me more about this "oneitis" thing ...? I've read it a few times on this and related subs, but haven't fully gotten what the MRP stance is on it.

I'm quite glad to hear from a christian RP noob who is cogent and can think for himself. It's fairly rare.

Yeah, I try to train the guys I teach to avoid being blind followers. Acts 17:11 commends the Bereans for being "more noble than the Thessalonians" because instead of just taking Paul's word for it when he taught things, they

actually looked it up and tested his words against the Scripture to see if what he said was true. We should all be striving to be more like the Bereans ... otherwise, why would Luke commend them as being "more noble" if we weren't supposed to follow in their footsteps?

confirmation bias

Agreed and understood. In the many years I've spent developing my study/interpretation skills, hermeneutics, etc. this is one of the things I've worked at the most.

My discipler once suggested when we were studying a passage together, "How would your mom interpret this verse?" It caught me off guard. The he asked, "What about the president? How would he react to this? Or what about an atheist or buddhist or hindu? How would your best friend interpret this?" I scratched my head and realized I couldn't answer all these questions. He concluded, "Until you can visualize something from other perspectives beyond your own, you'll never fully understand it. That's the core premise behind meditating on Scripture." I now practice this regularly when I study the Bible, and have taken it a few levels forward since then as well.

RP and religion ...?

1 upvotes · 27 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

if you see the dishes need to be cleaned, you do them. Why? Because they are dirty and you want a clean house.

That's probably where my biggest disconnect is. If the sink is loaded, sure, I'll want it cleaned. If there are a few dishes, I don't care to clean it more than it is ... but I still do it just because it's there and it needs to be done, not because it makes my house cleaner. I think it has more to do with making progress, even in the little things that don't matter - knocking them out before they do matter, even if I don't get the same gratification from it as if I had waited until it was a full sink and can actually see significant progress at the end.

game your wife ... "i dont need you. But i want you."

I've had this conversation many times :) In fact, there have been a handful of times when she has asked me, "How would you feel if I died?" My response is typically, "I would be sad, but not devastated. I find my satisfaction in God, not you. You're here because I like you and want you around." It's never translated to sex, though ... and that logic really came from beta me trying to be all sweet and thoughtful without sacrificing honesty. Needless to say, beta me was too internally screwed up to have the guts to pull her into the bedroom.

RP and religion ...?

1 upvotes · 26 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

Agreed.

RP and religion ...?

1 upvotes · 26 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

My alpha days were when we were dating and probably the first year of our marriage. I wasn't implying that I've been alpha the whole time, by any means ... betaness just developed over time. You may or may not believe me (doesn't really matter), but I'm content in what I believe to be an objective perception of how I interacted with the world and my wife back then. In her terms, that's what made her want to marry me, but it never did much for our sex life.

I didn't say I was concerned about getting BJs or going down on her. I was merely curious how this community

would interpret things I've been through. I'm new to TRP/MRP, so I'm still absorbing things from an intellectual standpoint before I can start personalizing it. My analytical mental framework has that innate drive to want to understand where a thing begins and ends before I start walking its line.

I do feel like I have a strong understanding of my life's purpose and I'm committed to it. That is one of the things I have never wavered on during the course of our marriage. That said, I totally agree that I "don't know what MRP is," and that's the primary purpose of my post: to figure out what the heck this is all about and how MRP principles would apply in different scenarios. Understanding it as a sex strategy frame-work really helps (none of the other posts I read put it so bluntly). Is that the end-goal of MRP, or is there something more to it? I see a lot of "becoming the best you you can be!" slogans paraded through the comments sections, but that just seems cheesy and lame when it's put that way.

Soon-To-Be-Ex-Wife blows up constantly. Do I handle this right for the moment?

1 upvotes · 26 June 2017 · /r/askMRP

You say you don't want to re-commit to her, but I'm sensing ambiguity based on the character of your relationship and my experience as a divorce attorney tells me you could end up back together (I've seen it happen several times - even facilitated it, including after a 2-year long case that went right up to trial).

So, if you do want to get back together, here's something I just wrote up for the other guy who has problems with an explosive wife:

https://www.reddit.com/r/askMRP/comments/6jbhmn/wife_threatened_to_take_the_kids_from_me_over_a/djelguf/

I always err on the side of trying to preserve marriages, but from your description it sounds like she has borderline personality disorder (although I'm not yet licensed to diagnose, our firm specializes in divorce cases involving psychological issues) and you might have a touch of narcissism, which is always a devastating combo and can make relationships very difficult. So, I don't blame you for wanting out. But I would do some research on borderlines so you know (1) how to interact with her as the mother of your child, and (2) how to avoid these types of women in the future, or otherwise engage with them in a meaningful way.

My Daughters Rules for Dating My Daughter.

0 upvotes · 10 April 2021 · /r/RPChristians

My theory would be that it would breed resentment if she were forced into it

Do you believe that's the case because you come from a society that encourage people to choose their own spouses for any reason they feel like, and therefore shifting them to an arranged-marriage structure would be offensive to your values?

Or are you looking at this from the viewpoint of a society where that is all people have ever known, and the idea of choosing your own spouse would seem not only foreign, but even offensive and illogical?

So it's not really about having dad there, per-se, as much as not leaving any room for impropriety.

That makes more sense. Though now we're back to standard courtship culture: only group environments all the time, never alone (among other things). There's wisdom there. We just have to remember in this that we're not pulling these views from Scripture, but from our own efforts to be wise. As long as people recognize this, then you have freedom to lead your house as you do :)

Backwards sexual dynamic?

0 upvotes · 16 February 2021 · /r/RPChristians

Spiritual reproduction = causing people to be "born again," as Jesus puts it, and then raising up your spiritual children. More commonly: evangelism and discipleship.

Post is up: https://www.reddit.com/r/RPChristians/comments/lld7is/why_god_doesnt_love_you/

Is there a subreddit to post Christian Discord Servers?

0 upvotes · 7 February 2021 · /r/RPChristians

You mean is there a subreddit that will let you advertise your server for free to all of their user base so you don't have to put in the work to build it yourself? Good luck.

Anyone else frustrated with their church leadership re: COVID?

0 upvotes · 30 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I don't disagree. But what of those ~~pastors~~ congregation leaders who make the personal decision that they wouldn't go? This approach basically forces all ~~pastors~~ congregation leaders to align their own preference with those who want to attend services in order to give them that opportunity.

The reality is that some places will open sooner than others. If someone whose congregation is closed wants to attend a service, they're welcome to go somewhere else that's actually open. This will, in the long-term, preference places that open sooner and cause a lot of member-shifting if the more scared ones stay closed.

That said, I prefer congregations to stay closed as long as humanly possible - not out of fear of corona, but because the prospect of re-opening is what's keeping most of churchianity from reflecting on necessary modifications to the structure and mission of the church during this time.

Actual conversations with "abuse" victims.

0 upvotes · 14 June 2020 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Nah. Your every comment only proves the exact point of my post more and more. You're claiming you're the victim of "sexual coercion" yet simultaneously saying that you have sex over 7 times a week, on average, and that you initiate 60% of the time. Realistically, do you believe your husband deserves to be punished by the legal system in this situation? That's just laughable. Or perhaps you missed that I'm a divorce attorney and all of the examples I gave were specifically in the context of women asking the legal system to make their husbands pay for their "abusive behaviors."

But I also don't expect you to understand the way your own comments have been proving my point. You are entertaining this conversation from an emotional standpoint rather than rational thought. I'd never dream of telling you to calm down because (1) I doubt it would have the intended effect, (2) I don't think you'd be capable in this conversation, even if you wanted, and (3) that would take the fun out of it.

What is the Christian right's future in American politics?

0 upvotes · 20 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

What you're describing is called, by some, "missional communities" (a term that's expanded to mean other things too, as of late). The goal here, of course, shouldn't be to create political change because Jesus never intended the church to be a political kingdom on earth. That's what made Catholicism go so cockeyed. They tried to become a political force and lost track of the spiritual nature of God's Kingdom. Do you really want to repeat their mistake?

Let human governments do what they will. We keep focusing on discipleship.

That doesn't mean we can't exercise our political influence in a godly manner. By all means, do that! For most, our only political influence is the right to vote. For others, like myself, it includes influencing those who hold

office. For still others, it means actually running for office and enacting change. But under biblical terms, it NEVER means revolution against the prevailing authorities, which would be a direct violation of Romans 13. If we were to disrespect our ungodly political authorities, being in the submissive position beneath them, it would, by parallel, set a precedent that wives, being in submission, should revolt against ungodly husbands. None of this is modeled by Jesus and the apostles in their interactions with a politically oppressive government.

Response to RPChristians from a Hindu

0 upvotes · 26 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Biblically, it's hard to make a case for polygamy as a black-and-white sin. Really, as I understand Romans 14, really nothing can be called a black-and-white sin at all. Rather, sin is based on an assessment of one's own heart toward the situation, as well as the prompting of one's faith (which flows from Scripture) toward the behavior.

Back on track: there are numerous godly men who were polygamous and never condemned for it or experienced the disastrous consequences that the anti-polygamists claim are "always" associated with polygamy in Scripture. What I see is quite the reverse - that God often even redeems polygamous relationships. Two easy examples:

- Jacob w/ Rachel/Leah/their servants. God used these multiple sexual sources for Jacob to father the 12 tribes of Israel, blessing all of them as part of the mighty nation, rather than only those born of Leah (which is a stark contrast to the Abraham story).
- David and Bathsheba. She was one of David's many wives - and her husband, who David essentially killed, was one of his mighty men and closest friends. Yet God chose her to bear Solomon rather than David's first/previous wives. In the entire story, the polygamy is never condemned; rather, it was the murder/adultery with another man's wife that was condemned. In fact, that's the point where Nathan even tells David, "I gave you all of Saul's wives and concubines, and if you wanted more I would have given them to you also," virtually endorsing David's polygamy as God's gift to him. How could we, then, call it sinful for all people?

Also, you say that Solomon was "punished" for having many wives and concubines. But I don't see that in the Bible. I see that he was punished because of the idolatry that these women led him into.

That said, and in light of the clearly negative examples of polygamy in Scripture, it's obvious that polygamy is generally unwise. Most men can barely handle one wife. Why make yourself responsible for even more? The NT is clear enough that it's even better to have no wives than one, but even if you're going to have a wife, it's better to have 1 than more or else you'll be disqualified from having any position of authority within the church. Who would want to sacrifice that if he has the capacity to avoid it? I certainly wouldn't want to compromise my life's mission in that way. Certainly it's unwise to increase the number of people you're married to, no matter what your current number is (which is why Paul advises in 1 Cor. 7 for each person to stay as they are).

But that doesn't make it inherently sinful.

At best, we could argue that Jesus has a singular bride: the Church, and therefore having multiple brides would be a poor reflection of Jesus's model of marriage, as he is not polygamous. Then again, others argue that we are all Christ's bride, which has the appearance of polygamy, as we are all independently autonomous in our relationship with him. Then others appropriately recognize that we're all also only part of one singular body - and I am not married to my wife's nose separately from her finger. Yet the other camp will also recognize the limited nature of this parallel because my wife's nose and finger aren't separately sentient. And around and around we go to the point that there's no definitive conclusion that can be made from this line.

The hard teachings against polygamy in churchianity are based on a combination of general wisdom and cultural condemnation of the practice. It's unlawful in most places in the world, so the church has conformed to the government's condemnation of it as well, as the church conforms to the secular world on a number of other things also.

But I do believe that God initially gave men a polygamous drive in order to populate the world. I also expect that, to some degree, God wanted us to see on a spiritual level that Jesus wants to reproduce through all of us and not just the one guy in a generation who happens to be a super-evangelist, like Billy Graham.

I don't see polygamy as being inherently sinful. But like all things, I see that it is most often expressed in a sinful way, just as sex isn't inherently sinful, but is often expressed in sinful ways.

To that end, I often tell people: if you live in a country where polygamy is legal and you have the financial resources to provide for multiple wives and you are willing to take on the responsibilities of a spiritual bond with multiple women, and you're also willing to give up your ability ever to be an authoritative figure in God's Kingdom, then go for it. For everyone else, you're best with no wife, or one if you can't keep your pants on.

The Main Event

0 upvotes · 1 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I disagree, actually. Sometimes a woman will not respond to a man's improvement, no matter how much he improves. We simply can't control this. Also, she might trigger the main event due to her own hypergamy, independent of the degree of the man's improvement.

There will always be outliers. The red pill is focused more on maximizing probability by assuming all women will conform to the norm because the norm for women is overwhelming, and all women are innately inclined to the norm. Buy certain outliers, either through psychological damage or incredible discipline, simply break the norm and we can't predict that.

What to do about boundaries being crossed?

0 upvotes · 8 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

If she brings up the parent-child dynamic again poke fun at her like you would if your little sister was bugging you.

Next time he makes dinner he should put a bottle with milk in it on the table where her drink should go. "Oh, I'm sorry, when you said parent/child you thought you were an older child?"

Discussion: Is it okay to masturbate to thoughts of your wife?

0 upvotes · 6 April 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Solid answer. I do think the bible gives more regulation than is implied here, as in isolation one could read this post and assume watching porn is just fine. But on the broader scope, within scriptural bounds, this is pretty darn close to my view.

I'm still committed to Romans 14:23 such that if you can't honestly say, "I was thinking about the gospel and it made me feel like I should jack off today," then it's still sin - as is the default state we live in. But, as you note, there can be a wisdom in being in one type of sin over another, and I believe there likely are circumstances where faith might compel masturbation (I'm just not in a place to conduct that thought experiment right now, need to be on a run or at the gym).

And I appreciate your fair treatment of the other side too.

Using power/muscle during sex

0 upvotes · 18 January 2019 · /r/askMRP

There's a difference between: "I love holding my wife against the wall and pounding away" and, "Hey guys, help me find more ways to show off my muscles in the bedroom." The context of the question screams validation-seeking.

Follow the Red Pill but Do Not Sin...

0 upvotes · 8 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Why do you care what he calls you? Amused mastery, and don't live in his frame ... then humbly learn and move on.

Where's the best place for a 21 year old man to meet other christian singles?

0 upvotes · 14 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

but the people I meet aren't grounded in the same values I am

You're looking for people who are ready made. Be a leader. If they don't share your interests now, find people who differ and lead them until they do. Intentional influence, even if not overtly recognized, can be very powerful.

The Consciously Crazy Wife

0 upvotes · 29 October 2018 · /r/askMRP

My wife hates the calm smile as well. She's commented on how much she hates it before.

I think they interpret it as a sign of intentionally flaunting to her that she has no power over you. To her, that's worse than me maintaining an even composure. It doesn't stop me from doing it, though - especially when it comes out because I'm trying to hold back actual laughter.

Was recommended to cross post from MRP.

0 upvotes · 29 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

After all, it takes 2 to escalate and go crazy most of the time.

"*Most of the time*" is the operative phrase. In my response, I identified with OP given a situation that happened just yesterday where my wife escalated into enraged shouting literally because she asked me to talk about something and I said "OK" and not "OK, let's talk about it sometime."

She acknowledged mid-conversation that she had no idea how her feelings escalated to that level and that it was completely irrational for her to be upset with me about it in the first place. But, "This is still how I'm feeling anyway," sprinkled with a little attitude that communicated, *And you're responsible for my feelings, whether you caused them or not.*

Open thread

0 upvotes · 27 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

It's interesting, but definitely not odd.

1. 69% of redditors are men and 31% are women, so there's already a default leaning that you're more than 2x as likely to come across men as women.
2. Most of the users on RPC came from MRP, which expressly excludes women from participating (they're banned on sight, as they make it clear up-front that it's a men-only space).
3. Red pill praxeology resonates with men more than women because most women are already indoctrinated by feminism and see the red pill as their enemy, not a legitimate and viable option.
4. Similarly as 3, the biblical leader-helper dynamic, while being equally advantageous to both parties on the

whole, has a first-blush appearance of favoring men, who get to be the leaders, and stifling women, who are instructed to be submissive, and thus men are going to be more drawn to it because they're quicker to embrace this biblical balance.

So, I'm not surprised that it's mostly men, but we do have about 5 or 6 women who comment fairly regularly and a few others that pop up here and there.

For Women: Getting Your Beta to Man Up

0 upvotes · 20 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

There is so much wrong with the underlying attitude you're writing with.

New to Christianity

0 upvotes · 20 October 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Read the first word of the quoted text. There is no major conflict like that.

A Guide to Manipulation - Part 1: Are You Being Manipulated?

0 upvotes · 13 March 2018 · /r/MarriedRedPill

In 1, a person feels this way regardless of the behaviors of other people. They are often irrational in the way they experience these things. Examples:

- 1 - Adam's girlfriend has always been encouraging and positive about the relationship, but he's still constantly afraid she'll leave him.
- 5 - The relationship is very normal and straight forward, but Adam feels like it's complex anyway.
- 8 - Adam's GF is happy and never indicates there's anything wrong, but he's paranoid and constantly thinks there is anyway.
- 9 - Adam's GF doesn't attack or criticize him, but he still feels compelled to explain away behaviors that he believes she *should* be upset by.
- 10 - Adam's GF has been faithful, shown every sign of trust, and has had absolutely no opportunity to cheat on him, yet he obsesses about the idea that if he stops watching her for a moment, she will betray that trust.
- 14 - Adam's GF has responded positively and been very receptive even when Adam has expressed negative thoughts/emotions, but Adam still feels like he's "not allowed" to do that around her.
- 18 - Adam's GF has always been warm and affectionate, but (for example, because of past relationships) he still thinks that she will withdraw sex, love, affection, etc. if he's not extremely cautious.

In 2, the person experiences these things because of cues triggered by the other person. For example, assume Bob has never experienced the strength and freedom of being a strong-independent man, still deeply-rooted in blue pill thinking:

- 1 - Bob's GF threatens to leave him frequently ... she has manipulated Bob into fearing the loss of the relationship because he doesn't want to be *forever alone* again.
- 5 - Bob's GF is constantly changing the context of the relationship and he can't understand her, making him feel unstable ... she has manipulated him into a position whereby he is easily malleable in any direction.

- 8 - Bob's GF is constantly complaining that something is wrong, making Bob feel like something is wrong even when she's not complaining anymore ... she has manipulated him into a framework of always trying to please her.
- 9 - Bob's GF is constantly attacking him, putting him on the defensive ... she has manipulated Bob into thinking that she is his judge and her word is final.
- 10 - Whether or not she's actually cheating, she suggests to Bob that she can go off and screw other guys whenever she wants and that she might do it if she's mad at him ... she has manipulated Bob into an emotional state that she can pull out as a trump card in any argument: "You're just being jealous, like when you __, __, and __. You know I wasn't being serious when I said that [regardless of whether she was or not]."
- 14 - Bob's GF guilt trips him every time he says something or acts in a way that makes her feel bad ... she has manipulated Bob into believing he is unlovable and must present himself to her on her terms in order to be loved.
- 18 - Bob's GF constantly denies him sex, storms out of the house, slaps his hand when he tries to touch her, etc. whenever he's not behaving the way she likes ... she has manipulated Bob into believing that he must behave on her terms in order to receive love, sex, attention, etc.

Both Adam and Bob have weak frames and are operating in their GF's frame. In Adam's case, he's doing it to himself, most likely because he lived Bob's situation in a previous relationship. He does not have a context for it in this present relationship, but can't let those feelings go anyway. In Bob's case, he enters without any inherent assumptions about the relationship, but his GF bends and twists him until he complies with her desire to control him, and if he leaves her he'll likely end up like Adam in the next relationship.

To [/u/johnyapocalypse](#)'s credit, these both do result in mental illness, which will often persist even after the relationship ends. But in Adam's case, his GF is not manipulating him - Adam is just a manipulated man. Bob is a man who was not manipulated, but is being manipulated.

To be clear: Bob's girlfriend may not be doing any of this intentionally. It's just who she is. Bob just doesn't know how to deal with it.

Husband pastor & quite time

0 upvotes · 2 March 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

Gay marriage has a different theological premise than the "women should never have a day job" concept you espouse. Homosexuality falls within my 95% overlap estimate. Your position is within the 5% that does not overlap.

Even Jesus debunked the Soul Mate Myth.

0 upvotes · 31 January 2018 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I agree with the heart behind a lot of what you're saying, with a few exceptions. I do want to be clear that in the absence of divine prophecy (which must be treated with great skepticism), even if God does have a specific "one" for you, there's no way of having concrete evidence of who she is.

To that end, apart from divine prophecy, the concept of a "soulmate" is a moot concept even if it is a theologically accurate one.

Hosea wasn't told to marry a specific woman, he was told to marry a prostitute, and he chose Gomer. He could have chosen another prostitute.

Good catch. I have been misremembering that for years!

And it is a search, for God says "he who findeth a wife findeth a good thing."

Oooh ... and you were doing so good. That word "find" is *matsa*, which is actually a type of Israeli food ... oh wait, that's matzah. For real, though, of its 455 uses, only once is it ever translated as "seek." Virtually every other context implies "happening to come across."

This goes perfectly with my view that men and women should avoid marriage to pursue God as their primary and sole interest, but that if while doing so they happen to be pursuing God alongside someone of the opposite gender and sexual attraction is becoming an issue, then get married and go at it. For the several people I know who have done just this they have the most godly marriages I know, including in an PR sense.

He does answer prayers, after all. It would seem awfully odd for God to answer prayers in other aspects of life, but not in the second most important decision a man will ever make that is to mirror one's own relationship with the Lord.

This presumes that God wants everyone who prays for a wife to get married. I believe that most people looking for spouses are doing so not because God wants them married, but because of societal pressure toward marriage. Now, some people legitimately should be married even by God's own plan, but they still marry for social pressure reasons, which I don't see God endorsing. God cares not only about what a person does, but why he does it (1 Samuel 16:7 and all).

To that end, I've long held the view, even since college before reddit was invented, that God will not aid someone in finding a spouse until they are first content in Him alone. When a man says, "God, I can't possibly be happy and satisfied on earth unless I get married," he has plainly made "marriage" an idol in his life. This is literally the epitome of blue pill thinking, and it was my first self-taught escape into red pill awareness. I do not see God supporting a man in his pursuit of idolatry - even if it is a man who, for all other practical purposes, God does intend to be married. So, no, I don't think God would assist this man in answering that prayer, though he won't hold him back from his idolatry (per the Romans 1 - "I'll give you over to your sinfulness" pattern).

Be the Judge

0 upvotes · 21 December 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I feel like we're saying a lot of the same stuff, so maybe I just worded myself very poorly.

High value men are not in short supply. A high value man she can "command" is the unicorn. That "command" comes from commitment - when she feels like she has him on her hook for whatever reason. Of course, it's a unicorn because once she commands him (because his commitment interferes with his power in the relationship) he loses value, as you noted.

Women DO want commitment. But they also want to be attracted to their spouse and it's darn near impossible to have both, which is why dread (demonstration of risk of commitment loss) actually works. It's these paradoxically competing desires that creates the problem I was outlining, and which I have written about on RPC.

So, my point was that she doesn't want the guy's "high value dick." She wants control of him which comes through commitment. That's the essence of hypergamy. She wants to know that she's locked Chad down. If it was really just about sex with a high value man and nothing more, marriage 1.5 or 2.0 wouldn't be a thing. There would be no concern for utilizing social and legal pressures to keep him committed because the next Chad is just around the corner, as the rate of women filing for divorce demonstrates.

The number one reason for leaving red pill

0 upvotes · 29 November 2017 · /r/ExRedPill

You assume too much.

113 - A History of Feminism

0 upvotes · 17 November 2017 · /r/RPChristians

Politics aside, it is significant to note that (1) no biblical society allowed women a right to vote or hold political office (Deborah being the rare, unusual case), (2) God never condemned that aspect of any of these societies, (3) God never issued any statement supporting equal political authority rights for women, (4) that these positions were true during a time when Israel was ruled by God before the reign of kings, and (5) that these principles continued throughout the new testament times, and (6) that these principles remained consistent throughout virtually all of church history until the 1800s, and (7) that given the obvious parallels between Israel and the church, it's very difficult to argue church leadership structure should be managed distinctly and separately from an ideal political structure among a godly people/society - and we should desire our nation to become a godly people/society.

Explain to me the problems of Red Pill

0 upvotes · 10 October 2017 · /r/ExRedPill

It sounds to me like you're in the same camp I'm in - you agree with the *descriptive* elements of RP, but disagree with the *prescriptive*. That is, RP seems to understand correctly how the world operates, and you find value in that - but when it comes to the advice on what people should do with that knowledge, you pave your own way. Sometimes it makes sense, like lifting, dressing better, flirting with your spouse, being a strong leader, etc. Other times it's stuff that can be rejected, like plating, negging, treating women like they're inferior, etc.

Anytime someone comes on this sub asking questions about why they're against RP, it's always the same response: "What does RP give that you can't get anywhere else?" The same question could be asked about any other mentality. There's nothing new under the sun. All we're doing is rearranging old ideas into more useful patterns. To that end, nothing in RP is "new" - but it does pull together useful ideas in a way that cannot be found anywhere else.

To clarify, if you're having trouble with your wife, you might find a marriage counselor who can explain how to develop an "amused mastery" (a common psychological concept by several different names) so that you don't get so worked up over small problems. But that counselor may not be familiar with developing an abundance mentality (another common psychological concept), although the counselor down the street might know about this one. Counselors are also pretty ignorant about things like personal hygiene, fitness, style, etc., so if you don't happen to bump into a life coach or personal trainer, you're not going to figure out how to do those things. Oh, and none of these people are going to understand the more intellectual backdroppings of socio-political movements, gynocentrism, covert matriarchies, etc., so you'd have to stumble across the right books to figure that stuff out.

In reality, there's even more useful information out there that RP hasn't yet discovered either - and some of what they've discovered is bogus. But that doesn't mean you throw the baby out with the bathwater. Take what's good and leave the rest. If being on RP was the only thing that motivated you to get to the gym in the past 5 years, the fact that someone else in the world might have been able to motivate you doesn't change the fact that in the absence of RP you may never have found that person or realized the importance of finding that person. So, "You can get all the good stuff somewhere else" isn't really helpful when "somewhere else" isn't knocking at your door saying, "Here I am! Now you know where to find me!"

To be clear, I'm in the same boat as you. I reject all the derogatory stuff against women. I reject ideas like "treat women like they're nothing more than sex toys" or "if she's not responding to you, just divorce her" and all that other garbage. I started a sub ([r/RPChristians](#)) specifically to invite the moralizing component into the

conversation - to get the good stuff without the negative prescriptive aspects. MRP ([r/marriedredpill](#)) also has a much, much healthier view (although still has some serious problems).

For more information in the "RP" view of gender equality, [This Thread](#) was very, very interesting. It's not the "screw women, they're the scum of the earth" attitude that this sub would have you think RP believes. My guess is that most people on this sub are people who were on RP for a little while, saw a bunch of ignorant surface-level comments without getting into the meat of the material, and then decided to boycott it because they couldn't discern between the non-RP-hater-wannabes and the real deal. This sub would make more sense as "ex-MGTOW," where (from my limited understanding) women really are treated as scum of the earth.

What's the MRP stance on responsive sexuality?

0 upvotes · 20 September 2017 · [/r/askMRP](#)

What you're describing is still spontaneous, though. The fact that a man gets hard when he sees cleavage but is flaccid when she's in a sweater doesn't make him a sexually responsive person, otherwise you'd be labeling pretty much everyone on the planet as "responsive" except a select few, which would render the whole classification system as pointless; or otherwise would just be defining things inconsistently with the alleged research behind it.

My understanding is that it's a scale. Nobody is 100% purely spontaneous or 100% purely responsive. The man who gets hard to the simple sight of cleavage is probably 98% spontaneous, 2% responsive. The woman who gets tingles before Chad even approaches her is 98% spontaneous, 2% responsive.

Maybe this is just my poor judgment, but a 'responsive' label should only apply when it takes some degree of sexual initiation before the person becomes aroused. So, if she's getting tingly before Chad makes his intentions for the evening clear, that leans more toward spontaneous desire - she wants it even before she knows it's coming.

I know the redpill advice, want to hear yours.

0 upvotes · 15 September 2017 · [/r/ExRedPill](#)

With minor caveats, this seems applicable: <http://adam4d.com/help-im-trapped/>

FR: 1 Year from the artist formally known as prarrott

0 upvotes · 10 September 2017 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

1/2

I spin narratives for my job. OP's not getting divorced, so that's out. With my faith, I simply tell it like it is. To that end, [/u/redeemedpr](#), [r/RPChristians](#) will be your friend in the upcoming future - but stick around here too. Regardless, here's what's happening from a biblical lens.

For context, so I don't have to go through the long proof, just assume husband/wife = Christ/church and that physical reproduction (i.e. sex) parallels spiritual reproduction (i.e. evangelism).

With that in mind, you've got a Hosea story (as most Christian men I know do). God has you married to someone whose behaviors are going to teach you what I bet you're doing to God. After all, you're part of the bride of Christ. If you don't like what your bride is doing to you, how do you think God feels when you do it to him? Especially since God isn't a big screw up like us!

conception of this child

Malachi 2:15 - *And why did the Lord God make them one, commingling a portion of His Spirit in their union? To produce godly offspring.* God's purpose in marriage is not just any kids, but raising godly kids.

I'm not sure why this aspect got so overlooked here, but you've got a new kid. This is clearly a driving force for her. Why? Because God put an innate biological drive in you and her to want to be with someone who will be effective at raising your kids. A repentant natural birth father is better than a half way decent step-father any day. Less psychological problems for the kids down the road. This influenced her - not just physically, emotionally, and mentally, but in her spirit.

one of the handful of times a year my wife and I would have sex

About as often as God's people attempt spiritual reproduction (i.e. evangelism)?

My wife seemed to despise me, she did not want to spend time with me, she did not respect me. She certainly didn't seem attracted to me. Common story here.

Common story for God's bride too.

I needed sex to fulfill me. To make me feel like a man.

Because God put that drive in you - not for the sake of sex itself, but as a path to lead you to the real conclusion: that your life should be revolving around evangelism. God doesn't need our spiritually reproductive efforts to be fulfilled any more than a good RP guy depends on his wife's vagina for his satisfaction in life. But there is a reason that for all of time most men have had a fairly one-track mind about sex. Our drive for physically reproductive acts is meant to highlight God's drive for spiritual reproduction through us. That's why you needed sex to fulfill you. Once you've got your mission (which *should be* discipleship), you will have arrived at the destination and can be truly OI about the road. You don't need the road once you've gotten where you're going.

As I swallowed the pill I began to generate, and be able to notice, interest from other women

You matured in a human way and generated tempting interest from other humans. Begin to mature in a spiritual way (read: become a threat to the enemy) and you'll generate temptation and seduction from evil spirits. You failed on the human side. So be it. Succeed where it counts. Now that you know the physical repercussions, don't let those become spiritual as well.

I began to pursue other women more intentionally

One of the main reasons God hates divorce and adultery is because men are meant to model with their wives how God interacts with his church. If we fail in this, we're sending a broken reflection of God's character to the world, compromising the impact of the Gospel in our lives. Just as cheating has a negative impact on your physical sex life, it's devastating to your spiritual sex life. Gotta love grace and forgiveness!

As Jerry Seinfeld says

Literally on my second monitor screen right now.

I was content to move on ... My wife began to change drastically

Like I said up front: God doesn't need us. If we refuse spiritual reproduction with him (read: bear good fruit, per Matthew 7), he moves on. Even when he sees people trying to impress him, if they don't really love him he says, "Screw off you evil scumbags" (also Matthew 7). It's interesting to me that Jesus passionately loves people and wants followers, but he's on the move and he's not going to compromise his path to suck up to people to get them to follow him.

I repented and returned to my faith

You hadn't repented yet. That didn't come until you fully confessed.

take that to my grave as my secret

It's often said: *It only takes one sin to make a man imperfect.* Imperfection is what separates us from God and dooms us to hell. If you tell God, "I'll give you 99.999% of my sin, but not this .001%" - you're still .001% imperfect, and therefore are not made perfect in Christ, and therefore are not saved. That's not to say you can't fail, but by reserving something to yourself and refusing to give it to Christ, that's a different story from, "I'm trying to give it to you, I just keep failing."

voice telling me without question to confess

1 John 1:9 - *If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just and will forgive us of our sins and will purify us from all unrighteousness.*

Information too late ...

0 upvotes · 1 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

Not getting any isn't a problem right now and that's not what I asked about, although I get that guys here tend to just assume that's the question because it usually is. Either way, this should be clear from our conversation elsewhere here.

Mitch's Red Pill

0 upvotes · 29 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I'm pretty sure I fully understand what he's saying and share his mindset on this. If I'm mistaken, let me know, but don't just assume because it reaffirms and validates your view of me. Despite whatever push-back I may give, I enjoy our conversations, but only to the degree they're helpful and actually cause me to re-evaluate myself. Unsubstantiated accusations that come off as assumptions to reaffirm your perceptions are not helpful. Not that you care for my respect (or even should), but that's where I start to lose some.

As for what [/u/weakandsensitive](#) is saying, this is an area where I think a proper biblical understanding really helps because this is a concept fully embraced about how God models relationships with us. He's God. He doesn't need us. That's theology 101. If every human on the planet rejected him and we all went to hell, he would not be devastated or ruined; he is internally self-contented. He only gives us comfort when we need it because it pleases him, not because he's worried he'll lose us. We have no power over him, not even over his mood (although many Christians mistakenly believe otherwise). This is something I've understood and modeled long before my RP days (albeit not as intentionally).

It's probably not the most "Christian" attitude to have, but I often maintain the mentality that I express positive virtues toward my wife because that's the kind of man I want to be, yet internally I think to myself: "I'd be totally fine, maybe even happier, if she walked away; I could do better." I desire a happy, successful marriage, but I also desire all the benefits that ending my marriage will bring, and I'm constantly living in the tension between the two - and I think that's a healthy tension to live in. So, my response is simply to be the kind of man I want to be (or more accurately: who God created me to be) and let the chips fall where they may. If it means my marriage remains, great. If it means my wife leaves me and I "upgrade," great. This is how I see Jesus approaching people - he's just going to be himself and if people want to respond, great. If they reject him or walk away, he's not pandering to them like a puppy scratching at the door when someone leaves.

In fact, when Jesus' followers were shouting his praises the religious people of the day tried to get Jesus to stop them. Jesus' response: **"Even if they stop, the stones will cry out."** In other words, God is worshiped because he deserves to be worshiped. Even if everyone rejected him, he'd just make the rocks sing his praises instead.

As for us, Romans 1 tells us that the more we walk away from God the more he "gives us over" to the things we left him for, essentially saying, "Fine, that's what you want? Go for it, see if I care. I'm going to keep doing my thing." To me, this parallels with, "You want to screw Chad? Go for it, you're not my problem anymore. I'm going to keep being awesome without you." - and mean it, not as a jab at her, but as a fact about you.

How do I get better at AA

0 upvotes · 28 August 2017 · /r/askMRP

I literally just wrote [this comment](#) that answers the question.

What I didn't say to [/u/AustralianArm](#) that more clearly applies to you: *Your AA sucks because you don't believe it.* I'm 99% confident that when you AA you play it off like a joke. It kind of works because she laughs at the joke and it lightens the mood, so you feel like you're doing it right. Obviously you're not seeing the results you've been reading about. Why? Because it's not a joke.

AA is a tactic within the amused mastery mentality. If my son does something bad and I give him the stink-eye, he might say, "Daddy, you're being mean!" I then tell him: "You're right I'm being mean [agree], and if you keep talking to me like that, you'll see just how mean I can get [amplify]." I'm not kidding when I say this. I have an amused mastery over my son because his misbehavior isn't actually ruining my day - I'm above that; but I communicate on his level so he can understand me. If I had to guess, you haven't risen above her testing within your own mind yet. That will come. Until it does, AA will be a lot harder to pull off.

With that in mind, with your wife, when you're ready to AA (and don't take the word "ready" lightly) this works better if you add playful innuendo. "You're right I'm being mean [agree]. Maybe it's because you need to be punished [amplify]." Now, if I say this as a joke, she's going to laugh, roll her eyes, flirt back, or ignore me and go on with whatever else she naturally would have said/done - probably a combination. **If your actions after AA are dependent on how she responds, you've already lost.** You have two primary actions:

- **Follow through and have sex with her.** If this is what you want and the opportunity exists, you have to follow through. Make it a genuine initiation. Show her you mean it. After you say something like that, you pin her to the wall and say, "Do I need to get the handcuffs or do you promise to be good?" Obviously don't commit spousal rape, but do show her that you're willing to follow-through. If she believes that, you're good, even if she ends up giving a hard no anyway.
- **If you don't want sex,** you've got to at least make her believe you would (or that you would if circumstances would permit). For example, if the kids are up, you start to initiate until she pulls away, then keep going a bit more until she's a bit uncomfortable, then you say, "You're lucky the kids are up right now or you'd be in big trouble." Same deal with "company's over" or "we have to go somewhere." After you do this, withdraw your presence. Remember, she's fitness testing you. If you want sex right then, great; if not, don't reward her garbage by re-engaging in the conversation afterward. Pull a tease-and-leave. If you can't control the conversation after an AA (or even before, for that matter), you've got bigger problems than learning how to AA.

Her need for external validation

0 upvotes · 21 August 2017 · /r/askMRP

I am wondering where this is explained in more detail, is it in the female psychology book that's recommended?

If you can get past some of the religious stuff, I write a lot about this validation-seeking behavior in women [here](#). I call it *The Comparison Game/Trap*.

My conclusion is in the "Husbands: Don't Play the Game" section, et seq.

Does anyone really know what they want?

0 upvotes · 16 August 2017 · /r/askTRP

If you mistakenly assume there is no God and reject Jesus/the bible/etc. then this is the sad reality. The best you can do is have as much fun as possible then die. Of course, if you're wrong, the result of that life will be terrifying :/

The Sandbox and the Swingset, Introducing MRPW

0 upvotes · 6 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Hard to find old posts on mobile. I dug it up nonetheless. This was written before I started talking to the other guys, but there wouldn't be too many other things they'd add. I don't pretend all of these will work for everyone - just the things that worked for me (and as I later discovered, for other guys as well).

It is certainly possible to bring out the alpha in him, but at some point he has to want it. Your job is to make him want it and give him an opportunity to practice. Here are a few tricks to try that worked when my wife (sometimes unintentionally) did them on me:

FIRST - Tell him bluntly. Also, explain that, physical characteristics aside, you aren't attracted to a man who defers to you all the time.

SECOND - Let things fall apart. He doesn't lead because he's grown comfortable with you doing it. Break that comfort. Escalate the discomfort if it doesn't work at first. Here are examples in escalating order:

- Stop cleaning/vacuuming/doing the dishes. Let them pile up until he asks you to do them. If he gets mean about it (releasing his harbored resentment - a classic beta trait), just say, "All you had to do was ask," and go do it with a smile.
 - Beta guys don't know the difference between being assertive and being a jerk. So, although it sounds counter-intuitive, you have to reward him when he's being assertive in any capacity, even if he's being a jerk too. When he learns that it's okay to be assertive around you, that's when you start helping him filter his jerk qualities out. His re-calibration will demand that he leave one extreme for the other extreme before he is able to find a balance. He is incapable of going directly to that happy balance.
- Stop doing the laundry. When he doesn't have clothes to wear to work, just say, "Oh, I didn't know it needed to be done," and toss him something from off the floor.
- Stop keeping the calendar. If friends want to hang out, forward the text message to him and make him answer it. Don't remind him when the day comes. If you miss it, then you miss it. Your friends may be upset, but you can always pass it off: "He was in charge of setting everything up."
- Toss the bills on his desk and if they don't get paid, let them go unpaid until he gets it done. Yes, you will lose some money by doing this, but consider that the cost of a much happier future together.

THIRD - Fuel his desire to be an initiator. Start with something you know he wants: a physical relationship. Wear something *mildly* provocative and doll yourself up *a little bit more than normal*, but act like you're wearing a nun's outfit. Don't get so dolled up that he thinks it's you passively initiating, though, because then he's just responding and not leading. The slight provocation will start spinning his wheels, but your non-initiation will force him to step up his game if he wants any actual action.

FOURTH - Don't start conversations. If he's not willing to initiate a conversation, let there be very, very, very

long silences until he decides it's time to talk. My guess is he's used to you being the one to ask him questions and get the ball rolling. If he asks if there's a problem, just say, "No, I feel great today," and go about your business.

FIFTH - Do your own thing, not the default thing. Netflix and phone-scrolling are specifics, but the broader category is just chilling. He likes chilling with you. That's fine, but he has to lead you in that. So, get up and do other things around the house during the time you would normally watch Netflix. When he's all confused why you're not just automatically doing what he expects, he'll ask you, "Hey, are you coming down to watch?"

SIXTH - Flip conversations. If he asks you a question, put the onus back on him. For example, with that last question ("You coming down?") reply: *"Do you want me to?"* He asks: "What do you want for dinner?" You reply: *"Thanks for asking. I'd rather you pick today."*

SEVENTH - Master the art of fostering subtle curiosity. This is a very tricky concept to implement, but when a person becomes curious about something, it can consume them until they get answers. This, in itself, doesn't translate to leadership, but there are a great many alpha qualities that come out with this one-track-mind drive. If he's not typically a curious person, making him curious about things more frequently might get him practicing alpha traits without knowing it. For example, something as simple as turning off his facebook app to google the answer to a question (ex. "What else has that actor been in?") gives him a mini-goal and lets him practice immediately accomplishing that goal. Escalate this into bigger things down the road, like making him curious about why you wore that outfit in the third point, above, or why you put on lipstick just to hang around the house, when you almost never do that.

EIGHTH - If all else fails, as a last resort start commenting about situations at work, among friends, on TV, etc. where you see a guy take charge and how you respect that. This can really make beta guys insecure about the possibility that you're cheating, and RP guys are 100% going to tell him you're cheating when you make comments like that ... but sometimes a little reverse dread, highlighting the things you find attractive in a man, could do him a little good. [Since writing this post I've noticed my wife doing this more and more - pointing to clear alpha guys on TV, not saying anything about sexiness or attraction ... just that she's rooting for them even though everyone else thinks they're total jerks. It's subtle and context appropriate, but affirms in me the direction I've been taking our relationship, furthering my inspiration/motivation to be more alpha. If I were still beta-me this type of stuff would have kicked me in the but to think, "Clearly she's attracted to that - I better not let the clue go unnoticed."]

I hope this helps.

The Sandbox and the Swingset, Introducing MRPW

0 upvotes · 6 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I agree that a woman can't make a man alpha, and that too much effort in trying will cause her to lose attraction. Women who make "projects" of their men still see them as inferior, even if they make them superior. That's how basic ego functions.

That said, I do find that there are tactics a woman can employ that foster a higher likelihood that her man will develop alpha traits through probabilistic stage setting. My wife (unintentionally) employed many such tactics on me, which opened my eyes to the concept. I later revisited guys I'd known who had shifted from mostly beta to mostly alpha and asked what prompted the change, and of the 3 I asked, all of them explained things their wives did, in detail, that kick started the process.

They also agreed that their leadership is their responsibility, not hers ... but that she is not powerless in cultivating a leader. "STFU and get out of his way" can be part of that process, but there can be more active components as well. STFU is basically removing all the weeds and toxic substances you've been using from your garden. From there, a seed on the ground might grow from rain alone, but a diligent gardener will tend the soil, water it, and ensure proper lighting. The gardener can't force it to grow, but *can* cultivate the right conditions for growth to

happen.

Wanted: Op-Sec Tips for MRPer out there getting numbers

0 upvotes · 25 July 2017 · /r/askMRP

Twice?

Married to a Beta Husband - How Can I Ask For More Leadership and RP Attitude?

0 upvotes · 20 July 2017 · /r/askMRP

The dangerous answer is that if he isn't comfortable taking control, be out of control so he has no choice but: (1) take control of you or (2) leave you. The problem is that he probably knows you well enough to know when you're acting out just to get him to do something. This will actively work against any RP directive he pursues because he's only doing it for the sake of fitting into the RP frame you want to create for him rather than him creating his own frame that you can rest in. It's a catch-22 for you.

Softer answers can be found in my post [here](#)

Rejecting appreciation ... weird concept, but it works for me.

0 upvotes · 17 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Agreed.

Rejecting appreciation ... weird concept, but it works for me.

0 upvotes · 17 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

and apparently you've missed 4 or 5 other opportunities

I should have noted that I did escalate most of the time. There was one where I didn't, but for good cause. I guess I still have latent tendencies about not bragging or "gentlemen don't kiss and tell," so I stopped with her reaction rather than continuing the story. I'll have to remember not to do that here. Thanks for the tip anyway.

How'd you guys beat the anger phase of trp, because I get these random feelings of anger randomly throughout the day

0 upvotes · 15 July 2017 · /r/askTRP

What causes the anger phase? I skipped this somehow and went straight to excited. What am I missing?

Part 1 - Signs your wife might have a personality disorder

0 upvotes · 12 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I do not believe anything I have posted to date would fail your test. Being an attorney, I'm inherently skeptical of making an assertion (particularly a public one) that I cannot back up. The entirety of law centers around personal observation (hence rejecting hearsay, unauthenticated documents, etc.).

To be clear, this post is not to suggest that I've personally had successful sex stories with women who have these issues. But I do take the role of a scientist or observer, watching patterns and seeing what works and what doesn't. In the divorce itself I see very clearly what doesn't work and I often investigate why (because that often validates the findings of the psychological evaluation or is otherwise necessary to rebut it). But in virtually all of my cases, each party already as a new SO only a few months in, and I have the opportunity to chat with them about their bond and how/why they got together (this is relevant to discern stability ough homer environment for children or to see if the relationship will likely flake out).

Have you seen RESULTS from RP aware men

This is your best point. I do see proven results with fairly undeniable patterns of success v. failure. That said, I have never asked a client, "Do you follow red pill praxeology?" I could say this would violate rule 0 and bow out, but admittedly I haven't even known red pill terminology long enough to be so direct even if it were a good idea to ask. That said, I have been retroactively assessing (based on the information I now know) how aligned these men are with core RP concepts, whether they know it by red pill terms or not.

I hope that makes sense. I guess my position is that some data or parallel data is better than no data at all. So, where I have noticed RP had a blind spot, if I can use what I have personally observed to help fill in some gaps, even if it's not perfect, it's better than just "keep trying the same tactics even harder until it works," which is the mentality NMMNG condemns Nice Guys for using.

Part 1 - Signs your wife might have a personality disorder

0 upvotes · 12 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I usually see it in the PD context. It might simply be a severity line, like how schizotypal is a less severe schizophrenia(ish). I do know the DSM has categorized OCPD as a PD.

Marital Confidence Intervals and Probabilistic Stage Setting

0 upvotes · 8 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Very well said. I agree entirely.

That said, I'm not seeing the conflict with my perception of the "ditch and replace" attitude. If I get what you're saying, it can be summed up: *guys can be emotional, we just can't let our emotions control us*. In a marriage context, here are two possible scenarios:

ONE

- Guy 1's goal is to have a healthy sex life with his wife.
- He's not getting any, making him emotionally upset.
- He tries to fix it, but doesn't see improvement in a satisfactory time-frame.
- He leaves his wife to find someone else.

TWO

- Guy 2's goal is to have a healthy sex life with his wife.
- He's not getting any, making him emotionally upset.
- He tries to fix it, but doesn't see improvement in a satisfactory time-frame.
- He continues addressing the issue from different angles until he gets what he wants.

For guy 1, his emotional investment in the outcome of his efforts with his wife has led him to abandon his goal.

For guy 2, his emotional investment in the outcome of his efforts with his wife has not impacted his laser-sight gaze on that goal and he continues to pursue it.

The implication to me is that guy 1 lets his emotions control which goals he pursues, whereas guy 2 does not - he pursues the goals he wants to pursue independent of his emotional upset. Oneitis comes off as being an excuse to justify guy 1 giving up on the goal.

I'm sure I'm missing something here ... what is it?

Marital Confidence Intervals and Probabilistic Stage Setting

0 upvotes · 8 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I can respect that. What will help most is simply to say what you disagree with rather than complaining how noob I am. That's really it, in a nutshell.

As for fusing TRP and Christianity, I don't see why it can't work. TRP is not a supreme, ultimate concept that is all-or-nothing. I've seen it posted many times, "Don't accept things just because it's said here. Take what works and leaves the rest behind." When it comes to my faith, that's all I'm doing - my faith is the filter, and I have no problem taking everything that will slide through and leaving the rest behind. So far, I haven't found very much of the active advice here to need filtered out; it's predominantly the philosophical/theoretical context.

If RP really is the absolutely best possible sex strategy ever ... even if, say, 20% does get filtered out in the end, it just means Christians will run on 80% efficiency instead of 100%. My guess is that we have other advantages that non-Christians don't have, which I suspect can more than make up for that other 20%.

How to game rich girls?

0 upvotes · 6 July 2017 · /r/askTRP

I may get chastised here for this, but [/u/firewaterdirt](#) needs to go watch Notting Hill. I don't remember Hugh Grant's character well enough to recall if he should be a role model (probably not, since it's a chick flick), but the story is basically the same: super high-class girl gets into a blue collar worker; the quote the movie is famous for: "I'm just a girl standing in front of a guy asking him to love her." That's all she is - money, looks, fame and all that don't change the fact that girls are still girls and guys are still guys.

Really really fucked up. Shit test or comfort test?

0 upvotes · 26 June 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

I'm new to this whole thing, but my tactic has worked quite well for me. I just posted this elsewhere, but this is how I handle heated arguments with my wife now (not the menial day to day nit-picks):

- she's yelling about who knows what, trying to get a reaction out of me or just vent her frustrations ... doesn't matter
- hug her for about 15 seconds, counting it out if you have to; remain silent during this time, even if she tries to talk (let her, but don't respond); go longer if you have to
- lean your head back and brush her hair away from her cheek and put your hand on her cheek briefly
- lean in and kiss her cheek
- say, "I love you and appreciate that you are intensely passionate over this issue; but in this particular moment you are over-reacting and I'm not going to let it get to me."
- peck her on the forehead
- walk away with a smile
 - if she lets you go, the next time you see her in a calmer environment you **HAVE TO** re-raise the issue; this time it will be on your terms. Have an action-plan ready to go for how to solve the conflict, showing simultaneously that: (1) you care about her concerns; (2) you understand her perspective without validating the thought itself or how she handled the situation [don't underestimate the importance of this in any argument]; (3) you will take charge of the situation so she doesn't have to be the one to worry about it

anymore; and (4) her over-reaction was not going to solve the problem. This is a perfect quadfecta (and if I really took the time to think about it, I could probably come up with 2-3 more benefits), but I feel like 99% of men miss the opportunity by forgetting to re-raise the issue on their own terms.

- if she follows you, still yelling and screaming: repeat all of the above until she doesn't know what to do. If that doesn't work or ...
- if she doesn't let you leave in the first place ("No! I'm not over-reacting. This is seriously an important issue. How can you not see that?!?" Proceeds to block the door.) ... fog. "I agree that this issue is important. You're right, we should be spending more attention on this issue. I actually have an idea for how we can address the issue," and then pull an action plan out of your butt, even if it's a crappy one. If she doesn't like it, let her make some adjustments. The point isn't to come up with the perfect solution; it's to show her how idiotic her over-reaction was when you could come up with a solution to the problem literally on the spot and you can all tweak the solution from there. This has the same benefits as the first option ("if she lets you go ...") except #1, as it usually comes off as you brushing the issue aside too quickly. Even so, she doesn't care because that negative is outweighed by the other benefits.

Is the wife's desire in Genesis 3:16 affectionate or antagonistic? Let's explore

-1 upvotes · 24 March 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Nice. I don't agree with all of his theology, but I do appreciate how well he articulates his thoughts and works through Scripture rather than his own musings, as most other commentators do. In this case he's spot on.

Mitch's Red Pill

-1 upvotes · 5 September 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

This makes a lot of sense and is quite helpful.

moralizing ... advice initially was often to "talk."

Yeah, I definitely did that, been trying to tone it down. Also cut back on the main posts because, as you appropriately note, I still have a lot to learn.

you are missing an anger stage- which strongly suggests you have not changed your opinion about women and their motivations

I definitely missed that stage, but I think it's because I kind of went through it long before figuring out RP. My theology tells me that, at our core in our sinful nature, we're all extremely depraved. Couple that with the inherent sexuality of men and women that God imbued in us from even before the fall and logic alone can lead to the RP result.

For guys that's easy to visualize: rampant sex with whoever, whenever. For girls, it took me some time, but (with subtle clues my dad unintentionally fed me over the years) things like hypergamy, crabs in a bucket, AWALT, cheating, etc. became the expectation apart from Christ. I've also had my wife fess up to me a couple times early in our marriage that other guys were hitting on her and she liked those guys more than me - and that if it wasn't for her faith she would have cheated on me. So, that was figuring it out by being tested through fire.

But even then the anger was missing. By all rights, I should have been angry, but I was too beta at the time, setting my emotional conditions aside in an idiotic attempt to nurture my wife back to me. In short, most of the RP concepts about women were not new to me when I swallowed the pill - I only knew them by my own self-made terminology/explanations rather than the terminology I've learned here.

Interesting point to note, though: this might be why some other users (/u/88will88, for example) think I'm trying to stretch RP concepts beyond their RP definition. It's not that I've learned a concept from RP, didn't like it, then

try to change it. Instead, I've probably taken some of my own discoveries, figured out what RP calls it, then started using the RP terminology while not realizing the subtle distinctions between the two. I tend to trust my experiences more than others, so it's hard for me to give up my perceptions of things - although I value the fact that if thousands of other men are seeing a more refined definition of a thing, I should respect that.

It probably helps to know that in my pre-Christian days (though I thought I was a Christian at the time) I was extremely Machiavellian. I would literally run experiments on people every day. Jocks, nerds, cheerleaders, tom boys, etc. You name it, I was trying to figure them out. I'd get in a conversation, then say things that are totally insane or unusual just to learn how people react. I would tell people lies to see how they'd respond - if they'd leave their boyfriend or decide to trust him over me. I refused to date anyone during this time, so it wasn't about getting girls. It was more just an effort to understand people, especially male-female social and relational dynamics. My overarching scheme was this: *If I can figure out how people work, I can manipulate them to do anything.*

It worked insanely well. From my freshman year of high school to my senior year, I went from the pudgy nerd that everyone picked on to getting the homecoming queen to ask me out to prom. By my first year of college I had come about as close to mastering the art of interpersonal manipulation as I imagine a person can get. Even with random strangers, after sizing them up in the first 30 seconds of a conversation, I could figure out how to make them laugh, cry, smile with glistening eyes of longing, or slap the guy sitting next to me because I didn't like him but had more fun masterminding someone else to torment him than just doing it myself (true story).

I still remember how to do most of this, but choose not to apply it (except in rare circumstances). Although the power itself wasn't problematic, the way I was applying it didn't mix with what God was doing in my heart at the time. To some degree, RP is re-awakening in small measure these aspects of my former self that I had buried for too long. I'm just applying them in a different context. But I'm also somewhat afraid of what I'll do if I go back to employing these things in full measure the way I used to.

Information too late ...

-1 upvotes · 1 September 2017 · /r/askMRP

It's not that I've intentionally withheld the information. Her mom's been over and I'd rather not have that conversation while she's around. The only reason I mentioned that line was to allay certain other anticipated responses.

My fiance has a dress code he wants me to follow.

-1 upvotes · 30 August 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

You mention church, so let me put a slight biblical spin on this. In 1 Cor. 11 Paul talks about women needing to wear head coverings. It's easy to brush this off as an antiquated passage that we should just ignore, but his rationale actually comes from Adam and Eve. In other words, Paul is saying, "This is because of how God designed men and women in the first place and has been true for thousands of years, and is something that transcends culture or eras of humanity." I've studied this so much that no one will ever convince me that this is a part of the Bible we can just ignore. So, the question is, then, how do we apply it?

The rationale Paul gives for why he insists on women wearing head coverings is that it is "a symbol of authority on her head." I don't think the "what" of the symbol matters as much as that there is one. This symbol is clearly tied with something to be worn - that is publicly visible and not something you keep in a box at home, although there's no clear requirement that other people have to understand its nature as a symbol other than those in the authoritarian relationship.

So, my wife often wears something that functions as a symbol of our leader-helper authority structure. She

openly accepts this and embraces it. Most of the time, that's her ring. Other times it's me telling her what to wear on a particular day when we go out.

When biblical women were not in public, there was no requirement to wear a head covering or to show a symbol of authority. So, if he wants you to lounge around the house in a skirt and high heels, that's his own preference and you'll have to reconcile that with your views of him being the leader of your relationship - especially when he is your husband.

But when you go out *together* (possibly even without him, I haven't thought about that aspect of application of this passage), then there is certainly a Scriptural basis for you expressing his authority by what you wear. Now, you could argue that it should be this or that - like your engagement ring or wedding ring. But if he tells you what he wants that symbol of authority to be and you reject that authority to decide what your own symbol of authority will be ... what value is there in wearing a symbol of an authority that you don't submit to?

To be fair, this is also a passage I don't necessarily think about 24/7, so most of the time I'm not paying attention to whether or not my wife has her ring on, or I'm not telling her what to wear or anything like that. I'm not sure if this is a form of sin by neglect and I really should be stepping up and insisting on more adherence to 1 Cor. 11 or not - I just know that when I do express that it matters to me, it would be inappropriate for her to reject that authority. If he makes an overbearing requirement, my guess is that his request isn't following biblical principles anymore than your rejection of his request would be a rejection of biblical principles ... not that his wrong makes your wrong somehow acceptable.

Engaged or not, if he's that controlling, you're in for a wild ride. Get out before your submissiveness becomes a biblical/sin issue, particularly if he's going to abuse that obligation to funnel into a controlling nature on his part.

The Sandbox and the Swingset, Introducing MRPW

-1 upvotes · 6 August 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

You're right: if someone is an idiot and does all of this at once overnight it'll probably lead to divorce, just like practicing male RP tactics in Rambo mode will lead to divorce. My wife did these things over a span of years.

Biblical submission involves (1) following someone else's lead (2) even in the face of disagreement. If she's only willing to follow his lead when she agrees, it's not submission. More to the point, if a man isn't leading, nothing the wife does can rationally be called submission. It might be humility, being a servant, being responsible, or any number of other positive traits, but it's not submission.

So, if a man does not lead, a wife cannot exercise biblical submission. To get there, I don't see a problem with a woman doing things to foster an imperative in him to lead - as long as (per one of my other comments) she maintains a positive attitude in how she implements these things.

Where is attraction? From my observation, attraction is not only from (1) seeing somethings who is capable of fulfilling their role in the relationship, but also (2) seeing someone who will let you fulfill your role in the relationship. Most men will not find a woman attractive who is bulging with muscles or is entirely independent, having no need for him. The things I have suggested, for the most part, are ways that she can show she actually needs or desires his presence in her life. If done with positive attitude, it can make a man feel fulfilled in the relationship and become more attracted to her, as opposed to relationships where the wife just romps around doing everything herself and shoving the husband into a corner in the basement to love out his days.

What percent of men are Alpha?

-1 upvotes · 27 July 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

These are about the percentages I had in mind. If a guy's going to "get it," it's most likely going to happen in his 30s. I assume this is because his SMV keeps going up until around 35-40, whereas women's goes down during that same age-range. So, he starts becoming superior to his female contemporaries on the SMP, which gives him

unusual confidence.

Also, most divorces happen when people are in their 30s. So, the beer belly the guy had tends to go away at that time and he's re-learning how to game women for that next girl. Women post-divorce make an effort to fix themselves up too, but post-wall, they're fighting a much more uphill battle than he is.

What if you are just ugly?

-1 upvotes · 21 July 2017 · /r/askTRP

Find Jesus, become a pastor! No matter how ugly, an overwhelming majority of pastors seem to have one of the hottest girls in church as their wife.

Seriously, though: this is a horrible reason to "find Jesus" ... but there's truth in my jest.

The number one reason for leaving red pill

-3 upvotes · 6 September 2017 · /r/ExRedPill

What behavior are you referencing?

TRP isn't all bad, but hurt and/or hateful men take it too far

-3 upvotes · 13 August 2017 · /r/ExRedPill

To quote /u/imathrowyaaway:

you are essentially doing exactly what extreme-TRP is doing. generalizing a whole group, disregarding any valid issues those people have faced, advocating poor treatment of them regardless of what they actually did, just because they follow [_____]

TRP isn't all bad, but hurt and/or hateful men take it too far

-3 upvotes · 13 August 2017 · /r/ExRedPill

The core of the problem is disrespect for women as lesser beings.

Again, you're only referencing [r/theredpill](#) and you're making claims without a basis. At [r/RPChristians](#) we believe that women were also created in God's image and hold equal value as men. The fact that God assigned different roles does not mean one is a "lesser being."

As for MRP, you're right in that many people there do still maintain that type of attitude.

Marital Confidence Intervals and Probabilistic Stage Setting

-4 upvotes · 8 July 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

You're right, I do still have a lot to learn. That said, looking back over the past couple years, especially in the last 6 months, I see that I am much further than I initially thought, and certainly than you'd like to give me credit for. Whereas many men may have to travel 1,000 miles from Disney Land to climb to the summit of Pike's Peak, I found myself already at the foot of the mountain - I just needed to start climbing. Instead of results (vertical ascent up the mountain) taking a year to manifest (because of the lateral journey to get to the mountain in the first place), they took a week - and I'm still climbing.

You're right, most alphas don't like "taking lessons from noobs." There are many ways in which I'm still noob-ish, and I'll keep climbing. As [/u/man_in_the_world](#) pointed out, my use of RP terminology is probably off. Although most of the concepts are not new to me, I'm used to a different set of terminology from before I discovered RP, and the concepts might not be an exactly perfect match. That said, I'm limiting my posts to areas where I have

had personal experience and success, which laid the foundation for immediate results as soon as I discovered a few RP concepts that finally started building on the foundation I had built before coming here (ergo being at the foot of the mountain and starting to climb rather than still on the road from Disney Land). If I'd known how close I was, I probably wouldn't have been so whiny in my posts a couple weeks ago. In the meantime, I will try to discuss things more conceptually rather than using foreign terms until I'm sure my use of them is consistent with their application here.

In the meantime, I'll ask that you stop stalking my posts trying to discredit me. You come off as the ticked off ex throwing a hissy fit in public to the new girlfriend, "It's not fair! He's not supposed to be good in bed! He was just a crappy virgin who didn't know how to please a woman a couple weeks ago!" Presenting yourself this way makes it harder for me to take your accusations seriously and to learn from them. If what I'm saying is something people find helpful and beneficial, accept that and move on. If I say something wrong, correct me and I'll change it. It's that simple. There's no need for whining about how noob you think I am.

EDIT: Also, I expect some conflict between us, and that's okay. Looking through your conflict history, it's clear that we have different goals for being in MRP. I'm okay with that.

Tag: [/u/GargantuaBlarg29](#) - since you joined the conversation

TRP isn't all bad, but hurt and/or hateful men take it too far

-5 upvotes · 12 August 2017 · [/r/ExRedPill](#)

A lot of the info ... is based on facts and useful in the right context ... but if taken to the extreme ... it makes men become comical caricatures

This is why I started [r/RPChristians](#) - basically sift out all the garbage, like plating, objectification, divorce/cheating, etc., while retaining the things that are actually of value.

As far as the alpha caricature thing goes, my guess is you probably haven't been to MRP ([r/marriedredpill](#)) or spent much time there. Where TRP only focuses on the physical aspects of male-female interactions, MRP adds the emotional, acknowledging the need to balance both alpha and beta traits.

As one regular noted: *Tingles without fuzzies won't last, fuzzies without tingles are worthless*. To put it another way: if you don't have a balance of beta in your character, you're never going to be able to keep a stable relationship.

To the point [/u/raziphel](#) made about seeing women as objects, it's important to remember that red pill praxeology is, at its core, merely a descriptive set of facts - observations that have been generalized after repetition has proved them reliable.

That said, most people don't want to understand how the world works - they want to use that understanding to take advantage of the system. This is natural and we all do it. If my computer isn't working, I'm not going to read a book about how computers function just for the fun of it - I'm going to read it to try to figure out how to fix my computer. If someone's marriage or relationship patterns are broken, they're not going to read books about fixing relationships just for the fun of it - they're doing it to fix a problem in their lives.

The problem with TRP is that it's mostly people who don't want to read the book or understand how it works - they just want to skip straight to the answers. It's like going on a "fix your computer" forum and asking how to fix your computer, they ask you what kind of motherboard you have, but instead of answering the question you insult them and insist that they give real answers on how to fix your computer. It skips the descriptive aspects and goes straight to the prescriptions. But if you take the wrong prescription for your problem, it's really damaging, which is why you need to understand your issues and symptoms before engaging. That's the real problem with TRP.

MRP is much better at sticking to the core descriptive understandings of RP praxeology, but still has some problems with pushing prescriptive measures out of alignment, like telling people, "Just divorce her, she's crazy"

without actually trying to figure out why she's crazy and trying to address the problem. They'll simply answer, "That's too much effort. Stop your oneitis and go find someone else."

Over at [r/RPChristians](#), the goal is to figure out what's at the core of a problem and give uniquely targeted solutions based on what we know about how the world functions (most of which we believe, of course, can be sourced in the Bible and isn't anything new RP discovered - after all, God created the human nature that RP is attempting to figure out, right?).

Rejecting appreciation ... weird concept, but it works for me.

-6 upvotes · 17 July 2017 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

... oh good, another comment that attacks the age of my account rather than actually discussing the merits of anything I've said. I bet your wife finds it really sexy when she sees you picking all the low hanging fruit and rationalizing why it doesn't make sense to try for the better apples up top.

Using power/muscle during sex

-7 upvotes · 18 January 2019 · [/r/askMRP](#)

Is there a reason you need to feel macho and strong while having sex? Are you trying to impress your queen and judge with your muscles?

Preempting the DV charge.

-8 upvotes · 16 November 2017 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

Everything can be abused for the wrong purposes.

Preempting the DV charge.

-11 upvotes · 16 November 2017 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

Note the intro about when actually to apply some of this stuff. Some guys know when it's coming and it's wise to be prepared. If you're at low risk, ignore doing any of this.

Preempting the DV charge.

-12 upvotes · 16 November 2017 · [/r/MarriedRedPill](#)

I'm an attorney. I assure you, they are very real and literally happen every single day - in my city alone. I've known 2 policemen who have quit the force, in part because they couldn't stand the number of fake DV calls and the fact that their employers obligated them to support the charge, despite the evidence to the contrary.

The number one reason for leaving red pill

-12 upvotes · 5 September 2017 · [/r/ExRedPill](#)

Both you and "the red pill" make the mistake of assuming people have one nature. Christianity offers an alternative: dual natures. We were created by God to be one way (perfect, good, righteous, holy, whatever you want to call it), but because of sin we live another way (evil, depraved, selfish, etc.).

The Red Pill has figured out how the sinful nature works without acknowledging that there is something good and pure that God intended for us - including women - to live in. The solution you seem to be proposing is the opposite: to assume that women aren't any of these things. That's equally fallacious.

The more appropriate response is to realize that people have certain tendencies, but also have a modicum of free will to balance their sinful desires with the general redemptive grace that God gives to all people, which is meant to lead them to Jesus, who is the epitome model of living the redeemed life.

With Jesus alongside us, women can be more than the red pill would accuse them of being. But that doesn't mean

those tendencies go away. In Romans 7:25, Paul notes, "I myself in my mind am a slave to God's law, but in my sinful nature a slave to the law of sin."

So, there's nothing wrong with suggesting that all women have certain tendencies. The Bible as much as says so. The Bible also makes such claims about men. The fallacy is in assuming that these tendencies are the only basis for operative thought processes, or otherwise in assuming that those tendencies don't play a role at all.

Of course, none of this makes sense if you don't buy into the Bible as a source for truth.

Preempting the DV charge.

-29 upvotes · 18 November 2017 · /r/MarriedRedPill

Read the second introductory bullet point.

Where Are We Truly Investing: Earthly Things or the Kingdom?

score hidden · 2 March 2026 · /r/RPChristians

I don't see the dichotomy, unless we treat "investing in the Kingdom" as synonymous with "your own spiritual growth." Under this (inaccurate) definition, sure, you have to choose between "character, obedience, prayer life, and love for others" and "lifting, charisma, confidence-building, family-leading, career development, etc." because one would be drawing a line between what advances spiritual development v other forms of development.

In reality, "investing in the Kingdom" is about seeing it grow by spreading the Gospel to everyone around us, and discipling them into maturity so the Kingdom maintains the quality of people God desires. In this framework, we don't divide between tasks because each task is a different angle of pursuing the same goal.

- Prayer (i.e. talking to God) helps us communicate with Him and appeals for His help in the work He gave us, whereas charisma (i.e. talking to people) helps us draw those people to the Kingdom.

- Bible-reading helps us learn God's purposes, strategies, and principles for living out His purposes, whereas sidebar-reading helps us learn how to become more influential/persuasive to the people we're meant to be reaching as part of God's purpose.

- Developing spiritual character is good for making sure we don't stray from the mission; developing charm, confidence, and other "RP character" traits are good for helping us connect with people in ways that fulfill the mission.

- In the "love your neighbor as yourself" line, "loving others" feels like the spiritual, godly part because it is the reason why we bring the Gospel to them in the first place; the "as yourself" part is equally biblical as the degree to which you take care of yourself directly affects the degree to which you are capable of loving others, or for which they're willing to receive love from you.

For example, imagine some scrawny, pimple-faced geek who nerds out on mastering Tolkein's elvish language and has never talked to a girl in his life, other than his mom - although he prays and reads his Bible a lot. He decides to do something for God's Kingdom, so he goes out to the mall and tries to talk to strangers about how important it is to love Jesus. Sure, God can work miracles and use Him, but his pragmatic life choices have postured him to be entirely ineffective at accomplishing his goal. Most people will write off what he has to say - and when he fails at winning anyone's attention, he'll probably assume: "They rejected the Gospel message I was bringing" instead of the more accurate: "They rejected an ugly, socially awkward, socially inept nerd."

Again, I know God can work miracles. He can use a donkey to share His truth if He wants, or cause the rocks to cry out His praises. But the reality is that He chooses to work through us, and He has chosen not to do so through miraculous means for the vast majority of the fulfillment of His purposes for the building of His Kingdom. So, insofar as there are any hinderances, if anything will hold people back from accepting the message, let it be the

message itself and not the messenger who gets in the way. Be the type of person you know others would want to hear from - and then if they turn you down, you'll know it was because of their disbelief in the Gospel that they walked away from Christ, not their disdain for the person sharing it that caused them to walk away.

In the meantime, never stop sharing, even before you're a prime messenger - because even if some do believe, you'll know it was by God's power through your weakness; not as an excuse to continue being weak, but as praise to God that He could use you even while you were still growing.

Welcome Disciples!

score hidden · 29 July 2022 · /r/RPChristians

I appreciate what you're doing, but promoting other subs isn't allowed here - especially brand new ones with no history to show if they're actually reliable or not.

Top tier

score hidden · 14 June 2022 · /r/RPChristians

This got to stay up for a day, but I'm taking it down for being low quality.

That said: welcome! Best way to get to know many of us is through the discord. Post an introduction to get access to the full thing.

Why is marriage special if there is no ONE soulmate?

score hidden · 10 May 2022 · /r/RPChristians

Read this post:

https://www.reddit.com/r/RPChristians/comments/cnoykj/understanding_why_sexual_sins_are_sin/

And this one:

https://www.reddit.com/r/RPChristians/comments/85wf8w/is_sex_outside_of_marriage_a_sin_an_official/

The second one is on our sidebar. The other is also highly relevant. As another user said, do read the sidebar before posting basic questions like this.

Hello

score hidden · 16 March 2022 · /r/RPChristians

Hello to you too. We don't normally let posts like this stay up, but I'd highly encourage you to join the discord and start conversation there.

Read the Sidebar

score hidden · 23 February 2022 · /r/RPChristians

I'll endorse it. This is now an announcement post.

I took a dose of finasteride to see how the body would respond. The drug has irreversibly emasculated my brain.

score hidden · 23 February 2022 · /r/RPChristians

I'm taking this down. Not enough substance here. Feel free to repost on [/r/askRPC](#).

Need Help with Recurring Dreams

score hidden · 8 February 2022 · /r/RPChristians

I'll leave the askRPC post up and remove this one.

In defense of the top moderator of Christian Marriage (who wrote a long essay earlier today rebuking this subreddit)

score hidden · 7 August 2021 · /r/askRPC

I wanted to politely advise the members of this subreddit not to brigade his subreddit

Let me be clear about this: we do not permit brigading. If anyone is instigating brigading, let the mods know and we'll put a stop to it.

MedianNerd is a good Christian who simply doesn't view the world through a red-pill lens.

That statement should also be true for every godly person on RPC also.

He's kind, caring, polite, and friendly as long as you reach out to him in good faith.

So is the devil, when it suits him. Be cautious with the metric you use to define the "goodness" of a person. Jesus tells us to look to a person's fruit, not how nice of a person they are. Kindness, caring, politeness, etc. can be faked quite easily. I say this with no judgment on [u/MedianNerd](#) - I've never talked to him or (I think) participated on his subreddit. It's more of a general caution.

That said, as others have noted: yes, he put up a lot of misinformation without giving us an opportunity to weigh in before defaming us. Oh well. It's his space and he can do what he wants with it. There's no reason to get in a tizzy about this. **I'd rather quell any drama rather than stir it up**, so I'm removing this post and leaving it up to MN if he wants to have an honest conversation at any point.

How to survive 'no sex before marriage' when your Love language is physical touch.

score hidden · 22 July 2021 · /r/RPChristians

Per [this post](#), which is still an announcement on our main page, I have to remove this post and redirect you to [/r/RPCWomen](#).

That said, I agree with what [/u/HughBeaumont500](#) said. Love languages aren't in the Bible. They're a human classification system and not something ingrained in us by God. They are just a classification system based on generic preferences. It's like Myers-Briggs typology. It would be ridiculous to say, "I'm a P, not a J, but my boss wants me to be on time to work. What should I do?" The answer is: you be on time. **You are not a slave to the labels people create to categorize you.**

Also, LOTS of people claim that "physical touch" is their love language. The author of the book who man-made invented that categorization system even notes that physical touch doesn't mean "I feel loved when you have sex with me." My oldest daughter, for example, receives love through physical touch more than anything else. Does that mean I should start having sex with my daughter? Obviously not - nor would that actually make her feel loved. Because physical touch isn't about sex. It's about hugging, cuddling, holding hands, rubbing her head when we're watching a show together, or just putting my arm around her.

The reality is that most people who claim that "physical touch" is their "love language" really mean more generically, "I just want to have sex," which isn't a love language at all. It's a basic biological impulse. "This makes me aroused" and "this makes me feel loved" are not the same. Learn to distinguish between those two and you'll be fine.

My Current Status in this Scene

score hidden · 18 March 2021 · /r/RPChristians

Glad to see you back. With the number of bloopers and mental masturbators who have flooded into this place since

the COVID boom, it's good to see someone around who knows their stuff and at least has the capacity to add value to the conversations here - something I really need to get back to, as I've spent too much time on the discord and neglected this sub lately.

I no longer run anything concerning these groups but I do have men in my life that I have my own independent group with ... I just enjoy mentoring and seeing others succeed.

Right. This is what we call discipleship. And what you're doing reminds me of a conversation that [/u/r_horizon](#) shared with me that one of my "heroes" - Dawson Trotman - had with a guy he was discipling. Dawson asked the guy what his long-term plans were for his life. The guy answered:

- Billy: Gee, Daws, I think I want to be a pastor. There's such a need for good pastors these days.
- Daws: Say, that's a great idea Billy. I bet you'd be a fine pastor.
- Billy: Me too. Thanks for the encouragement.
- Daws: Any time. But you know, Billy - I have a thought. What if you discipled a guy to become a pastor. Then you'd have a pastor to do your pastoring for you and you could still do whatever you want.
- Billy: Hey, that's not a bad idea! I suppose if I could do something else, there's really a need for missionaries in China. I could go do that!
- Daws: Wow. What a great idea, Billy. But what if you discipled a guy and sent him to China? Then you'd have a pastor here and a missionary there and you could do whatever you want. What would you do then?
- Billy: I suppose I might start up a soup kitchen or serve the homeless in some way.
- Daws: Now I bet you can guess what I'll say is the best way you can multiply your efforts to reach the homeless, right? And not only the homeless, but the people who need pastors and the countries that need missionaries, or whatever else the Kingdom might need.

Too many people are content to be a single cog in the machine. Yeah, those cogs are necessary. But there is no lack of cogs. There is a much greater lack in mechanics who know how to put the cogs where they need to go. Even greater is the number of people who don't realize that our miraculous God can turn a metal cog into a human mechanic.

My memory verse for the week: "For though by this time you ought to be teachers, you need someone to teach you again the basic principles of the oracles of God. You need milk, not solid food" (Hebrews 5:12). Everyone is meant to be moving forward from cog to teacher.

Yeah, there are some on this thread who will expect you to earn that role with current involvement rather than relying on past rapport - and you can even count me among them. But if I remember you well enough and your "re-joining" the manosphere brings with it consistency of involvement, I don't expect you'll fail to do just that.

Question for wives

score hidden · 23 February 2021 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

First off: *Why are you asking women?* Watch what they do, not what they say, brother.

Second: There's an [r/RPCWomen](#) sub for a reason. This type of question belongs there.

Would you wear a mask in church?

score hidden · 15 February 2021 · /r/RPChristians

This is way too off-topic. Removed.

Christian Marriage is not a good sub for young men looking for direction

score hidden · 13 February 2021 · /r/RPChristians

I just removed this post and you're going to re-post it? If it doesn't add value to our community, it doesn't belong here. Just because you're butthurt about what a mod on another sub did doesn't mean this is the place to whine about it.

Christian marriage sub is banning those who don't want their wives to hang out with the opposite sex

score hidden · 13 February 2021 · /r/RPChristians

Yeah, some subs suck. This isn't the place to complain about them unless you have an analysis that actually adds value to this community. Removed.

NoFap Accountability Telegram Group

score hidden · 22 January 2021 · /r/RPChristians

Rule 4.

Getting your wife back after a separation

score hidden · 12 January 2021 · /r/RPChristians

MOD NOTE: This post does NOT represent the position of this sub. I'll write up a reply separately, but at least wanted to sticky this much. My actual analysis is, of course, subject to peer review.

Women are snakes

score hidden · 11 January 2021 · /r/RPChristians

I agree with the others. I normally enjoy our conversations on discord, but this particular post doesn't resonate with me and seems more likely to produce weeds than fruit. Even if you're right about much of this (I don't know enough about snakes to confirm), it's not something that most people will be able to learn from.

Day 2- working from home

score hidden · 24 December 2020 · /r/RPChristians

This post isn't substantive for the main sub. This looks like it should be one part of an OYS comment. Also, your method for dealing with temptation is purely human effort. Galatians 3:3 - "Are you so foolish? Having begun by the Spirit, are you now being perfected by the flesh?" Or in the NIV: "human effort."

You didn't list spiritual reproduction as one of your strategies for conquering PMO, so you're doomed to fail. Good luck. In the meantime, if you want to share this, do it in a broader OYS comment.

Where should I get started with sidebar readings?

score hidden · 15 December 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Yet another question that really should have been on [r/askRPC](#). Thread locked. I'm going to keep locking/removing these until people get it. Just leaving a few up so others can see that these low-quality questions don't belong on the main sub. We started [r/askRPC](#) for a reason.

Book recommendations for my single brother

score hidden · 15 December 2020 · /r/RPChristians

This really belongs on [r/askRPC](#). It's already gotten a good number of replies and attention, so I'll let it stay up, but bear in mind that we have the other sub for a reason. Yeah, there are fewer total subscribers - but the active users here are over there also, so you're still getting the same quality of replies - you just bypass all the lurkers and bleeps who concern troll around here.

surrendering pride

score hidden · 15 December 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I'm locking this for a few reasons. First, I'm not sure how it connects to the purpose of our sub. There are lots of other forums to comment on general concepts of Christianity. This particular forum is meant to be more targeted to issues affecting relationships, sexuality, masculinity, and mission. Yes, "pride" as a general concept can tangentially relate to these categories, but you made zero effort to connect them, so I'm not sure why this post belongs here as opposed to somewhere else. Feel free to tweak and I may change my mind on this bit.

Second, and more significantly, you present nothing helpful here. Your entire post can be summarized in 3 words: "Pride is bad," [mmkay](#)? The "advice" you give is so vague as to have no practical utility. "Release things to God and trust Him" - what does that even mean. HOW does someone release something to God? HOW does someone trust him? These are very churchy-sounding words because they have a feel-good sentiment, but at the end of the day pastors primarily love using them because they're not challenging anyone to do anything different. It's so vague that people can FEEL like they're heeding the message even without changing their lives, simply because they *feel* different every now and then when they are reminded of the cool catch-phrases they heard on a Sunday morning. Let's be better than that.

If you want to write an exposition on how to conquer pride, and include why conquering pride is relevant to matters of sexuality, masculinity, relationships, etc. - I'm all for that. But let's step up the bar in the quality of content you're trying to post here.

Reviving the Lost Pursuit of Christian Manliness

score hidden · 10 December 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I haven't yet seen anything of unique value on that sub which isn't already addressed here. Significantly raise the quality bar and maybe we'll let you refer there in the future.

This is a good and easy way to share the Gospel! It's basically Ray Comfort in your pocket!

score hidden · 30 November 2020 · /r/RPChristians

No link posts.

Getting back into lifting.

score hidden · 25 October 2020 · /r/RPChristians

This is for [r/askRPC](#).

The impact of being Christian while dating.

score hidden · 24 October 2020 · /r/RPChristians

This is a post for [r/askRPC](#). The main sub is for more substantive posts.

why does it seem many former protestants convert to eastern orthodox rather than catholicism if both orthodoxy and catholicism are technically part of the same church from Jesus?

score hidden · 24 September 2020 · /r/RPChristians

You had it up for a while, but I'm removing this because the question really has very little to do with our sub. It's

more for [r/askRPC](#).

Post-Divorce Reports

score hidden · 21 September 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Let's be clear: **RPC does not endorse casual divorce**, especially for the purpose of "trading in for a much better wife." Your post is conspicuously absent of any biblical context.

That said, while the post inappropriately encourages men toward divorce, we'll leave it up for now on the expectation that maybe a few men in the process of divorce or who have recently been through divorce can be encouraged.

Another cuationary:

being less than two years after divorce and remarried

This tells me you're still in the honeymoon phase, so I'm extremely skeptical of the permanency of the results you're seeing. I'd prefer to see you write this post after you've got 10 years with the new woman under your belt. Yes, some men can and will - and I hope you're one of them. But for a newlywed, I wouldn't be surprised if you could also end up in the other larger camp of men who find that their second marriage is a re-hash of their first.

Put another way, you're not far enough in yet to be able to say authoritatively that your choice was a wise one, at least in the classic sense. Biblically, depending on your circumstances and theology, it's almost certainly a sinful choice. Though perhaps there's room for the choice to be redeemed.

Desire, Love and Intimacy: Red Pill Christian Podcast - Ep. 12

score hidden · 20 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

FYI - It got too complicated for [/u/r_horizon](#) to be the one to edit everything, then me to make these posts, so I delegated to him. When he posts them, it's still official.

Nowhere else to turn: Husband seeming to have trouble accepting a baby girl and I don't know what to do/how to support him

score hidden · 18 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

FYI - while this is also an appropriate place for this question, I'd also recommend posting on [r/RPCWomen](#).

Official RPC Discord

score hidden · 15 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

When you join, do note Rule 1: **THOU SHALT USE YOUR REDDIT USERNAME.**

Do you have any concerns about how it seems like this view errs on the side of control of your wife over her personal growth and freedom?

score hidden · 15 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Mod Note: This post obviously does not reflect the views of this sub. OP admitted to being a troll on this sub, so he naturally got banned. That said, I'm leaving the post up anyway. I think there's enough value in the comments - especially from [/u/Deep_Strength](#) and [/u/RedPillWonder](#) - and I'm sad that [/u/Praexology](#)'s comment didn't get much reply, because that would have led to some fruitful discussion too. Well done boys - and I mean everyone here, not just the guys I named.

I'm waiting on God to tell me who my wife is.

score hidden · 13 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

You get one. This is your one. Best for [/r/askRPC](#) for anyone else reading this. Expressing anger is fine, but the way you've acted in the comments (which I've removed) is completely out of line.

Your frame sucks. Fix it. That's got to be high on your priority list while you're here.

Also: stats? That's another rule. Yeah, you're not technically asking for advice - but your post is implicitly calling for it. It's relevant to the responses you'll get. Put them up.

The Southern Baptist Convention is going SJW. You read that correctly.

score hidden · 12 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Removed. This is a link post without adequate explanation. Please refer to Rule 8 and my comment linked there. [u/Aaaquad](#) also did a post on the subject, showing what a good link post looks like [over here](#).

A picture of a relationally solid church community

score hidden · 11 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

MOD NOTE: We, as a sub, do not endorse the content written here. I have written more about this in my underlying comment. While the post is being left up for the interesting discussion it can generate, what this congregational structure is doing is neither red pill nor biblical, as far as I can tell based solely on OP's representations. I do believe this congregation's intentions are noble, but still ultimately misguided.

Update: Looking for guidance

score hidden · 6 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I'm sorry to hear about your situation. I've been there. But here's something I do want to comment on:

I think basically any relationship issue can be rectified through prayer, communication, and possibly therapy

Yikes. I mean, I might agree in the sense that you said "can" and I agree that it's theoretically possible.

But the reality is that if you take 1,000 couples with serious relational problems and told them: *Use prayer, communication, and therapy as your primary strategies for fixing the problems*, I'd wager 990 of them are going to pretend to feel better for a time, but end up in a cyclical pattern of relapsing and never finding permanency in their solutions.

Yes, some people will anecdotally find good results from these. But they are not consistently reliable strategies. It's like the guy who says that having an accountability partner is the best way to kick a porn problem. Out of several hundreds of people who try it, maybe 3-4 will actually find permanency in the cure from that method.

I want to be clear: I'm not knocking prayer. Prayer has value, but its purpose is not to fix our problems. God gave us other tools and resources. Prayer exists to give us a forum for expressing ourselves to God. It is not a "give me what I want" session - and those who treat it this way always find (as referenced above) extremely inconsistent results, often self-fulfilling to the degree that even if they get what they want, it's because they made it happen, not because they prayed for it to happen. This is a misuse and misunderstanding of biblical prayer.

For reference: "communication" sounds like a nice word, and it can be helpful, but usually not with the communication strategies that are taught to young married couples.

Likewise, "therapy" is often so doggone blue pill that it's actually likely to make relationship problems WORSE, not better.

Just some things to think about.

Who should you listen to on RPChristians?

score hidden · 4 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

If I'm not mistaken, this is a copy/paste of the last time you wrote a similar post. As such, some of the endorsements need to be updated, but I get the point. That said, as a note of explanation:

flair is almost always with black letters on a green background ... In some cases, it may be a blue background.

Green represents married men; blue for singles; pink for women.

Almost every single response is blue pilld af. What should we do as Christians to make the baseline of Christian social views more properly in line with the Bible so this doesn't happen?

score hidden · 4 August 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I'm removing this. I didn't, at first, realize it was a direct link to the other sub. It's not even an np link, thus could instigate brigading and get us in trouble with the Reddit admins. /u/RedPillWonder just wrote up a post on how to deal with this going forward.

Blocking Porn

score hidden · 27 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Who are you discipling right now?

For when you stumble

score hidden · 27 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I'm removing this because it doesn't seem substantially related to the purpose of the sub. This would be better posted on r/askRPC, where shorter, lower-effort content is permitted.

Divorce and Biblical Dread Game

score hidden · 24 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I'm removing this until you remove the links. We generally don't permit link posts unless it's within reddit or to a clearly established source. Take those down and the post will go back up.

Also, I appreciate your zeal here. You have a lot of good things to say. If you could tone down the bitterness you might actually gain some influence for your cause ... otherwise people will object to you - not necessarily on the basis of your content, but on your exaggerated communication style that makes you seem non-credible.

How to raise a man - Fr Ripperger

score hidden · 13 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

These types of posts require a description of the content before I'll allow it. This means at least an outline of his major points, not just a short blurb about the general topic.

Thanks!

Reformed? Or Arminian?

score hidden · 2 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

reformed or Arminian?

Compatibilist. Imagine being a two dimensional being looking at **this three dimensional object**. One person looking from the bottom would swear it's a square. Another looking at it from the side would think the first guy is

crazy because it's obviously a triangle. The two appear completely incompatible, right? Yet those of us existing in 3 dimensions see how plainly simple the shape is.

Complementarian or egalitarian in marriage doctrine?

I say this as a mod and founder of this subreddit: **EGALITARIANISM IS NOT WELCOME HERE AND IS NOT BIBLICAL.**

...if you are egalitarian in doctrine id love to hear more from you!

For what purpose? Because you are an egalitarian and want more support for your unbiblical view? Or because you are opposed to egalitarianism and are curious to understand why anyone would believe such an unbiblical view?

What is this subreddit

score hidden · 1 July 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I'm removing this, as the answer is on the sidebar:

Welcome to Red Pill Christians

We are a subreddit that exists to provide a place for Christians to discuss problems, solutions and insights on relationships, sex, and biblical masculinity according to biblical principles.

How do I start serving in church?

score hidden · 29 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I get frustrated with the framework most people operate in when discussing things like this. There's a fundamental difference between "serving in the church" and "serving the Church." It's subtle, but do you notice it?

The Church = God's Kingdom, not these pockets of communities that amass in a particular building. Serving the people who congregate in your building is not the same as serving the interests of God's Kingdom. Yes, often-times they do overlap, but not nearly as much as you might think. This is why we call it "churchianity," right? Because at some point it stopped serving Christ in CHRISTianity and started its improper focus on itself as the church, hence CHURCHianity.

If you want to serve your local congregation, just ask someone on the welcoming team or the pastor. You'll get plugged in fast. But you'll be serving a machine. Sometimes it's a useful machine, other times it's not. Make sure you know which your congregation is before you start investing too much time. Just because they preach stuff you approve of doesn't necessarily mean they're actually advancing God's Kingdom.

But if you want to serve The Church, Jesus made it clear how to do that: "make disciples of all nations." Who are you discipling? If you're not discipling anyone yet, that's the starting point. As you do that, everything else unfolds.

So, start re-framing your thoughts away from "serving in my local church congregation" and toward "serving God's Kingdom" (i.e. The Church) and you'll find yourself likely coming up with a vastly different set of answers, all more biblical than the first question would produce.

What do I need to learn from here since I came from the og TRP?

score hidden · 20 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

As /u/r_horizon said, what you need to learn from here is on the sidebar. The most common answer to virtually

any question that gets asked here is: "lift, sidebar, STFU." What that means is:

- Lifting is the foundation of being attractive - not only to women, but to make friends, earn respect in the workplace, gain influence in your social circles, etc. We could debate over whether the world *should* function this way or not, but the reality is that attractive people fare much better than unattractive people, and lifting is the most important factor in that equation.
- Sidebar content is all of the information you'll need to know beyond just lifting. If we break it down into physical, mental, spiritual, lifting covers the physical and the sidebar content covers the mental and spiritual. Specifically, the 100s and 200s cover the mental and the 300s/400s cover the spiritual (plus the other posts).
- STFU means to keep yourself out of trouble while you're getting fit and learning from the sidebar. People who talk too much while still ignorant end up with problems. Once you start developing a frame, ease your way back into dominating social communications once again, whether with a wife/girlfriend, boss, friend, etc.

I don't have a mission for Christ.

Of course you do. You're just not living it. A mod over on [/r/TrueChristian \(/u/fictitiousfishes\)](#) once commented appropriately that God doesn't have a history of repeating with unique, special revelation what he's already said in Scripture. You can pray for thousands of hours on the question, "God, should I lie or tell the truth?" He's not going to proclaim from the heavens that you should tell the truth. He already told you not to lie in Scripture and he won't repeat himself. God already told you to make disciples in Scripture. That's your mission. He's not going to repeat himself with some unique and special calling.

Your context in how you make disciples may differ from your neighbor's. But the goal is still the same. If you're spiritually gifted at hospitality, invite people into your home and disciple them. If you're gifted in mercy, disciple those who are suffering and in need. If you're gifted in teaching, disciple your students rather than merely teaching them. If you're gifted in evangelism, disciple those who are saved through your preaching. If you're gifted at fixing pipes, then disciple those whose pipes you fix. If you're an expert at delivering pizza, disciple those at the pizza shop or build relationships to people who order pizza and get to know them beyond your pizza-delivery role so you can one day disciple them. If you're (in [/u/lamecatchphrase's](#) case) gifted at protecting people, disciple those who protect others alongside you, or disciple the people you're protecting.

Context matters, but it is not the goal in itself. You can create new contexts for yourself, but people who are overly ambitious about "improving" their context, from a missional perspective, aren't improving at all - they're merely changing their context. In reality, devaluing your context is probably an actual improvement on a missional level. The poor and needy are more likely to receive discipleship than the wealthy. So, while getting a promotion may look like an "improvement" in your context, if it means being around wealthier people more and they're more resilient to the Gospel, then you've actually harmed your mission by getting that promotion (not that you shouldn't take it; but that you find a way to leverage your new context more efficiently and work harder to make your mission work in your new context).

This is partly, I believe, why Jesus said it's so hard for a rich person to enter the Kingdom of Heaven - because "improvements" in context from a worldly perspective are actually a devaluation in God's missional perspective. Yet when our context "declines" by losing our job, going into foreclosure, etc. then we actually end up with an even greater pool of people receptive to the Gospel - and that's a beautiful thing. That's not to say we shouldn't improve context from a more common sense of worldly ambition; just make sure you're leveraging the new context properly.

Thoughts about fraternity/sorority culture?

score hidden · 16 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

This is a post for [r/askRPC](#). Please relocate it there. Thanks!

How to reach to being “ghosted”?

score hidden · 16 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I'm removing this post for two reasons:

1. It doesn't include your stats.
2. It cross-posts to another sub.

Please add the stats (see Rule 2 on the sidebar) and paste the post onto this sub so we're not redirected elsewhere, then you'll be approved. You may also want to post this on [r/askRPC](#) instead of [r/RPChristians](#), as it's meant for these types of questions and the pool of users is more likely to evoke responses from quality contributors, as passive lurkers who decide it's time to chime in are less frequent there.

Need some dating advice...

score hidden · 10 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I thought I didn't need to put down things that didn't have anything to do with the question

I'm stickying this so EVERYONE can see this PERFECT example of why stats are absolutely necessary on advice threads. Asking a theology question? Screw the stats. Advice? Mandatory. Period. Let's break this down.

She would also like to, but one thing is holding her back: ~~I'm going into law enforcement~~ ... I am 5'7", 125lbs

FTFY.

[/u/OsmiumZulu](#)'s advice to you is solid gold. He said pretty much everything I would have. The most critical point to absorb on why your stats matter?

- **Women go out of their way to bend their schedules, goals, and preferences to suit a guy who she is *highly* attracted to, especially on a sheer *physical* level.**

Now, in the comments below I'm seeing you make these statements:

the point of my post had nothing to do with physical fitness

and

Pretty sure I was asking relationship advice, not for a workout guide

and

I never said I had no intention of gaining more muscle mass. Btw, why did you comment, it has nothing to do with the topic of my original post. Literally the only reason why that's there is because otherwise I was violating rule 2 and this thread would be locked. Otherwise I would not have added it because it has nothing to do with the questions in my original post.

and

nothing in my post had anything to do with, "I weigh this much will she think I'm cute". It had nothing to do

with physical fitness. It was more of a, to put it simply, "how should I handle this particular situation" kind of questions

You've literally had at least 5, maybe 6 guys pushing the stats issue. You DEER and ignore every one of them. Consider the possibility that *maybe* ... just *MAYBE* there's a chance 5-6 people give the exact same advice for a reason. After all, only 5-6 guys actually engaged with the question that YOU thought was relevant.

Okay, let me put a bar here to emphasize the juxtaposition I'm trying to create.

OZ: Women go out of their way to bend their schedules, goals, and preferences to suit a guy who she is highly attracted to, especially on a sheer *physical* level.

You: nothing in my post had anything to do with, "I weigh this much will she think I'm cute". It had nothing to do with physical fitness

With those statements in mind, let's go back to your question. I'll paraphrase for you: *I like a girl, I want to be a cop and she doesn't date cops, but might be changing her mind. Should I go for it or not?*

The advice you're seeking is likely tied to your stats. If you were Chris(tian) Hemsworth as a cop, do you think she'd even think twice about dropping her "no cops" rule? Do you think she would have even told you that standard in the first place, knowing that it could drive you away? No. She wouldn't possibly take that risk.

By pre-emptively DEERING about your stats while simultaneously insisting that guys ignore your stats and focus on the question you want answered, what you're saying is: *"I know my stats are probably the real problem in why this situation exists in the first place, but I'm going to repress that thought and see if there's another technical answer I can hang my hat on so that I don't actually have to fix my stats and can still get what I want."*

I don't blame you for doing this (even if subconsciously or unintentionally). **I did it once upon a time too.** I had appearance issues I knew I needed to work out when I wrote up my first askMRP post. I lied and pretended I was in great shape. Why? Because I didn't want "relationship advice" to be clouded by a constant refrain of "get in shape." It's embarrassing now to look back at that. The one thing that made the singular biggest difference in my situation, taking away all the complications, was the one answer I didn't want to hear. Implementing all of the other advice without taking care of my physique wouldn't have come anywhere near to getting me the results I was looking for.

CONCLUSION

Yes, the stats matter. I don't say this to fault or shame you for anything - again, I've tried to get advice while ignoring my own stats too. Let my wasted effort be a lesson to you to start where we tell every guy to start: at the gym.

Practical Ways to Become More Masculine

score hidden · 7 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I agree with /u/Deep_Strength about needing the Rule 2 information. This post is locked until edited to include that information.

What is this subreddit about? I can't figure it out based on the posts

score hidden · 3 June 2020 · /r/RPChristians

This is more a post for [r/askRPC](#). But yes, the answers are on the sidebar.

Pre-marriage sexuality

score hidden · 1 June 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

While this is an interesting question, I'd prefer you re-post it on [r/RPCWomen](#) and [r/askRPC](#). Thanks!

Women are the beloved creation of Gods hand before they are temptation to you

score hidden · 21 May 2020 · [/r/RPChristians](#)

I thought about removing this thread for the blatantly unbiblical view it expresses, but maybe there's more value in leaving it up and just locking it instead. Before doing so, though, let's clear up some things ...

Looking at someone with lustful intent

It's amazing to me how many people call "lust" or even "lustful intent" a sin. Have you not read Matthew 5? Is it wrong for me to lust after my own wife? Of course not. Let's quote Jesus: "Anyone who lusts ... has committed adultery in his heart." Lust is not the sin. Adultery is. If the lustful intent is not in an adulterous context, we can't so quickly call it sin. I expanded on this significantly in my comment to [/u/DeChef2](#) below. [Here's the link for the lazy.](#)

purely as a means of gratification for you- as a means of satisfying a desire you have. It is turning them into a commodity to be consumed, rather than a person to honor

Hmm ... the word for "lust" in Matthew 5:28 is a conjugation of *epithumeo*. Let's look at another example the same author uses - Matthew 13:16-17.

- But blessed are your eyes because they see, and your ears because they hear. For truly I tell you, many prophets and righteous men [*epethymesan* - selfishly desired for their own gratification, as a commodity to be consumed rather than to be honored,] to see what you see but did not see it, and to hear what you hear but did not hear it.

Does that interpretation make ANY sense to you at all? This garbage interpretation by the author is imputing his own definitions and ideas of what that word means and using that as a foundation for Scriptural interpretation. That is not how we do things here.

Instead, from the very next time Matthew (again, the same author) uses the word, we see that this "lust/desire" is utilized in a very holy context by righteous people. Lust is not inherently degrading to women. The context and motive in which it is used is what causes the problem, per above.

David

As others have pointed out, this wasn't a one-way thing. Bathsheba was married to one of David's mighty men. Historically, David is understood to be close to 60 years old at this time. Most people also believe his mighty men came about when he was serving Saul as a young man! That means they'd known each other for a LONG time. This is also clear from Uriah's closeness to the palace. David almost certainly knew Bathsheba, and her him.

Yeah, she's either on the roof or bathing with an open window. Yeah, she could see the palace out the window. Yeah, she knew David lived in the palace. There's nothing in the Bible to suggest she shut the window if/when she noticed David oggling her. There's also nothing that indicates ANY type of resistance whatsoever to David's advances toward her. After all, she's a lonely woman whose husband was off at war, so she's hot and lonely.

Can we say definitively that she sinned in all of this? I suppose we could assume that David actually raped her. But something tells me that if he did, Nathan would have been having a different conversation with David later

on. David was condemned by God in this situation for committing adultery and sending Uriah to his death. He was also condemned and got numerous Israelites killed by a plague for something as small as taking a census. If rape had occurred, something tells me God would have mentioned that to us, in light of the smaller things about David that actually are brought up.

In the absence of rape, the only other conclusion is that Bathsheba was willing. This was mutual adultery. And if she was willing when summoned, is it a hard leap to assume she was hopeful and perhaps even tempting? Obviously there's no guarantee that she lured David into this. But these are not far stretches, and they're pretty commonly agreed upon even by many blue pill pastors - one of the few cases in Scripture where I've actually heard pastors be willing to share the blame.

Oh, one reason I've heard for why Bathsheba was presumed to be at fault was God's insistence on the death of the baby. One pastor noted that 1 Cor. 7 sanctifies children born of sinful relationships as long as one of the parents is a believer/righteous. The presumption given was that if Bathsheba was innocent before God in the situation, he would have spared the baby, but because the baby died it implies that neither of them were innocent. Sure, this is a bit of a stretch, but also an interesting thought.

Who should you listen to on RPChristians?

score hidden · 20 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Thanks for posting this, brother. I want to clarify that being endorsed here isn't purely about reliability to the rest of the community, though that's definitely its primary function. It also determines the pool of people we select from for other projects. Examples of "other projects" include:

- Giving one-on-one attention for phone calls/zoom meetings to discuss important issues related to the sub, personal life, etc.
- I have on a couple occasions hosted small groups online, and when we set these up, it's primarily for flaired contributors or those who we are contemplating giving flair to.
- Endorsed/flaired contributors are also the only ones considered for participation in the RPC video chat series, which will be posted very soon (we have a number of sessions already recorded). Right now the group consists of 3 mods and 2 ECs. Other ECs may be asked from time to time to join in as guest speakers to the conversation.

My point is, there are other benefits to being a flaired contributor. While your motivation toward becoming a model for others to look up to should be internal and not motivated by flair-seeking, we do want to reward those people whose lives and participation here reflect what others should aspire to.

Does that mean you have to be perfect? Heck no. I was just chatting with [u/TheChristianAlpha](#) the other day about how I broke frame with my wife a couple weeks ago. There are some ECs who aren't even married, but that doesn't mean they can't give advice to those who are. There are others who are married, but still don't have the sex life they've always wanted. As Deep often says, our faith is one of direction, not destination. Of course, passing certain mile-markers can help make clear which direction you're moving.

Let me add a few more points on flair, in general:

- **If you think anyone is a good candidate for endorsement, let us know. We will investigate it and make a decision.** If you have any suggestions, put them here. [/u/dechef2](#) is on my radar, for example. AlanNoles is someone I've meant to endorse for a while and hadn't done it yet - I'm going to get to that now. [u/angusisin](#) is another one, though he's significantly less active on reddit.
- You're welcome to nominate yourself for endorsement. We don't take this as arrogance. Also, if you take the view that "macho people don't ask for stuff like this," ease up. Paul says to eagerly desire the greater gifts, as

if we are meant to pursue them with ambition. I take the pursuit of flair as a similarly appropriate ambition to have in order to enhance your ability to make a difference for God's Kingdom on this sub. That said, in humility, accept it if we say no.

- To re-emphasize: endorsement requires BOTH being red pill fluent and biblically grounded, though we may at times add other flair if someone is exceptional at one, but not the other. Also, you actually have to have a post/comment history that shows a wide enough array of your views, advice, and commentary to give us something to assess, which means you have to be fairly active before asking for flair.
- We will always give flair to any woman who wants it. Women having flair is not an endorsement, nor is it "favoring women" (instead, some may argue it's the exact opposite). It's for ease of differentiating whether you're talking to/getting advice from a woman or a man. That said, we won't automatically tag women publicly without a request because we already have a tagging system visible only to mods, so there's no need for our own purposes.
- We are not against adding negative flair for problem users. Some even specifically request it - like our "visiting infidel" who shows up from time to time.
- We're also not opposed to unique flair for people we don't necessarily endorse, but who do have a unique, valuable quality worth highlighting.

If you notice a color coding system with the flair, it's simple:

- Green: married man
- Blue: single man
- Pink: woman

Christians who have used the dating site E harmony, what was your experience like?

score hidden · 20 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

This is a post for [r/askRPC](#).

What is the Christian right's future in American politics?

score hidden · 20 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I'm removing this temporarily. You haven't done enough to explain the content. We removed the option to give link posts for a reason. If you want to post a link, that's fine, but you've got to summarize what we'll hear so that people can engage without actually having to click on the link if they don't want to. Too many people will not actually watch the video. I don't want discussion confused between those who did and those who didn't.

What are the main points in the video? Add that to your post and I'll re-approve.

How do I approach my husband about this issue?

score hidden · 19 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

"HOLY TINTINNABULATION, BATMAN!" The comments in this post are sending off all kinds of alarms. It's like the bloopers were chomping at the bit for an opportunity to play white knight for the damsel in distress against the mean, evil husband ... despite not knowing his side of the story, which OP respectfully pointed out in the comments.

I'm truly shocked at the advice given in this thread. So many people are quick to hop on the "communication" bandwagon. Seriously? Do you all really believe that telling her husband what he's doing wrong - no matter how

"lovingly" it's couched - is the solution here? Come on.

Sure, female strategy is going to be different from male strategy. But I'm completely baffled by comments advising: "tell him" followed by quoting Scripture that says to win him over "without words." If his frame is as strong as you portray it - cold and jagged, though it may be at times - your words are going to have very little impact and will, instead, more likely be interpreted as you complaining/nagging him, no matter how nicely you tell him.

So let's get to the meat of this. 1 Peter 3 is pretty clear: submit to your husband. The context is illuminating. Before, he talks about slaves submitting to oppressive masters. After, he talks about Jesus submitting to the government that was crucifying him. Right in the middle, he tells wives to submit to their husbands - specifically referencing non-believing husbands. The impression he's (likely intentionally) creating is that a wife should live in quiet submission to her husband, no matter how irrational or unbiblical his expectations are over her.

Yes, that's a tough pill to swallow. That's why it's a red pill and not a sugar pill.

Many people I've had this conversation with want to jump to 3:7 - "Husbands, in the same way be considerate as you live with your wives." But we're not talking to him. If he's in sin, he will answer for it. It's not your responsibility to repay his sin by more sin of your own in how you interact with him. That's horrible logic and God won't honor it. Even if he is at fault here, that's beside the point. You can't control him.

What you can do is control yourself and treat him the way the Church is to treat Christ.

First, I've heard a number of sermons preached on "Things we wish Jesus didn't say." The Great Commission often makes the list. It's hard work. It's easy for the Church to throw it back at Jesus, "Why is the burden on us to get your Gospel to the nations? Can't you just write it in the stars? It's your goal, after all, not ours. Why don't you help out some more?" Can you imagine having a conversation with Jesus like that? And if the Church shouldn't be talking to Jesus this way, why would it be appropriate for a wife to talk to her husband that way?

From there, some people like to say, "But Jesus's yoke is easy and his burden is light." Yeah, but that "easy/light" burden also required the rich young man to sell all his wealth and give it away in order to follow Jesus. That's what the Church is expected to do for Christ, upon his request. Are you willing to give up all of your paycheck to your husband instead of just \$1k every couple weeks?

[/u/rocknrollchuck](#) brought this up, so let me include it here: at \$52k/yr, after tax let's say you're at \$45k. \$1k/2wk = \$26k/yr. That leaves you another \$19k/yr reserved for yourself. If that's his idea, fine. But perhaps his thought is that if you're working full-time, but he's not getting the full benefit of your employ because you reserve so much for yourself, maybe he's recouping that value in a disproportionate share of the housework.

Sure, many objectors are going to say, "But that's not fair!" And yet who are you to judge what is fair in a man's own home without knowing the man? I know in my own home, my wife has often believed the balance of responsibilities is unfair - but this is because she does very little in the way of making disciples. She balances her job + kids + house. I balance my job + kids + house + **making disciples**. The last one is probably more time-consuming than any of them. It's also the one God's ultimately going to look at when judging what we did with our married life. So, if I spend an equal amount of time at work and with the kids, but I spend 90% more time making disciples than her, it only makes sense that the "fair" thing is that she do 90% more housework than me - or more, given that the two aren't actually equal and I'm carrying the load for her. Yet I still probably do about 45% of the housework anyway ... not to mention other necessary areas I spend more time on than her, like lifting.

My point is: housework isn't a 50/50 thing. Marriage is not a 50/50 split of responsibilities. **THE BIBLE IS NOT EGALITARIAN. The balance is whatever the head of the household decides it should be.** If he

decides to make you do more work than he does, then that's the balance for your home. His obligation is not to be overbearing on you. I don't know that you've described any situation that I'd call sinfully overbearing. "Unfair," sure ... if we only look at housework compared to housework. But "overbearing" in a 1 Peter 2-3 sense? Not by a long shot.

The flip of this is that he bears the responsibility for the finished product. You don't. There's a value to that responsibility as well. Consider: my wife works for a large accounting firm. She has been offered a promotion multiple times. It would involve (1) significantly increased pay and (2) reduced hourly requirements, but (3) more responsibility for the final product. More money, less hours! Fantastic deal, right? Yet she refuses to do it. Why? "Because I don't want the pressure of knowing that everything in my department falls on my head if something gets screwed up." So, she actually prefers to bear a larger time responsibility with lower compensation in order to avoid that responsibility.

As men, we bear that responsibility whether we like it or not. There is a weight to this constantly hanging over our heads. And that weight comes with a value on our time that inherently permits a reasonable degree of offsetting actual hours worked against the weight of responsibility.

So, where one user commented that "The fact that he makes more money is IRRELEVANT to household planning" - I couldn't possibly disagree more. There is a premium on each person's time. A law firm owner working 50 hours per week bears WAAAY more stress and responsibility than a Subway worker doing 50 hours per week. I can say this because I've done both. If the pay were even remotely close, I'd take the sandwich artist job every time. The work simply isn't as hard and doesn't take nearly as long to recover from. When I worked at Subway, I went home and had no further cares. As a law firm owner, I come home and am still working out cases in my hind-brain, pondering whether there will be enough to cover payroll, wondering if I forgot about any deadlines, etc.

Now, imagine those same types of pressures on an eternal scale. It's up to you to consider day-in and day-out whether or not your marriage, family, and personal life is moving in a direction you could proudly present to God, or if you are failing to lead your wife properly, should have shared the Gospel with that guy you saw while out running the previous day, forgot to train your children how to lead their friends to Jesus, accidentally gave bad advice to the guy you're discipling whose life is in a bad spot, etc. **I know for a fact my wife doesn't think about these things. Nor should she have to.** It's not her responsibility to think about everything that needs to be done under God's eyes for our marriage. That's my job. But the added responsibility comes with an added premium on my time. This means that my man-hours contributed to low-responsibility work are worth more than her woman-hours. In an egalitarian marriage, that obviously wouldn't be the case - but in a godly, biblical marriage, this will always be true.

Now, it's perfectly possible that your husband isn't actually thinking of any of these things. He may not actually be leading your marriage properly toward making disciples. And if that's the case, then he's a crappy leader, still bearing the responsibility, yet ignoring and squandering it. But there's no evidence that this is the case, so I'm not going to make that assumption.

Lastly, just because you're required to submit to him, regardless of how "unfair" you think it is, that doesn't mean you have to like it. The Bible compels slaves to obey masters, Jesus to die on the cross, and wives to submit to their husbands. It doesn't compel any of these people to *feeeeeeel* a certain way about the situation they're in.

Too many people think that "good Christians" should always have positive feelings all the time. That's absurd when we see how often Jesus had negative feelings. Are we to preach at him about how he needs to depend on God more? Absurd!

He can lead his home how he wants. But his leadership may bring with it the consequence of an unhappy spouse. You should not disrespect him in your unhappiness, but you're not obligated to feel good about it. So, embrace your frustrations and allow yourself to feel it. Don't repress or stifle your anger and annoyance, pretending to be happy when you're not. But in the way you conduct yourself, allow how you feel to be tempered by the behavior of one who has the "beauty of a gentle and quiet spirit, which is of great worth in God's sight."

"But RC, that's an outdated passage!" cry the liberals. Verse 5, "For this is the way the holy women of the past who put their hope in God used to adorn themselves." In other words, Paul is saying, "Culture is changing, but this is the way it was done in the past, and that's reason enough to keep doing it that way."

What is your opinion on women who have had a breast reduction?

score hidden · 12 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

These are the types of posts that belong in [r/askRPC](#). It's a question worth discussing. But it's not substantive enough for the main page.

A biblical sex commentary.

score hidden · 4 May 2020 · /r/askRPC

[/u/Deep_Strength](#) has a book on the subject. Our sidebar here also has pulled together a lot of content like what you're describing and put it in readily readable format. While I have put it on hold for some time, I have a book in the works that I will be returning to soon. This content is certainly out there. I know there are plenty of other Christian manosphere authors as well. Some of them are more reliable than others. Just take a look around.

That said, I have no idea how reliable you are, so it's hard to endorse what you're doing, and I'm debating removing this post for the self-promo without knowing what people will be reading. For all I know, it's a bait-and-switch and you've got some satanist garbage on your website.

There's one blogger who pretended to be a Christian red pill guy, yet was writing lots of blue pill content; another guy who claimed the same, but was going to such extremes as to have blog posts about how watching porn glorified God. You have to earn your place in the community here before you start promoting what you have to say. Start posting what you think would be valuable content to our sub, and as we see that your use of Scripture is appropriate and your understanding of the red pill is solid, and then let's talk.

In the meantime, especially given that it's broken, I'm going to request that you remove the link to your blog.

Single church group

score hidden · 2 May 2020 · /r/RPChristians

This is more appropriate for [r/askRPC](#). Removed.

Do you think the pandemic, is the foundation for the mark of the beast?

score hidden · 28 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

This is a question for askRPC, not here. Also, I'm a preterist (partial, leaning full). The beast/antichrist are a thing of the past, so no sense looking forward to any of that. For further reading: <https://revelationrevolution.org/>

Feel free to repost on [r/askRPC](#)

Response to RPChristians from a Hindu

score hidden · 26 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I agree with [/u/justforgigs96](#) insofar as I'm unsure what the purpose of your post is. If you want to post something here, you've got to engage the community in some way. That means either discussing an aspect of red pill or Christian truth that would be beneficial for the community to understand and that is not contrary to Christian

belief (which it sounds like you may not be able to do) OR you can ask questions for the community to answer (which you certainly could be doing).

Also, given how the aspect of peripheral faiths isn't necessarily on-point, this might be better content for [r/askRPC](#).

Lastly, as the other guy alluded to (though I don't necessarily track with his explanation), Christianity's position toward polygamy is more nuanced and not necessarily in alignment with what you make it seem.

Reposting as text: Advice on how to manage and potentially create a Red Pill women's subreddit for Christian women.

score hidden · 25 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

As [u/TheChristianAlpha](#) referenced, I'd be interested in chatting further about this. You're not the first woman to ask about doing this, and my advice to you is the same as I gave to the others: start out by posting content here that you find valuable for other women to know:

- What are unique things single girls need to be thinking about?
- How to inspire your husband to want to lead you?
- Why some men won't initiate and how to overcome that problem?
- How to handle marital conflict as a woman?
- Share examples from your own life or tell stories about your friends that affirm what the bible says about gender and relationships and why it's significant.

You may think of even better topics than these! I'm just working off the top of my head.

As you build rapport through high value content here, you will quickly become someone we can stand behind, and it would be much easier to endorse a sub like this. The women here will also realize you're someone they can learn from, especially in a Tatus 2 sense. That would be truly awesome.

With that foundation, I'd be happy to help you build such a sub. What I don't want is someone who is half committed or doesn't have much to offer the Christian female community. Without getting to know you, it's hard to tell which camp you'd fall into, hence building rapport here first.

Now, I do realize that some of the men in this community aren't too keen on the posts addressed primarily to women. If that's your hangup, I'm happy to chat in other ways to work toward establishing that foundation. I'd really like to see this happen eventually, and have thought about starting it a number of times, myself. But I ultimately hold with Titus 2, Song of Solomon, and other places of the Bible that model women mentoring other women (though not to replace a husband's role, but as a supplement).

Also: all your stats are going to be relevant here also. Are you actually the kind of woman other women will want to be like? Should they be learning from you at all? I've recently seen some of the videos [u/pearlsandstilettos](#) is putting out with [u/bsutansalt](#). Look at what she's doing for the general population as a resource for what you can be doing for Christian women. But above all: remember that you're always going to have a bigger impact on women and the world through individual discipleship. A large group gathering place should always be seen as a hobby, not your primary ministry.

Also, if you're married, how does this ambition jive with your husband's goals and mission?

Just some things to think about.

Galatians 5, or The Answer to "Is XXXXXXXX a Sin?"

score hidden · 16 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

[u/ruizbuja](#) beat you to the punch on this one. He just uses Romans 14 instead of Galatians 5, but it sounds like the conclusions are the same. His analysis is a much more thorough break-down, and it gives a much clearer explanation for why you can't just go around sinning whenever you feel like it.

Either way, I'm glad you've discovered this very important aspect of how we ought to relate with God and orient our lives. I'll investigate Galatians 5 further, as I don't think I've read it recently enough with this context in mind.

For quick reference, ruiz's post is here:

https://www.reddit.com/r/TrueChristian/comments/f8vuke/is_this_a_sin_is_that_a_sin_not_the_right/ - I recommend everyone to read this as a supplement to what OP is saying here.

2 "Redpill" lies and deceptions built to enslave us.

score hidden · 7 April 2020 · /r/RPChristians

I think you're lacking insight of the oneness bond between God and man among those who are saved. Is God not excellent? Is he not sanctifying us into his likeness? Is God not in us? And if God is in us and he is excellent and he is sanctifying us into his image, should we not also become excellent in all the same ways he is? A failure to do this would seem to be sin to me.

The fact that God is in us is significant here. I've often commented before that the ultimate goal is not that we do things for God. This amounts to an external show of action of his will over our will in our lives. Some people praise the concept of defying their own will for God. Great. That's a start. But if sanctification is working in any way in your life, then *your will* gradually BECOMES *his will* until doing what you want to do IS doing what God wants to do. So, when you talk against man becoming his own point of origin, you're neglecting the impact of sanctification on a person's life.

And let's be clear: even secular MRP is going to say, "If you have a crappy frame, fix your frame before you start projecting it on others." That is, you have to have a proper frame before it's worth holding frame or living in your own point of origin. Secular RP will also say that your frame is "your best self."

Our best self is our fully sanctified self. A fully sanctified person's own desires ARE God's desires. They don't have to deny their own will in order to do God's will. They live out of their own heart and desires as one already fully aligned with God, whose internal compulsions are conformed to his character and will. This is an even better state than the one who still has to actively deny himself every time he makes a decision - because that person's heart isn't actually being transformed; he's just becoming better and better and conforming his behaviors.

Now, let's be clear: this process won't be complete until we're in heaven (unless you're Nazarene and believe in total sanctification). But that doesn't mean we can ignore all progress on earth. Part of chasing excellence is the path of becoming that person.

- Chase Excellence: Become more and more like Christ
- Operate From Your Own Point of Origin: As your frame improves from your pursuit of internal Christ-likeness, your internal point of origin is the EXACT place you want to operate from.

I have also commented to men before: I would MUCH rather you live out of your own point of origin than out of some idealistic notion of how you think you SHOULD be living. Yes, that means you will start sinning a lot more. But it also shows you EXTREMELY fast the true nature of your heart.

Those who behavior-control themselves as their *primary* mode of living ultimately identify themselves through their behavior and believe that their behaviors are the ultimate decider of their relationship with God. This is better known as legalism. Those who operate out of their own frame recognize quickly where they haven't yet been sanctified and are able to pray, repent, and work with God toward the internal change - the "renewing of

your mind" - on those issues.

I'd like to talk [20M].

score hidden · 23 March 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Locked until edited for Rule 2 information and more information on what advice you actually need. Also, while there are certainly a few people I would endorse for personal, one-on-one chats (ex. mods, /u/TheChristianAlpha, other ECs), it's generally a bad idea to open the door to a 3k+ community and assume that whoever randomly says "yes" will be a reliable source of information. We have ECs for a reason.

Are women allowed to post?

score hidden · 17 March 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Yes, women are certainly permitted to post here. However, this particular thread is locked for lacking Rule 2 information. Please edit with this information and PM or another mod so we can unlock the post.

In the meantime ...

I really have a sense of feeling like he deserves someone with undying love for him no matter what and believe he should find someone new that is making him happy.

Way to hamster this one. You're unsatisfied and want out, but you find a way to rationalize that somehow it's for his benefit to end all of this? If he wants out, he can make that decision for himself. If you want out and you're willing to sin (divorce) to do it, take ownership of that rather than using cop-outs like this to make yourself feel better about a bad decision.

How to deal With People that have Contempt on you?

score hidden · 12 March 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Be attractive. Don't be unattractive. What are your stats? Rule 2.

How to game my fiancé?

score hidden · 10 March 2020 · /r/RPChristians

Rule 2. Edit to add this info. Locked until then. PM me or another mod when you do so I don't miss it and forget to unlock this.

In the meantime ...

things get a little dry, definitely not her fault as she is a reflection of me

She's not a reflection of you yet - especially if you're not even around each other often. She's only a reflection of you after she's had time to mold to your leadership. It sounds like you're not even close to having been together long enough for that to happen. It's possible she's just a dry person. Or it's possible that you're dry and she doesn't know how to deal with you. Or it's possible that neither of you are dry, but that you're both on different wavelengths so your passions never line up.

But don't play the "your wife is a reflection of you" card before you're even married. She will be like you, and if you keep this up you might find yourself very unsatisfied. So definitely take ownership of being your own solution. But don't make excuses for her before marriage either. You need to know now if this is going to get screwed up or not.

Confused

score hidden · 9 March 2020 · /r/RPChristians

As others have noted, our community is predominantly men, but this sub intentionally keeps the door open for women to participate. The sidebar contains the following introduction:

We are a subreddit that exists to provide a place for Christians to discuss problems, solutions and insights on relationships, sex, and biblical masculinity according to biblical principles.

We are certainly open to topics on biblical femininity as well.

Our stated core principles are also on the sidebar:

- Genesis 1:28 - "Be fruitful and multiply" - God created us to be relational, sexual beings. It's okay to embrace that.
- 1 Corinthians 9:24-27 - God wants us to take care of our bodies. That means staying fit and exercising restraint both sexually (i.e. porn, pre-marital sex) and in our diets.
- Genesis 2:18, 3:16 - God designed husbands to be leaders and wives to be helpers. Although they have equal value in relation to God, we are not co-equals in authority within the household.
- Ephesians 5 - God designed physical relationships to parallel our spiritual one with Him; what God models on a spiritual level with us will work in our physical relationships as well.
- Galatians 6:1-10 - We can help, but you are ultimately responsible for your own life decisions. This is how it works with your spouse too. We are not here to help you engage in destructive manipulation tactics on your SO.

That said, I'm with [/u/CarelessBowler5](#) in wanting to know the context that brings you here, as that affects how we respond. I'm locking this post until you edit it to include an answer to that question.

should men be the head of the house?

score hidden · 2 March 2020 · /r/RPChristians

This question shouldn't need to be asked here. It is plastered everywhere on our sidebar and inherent in all of our discussions. This is such a low-quality, over-basic post that I'm locking it from further discussion.

How to find Devout Christians my Age?

score hidden · 17 December 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Devout Christians are rare anywhere, not just Australia. The solution isn't to look harder. The people who often come off as "devout" really aren't "devout" at all. They're pious. They have an appearance of being "devout" because they "devote" so much of their time, money, etc. to churchianity, but they're not actually doing the work God called them to do. They're not making disciples. They're not sharing their faith. They just serve in 3-4 different ministries and show up to all the volunteer projects their congregation schedules so they feel like an all-star to the guy who calls himself a pastor.

If you want a truly devout believer to connect with, the best way is to disciple someone into being the exact type of person you want to relate with in the first place.

The Importance of Being Happy

score hidden · 26 November 2019 · /r/RPChristians

[/u/redwall92](#) is spot-on on this one. RP is not about finding happiness. It's about discerning truth. There are many happy people on both the red and blue lines, just as there are unhappy people on both sides. You're trying to affix a false relationship between happiness and the red pill.

That said, you're right: the red pill cannot be the source of someone's happiness - not sex, nor women, nor amusement parks or money or Netflix. Our satisfaction and happiness is found in God - and it is that restored relationship for which Jesus died.

Yes, this is on our sidebar, codified as the 400 series.

What are your thoughts on kissing a girl on the first date?

score hidden · 4 November 2019 · /r/RPChristians

This is more of an [r/askRPC](#) question. Because I didn't see it in time, I'll leave it up anyway. But low-effort stuff like this belongs over there in the future.

religion and the red pill and books

score hidden · 10 October 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Removed. I have no objection to posting to Rollo's content that are relevant here - in fact, I encourage it. But you can't just post a link. We don't allow link posts for a reason.

Please provide some insights on what you learned from the video, some of the interesting points, things you might disagree with, etc. Posts MUST be substantive.

Career change

score hidden · 4 October 2019 · /r/RPChristians

This post is better suited for [r/askRPC](#). Please re-post it there.

I love The Red Pill

score hidden · 16 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I'm removing this just because it doesn't add much of value. Feel free to repost on [r/askRPC](#) with a little more content or a question to go with it.

Confronting the myth that you have to “earn sex” in marriage, and that if your wife deprives you, or worse, cheats on you with another man, it is completely your fault as a man for not being “red pillled” enough to stop her. This attitude is blue pillled, and takes away responsibility from women.

score hidden · 11 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I almost removed this post for concern trolling. But given our pleasant interaction in mod chat on another matter, I'm inclined to assume you're not trolling - just didn't have your head on straight when you wrote this. I don't have time to explain myself fully, but here's the snapshot:

First, you're confusing blame with responsibility. Women are to blame. But men are responsible for those entrusted under their authority, just as Christ is responsible for the Church, his bride, under his authority. If a manager hires an employee who screws up the whole office, the employee is to blame, but the manager is responsible to deal with the mess. Even worse if the CEO says, "Sorry, you can't fire her. You hired her, she's your problem now." Are you going to win any points with the CEO every time you blame the staff member for the screwed up state of your office at the executive meetings?

I'm all for blaming women when they're at fault. But I'm more interested in being a responsible manager over my

own home. Blaming my wife might make me feel vindicated, but feelings are for girls and this is about getting your house in order. Crying to all my relatives that I'm too weak to get control over my wife so they can do my work for me doesn't strike me as the particularly manly or responsible thing to do. That's kind of like saying, "I can't afford my \$100/mo health insurance premium, so let me get 10 other people who are better off than me to pay \$10 each toward my premium so I don't have to pay it at all." Get that liberal garbage out of here.

Lastly, you have **ABSOLUTELY NO CONCEPT AT ALL** what frame is. You're confusing SMV with frame. Social status, looks, wealth, fame - none of these are frame. They are all external factors that women use to size-up a man before investing much time in him. Frame is not external; it's internal. It's the way you project yourself into the world. Maintaining frame is continuing to project yourself rather than allowing others to project themselves onto you. A titanium, barbed wire frame is the guy who pushes people away because he has no problem telling people to screw off when they want something from him. A fortified palace frame is the guy who draws people toward him by the way he tells them to screw off.

Red pill states that you may improve your frame so that she is less inclined to act out her hypergamous nature

Are you kidding me? I call shenanegins! AWALT. You can't control hypergamy. You make it work for you.

This entire post reeks of flagrant misunderstandings of the red pill. Back to the sidebar with you.

Self-conscious about things I cannot change immediately.

score hidden · 9 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

This should be an [r/askRPC](#) question - not substantive enough here. Please re-post it over there.

Also, OYS. Midgets have reason to be upset about their height, but the ones who own it still get laid. Heck, Joaquin Phoenix has that unusually pronounced and off-center strip below his nose that's totally awkward, but he owns it and is a star. You got problems? Own them. Don't hide them.

I believe I have found my mission

score hidden · 2 September 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Due to vagueness and low-quality, I'm removing this post. Please re-up it when you add some more details about why you've selected this particular mission and once you have some vision to share about how you're going to live it out in a way that isn't vague and amorphous.

Any tips/resources for evangelism in the west?

score hidden · 27 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Lots to say on this. But this is a PERFECT question for askRPC, as it's too off-topic for the main sub. I'm going to remove this and request you post it there. Thanks!

was lutheranism cucked from the start?

score hidden · 26 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Again, good and interesting questions - but off-topic here.

Need help, asktrp was unable to help, maybe you guys can.

score hidden · 15 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Lots and lots that needs to be said here. But before going there, this is locked until the Rule 2 information is added in. It is virtually impossible to help you without that information.

A mission

score hidden · 7 August 2019 · /r/RPChristians

That's not a mission. That's an amorphous goal that even someone like Joel Osteen would tout from the pulpit. Please read the sidebar content on developing a mission and come back. In the meantime, this post is removed for soliciting our members to something that we can't vet - Rule 4.

How to improve sex with wife?

score hidden · 8 July 2019 · /r/RPChristians

For reference, while I appreciate the edit to add a small component of the Rule 2 information being added, I agree with [/u/OsmiumZulu](#) that so much of this information is covered on the sidebar that I'd like to see you read that first, then come back and post a more narrow question about what has or hasn't worked and why.

On Sodomy by bonald

score hidden · 20 May 2019 · /r/RPChristians

This is the definition of a low effort post. There's a reason we don't allow link posts. I have no problem with people posting links - but you've got to give us something else to go along with it. What's the article about? Why is it relevant to this sub? How did it affect your ministry or sex life? What applications do you expect people to walk away with? Something.

What to look for in wife

score hidden · 21 March 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Removed for Rule 4. If you want to re-post this with a description of the content in text and a link to your video at the end, that's fine. But this comes off as if you're just trying to use our sub to get more views.

Any RPChristians Near Dayton, OH?

score hidden · 15 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

To all, be extremely cautious about the risks of doxxing yourself or giving enough information about yourself for someone else to dox you.

While I have exchanged personal contact information with many of you, including face-to-face meetings, I only do this to the degree that I genuinely trust a user in advance, and where the prospective benefit outweighs the risk.

Do not exchange personal identifying information with anyone on this sub unless you believe that the benefit you would attain from doing so outweighs the potential risk of any involvement you have with this sub (including things you've posted or commented) getting to your wife, your boss, your friends, posted on your social media account, etc.

I received access to a reddit account not mine.

score hidden · 15 February 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Yeah, this is definitely not a post for this sub. I'd recommend just deleting the credentials and not worrying about it. If you have a used phone, it could be a remnant from the previous user, or perhaps someone else logged into their account using your phone. Or maybe a device that you have synchronized to your phone was used by someone else to log into reddit. There's a million ways this could happen.

I'm sure there is another subreddit for this type of stuff, I'm just not sure what it would be.

State of the Manosphere - Rollo

score hidden · 30 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

Sorry, this is way too low effort. You gotta give some kind of summary. We don't allow link posts for a reason.

Red Pill Discord for Discussion and Support

score hidden · 10 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I'm removing this temporarily to give time to discuss with the other mods. I'm mildly concerned about directing our users to a non-RPC sub when we don't know what content will be taught there, what conclusions will be reached, who will be running it, if it's faith-based or secular, etc. Also, we don't have any authority to take action if something happens over there that works against RPC's goals and interests, which can be concerning. Please update this with lots of additional information so we can evaluate whether it's a safe space or not, and whether we can trust the authority of those who moderate the discord in the absence of any of our authoritative involvement. It's not a matter of stepping on anyone's toes or wanting to take over ... just a lot of unknowns.

Question - Book Recommendation on Finding Your Mission?

score hidden · 4 January 2019 · /r/RPChristians

I'm removing secular sources from this thread for obvious reasons.

Would the Modern Woman be Attracted to Jesus?

score hidden · 26 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians

This is a fun read. I suppose my biggest question is: how's that working out for you?

Specifically, the formula you propose at the end is too nebulous to have any actual value. Does denying oneself mean sacrifice just for the sake of sacrifice? What does it mean to take up one's cross? It sounds beautiful and christiany, but without the context of who Jesus is, they're just idle words.

Your end formula is also only targeted at one single thing Jesus told us to do, and certainly doesn't even embody the fullness of being Christ-like. More to the point: it does nothing to address the relational issues men find themselves in, as you acknowledge is still lacking in your own life. Until you have the results, the advice is suspect.

Perhaps the biggest problem inherent in your post is the confusion between the physical and the spiritual. When we use Christ as the model, it's not by the way he attracted physical women on earth. He didn't set out to do that in the first place. He did attract a spiritual bride, though. So rather than looking at whether or not Jesus was a physical Chad, contemplate the spiritual truths in his relationship with the church.

It seems to me that you misunderstood this core and foundational concept inherent in everything this sub teaches. Don't look at how Jesus would have attracted physical women, as that was never his goal. Look at how he attracted his bride. You'll find that all the one-sided, partial picture verses you quoted are well taught here, but alongside the other aspects of Jesus's character that you left out. It's highly suspect to say you "don't pretend to present a full picture of Jesus in a few verses," but then clearly present only verses that paint a partial picture.

Back to the sidebar.

Burn the NIV

score hidden · 15 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians

As a moderator note: all of the mods agree that the 2011 NIV (and any revisions thereafter) is a relatively awful translation that does the original language an incredible disservice and often lends itself to grossly inaccurate interpretations of the text. We also recognize that their insistence to force gender-neutral language in an otherwise highly gendered text is a weak concession to the feminine imperative and reinforces the ongoing anti-male sentiment plaguing many churches.

That said, the attitude with which you communicate the point is not well-taken. This community is designed to help men, not flame against feminism and women. Pointing out the flaws in an overly-feminized culture, and even expressing frustration and anger against the impact this has on the broader church culture is appropriate. But trash-talking and raging are not appropriate here. This is not a hate community. Consider this a warning.

SHAME Case Study #2: The Freezing Point Of Water And The Isolation Of Shame

score hidden · 15 December 2018 · /r/RPChristians

You have been warned on more than one occasion, including by me personally, to stop using the oversized text. Take note, and the other mods have agreed, that further infraction will result in your posts and comments being removed.

Protection of the innocent femininity

score hidden · 12 November 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Let me be clear: this is not the position of the moderators.

I have debated with myself and others on a number of occasions whether or not to allow women to participate here. 4 out of the 5 mods have weighed in already and seem to agree to their ongoing place here, for differing reasons.

Let me also note that this is not a church. 1 Cor. 14:33-35 does not apply here. If you like, you can download the reddit extended suite extension and create labels to help you remember who the girls and boys are, or you can simply block any women so you don't have to read their comments.

The reason I have left this post up is simply to allow anyone to discuss the issue openly, not as an endorsement of the suggestion itself.

Question: Any Advice for a man wanting to start a relationship with a women?

score hidden · 18 September 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I'm temporarily locking this post until you edit it to comply with Rule 2. Once you do that, we'll be better able to help. Quite frankly, it sounds like you haven't read much of the sidebar yet, as many of your questions can be answered there. But without seeing your Rule 2 info, we can't really know where exactly you're at and where you're coming from.

Im a little women who needs some word of wisdom.

score hidden · 17 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I'm temporarily locking this post until you edit it to comply with Rule 2.

Head over heels infatuation.

score hidden · 15 August 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I have temporarily locked this post until it is edited to comply with Rule 2. As much as we would love to communicate with you on a conceptual level about this issue, relevant feedback can't be given until we know more about your situation. Thanks!

Sexuality

score hidden · 29 April 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Hey, I'm removing these posts - not because I don't want you to post this content, but because I'd like you to add more details with this.

I prohibit link posts for a reason, and it seems like you're trying to skirt around that by just posting the link with no context. What I've told other people who have wanted to post links, I usually have a few quick guidelines:

1. Do it as a text post [which on this sub is automatic]
2. Include a summary of the content in the link sufficient that someone could engage in the conversation without actually having to click on the link
3. Include a discussion prompt, such as "I'd love to talk about ___" or "What do you think about ___?"
4. Include the link at the bottom with a line: "If you'd like to read more, check this link ..."

Following this format will get you a lot more participation and discussion, which is better for both you in getting feedback and the sub as a whole :)

Also, you might want to space this out a bit. I know you're super into orthodoxy right now, which is cool. But I'd also be cautious not to have yourself labeled as "that guy who's always pushing orthodoxy," which your flair already kind of does :/ You've got some great things to say and I wouldn't want you to lose credibility by boxing yourself in a niche.

I hope this helps. That said, feel free to re-post these links (preferably one per day) pursuant to the guidelines above :) Thanks for your ongoing participation and contributions, brother!

Let's start a distinctly RP Christian feminist movement!

score hidden · 22 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

I don't know ... should this be the first ever post taken down by this sub? I'll let /u/OsmiumZulu and /u/rocknrollchuck decide :p

I just don't even know what to say to this. It's basically saying, "Men, do everything and let your wives rest atop your slave labor because she's a woman and she deserves it because she has a vagina and you don't." Combine that with your comments in the other sub against biblical authority structure ... It's attitudes like this that make me want to take up cussing.

Jesus defined masculinity

score hidden · 22 February 2018 · /r/RPChristians

Warning: This is a troll post. Take that into account in your review.

This user has been temp-banned for 3 days. Feel free to leave your comments all the same, but do it for the benefit of the community and not to engage in an argument with a troll.

The Real Purpose of Woman!!!

score hidden · 8 January 2018 · /r/RPChristians

If you're just asking the question, this is fine. But if your point is to get people to watch the video without any description or explanation, that's not cool. I'll give you the benefit of the doubt and leave this up, but put in a little more effort to posts that link to outside content.

Simple Questions

score hidden · 1 September 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

As was shared with me recently, there's some confusion over what constitutes "beta traits." Many people call things like kindness, compassion, empathy, etc. beta traits as a gut reaction because betas emphasize them. But RP doesn't actually define the traits themselves as alpha or beta; rather, the traits can be alpha or beta depending

on who is applying them and for what reason.

So, if a guy is acting kind and compassionate to his wife because he thinks she will leave him if he doesn't, that's a beta trait. If another guy acts the exact same way because his wife makes him happy and he wants to reward her with his kindness and compassion, that's an alpha expression of the same traits.

From what I gather, a person is beta if they (among many other things):

- Operate on covert contracts
- Function on what they feel they need to do to get by
- Hide their faults
- Respond to threats passive aggressively
- Look for affirmation/validation from others
- Their plan for life is reactive to what the world throws at them

A person is alpha if they

- Operate on overt boundaries
- Function on what they want to do to enjoy life
- Own their faults
- Respond to threats with active aggression
- Don't need affirmation/validation from others
- Their plan for life is proactive, shaping the world around them

With these things (and more) in mind, you'll see quickly that buying your wife flowers, watching a chick flick, and rubbing her feet can all be done by an alpha male without compromising his alpha. The alpha does these things as an ongoing pattern of maintaining control over his environment. Part of that control falls into the "reward good behavior" advice we often see.

The "pure alpha" does not "care for themselves only" - they simply decide for themselves who they will care about and when and how and why. They don't let culture, social norms, etc. tell them who they should care for. If they decide they don't want to care about their wives anymore, for better or worse, they believe that's their prerogative and we're not going to let culture tell us, "No, you have to love her because you're married!" But many do care for their wives anyway. Why? Because we want to. Because that's who we are - proactively living out of our internal sense of wholeness and not reactively trying to meet a standard or identity that culture tries to push on us.

Simple Questions

score hidden · 3 August 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

It wouldn't be manipulative at all. Just explain to him that you did have sex, realized it was a mistake, and that you want to do better for the man you're going to marry one day. That's not manipulative, that's high-integrity.

Simple Questions

score hidden · 1 August 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

It's very hard to get turned down by a partner, so make sure you don't do that.

More to [/u/AccountHoppingBunny](#) - in my marriage I have found the old adage to be true: *The greater the risk, the greater the reward.*

Some people like to "ease into" initiating sex. They start very gradually and escalate. This is safe. If you hit a stopping point, you have all kinds of rationalizations as to why it didn't work, and you really didn't put yourself very far out there, so it's not like he's rejecting you ... he's just rejecting the little bit of effort you threw out. In your mind you think, *I still have a lot more to offer. I could get him if I wanted*, and that belief makes you feel safe.

But at some point, if you don't just put yourself fully on the table (sometimes literally), your mini-failures might breed enough resentment and insecurity that your "all-in" cards absolutely have to stay hidden to protect your last vestige of dignity and self-esteem. As a result, you're never willing to try something big.

Seriously, though ... work out hard and diet for a few weeks to do some short-term toning (after 2 weeks hard, it will always be noticeable), then put on some lingerie, light some candles, get some mood music set up, if you have kids, send them to grandma's for the night (even if you have to pay her and it doesn't make sense in your calendar), and maybe bring something fun into the bedroom that you can dangle when he walks in (handcuffs, whipped cream, etc.).

For some people, they have been rejected so many times that this thought absolutely terrifies them. "If he rejects me then, I'll have nothing left. I will have literally given it my all - and then I will know that it's not just the timing or the mood, it's *ME that he's rejecting*." That's a huge risk. But if it pays off (and it usually will), then the pay-off is big. First, you get a great night. Second, he sees that you have more to offer than what he previously knew (i.e. the \$125 shoes from my other comment, rather than the discount wares), so he's interested again. Third, you'll feel sexier and be more motivated in the future. Fourth, you will be reaffirmed in the relationship that you really do have what it takes to please him, so your relationship will deepen rather than growing into fear and resentment.

Simple Questions

score hidden · 1 August 2017 · [/r/RedPillWomen](#)

Sounds like you've definitely got him interested. That's good! Keep upping your game (but not beyond sustainability) and he'll keep coming after you. My suggestion is not to put out until you're married, for a variety of reasons ... but suffice it to say that if you make yourself so desirable that he'll stick with you without sex until marriage (and you can keep that desire going into marriage rather than letting yourself go), you're going to be one happy wife when sex is on the table and he finally gets to unleash the pent-up desire he has for you, and that's going to make it easier for you to keep upping your sexiness game.

This is the positive-cycle that counters the negative-cycle that most people get stuck in, where sexlessness breeds resentment breeds less sex breeds more resentment, etc. The negative cycle starts when sex becomes commonplace and boring because you make it too cheap or routine (see my other comment in this thread to [/u/AccountHoppingBunny](#)).

If it doesn't get to marriage, at least you haven't upped your n-count for no reason.

Simple Questions

score hidden · 1 August 2017 · [/r/RedPillWomen](#)

- Same = same
- more of the same = more of the same.

- Changed strategy = changed results.

You want changed results, so you need to change your strategy for getting the kind of passion you want. So, what you're really asking is what new strategies are likely to give you better results than you have now rather than worse results.

To be perfectly honest, if you think something's going to help, you probably know him well enough to be right. I just wrote [this comment](#) on another thread, which might be helpful. The general concept is that after some time in a relationship, the typical affection and intimacy becomes "cheap." You know you can get it anytime you want, so it doesn't hold high value anymore, whereas early in the relationship you had to work for it, so you desired it more.

So, when he's around you he probably feels like he's strolling through "Discount Clothes - All Wears 90% Off Store Wide!" It's comfortable and easy, so we shop at cheap places like this. But when he sees an amazing blazer in the latest GQ magazine, he thinks, "Man, I really wish I had something like that" and he just might start working harder to get that new blazer.

Simply put, don't be the "going out of business sale" girl - stock your shelves with some of that high quality product. He might not even know you've that stuff in the back room because he hasn't seen it on the shelves, so he's never bothered to ask. He assumes all of your wares are consistent with what he's seen so far.

Here's the key, though. Once you give him the high-quality product (i.e. buy some new lingerie, surprise him with a candlelit bedroom, have some whipped cream by the bed, etc.) - after 2-3 times, stop giving it to him until he works for it. If everyone drove a BMW, nobody would care about BMWs. If his entire closet was full of that blazer, he wouldn't value that blazer anymore. He'd know instinctively that he had a lot of high quality blazers in his closet and that he has better clothes than most other men ... but *he will not personally value it* because he doesn't have to work for it anymore, nor is it a symbol of his hard work. It's commonplace.

Now, if he's consistently putting in the effort to rekindle things, then you should be consistently returning the favor. After all, you don't want to make him think he's throwing money at a store and getting a defective blazer with loose strings and a button falling off. But my guess is that when he starts putting in the effort, you're going to enjoy it and be into it too, so that shouldn't be much of a problem.

Simple Questions

score hidden · 1 August 2017 · /r/RedPillWomen

isn't actively looking for a relationship but that he can change his mind as we connect ... (No sex)

Educated guess: he's dangling commitment the same way you're dangling sex - it's an elusive goal that you don't intend to give until the other person goes first. Win that battle or he'll be gone in time ... but if you don't make him want your carrot bad enough (and keep wanting it even after marriage), he might be gone anyway when someone with an easier-to-get carrot comes along. It's a tough game, indeed.